MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

October 20th, 2026

3:30 WORK SESSION 5:00 REGULAR MEETING

PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that the MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION will hold a regular Commission meeting in the Commission meeting room at 48 West Young Street, Morgan, Utah.

3:30 JOINT WORK SESSION WITH PLANNING COMMISSION

Planning Outpost, Valerie Claussen – MORGAN COUNTY GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

5:00 COMMENCEMENT OF MEETING

(A) Opening Ceremonies

1. Welcome
2. Invocation and/or Moment of Reflection: **Hon. Commissioner Newton**
3. Pledge of Allegiance

(B) Consent Agenda Items

1. Approval of the Morgan County Commission Minutes from October 6th, 2026.
2. Approval of a letter of support for the RCOG grant application of Morgan City for their proposed fishpond and surrounding amenities.
3. Acknowledgement of the October 1 notice rescinding stage 1 fire restriction order #WFCLO2619.
4. Approval of RFP language for Rodeo Stock Contractor Services.
5. Acknowledgement of the Utah Retirement Systems compliance audit.

(C) Commissioner Declarations of Conflict of Interest

(D) Public Comments (please limit comments to 3 minutes)

(E) Presentations

(F) Action Items

1. **Bret Heiner** – Discussion/Decision – Morgan County Public Works Director
   Discussion and decision on Phase II of the Fairgrounds Trail project.
   This came before the Commission on September 16th, 2025 where the action item was postponed but was never placed on a subsequent agenda.

2. **Kent Page** – Discussion/ Decision – Morgan County Planning & Zoning
   Wasatch Peaks Ranch Plat 1, Third Amendment: consolidating two lots (C15 & C16).

3. **Morgan County Commission** – Discussion/ Decision – Appointment of Hearing Officer
   Discussion and decision on **Resolution CR 26-45** appointing Craig Call as the Administrative Hearing Officer to hear appeals under Morgan County Code Title 15 Chapter 154, Surveying and Survey Monuments.

4. **ROAM Public Infrastructure District** – Discussion/ Decision – Trustee Appointments
   Discussion and decision on **Resolution CR 26-48** affirming and reappointing certain Trustees and terms of officer for the Board of Trustees for ROAM Public Infrastructure District No. 1 and ROAM Public Infrastructure District No. 2.

5. **Morgan County Fairgrounds Board –** Discussion/ Decision – Fee Waiver Request
   Discussion and decision on **Resolution CR 26-44** to waive certain planning and zoning fees for the Fairgrounds Pavilion; Permit # 0442401.

6. **Morgan County Commission –** Discussion/ Decision – Auditorium Upgrade
   Discussion and decision on funding a feasibility study in partnership with the Morgan Valley Arts Council for upgrades to the Morgan County Auditorium and designating the funding mechanism for said study.

7. **Morgan County Commission –** Discussion/ Decision – UCIP Representatives
   Discussion and decision on **Resolution CR 26-51** designating a UCIP Representative and Alternate for the upcoming annual meeting in Sandy, UT on November 18th, 2026.

8. **Hon. Commissioner Matthew Wilson –** Discussion/ Decision – Commissioner Request
   Discussion and decision on a motion to reconsider pursuant to Morgan County Resolution CR 26-03 'Commission Rules of Order and Procedure,' Rule VIII (10); Motion for reconsideration is a vote on action item 6 from the September 15th Commission Meeting regarding the "Cottonwoods at Mountain Green Development, Third Amendment."
   Procedural Note: *If motion to reconsider is approved, the action item will be brought back for discussion and decision at the next scheduled County Commission meeting.*

9. **Hon. Leslie A. Hyde –** Discussion/ Decision – Tentative 2027 Budget
   Discussion and approval of **Resolution CR 26-52 the** tentative 2027 Morgan County Budget and public notice that said tentative budget is available to the public in the Morgan County Clerk/Auditor's office until it is voted on in its final form at the December 1st, 2026 Commission meeting following the required public hearing.

10. **Hon. Leslie A. Hyde –** Discussion/ PUBLIC HEARING/ Decision – Budget Adjustments
    Discussion and approval of **Resolution CR 26-50** adopting certain adjustments to Morgan County's 2026 Budget.

11. **Kent Page –** Discussion/ PUBLIC HEARING/ Decision – Citizen Request Code Text Amd.
    Morgan County Code citizen initiated proposed text amendment to section 155.132: This code text amendment County **Ordinance CO 26-21** would permit, with a Conditional Use Permit issued by the Zoning Administrator, Recreational Vehicle Parks in the Town Center (TC) zoning designation.

12. **Kent Page –** Discussion/ PUBLIC HEARING/ Decision – County Planning and Zoning
    Morgan County Code proposed text amendment clarifying the intent of section 155.426 (C) (5):
    County Ordinance CO 26-22 "The flagpole or panhandle portion of a flag lot shall not be included in calculated gross square footage of a lot;"

13. **Morgan County Commission –** DISCUSSION ONLY – Kent Smith Park Trust Fund
    Discussion on Morgan County Ordinance 135 dated May 19, 1992 providing for the creation of trust fund accounts for Mountain Green / Kent Smith Memorial Park. There is nothing in the Ordinance language that gives a mechanism for dissolution. The fund was solvent in 2009 and no additional monies were deposited until 2016. Staff requests Commission's preference in keeping but clarifying this ordinance or unordaining the same.

14. Morgan County Commission – DISCUSSION ONLY – Public Safety Sales and Use Tax
Discussion on enacting a Morgan County Ordinance imposing a local option sales and use tax of three-tenths of one percent (0.30%) pursuant to Utah Code Annotated 59-12-2216; establishing the tax rate and retail transaction base.

(G) Commissioner Comments

- Commissioner Blocker
- Commissioner Newton
- Commissioner Fackrell
- Commission Vice Chair Nickerson
- Commission Chair Wilson

The undersigned does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda were posted as required by law this **14th** day of **October 2026**, then revised and reposted on **October 16th, 2026.**

Kate Becker – Morgan County Administrative Manager

The Commission may vote to discuss certain matters in closed Session (Executive Session) pursuant to Utah Code Annotated §52-4-205. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons needing auxiliary services for these meetings should call Kate Becker at 435-800-8724 at least 24 hours prior to this meeting. This meeting is streamed live.

MORGAN COUNTY UTAH

2026 General Plan

Rural by choice, connected by community

DRAFT

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements iv

Executive Summary v

How to Use this Plan vii

Utah State Code Compliance Summary ix

OUR VALLEY, OUR VISION 11

Public Participation Program 15

Morgan County Vision 17

OUR PEOPLE, OUR OPPORTUNITIES 19

Population & Household Growth 19

Housing 23

Housing Policies 30

Economic Development 32

Economic Development Policies 40

OUR CONNECTIONS, OUR RESILIENCE 42

Transportation Element 42

Transportation Policies 49

Water Service & Infrastructure 51

Water Service Policies 54

Sewer & Onsite Wastewater 55

Sewer & Onsite Wastewater Policies 59

Community Amenities 60

Community Amenities Policies 62

Public Facilities & Services 63

Public Facilities & Services Policies 66

Waterways, Sensitive Lands & Natural Hazards 67

Sensitive Lands & Natural Hazards Policies 73

OUR LAND, OUR COMMUNITIES 75

DRAFT

Land Use Element 75
Future Place Types 90
COMMUNITY AREA PLANS 108
Countywide Land Use Policies 109
Existing & Future Community Area Boundaries 116
Croydon Community 118
Croydon Community Policies 120
Enterprise Community 128
Enterprise Community Policies 130
Milton Community 138
Milton Community Policies 140
Mountain Green Community 149
Mountain Green Community Policies 151
Peterson Community 162
Peterson Community Policies 164
Porterville Community 172
Porterville Community Policies 174
Richville Community 180
Richville Community Policies 182
Round Valley Community 189
Round Valley Community Policies 191
Stoddard Community 200
Stoddard Community Policies 202
OUR IMPLEMENTATION, OUR GOALS 209
Community Implementation Goals & Policies 209
Amending the General Plan 217
APPENDIX A: X
APPENDIX B: X

DRAFT

DRAFT

Acknowledgements

County Commission

Matt Wilson, *Chair*

Vaughn Nickerson, *Vice Chair*

Raelene Blocker

Blain Fackrell

Mike Newton

Planning Commission

Maddie Maloney, *Chair*

Steve Wilson, *Vice Chair*

Randy Watt

Travis Taylor

Matthew King

Debbie Sessions

Chans McMillan

County Staff

Kate Becker, *County Administrative Manager & Acting Zoning Administrator*

Consultant

Planning Outpost

In partnership with

J-U-B Engineers, Inc. and

Gateway Mapping, Inc.

and

Zions Public Finance, Inc.

DRAFT

Executive Summary

Morgan County 2026 General Plan

Rural by choice, connected by community

Morgan County's General Plan establishes a long-range direction for land use, community investment, and stewardship of the valley's working lands and natural resources. Its central purpose is to maintain a rural, agricultural, family-oriented county while responding responsibly to changing household needs, regional pressures, and essential services. It primarily guides decisions in unincorporated areas and supports coordination with Morgan City and other partners.

A Shared Vision, Distinct Communities

The Plan reflects public participation through surveys, community workshops, open houses, forums, and opportunities to review proposed policies and maps. Residents emphasized rural character, agricultural preservation, reliable water, safe roads, recreation opportunities, and transparent decisions. These priorities inform five guiding principles: *protect rural and natural landscapes; align growth with community capacity; improve appropriate recreation connections; strengthen compatible local businesses; and build trust and community identity.*

Community Area Plans translate this countywide direction for Croydon, Enterprise, Milton, Mountain Green, Peterson, Porterville, Richville, Round Valley, and Stoddard. Each community's vision, policies, planning context, and Future Land Use Map guide the development patterns appropriate to its setting. The Plan does not assume that every community should accommodate the same forms or intensity of development.

Preserve the Rural Framework

The Plan recognizes residents' strong preference to preserve existing rural conditions and avoid additional growth. It does not establish a growth target or broadly support increased rural residential density. Future Place Types distinguish agricultural and rural landscapes from locations supporting neighborhood, commercial, employment, and civic uses. These designations guide decisions; they do not replace zoning or create development entitlements.

Rural Living and Rural Corridor areas retain a restrained approach to discretionary density increases. Listed implementing districts are not automatically appropriate on every property. Additional flexibility depends on location-specific community direction or a separately adopted framework defining eligibility and limits. The Plan discourages continuous residential and commercial frontage development and incremental fragmentation of agricultural lands.

DRAFT

Existing lawful resort areas are recognized, while amendments establishing new resort areas, expanding boundaries, or materially increasing supported resort intensity are strongly discouraged. Infrastructure investment and anticipated economic benefits alone do not justify such changes.

Support Community Life Without Broadening Growth

Population and household information helps anticipate needs, but projections are not development targets. Housing policies address different stages of life through appropriately located choices, preservation of existing homes, and selective review of development standards. Affordability and workforce needs do not independently justify greater intensity in rural or agricultural areas.

Economic development emphasizes existing businesses, agriculture, entrepreneurship, suitable employment areas, and compatible local services. Commercial activity should strengthen supported centers rather than extend continuously along rural roads. Community amenities emphasize existing resources, practical partnerships, lawful access, and sustainable operating responsibilities rather than unsupported facility commitments.

Match Decisions to Infrastructure and Natural Conditions

Transportation policy prioritizes safety, rural compatibility, regional coordination, emergency access, and useful walking and bicycle connections. A separate Transportation Master Plan will refine technical needs and project priorities. Water and wastewater planning requires demonstrated service capability and site suitability; neither utility availability nor proposed improvements independently justify additional density.

Water conservation, drinking-water protection, flood resilience, and geologic review are integral to responsible planning. Hazard exhibits identify potential constraints but do not replace applicable regulations or professional investigations. Conservation strategies, including voluntary easements and agricultural protection tools, are options for evaluation, not already funded programs or automatic density incentives.

A Practical Framework for Implementation

Implementation focuses on consistent staff review, cumulative impacts, verified infrastructure capability, enforceable commitments, appropriate development standards, and coordinated capital planning. Significant decisions should explain consistency with applicable policies, identify conflicts, and show how public concerns were considered. Amendments should respond to demonstrated needs and a broader planning rationale rather than frequent, piecemeal requests for additional development potential.

DRAFT

How to Use this Plan

Morgan County's General Plan is a long-range guide for land use, community investment, and stewardship of the County's rural landscapes. It primarily guides decisions in unincorporated areas and supports coordination with Morgan City and other partners. You do not need to read the entire document to begin using it, but relevant maps and policies should always be considered **together**.

Start with Your Question

Read Countywide and Community Direction Together

Countywide policies establish a common framework. Community Area Plans provide more specific direction based on local character, infrastructure, natural resources, and resident priorities. Where a community policy provides more specific direction for a defined location, it should guide review alongside applicable law and County regulations. A development pattern supported in one community is not automatically supported elsewhere.

Read the Map with the Description

Future Land Use Maps identify intended place types; the accompanying descriptions and policies explain their purpose and limits. A mapped designation does not automatically support every listed implementing district, the smallest lot size, or the highest development intensity. Baseline implementation and limited or location-specific options must be distinguished. Proposed density increases may require specific community direction, an adopted exception framework, or consideration of a Plan amendment. Service-area and hazard exhibits provide planning context. They do not guarantee utility connections, establish public access, or replace current regulatory information and site-specific investigations.

Understand What the Plan Does Not Approve

The General Plan does not, by itself, rezone property, approve development, eliminate existing lawful approvals, fund improvements, or authorize public use of private land. Parcel-specific zoning, permits, service eligibility, and access rights must be confirmed through the appropriate records and reviewing agencies.

Use the Plan to Evaluate Decisions

For significant proposals, identify the applicable vision, policies, mapped direction, infrastructure needs, natural constraints, and cumulative effects. Review should explain consistency, disclose conflicts, and address public concerns. Infrastructure availability alone does not establish support for increased development intensity.

DRAFT

Implementation recommendations identify future work, not automatic commitments. Proposed changes to the General Plan should follow the review direction in "Amending the General Plan."

> *The General Plan **guides** County decisions. It **can be changed**, but it should not be **ignored.** When considering major proposals, County officials should explain how the proposal fits the Plan's policies and maps and address any conflicts. Changes to the Plan should go through public review and be supported by clear reasons related to community character and the County's long-term goals, not just the needs of one project.*

***TABLE X.** General Plan Quick Reference*

If you want to…	Start here…
Understand the County's overall direction	Executive Summary, Vision Statement, and Guiding Principles
Find the direction for a particular community	The applicable Community Area Plan and Future Land Use Map
Understand a proposed land-use or zoning change	Future Place Types, Place Type Implementation, Countywide Land Use Policies, and the applicable community policies
Review housing or business priorities	Housing and Economic Development
Understand infrastructure or site constraints	Transportation, Water Service & Infrastructure, Sewer & Onsite Wastewater, and Waterways, Sensitive Lands & Natural Hazards
Find recreation and public-service priorities	Community Amenities and Public Facilities & Services
Understand implementation or proposed plan changes	Community Implementation Goals & Policies and Amending the General Plan

DRAFT

Utah State Code Compliance Summary

Overview of General Plan Requirements in Utah

Under Utah Code Title 17, Chapter 79, counties are required to prepare and adopt a comprehensive, long-range General Plan that addresses both present and future needs of the community. The plan should guide growth and development within the County's boundaries and may address topics such as land use, transportation, economic development, public services, and environmental stewardship.

Mandatory Plan Elements

At a minimum, a General Plan must include:

1. **The Land Use Element:** A map and narrative describing existing and proposed land uses, densities and development patterns.
2. **The Transportation and Traffic Circulation Element:** The general location and extent of existing and planned transportation facilities, including freeways, arterial and collector streets, public transit, active transportation facilities, and other appropriate transportation modes.
3. **The Water Use and Preservation Element:** The effect of development patterns on water demand and water infrastructure, methods for reducing water use in future and existing development, and opportunities to reduce water waste through County operations and practices.
4. **The Resource Management Plan:** Findings, objectives, and policies related to the use, protection, and management of natural and other identified resources, as provided in Utah Code Section 17-79-402. The plan also helps guide coordination with other agencies on resource-related issues.
5. **A Moderate-Income Housing Element:** Required only for a specified county under Utah law. Morgan County is not a specified county and is therefore not required to prepare a separate moderate income housing element, though this plan incorporates a discussion on housing opportunities throughout the County.

Optional but Encouraged Elements that Morgan County's Plan also includes are the following:

- Economic Development
- Community Amenities
- Public & Private Utilities & Infrastructure
- Waterways, Sensitive Lands & Natural Hazards

DRAFT

Flexibility and Local Control

While the state outlines required components, counties retain flexibility in determining the comprehensiveness, format, and extent of their General Plan. This enables each county to shape its plan according to local priorities, resources, and community values, while still meeting statutory obligations.

State Code Compliance Chart

Required Element	Plan Location(s)
Land Use	OUR LAND, OUR COMMUNITIES: Land Use Element & Community Area Plans
Transportation & Circulation	OUR CONNECTIONS, OUR RESILIENCE: Transportation Element
Water Use & Preservation	OUR CONNECTIONS, OUR RESILIENCE: Water Service & Infrastructure and *Appendix A*: Water Use & Preservation Element
Resource Management Plan	*Appendix B*: Amendments to the 2017 Resource Management Plan and the 2017 Resource Management Plan

DRAFT

OUR VALLEY, OUR VISION

This section establishes the foundation for Morgan County's General Plan: the valley's history, the character of its communities, and the values residents want to carry forward. It explains the purpose of the Plan, describes the public participation process, and presents the shared vision and guiding principles developed through community input. Together, these chapters connect Morgan County's agricultural heritage and rural identity with a clear direction for future land-use decisions, public investment, and community stewardship.

History & Background

Morgan County's history—from Indigenous homelands to agricultural settlements and railroad-linked communities—helps explain its land-use patterns, transportation routes, and rural identity. Its canyon geography and agricultural heritage continue to shape planning opportunities and limits as the County becomes more connected to the Wasatch Front.

Indigenous peoples used the high valleys and Weber River corridor for thousands of years, relying on fish, game, and plant resources and moving seasonally through canyons and meadows. These routes and resources reflect the longstanding importance of waterways, valley bottoms, and canyon access to life in the area.

Permanent Euro-American settlement began in the 1850s as Latter-day Saint settlers moved eastward into Morgan Valley. Reliable water, irrigable bottomlands, timber, and grazing lands supported small farming communities along the river and in side canyons. Improvements to roads through Weber Canyon helped establish settlements such as Morgan and Peterson. Compact communities surrounded by fields, pasture, and open hillsides remain a defining pattern today.

In 1862, territorial leaders established Morgan County and designated Morgan as the county seat. Small towns and farmsteads were connected by roads, canals, schools, churches, and cooperative stores. Families raised cattle, sheep, and dairy herds and grew hay, grain, and garden crops. Development remained concentrated in valley bottoms, while steep hillsides and higher elevations stayed largely open or in grazing use.

The railroad's arrival through Weber Canyon in the late 1860s connected the valley more directly to Ogden and regional markets. Farmers could ship products and obtain goods and equipment more easily. Rail access and improvements to roads and public facilities supported modest commercial and industrial growth, including a courthouse, bank, and canning facilities in Morgan. Growth remained gradual, preserving the County's small-town scale.

For much of the twentieth century, Morgan County remained sparsely populated and strongly agricultural. Farming, ranching, and local institutions anchored community life.

DRAFT

Consolidated schools and a combined city–county building improved services for a dispersed population while keeping major public facilities within established towns.

In recent decades, improved transportation and regional growth have strengthened connections to the Ogden–Salt Lake area. Subdivisions, ranchettes, and rural homes have developed alongside historic farms, especially near major roads and accessible valley lands. More residents commute to urban employment centers, increasing demand for housing, services, and transportation while placing pressure on agricultural land and open space.

This history provides the setting for the General Plan. Settlement patterns, irrigation systems, canyon routes, and working landscapes shape where development can occur and how it affects surrounding communities. The County's challenge is to respond to community needs while protecting its rural character, agricultural lands, and natural resources.

Countywide Framework

Existing Conditions & Trends

Morgan County remains rural, but its housing market, employment, and transportation needs are closely connected to the Wasatch Front. A small population, constrained valley geography, and strong agricultural heritage distinguish it from neighboring urban counties.

The County's population increased from approximately 9,523 in 2010 to 12,585 in 2023, with further growth anticipated. Although modest compared with urban counties, this increase is significant relative to Morgan County's population and limited developable land. Migration and residential development, rather than large-scale local employment expansion, have been important influences.

Growth is concentrated on valley floors and near established communities, where roads, water service, and gentler terrain make development more feasible. Steep slopes, canyon walls, flood-prone areas, and working agricultural lands limit expansion. Decisions about housing locations therefore have lasting effects on community character, service costs, and rural landscapes.

Housing costs reflect demand for rural living near regional employment centers. Data USA reported a 2023 median property value of approximately $600,900 and a homeownership rate of 90.2 percent. Market listings in 2026 showed median home prices of roughly $765,000 to $782,000. These different measures indicate a high-cost ownership market that can limit choices for younger households, local workers, and longtime residents.

Most workers travel outside the County for employment, and residents rely heavily on automobiles to reach jobs, schools, and services. Data USA reported an average commute of about 26 minutes and average household vehicle ownership of three cars. Regional employment supports household income, but commuting also increases the importance of roadway capacity, canyon access, and traffic safety.

Agriculture and small-scale industry remain important, alongside income earned outside the

DRAFT

County and recreation-related activity. Scenic landscapes and proximity to employment attract residents seeking rural living, but additional development can divide farmland and increase demands on services.

Together, these conditions call for careful decisions about housing, infrastructure, transportation, and land preservation. The Population, Housing, and Economic Development chapters provide more detailed information; this framework connects those issues to the County's overall planning direction.

Land Use & Development Patterns

Morgan County's geography and agricultural history shape where land uses occur. Valley floors and benches contain most communities, roads, irrigated fields, and residential development. Steep slopes, canyon lands, and higher elevations remain largely undeveloped or in open-space and resource uses.

The established pattern contrasts settled communities with surrounding agricultural and open lands. Homes and civic facilities are generally concentrated near existing roads and communities, while farms, grazing lands, and open landscapes maintain separation between developed areas.

Agricultural land serves several purposes. Fields, pastures, and irrigation systems support production, preserve views, and help maintain the County's rural identity. Dividing these lands into residential parcels can affect both their appearance and their continued usefulness for farming and ranching.

Residential proposals are most common where roads, services, and terrain make construction practical. County regulations provide for different development patterns, from very low-density rural uses to neighborhood and village-scale housing and mixed uses. The appropriate pattern depends on the location and applicable community direction—not simply the availability of services.

Commercial, industrial, and employment uses are comparatively limited and concentrated in specific locations. Highway commercial, neighborhood commercial, business park, industrial, and town center districts provide tools for accommodating these activities while protecting nearby homes and rural lands. Many residents nevertheless continue to rely on businesses outside the County for work, shopping, and services.

Natural conditions also affect land suitability. Floodplains, unstable slopes, canyon corridors, and other sensitive areas require attention to safety, environmental protection, and development costs. Scenic views, open space, and lawful recreation access are additional considerations.

The General Plan emphasizes working-land preservation, rural character, and distinct community settlement patterns. Where development is supported, its location and layout should follow the applicable Community Area Plan and avoid unnecessary division of agricultural and open lands. Nearby development, available infrastructure, or a conservation-oriented layout does not, by itself, justify additional density.

DRAFT

What is a General Plan?

A General Plan is the county's long-range guide for growth, development, and public investment over roughly the next 15 to 25 years. It reflects countywide values and priorities and provides a common framework for decisions by elected officials, county staff, partner agencies, developers, and residents across topics such as land use, transportation and county roads, natural resources, economic development, public safety and health, parks and recreation, and coordination with cities and special districts.

A General Plan helps counties:

- Coordinate development in unincorporated areas in a logical, efficient way that matches county service roles.
- Guide capital investments in roads, facilities, and emergency management with a long-term perspective.
- Preserve natural landscapes, open space, and community identity at a countywide scale.
- Support grants and funding efforts by demonstrating a clear, adopted vision and priorities.
- Plan proactively rather than reactively, so decisions respond to shared goals instead of only to individual proposals.

Planning Process

The planning process begins with **project initiation**, establishing scope, goals, and stakeholders for the County. An **existing conditions** analysis documents current demographic, economic, environmental, and land use conditions, while **community engagement** gathers input from residents, agencies, and partner jurisdictions to shape priorities.

From this, a countywide **vision and guiding principles** are developed, leading to a **land use and growth framework** that outlines where and how different parts of the County should change, remain stable, or be protected.

As **priorities** are identified and vetted, they are translated into draft policies and strategies, which are refined into the **final General Plan**, a cohesive, adopted guide for future growth, development, resource stewardship, and public investment across unincorporated areas and in coordination with cities. Community engagement was a core thread throughout this process, shaping the vision, priorities, and policies that appear in the chapters that follow.

DRAFT

Public Participation Program

The Public Participation Program describes how residents, stakeholders, and partner agencies contributed to the planning process. It summarizes the outreach activities the County used to gather input, the main themes heard from participants, and how that feedback informed the General Plan's goals and policies.

Public participation was an integral and critical part of the Morgan County General Plan update and helped ensure that the plan reflects both countywide priorities and the perspectives of residents, stakeholders, partner agencies, and local leaders. Outreach for the plan included public meetings, stakeholder discussions, and online opportunities for review and input, creating multiple ways for the community to identify concerns, express values, and help shape the plan's direction.

Public Engagement Opportunities

EVENT	OPPORTUNITY
Kick-off Meeting October 7, 2025	County Commission held a work session where the project outline and schedule was presented & discussed with the Commissioners.
General Plan Project Website October 2026-January 2027	Project information available 24/7 at resident's fingertips with updates, contact information to provide feedback on the plan or any of its components.
Resident Survey October 24, 2025 to November 24, 2025	A resident survey was deployed to obtain feedback from the community at-large on what they value and see as priorities, what they see as the biggest challenges, and what they envision the future to be.
Community Area Workshops November 3, November 5, November 6, and November 10, 2025	Residents were invited to attend community-specific meeting workshops where the communities completed SWOT analysis, provided feedback on what community meant to them, what they envisioned the future.
Themes Survey January 25, 2026 to February 26, 2026	A survey was deployed to obtain feedback from residents regarding the themes that emerged from the Community Area Workshop and whether or not they strongly agreed or disagreed with what was presented.
General Plan Open Houses April 27, April 28, & May 6, 2026	Residents were invited to attend a series of Open Houses at County offices to review and provide feedback on the draft of the Plan's themes & working exhibits for Land Use/Future Annexation, Transportation & County Trails.

DRAFT

Future Land Use Maps Comment Review Period April 27, 2026 to May 29, 2026	Future land use maps and exhibits from the Open House were posted on project website with a feedback form to submit if they had comments.
General Plan Forums September 28, 29, and 30, 2026	Residents were invited to attend a series of forums at County offices to obtain additional feedback on the revised land use maps and to review the Community Area Plan Visions and Policies.
Community Area Chapters and Future Land Use Maps Comment Review Period September 28, 2026 to October 22, 2026	Residents were notified of the Community Area chapters of the plan being available for review on the project's website to provide additional comment & feedback prior to the County's final work sessions & public hearings.
Joint Work Sessions October 20, 2026 October 27, 2026	Joint work sessions are scheduled/were held with the County and Planning Commissions and interested residents for the review of the proposed plan in preparation for the public hearings.
Public Hearings TBD Nov XX, 2026 December XX, 2026	Pursuant to Utah State Code 10-79-404 public hearings are/were scheduled and appropriately advertised with the Planning Commission prior to making recommendation of the plan adoption to the County Commission.

DRAFT

Morgan County Vision

Morgan County will remain a rural, agricultural, family-oriented connected community of small towns and working landscapes, where farms and open spaces endure, and growth is carefully matched to our water and infrastructure, and residents of all ages enjoy safe transportation, recreation, and gathering places without losing the rural character and neighborly spirit that make this valley home.

Guiding Principles

The Guiding Principles reflect the collective values, aspirations, and priorities of Morgan County's residents, drawn directly from community meetings, questionnaires, and local experience. Together, they express the County's commitment to remain a rural, family-oriented place that protects its landscapes and water, plans growth carefully, and invests in everyday community life and safety. This chapter ensures that public policies, projects, and investments consistently advance that vision rather than work against it.

The Guiding Principles also provide continuity between Morgan County's cherished past and its future, linking long-standing agricultural roots and small-town identity with thoughtful, well-managed change. They serve as a touchstone for decisions across land use, infrastructure, recreation, and economic development, helping leaders and residents alike evaluate whether proposed actions protect rural character, align growth with community capacity, expand recreation opportunities, strengthen the local economy in compatible ways, and build trust and transparency in how choices are made.

Rural Character and Community Choices

Morgan County's rural character is a deliberate community priority, but preserving it requires choices about development, housing, services, public investment, and private land. Residents seek to retain working farms, open landscapes, quiet neighborhoods, and limited growth while also seeking opportunities for younger generations to remain in the County, convenient local services, safe roads, recreation access, and community facilities. These objectives are not always achievable in the same location or through the same development pattern.

This Plan responds by distinguishing among communities and directing appropriate housing, business activity, and public investment to locations supported by the Future Land Use

DRAFT

Maps and Community Area Plans. It also recognizes that desired improvements may require funding, partnerships, voluntary landowner participation, or adjustments to expectations. Preserving rural character does not mean that every requested amenity can be provided without cost, nor does a desire for amenities establish justification for additional development. Significant decisions should explain both the benefits of a proposal and the consequences of approving or declining it.

Protect rural character, open lands, and natural environment

Maintain Morgan County's rural look and feel by supporting working farms and ranches, preserving open fields, valley views, and dark skies, and safeguarding clean air, rivers, wildlife habitat, and other shared natural features. Guide new development so it respects agricultural and open-space areas and carefully limits visual and environmental impacts on the County's distinctive landscape.

Align growth with infrastructure and community capacity

Shape the pace, location, and intensity of growth so it fits available water, roads, services, and surrounding community character. Ensure roads, utilities, drainage, and emergency services are upgraded to resolve existing safety and capacity issues and are in place ahead of or alongside new development, rather than after problems emerge.

Expand and enhance community recreation networks and facilities

Create safer, connected trails, sidewalks, and bikeways that link neighborhoods, schools, parks, and key destinations, while respecting adjacent properties and working lands. At the same time, invest in parks, sports fields, fairgrounds, and indoor community spaces so residents of all ages have convenient, year-round places to be active, gather, and enjoy Morgan County's outdoor lifestyle.

Strengthen the local economy while maintaining character

Encourage compatible local businesses, such as light industrial, agricultural support, tourism, and neighborhood-scale commercial, that fit Morgan County's rural character, create jobs, and broaden the tax base, helping reduce reliance on property taxes without introducing resort-style or high-impact development.

Build trust, transparency, and community identity

Support open, consistent decision-making that follows adopted plans, clearly communicates changes, and reflects the distinct character of each community within Morgan County.

DRAFT

OUR PEOPLE, OUR OPPORTUNITIES

This section looks at Morgan County's residents, housing needs, and local economy. It describes population and household characteristics, forecasts for future growth, housing choices and affordability, and opportunities to support businesses and employment. Together, these chapters help the County understand community needs and consider practical ways for residents to live, work, and build a future here while maintaining its rural character.

Population & Household Growth

The Population & Households chapter describes Morgan County's population, household characteristics, and demographic changes that influence housing, schools, employment, infrastructure, and community services. Based on the housing and economic development reports prepared by Zions Public Finance, Inc., the 2025 Morgan County Rural Economic Blueprint, and available Census information, this chapter connects existing conditions and projected needs with the County's long-term vision and land-use framework.

Population & Household Growth

Morgan County's estimated population was 13,383 on July 1, 2025. The County continues to grow, though more slowly than during earlier periods of rapid growth.

Long-range projections anticipate approximately 15,538 residents by 2040 and 23,643 by 2065. People moving into the County are expected to account for about four-fifths of long-term growth, with births exceeding deaths accounting for the remainder.

These figures are forecasts, not growth targets. They provide an outlook for planning roads, water systems, schools, and other services.

Household size & future demand

Morgan County's average household size was 3.38 people in the 2020–2024 estimates, compared with 2.97 statewide.

The projection series anticipates approximately 5,518 households by 2040, about 1,500 more than its modeled 2025 baseline of 4,027. Average household size is projected to decline to approximately 2.82 people by 2040.

Smaller households mean more homes may be needed to accommodate the same number of residents. Housing demand can therefore increase even when population growth is moderate.

DRAFT

TABLE X: Morgan County Population & Household Projections

Year	Projected Population	Projected Households
2025*	13,117	4,027
2030	13,248	4,429
2035	14,166	4,957
2040	15,538	5,518
2050	18,786	6,709
2065	23,643	9,024

**Modeled Baseline Sources: Zions Public Finance, Inc., housing analysis; population projections attributed to the Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute, State and County Projections 2025–2065; household projections developed using population projections, housing inventory information, and ACS data. The modeled 2025 baseline is not the same as the Bureau's July 1, 2025 population estimate.*

TABLE X: Key population & household indicators

Indicator	Countywide condition	Reference period
Total population	13,383 residents	July 1, 2025 Census estimate
Average household (HH) size	3.38 persons (2.97 statewide)	2020-2024 ACS
Residents under age 18	Approx. 33%	2020-2024 ACS
HH with a person under age 18	Approx. 45%	2020-2024 ACS
HH with a person age 60 or older	Approx. 37%	2020-2024 ACS
Residents ages 25-35	Approx. 8.7% (14.8% statewide)	2020-2024 ACS
Median household income	$130,929 ($95,166 statewide)	2020-2024 ACS
Owner-occupied housing units	Approx. 89% of occupied units	2020-2024 ACS

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, population estimates; Zions Public Finance, Inc., housing and economic development analyses using ACS data. Household age categories overlap and should not be added together.

DRAFT

Growth Within Distinct Communities

Population and residential development are concentrated in established communities, particularly Morgan City and Mountain Green. Other areas have more dispersed homes and agricultural land, with different roads, water and wastewater systems, and natural conditions.

Where growth occurs affects how it can be served. Additional residents near existing services may require different improvements than the same number living across rural properties. Local conditions should guide the location, timing, and design of those improvements.

The Future Place Types, Community Area Plans, and Future Land Use Maps establish where different development patterns may be appropriate and where agricultural, open-land, and low-density rural uses should remain predominant. Population forecasts do not replace that direction.

Residents & Households

Children & Families

According to the 2020–2024 estimates, approximately 33 percent of residents were under age 18, and about 45 percent of households included at least one child under 18.

Young adults

Approximately 8.7 percent of residents were ages 25–35, compared with 14.8 percent statewide. This difference highlights the importance of opportunities for young adults who want to establish a household, find work, or return to Morgan County.

Education, employment, housing costs, and personal preferences influence where young adults live. Local economic planning has identified high housing costs and limited entry-level housing choices as potential barriers for younger households.

Older residents

Approximately 37 percent of households included someone age 60 or older. Some also included children, so these household categories overlap.

Accessible homes, manageable maintenance, transportation, health-related services, and convenient gathering places can help older residents remain in their communities. Facilities and services that serve multiple generations can support residents through different stages of life.

Homeownership & housing choices

About 89 percent of occupied homes were owner-occupied, and 11 percent were rented. With detached single-family homes dominating the housing supply, choices may be limited for people starting out or responding to changes in family size, employment, or age. The Housing chapter addresses suitable housing options in appropriate locations.

Household income

Morgan County's median household income was approximately $130,929, compared with $95,166 statewide. However, about 21 percent of households earned less than $75,000 annually.

The County's relatively high median income does not reflect every household's resources.

DRAFT

Household size, housing and transportation costs, and circumstances such as retirement or employment changes also affect what residents can afford.

School Enrollment & Planning

Enrollment patterns

Declining school enrollment has been identified as a local concern, despite the County's substantial population of children. Population growth does not necessarily bring more students. New residents may not have school-age children, and smaller groups entering kindergarten may replace larger graduating classes. Housing costs, births, residents' ages, households moving in or out, and school attendance choices can all influence enrollment.

Planning for school needs

The County should work with the school district to review enrollment by school, grade, and attendance area alongside the location and timing of potential development.

Countywide enrollment declines do not necessarily eliminate needs at individual schools. Current district information should guide planning for facilities, bus routes, roadway safety, walking and bicycle connections, and opportunities to share recreation and community spaces.

Implications for the Future

Morgan County should coordinate with Morgan City, the school district, utility providers, transportation agencies, and emergency-service providers to:

- Identify current needs and prepare for future demands.
- Match improvements to the location and timing of growth, using verified service capacity.
- Review population, household, housing, and enrollment trends and update planning assumptions when needed.

As new information becomes available, the County should update its planning assumptions and adjust facility, service, and investment priorities as needed.

DRAFT

Housing

This chapter describes Morgan County's housing supply, affordability, and projected needs, drawing on the housing report prepared by Zions Public Finance, Inc. for the General Plan. It identifies opportunities for housing choices that serve residents at different stages of life and fit the County's distinct communities.

Housing & Community Character

Housing is an important part of Morgan County's identity and quality of life. Rural homes, established neighborhoods, farmsteads, and growing residential communities provide places for families to put down roots and contribute to community life. The relationship between these homes and the surrounding fields, mountains, waterways, and open lands helps distinguish Morgan County from more continuously developed areas along the Wasatch Front.

The County's housing challenge is not simply to accommodate additional homes. It is to provide appropriate housing choices while protecting the landscapes, working lands, infrastructure, and community character that make the valley an attractive place to live. The General Plan's vision calls for a rural, agricultural, family-oriented community where growth is carefully matched to water and infrastructure and residents of all ages can enjoy the qualities that make Morgan County home. Housing decisions should advance that vision through the location, scale, design, and timing of development.

Countywide housing conditions, including those within Morgan City, provide important context for understanding the housing market. Implementation should focus on unincorporated areas and coordination with Morgan City, service providers, and other partners. Housing policies should be considered together with the Future Place Types, Community Area Plans, Future Land Use Maps, and applicable County regulations.

Existing Housing Conditions & Trends

A predominantly single-family housing supply

Morgan County's housing supply consists primarily of detached single-family homes. The County has approximately 4,195 housing units, of which about 89 percent are single-family detached homes. Townhomes, apartments, duplexes, and mobile homes make up the remaining supply. These other housing types are concentrated principally in Morgan City and portions of Mountain Green, while much of the surrounding County retains a detached-home and rural-residential pattern.

Homeownership is also substantially higher than the statewide average. Approximately 89 percent of occupied housing units in Morgan County are owner-occupied, compared with about 70 percent statewide. This ownership pattern supports long-term residential stability, but the comparatively small rental supply provides fewer options for households that are not ready to purchase a home or prefer the flexibility of renting.

DRAFT

Detached homes remain an important part of the County's housing future, but a supply dominated by one housing type offers fewer choices for residents with different budgets, household sizes, or maintenance needs.

High home values and limited entry-level choices

Housing values in Morgan County reflect strong demand for rural living within reach of the Wasatch Front. Median owner-occupied home value was approximately $654,900 in the 2020–2024 American Community Survey, while the Zillow home-value estimate reached approximately $750,000 in July 2026. These measures describe different periods and use different methods, but both indicate a high-cost ownership market.

The housing inventory also shows a substantial difference in value among housing types. Median market value per unit is approximately $722,000 for detached single-family homes and $372,000 for townhomes. These inventory values are not equivalent to current sale prices, but they demonstrate the relationship between housing type and the range of housing values available within the County.

Entry-level choices are limited. Only about 13 percent of housing units have an inventory market value below $450,000, while more than one-fifth are valued above $1 million. Smaller and older homes account for an important portion of the lower-value supply. Maintaining existing homes and allowing appropriately located smaller housing options should therefore be considered alongside new residential construction.

Uneven construction activity

Residential construction has varied considerably from year to year. Over the 15-year period evaluated for this plan, approximately 50 housing units were permitted annually on average, with individual years ranging from about 5 to 124 units. Although detached homes dominate the overall inventory, townhomes and apartments have accounted for a substantial share of recently permitted housing.

These fluctuations make it important to distinguish long-term housing trends from short periods of unusually high or low activity. Permitted units also should not be treated as equivalent to completed and occupied homes. Monitoring approvals, construction, and occupancy together will provide a clearer picture of how the housing supply is changing.

DRAFT

TABLE X: Key housing indicators

Indicator	Countywide finding	Planning significance
Housing inventory	Approximately 4,195 units	Provides a baseline for understanding the scale and composition of the housing supply.
Detached single-family housing	Approximately 89 percent of units	Indicates a limited range of alternatives for smaller households and residents seeking different housing arrangements.
Owner-occupied housing	Approximately 89 percent of occupied units	Reflects a strong ownership market and comparatively limited rental opportunities.
Housing cost burden	Approximately 20 percent of households	Shows that high countywide incomes do not eliminate affordability concerns.
Historical permitting activity	Approximately 50 units annually on average	Provides context for evaluating whether construction activity is keeping pace with projected household growth.

Source: Supporting Morgan County housing analysis. Indicators use different datasets and reference periods and should not be treated as a single-year statistical snapshot.

Changing Households & Future Housing Needs

Household growth and smaller households

The Population & Households chapter describes the County's broader demographic outlook. For housing planning, an important consideration is that household growth may outpace population growth as average household size declines. Each additional household needs a place to live, even when the number of people within individual households becomes smaller.

The projection series anticipates an increase from a modeled 2025 baseline of approximately 4,027 households to 5,518 in 2040, an increase of roughly 1,500 households over the planning period. Average household size is expected to decline during the same period. Together, these trends indicate continued demand for additional housing and for homes suited to a wider range of household sizes.

These projections are planning estimates, not development targets or commitments to approve a particular number of units. Actual demand and construction will depend on market conditions, migration, infrastructure availability, land-use decisions, and other factors. The County should use the projections to evaluate housing

needs and development capacity while continuing to apply the location, character, and infrastructure direction established elsewhere in the General Plan.

Housing for different stages of life

Housing needs change as residents move through different stages of life. A young adult establishing an independent household may need a rental unit or a smaller home. A growing family may need additional bedrooms and outdoor space. An older resident may prefer a home with fewer stairs, less maintenance, or closer access to services and family support.

A wider range of appropriately located homes can help residents establish a household, adjust to changing circumstances, or remain in the community as they age.

Remaining in the community as residents age

The General Plan should support opportunities for residents to remain in their community as their housing needs change. For some residents, this may mean adapting an existing home. For others, it may mean moving to a smaller home, an accessory dwelling, or a residence with more accessible features.

The County should encourage single-level living options, accessible entries, adaptable floor plans, and smaller homes in locations consistent with the Future Land Use Map and applicable Community Area Plan. Housing near services, gathering places, and safe walking connections may also provide useful options where the community setting and infrastructure support that pattern.

Accessory dwellings are another potential way to accommodate changing household needs without creating a separate conventional subdivision. Their suitability should be evaluated in relation to applicable regulations, water and wastewater capacity, access, parking, site conditions, and compatibility with neighboring properties.

Housing Affordability & Local Opportunity

Affordability varies among households

Morgan County's relatively high household incomes do not eliminate housing affordability concerns. Approximately one in five households spends more than 30 percent of household income on housing costs. This measure, commonly described as housing cost burden, includes housing-related expenses rather than the purchase price or rent alone.

Cost burden is particularly significant among households earning less than $75,000 annually. Approximately 45 percent of households within that income range are cost-burdened, compared with about 13 percent of households earning $75,000 or more. Both renters and homeowners experience housing cost burdens.

Countywide averages therefore tell only part of the story. Households with lower incomes, a single earner, fixed retirement income, or changing employment circumstances may face housing challenges that are not apparent from the County's overall income levels. Housing policy should consider these differences while

DRAFT

recognizing that no single housing type or program will address every need.

Housing and the local workforce

The relationship between housing costs and local employment is another important planning consideration. More than half of jobs located in Morgan County pay less than $40,000 annually. Individual job earnings are not equivalent to total household income, but the comparison illustrates the difficulty some locally employed workers may face in purchasing housing within the County.

Housing choices should be considered alongside the General Plan's economic development direction. Smaller homes, rental opportunities, and other appropriately located housing could broaden the choices available to employees of local businesses and service providers. These efforts should complement, rather than replace, the County's expectations for infrastructure capacity, community compatibility, and responsible growth.

Addressing avoidable development barriers

Lot size, setbacks, frontage, parking requirements, and approval procedures can affect the feasibility of smaller and more varied housing.

The County should evaluate these standards selectively, with attention to the purpose each requirement serves and the locations where a change would be appropriate. A standard that is suitable for a rural property relying on private water and wastewater systems may not be necessary in the same form within a planned village neighborhood served by centralized infrastructure.

Any proposed changes should implement the adopted land-use framework. Reducing housing costs should not be used as a general justification for smaller lots in agricultural or rural areas, increased development along constrained roads, or projects that depend on water and infrastructure capacity that has not been demonstrated.

Housing Locations & Development Patterns

Match housing choices to the Future Place Types

The Future Place Types, Future Land Use Maps, and Community Area Plans guide where different housing forms may be appropriate. Housing variety does not, by itself, justify increased density or introducing multifamily housing into rural and agricultural areas.

Provide neighborhood-scaled housing variety

"Missing middle" housing accommodates more than one household while retaining a house-scaled or neighborhood-scaled form. Examples include duplexes, small multifamily buildings, cottage courts, and townhomes.

For this General Plan, the important consideration is how these housing forms fit the mapped location and surrounding community. Proposed development should address building height and mass, entries, parking placement, landscaping, open space, pedestrian connections, and transitions to nearby homes.

DRAFT

Coordinate housing with infrastructure and services

Housing development should be matched to reliable water, wastewater disposal, roads, emergency response, and other essential services, with necessary improvements in place as development proceeds. Available infrastructure alone does not justify housing that conflicts with the mapped place type or applicable Community Area Plan.

Protect agricultural and open lands

Housing layouts should avoid dividing working farms and connected open land into smaller, less useful pieces. Large residential lots alone do not protect rural character. Where community policies support clustering, it should remain within the otherwise supported overall density and provide lasting protection for retained land. Conservation tools are addressed in Land Conservation & Agricultural Preservation.

Neighborhood Quality & Community Connections

Connect homes with everyday destinations

Housing contributes to community life when residents can safely reach schools, parks, trails, gathering places, and other destinations. In neighborhood and village settings, development should provide practical walking connections, coordinated street networks, and usable shared spaces.

The design of these connections should reflect the local setting. Village areas may support sidewalks and more closely connected streets, while rural areas may require pathways or other context-sensitive improvements that protect agricultural access, drainage, private property, and roadway safety.

Create safe and welcoming residential environments

Proposed housing and neighborhood improvements should address pedestrian safety, clear access, visibility, appropriate lighting, and the relationship between homes and shared spaces. Entrances, pathways, parking areas, and gathering places should be easy to understand and maintain.

Design expectations should remain compatible with Morgan County's rural and small-town setting. Lighting, landscaping, street improvements, and public spaces should provide useful amenities without unnecessarily introducing an urban appearance, excessive infrastructure obligations, or conflicts with surrounding agricultural uses.

Address second homes and short-term rentals

There are approximately 350 second homes countywide. Seasonal and visitor-oriented housing is part of the County's broader housing picture, particularly in recreation-related settings, but its role differs from housing occupied by year-round residents.

The County should monitor the location and operation of second homes and short-term rentals and evaluate their relationship to permanent housing availability, neighborhood conditions, infrastructure, and emergency

DRAFT

services. Any proposed licensing or operating standards should address applicable requirements and practical concerns such as occupancy, parking, noise, property maintenance, emergency contact information, and enforcement.

Recreation-related housing should remain consistent with the Recreation/Resort place type and applicable Community Area Plan. It should not serve as a basis for extending resort or visitor-oriented development into areas intended to remain agricultural, rural, or primarily residential.

DRAFT

Housing Policies

The following policies guide County decisions on land use, updates to development regulations, coordination with partners, and next steps for carrying out the Plan. They should be read together with the Countywide Land Use Policies, Future Place Types, Community Area Plans, Future Land Use Maps, and applicable County regulations.

Housing Policy 1.0 — Provide housing choices in appropriate locations.

Support a range of housing choices for households of different sizes, incomes, and stages of life in locations identified as appropriate by the Future Land Use Map and applicable Community Area Plan. Match housing type, scale, density, and design to the intended character and available infrastructure of each location.

Housing Policy 2.0 — Maintain the rural and agricultural land-use framework.

Do not use housing demand or affordability objectives alone as a basis for supporting smaller-lot or more intensive development in areas intended to remain agricultural, open, or predominantly rural. Housing proposals should implement the applicable place type and community policies rather than circumvent them.

Housing Policy 3.0 — Align residential growth with infrastructure capacity.

Evaluate proposed housing in relation to sustainable water supply, wastewater disposal, transportation, drainage, emergency access, and public-service capacity. Address the funding, timing, construction, operation, and maintenance of necessary improvements before supporting development that depends on those improvements.

Housing Policy 4.0 — Support housing for changing household needs.

Encourage appropriately located smaller homes, rental opportunities, accessory dwellings, and accessible housing features that can serve young adults, smaller households, families, and older residents. Evaluate these options in relation to applicable regulations, infrastructure capacity, and community compatibility.

Housing Policy 5.0 — Review development standards selectively.

Evaluate whether development standards or approval procedures create avoidable barriers to housing types supported by the adopted General Plan. Consider targeted changes where they can improve feasibility while retaining necessary protections for safety, infrastructure, natural resources, agriculture, and neighborhood character.

DRAFT

Housing Policy 6.0 — Strengthen neighborhood connections and design.

Encourage residential development that provides safe access, appropriate pedestrian connections, usable open space, and transitions to adjoining properties. Match improvements to the local setting and coordinate them with parks, trails, schools, gathering places, and nearby services where feasible.

Housing Policy 7.0 — Preserve existing housing opportunities.

Consider existing smaller and older homes as part of the County's housing supply. Evaluate opportunities to support maintenance, rehabilitation, accessibility improvements, and appropriate adaptation of existing residences while addressing safety and infrastructure requirements.

Housing Policy 8.0 — Evaluate housing and conservation tools before adoption.

Consider conservation-linked development approaches, partnerships, or housing incentive programs only through a clearly defined framework that addresses eligible locations, public benefits, infrastructure needs, financial feasibility, administration, and consistency with the General Plan. Identifying a potential tool does not establish eligibility, an entitlement, or a commitment of public resources.

Housing Policy 9.0 — Coordinate housing planning and monitor change.

Coordinate with Morgan City, service providers, employers, and other partners on housing conditions and infrastructure needs. Periodically review housing permits, completions, housing types, household trends, cost burden, and seasonal housing activity to determine whether implementation measures remain responsive to changing conditions.

DRAFT

Economic Development

This chapter describes Morgan County's economic conditions, business opportunities, and priorities for strengthening the local economy. It draws on the economic development and sales leakage report prepared by Zions Public Finance, Inc. and the 2025 Morgan County Rural Economic Blueprint prepared through the Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity.

Economic Development & Community Character

Morgan County's economy draws on agriculture, construction, manufacturing, local businesses, recreation, and connections to the Wasatch Front. Many residents work outside the County, while local employers rely on both residents and workers commuting from surrounding areas.

The County's agricultural heritage, small-town relationships, and distinctive communities are economic assets. Supporting businesses that build on these qualities can provide convenient services, employment, and opportunities for farms, ranches, and entrepreneurs without creating continuous urban or suburban development.

The objective is a stronger local economy, not simply more commercial development. Business opportunities should fit their surroundings and the County's available land, water, roads, and services.

This chapter uses countywide information, including Morgan City, to describe the local economy. County implementation focuses on unincorporated areas and coordination with the City, businesses, service providers, and other partners. The Future Place Types, Community Area Plans, Future Land Use Maps, and County regulations guide where different business activities may be appropriate.

Economic Assets & Planning Priorities

The County's economic approach should build on its strengths and address barriers to business success. The following table connects the Rural Economic Blueprint's findings with practical planning responses.

DRAFT

TABLE X: Title here

Economic consideration	Planning response
Rural identity, community relationships, and agricultural heritage	Support businesses that reinforce local character and working lands.
Regional access and established business centers	Focus appropriate commercial and employment activity in mapped locations.
Resident skills and professional-service opportunities	Support entrepreneurship, remote work, and workforce partnerships.
Limited public access and suitable business sites	Coordinate voluntary access partnerships and evaluate site readiness.
Housing costs and regional competition for workers	Coordinate housing, transportation, training, and employer needs.
Risk of agricultural fragmentation and dispersed development	Apply community-plan direction and evaluate long-term infrastructure and land-use effects.

Source: Adapted from the 2025 Morgan County Rural Economic Blueprint, SWOT analysis, pages 9–12

Existing Economic Conditions & Trends

Regional employment connections

The 2023 commuting dataset identified approximately 6,547 employed County residents. About 1,489 worked within Morgan County and 5,058 worked elsewhere. Approximately 1,600 workers commuted into the County. These figures cover the employment included in that dataset, not every form of work or business activity.

Employment outside the County supports much of residents' income and purchasing power. Local businesses also depend on access to workers from surrounding areas. Reliable regional transportation will therefore remain important even as the County seeks additional local employment.

Established business centers

Business activity is concentrated principally in Morgan City and Mountain Green. Morgan City serves as an established employment and commercial center, while Mountain Green benefits from access to Interstate 84, Trappers Loop Road, and the Wasatch Front.

In 2025, physical business outlets grouped within the Morgan City business node accounted for approximately $71 million in taxable sales, compared with $27 million in Mountain Green and $16 million elsewhere in the County. These

DRAFT

analytical business groupings do not precisely follow municipal or community boundaries.

Future business activity should build on suitable existing centers rather than extend commercial development continuously along rural roads and highways.

Households and local demand

Morgan County's relatively high household incomes, larger households, and substantial population of children suggest opportunities for family-oriented services, recreation, restaurants, and businesses serving household needs.

An economy broader than retail

Construction accounted for approximately 22 percent of jobs located within the County in the 2023 employment data, and manufacturing accounted for about 7 percent. Agriculture and related businesses also contribute to the economy through working lands, production, services, and connections to other industries. Their value cannot be measured by retail sales alone.

Economic development should support existing employers, local suppliers, and professional and technical businesses alongside retail opportunities. Recruitment should complement the County's existing skills and industries rather than focus only on capturing consumer spending.

Remote work and professional services

Remote work and small professional businesses offer opportunities for residents to work locally without extensive new commercial or industrial development.

Reliable broadband, clear home-based business standards, and access to local services can support these activities. Shared workspaces and small offices may provide additional options in suitable commercial centers. Standards should address neighborhood compatibility and the activity's actual service needs.

Local Spending & Market Opportunities

Understanding sales leakage

Sales leakage compares taxable sales assigned to the County with estimated spending demand from residents. A capture rate below 100 percent means measured sales are lower than estimated demand; a rate above 100 percent means sales exceed that demand and may include purchases by visitors or travelers.

Across the retail and consumer-service categories analyzed, the estimated capture rate is approximately 67 percent, with a net spending gap of about $89 million. The largest gaps include general merchandise, food services, and accommodation. Food and beverage stores have an estimated capture rate of approximately 113 percent, suggesting they serve customers beyond the resident population.

These findings identify opportunities to investigate, not proof that a new business will succeed. Customer volume, competition, access, visibility, operating costs, and convenience also matter. The objective is to find realistic

DRAFT

businesses that meet local needs—not eliminate all spending outside the County.

Different businesses serve different markets

Businesses may serve three overlapping markets:

- Local customers seeking everyday goods and services.
- Passing travelers who stop while moving through the County.
- Destination customers who make a deliberate trip for a particular product, service, or experience.

A convenience business may depend on nearby customers and easy access, while a destination business may attract people from farther away. Matching the intended market to the location is an important part of evaluating an opportunity.

Future purchasing power

Using the projection series' modeled 2025 baseline, the supporting analysis anticipates approximately 2,421 additional residents by 2040. Based on statewide spending averages, this could represent about $59.6 million in additional annual purchasing power.

This is not a forecast of sales that will occur within Morgan County. Some spending will remain outside the County or occur online. Local businesses will capture a share only if their offerings are convenient, competitive, or distinctive.

DRAFT

TABLE X: Selected market findings

Indicator	Supporting analysis	Planning significance

Regional employment connections	Approximately 77 percent of employed County residents in the 2023 commuting dataset worked outside the County.	Regional access remains important even as the County seeks additional local employment.
Established business concentrations	Morgan City and Mountain Green contain the principal business nodes.	Build on appropriate centers rather than extend continuous commercial development along rural corridors.
Retail and service capture	Approximately 67 percent across the categories analyzed.	Investigate opportunities selectively; leakage does not establish business feasibility.
Grocery-related sales	Food and beverage stores have an estimated capture rate of approximately 113 percent.	Existing businesses already benefit from customers beyond the resident population.
Additional resident purchasing power	Approximately $59.6 million annually by 2040 under the report's assumptions.	Growth may support additional businesses, but only part of the spending will be captured locally.

Source: Supporting Morgan County economic development and sales leakage analysis. Measures use different datasets, reference periods, and analytical assumptions.

Place-Based Economic Development Opportunities

Mountain Green: services and regional access

Mountain Green's location near Interstate 84 and Trappers Loop Road connects businesses with residents, commuters, and recreation travelers. Residential growth may also increase demand for local goods and services.

Categories for further market evaluation include restaurants, family-oriented activities, specialty outdoor retail, personal services, and home furnishing or fixture showrooms.

A coordinated village commercial center can bring shopping, services, employment, and gathering places together. Planning should address connected streets, pedestrian access, coordinated parking, building scale, infrastructure, and transitions to nearby homes.

The Mountain Green Community Area Plan and Future Land Use Map should guide the location and scale of commercial activity. Village-scale services and larger visitor-oriented businesses have different effects and should be evaluated accordingly.

Morgan City: established commerce and partnerships

Morgan City's business base and historic commercial setting provide opportunities for distinctive shopping, dining, and visitor experiences. Partnerships may include business promotion, wayfinding, community events,

DRAFT

recreation connections, and improvements that help customers reach existing businesses.

County and City efforts should complement one another and support viable businesses within the established city centers.

Rural communities: limited business opportunities

Agricultural-support businesses, home-based activities, farm stands, and limited local services may provide opportunities suited to rural communities. Destination businesses and agricultural experiences may also be appropriate in some locations, subject to the individual Community Area Plan.

Employment and industrial areas

The Employment and Industrial place type identifies areas for offices, manufacturing, warehousing, contractor activities, logistics, and airport-related businesses. These areas should remain employment-focused and protected from incompatible uses that could constrain operations.

Economic development efforts should support existing employers and suitable new businesses in these locations. Site planning should address truck access, utilities, loading, outdoor storage, drainage, noise, and transitions to neighboring properties.

The County should maintain an inventory of potential commercial and employment sites identifying zoning, parcel characteristics, access, utilities, and development constraints. Working with willing owners and service providers can help distinguish land designated for business use from sites that are ready for development. Listing a property does not grant development approval or commit public funding.

Agriculture, Recreation & Visitor Activity

Support working farms and ranches

Agriculture should remain a working part of the economy, not simply a backdrop for housing or tourism. Business support should help sustain agricultural services, market access, and the infrastructure farms and ranches need.

Farm stands, tours, and other agricultural experiences may provide additional income where they support the operation and remain compatible with neighbors and services. Visitor activities should not become a route to dispersed commercial, lodging, or event development that conflicts with the community's agricultural direction.

Recreation-related businesses

Outdoor recreation can support equipment sales and rentals, food services, appropriately located accommodations, and other businesses serving residents and visitors.

Businesses serving recreation users should be distinguished from resort or destination complexes. Proposals should address seasonal traffic, parking, water and wastewater demand, emergency response, hazards, and protection of the resources that attract visitors.

Small-scale and seasonal businesses

Mobile food service and other businesses with modest permanent investment may offer flexible

DRAFT

ways to serve recreation users. Reliable internet access can support mobile payments and online services.

Appropriate standards should address owner permission, access, parking, sanitation, waste, seasonal operation, and resource protection. Sites near reservoirs or other attractions may require coordination with the managing agency. Temporary or small-scale operation does not remove the need to address impacts.

Business Support & Community Investment

Infrastructure and public costs

Business development should be matched to available water, wastewater disposal, roads, drainage, utilities, and emergency services. Projects should identify necessary improvements and responsibility for construction, operation, and maintenance.

For significant projects or public investments, the County should evaluate expected revenues alongside service costs, maintenance obligations, and financial risks. Review should identify which entities receive revenues and which bear the costs.

Any incentives or public participation should have clear public benefits, performance expectations, and accountability measures. Potential tax receipts are not a guarantee of lower residential taxes or a substitute for suitable land use and reliable infrastructure.

Support existing businesses

Business retention deserves attention alongside recruitment. Regular contact with owners, clear application information, and coordination among reviewing agencies can help identify recurring problems and practical improvements.

Regulations should clearly distinguish home-based businesses, agricultural-support uses, neighborhood services, employment uses, and intensive commercial activities. Procedures should explain requirements and expectations without implying that every proposal will be approved.

Connect businesses and community amenities

Trails and connections among business areas and recreation destinations may support local activity. Potential routes along the river, canal, and Morgan Valley Drive should be evaluated through transportation, parks, and trails planning.

Improvements should benefit residents as well as businesses and address lawful access, willing landowners, agricultural operations, safety, environmental conditions, funding, and maintenance. Assumed visitor spending should not be their sole justification.

Workforce, training, and housing

The County should work with employers, schools, workforce agencies, and training providers to identify needed skills and connect residents with employment opportunities. Partnerships may include career exploration, internships, apprenticeships, certificates, and skills training.

Recruitment and retention also depend on wages, housing choices, and transportation.

DRAFT

Local employers compete within a regional labor market, and some rely on workers commuting into the County.

Implementation and progress

The County should maintain a practical economic development work program identifying lead organizations, partners, potential funding, and next steps. It should distinguish County land-use responsibilities from business-support, workforce, tourism, and infrastructure activities carried out with partners.

Progress measures may include business outreach, retention and expansion, site readiness, workforce partnerships, infrastructure milestones, employment, and taxable sales. Measures should reflect each initiative's purpose rather than simply count new businesses or commercial development.

Initiatives should remain consistent with the General Plan. Proposals requiring changes to its land-use direction should follow the appropriate planning and public-review processes.

DRAFT

Economic Development Policies

The following policies guide County decisions on land use, updates to development regulations, coordination with partners, and next steps for carrying out the Plan. They should be read together with the Countywide Land Use Policies, Future Place Types, Community Area Plans, Future Land Use Maps, and applicable County regulations.

Economic Development Policy 1.0 — Strengthen the economy while maintaining community character.

Support businesses and employment opportunities that contribute to local prosperity, provide useful goods and services, and fit the County's rural, agricultural, and small-town character. Evaluate economic benefits together with infrastructure demands, land-use compatibility, and long-term public responsibilities.

Economic Development Policy 2.0 — Direct business activity to appropriate locations.

Accommodate commercial and employment uses in locations supported by the Future Land Use Map and applicable Community Area Plan. Build on appropriate business centers and employment areas rather than extend continuous strip-commercial development along rural highways and roads.

Economic Development Policy 3.0 — Support existing businesses and local entrepreneurship.

Maintain communication with existing businesses and evaluate opportunities to address infrastructure, information, or procedural needs. Provide clear guidance for business applications and consider compatible small-business, home-based, and agricultural-support opportunities within the adopted land-use framework. Support compatible remote work and professional-service businesses through reliable connectivity, clear home-based business standards, and coordination with small-business assistance providers.

Economic Development Policy 4.0 — Use market analysis to identify realistic opportunities.

Use sales leakage, household characteristics, regional access, and visitor activity as starting points for evaluating business opportunities. Do not treat a spending gap, projected traffic growth, or a broad regional market as proof of feasibility or justification for a particular land-use approval.

Economic Development Policy 5.0 — Preserve suitable employment land.

Maintain mapped Employment and Industrial areas for compatible job-producing uses. Evaluate the effects of proposed nonemployment or sensitive uses on the availability of business sites, industrial operations, truck access, utilities, and opportunities for future expansion. Maintain information on suitable commercial and employment sites and coordinate with willing property owners and service providers to identify site-readiness needs.

DRAFT

Economic Development Policy 6.0 — Support agriculture as a working economic activity.

Encourage agricultural-support businesses and compatible opportunities that strengthen farm and ranch viability. Evaluate farm stands, agricultural experiences, and similar activities in relation to agricultural operations, access, infrastructure, neighboring properties, and the applicable Community Area Plan.

Economic Development Policy 7.0 — Manage recreation and visitor-related business impacts.

Consider visitor-serving businesses where their location, scale, and operation are consistent with the adopted land-use framework. Address seasonal traffic, parking, water and wastewater demand, emergency response, natural-resource protection, and compatibility with nearby communities and working lands.

Economic Development Policy 8.0 — Coordinate economic growth with infrastructure.

Evaluate business development in relation to available and committed infrastructure and service capacity. Identify responsibility for necessary improvements, including funding, timing, construction, operation, and maintenance, before supporting development that depends on those improvements.

Economic Development Policy 9.0 — Evaluate public investments and partnerships carefully.

Consider business-support initiatives, community amenities, and potential incentives through a transparent evaluation of public benefits, costs, feasibility, funding, and consistency with the General Plan. Identifying an opportunity does not establish a commitment of public resources or a development entitlement. Evaluate anticipated revenues alongside infrastructure costs, service demands, maintenance obligations, and financial risks. Establish clear performance and accountability expectations where public resources are committed.

Economic Development Policy 10.0 — Coordinate planning and monitor economic change.

Coordinate with Morgan City, employers, service providers, recreation managers, and other partners on business conditions, infrastructure, workforce needs, and community investment. Periodically review business activity, employment, taxable sales, market trends, and development conditions to determine whether implementation measures remain responsive to County priorities. Maintain a coordinated implementation work program identifying lead organizations, partners, priorities, and measures of progress.

Economic Development Policy 11.0 — Connect residents and employers with workforce opportunities.

Coordinate with employers, schools, workforce agencies, and education and training providers to identify local skill needs and support relevant career exploration, internships, apprenticeships, certificate programs, and business-development assistance. Consider workforce initiatives together with housing, transportation, and other conditions affecting access to local employment.

DRAFT

OUR CONNECTIONS, OUR RESILIENCE

This section addresses the systems, services, and natural conditions that support daily life and the long-term well-being of Morgan County's communities. It brings together transportation, water and wastewater infrastructure, community amenities, public facilities and services, sensitive lands, natural hazards, and water-use preservation. The chapters establish direction for improving safety and useful connections, maintaining reliable services, protecting water and natural resources, and evaluating community needs alongside infrastructure capacity, funding, and long-term responsibilities. The emphasis is on practical, coordinated improvements that serve residents and strengthen resilience without compromising the County's rural setting.

Transportation Element

This chapter describes Morgan County's transportation network and priorities for safe, reliable travel. It addresses roads, community and emergency access, and walking and bicycle connections while respecting rural character. The Transportation Master Plan and coordination with responsible agencies will refine project needs, designs, costs, and priorities.

Transportation & Community Character

Morgan County's transportation system serves residents, agricultural operations, businesses, schools, emergency responders, and visitors while carrying regional passenger and freight traffic. Interstate access, rural roads, canyon routes, bridges, and local connections perform different but interrelated functions. Transportation planning should recognize these differences rather than apply the same road design or development expectations throughout the County.

Correcting an existing safety problem may be necessary even where additional growth is not supported. Conversely, an available road connection does not demonstrate that a property is appropriate for more intensive development. Land-use and transportation decisions should be coordinated so that improvements serve the intended community pattern rather than redefine it.

Existing Network & Travel Patterns

Regional Routes & Local Connections

Interstate 84 provides a major regional connection, while Trappers Loop Road, Morgan Valley Drive, Old Highway Road, and other community roads connect residential areas, agricultural lands, employment locations, and recreation destinations. These routes also carry traffic generated outside the communities through which they pass. Recreation travel to and from the Ogden Valley is an important consideration for Mountain Green and Trappers Loop.

DRAFT

Transportation planning should distinguish regional through-travel from locally generated trips. Residents may experience additional traffic even when their community maintains a limited-growth direction. Coordination with state agencies and neighboring jurisdictions is therefore important to protecting local access, safety, and community livability.

Roadway Functions & Design Standards

Roadways serve different functions within the transportation network. Arterial routes emphasize movement between communities and regional destinations; collector roads connect local roads with the broader network; and local roads primarily provide access to individual properties. Roadway design and access management should reflect these functions while responding to surrounding land uses and rural conditions.

The Transportation Master Plan should confirm applicable classifications and identify appropriate design guidance. Construction and improvement requirements should follow current adopted standards and the requirements of the responsible roadway agency. This General Plan does not establish new roadway dimensions or a commitment to widen existing roads.

Rural Roads & Constrained Access

Rural roads accommodate passenger vehicles, school transportation, agricultural equipment, service vehicles, and emergency responders. Some routes have limited shoulders, narrow rights-of-way, constrained intersections, or few alternate connections. Canyon access, river and railroad crossings, agricultural routes, and private lanes create additional conditions that require location-specific review.

Roadway adequacy should be evaluated in relation to the proposed use, not merely whether a road exists. Review should consider geometry, sight distance, drainage, surface condition, bridge and culvert limitations, emergency access, maintenance, and the cumulative effects of additional traffic.

Transportation investments should preserve essential agricultural access and accommodate farm equipment and established lawful livestock movement where appropriate, with attention to safety and coordination with other roadway users. Improvements should avoid unnecessary disruption of irrigation facilities, working lands, and adjoining properties.

Freight, Railroad & Airport Coordination

Transportation planning should address freight movement and railroad crossings alongside passenger travel. The County should coordinate with roadway agencies, railroad operators, emergency responders, and affected businesses to evaluate crossing safety, emergency access, and appropriate truck circulation. Industrial and commercial traffic should use suitable routes and avoid unnecessary intrusion into rural residential neighborhoods.

Airport-related transportation and surrounding development should be coordinated with the Airport Overlay provisions and applicable aviation planning. Review should address safe ground access and compatibility between airport operations and nearby land uses. Recognition of the airport's transportation role does not

DRAFT

establish support for expansion or additional development beyond the adopted land-use framework.

Future Traffic & Transportation Planning

Planning for Changing Demand

Traffic on selected key routes is projected to increase approximately 50 to 100 percent by 2050 under the Utah Statewide Annual Average Daily Traffic Forecast. These projections describe potential travel demand under the forecast assumptions.

The Transportation Master Plan should identify the affected routes, evaluate forecast assumptions, and refine potential improvement needs. Review should distinguish average daily traffic from seasonal, recreational, school-related, and other peak-period conditions that may place different demands on the network.

Forecasts should inform transportation planning without becoming an independent basis for additional land-use intensity. Where projected demand raises concerns about rural character or community capacity, the County should evaluate access management, operational improvements, development phasing, and regional coordination alongside potential capacity projects.

Relationship to the Transportation Master Plan

Morgan County is preparing a separate Transportation Master Plan to evaluate transportation conditions, future travel demand, network needs, and potential improvements. This General Plan establishes the community values and land-use direction that should guide that work, including rural preservation, safe access, agricultural compatibility, emergency circulation, and practical walking and bicycle connections.

The Transportation Master Plan should refine technical recommendations, project priorities, and implementation needs in coordination with the Future Place Types and Community Area Plans. Its analysis should distinguish needs associated with existing residents, regional travel, and development supported by the General Plan.

Where a proposed transportation improvement would depend on or encourage land-use changes inconsistent with this Plan, the County should identify and evaluate that conflict through the appropriate planning and public-review processes.

Until the Transportation Master Plan is completed and adopted, conceptual improvements should be clearly distinguished from approved or funded projects. Following adoption, the County should review the relationship between the two plans and make any necessary updates through the applicable amendment processes.

Mountain Green & Interstate Access

Proposed Interchange & Existing Access

A proposed interchange near Trappers Loop and Interstate 84 presents important questions about regional movement, local circulation, and the future role of the existing Mountain Green interchange. Residents have expressed differing perspectives on whether existing access should remain open, including concerns about

DRAFT

emergency response, peak-period capacity, and the relationship between interchange changes and surrounding development.

The County should participate actively in state and regional planning to ensure these concerns are evaluated before decisions about existing access are finalized. Review should address traffic distribution, alternate routes, emergency movement, construction-period access, and effects on local streets and businesses.

The General Plan does not presume closure or retention of an interchange before the necessary agency decisions and technical review. County recommendations should explain the preferred access outcome and its basis while recognizing that interstate projects require coordination with the responsible transportation agencies.

Trappers Loop & Old Highway Road

Residents have identified traffic management at Trappers Loop and Old Highway Road as a concern. Suggested treatments include stop control, a roundabout, and a traffic signal.

The County should coordinate evaluation of an appropriate treatment with the agency responsible for the intersection. Selection should consider traffic operations, crash and safety information, sight distance, pedestrian needs, emergency movement, terrain, and development supported by the Plan, not solely preference for a particular device.

Evaluation should distinguish interim safety measures from longer-term improvements so that practical near-term actions are not unnecessarily deferred.

Access Management & Development Circulation

Avoid Continuous Frontage Development

Repeated individual driveways and frontage-lot development can undermine roadway function and the rural-character objectives established in the Rural Living and Rural Corridor policies. Development review should consider shared access, driveway consolidation, internal circulation, and appropriate connections that reduce unnecessary direct access to major roads.

Existing roadside zoning or development should not establish support for extending similar access patterns onto adjoining lands. Proposed circulation should protect agricultural operations and avoid directing development traffic through roads or private lanes that cannot adequately serve it.

Coordinate Development Phases

Where development is supported, access and circulation should function safely during each phase. Essential connections, emergency access, and proportionate transportation improvements should not be deferred to an uncertain later phase.

Review should identify required improvements, responsible parties, funding, construction timing, and maintenance arrangements. County acceptance of a road or facility should follow applicable standards and an express evaluation of its public purpose and long-term obligations.

Private Roads & Agricultural Lanes

DRAFT

A private road or agricultural access route should not be assumed adequate for additional residential or commercial traffic. Where its use is proposed, review should establish lawful access and appropriate arrangements for design, emergency service, drainage, snow removal, maintenance, repair, and funding.

New private-road arrangements should not create avoidable liabilities or maintenance burdens for existing residents or the County.

Safety, Emergency Access & Network Reliability

Transportation planning should address routine travel and conditions that disrupt access, including wildfire, flooding, severe weather, crashes, and roadway closures. Particular attention should be given to communities with limited secondary access and routes involving bridges, railroad crossings, or narrow canyon geometry.

Potential alternate access should be evaluated for feasibility, ownership, environmental effects, cost, and compatibility with the applicable Community Area Plan. An emergency-access concept should not independently establish support for additional development or a new public road.

Coordination with emergency responders should identify critical access limitations, evacuation concerns, and priorities for practical improvements. Development review should consider whether additional users would increase exposure to hazards or place new demands on an already constrained route.

Walking, Bicycling & Trails

Everyday Connections

Residents have expressed interest in continuous sidewalks, safe school routes, improved major-road crossings, and additional opportunities for walking and bicycling. Priority should be given to useful connections among homes, schools, parks, gathering places, and supported commercial areas.

Improvements should reflect local conditions. Sidewalks may be appropriate in neighborhood and village settings, while separated pathways or other rural treatments may better fit agricultural areas. Pedestrian improvements should address applicable accessibility requirements and provide usable connections for people with disabilities, older residents, and others with differing mobility needs. Review should consider crossings, grades, surfaces, and maintenance.

Shoulders & Bicycle Facilities

Roadway shoulder improvements may provide opportunities to improve bicycle travel where conditions are suitable. Evaluation should address vehicle speeds, traffic composition, available width, crossings, drainage, surface condition, and maintenance.

A shoulder should not automatically be represented as a safe walking route or as a substitute for a separated facility where conditions warrant one. Roadway projects should consider opportunities for appropriate bicycle and pedestrian improvements without assuming the same treatment is suitable throughout the County.

DRAFT

Recreation Routes & Lawful Access

Trail planning should distinguish everyday community connections from recreational routes serving different users. Walking, bicycling, equestrian, and motorized recreation may require different locations, designs, and management arrangements.

Routes across private land require established access rights or voluntary agreements. Proximity to public lands does not establish a lawful route to them. The County should coordinate with landowners and managing agencies before identifying a conceptual connection as publicly available.

Private resort trails and recreation amenities should not be counted as public transportation or recreation connections unless public access is expressly secured.


Investment, Coordination & Implementation

The County should prioritize transportation investments according to safety, existing deficiencies, emergency function, community benefit, land-use consistency, cost, and maintenance responsibility. Projects should distinguish improvements needed by existing residents from those required by development and those associated with regional traffic.

Development should address its proportionate transportation effects through lawful requirements and enforceable commitments. Public investment should not be justified solely by speculative future growth or anticipated resort activity.

Implementation should be coordinated with the Transportation Master Plan, capital planning, state transportation agencies, Morgan City, neighboring jurisdictions, school transportation, emergency responders, and affected property owners. Project information should clearly identify whether an improvement is conceptual, under evaluation, approved, funded, or scheduled for construction.

DRAFT





MORGAN COUNTY

TRANSPORTATION

0 4 8
Miles

February 2026

Freeway Exit Locations

Railroads

Planning Outpost

JUB ENGINEERS, INC.

THE LANDON GROUP

GATEWAY MAPPING INC.

J-U-B FAMILY OF COMPANIES

Transportation Policies

Transportation Policy 1.0 — Maintain a safe, rural-compatible network.

Plan and improve transportation facilities according to their function, local conditions, and the applicable Community Area Plan. Address safety and reliability without unnecessarily introducing urban roadway patterns into rural communities.

Transportation Policy 2.0 — Coordinate transportation and land use.

Use the adopted land-use framework to guide transportation planning. Do not treat new access or capacity as an independent basis for increased density, expanded commercial uses, or additional resort development.

Transportation Policy 3.0 — Refine forecasts and project priorities.

Use the Transportation Master Plan to evaluate demand, safety, operational needs, and project alternatives. Clearly distinguish forecasts and conceptual improvements from adopted, funded, or approved projects.

Transportation Policy 4.0 — Protect interstate and regional access.

Participate in planning affecting Mountain Green and other regional connections. Evaluate existing interchange access, emergency movement, local circulation, and community impacts before recommending changes.

Transportation Policy 5.0 — Manage access along major roads.

Limit unnecessary direct driveways and repetitive frontage access. Consider coordinated circulation and shared access while protecting agricultural operations, neighboring properties, and rural character.

Transportation Policy 6.0 — Align development with transportation capability.

Evaluate supported development for roadway, intersection, crossing, drainage, and emergency-access needs. Require transportation analysis appropriate to the proposal's scale, location, and likely effects, consistent with adopted County requirements. Establish proportionate improvements, timing, funding, and maintenance before development depends on them.

Transportation Policy 7.0 — Protect emergency access.

Coordinate with emergency responders on constrained routes, evacuation, and alternate-access feasibility. Do not use emergency-access proposals as an independent justification for greater development intensity.

Transportation Policy 8.0 — Improve practical walking and bicycle connections.

Prioritize safe school access, useful community connections, and appropriate crossings. Match facilities to terrain, roadway conditions, agricultural uses, and the intended community setting.

DRAFT

Transportation Policy 9.0 — Respect ownership and establish maintenance.

Confirm lawful access and long-term responsibilities for roads, pathways, and trails. Do not assume public access across private land or County responsibility for private facilities.

Transportation Policy 10.0 — Evaluate cumulative and regional effects.

Consider traffic from approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development together with regional travel. Address seasonal and peak-period effects, including recreation, resort, industrial, and construction traffic.

DRAFT

Water Service & Infrastructure

This chapter describes Morgan County's water-service systems and the coordination needed to serve existing users and supported development. It focuses on water supply and infrastructure. Conservation and responsible water use are addressed in the Water Use & Preservation Element, recently adopted by the County in December 2025 and included in the Appendix. The two should be read together when planning water service and making land-use decisions.

Water Service & Community Character

Reliable culinary water is essential to existing homes, businesses, public facilities, and agricultural communities. Service arrangements differ across Morgan County, requiring coordination with individual providers and consideration of site-specific conditions.

Water-system availability should be evaluated together with the Future Place Types and Community Area Plans. A service connection, water right, or proposed extension should not independently establish support for additional density or a different development pattern.

The County should distinguish improvements needed to sustain existing service from extensions associated with supported development. Infrastructure planning should protect existing users and working agricultural operations rather than presume conversion of agricultural lands or water to residential use.

Existing Service Arrangements

A varied provider network

The Water Service Areas exhibit identifies a range of community, institutional, business, and resort-related water systems. Named systems include providers serving Mountain Green, Peterson, Enterprise, Croydon, Richville, Morgan City, and particular properties or facilities. The exhibit also identifies Wasatch Peaks Ranch and smaller systems serving individual institutions, businesses, camps, and recreation sites.

The mapped systems do not form a single countywide service network. Their service responsibilities, connection procedures, infrastructure, and available capability must be confirmed with the applicable provider.

Areas outside mapped systems may depend on private wells or other lawful supplies. The absence of a mapped water service area should not be treated as a definitive statement that a property lacks water, just as inclusion within a service area should not be treated as a guarantee of a connection. The exhibit provides planning context, not a parcel-specific determination of service eligibility.

The map also does not establish water rights, available source yield, treatment capability, storage, distribution pressure, fire flow, or unused connection capacity.

Water Rights, Supply & Delivery Capability

Water-rights totals and reported water use measure different aspects of the water system

DRAFT

and should not be treated as interchangeable or as proof of an available development surplus.

The County should distinguish:

- Legal authority to use water.
- Reliable source availability.
- Existing use and commitments.
- Treatment and storage capability.
- Distribution capacity and pressure.
- Provider approval and connection availability.
- Necessary improvements and their timing.

A provider's rights or sources may not be available at the location of a proposed project. Agricultural use, infrastructure limitations, and existing commitments may also affect practical availability.

Water planning should therefore use current provider documentation rather than a countywide total as the basis for evaluating individual development proposals.

Private Wells & Existing Users

Where a private well is proposed, its lawful establishment and suitability should be confirmed through the responsible agencies. Morgan County identifies the Weber-Morgan Health Department as the permitting contact for wells and septic systems.

Development review should address the relationship between wells, wastewater disposal, groundwater protection, and surrounding uses. Proposals should not assume that installation of additional wells will resolve water-service limitations without evaluating applicable requirements and site conditions.

Existing users should be considered when evaluating system changes, extensions, or new demand. Agricultural irrigation facilities and water arrangements should not be disrupted or presumed available for transfer without the necessary agreements and approvals.


System Improvements & Development

Supported development should identify the water improvements necessary for each phase, including connections, distribution facilities, storage, pressure, and fire-flow provisions where applicable.

Provider documentation should identify both current capability and any conditions that must be satisfied before service is available. A general willingness to consider service is not equivalent to completed infrastructure or an unconditional commitment.

Responsibility for design, permits, funding, construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement should be established before a project depends on the improvements. Service extensions should implement the supported land-use pattern, not establish a basis for extending that pattern onto adjoining lands.

DRAFT



MORGAN COUNTY

WATER SERVICE AREAS

0 4 8

Miles

February 2026

1. Monte Verde
2. Mountain Green Water Association
3. Highlands Water Company Inc
4. Mountain Green LDS Church
5. Mountain Green Highway Rest Stop
6. Browning Arms
7. Cottonwood Mutual
8. Wasatch Peaks Ranch
9. Peterson Pipeline Association
10. West Enterprise Water Association
11. Central Enterprise Water Co
12. Milton LDS Church
13. Kellys Road House #2 LLC
14. Hidden Hollow Water Company
15. South Littleton
16. Morgan City Water System
17. South Robinson Spring Water Users
18. Round Valley Country Club
19. Taggarts Grill
20. Holcim (US) Inc.
21. Croydon Pipeline Corporation
22. Richville
23. Morgan 5th & 6th Wards
24. Camp Zarahemla
25. Camp Woodland
26. East Canyon State Park
27. East Canyon Resort

Planning Outpost

JUB ENGINEERS, INC. | THE LANGDON GROUP | GATEWAY MAPPING INC.
JUB FAMILY OF COMPANIES

Water Service Policies

Water Service Policy 1.0 — Coordinate with the responsible provider.

Confirm the applicable provider, service eligibility, available capability, and necessary improvements for supported development. Maintain communication with providers concerning existing needs and potential changes.

Water Service Policy 2.0 — Distinguish rights from service capability.

Do not treat water-rights totals, reported usage, or mapped service boundaries as proof of available development capacity. Use current documentation addressing rights, reliable supply, commitments, and infrastructure.

Water Service Policy 3.0 — Retain land-use limits.

Do not use a connection, private well, or proposed system extension as an independent justification for increased density or development inconsistent with the Community Area Plan.

Water Service Policy 4.0 — Protect existing users and agricultural systems.

Evaluate proposed changes for effects on existing service, wells, irrigation infrastructure, and agricultural operations. Do not presume that agricultural water is available for development.

Water Service Policy 5.0 — Establish improvement responsibilities.

Identify necessary water improvements and enforceable arrangements for funding, timing, construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement before supported development relies on them.

Water Service Policy 6.0 — Keep service information current.

Periodically review the service exhibit and provider information. Clearly distinguish mapped planning areas from confirmed parcel-level service and refer conservation matters to the Water Use & Preservation chapter.

DRAFT

Sewer & Onsite Wastewater

The Sewer & Onsite Wastewater chapter describes centralized sewer service, reliance on septic systems in rural communities, and the relationship between wastewater suitability and development intensity. It establishes direction for protecting groundwater, coordinating with service providers and the Weber-Morgan Health Department, and evaluating wastewater proposals without presuming countywide sewer expansion.

Wastewater & Rural Development

Onsite wastewater disposal is the predominant arrangement in many of the County's rural communities. Centralized sewer service is geographically limited, and additional development outside those areas depends on lawful, suitable wastewater disposal. Currently there are limited systems and substantial practical constraints on service expansion.

This chapter does not presume a County objective to extend sewer throughout rural communities. Its direction is to maintain safe existing systems, recognize wastewater limitations, and evaluate any proposed service change against the applicable Community Area Plan.

Wastewater infrastructure should not independently establish support for additional density. Where a property cannot accommodate the proposed development safely, the response should not automatically be to extend sewer or introduce another treatment system so the same development intensity can proceed.

Existing Sewer Systems & Service Areas

The Sewer exhibit identifies Morgan Wastewater, the Mountain Green Sewer Improvement District, a separately depicted future Mountain Green service area, and the WPR Utility District.

These areas should be interpreted as planning information rather than proof of available connections. A future service area does not establish that infrastructure has been constructed, funded, approved, or made available to every property within it.

The supporting material identifies cost and physical constraints affecting potential expansion, including crossing Interstate 84. Provider intentions and service capability should be confirmed directly before the County relies on an extension assumption.

The County should not treat a resort-related utility system as available to adjoining communities without an express determination by the provider and the necessary agreements.

Septic Suitability & Development Limits

Septic systems are not suitable for every property or development pattern. The Weber-Morgan Health Department evaluates site and soil characteristics and applies state and local onsite wastewater requirements before determining system feasibility. The process includes review of property conditions and,

DRAFT

where required, percolation testing, system design, permitting, and inspection.

Lot area alone does not establish suitability. Review should address soils, groundwater conditions, slope, drainage, disposal and replacement areas, water-source separation, and the proposed wastewater load.

A mapped Rural Living or Rural Corridor designation does not establish that a site can accommodate septic disposal at the smallest listed lot size. Wastewater limitations may require a larger parcel, a different arrangement, fewer units, or a conclusion that the proposed intensity is unsuitable.

Subdivision review should comply with applicable County and Health Department requirements concerning onsite disposal, lot numbers, technical review, and any requirement for another treatment approach. A numerical subdivision limit should not be interpreted as a finding that every proposal below that threshold is safe or feasible.

Groundwater & Cumulative Septic Effects

Wastewater evaluation should consider the combined effects of existing, approved, and proposed systems. Review of individual lots may not fully address the consequences of repeated divisions within the same groundwater setting.

Utah experience demonstrates why this matters. Reporting on Millville identifies septic effluent as at least a partial source of nitrate contamination affecting its aquifer and drinking-water concerns. The Utah Geological Survey also identifies septic wastewater among potential human-related nitrate sources in groundwater. These examples support caution; they do not establish that comparable contamination has been documented in Morgan County.

Where development may affect drinking-water sources or vulnerable groundwater, the County should coordinate with the Health Department, water providers, and appropriate specialists to determine the necessary level of cumulative-impact evaluation. Relevant considerations include system concentration, groundwater movement, recharge, existing water quality, and public-water-source protection areas.

Passing an individual percolation test should not substitute for broader groundwater evaluation where the location or cumulative development pattern warrants it.

Sewer Extensions & Alternative Systems

No presumption of expansion

Sewer extensions should be considered only for a clearly identified purpose, such as addressing a demonstrated existing health concern or serving development independently supported by the Plan. An extension should not establish a new growth area or justify increasing density on surrounding rural lands.

Review should distinguish correction of an existing problem from a proposal principally intended to enable additional development.

Feasibility and responsibility

Any extension or alternative treatment proposal should establish the responsible provider,

DRAFT

regulatory approvals, treatment and conveyance capability, construction feasibility, funding, and long-term management.

Evaluation should include effects on existing customers, agricultural lands, waterways, road crossings, and neighboring properties. The County should not assume operational or financial responsibility for a developer-proposed system without expressly evaluating and accepting that role.

Shared or alternative treatment

A shared system or other alternative should not be treated as an automatic exception to the Plan's density limits. Such systems remain subject to applicable technical and regulatory requirements, and development intensity must have a separate basis in the adopted land-use framework.


The County should guard against incremental expansion of a small system into an unintended service area or rural growth center.

Existing Systems & Long-Term Care

Protecting groundwater requires attention to existing septic systems as well as new proposals. The County should coordinate with the Health Department on understandable information concerning operation, maintenance, repair, and applicable permit requirements.

Where failing systems or water-quality concerns are identified, responses should be based on documented conditions and appropriate technical review. Potential remedies should not presume broad sewer expansion or unrelated increases in development.

DRAFT



MORGAN COUNTY

SEWER

0 4 8

Miles

April 2026

- 1. Morgan Wastewater
- 2. Mountain Green Sewer Improvement District
- 3. Mountain Green Sewer Improvement District (Future)
- 4. WPR Utility District

Planning Outpost

JUB ENGINEERS, INC. | THE LANGDON GROUP | GATEWAY MAPPING INC.

Sewer & Onsite Wastewater Policies

Wastewater Policy 1.0 — Recognize wastewater limits.

Use demonstrated wastewater suitability and service capability to inform supported development. Do not assume that a mapped designation or minimum lot area establishes septic feasibility.

Wastewater Policy 2.0 — Require applicable technical review.

Coordinate with the Weber-Morgan Health Department and responsible providers concerning site suitability, subdivision requirements, permits, and lawful disposal before development depends on them.

Wastewater Policy 3.0 — Evaluate cumulative groundwater effects.

Consider existing, approved, and proposed onsite systems together where groundwater vulnerability or development concentration warrants additional review. Protect drinking-water sources and established source-protection areas.

Wastewater Policy 4.0 — Avoid speculative sewer assumptions.

Do not rely on conceptual service areas, unapproved extensions, or a provider's proximity as proof of available service. Confirm capability, approvals, funding, and timing.

Wastewater Policy 5.0 — Retain the rural land-use framework.

Do not treat sewer availability, shared treatment, or developer-funded infrastructure as an independent basis for increased density or expansion into agricultural and limited-growth areas.

Wastewater Policy 6.0 — Evaluate extensions for a defined purpose.

Consider proposed extensions in relation to documented existing needs or independently supported development. Address feasibility, cumulative effects, public costs, provider commitments, and Community Area Plan consistency.

Wastewater Policy 7.0 — Establish long-term responsibility.

Require clear arrangements for ownership, operation, maintenance, monitoring, repairs, replacement, and funding of supported wastewater facilities. Do not presume County acceptance of private systems.

Wastewater Policy 8.0 — Support safe existing systems.

Coordinate public information and responses to documented system failures or water-quality concerns with the Health Department and relevant providers. Match remedies to the demonstrated problem.

DRAFT

Community Amenities

The Community Amenities chapter describes existing resources and opportunities for recreation, gathering, and outdoor activity within Morgan County's rural setting. It establishes direction for making effective use of existing facilities, considering practical community connections, and evaluating potential improvements according to community benefit, feasibility, funding, and long-term responsibility.

Rural Living & Community Amenities

Residents expressed interest in additional recreation and gathering opportunities, walking and biking connections, and improved access to outdoor recreation. These requests reflect a desire for places to gather, opportunities for year-round activity, and safer ways for residents of all ages to enjoy their community. The General Plan recognizes these needs alongside residents' equally strong commitment to maintaining rural character and limiting growth.

Providing amenities in a rural, low-density county involves important tradeoffs. A smaller, dispersed population may make it more difficult to support facilities that depend on regular use, membership revenue, or substantial public funding. The cost of a facility includes not only land and construction, but also staffing, utilities, maintenance, repairs, and eventual replacement. A project that can be constructed through a grant or one-time contribution may still require a dependable source of ongoing operating funds.

These considerations do not mean that community amenities are unimportant or unattainable. They mean that the County should evaluate the scale, location, service area, funding, and long-term responsibilities of proposed improvements before making commitments. Additional residential growth should not be treated as the default solution for financing amenities, particularly where it would conflict with a Community Area Plan's rural-preservation direction.

Recreation & Gathering Opportunities

Recreation and gathering opportunities should be appropriately scaled, financially sustainable, and compatible with the County's rural setting. The Plan recognizes these interests while emphasizing improvements that are appropriately scaled, financially sustainable, and compatible with the County's rural setting.

The County's approach should prioritize effective use of existing facilities, modest improvements, and opportunities provided through willing partners, community organizations, or compatible private investment. Consideration of any additional amenity should address anticipated use, accessibility, funding, management, and long-term operating and maintenance responsibilities.

DRAFT

Walking Connections & Recreation Access

Residents' interest in additional trails should be addressed through useful, achievable connections, not assumptions that surrounding open land is available for public use. Scenic visibility, undeveloped land, and proximity to public lands do not, by themselves, establish lawful access. Proposed routes should address ownership, authorized access, agricultural operations, safety, construction, and long-term maintenance.

In developing neighborhoods, appropriate walking routes and recreation connections should be considered as part of coordinated site planning, consistent with applicable regulations and the Community Area Plan. Elsewhere, priorities may include improving existing routes, closing short connection gaps, and pursuing voluntary landowner or agency partnerships. Walking and biking improvements should reflect the local setting and avoid creating conflicts with working lands or directing users onto private property without permission.

A Practical Path Forward

The County should maintain a clear record of requested amenities and periodically evaluate opportunities using consistent criteria: community benefit, likely use, feasibility, rural compatibility, funding, accessibility, and long-term responsibility. Evaluation should distinguish improvements serving existing residents from those needed because of new development.

Where a requested amenity cannot be advanced in the near term, the County should explain the principal constraints and identify any reasonable alternatives or prerequisites. Recognizing a need does not guarantee construction, but residents should be able to understand how their requests informed priorities and what would be necessary to move an opportunity forward.

DRAFT

Community Amenities Policies

Community Amenities Policy 1.0 — Recognize resident needs while maintaining rural character.

Consider residents' requests for gathering places, year-round recreation, walking and biking routes, and outdoor access as important community needs. Pursue appropriately scaled improvements consistent with the applicable Community Area Plan.

Community Amenities Policy 2.0 — Evaluate feasibility and long-term responsibility.

Before committing County resources to a significant facility or improvement, evaluate anticipated use, location, accessibility, construction costs, operating expenses, funding, and long-term ownership and maintenance. Distinguish one-time funding opportunities from dependable resources for ongoing operation, repair, and replacement.

Community Amenities Policy 3.0 — Prioritize Existing Resources & Compatible Partnerships.

Prioritize effective use of existing facilities, modest improvements, and voluntary partnerships that provide recreation and gathering opportunities without creating unsupported County financial or operational obligations. Compatible private investment may provide additional opportunities where consistent with the applicable Community Area Plan and zoning. Partnerships should establish clear responsibilities for access, funding, management, and maintenance; they should not imply County construction, ownership, or subsidy.

Community Amenities Policy 4.0 — Prioritize useful and lawful recreation connections.

Prioritize walking and biking improvements that connect homes with schools, parks, gathering places, and other appropriate destinations. Confirm ownership and authorized access before representing a route as available for public use. Respect agricultural operations, irrigation facilities, neighboring properties, natural resources, and the maintenance capacity of the responsible entity.

Community Amenities Policy 5.0 — Coordinate amenities with supported development.

Where development creates a demonstrated need for recreation facilities or connections, apply lawful, proportionate requirements consistent with County regulations and the applicable Community Area Plan. Establish the timing, ownership, access, construction, funding, and maintenance responsibilities for required improvements. Do not assume that private resort amenities satisfy public recreation needs or that scenic and conservation lands provide usable recreation space.

Community Amenities Policy 6.0 — Communicate priorities and constraints.

Maintain an understandable record of significant amenity requests and periodically report on their status. Explain whether an opportunity is being evaluated, pursued through a partnership, deferred pending funding or other prerequisites, or not recommended because of identified constraints. Provide opportunities for residents to help establish priorities and understand the tradeoffs involved.

DRAFT

Public Facilities & Services

Public facilities and services support daily life, community well-being, and emergency readiness. Morgan County should prioritize reliable existing services, effective partnerships, and improvements matched to demonstrated needs, available resources, and rural community conditions.

Public & Human Services

Public and human services help residents access health, family, aging, and other support resources. Regional partnerships are important to service delivery; Weber Human Services provides mental health, substance-use, and aging services through cooperation between Weber and Morgan Counties. The County should support clear information, referrals, and coordination, with attention to residents who face transportation, mobility, or other access barriers.

Public Safety

Sheriff's Office

The County should coordinate with the Sheriff's Office on law enforcement, community safety, and emergency planning. Land-use review should consider access, response needs, and demands associated with supported development, recreation activity, and regional travel. Additional development should not depend on unverified assumptions about staffing or service capacity.

Fire & Medical Response Services

Morgan County Fire Department and Mountain Green Fire Protection District provide fire and emergency medical services within their respective service arrangements, with regional coordination and mutual aid supporting response. Planning should address emergency access, wildfire exposure, water availability for firefighting, and the resources needed to serve existing communities and supported development. Private infrastructure does not, by itself, resolve emergency-response demands.

Library

Morgan County Library provides a local resource for reading, learning, and information access. The County should support effective use of the existing library and evaluate service improvements according to resident needs, accessibility, staffing, and sustainable funding.

Schools & Higher Education

Primary & Secondary Education

Morgan School District is a key partner in planning for community needs. The County should coordinate with the District on enrollment trends, school access, transportation safety, and potential facility needs. Population growth should not be assumed to produce uniform enrollment increases, and school needs should not independently justify development inconsistent with the Community Area Plans.

DRAFT


Post-Secondary Education


The County should support connections to post-secondary education, technical training, and continuing education through appropriate regional and online opportunities. Coordination with education providers and employers should emphasize practical access, workforce skills, and opportunities for residents without presuming construction of a local campus.

Coordination & Implementation

County decisions should distinguish improvements needed by existing residents from demands created by new development. Significant proposals should identify the responsible service providers, demonstrated capacity, necessary improvements, funding, and long-term obligations. Partnerships and phased improvements should be considered before creating new County facilities or unsupported operating commitments.

DRAFT





MORGAN COUNTY

PUBLIC FACILITIES

0 4 8
Miles

February 2026

- Airports (1)
- Cemeteries (10)
- Fairgrounds (1)
- Fire Stations (2)
- Forest Service Stations (2)
- Law Enforcement Locations (2)
- Post Offices (1)
- Public Libraries (1)
- Rifle Range (1)
- Schools (PreK-12) (6)
- Schools (Higher Education) (1)
- Transfer Station (1)
- County Courthouse (1)

Planning Outpost

JUB ENGINEERS, INC.

Public Facilities & Services Policies

Public Facilities & Services Policy 1.0 — Maintain reliable services and use existing facilities effectively.

Prioritize dependable services and effective use of existing public facilities, including the County library. Evaluate improvements according to demonstrated needs, accessibility, staffing, available funding, and long-term operation and maintenance. Consider partnerships, shared use, and phased improvements before committing to new County facilities.

Public Facilities & Services Policy 2.0 — Improve access to human services.

Coordinate with regional providers to help residents access health, mental health, substance-use, aging, family, and other support services. Support clear information and referrals, with particular attention to residents facing transportation, mobility, or other access barriers.

Public Facilities & Services Policy 3.0 — Coordinate public safety and emergency readiness.

Work with law enforcement, fire, and emergency medical providers to address response needs, emergency access, evacuation, wildfire exposure, and water availability for firefighting. Evaluate the combined demands of existing communities, supported development, recreation activity, and regional travel. Do not assume that private infrastructure alone resolves public safety or emergency-response needs.

Public Facilities & Services Policy 4.0 — Support education and learning opportunities.

Coordinate with Morgan School District on current enrollment information, school access, transportation safety, and potential facility needs. Support access to post-secondary education, technical training, and continuing education through regional, online, and employer partnerships. Do not assume that population growth produces uniform enrollment increases or that identified education needs require a new local campus.

Public Facilities & Services Policy 5.0 — Match development with demonstrated service capacity.

For significant proposals, identify responsible service providers, available capacity, necessary improvements, and arrangements for funding, timing, operation, and maintenance. Distinguish existing community needs from demands created by development and apply lawful, proportionate requirements to address development's effects. Do not rely on unverified staffing or service assumptions or create unsupported County obligations. Facility and service needs should not independently justify development inconsistent with the applicable Community Area Plan.

DRAFT

Waterways, Sensitive Lands & Natural Hazards

This chapter describes waterways, sensitive lands, and natural conditions that influence development suitability, public safety, agriculture, and community infrastructure. The Waterways & Flood Hazards and Soils exhibits provide a countywide framework for identifying areas that may require additional review. The chapter establishes direction for protecting natural systems, avoiding inappropriate development, and addressing site-specific risks in coordination with applicable County regulations and responsible agencies.

Natural Systems & Community Character

Morgan County's rivers, streams, irrigated lands, wetlands, foothills, and mountain terrain help define its rural character. These features also influence where development, roads, utilities, and public facilities can be located safely and responsibly.

Sensitive lands should not be viewed simply as vacant areas awaiting development. Their value may include agricultural production, water protection, drainage, habitat, scenic views, and separation between communities. Retaining these functions can advance the County's rural-preservation objectives while reducing exposure to natural hazards.

Development suitability should be evaluated independently of a property's future land-use designation. A mapped place type does not establish that all portions of a property are buildable or that identified hazards can be acceptably addressed.

Understanding the Planning Exhibits

The Waterways & Flood Hazards exhibit identifies mapped flood hazards, wetlands, groundwater source-protection zones, Quaternary faults, and properties identified as high-risk within the wildland–urban interface.

The Soils exhibit consolidates the geologic map units identified as geologic hazard study areas under Morgan County Code § 155.223(A). Rather than displaying each unit separately, the exhibit groups them to show their general distribution and combined extent throughout the County. The mapped category identifies areas where geologic conditions warrant further evaluation under applicable County requirements; it does not indicate that every property has the same hazard or is unsuitable for development.

Areas outside this category are not necessarily free of hazards, because slope conditions, landslides, debris-flow exposure, faults, and other site-specific circumstances may also require investigation. Development review should use the applicable County provisions, current UGS information, and any required professional studies to determine the conditions affecting a particular proposal.

These exhibits support early identification of potential constraints. They do not replace current regulatory maps, professional investigations,

DRAFT

wetland determinations, provider source-protection plans, or site-specific review.

The absence of a mapped hazard does not establish that a property is free of risk. Likewise, identification within a mapped study area does not, by itself, determine whether development is prohibited or what mitigation would be required. Morgan County's geologic-hazard provisions identify study areas using multiple criteria, including geologic mapping, landslide information, slope conditions, debris-flow exposure, and fault activity.

Waterways, Wetlands & Drainage

Protect the function of water corridors

The Weber River, Lost Creek, other streams, and associated drainageways are important components of the County's landscape. Planning should preserve their ability to convey water and support surrounding agricultural and natural systems.

Development, grading, road crossings, and utility work should avoid unnecessary disruption of stream corridors, irrigation facilities, and natural drainage patterns. Review should consider erosion, sediment movement, channel stability, downstream effects, maintenance access, and the consequences of concentrating or redirecting runoff.

Keeping a drainage corridor open is not necessarily the same as providing public access. Ownership and authorized access should be established separately before identifying recreation opportunities along waterways.

Wetlands and site-specific review

Mapped wetlands provide an initial indication of potentially sensitive areas, but National Wetlands Inventory mapping does not establish regulatory jurisdiction or definitive site boundaries. Field conditions and applicable agency requirements must be evaluated where a proposal could affect wetlands or other waters.

The County should encourage early identification of these resources so project layouts can avoid unnecessary impacts before substantial design work occurs. Required permits or agency determinations should be resolved through the applicable review processes.

Flood Hazards & Development Suitability

Interpret flood probabilities correctly

The exhibit distinguishes the 1-percent annual-chance flood hazard, regulatory floodway, 0.2-percent annual-chance flood hazard, areas of undetermined flood hazard, and areas with reduced risk due to a levee.

A 1-percent annual-chance flood has that probability of occurring in any given year; the term "100-year flood" does not mean flooding occurs only once every century. FEMA also distinguishes the broader floodplain from the regulatory floodway, which is subject to more restrictive development considerations.

Reduced or undetermined mapped risk should not be interpreted as an assurance that flooding cannot occur. Review should use the applicable effective flood information and consider local

DRAFT

drainage conditions that may not be fully represented by the countywide exhibit.

Retain flood conveyance and avoid transferring risk

Morgan County's Flood Damage Prevention ordinance establishes requirements for development in regulated flood-hazard areas, including specific standards and floodway provisions. These requirements remain separate from the General Plan's broader land-use direction.

As a planning priority, the County should favor compatible agricultural, open-land, and other low-intensity uses in flood-prone areas. Proposed development should address the safety of buildings, access routes, utilities, and wastewater facilities, not just the elevation of an individual structure.

Fill, grading, drainage changes, and crossings should be evaluated for effects on flood conveyance and neighboring or downstream properties. Protection of one site should not create unacceptable risks or maintenance obligations elsewhere.

Soils, Slopes & Geologic Conditions

Problem soils and unstable ground

Soil and underlying geologic conditions can affect foundations, roads, utilities, drainage, and onsite wastewater suitability. Utah Geological Survey guidance identifies hazards associated with expansive or collapsible materials, landslides, shallow groundwater, and other problem soils and rocks.

Morgan County also has documented geologic conditions relevant to slope stability. UGS mapping describes altered volcanic sedimentary rocks of the Norwood Formation in the Morgan quadrangle as prone to landsliding. This is regional context, not a finding that every property containing that formation is unsafe.

Development review should establish the conditions affecting the particular site and the implications of grading, excavation, irrigation, drainage changes, and proposed structures. A foundation solution alone should not be assumed to resolve broader slope or off-site risks.

Professional investigation and mitigation

The County's geologic-hazard provisions establish report, certification, review, and disclosure requirements for applicable proposals. They address risks to on-site and off-site property, infrastructure, and people, including the effects of proposed site modifications.

Where required, investigations should inform the location and layout of development before critical decisions are made. Recommendations should be incorporated into the applicable plans, approvals, and construction documents.

Mitigation should not be treated as an automatic reason to support greater development intensity. Where acceptable risk cannot be demonstrated, the County should consider avoidance, relocation, reduced intensity, or denial as appropriate under applicable law.

DRAFT

Groundwater Protection & Related Hazards

Drinking-water source protection

The groundwater source-protection areas shown on the exhibit identify another important layer of development review. Public drinking-water source-protection plans are based on source-specific evaluations and may identify activities requiring controls to protect water quality.

The County should coordinate with water providers, the Weber-Morgan Health Department, and relevant state agencies when development could affect a drinking-water source. Particular attention should be given to wastewater disposal, excavation, drainage, and the cumulative effects of surrounding land uses.


Utah DEQ provides guidance specifically addressing onsite wastewater systems in drinking-water source-protection zones and planning in non-sewered areas. Source protection should therefore be considered alongside—not replaced by—individual septic suitability review.


Faults and wildfire exposure

Mapped Quaternary faults and wildland–urban interface information should prompt review appropriate to the proposed use and location. A mapped fault trace is not a parcel-specific setback determination, and fault-investigation requirements depend on the applicable County provisions and fault classification.

Wildfire concerns should be coordinated with fire providers and emergency planning, including access, evacuation, water availability, and surrounding vegetation. The mapped wildfire layer should not be treated as a complete countywide assessment or a guarantee of safety outside the identified areas.

DRAFT





MORGAN COUNTY

SOILS

0 4 8
Miles

October 2026

Hazardous Soils


Non-Hazardous Soils

Data from the Utah Geologic Survey quad maps Salt Lake City (100k) and Ogden (62k).

Categories summarize the geologic map units listed in Morgan County Code § 155.223(A). "Non-Hazardous Soils" indicates areas outside the consolidated listed-unit category, not a determination that a property is free of geologic hazards or exempt from further review.

Planning Outpost

JUB ENGINEERS, INC.


MORGAN COUNTY
WATERWAYS & FLOOD HAZARDS
0
4
8
Miles
October 2026
Quaternary Faults
High Risk WUI Properties
National Wetlands Inventory
Groundwater Source Protection Zones
Flood Hazard Zones
1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
Regulatory Floodway
Area of Undetermined Flood Hazard
0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
Area with Reduced Risk Due to Levee
Planning Outpost
JUB ENGINEERS, INC.
Ogden Valley City
Pineview Reservoir
Huntsville
Causey Reservoir
Lost Creek Reservoir
Mountain Green
Peterson
Enterprise
Stoddard
Croydon
Milton
Morgan
Round Valley
Fruit Heights
Farmington
Richville
Porterville
Henefer
Echo Reservoir
Centerville
West Bountiful
East Canyon Reservoir
Coalville
Bountiful
Woods Cross
North Salt Lake
Salt Lake City
Emigration Canyon
Little Dell Reservoir
Rockport Lake
158
39
84
80

Sensitive Lands & Natural Hazards Policies

Sensitive Lands Policy 1.0 — Protect natural functions and rural character.

Maintain waterways, working agricultural lands, wetlands, drainage corridors, and other sensitive areas as functioning landscape systems. Favor land-use patterns that avoid unnecessary disturbance and retain their agricultural, environmental, and scenic value.

Sensitive Lands Policy 2.0 — Use maps for screening, not final determinations.

Use the planning exhibits to identify potential constraints and necessary review. Confirm applicable regulatory information and site conditions before determining development suitability.

Sensitive Lands Policy 3.0 — Avoid inappropriate development in flood-prone areas.

Apply current floodplain requirements and evaluate access, utilities, wastewater, and off-site effects. Do not support discretionary changes that increase exposure or transfer unacceptable flood and drainage risks to other properties.

Sensitive Lands Policy 4.0 — Require applicable professional review.

Apply County requirements for geologic-hazard investigation, certification, review, mitigation, and disclosure. Ensure that required recommendations are reflected in project design and implementation.

Sensitive Lands Policy 5.0 — Protect drinking-water sources.

Coordinate land-use and wastewater review with source-protection plans and responsible agencies. Consider cumulative effects where surrounding development could threaten groundwater or public drinking-water sources.

Sensitive Lands Policy 6.0 — Do not presume mitigation justifies intensification.

Treat hazard mitigation as a condition of otherwise supported development, not an independent basis for increased density. Where acceptable risk cannot be established, consider appropriate avoidance or changes to the proposal.

Coordination & Implementation

The County should maintain current hazard-screening information, coordinate review with qualified professionals and responsible agencies, and periodically update exhibits as better information becomes available. Significant decisions should identify the relevant hazards, required investigations, proposed responses, and responsibilities for long-term maintenance.

Implementation should remain coordinated with the Community Area Plans, transportation and utility planning, conservation priorities, and emergency-management efforts. The objective is to protect

DRAFT

existing communities and avoid creating preventable risks—not to imply that every constrained property can or should be developed.

DRAFT


OUR LAND, OUR COMMUNITIES

This section explains how Morgan County's land should be used and protected and how that direction applies to each community. It describes existing land uses, ownership, and conservation opportunities, then introduces the Future Place Types and countywide land-use policies. The Community Area Plans provide visions, policies, and maps that reflect local character, priorities, and conditions. Together, these chapters guide decisions that protect working lands and rural landscapes while respecting the differences among communities

Land Use Element

The Land Use Element guides how land in unincorporated Morgan County should be used and protected while maintaining the County's rural and agricultural character. It describes existing land uses and ownership patterns, identifies conservation and agricultural-preservation tools, and establishes Future Place Types to guide the location, scale, and character of development. Read together with the Community Area Plans and Future Land Use Maps, it provides direction for decisions that respect private-property rights, protect working lands and natural resources, and reflect each community's distinct setting and the capacity of its roads, water systems, and other services.

DRAFT



MORGAN COUNTY

0 11,000 22,000
Feet

September 2026

DRAFT

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LANDS

Morgan County

Land Ownership

Public (7%)

Private (93%)

Planning Outpost

JUB ENGINEERS, INC.

THE LANDON GROUP

GATEWAY MAPPING INC.

JUB FAMILY OF COMPANIES

Privately Owned Land

Privately Owned Land

Morgan County's rural character is defined by expansive mountain views, agricultural fields, ranchlands, waterways, and open landscapes. Although these surroundings create a strong sense of openness, most of the land is privately owned. Approximately 93 percent of the County's land is privately held, while approximately 7 percent is publicly owned. Private ownership is therefore a central consideration in planning for land use, conservation, trails, and recreation.

The distinction between open land and publicly accessible land is important. Undeveloped hillsides, pastures, river corridors, and other scenic areas may contribute to community character without being available for public walking, cycling, fishing, or other recreation. The presence of an existing road, informal path, or visible destination should not be treated as evidence of public access. Likewise, the land ownership exhibit identifies ownership categories; it does not establish where public recreation is permitted.

Scenic landscapes & public access

Residents value the County's scenic setting and seek opportunities to experience it through trails, pathways, parks, and access to outdoor destinations. However, recreation planning must distinguish among scenic lands, existing public recreation areas, private facilities, and properties where access would require a separate agreement. The limited availability of accessible land is an important consideration in evaluating potential trail connections and recreation improvements.

The County should identify practical opportunities to improve access to appropriate destinations while respecting private ownership, working agricultural operations, natural resources, and surrounding communities. Proposed routes should be evaluated for their access status, feasibility, safety, environmental conditions, and long-term operation and maintenance. Publicly owned land should not automatically be assumed to be suitable or available for every type of recreation.

Clear maps, signs, and public information should distinguish established public routes and facilities from conceptual connections or privately controlled areas. Recreation planning should avoid creating expectations of access before the necessary permissions, agreements, or improvements are in place.

Recreation access & landowner partnerships

Morgan County's scenic landscape is an important community and economic asset, but scenic visibility does not necessarily provide public access. Recreation and visitor-related initiatives should distinguish between existing public destinations, private facilities, and opportunities that would require voluntary landowner participation.

Potential access agreements, easements, trail connections, or other partnerships should address agricultural operations, resource protection, public safety, liability, maintenance, and long-term responsibility. Where a route crosses or adjoins working lands, planning

DRAFT

should consider irrigation facilities, farm equipment, livestock, gates, fencing, seasonal activities, and potential conflicts between recreation users and normal agricultural practices.

The County should prioritize improvements that strengthen access to appropriate existing destinations and provide lasting community benefits without assuming public use of private land or requiring development that conflicts with the applicable Community Area Plan. Voluntary partnerships should provide clear expectations for both landowners and users and should not depend on informal arrangements that leave access or maintenance responsibilities uncertain.

Walking paths & recreation within developing communities

The predominance of private land makes it particularly important to plan walking paths, usable open space, and recreation opportunities as part of developing communities. Residents should not have to rely on access to surrounding private hillsides, fields, or river corridors to meet everyday walking and recreation needs.

In developing areas such as Mountain Green, neighborhood planning should incorporate connected walking routes and appropriate recreation spaces alongside streets, utilities, and other community infrastructure. Paths should provide useful connections among homes, parks, schools, gathering places, and nearby services where feasible. Their design should reflect terrain, drainage, roadway safety, accessibility, and the intended character of the community.

Development review should distinguish between land retained for scenic or conservation purposes and land designed and legally available for recreation. Steep slopes, drainage areas, agricultural land, and other undeveloped portions of a project may provide important landscape benefits without providing usable recreation space. Open-space planning should therefore consider the function, accessibility, and long-term management of retained land—not simply its acreage.

Where consistent with applicable regulations and the Community Area Plan, development proposals should identify how residents will reach usable recreation areas and how walking routes will connect within the project and to appropriate adjoining routes. Connections outside a development should depend on established access rights or documented agreements rather than assumptions about future access across neighboring properties.

Connectivity, phasing & long-term responsibility

Walking paths and recreation spaces should be planned as a coordinated network rather than as isolated amenities within individual developments. Project layouts should identify appropriate opportunities for future connections while protecting neighboring properties and avoiding routes that lead users toward private land without authorized access.

Phased development should identify when pathways and recreation improvements will be constructed and how they will serve residents during each phase. Routes should be usable and

DRAFT

safely connected when the areas they serve are occupied, rather than deferred indefinitely to a later stage of development.

Proposals should also identify whether paths and recreation spaces will be available to the public or limited to residents of the development. Ownership, access arrangements, construction responsibilities, maintenance, and funding should be clearly established through applicable approvals and agreements. The County should not assume responsibility for private recreation facilities unless that responsibility is expressly evaluated and accepted.

Together, these considerations allow the County to expand practical walking and recreation opportunities while respecting private property, supporting working lands, and maintaining the scenic landscapes that define Morgan County.

Morgan City & Unincorporated Communities

Morgan City

Morgan City is the only incorporated municipality in Morgan County and serves as the county seat. With a population of 4,071 at the 2020 Census, it is an established center for housing, employment, shopping, civic facilities, and community services. Its historic commercial setting and residential neighborhoods reflect the valley's agricultural and railroad heritage, while local businesses and public facilities serve both City residents and the surrounding County.

Morgan City maintains its own municipal planning framework. The County's General Plan primarily guides land-use decisions in unincorporated areas, while providing a basis for coordination with the City on transportation, infrastructure, housing, economic development, and other shared interests. Maintaining a clear relationship between City development and surrounding rural lands is an important consideration in preserving community character and planning for services.

Unincorporated Communities

Outside Morgan City, the County's nine principal unincorporated communities are:

- Croydon
- Enterprise
- Milton
- Mountain Green
- Peterson
- Porterville
- Richville
- Round Valley
- Stoddard.

These communities range from developing residential neighborhoods to historic rural settlements surrounded by farms, ranches, and open landscapes. Each has its own identity, development pattern, infrastructure conditions, and relationship to the valley's agricultural and natural setting. Other smaller settlements and locally recognized places also contribute to the County's history and character.

DRAFT

Land-use planning in these communities is administered by Morgan County. The General Plan's countywide policies, Community Area Plans, and Future Land Use Maps provide direction for evaluating development, protecting working lands and natural resources, and coordinating infrastructure and community improvements. This framework recognizes that the location, scale, and form of development appropriate in one community may not be appropriate in another.

Existing County Land Uses

County extent & development pattern

Morgan County encompasses approximately 611 square miles, including approximately 609.17 square miles of land, or about 389,869 acres. The remaining area consists of water. Its mountain terrain, narrow valleys, waterways, and agricultural history have shaped a development pattern in which established communities and transportation corridors are surrounded by extensive working lands and largely undeveloped landscapes.

Morgan City occupies approximately 3.2 square miles, or about 2,050 acres, within the County. As the only incorporated municipality, it contains an established concentration of residential neighborhoods, commercial businesses, employment uses, and civic facilities. Most of the County lies outside the City's boundaries and consists of unincorporated communities, agricultural land, rural residences, grazing areas, foothills, and mountainous terrain.

Development is generally concentrated in valley locations and near established roads, where access, terrain, and infrastructure make construction more feasible. Interstate 84, Morgan Valley Drive, State Route 66, and other principal roads connect the County's communities and support residential, agricultural, commercial, and recreation-related activity. Steep slopes, flood-prone lands, water and wastewater limitations, and other site conditions influence the location and intensity of development.

Agricultural & rural residential lands

Agriculture and rural residential uses define much of the County's settled landscape. Working farms and ranches, irrigated fields, pasture, livestock facilities, farmsteads, and homes on larger parcels occur throughout the valley communities. These uses contribute to the County's economy and identity while maintaining open views and separation between more developed areas.

Outside Mountain Green and Peterson, the central portions of the unincorporated communities are predominantly characterized by A-10 and A-20 agricultural zoning, with minimum parcel sizes of 10 and 20 acres, respectively. This zoning framework reflects the prevailing agricultural and low-density rural setting. Actual conditions vary among properties and include active agricultural operations, rural homes, accessory buildings, and undeveloped land.

Agricultural zoning should not be interpreted as evidence that every parcel is actively farmed or that all existing parcels conform to the current

DRAFT

minimum area. The existing landscape reflects historic settlement, prior development approvals, property divisions, and ongoing agricultural and residential use.

Mountain Green & Peterson

Mountain Green has the most diverse mix of land uses and zoning among the County's unincorporated communities. Its existing pattern includes residential neighborhoods, rural and agricultural properties, commercial and service activity, employment uses, and community facilities. Its proximity to Interstate 84 and Trappers Loop Road, together with residential development, distinguishes it from the predominantly agricultural and rural patterns found elsewhere in the County.

Peterson also contains a comparatively varied land-use and zoning pattern, although its mix is less extensive than Mountain Green's. Rural residences, agricultural properties, and areas accommodating other development forms create a different planning context from communities whose central areas are predominantly zoned for larger agricultural parcels.

These differences are important to understanding existing conditions, but they do not establish that either community should accommodate every type of development. The applicable Community Area Plan, Future Land Use Map, infrastructure capacity, and surrounding land uses should guide decisions about future changes.

Peripheral & mountainous lands

Beyond the central settled areas, much of the County's peripheral and mountainous land is zoned MU-160 or Forestry. These areas form the broader landscape surrounding the valley communities and are generally associated with large parcels, grazing and resource uses, forested terrain, open space, and limited development.

Their largely undeveloped appearance does not establish public ownership or recreation access. Many of these lands are privately held, and their use and accessibility depend on ownership, applicable regulations, established access rights, and site conditions. The preceding land ownership section addresses this distinction and its implications for recreation and trail planning.

Commercial, employment & community-serving uses

Commercial and employment activity is concentrated primarily in Morgan City and Mountain Green, with more limited businesses and other nonresidential uses elsewhere in the County. Existing activities include retail and personal services, construction-related businesses, manufacturing, and other employment uses. Schools, government facilities, religious institutions, parks, utilities, and other community-serving uses support residents throughout the valley.

Recreation and visitor-related uses also contribute to the existing land-use pattern. These include reservoir-related facilities, recreation and resort properties, and associated activities that differ in scale and operation from the surrounding agricultural and rural residential landscape. Their presence creates specific

DRAFT

considerations for access, seasonal traffic, infrastructure, emergency services, and compatibility with nearby properties.

Existing zoning & future land-use direction

The existing land-use descriptions in this chapter provide a general overview of County conditions at the time of plan preparation. References to zoning districts describe broad development patterns and are not intended to identify the current zoning or permitted uses of individual properties. Parcel-specific zoning information should be confirmed through the County's current official zoning records and applicable land-use regulations.

The General Plan's Future Place Types and Community Area Future Land Use Maps establish a separate, long-range framework for evaluating future land-use decisions. These designations guide planning and consideration of zoning changes; they do not replace current zoning or establish development entitlements. Future proposals should be evaluated for consistency with community character, agricultural protection, infrastructure capacity, natural resources, and the applicable Community Area Plan.

Land Conservation & Agricultural Preservation

Land Conservation & Agricultural Preservation

Morgan County's working farms, ranches, open fields, waterways, habitat, and scenic landscapes are central to its rural identity. Conservation should protect these lands as functioning agricultural and natural systems, not simply as undeveloped space between homes. Particular attention should be given to retaining connected working lands, reliable irrigation systems, meaningful separation between communities, and the resources that support the County's rural economy and quality of life.

Residents in several communities have expressed a strong preference to retain existing rural conditions and avoid additional development. Conservation strategies provide different ways to respond to that preference while respecting private ownership and existing lawful uses. Some tools guide future land-use decisions, some protect agricultural operations, and others establish long-term or permanent restrictions through voluntary agreements. These approaches should be considered together rather than treated as interchangeable.

The General Plan identifies conservation priorities and potential tools; it does not, by itself, purchase land, establish conservation easements, remove existing development rights, or commit County funding. Conservation programs should be developed through the appropriate legal, financial, and public-review processes.

What Conservation Can—and Cannot—Accomplish

Agricultural zoning and careful land-use decisions help maintain a rural development framework, but they are not equivalent to permanent conservation. Agricultural Protection Areas provide statutory protections for agricultural activities, while conservation

DRAFT

easements can establish permanent restrictions on specified uses. The appropriate tool depends on whether the objective is to maintain current density, protect working agriculture, prevent particular development, preserve habitat, or secure public ownership and access.

Conservation does not necessarily mean prohibiting every building or land-use change. An agricultural conservation easement may allow farming, ranching, agricultural improvements, and certain reserved residential uses while restricting subdivision or other development inconsistent with its purposes. The terms must be negotiated and documented for the particular property.

Likewise, conserved land is not automatically available for public recreation. Public access requires appropriate ownership rights or express agreements and should be considered separately from protection of agriculture, habitat, or scenic resources.

Conservation Strategies & Practical Considerations

The following comparison identifies potential strategies. Relative effort reflects the work needed to establish and administer the tool, not a guarantee of approval, funding, or landowner participation.

easements can establish permanent restrictions on specified uses. The appropriate tool depends on whether the objective is to maintain current density, protect working agriculture, prevent particular development, preserve habitat, or secure public ownership and access.

Conservation does not necessarily mean prohibiting every building or land-use change. An agricultural conservation easement may allow farming, ranching, agricultural improvements, and certain reserved residential uses while restricting subdivision or other development inconsistent with its purposes. The terms must be negotiated and documented for the particular property.

Likewise, conserved land is not automatically available for public recreation. Public access requires appropriate ownership rights or express agreements and should be considered separately from protection of agriculture, habitat, or scenic resources.

Conservation Strategies & Practical Considerations

The following comparison identifies potential strategies. Relative effort reflects the work needed to establish and administer the tool, not a guarantee of approval, funding, or landowner participation.

DRAFT

CONSERVATION STRATEGIES & PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS		
STRATEGY 1.0	**Maintain agricultural zoning and limit discretionary density increases**	
What it Accomplishes	Retains the rural-density framework and helps avoid fragmentation through future zoning decisions.	
	Advantages	**Limitations & Tradeoffs**
	Can be applied through existing planning and review processes; does not require purchasing every property.	Does not permanently conserve land or eliminate development allowed under existing zoning. Future legislative decisions can change the framework.
Relative Effort & Potential County Role	**Low to moderate.** Apply adopted policies consistently, monitor amendments, and review cumulative development effects.	
STRATEGY 2.0	**Agricultural Protection Areas**	
What it Accomplishes	Provides statutory protections for qualifying agricultural operations and lands.	
	Advantages	**Limitations & Tradeoffs**
	Supports agricultural continuity and addresses certain regulatory, nuisance, and public-project conflicts.	Not equivalent to a permanent conservation easement. Eligibility, establishment, review, and changes follow statutory procedures.
Relative Effort & Potential County Role	**Low to moderate.** Inform interested owners, assist with the application process, and administer the applicable County procedures.	
STRATEGY 3.0	**Voluntary conservation easements**	
What it Accomplishes	Permanently restricts specified uses while land generally remains privately owned.	
	Advantages	**Limitations & Tradeoffs**
	Can protect working agriculture, habitat, waterways, and scenic lands while allowing compatible activities.	Requires willing owners, an eligible holder, negotiated restrictions, due diligence, and ongoing stewardship. Restrictions affect future owners; public access is not automatic.
Relative Effort & Potential County Role	**Moderate to high.** Connect willing owners with qualified partners and evaluate priority projects.	

DRAFT

STRATEGY 4.0	**Purchase of development rights or purchased conservation easements**	
What it Accomplishes	Compensates willing owners for accepting conservation restrictions instead of purchasing the entire property.	
	Advantages	**Limitations & Tradeoffs**
	Provides a financial alternative to development while allowing continued ownership and compatible agricultural use.	Requires substantial funding, valuation, transaction work, and long-term stewardship. Funding is limited and competitive. This is a funding approach for easements, not an entirely separate form of protection.
Relative Effort & Potential County Role	**High**. Pursue partnerships, grants, and a transparent project-selection process if the County elects to participate.	
STRATEGY 5.0	**Transfer of development rights**	
What it Accomplishes	Protects designated "sending" lands while allowing purchased development rights to be used in designated "receiving" areas.	
	Advantages	**Limitations & Tradeoffs**
	May compensate owners through a development-rights market rather than relying entirely on public acquisition funding.	Requires suitable receiving locations, demand for additional development, clear transfer rules, and permanent sending-area protection. It relocates development potential rather than simply eliminating it.
Relative Effort & Potential County Role	**High**. Undertake a feasibility study before considering an ordinance or program.	
STRATEGY 6.0	**Voluntary land acquisition**	
What it Accomplishes	Acquires ownership of selected land for conservation, agriculture, habitat, or appropriate public purposes.	
	Advantages	**Limitations & Tradeoffs**
	Provides direct control over the acquired property and its management.	Requires acquisition funding and ongoing responsibility for management, maintenance, and any public use.

DRAFT

Relative Effort & Potential County Role	**High**. Reserve for strategic opportunities supported by willing sellers, funding, and a long-term management plan.	
STRATEGY 7.0	**Conservation-oriented site design**	
What it Accomplishes	Locates otherwise supported development to retain meaningful agricultural or open land.	
	Advantages	**Limitations & Tradeoffs**
	May reduce fragmentation, grading, and infrastructure impacts compared with conventional layouts.	Still accommodates development; it is not a no-growth strategy. Retained land needs durable protection and management, and clustering may conflict with community policies.
Relative Effort & Potential County Role	**Moderate to high**. Consider only where the Community Area Plan supports the approach and the overall density is independently justified.	

Priorities for Morgan County

Conservation efforts should focus on lands whose protection provides lasting agricultural, environmental, or community benefits. Priority considerations should include:

- Productive agricultural soils and reliable irrigation resources.
- Larger, connected farms and ranches rather than isolated remnants.
- Irrigation facilities, agricultural access, and land needed for workable farm operations.
- Waterways, riparian areas, wetlands, habitat, and connections between natural areas.
- Open-land separation between communities and important scenic foregrounds.
- Development pressure and the opportunity to protect land before fragmentation occurs.
- Willing landowners, qualified conservation partners, and feasible long-term management.

Identification of a conservation priority should not imply public ownership, public access, compulsory acquisition, or enrollment in a conservation program. Project selection should distinguish the conservation value of land from the willingness and practical ability to complete a transaction.

Funding & Conservation Partnerships

The County should help interested landowners understand available conservation partnerships rather than assume it must purchase or administer every easement itself.

Morgan County may coordinate with organizations such as Utah Agricultural Land Trust and Utah Open Lands to help interested

DRAFT

landowners evaluate voluntary conservation opportunities. Potential public and local partners include the Utah Department of Agriculture and Food, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, and Morgan County Conservation District. These entities serve different roles, including conservation-easement planning and stewardship, funding assistance, agricultural-resource conservation, and local coordination. Identification in this Plan does not establish a formal partnership, project eligibility, funding availability, or a commitment by an organization to accept a particular property.

Utah's LeRay McAllister Working Farm and Ranch Fund supports the purchase of conservation easements on working agricultural lands. Funding depends on legislative appropriations and program selection; eligibility does not guarantee an award.

State and federal programs, land trusts, and other conservation partners may provide funding or technical assistance for voluntary land conservation. Available assistance will depend on program requirements, funding, and project eligibility. Before supporting a project, the County should identify the partners, resources, and responsibilities needed to complete the conservation agreement and provide long-term monitoring and stewardship.

Landowners should obtain independent legal and financial advice concerning proposed transactions, retained uses, succession plans, property value, and any potential tax consequences.

Applying Conservation Without Expanding Growth

Conservation should reinforce the General Plan's rural and agricultural direction rather than become an independent justification for additional development.

A proposed conservation easement, open-space dedication, clustered layout, or transfer of development rights should not automatically establish support for increased density. Any development component should have a separate basis in the applicable place type, Community Area Plan, and adopted regulations.

A potential transfer of development rights program should be considered only if the County can identify appropriate receiving areas where the additional development is acceptable and supportable. Communities seeking to retain existing density should not become receiving areas merely because conservation is occurring elsewhere.

Where conservation-oriented development is supported, retained land should be usable for its stated purpose, sufficiently connected, and protected through enforceable arrangements. Steep slopes, drainage areas, narrow buffers, or leftover portions of a subdivision should not be treated as equivalent to protection of a viable farm or connected landscape.

DRAFT

Conservation Policies

Land Conservation Policy 1.0 — Maintain the rural and agricultural framework.

Apply the Future Place Types, Community Area Plans, and Countywide Land Use Policies to retain existing rural-density frameworks, protect working lands, and limit cumulative fragmentation. Do not treat conservation objectives as an independent basis for discretionary increases in development intensity.

Land Conservation Policy 2.0 — Support voluntary, durable conservation.

Support willing landowners in evaluating conservation easements, purchased development rights, Agricultural Protection Areas, and other appropriate tools. Match the tool to the intended outcome and clearly distinguish permanent land protection from regulatory or agricultural-operation protections.

Land Conservation Policy 3.0 — Prioritize connected working lands and natural systems.

Prioritize conservation opportunities that retain viable agricultural operations, irrigation systems, water resources, habitat connections, scenic landscapes, and meaningful separation between communities.

Land Conservation Policy 4.0 — Establish feasibility and stewardship before commitment.

Before committing County resources, evaluate landowner willingness, conservation value, legal authority, funding, transaction requirements, retained uses, and long-term monitoring and enforcement responsibilities. Identification in this Plan does not establish a funding commitment.

Land Conservation Policy 5.0 — Separate conservation from public access.

Do not assume that conserved private land provides public trails, parks, or recreation access. Establish any public access through express agreements addressing agricultural compatibility, safety, maintenance, liability, and resource protection.

Land Conservation Policy 6.0 — Evaluate development-linked tools before adoption.

Consider transfer of development rights, conservation subdivisions, or similar approaches only through a separately defined framework addressing eligible lands, supported development locations, density limits, permanent protection, administration, and consistency with Community Area Plans.

Initial Implementation Priorities

1. Prepare a plain-language landowner guide explaining available tools, partner contacts, and the distinction between agricultural protection and permanent conservation.
2. Identify interested conservation partners and willing landowners without implying a commitment to fund or approve a project.

DRAFT

3. Establish project-selection criteria based on agricultural viability, connected land protection, natural resources, development pressure, and transaction readiness.
4. Evaluate grant and matching-fund opportunities for a manageable number of priority projects.
5. Review progress periodically, distinguishing acres under permanent protection from acres covered by zoning or Agricultural Protection Area designations.

DRAFT

Future Place Types

The Future Place Types chapter establishes the County's long-range framework for the type, scale, character, and general location of future development and conservation throughout unincorporated Morgan County. The place types are applied on each Community Area Future Land Use Map and provide a common vocabulary for residents, property owners, developers, staff, and decision-makers to discuss what kinds of land uses and development patterns may be appropriate in different parts of the County.

Future Land Use Place Types

Future Land Use Place Types are intended to guide thoughtful planning and early evaluation of development concepts before a specific application is submitted, helping proposals respond to community character, infrastructure capacity, natural resources, access, public facilities, and other local conditions. The place types range from agricultural, rural, conservation, and open-space areas to residential neighborhoods, village and commercial centers, employment and industrial areas, recreation and resort areas, civic facilities, and overlays or planned-community frameworks. Place types are not zoning districts or development entitlements; rather, they guide future zoning, development review, capital planning, and decisions regarding whether a proposal is consistent with the General Plan and the applicable Community Area Plan.

The County recognizes residents' strong preference to preserve existing rural conditions and avoid additional growth. This Plan does not establish a growth target or broadly support increased rural residential density. It retains limited opportunities for compatible development within the prevailing rural framework and through specifically identified locations or narrowly defined, adopted exceptions. These opportunities are intended to remain limited in their cumulative effect and should not become a basis for incremental conversion of agricultural lands or continuous development along rural roads.

Place Type Implementation

The zoning districts associated with each Future Place Type identify potential implementation options, not an expectation that every listed district or lot size will be appropriate on every property. Where a place type includes a range of rural lot sizes, the predominant pattern described for that place type will guide County decisions. Consideration of smaller lots will depend on the proposal's location, arrangement, relationship to surrounding lands, and consistency with the applicable Community Area Plan. A mapped designation alone does not establish support for a particular rezoning, density, or development configuration.

The predominant implementation column identifies districts that may maintain the intended character of a place type; it does not establish support for increasing the residential

DRAFT

density of every property within that designation. The limited or location-specific implementation column identifies additional options that may be considered only where supported by location-specific Community Area Plan direction or a separately adopted exception framework. Such direction or framework should identify eligible locations or circumstances, allowable density or development scale, and approval criteria. A general place-type designation on the Future Land Use Map does not, by itself, establish that eligibility.

The following table identifies each Future Place Type, its predominant implementing zoning districts, and any limited or location-specific implementation options available within Morgan County's Development Code.

DRAFT

Morgan County PLACE TYPE	Baseline Implementation & Existing Density Framework	Limited & Location Specific Implementation
LP-AG **Large Parcel Agriculture**	F-1: Forestry District MU-1 60: Multiple Use District	*None identified.*
Large rural parcels used for agriculture, grazing, forestry, conservation, and other low-intensity activities. These areas often include steep terrain, watersheds, habitat, and scenic landscapes. Development should remain very limited and secondary to working-land, natural-resource, and rural-character objectives		
AG **Agricultural/Working Lands**	F-1: Forestry District MU-1 60: Multiple Use District A-20: Agriculture District	*None identified.*
Large contiguous areas of active farming and ranching with farmsteads, irrigation infrastructure, and associated ag support uses. Residential uses are very low density and clearly secondary so that crop production, pasture, grazing, and related operations remain the dominant use and visual character.		
RL **Rural Living**	A-20: Agricultural District	RR-2.5: Rural Residential District RR-5: Rural Residential District RR-10: Rural Residential District
Low-density rural areas defined by larger parcels, rural homes, open fields, pasture, small-scale agriculture, and meaningful separation between homes. A-20 is the baseline implementing district where it is the existing zoning. Existing lawful rural residential zoning and development are recognized, but the Rural Living designation does not, by itself, establish support for increased residential density or extension of smaller-lot zoning onto adjoining properties. Retain the existing density framework unless a change is supported by location-specific Community Area Plan direction or an adopted exception framework identifying eligible locations or circumstances, allowable density, and approval criteria. New rezonings to RR-10, RR-5, or RR-2.5 that increase residential density may be considered only under that direction or framework; these districts are not the expected outcome throughout mapped Rural Living areas. Infrastructure availability, site suitability, nearby smaller lots, or an applicant's intended family use should not, by themselves, justify increased density. Development should retain the open rural landscape, protect agricultural operations and irrigation facilities, and preserve meaningful separation between homes and working lands. Avoid continuous frontage-lot, linear, second-tier, or suburban-style development patterns that would incrementally convert rural or agricultural areas into continuous residential development.		

DRAFT

Morgan County PLACE TYPE	Baseline Implementation & Existing Density Framework	Limited & Location Specific Implementation
RC **Rural Corridor**	RR-5: Rural Residential District RR-10: Rural Residential District	R1-20: Residential District RR-1: Rural Residential District RR-2.5: Rural Residential District CH: Highway Commercial District NC: Neighborhood Commercial

Established rural highway and main-road areas containing rural residences, agricultural properties, and limited commercial or service uses. The intended development pattern varies by corridor segment. Specifically identified locations may accommodate additional rural residential development or limited commercial activity, while other areas should retain existing larger-parcel density, working lands, and open frontages.

Existing one-acre zoning along rural roads is recognized as part of the established zoning framework, but it should not be treated as the preferred future development pattern for the entire corridor. The Rural Corridor designation does not support extending that zoning onto adjoining agricultural lands, deepening narrow roadside zoning strips, or creating additional tiers of smaller-lot development behind them. New discretionary zoning and development decisions should avoid perpetuating continuous one-acre or half-acre frontage development and should preserve meaningful open-land separation, agricultural operations, and safe, coordinated access.

A general Rural Corridor designation does not, by itself, establish support for increased residential density or commercial zoning. Changes to the existing density framework or land-use pattern should be supported by location-specific Community Area Plan direction or an adopted exception framework identifying eligible locations or circumstances, allowable density or development scale, and approval criteria. Existing zoning, infrastructure availability, nearby smaller lots, or existing businesses should not independently justify additional intensity or extension of a supported development pattern beyond its identified location. Commercial development should be concentrated in supported locations rather than distributed continuously along the corridor.

DRAFT

Morgan County PLACE TYPE	Baseline Implementation & Existing Density Framework	Limited & Location Specific Implementation
RN **Residential Neighborhood**	R1-8: Residential District R1-12: Residential District	R1-20: Residential District
Predominantly single-family residential areas on standard residential lots in a mostly auto-oriented street pattern. These neighborhoods provide conventional detached-home development at a lower intensity than Village Residential Neighborhoods. May include some small parks, schools, and churches, and other compatible civic uses, with connectivity to nearby commercial areas and modest sidewalks or trails where appropriate.		
VRN **Village Residential Neighborhood**	R1-8: Residential District R1-12: Residential District RM-7: Multiple Residential District	RM-15: Multiple Residential District NC: Neighborhood Commercial
Neighborhoods with a mix of house-scale housing types, such as small lots, cottages, townhomes, and small multifamily, in a walkable pattern. Overall densities are slightly higher than typical single-family but still neighborhood-scaled, often near a Village Commercial Center. The limited commercial will typically be small-scale commercial nodes embedded in or next to neighborhoods that provide daily goods and services. Uses might include convenience retail, cafes, and personal services sized to serve nearby residents, with building and site design compatible with the neighborhood context. Residential densities in this place type will not exceed more than15 dwelling units per acre.		
VCC **Village Commercial Center**	NC: Neighborhood Commercial District CS: Commercial Shopping District	TC: Town Center District
Generally more compact, walkable commercial centers with shops, services, civic uses, and optional housing organized around streets and public spaces. Primary character is commercial and civic; housing may be included consistent with the center's role and approved through base zoning or Planned Community tools and will be at residential densities of not more than 15 dwelling units per acre.		

DRAFT

Morgan County PLACE TYPE	Baseline Implementation & Existing Density Framework	Limited & Location Specific Implementation
CC **Commercial Centers & Corridors**	CS: Commercial Shopping District CH: Highway Commercial District GC: General Commercial District BP: Business Park District TPC: Technical and Professional Campus District	*None identified*
Larger commercial areas and corridors with shopping centers, restaurants, offices, and auto-oriented services drawing customers from across the community or region. Often located along major roads or at key intersections, with higher traffic volumes, shared access, and opportunities for reinvestment or partial retrofits toward more walkable patterns.		
EI **Employment & Industrial**	LM: Light Manufacturing District I: Industrial District BP: Business Park District CB: Commercial Buffer District	*None identified*
Areas reserved for job-producing uses such as offices, light and general industrial, warehousing, logistics, and the airport. Sometimes they may be in business park or campus settings. Non-industrial uses are limited so the district remains primarily employment-focused, with site design managing truck access, noise, and screening next to more sensitive areas.		
REC **Recreation/Resort**	RSD: Resort Special District *Existing lawful zoning & approvals only*	*No additional resort zoning or expansion supported by this designation alone*
Areas recognizing existing lawful resort zoning, approved resort development, and associated recreation uses. This designation is not intended to establish new resort growth areas or encourage additional destination-oriented residential, lodging, or commercial development. The County strongly discourages new Resort Special District zoning, expansion of existing resort areas, and discretionary increases in approved development intensity that would increase through-traffic, compromise rural character, or place additional demands on surrounding communities. Existing lawful zoning, approvals, and applicable development agreements should guide development within established resort areas. Private ownership, restricted access, and developer-funded infrastructure do not, by themselves, establish a public recreation benefit or justify additional resort		

DRAFT

Morgan County PLACE TYPE	Baseline Implementation & Existing Density Framework	Limited & Location Specific Implementation
development. Any proposal requiring new zoning, a geographic expansion, or development intensity beyond that supported by the Plan should be considered through the applicable General Plan amendment and public-review processes.		
CIV **Civic**	VARIES	*None identified*
Sites for public and quasi-public uses such as schools, government buildings, emergency services, utilities, libraries, and other community facilities. These areas provide essential services, gathering spaces, and institutions that support the broader community and surrounding neighborhoods.		
AO **Airport Overlay**	AOZ: Airport Overlay Zone	*None identified*
Areas within and around the airport where additional land use, height, and design standards apply to protect aviation operations, public safety, and noise-sensitive uses. Underlying place types and zoning remain in effect, but are modified by overlay regulations to retain compatible uses in relation to airport flight paths and facilities.		
PC **Planned Community**	PC: Planned Community Zoning District	*None identified*
Any Planned Community (PC) Zoning District can implement any of the County's Future Place Type Land Uses. Planned Community should not be used to circumvent the purpose of the Future Land Use Map, infrastructure requirements, natural-resource protections, or compatibility standards applicable to the site.		

DRAFT

Morgan County Zoning Districts' Average Densities

Zoning District	Minimum Area	Avg Density
MU-160	160 AC	<0.1 DU/AC
F-1	¼ section	<0.1 DU/AC
A-20	20 AC	<0.1 DU/AC
RR-10	10 AC	<1 DU/AC (0.1 DU/AC)
RR-5	5 AC	<1 DU/AC (0.2 DU/AC)
RR-2.5	2.5 AC	<1 DU/AC (0.4 DU/AC)
RR-1	1 AC	1 DU/AC
R1-20	20,000 SF	2 DU/AC
R1-12	12,000 SF	3.6 DU/AC
R1-8	8,000 SF	5.5 DU/AC
RM-7	7,000 SF/6K SF/5K SF	6.2 to 8.8 DU/AC
RM-15	8,000 SF/3.5K SF/3.5K SF	~11 DU/AC

DRAFT

Agricultural and rural places

LP-AG — Large Parcel Agriculture

The Large Parcel Agriculture place type is intended for the County's most rural, expansive, and resource-sensitive landscapes. These areas generally include large tracts with significant topographic constraints, forested lands, watersheds, waterways, wildlife habitat, steep slopes, scenic viewsheds, or other natural features that make intensive development inappropriate or undesirable. The place type is also appropriate for lands whose long-term value lies in maintaining open landscapes, passive recreation opportunities, trail connections, conservation areas, and rural separation between more developed communities.

Development within Large Parcel Agriculture areas should remain very limited and carefully located. Where development occurs, it should avoid sensitive lands; preserve the prevailing open character; minimize grading, vegetation removal, and visual impacts; and maintain access to public lands, waterways, trails, and other natural resources where appropriate. Agricultural, forestry, open-space, conservation, recreation, and similarly low-intensity uses are characteristic of this place type. Residential development, if permitted, should occur at very low densities and should be secondary to the preservation of land, natural systems, and rural character.

The F-1 Forestry District and MU-160 Multiple Use District are the principal zoning tools that may implement this place type. These districts generally support densities below 0.1 dwelling unit per acre and are intended to retain large, predominantly undeveloped parcels.

AG — Agricultural/Working Lands

The Agricultural/Working Lands place type is intended to sustain Morgan County's working farms, ranches, grazing lands, farmsteads, irrigation systems, and other lands that contribute to the County's agricultural economy, history, landscape, and identity. These areas are characterized by large, contiguous parcels that can support crop production, pasture, livestock operations, hay production, orchards, agricultural processing and storage, and related agricultural-support activities.

Maintaining the long-term viability of agriculture is the central purpose of this place type. Land-use decisions should seek to limit fragmentation of productive agricultural ground, protect irrigation infrastructure and water access, reduce conflicts between agricultural operations and nearby nonagricultural development, and preserve the open views and working-land character that distinguish Morgan County. New residential development should remain very low density, should be clearly subordinate to agricultural use, and should be designed to avoid unnecessarily converting productive land or constraining normal agricultural practices.

Appropriate implementing districts include the F-1 Forestry District, MU-160 Multiple Use District, and A-20 Agriculture District. These districts provide for large parcels and very low average residential densities, generally below 0.1 dwelling unit per acre, while allowing the agricultural and natural-resource uses that define this place type.

DRAFT

RL — Rural Living

Rural Living is intended to retain Morgan County's established low-density rural settlement pattern, where larger residential parcels, open fields, pasture, small-scale agriculture, and meaningful separation between homes remain defining features. The designation recognizes rural residential use within a landscape that remains predominantly open and agricultural in character. It is not intended to establish a general growth area, encourage conversion of working agricultural land into residential subdivisions, or signal that smaller rural lots will become appropriate as infrastructure becomes available.

A-20 is the baseline implementing district where it is the existing zoning. Existing lawful RR-10, RR-5, RR-2.5, and other rural residential zoning and development are recognized, but their presence does not establish support for extending those districts onto adjoining properties. The Rural Living designation identifies the intended rural character of an area; it does not establish a general transition from agricultural zoning to rural residential zoning or independently support increased residential density.

The County should not support discretionary changes to RR-10, RR-5 or RR-2.5 unless the applicable Community Area Plan and Future Land Use Map expressly identify the location for that pattern, or separately adopted Community Area Plan provisions or County regulations establish a narrowly defined exception framework. Any such framework should identify eligible locations or circumstances, allowable density, approval criteria, and measures to protect the surrounding rural and agricultural landscape. Where no applicable location or exception framework has been adopted, a proposal seeking smaller-lot zoning will require adoption of the necessary General Plan amendments before the requested rezoning.

Adequate water, wastewater disposal, road access, or other infrastructure is necessary for development but does not independently justify increased density. Site suitability, proximity to existing smaller lots, an applicant's intended family use, or the ability to construct additional infrastructure should not, by themselves, establish support for smaller-lot zoning or a more intensive development pattern.

Where development is consistent with existing zoning or an expressly supported development opportunity, its location and arrangement should protect working agricultural land, irrigation facilities, natural drainageways, scenic views, and meaningful open-land separation. Avoid repetitive frontage lots, linear or second-tier residential development along rural roads, and subdivision patterns that cumulatively convert the surrounding landscape into a continuous residential area. New roads, driveways, grading, and utility extensions should be limited to those necessary to serve the supported development pattern and should not create a basis for additional intensification.

Clustering, Planned Community zoning, and development agreements should not independently establish support for additional dwelling units, smaller-lot zoning, or a departure from the applicable Community Area Plan. Where a community plan supports an alternative

DRAFT

lot arrangement, that arrangement should remain within the supported overall density and provide meaningful, durable protection of agricultural or open land. Where community policies discourage clustering or concentrated residential forms, those policies should guide the development pattern.

RC — Rural Corridor

Rural Corridor recognizes the varied conditions along established rural highways, main roads, and arterial routes, where rural homes, agricultural properties, existing businesses, and transportation functions may occur together. Its purpose is to guide development according to the intended character of each designated corridor segment—not to establish a continuous growth strip or make all land along a roadway eligible for smaller-lot residential or commercial development.

The development pattern supported within Rural Corridor areas should be established by the applicable Community Area Plan policies and Future Land Use Map. Some designated locations may accommodate a more complete rural residential or limited commercial development pattern. Other corridor areas should retain larger parcels, working agricultural land, open frontages, and limited development. The designation does not establish the same development intensity or mix of uses throughout a community or across the County.

Retain the existing density framework unless a change is supported by location-specific Community Area Plan direction or an adopted exception framework identifying eligible locations or circumstances, allowable density, and approval criteria. RR-10 and RR-5 may implement the existing or specifically supported rural pattern for a corridor segment, but their listing does not establish general support for increasing density on larger-parcel agricultural land. RR-2.5, RR-1, and R1-20 are limited or location-specific implementation options. New rezonings to any of these districts that increase residential density should meet the location-specific direction or adopted exception framework described above.

Existing one-acre zoning along rural roads is recognized as part of the established zoning framework, but it should not be treated as the preferred future development pattern for the entire corridor. The Rural Corridor designation does not support extending that zoning onto adjoining agricultural lands, deepening narrow roadside zoning strips, or creating additional tiers of smaller-lot development behind them. New discretionary zoning and development decisions should avoid perpetuating continuous one-acre or half-acre frontage development and should preserve meaningful open-land separation, agricultural operations, and safe, coordinated access.

A general Rural Corridor designation on the Future Land Use Map does not, by itself, identify a property as eligible for increased residential density. Existing zoning, nearby smaller lots, site suitability, or infrastructure availability should not independently establish that eligibility. Where no applicable location-specific direction or exception framework exists, a proposal seeking increased density will require the adoption of the

DRAFT

necessary General Plan and, where applicable, Future Land Use Map amendments before the requested rezoning.

Where additional development is supported by location-specific Community Area Plan direction or an adopted exception framework, proposals should remain within the supported geographic extent or eligible circumstances, density, scale, and mix of uses. Support for development in one corridor segment should not establish support for comparable development elsewhere or justify extending the designated development area along the roadway. Development should provide coordinated access, appropriate transitions to nearby homes and working lands, and protection of waterways, irrigation facilities, scenic resources, and meaningful separation between communities.

Commercial development should be confined to locations supported by the applicable Community Area Plan and Future Land Use Map. CH and NC are potential implementation tools for those locations, not a basis for continuous commercial zoning along the corridor. The scale and operation of commercial uses should reflect the role assigned to the location, whether serving nearby residents, travelers, or agricultural activities. Safe access, coordinated circulation, parking, lighting, signage, noise, and transitions to adjoining properties should be addressed without expanding commercial activity into surrounding rural or agricultural lands.

Sustainable water supply, wastewater disposal, road capacity, drainage, and emergency access must be demonstrated for any supported development. Infrastructure availability or proposed improvements should not independently justify a more intensive land-use pattern than the Plan supports. Planned Community zoning, development agreements, and alternative site arrangements should implement the applicable corridor direction and should not serve as an independent basis for additional density, expanded commercial uses, or development beyond the identified area.

Neighborhood places

RN — Residential Neighborhood

The Residential Neighborhood place type is intended for predominantly single-family residential areas developed at more conventional suburban-like densities ranging from about 2 dwelling units per acre up to roughly 5.5 dwelling units per acre . These neighborhoods are generally characterized by standard residential lots, detached homes, local streets, and a development pattern that is primarily automobile-oriented. They may include neighborhood amenities such as parks, schools, churches, trails, stormwater facilities, and small areas of common open space.

Residential Neighborhoods should provide stable, safe, and attractive places for families and households while maintaining appropriate connections to community facilities, commercial areas, employment centers, and regional transportation routes. New development should incorporate internal street connectivity where feasible, safe pedestrian and bicycle facilities, usable neighborhood open space, and

DRAFT

transitions to adjoining rural, agricultural, commercial, or higher-density residential areas. Site and subdivision design should respond to terrain, drainage, viewsheds, and the County's need to provide services efficiently.

The R1-8 and R1-12 Residential Districts are the principal implementing districts for this place type. Their typical average densities are approximately 5.5 dwelling units per acre and 3.6 dwelling units per acre, respectively. The R1-20 district may also implement this place type where appropriate to the location and surrounding development pattern.

VRN — Village Residential Neighborhood

The Village Residential Neighborhood place type is intended for compact, neighborhood-scaled residential areas that offer a greater range of housing choices than conventional single-family suburban development. These areas may include detached homes on smaller lots, cottages, duplexes, townhomes, accessory dwelling opportunities where permitted, and small-scale multifamily buildings that are compatible in height, mass, and design with a residential setting. The overall character should remain human-scaled, walkable, and appropriate to Morgan County's community context.

Village Residential Neighborhoods are generally appropriate near Village Commercial Centers, established community areas, public facilities, and locations where residents can conveniently reach services, parks, trails, schools, and community gathering places. Limited neighborhood-serving commercial activity may be appropriate when located in small, carefully designed nodes or at the edges of neighborhoods. Such uses may include convenience retail, cafés, personal services, and similar daily-needs businesses, provided that their scale, hours, access, lighting, signage, and design are compatible with nearby homes.

Development should emphasize connected streets, sidewalks or pathways, pedestrian-scale design, neighborhood open space, transitions to lower-density areas, and a variety of housing options without creating an urban intensity that is out of character with the County. Residential density in this place type should not exceed 15 dwelling units per acre. The R1-8, R1-12, RM-7, and RM-15 districts may implement Village Residential Neighborhoods, with the applicable district and development standards selected based on site context and infrastructure capacity.

The NC Neighborhood Commercial District may also be used on a limited basis to implement small, neighborhood-serving commercial nodes; however, its location, size, permitted uses, access, and relationship to adjoining residences should be subject to careful review and public discussion to ensure that commercial activity remains compatible with the residential character, scale, and walkability of the surrounding Village Residential Neighborhood.

Centers and employment areas

VCC — Village Commercial Center

The Village Commercial Center place type is intended for compact, identifiable centers of daily community activity. These places may

DRAFT

include shops, restaurants, personal and professional services, offices, civic facilities, gathering spaces, and where appropriate, housing. The defining character is a concentration of commercial and civic uses organized around connected streets, public spaces, walkable blocks, and a recognizable village-scale center rather than a conventional highway-oriented commercial strip.

Village Commercial Centers should serve nearby residents and surrounding rural areas with everyday goods, services, and community amenities. Development should be designed to create an inviting public realm through building placement, sidewalks, pedestrian connections, landscaping, public gathering areas, active storefronts where appropriate, and coordinated parking and access. Buildings should reflect a scale and form compatible with Morgan County's communities and should transition sensitively to adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Housing may be incorporated into a Village Commercial Center when it supports the vitality and walkability of the center and is compatible with its commercial and civic role. Residential development may occur under base zoning or through Planned Community tools, but densities should not exceed 15 dwelling units per acre. The NC Neighborhood Commercial, CS Commercial Shopping, and TC Town Center Districts may implement this place type.

CC — Commercial Centers and Corridors

The Commercial Centers and Corridors place type is intended for larger-scale retail, restaurant, office, service, entertainment, and automobile-oriented commercial uses that serve a broad community or regional market. These areas are generally located along major transportation routes, at prominent intersections, near interchanges, or in other locations with suitable roadway access and visibility. They may include shopping centers, restaurants, professional offices, vehicle-oriented services, business parks, and similar employment-generating commercial uses.

Because these locations can generate substantial traffic and have a strong visual presence, development should prioritize coordinated access, safe circulation, shared driveways, appropriate parking design, pedestrian safety, landscaping, signage control, and transitions to nearby neighborhoods or rural lands. Reinvestment and redevelopment should be encouraged where it can improve site design, enhance connectivity, reduce conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians, and introduce more walkable or mixed-use characteristics where appropriate. The objective is not to eliminate the auto-oriented function of these areas, but to ensure that commercial growth is orderly, attractive, safe, and compatible with adjacent land uses.

The CS Commercial Shopping, CH Highway Commercial, GC General Commercial, BP Business Park, and TPC Technical and Professional Campus Districts may be used to implement this place type.

DRAFT

EI — Employment and Industrial

The Employment and Industrial place type is intended to preserve and expand areas for job-producing uses, including offices, research and technology uses, business parks, light manufacturing, general industrial activity, warehousing, distribution, logistics, contractor yards, airport-related businesses, and other employment-supporting development. These areas provide opportunities for economic diversification, local employment, and businesses that require sites with access to major roads, utilities, freight movement, or the airport.

Land uses in Employment and Industrial areas should remain primarily employment-focused. Nonindustrial and nonemployment uses should be limited when they would reduce the supply of suitable job lands, interfere with industrial operations, or create land-use conflicts. Site design should address truck circulation, loading areas, access management, noise, lighting, outdoor storage, screening, drainage, and transitions to homes, schools, parks, and other sensitive uses. Where employment areas adjoin residential or rural lands, buffers, landscaping, building placement, and operational standards should be used to minimize impacts.

The LM Light Manufacturing, I Industrial, BP Business Park, and CB Commercial Buffer Districts may implement this place type.

Recreation, civic, and overlay areas

REC — Recreation/Resort

The Recreation/Resort place type recognizes existing lawful resort zoning, approved resort development, and associated recreation uses. Its primary purpose is to guide the relationship between established resort areas and the County's surrounding rural communities, working lands, natural resources, and public facilities. It is not intended to establish additional resort growth areas or signal general support for new ski resorts, private destination communities, resort lodging, second-home developments, or associated commercial complexes.

The County strongly discourages creation of additional Resort Special District zones, geographic expansion of existing resort areas, and discretionary increases in resort residential density, lodging capacity, commercial intensity, or visitation that would materially increase through-traffic, erode rural character, fragment working lands, or create additional burdens for surrounding communities. Existing resort zoning or development should not establish a precedent for comparable development on other properties. A mapped Recreation/Resort designation does not, by itself, establish support for additional density, expanded uses, or development beyond existing lawful approvals.

Existing lawful zoning, land-use approvals, applicable development agreements, and vested rights should be respected. Proposals requiring discretionary changes beyond that framework should be evaluated against the applicable Community Area Plan and the County's rural-preservation direction. Where a proposal would establish a new resort area, expand a mapped resort boundary, or introduce a development pattern or intensity not supported by the Plan, the County would need to adopt the necessary

DRAFT

General Plan and Future Land Use Map amendments before the requested zoning or approval changes. Any recommendation to support such a change should specifically explain why it is warranted despite the Plan's direction discouraging additional resort development.

Evaluation of discretionary resort proposals should address effects beyond the project boundary, including through-traffic on rural roads, intersections and bridges, construction traffic, seasonal and peak-period travel, emergency response, wildfire evacuation, water resources, drainage, wildlife habitat, scenic views, lighting, noise, and compatibility with agricultural operations and nearby homes. Review should consider the cumulative effects of existing, approved, and proposed resort development rather than evaluate each proposal in isolation.

Construction and funding of a project's own infrastructure do not, by themselves, demonstrate compatibility with the surrounding community. Private roads, utilities, recreation facilities, and other project improvements may address internal development needs without resolving off-site traffic, rural-road safety, environmental effects, emergency-service demands, or changes to community character. Proposed mitigation should address the identified effects and establish clear responsibilities for implementation, funding, operation, and long-term maintenance.

Private recreation facilities should not be represented as public parks, public trails, public access, or community recreation benefits unless those benefits are secured through documented, enforceable arrangements. Public recreation needs should be evaluated separately from amenities reserved for resort residents, members, or guests. The County should prioritize appropriate public and community-serving recreation opportunities without relying on additional resort residential development as the means of providing them.

For proposals involving General Plan amendments, resort rezonings, or other significant discretionary changes, the County should provide understandable information and meaningful opportunities for affected residents to participate before recommendations and decisions are made. Review materials should identify the requested changes, existing approvals, anticipated full-buildout effects, off-site impacts, proposed mitigation, and consistency or conflicts with the applicable Community Area Plan. Staff reports should summarize significant public concerns and explain how they were addressed. Proposed amendments are also subject to the resort-specific review direction in the "Recreation/Resort amendments" subsection of "Amending the General Plan."

The RSD Resort Special District is the principal implementing district for established resort areas. Its identification here recognizes existing lawful zoning and approvals; it does not establish support for additional RSD zoning or expansion. Planned Community zoning and development agreements should not be used to circumvent this place type's limits on additional resort development.

This direction does not preclude appropriately scaled hotels or similar lodging within

DRAFT

commercial locations supported by a Community Area Plan and Future Land Use Map or where permitted by the applicable zoning. Such lodging should be evaluated as commercial development rather than as a basis for new Recreation/Resort designations or Resort Special District zoning. A hotel proposal should not establish support for an associated resort residential community, private destination complex, or expansion of development into adjoining rural or agricultural lands.

CIV — Civic

The Civic place type identifies public and quasi-public facilities that provide essential services, community gathering opportunities, education, public safety, infrastructure, and institutional functions. Civic uses may include schools, government offices, fire and emergency services facilities, libraries, parks, utilities, public works facilities, religious and community institutions, and similar facilities that serve the County or surrounding neighborhoods.

Civic sites should be located and designed to provide convenient access, safe circulation, adequate parking and loading, compatibility with adjacent land uses, and opportunities for shared use where appropriate. Because civic facilities vary widely in size, service area, and operational needs, the appropriate zoning district will depend on the nature of the facility and the context of the surrounding place type. Civic uses may occur within many areas of the County, provided that their design and operation are compatible with nearby development and that needed infrastructure and services are available.

AO — Airport Overlay

The Airport Overlay applies to lands within and around the airport where special land-use, height, safety, and design considerations are necessary to protect aviation operations and the public. The overlay is intended to reduce hazards to aircraft, protect airport approaches and airspace, minimize exposure of people and sensitive uses to airport-related noise and safety impacts, and preserve the airport's long-term operational capacity.

PC — Planned Community

The Planned Community designation recognizes that large, coordinated developments may require a master-planned approach that integrates multiple land uses, infrastructure systems, open-space networks, transportation improvements, public facilities, and development phases. A Planned Community is not a separate future land-use outcome in the same sense as an agricultural, residential, commercial, or industrial place type. Instead, it is an implementation and development framework that may be used to carry out one or more of the County's Future Place Types.

A Planned Community should demonstrate how its land-use mix, residential densities, development pattern, circulation system, public facilities, utility infrastructure, open-space preservation, phasing, and design standards advance the policies of the General Plan. The PC District may implement any Future Place Type shown on the Future Land Use Map, but the

DRAFT

applicable place type should continue to guide the appropriate scale, intensity, character, and mix of uses. Planned Community approvals should not be used to circumvent the purpose of the Future Land Use Map, infrastructure requirements, natural-resource protections, or compatibility standards applicable to the site.

applicable place type should continue to guide the appropriate scale, intensity, character, and mix of uses. Planned Community approvals should not be used to circumvent the purpose of the Future Land Use Map, infrastructure requirements, natural-resource protections, or compatibility standards applicable to the site.

DRAFT

COMMUNITY AREA PLANS

Community Area Plans refine the County General Plan for geographically distinct communities and planning areas. They express locally specific conditions, priorities, future land-use direction, and implementation actions. Area-plan policies are to be read together with countywide General Plan goals, policies, and maps. Where an area plan provides more specific direction for a defined location, that direction should guide County land-use and capital-facility decisions, subject to applicable law and the County's adopted development regulations.

Upon adoption, this General Plan and its Community Area Plan chapters supersede prior Morgan County area plans, area-plan amendments, committee recommendations, and similar planning documents to the extent they are inconsistent with this Plan. Historical documents may be retained as background and engagement records but do not independently establish current County land-use policy.

place → values → land-use direction → implementation

Each Community Area Plan follows a consistent structure that moves from place to action. It begins by defining the community's location, boundaries, existing character, and distinguishing features; identifies the values, priorities, and area-specific policies expressed by residents and the County; translates that direction into an existing and future land-use strategy and Future Land Use Map; and concludes with the key issues, development constraints, priority actions, and coordination needed to implement the plan. This format allows each area to retain its distinct identity and priorities while providing a clear, consistent framework for future land-use and infrastructure decisions.

DRAFT

Countywide Land Use Policies

The following Countywide Land Use Policies apply throughout unincorporated Morgan County and should be read together with the applicable Community Area Plan, Future Land Use Map, and County regulations. These policies establish a consistent framework for evaluating land-use decisions, infrastructure investments, development proposals, and plan amendments throughout unincorporated Morgan County, while allowing each Community Area Plan to provide more specific direction based on its distinct character, growth strategy, natural resources, infrastructure conditions, and community priorities.

Countywide LU Policy 1.0 — Consistency Review for Significant Land-Use Decisions.
For proposed General Plan amendments, Future Land Use Map amendments, rezonings, planned developments, development agreements, major subdivisions, conditional uses, and other applications identified by County ordinance, Morgan County staff reports and recommendations will identify the applicable Countywide Land Use Policies, Community Area Plan vision and policies, Future Land Use Map designations, and other relevant General Plan direction.

Staff reports will explain how the proposal is consistent with that direction. Where staff identifies that a proposal conflicts with one or more adopted policies, map designations, or other applicable General Plan direction, the staff report will identify the conflict and explain whether it can be addressed through denial, project modification, conditions of approval, a development agreement, or an ~~concurrent~~ amendment to the General Plan or Future Land Use Map.

Countywide LU Policy 2.0 — Cumulative Effects and Plan Consistency.
Morgan County will evaluate proposed General Plan amendments, Future Land Use Map amendments, rezonings, subdivisions, development agreements, and other significant land-use decisions for consistency with the adopted General Plan and applicable Community Area Plan. Review will consider the cumulative effects of existing approvals, pending proposals, reasonably foreseeable development, infrastructure capacity, public-service demands, natural-resource impacts, and changes to community character.

The County will schedule public hearings and consider proposed General Plan and Future Land Use Map amendments only during a designated annual amendment cycle. This coordinated process will allow related requests to be evaluated together and their combined effects assessed before individual decisions are made.

DRAFT

Countywide LU Policy 3.0 — Community Character and Compatibility.
Morgan County will maintain the distinct character of its communities. The County will evaluate proposed growth, redevelopment, infrastructure investments, and land-use changes for consistency with the applicable Community Area Plan vision, policies, Future Land Use Map, natural setting, and established development pattern.

Countywide LU Policy 4.0 — Growth and Infrastructure Capacity.
Morgan County will support development only when adequate water, wastewater, fire protection, emergency access, roads, drainage facilities, public services, and long-term maintenance arrangements are available or are secured through enforceable, development-funded commitments concurrent with development.

Countywide LU Policy 4.1 — Limited Rural Homesite Options

Morgan County will evaluate whether to establish a limited rural homesite option that allows modest lot divisions without opening agricultural and rural lands to broader residential intensification. Any such option will be established through adopted County regulations with consistent eligibility criteria, limits on additional dwelling units and repeat divisions, protection of remaining agricultural and open lands, and clear access, water, wastewater, and maintenance requirements. An applicant's intended family use will not substitute for compliance with those standards.

Countywide LU Policy 4.2 — Rural Living Pattern and Development

Morgan County will maintain Rural Living areas as low-density rural landscapes characterized by larger parcels, rural homes, open land, agricultural activity, rural views, and meaningful separation between homes. The designation recognizes the intended rural character of an area; it does not establish a general transition from agricultural zoning to rural residential zoning or, by itself, support increased residential density.

A-20 is the baseline implementing district where it is the existing zoning. Existing lawful rural residential zoning and development are recognized, but their presence will not, by itself, establish support for extending smaller-lot zoning onto adjoining properties. The County will retain the existing density framework unless a change is supported by location-specific Community Area Plan direction or an adopted exception framework identifying eligible locations or circumstances, allowable density, and approval criteria.

New rezonings to RR-10, RR-5, or RR-2.5 that increase residential density may be considered only under that direction or framework. These districts are limited implementation options, not the expected outcome throughout mapped Rural Living areas. A general Rural Living designation on the Future Land Use Map does not establish eligibility for increased density. Where no applicable direction or exception framework exists, a proposal seeking increased density will require adoption of the necessary General

DRAFT

Plan and, where applicable, Future Land Use Map amendments before the requested rezoning. RR-1 is not identified as an implementing district for Rural Living.

Sustainable water supply, lawful wastewater disposal, safe road and emergency access, drainage, wildfire protection, and adequate public-service capacity are necessary considerations for development. Infrastructure availability, site suitability, nearby smaller lots, or an applicant's intended family use will not, by themselves, justify increased density. Development should protect agricultural operations, irrigation facilities, natural features, meaningful open land, and the rural separation that defines the area.

The County will not support new discretionary zoning or development approvals that create or extend continuous frontage-lot, linear, second-tier, or suburban-style development patterns inconsistent with the area's rural character. Particular attention should be given to avoiding strip or "tunnel" development along highways and major roads, cumulative fragmentation of agricultural lands, unnecessary driveway access, and extension of smaller-lot development into adjoining rural areas.

Where supported by the applicable Community Area Plan, clustering, Planned Community zoning, and development agreements should implement the intended rural character and supported development pattern. These tools will not, by themselves, establish support for additional density or development beyond the locations or circumstances identified by the Plan.

For rezoning, subdivision, development-agreement, Planned Community, and General Plan or Future Land Use Map amendment applications affecting Rural Living areas, staff reports shall identify the existing zoning and density framework, the applicable place-type and Community Area Plan direction, and any adopted exception provisions. Reports shall distinguish development consistent with existing zoning from requests for discretionary increases in density; identify the policy basis for any recommended increase; and evaluate cumulative effects on agricultural lands, open-land separation, access, infrastructure, public services, and rural character.

Countywide LU Policy 4.3 — Rural Corridor Pattern and Development

Morgan County will manage Rural Corridor areas as established rural highway and main-road settings containing rural residences, agricultural properties, and limited commercial or service uses. The intended development pattern varies by corridor segment and will follow the applicable Community Area Plan direction. Specifically identified locations may accommodate additional rural residential development or limited commercial activity, while other areas should retain the existing density framework, working lands, and open frontages. Rural Corridor is not intended to establish continuous residential or commercial growth along rural roads.

Existing one-acre zoning along rural roads is recognized as part of the established zoning framework, but it will not be treated as the preferred future development pattern for the entire corridor. The Rural

DRAFT

Corridor designation does not support extending that zoning onto adjoining agricultural lands, deepening narrow roadside zoning strips, or creating additional tiers of smaller-lot development behind them. New discretionary zoning and development decisions should avoid perpetuating continuous one-acre or half-acre frontage development and should preserve meaningful open-land separation, agricultural operations, scenic character, and safe, coordinated access.

A general Rural Corridor designation does not, by itself, establish support for increased residential density or commercial zoning. Discretionary changes to the existing density framework or land-use pattern should be supported by location-specific Community Area Plan direction or an adopted exception framework identifying eligible locations or circumstances, allowable density or development scale, and approval criteria. Where no applicable direction or exception framework exists, a proposal seeking such a change will require adoption of the necessary General Plan amendments and, where applicable, Future Land Use Map amendments before the requested rezoning.

RR-10 and RR-5 are potential baseline implementing districts where consistent with the existing zoning or the rural pattern established for the particular corridor segment by the applicable Community Area Plan. Their listing does not establish general support for rezoning larger-parcel agricultural land to those districts. RR-2.5, RR-1, and R1-20 are limited or location-specific implementation options. New rezonings to any of these districts that increase residential density should meet the location-specific direction or adopted exception framework described above. Existing lawful zoning and development are recognized, but they will not independently establish support for comparable zoning or development on other properties.

CH and NC may implement limited commercial or service locations supported by the applicable Community Area Plan and Future Land Use Map. Safe access, an established intersection, nearby businesses, or a demonstrated market opportunity will not, by themselves, establish support for commercial zoning. Commercial development should be concentrated in supported locations rather than distributed continuously along the corridor. Its scale, operation, setbacks, landscaping, screening, lighting, signage, and building design should preserve the corridor's rural character and provide appropriate transitions to nearby homes, agricultural operations, and open lands.

Sustainable water supply, lawful wastewater disposal, road capacity, drainage, emergency access, and public-service capacity must be addressed for supported development. Infrastructure availability, site suitability, nearby smaller lots, existing businesses, or an applicant's intended family use will not independently justify additional intensity or extension of a supported development pattern beyond its identified location. Development should provide coordinated access, limit unnecessary direct driveways, and avoid unsafe turning movements, agricultural fragmentation, and visual clutter.

Planned Community zoning and development agreements should implement the applicable Rural Corridor character and Community Area Plan direction. These tools will not, by themselves, establish

DRAFT

support for additional density, expanded commercial uses, or development beyond the locations or circumstances supported by the Plan.

For rezoning, subdivision, development-agreement, Planned Community, and General Plan or Future Land Use Map amendment applications affecting Rural Corridor areas, staff reports shall identify the existing zoning and density framework, the direction applicable to the particular corridor segment, and any adopted exception provisions. Reports shall distinguish existing lawful development opportunities from proposed discretionary changes; identify the location-specific policy basis for additional residential or commercial intensity; and evaluate cumulative effects on traffic, access, agricultural lands, open frontages, scenic character, infrastructure, public services, and adjoining rural communities.

DRAFT

Countywide LU Policy 5.0 — Water Quality, Water Supply, and Rural Wastewater Systems.
Morgan County will protect culinary-water supplies, groundwater, private wells, secondary-water resources, irrigation systems, water rights, surface waters, and rural wastewater systems. The County will support development only when an adequate, reliable, and sustainable culinary-water supply; secondary water where needed; lawful wastewater disposal; protection of groundwater and existing wells; and long-term operation and maintenance arrangements are available or secured through enforceable commitments. The County will not support development that would overburden existing water or wastewater systems, create unacceptable cumulative septic impacts, threaten surface-water or groundwater quality, interfere with irrigation systems or water rights, or create unreasonable risks to existing wells and water users.

Countywide LU Policy 6.0 — Natural Resources and Hazard Resilience.
Morgan County will protect water resources, waterways, wetlands, floodplains, drainageways, agricultural soils, wildlife habitat, scenic resources, slopes, and other sensitive lands. The County will avoid directing development to hazard-prone or environmentally sensitive locations unless site-specific analysis demonstrates that impacts and risks can be avoided or adequately mitigated without transferring unreasonable risks or long-term costs to adjacent property owners, residents, or public agencies.

Countywide LU Policy 7.0 — Agriculture, Irrigation, and Rural Stewardship.
Morgan County will protect agricultural operations, grazing, irrigation systems, ditch infrastructure, rural access, and customary agricultural practices as essential economic, cultural, and environmental assets. New development will be expected to be designed and located to avoid or minimize conflicts with existing agricultural operations and to preserve agricultural access and irrigation infrastructure where feasible.

Countywide LU Policy 8.0 — Transportation, Access, and Public Safety.
Development will be expected to provide safe access, internal circulation, emergency response, and proportionate mitigation for its transportation, road-maintenance, drainage, and public-safety impacts. Morgan County will protect local roads, agricultural access, and community livability from unsafe or unmitigated development impacts.

Countywide LU Policy 9.0 — Public Facilities and Fair-Share Responsibility.
Development will be expected to provide, construct, dedicate, or proportionately fund the infrastructure, public facilities, amenities, mitigation, and long-term maintenance needed to serve its impacts. Morgan County will use lawful planning, financing, phasing, development-agreement, impact-fee, exaction, and performance tools to ensure that growth does not impose disproportionate costs on existing residents, property owners, service providers, or taxpayers.

DRAFT

Countywide LU Policy 10.0 — Intensive-Use Compatibility.
Morgan County will direct commercial, industrial, extraction, storage, resort, utility, and other potentially intensive uses to locations identified as appropriate by the Future Land Use Map and applicable Community Area Plans. Such uses will be expected to demonstrate compatibility with water and wastewater capacity, safe access, public safety, nearby neighborhoods, agriculture, natural resources, scenic character, and public facilities, and to mitigate traffic, noise, dust, lighting, visual, environmental, and other foreseeable impacts.

Countywide LU Policy 11.0 — Transparent Decisions and Community Engagement.
Morgan County will provide early, clear, and accessible notice for significant planning, land-use, development, and infrastructure decisions. Notice materials will include legible maps, a plain-language description of the request and decision process, relevant Community Area Plan policies, likely public benefits and potential impacts, and meaningful opportunities for affected residents, property owners, service providers, and other stakeholders to provide input before recommendations and final decisions are made.

Countywide LU Policy 12.0 — Retain rural densities in potential annexation areas.

Maintain very low-density rural and agricultural land-use patterns in unincorporated areas adjoining Morgan City and identified within the City's adopted annexation expansion area. Avoid supporting smaller-lot rezonings or more intensive development that would limit future options for coordinated streets, utilities, and development consistent with City planning and standards.

Before recommending significant land-use changes or subdivisions in these areas, the County should consult with Morgan City regarding long-term land-use direction, access, infrastructure, and potential future annexation. Inclusion in the annexation expansion area should not, by itself, justify increased County density or create an expectation of City services or annexation. Existing lawful zoning and approvals should be recognized.


DRAFT

Existing & Future Community Area Boundaries

The County Overview Map depicts community area boundaries to provide a planning framework for organizing the County's Community Area Plans and applying community-specific vision, policy, and future land-use direction. The nine Community Areas were informed by the historic township areas reflected in County Assessor records, but they do not necessarily correspond exactly to township boundaries or other jurisdictional boundaries.

Planning-area boundaries were further refined through public engagement, including open houses where residents identified the communities with which they most closely associate. The hatched areas represent future expanded Community Areas established to ensure that all unincorporated areas of Morgan County are included within a Community Area planning framework. These boundaries are intended for long-range planning and policy application; they do not establish municipal boundaries, zoning districts, service areas, property rights, or development entitlements.

DRAFT



MORGAN COUNTY

COMMUNITY PLANNING AREAS

0 2 4 Miles

October 2026

- Morgan
- Current Community Area
- Future Expanded Community Area



Planning Outpost


JUB ENGINEERS, INC. | THE LANDON GROUP | GATEWAY MAPPING INC.

Croydon Community

Croydon Community Vision

Croydon will remain a safe, rural, and agriculturally rooted valley and canyon community that protects its water, wildlife, scenic landscape, and quiet way of life. Future growth will be limited, well planned, and compatible with the area's infrastructure, natural constraints, public-safety needs, and the values of those who call Croydon home.

DRAFT



MORGAN COUNTY

0 1,900 3,800
Feet

October 2026

DRAFT

CROYDON FUTURE LAND USE

Morgan County Boundary

Future Land Use

- Large Parcel Agricultural (LP-AG)
- Rural Living (RL)

Future Land Use - Expanded Village Area

- Large Parcel Agricultural (LP-AG)

Planning Outpost

JUB ENGINEERS, INC.

Croydon Community Policies

The following policies supplement the Countywide Land Use Policies and provide direction specific to the Croydon Community Area. They are intended to guide future land-use, infrastructure, capital-planning, and development-review decisions and should be considered together with the Community Vision, Future Land Use Map, Community Planning Context, and applicable County regulations.

Croydon Policy 1.1 — Maintain Croydon's rural valley identity.

Maintain Croydon as a distinct rural agricultural valley and canyon community centered on its historic townsite, working lands, open fields, rural residences, irrigation systems, foothills, and scenic views. Land-use and zoning decisions should preserve the visual and functional separation between Croydon's historic townsite, its agricultural and rural-valley lands, and the I-84/railroad/utility corridor. Croydon is not intended to become an extension of suburban development from Morgan City, the Wasatch Front, or nearby interchange areas.

Croydon Policy 1.2 — Preserve the rural growth pattern.

Direct any new residential development to locations and intensities shown on the Future Land Use Map and compatible with Croydon's historic townsite, rural road network, constrained valley geography, and established agricultural pattern. Avoid extending half-acre, suburban-density, or similarly intensive residential development northward or into the rural valley and canyon areas where it would fragment agricultural land, erode the transition between the townsite and surrounding working lands, or create strip development along Croydon Road, South Croydon Road, or Lost Creek Road.

Croydon Policy 1.3 — Protect the agricultural landscape and rural operations.

Preserve Croydon's productive agricultural lands, ranching operations, irrigation infrastructure, farm access, and livestock movement as defining features of the community's landscape, economy, and identity. New development should be located and designed to maintain the continued operation of established farms and ranches and to avoid conflicts between new residents and customary agricultural activities, including irrigation, livestock, equipment, odors, dust, noise, and seasonal operations.

Croydon Policy 1.4 — Coordinate development with Croydon's dispersed water and wastewater setting.

In areas served by private wells, springs, septic systems, or the Croydon Water System, evaluate development in relation to the carrying capacity and long-term protection of Croydon's local water resources and wastewater conditions. Support coordinated water-system solutions, where feasible, that protect groundwater and reduce unnecessary proliferation of individual wells. Protect Lost Creek, the Weber River, springs, riparian areas, irrigation facilities, and groundwater recharge areas from development patterns that could impair water quality, water quantity, agricultural use, or long-term system reliability.

DRAFT

Croydon Policy 1.5 — Protect constrained roads and canyon access.

Manage growth, recreation, and land-use change to protect the safety and function of Croydon Road, South Croydon Road, Lost Creek Road, local bridges, railroad crossings, and agricultural-access routes. Give particular attention to Lost Creek Road's narrow canyon geometry, limited shoulders, sharp curves, flood exposure, limited secondary access, and role as a route for residents, agricultural operations, emergency responders, and reservoir users. Before supporting proposals that would materially increase traffic in constrained locations, identify the access, safety, drainage, bridge, crossing, emergency-response, and long-term maintenance measures needed to address the proposal's local effects.

Croydon Policy 1.6 — Manage Lost Creek Reservoir visitation in coordination with local capacity.

Support public access and recreation at Lost Creek Reservoir and the surrounding recreation area only at a level and in a manner compatible with Croydon's constrained canyon access, rural residents, water resources, private property, natural resources, and emergency-service capacity. Coordinate with the Bureau of Reclamation, Utah State Parks, Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, emergency-service providers, nearby property owners, and other responsible agencies to address visitor capacity, traffic, parking, sanitation, enforcement, emergency response, resource protection, and the fair allocation of recreation-related costs.

Croydon Policy 1.7 — Concentrate intensive nonresidential uses in suitable corridors.

Direct community-serving, highway-oriented, industrial, transportation-related, utility-support, and other intensive nonresidential uses to established I-84, railroad, utility, and existing industrial corridors where access, infrastructure, and operational conditions are most suitable. Avoid dispersed commercial strips and new intensive uses in Croydon's historic townsite, rural residential areas, agricultural lands, and the Lost Creek corridor when they would undermine the community's rural character, scenic setting, agricultural function, water resources, or road safety.

Croydon Policy 1.8 — Sustain the community park and local gathering places.

Maintain Croydon's community park and other local gathering places as community-serving resources for residents, families, and local events. Coordinate management, maintenance, funding, and any future improvements with local residents and responsible entities so these facilities remain safe, functional, and accessible without creating disproportionate ongoing obligations for local groups or property owners.

Croydon Policy 1.9 — Community Plan Consistency Review.

For significant land-use and infrastructure decisions affecting Croydon, Morgan County staff will apply Countywide LU Policy 1.0 and identify the applicable Croydon Community Vision, Community Policies, Future Land Use Map direction, and relevant Community Planning Context. Staff reports should address the Croydon townsite and rural-valley transition, agricultural land, water resources, Lost Creek Road and

DRAFT

other constrained access routes, reservoir/recreation impacts, utility corridors, and natural-resource conditions.

DRAFT

Croydon Community Character & Values

Community Character

Croydon is a small, rural community characterized by agricultural land, ranches, open fields, dispersed homes, irrigation systems, foothills, canyon landscapes, and a strong connection to the Weber River and Lost Creek. The historic Croydon townsite provides a modest community focal point, while the broader area includes working agricultural land, rural residences, recreation access, transportation facilities, utility corridors, and established industrial uses near the I-84 and railroad corridors.

The community's physical setting is defined by narrow valley bottoms, productive agricultural soils in selected locations, steep surrounding terrain, canyon drainages, and limited road connections. Croydon Road, South Croydon Road, and Lost Creek Road are essential local routes for residents, agricultural operations, emergency response, recreation access, and travel through the area. Lost Creek Road is a canyon with constrained geometry, safety limitations, and limited opportunities for secondary access.

Community Values

Croydon residents value the community's quiet rural setting, working farms and ranches, open fields, foothills, wildlife, clean water, and scenic canyon and valley landscapes. Residents want Croydon to remain a distinct community rather than become an extension of suburban development from the Wasatch Front or nearby interchange areas. They place particular importance on the safety and capacity of Croydon Road, South Croydon Road, and Lost Creek Road; the protection of wells, springs, irrigation, Lost Creek, and the Weber River; and the responsible management of Lost Creek Reservoir recreation so that its impacts do not diminish the area's rural character or quality of life.

Croydon Community Planning Context

The following community planning context identifies the local conditions, resources, infrastructure, facilities, and development considerations that should guide future decisions in the Croydon Community Area. It should be considered together with the Community Vision, Policies, Future Land Use Map, Countywide Land Use Policies, and applicable County regulations.

Land Use and Growth Pattern

Croydon's identity is closely tied to its historic townsite, rural residences, productive agricultural lands, ranches, grazing lands, irrigation systems, open fields, foothills, canyon landscapes, and scenic views. The historic townsite provides a modest community focal point, while the broader area includes working agricultural land, rural residences, recreation access, transportation facilities, utility corridors, and established industrial uses near the Interstate 84 and railroad corridors.

DRAFT

Agriculture remains an important economic, cultural, and land-stewardship activity in Croydon. Farming and ranching involve livestock, irrigation systems, farm equipment, agricultural access, dust, odors, noise, and seasonal activity that are characteristic of rural living. New residential or nonresidential development may create conflicts with these activities when it is not appropriately located, designed, or coordinated with existing operations.

Croydon's constrained geography limits the amount of land that can reasonably support additional development. Narrow valley bottoms, productive agricultural soils in selected locations, steep slopes, foothills, flood-prone areas, drainage corridors, utility corridors, limited road connections, water and wastewater limitations, and existing agricultural operations all affect the suitability and capacity of land for residential and nonresidential uses.

Public input expressed a clear preference for maintaining Croydon's established rural character and avoiding future land-use designations or development patterns that would create suburban-scale growth. Residents identified concern that incremental subdivision, lot-configuration, and land-use changes could cumulatively alter the community's rural pattern, fragment agricultural land, increase demands on limited facilities, or create strip development along Croydon Road, South Croydon Road, or Lost Creek Road.

Transportation and Access

Croydon Road, South Croydon Road, and Lost Creek Road are essential community routes serving rural residences, agricultural operations, emergency response, public services, recreation traffic, industrial activity, and access to Interstate 84. The area also contains railroad facilities, bridges, utility corridors, and the constrained road network associated with the Weber River and Lost Creek valleys.

These facilities serve multiple functions within a limited physical setting. Local roads must accommodate passenger vehicles, agricultural equipment, emergency responders, visitors, industrial and service traffic, and recreation-related travel. The constrained valley and canyon setting limits opportunities for new or expanded transportation connections and makes safe access, road maintenance, drainage, bridge conditions, railroad crossings, and emergency response central considerations in local land-use planning.

Lost Creek Road is a particularly significant local constraint. The road serves a narrow canyon and functions as the principal and in some locations the only practical access route for residents, property owners, recreation users, emergency responders, and agricultural activity. The previous Croydon/Lost Creek plan and current resident input identified constrained road width, limited shoulders, drop-offs, sharp curves, sight-distance limitations, limited guardrails and delineators, farm-equipment conflicts, and limited secondary access as continuing safety concerns.

Recreation traffic associated with Lost Creek Reservoir can add congestion, road-safety risks, emergency-service demands, seasonal maintenance needs, and conflicts with local

DRAFT

agricultural and residential travel. Flood exposure, bridge conditions, railroad crossings, narrow canyon geometry, drainage conditions, and limited opportunities for alternate access further constrain the capacity and resilience of the Croydon road network.

Potential transportation and public-safety needs identified through prior planning and public input include striping, guardrails, delineators, signage, shoulder stabilization, drainage improvements, sight-distance improvements, bridge and railroad-crossing measures, and emergency-response planning. The need, timing, feasibility, funding, responsibility, and long-term maintenance of any improvement should be evaluated through the applicable County processes and coordination with responsible agencies, service providers, property owners, and affected residents.

Water and Wastewater

Croydon relies on a combination of the Croydon Water System, private wells, springs, irrigation systems, Lost Creek, and the Weber River. The availability, quality, protection, and long-term management of culinary water, groundwater, irrigation water, and surface-water resources are fundamental planning considerations in the community.

Current residents identified water quality as an important local concern. The prior Croydon/Lost Creek plan also emphasized aquifer protection, avoiding unnecessary proliferation of individual wells, and considering shared water-system solutions where feasible and economical. These concerns remain relevant because water availability and groundwater protection directly affect the community's ability to accommodate future development while protecting existing residents, agricultural operations, and natural resources.

Croydon Pipeline Corporation provides public culinary-water service in portions of the Croydon area. Development within or near the system's service area may involve considerations related to water rights, source capacity, storage, distribution infrastructure, peak demand, connection availability, pressure, fire-flow needs where applicable, and system improvements. The protection of groundwater sources, wells, springs, recharge areas, and related water infrastructure remains an important local planning consideration.

Much of the community does not have centralized wastewater collection and treatment. Development feasibility is therefore influenced by septic-system suitability, soils, depth to groundwater, lot configuration, drainage, flood hazards, cumulative septic density, private-well reliance, applicable health-department requirements, and the ability to establish reliable long-term operation and maintenance arrangements.

Lost Creek, the Weber River, springs, riparian areas, irrigation facilities, groundwater, and related water systems are interconnected local resources. Land-use and infrastructure decisions may affect water quality, irrigation operations, groundwater recharge, flood and drainage conditions, agricultural uses, and the reliability of water supplies serving existing residents and future development.

DRAFT

Natural Resources and Hazards

The Croydon area contains important natural resources, including the Weber River, Lost Creek, tributary canyons, riparian areas, springs, productive farmland, foothills, wildlife habitat, and scenic mountain and valley landscapes. These resources contribute to Croydon's rural character, agricultural economy, recreation opportunities, environmental quality, and quality of life.

Wildlife, hunting, and open land are meaningful components of the Croydon and Lost Creek setting. Residents and prior planning documents have identified elk, deer, cougars, eagles, bobcats, badgers, chukar, wild turkeys, and other wildlife within the area. Wildlife habitat, open land, foothills, river corridors, and scenic views are therefore relevant considerations when evaluating land-use change, development design, infrastructure placement, recreation activity, and the transition between developed and rural lands.

Waterways, riparian areas, floodplains, drainage corridors, steep slopes, foothills, wildlife habitat, scenic resources, and utility corridors are principal site constraints in Croydon. Flooding along Lost Creek and other watercourses has disrupted travel and affects the siting, design, access, long-term maintenance, and emergency response associated with roads, bridges, utilities, and development.

Flooding and drainage remain particularly important along Lost Creek and other watercourses. Local conditions may require careful attention to floodplain information, topography, drainage patterns, erosion potential, culvert and bridge capacity, access conditions, agency coordination, and the potential effects of development on neighboring and downstream properties. Site-specific information and applicable approvals may be necessary depending on a proposal's location, scale, and potential impacts.

The canyon also contains high-pressure gas pipelines, fiber-optic facilities, telephone lines, and power lines. These facilities create location-specific considerations related to setbacks, separation, safety, operation, maintenance access, emergency response, and coordination with utility providers.

Recreation and Community Facilities

Lost Creek Reservoir and the surrounding public lands provide important opportunities for fishing, hunting, camping, boating, and other outdoor recreation. Recreation is an important part of the area's identity and regional appeal. At the same time, visitation can create local effects involving traffic, road safety, parking, sanitation, emergency-service demand, water-quality risks, vandalism, property impacts, enforcement needs, and costs to local residents and County services.

The local road system and canyon setting place practical limits on the amount and type of recreation activity that can be accommodated without affecting community safety, access, environmental conditions, and quality of life. Recreation planning in the Lost Creek area involves multiple landowners, agencies, service providers, and jurisdictions, including the Bureau of Reclamation, Utah State Parks, Weber Basin

DRAFT

Water Conservancy District, Morgan County, emergency-service providers, nearby property owners, and Croydon residents.

Public input and prior planning identify the need to address visitor capacity, traffic management, road safety, parking, sanitation, visitor education, law-enforcement presence, emergency response, resource protection, operations, maintenance, and the fair allocation of recreation-related costs. These considerations are especially important when evaluating proposals or management changes that could increase visitation, require additional facilities, alter traffic patterns, or create new demands on local roads and public services.

The Croydon/Lost Creek area also includes a County park developed through substantial local effort and private contributions. The park is an important local gathering place and community asset. Its continued use, maintenance, programming, and long-term management should be considered in coordination with available funding, ownership, operating responsibilities, volunteer capacity, and the feasibility of future improvements or additional community-serving amenities.

Water Conservancy District, Morgan County, emergency-service providers, nearby property owners, and Croydon residents.

Public input and prior planning identify the need to address visitor capacity, traffic management, road safety, parking, sanitation, visitor education, law-enforcement presence, emergency response, resource protection, operations, maintenance, and the fair allocation of recreation-related costs. These considerations are especially important when evaluating proposals or management changes that could increase visitation, require additional facilities, alter traffic patterns, or create new demands on local roads and public services.

The Croydon/Lost Creek area also includes a County park developed through substantial local effort and private contributions. The park is an important local gathering place and community asset. Its continued use, maintenance, programming, and long-term management should be considered in coordination with available funding, ownership, operating responsibilities, volunteer capacity, and the feasibility of future improvements or additional community-serving amenities.


DRAFT

Enterprise Community

Enterprise Community Vision

Enterprise will remain a safe, rural residential and agricultural community defined by open land, foothills, quiet neighborhoods, and a strong sense of local connection. Future growth will be limited, well planned, and compatible with Enterprise's water, wastewater, drainage, road, fire-protection, and natural-hazard conditions. The community will support modest housing choices, parks and trails, and small-scale compatible businesses that strengthen community life while preserving Enterprise's rural character and quality of life.

DRAFT



MORGAN COUNTY

0 710 1,420 Feet

October 2026

DRAFT

ENTERPRISE FUTURE LAND USE

Morgan County Boundary

Future Land Use

- Large Parcel Agricultural (LP-AG)
- Agricultural/Working Lands (AG)
- Rural Living (RL)
- Rural Corridor (RC)
- Village Residential Neighborhood (VRN)
- Village Commercial Center (VCC)



Planning Outpost

JUB ENGINEERS, INC.

Enterprise Community Policies

The following policies supplement the Countywide Land Use Policies and provide direction specific to the Enterprise Community Area. They are intended to guide future land-use, infrastructure, capital-planning, and development-review decisions and should be considered together with the Community Vision, Future Land Use Map, Community Planning Context, and applicable County regulations.

Enterprise Policy 1.1 — Maintain Enterprise as a rural residential valley community.

Maintain Enterprise as a predominantly low-density rural residential community within the Weber River valley, with agricultural and grazing lands, open foothills, scenic views, and dispersed single-family neighborhoods as defining features. Land-use and zoning decisions should preserve Enterprise's rural residential pattern and avoid suburban-scale, strip-commercial, or visually intrusive development that would fragment open land, alter the foothill setting, or undermine the community's separation from Morgan City and more intensive interchange-area development.

Enterprise Policy 1.2 — Direct growth away from foothill hazard areas and constrained drainage systems.

Direct residential growth to locations and forms shown on the Future Land Use Map that avoid Enterprise's alluvial fans, drainage corridors, steep or unstable slopes, flood-prone areas, and other constrained foothill lands. Development proposed near Roswell Canyon, Devil's Hollow, Spring Hollow, or other tributary drainage areas shall demonstrate how it will preserve the function of natural drainageways, irrigation ditches, draws, culverts, and conveyance systems and avoid increasing flood, debris-flow, erosion, or slope-failure risks on adjacent or downstream properties. Morgan County should maintain mapped information regarding Enterprise's alluvial fans, canyon mouths, drainageways, known slide areas, and related facilities and use that information to guide development review, capital planning, emergency planning, and future updates to applicable County standards.

Enterprise Policy 1.3 — Protect Old Highway Road as a safe community corridor.

Manage Old Highway Road as Enterprise's principal community corridor and a critical connection to Morgan City and Interstate 84. Maintain safe and context-sensitive access, with particular attention to driveway spacing, shared access, internal street connections, intersection design, pedestrian crossings, bicycle and trail connections, and speed management near Enterprise Park, the church, and developed residential areas. Avoid development patterns that create unnecessary direct access, backing movements, unsafe turning conflicts, or roadway conditions inconsistent with adjacent neighborhood livability.

Enterprise Policy 1.4 — Limit reliance on new private roads.

Discourage new private roads in Enterprise unless no practical public-road or shared-access alternative exists. Where a private road is necessary, require durable, recorded arrangements for access, design,

DRAFT

drainage, emergency response, construction, snow removal, ownership, maintenance, repair, replacement, and funding so that the road does not create an avoidable long-term obligation for existing residents or Morgan County.

Enterprise Policy 1.5 — Preserve Enterprise Park and strengthen local connections.

Maintain and improve Enterprise Park as a central local gathering and recreation resource. Prioritize safe pedestrian access across and along Old Highway Road, neighborhood walking and bicycle connections, trails, and modest public or publicly accessible gathering spaces that serve Enterprise residents. Where larger development creates a demonstrated local need, seek usable park, trail, or open-space improvements that connect to the community's broader recreation network and include dependable long-term ownership and maintenance arrangements.

Enterprise Policy 1.6 — Support housing compatible with Enterprise's rural setting.

Maintain Enterprise's predominantly single-family rural residential pattern while allowing modest, appropriately regulated housing options that help local households age in place, accommodate family members or caregivers, and remain in the community. Consider accessory dwelling units, including compatible internal, attached, or detached units, where their design, parking, access, and service needs are compatible with the lot, surrounding neighborhood, and Enterprise's rural character. This policy does not support housing forms or densities that would change Enterprise into a conventional suburban growth area.

Enterprise Policy 1.7 — Limit expansion of intensive nonresidential uses.

Enterprise is not planned as a general commercial, industrial, extraction, or trucking growth area. Limit new nonresidential development to home occupations, agricultural-support uses, and small-scale community-serving uses compatible with Enterprise's rural residential setting. Carefully evaluate expansions of existing gravel, asphalt, trucking, industrial, outdoor-storage, or similar intensive uses near the north end of the community and the Peterson interchange for their effects on surrounding homes, Old Highway Road, drainage systems, air quality, noise, dust, visual character, and future reclamation. When such sites are discontinued, support reclamation and transition to agricultural, open-space, or other low-intensity uses compatible with the area.

Enterprise Policy 1.8 — Community Plan Consistency Review.

For significant land-use and infrastructure decisions affecting Enterprise, Morgan County staff will apply Countywide LU Policy 1.0 and identify the applicable Enterprise Community Vision, Community Policies, Future Land Use Map direction, and relevant Community Planning Context. Staff reports will explain how the proposal responds to Enterprise's rural residential character, water and wastewater limitations, drainage and alluvial-fan conditions, Old Highway Road and private-road access, agricultural setting, Enterprise Park, and other locally relevant considerations.

DRAFT

DRAFT

Enterprise Community Character & Values

Community Character

Enterprise is a small, predominantly rural residential community defined by its open valley setting, foothills, agricultural lands, dispersed and large-lot residential development, and proximity to the Weber River. The community's character is shaped less by a centralized commercial district and more by its residential neighborhoods, rural roads, irrigated lands, drainageways, foothill terrain, park, church, and informal community connections.

The built environment is primarily composed of detached homes, agricultural and accessory structures, private wells and water systems, irrigation infrastructure, and rural roadways. Home occupations and home-based businesses are present on a limited basis, while commercial development remains minimal. Existing industrial and extraction-related uses are concentrated near the north end of the area and are not intended to establish a broader industrial character for Enterprise.

Community Values

Enterprise residents value quiet rural neighborhoods, open valley views, foothills, agricultural land, irrigation resources, and a strong sense of local connection. They support careful, modest change that respects the limits of local water systems, wells, septic conditions, drainageways, roads, fire protection, and emergency access. Residents also value Enterprise Park, safe connections for walking and biking, and development that fits the community's predominantly single-family rural residential character without creating avoidable impacts from traffic, intensive uses, or growth in hazard-prone areas

Enterprise Community Planning Context

The following community planning context identifies the local conditions, resources, infrastructure, facilities, and development considerations that should guide future decisions in the Enterprise Community Area. It should be considered together with the Community Vision, Policies, Future Land Use Map, Countywide Land Use Policies, and applicable County regulations.

Land Use and Growth Pattern

Enterprise's future development capacity is influenced by the availability and reliability of water, groundwater protection, septic suitability, fire flow, emergency access, road capacity, drainage, alluvial-fan conditions, and geologic hazards. These are not merely technical development-review issues; they are central to determining the appropriate location, scale, design, and long-term serviceability of future development.

Residents also expressed concern about development patterns that could create strip development along Old Highway Road, scattered intensification in foothill or hazard-prone areas, increased burdens on existing infrastructure, or conflicts with established agricultural and rural residential uses.

DRAFT

Commercial, Industrial, and Extraction Uses

Enterprise has limited commercial development, consisting principally of home occupations and home-based businesses. The Future Land Use Map contemplates the potential for limited smaller-scale retail in the northern portion of the community, but Enterprise is not characterized by or planned as a broad commercial center. The scale, location, access, utility needs, and visual character of any nonresidential activity are particularly important because of the community's predominantly rural residential setting and limited infrastructure.

Existing gravel pits and an asphalt plant are located near the north end of Enterprise and the Peterson interchange. These uses, along with trucking, outdoor storage, and other industrial or extraction-related activity, may affect traffic, road safety, heavy-truck movement, dust, noise, operating hours, drainage, water resources, air quality, visual conditions, reclamation, and nearby rural residences.

The combination of topographic constraints, residential proximity, limited road capacity, local water and drainage conditions, and Enterprise's rural character creates distinct compatibility considerations for industrial, extraction, asphalt, trucking, commercial, and similar uses. Where industrial or extraction activity is discontinued, future land-use decisions may need to consider site reclamation, environmental conditions, access, drainage, compatibility with nearby uses, and the community's broader agricultural, open-space, and rural residential context.

Transportation and Access

Interstate 84 passes through Enterprise, but the area's principal interstate access is through the Peterson interchange. Old Highway Road is the primary local collector and an important connection between Enterprise, Morgan City, and Interstate 84. It passes through developed residential areas and near Enterprise Park and the church, requiring the road to serve both regional and local mobility functions as well as neighborhood safety, pedestrian activity, community access, and emergency response.

The Enterprise road network serves rural residences, agricultural operations, school-age pedestrians, visitors, local businesses, emergency responders, and traffic associated with industrial and extraction-related uses. Because the community relies on a limited number of road connections, land-use changes can affect access, roadway capacity, traffic safety, turning movements, driveway conflicts, emergency response, drainage, road maintenance, and the movement of farm equipment and heavy trucks.

Old Highway Road presents particular access-management and safety considerations. Existing residential development, Enterprise Park, the church, driveways, intersections, local traffic, pedestrian activity, bicycle use, and truck traffic all contribute to the need for careful coordination of development access and roadway function. Local planning considerations include driveway spacing, shared access, internal local streets, intersection design, sight distance, drainage, speed management, pedestrian crossings, bicycle accommodations, trails, roadway striping, rights-of-way, freight

DRAFT

movement, emergency access, and long-term maintenance.

Spring Hollow Road has local roadway, visibility, vegetation, speed-management, emergency-access, and geometry considerations that may affect the feasibility and impacts of additional development in that area. Blue Sage Road, Summer Ridge Road, and other private roads may have limited capacity for additional traffic or emergency access. Their ownership, maintenance, improvement needs, funding arrangements, and long-term responsibility are important considerations when evaluating proposals that rely on those roads.

Heavy truck traffic associated with extraction, asphalt, industrial, or similar uses may affect Old Highway Road and nearby residential areas. Potential considerations include hauling routes, traffic volume, vehicle size and weight, operating hours, noise, dust, road wear, safety, drainage, and mitigation of impacts on local residents and public infrastructure.

Water and Wastewater

Enterprise is served by the Central Enterprise and West Enterprise water systems, as well as individual private wells. These systems, together with local springs, groundwater resources, storage facilities, distribution infrastructure, irrigation facilities, and water rights, are essential to the community's existing residents and to its capacity to accommodate future development.

The availability, reliability, and capacity of culinary water are particularly significant local planning considerations. Development proposals may affect water rights, source capacity, storage, distribution infrastructure, peak demand, pressure, fire-flow needs where applicable, system extensions, and the financial and operational responsibilities of water providers and existing users. The protection of existing wells, springs, groundwater, irrigation facilities, and water rights is also important because Enterprise includes both public water systems and private water sources.

Secondary water and irrigation resources are important to Enterprise's agricultural and rural residential setting. Irrigation systems, water-delivery facilities, and water rights support agricultural operations, landscaping, open land, and rural lifestyles. Changes in land use or development on irrigated land may affect the continued use, conversion, replacement, protection, and maintenance of irrigation infrastructure and outdoor water supplies.

Enterprise does not have a public sewer system. Development feasibility is therefore influenced by septic-system suitability, soil conditions, groundwater conditions, lot configuration, cumulative septic density, drainage, applicable health-department requirements, and the ability to establish and maintain wastewater systems over time. Previous concerns have been raised that local alluvial materials may not adequately filter septic effluent as development increases. That concern remains relevant to the evaluation of cumulative wastewater effects, groundwater protection, and the range of wastewater solutions that may be feasible for larger or more complex proposals.

Water, wastewater, fire protection, drainage, emergency access, and long-term operation and

DRAFT

maintenance are interconnected considerations in Enterprise. The Countywide capacity-verification framework and Enterprise Policies provide the applicable direction for determining whether a proposal can be safely and sustainably served without imposing disproportionate operational or financial burdens on existing residents, water-system users, or service providers.

Natural Resources and Hazards

Enterprise's character and long-term resilience are closely tied to agricultural lands, grazing areas, irrigation systems, foothills, drainageways, springs, groundwater resources, and its proximity to the Weber River. These features contribute to the community's rural identity, scenic setting, agricultural economy, water resources, watershed function, and development capacity.

Ranching, grazing, vegetation management, and the condition of upper-slope ground cover can influence soil stability, watershed function, erosion, flood risk, drainage, and groundwater protection. Agricultural and grazing operations may also involve irrigation ditches, water-delivery facilities, livestock movement, farm equipment, dust, odors, noise, water management, and seasonal activity. These established practices are part of Enterprise's rural setting and can be affected by the location, density, design, and access patterns of new development.

Irrigation ditches, drainageways, culverts, and related conveyance facilities perform interconnected flood-management, irrigation, and drainage functions. Their condition, capacity, access, ownership, maintenance, and relationship to adjacent development are important local considerations. Changes to land use, drainage patterns, or infrastructure can affect the operation of these systems and the risk of erosion, flooding, or downstream impacts.

Flooding, Drainage, and Geologic Hazards

Enterprise lies below foothill drainage basins and is affected by intermittent canyon, draw, and alluvial-fan drainage. Roswell Canyon, Devil's Hollow, Spring Hollow, and other drainage areas can convey substantial runoff during cloudburst events. The community's setting presents potential for flooding, debris flows, mudflows, temporary canyon blockages, erosion, and sudden releases of water and debris onto lower alluvial-fan and bench areas.

Alluvial fans, drainageways, draws, canyon mouths, flood-prone locations, and areas downstream of steep foothill watersheds may involve location-specific concerns related to runoff from higher elevations, 100-year flood conditions, culvert and bridge capacity, debris-flow potential, detention or retention needs, erosion, emergency access, maintenance responsibility, and effects on neighboring or downstream properties. The appropriate level of technical analysis depends on the location, scale, and potential impacts of a proposal.

The foothills above Enterprise include faults, scarps, loose materials, steep slopes, and areas with potential slope instability. Known slide areas have been identified in the community. Earthquakes, heavy precipitation, erosion, altered drainage, grading, vegetation loss, and development on marginally stable land can

DRAFT

contribute to slope failure or hillside instability in susceptible areas.

Recreation and Community Facilities

Enterprise Park is an important local recreation and gathering resource that reflects substantial community investment and volunteer effort. The park, church, rural roads, foothill setting, and informal community connections contribute to Enterprise's sense of place and provide the community with limited but meaningful opportunities for recreation, gathering, walking, bicycling, and neighborhood interaction.

Safe access to Enterprise Park is an important local concern because Old Highway Road also functions as a primary transportation route through the community. Pedestrian crossings, bicycle and trail connections, visibility, local traffic conditions, roadway design, maintenance, and coordination with adjacent development are relevant considerations for future park and transportation planning.

Residents have identified interest in trails, walking and bicycling connections, safe crossings, small neighborhood or pocket parks, open spaces, and stormwater facilities that may also provide recreation or visual benefits. The feasibility of such amenities depends on land ownership, funding, construction costs, operating needs, liability, maintenance capacity, private-property considerations, agricultural compatibility, and long-term responsibility. Larger residential development may create demand for neighborhood park space, trail connections, pedestrian improvements, open-space linkages, or other community amenities.


DRAFT

Milton Community

Milton Community Vision

Milton will preserve its rural agricultural character, working lands, open space, scenic beauty, and quiet way of life by directing only limited, infrastructure-compatible growth to appropriate locations. Future development will avoid patterns that erode the community's identity or fail to provide a clear local benefit.

DRAFT



MORGAN COUNTY

0 1,750 3,500
Feet

October 2026

DRAFT

MILTON FUTURE LAND USE

Morgan County Boundary

Future Land Use

- Large Parcel Agricultural (LP-AG)
- Agricultural/Working Lands (AG)
- Rural Living (RL)
- Recreation/Resort (REC)

Planning Outpost

JUB ENGINEERS, INC.

Milton Community Policies

The following policies supplement the Countywide Land Use Policies and provide direction specific to the Milton Community Area. They are intended to guide future land-use, infrastructure, capital-planning, and development-review decisions and should be considered together with the Community Vision, Future Land Use Map, Community Planning Context, and applicable County regulations.

Milton Policy 1.1 — Maintain Milton's agricultural and large-lot rural landscape.

Maintain Milton as a low-density agricultural and rural residential community defined by working farms and ranches, irrigated fields, open land, foothills, large-lot homes, scenic views, and a quiet rural setting. Direct limited new residential growth to locations shown on the Future Land Use Map, principally near established development and the primary roadway, while preserving the separation between settled rural-residential areas and the broader agricultural, open-space, and foothill landscape. Milton is not intended to function as a suburban, commercial, industrial, or resort growth center.

Milton Policy 1.2 — Protect working lands and rural operations.

Preserve the agricultural lands, ranching operations, irrigation systems, agricultural access routes, and customary rural practices that shape Milton's economy and landscape. New development should be located and designed to avoid unnecessary fragmentation of productive land and conflicts with livestock, farm equipment, irrigation, odors, dust, noise, seasonal activity, and the movement of agricultural equipment on rural roads.

Milton Policy 1.3 — Limit intensive development inconsistent with Milton's rural role.

Avoid resort, high-density residential, large-scale commercial, industrial, and other intensive development forms that would alter Milton's low-density rural character or create service, traffic, access, water, or visual demands inconsistent with the community's setting. Any proposal for a use not typical of Milton's established rural pattern should demonstrate a clear local purpose, compatibility with the Future Land Use Map, and benefits that reasonably address its effects on Milton residents, rural infrastructure, agricultural operations, and scenic character.

Milton Policy 1.4 — Maintain the Deep Creek Road Frontage Area as a limited rural-development area.

The Deep Creek Road Frontage Area is the limited portion of the broader Deep Creek area where permanent rural residential development may be considered. ~~Limit permanent residential development in this area to parcels with frontage on the improved paved portion of Deep Creek Road and a minimum density of 10 acres per dwelling unit, subject to applicable County requirements.~~ Limit permanent residential development in this area to parcels with frontage on the improved paved portion

DRAFT

of Deep Creek Road, at a density no greater than one dwelling unit per 10 acres, subject to applicable County requirements. Maintain a large-lot, low-intensity pattern that does not create pressure for urban-level services, expanded road capacity, or dispersed backcountry development beyond the improved roadway corridor.

Milton Policy 1.5 — Preserve the Deep Creek Ranches as a remote, low-intensity area.

The Deep Creek Ranches, generally located beyond the improved paved portion of Deep Creek Road, are not planned as a permanent residential neighborhood. Discourage permanent development, residential occupancy, subdivision, zoning changes, and growth-inducing infrastructure in the Ranches. Allow only low-intensity temporary recreational use consistent with County regulations and the area's remote access, watershed sensitivity, limited emergency response, water-quality constraints, and scenic open-land character.

Milton Policy 1.6 — Prevent conversion of temporary recreation into permanent occupancy in the Deep Creek Ranches.

Do not treat temporary recreational use, seasonal structures, trailers, or limited-access use in the Deep Creek Ranches as a basis for permanent occupancy, permanent buildings, additional subdivision, expanded public services, or growth-inducing road and utility improvements. Seasonal structures and trailers shall be removed during the period required by County regulations, currently November 1 through April 30, unless an adopted regulation is amended. Manage temporary use to protect Deep Creek water quality, watershed resources, drainage, emergency access, and the remote character of the area.

Milton Policy 1.7 — Protect rural transportation corridors and access reliability.

Protect the rural function and safety of Morgan Valley Drive, Stoddard Lane, Deep Creek Road, local bridges, drainage crossings, and agricultural-access routes. Evaluate land-use changes, resort-related activity, visitor traffic, and other traffic-generating development for their effects on rural road capacity, sight distance, bridge function, drainage, agricultural equipment movement, school transportation, emergency access, maintenance, and the community's quiet rural character. Give particular attention to any proposed transportation, utility, recreation, or development connection that could increase demands on Milton roads from the Peterson area, Wasatch Peaks Ranch, or other adjoining areas.

Milton Policy 1.8 — Maintain Milton Park and modest community-serving amenities.

Maintain Milton Park as a central local gathering, recreation, and community-event resource. Support practical improvements to park access, safety, maintenance, walking and bicycling connections, and modest community-serving amenities where they are consistent with available funding, agricultural compatibility, rural character, and durable ownership and maintenance arrangements.

DRAFT

Milton Policy 1.9 — Community Plan Consistency Review.

For significant land-use and infrastructure decisions affecting Milton, Morgan County staff will apply Countywide LU Policy 1.0 and identify the applicable Milton Community Vision, Community Policies, Future Land Use Map direction, and relevant Community Planning Context. Staff reports should address agricultural preservation, private-well and septic limitations, Morgan Valley Drive, Stoddard Lane, and Deep Creek Road conditions, and the distinct management framework for the Deep Creek Road Frontage Area and Deep Creek Ranches.

DRAFT

Milton Character & Values

Community Character

Milton is a rural, agricultural community of working farms and ranches, irrigated fields, open land, foothills, and dispersed homes. Large lots, scenic views, and family ties to the land give the area a character distinct from Morgan County's more developed communities. Milton Park, local churches, and informal gathering places contribute to community life without creating a conventional town center.

Community Values

Residents value the ability to farm and ranch, live with space and quiet, and retain Milton's open landscapes. They favor preserving agricultural land and low-density rural living over extending suburban, resort, or industrial development patterns into the community. They also want decisions affecting Milton to be clearly explained and informed by local input.

Safe rural roads, dependable water and wastewater arrangements, and Deep Creek's remote character are especially important to residents. Protecting these conditions helps sustain the homes, agricultural operations, and way of life they value.

Milton Planning Context

The following community planning context identifies the local conditions, resources, infrastructure, facilities, and development considerations that should guide future decisions in the Milton Community Area. It should be considered together with the Community Vision, Policies, Future Land Use Map, Countywide Land Use Policies, and applicable County regulations.

Land Use and Growth Pattern

Milton's land-use pattern consists primarily of working agricultural land and dispersed rural homes, supported by irrigation facilities, private wells, septic systems, local roads, bridges, and drainage systems. Milton Park, churches, and other modest community-serving facilities are interspersed within this rural landscape rather than concentrated in a commercial or civic center.

Future development is shaped by the capacity of wells and septic systems, the condition of roads and bridges, drainage and erosion, emergency access, and the continued operation of farms and irrigation facilities. Changes in lot size, density, access, or infrastructure may appear modest individually but can collectively alter the rural pattern and increase demands on local systems. The Future Land Use Map should therefore be interpreted with attention to both site conditions and the cumulative effect of development on Milton's agricultural lands, open space, and rural infrastructure.

Deep Creek Area

The Deep Creek area is a rural, environmentally sensitive part of Milton with limited infrastructure and important water-quality, watershed, and access concerns. It includes two distinct settings: the Deep Creek Road Frontage Area along the improved paved portion of Deep Creek Road and the more remote Deep Creek Ranches beyond it. Their different conditions and land-use direction

DRAFT

should guide decisions about development, infrastructure, and recreation, including the combined effects of proposals on the road and surrounding lands.

~~The Deep Creek area is a rural and environmentally sensitive portion of the Milton planning area. It has limited infrastructure, constrained road access, important water-quality and watershed considerations, scenic and open-land resources, and a development pattern substantially different from the more settled portions of Milton.~~

~~The Deep Creek area includes two distinct land-use contexts: the Deep Creek Road Frontage Area and the Deep Creek Ranches. This distinction reflects the difference between land served by the improved paved portion of Deep Creek Road and the more remote lands beyond the existing improved roadway.~~

~~The Deep Creek Road Frontage Area includes parcels along the improved paved portion of Deep Creek Road. This area contains the locations where the County has identified limited, rural-scale development potential, subject to the Future Land Use Map, Milton Policies, applicable development regulations, access conditions, water and wastewater feasibility, drainage and erosion conditions, emergency response, and other site-specific constraints.~~

~~The Deep Creek Ranches are generally located beyond the existing improved paved surface of Deep Creek Road. The area is characterized by remote access, limited road capacity, limited infrastructure, watershed and water-quality sensitivity, open land, scenic resources, and limited ability to accommodate permanent development or increased service demands. The Deep Creek Ranches have a distinct low-intensity management framework under Milton Policies 1.5 and 1.6 and applicable County regulations.~~

~~The community's distinction between the Deep Creek Road Frontage Area and Deep Creek Ranches is essential to future land-use, infrastructure, transportation, recreation, watershed, and enforcement decisions. Any proposal in either area should be evaluated for its relationship to this established distinction, its cumulative effects on Deep Creek Road and surrounding lands, and whether it would create demand for growth-inducing infrastructure or services inconsistent with the area's intended long-term character.~~

Deep Creek Road Frontage Area

The Deep Creek Road Frontage Area follows the improved paved portion of Deep Creek Road and provides the limited location within the broader Deep Creek area where rural-scale residential development may be considered under the Future Land Use Map, Milton Policy 1.4, and applicable County regulations.

The rural road setting, private-well and septic reliance, drainage and erosion conditions, emergency-access constraints, scenic character, agricultural uses, and relationship to adjacent remote lands all affect the area's development capacity. The County's adopted density, frontage, access, water, wastewater, drainage, health, and infrastructure standards provide the applicable basis for evaluating proposals in this area.

DRAFT

The purpose of the area-specific framework is to retain a large-lot rural pattern near the existing improved road corridor, limit traffic and service demands on Deep Creek Road, protect water quality and private wells, avoid scattered or backcountry development patterns, and prevent incremental infrastructure extensions from changing the intended low-intensity character of the broader Deep Creek area.

Deep Creek Ranches

The Deep Creek Ranches are generally located beyond the existing improved paved surface of Deep Creek Road. They are characterized by remote access, limited road capacity, steep and environmentally sensitive terrain in some locations, watershed and water-quality concerns, limited public infrastructure, scenic open land, and a limited ability to accommodate permanent residential development or increased service demands.

The Ranches' remote setting creates practical considerations related to access, emergency response, road maintenance, erosion, drainage, water supply, wastewater disposal, sanitation, wildfire response, enforcement, and long-term maintenance. Permanent buildings, residential occupancy, subdivisions, land-use changes, and infrastructure extensions may raise particular concerns where legal access, frontage, acreage, water, wastewater, health, safety, and other County requirements cannot be met.

Milton Policies 1.5 and 1.6 establish the applicable County direction for low-intensity temporary recreational use, permanent development, seasonal structures, water-resource protection, seasonal removal requirements, road access, and enforcement in the Deep Creek Ranches. The Planning Context does not independently establish the applicable seasonal-removal date, occupancy limitations, acreage standard, or development entitlement. Those matters should remain in the adopted policies and applicable County regulations.

The key local planning consideration is that a temporary or recreational use should not be treated as a basis for permanent residential occupancy, permanent infrastructure, additional subdivision, growth-inducing road improvements, or an expectation of expanded public services in a remote area that is not planned to function as a permanent residential neighborhood.

Transportation and Access

Morgan Valley Drive, Stoddard Lane, and Deep Creek Road are essential rural transportation corridors serving residents, farms and ranches, school transportation, emergency responders, cyclists, pedestrians, equestrians, visitors, community facilities, and recreation areas. These roads also provide access to homes, agricultural operations, irrigation facilities, open lands, and remote portions of the Milton planning area.

The road network is rural in design and character. Several segments have limited width or shoulders, constrained geometry, blind curves, bridge limitations, drainage needs, and potential conflicts among passenger vehicles, agricultural equipment, trailers, cyclists, pedestrians, equestrians, school buses, and emergency vehicles. Residents have identified road safety,

DRAFT

speeding, bicycle conflicts, bridge and drainage conditions, and the ability to safely move agricultural equipment as major local concerns.

Additional residential development, resort-related traffic, visitor activity, heavy vehicles, or other traffic-generating uses may affect roadway capacity, driveway access, sight distance, bridge function, drainage, emergency response, school transportation, agricultural movement, rights-of-way, road maintenance, and the quiet rural character of Milton. The limited number of routes serving the community also makes access reliability and emergency response important considerations in land-use and infrastructure decisions.

Potential transportation needs identified through public input and prior planning include bridge assessment and repair, roadway maintenance, drainage and culvert improvements, signage, reflector posts, speed-management measures, shoulder or pull-off improvements where appropriate, and measures that improve safety for agricultural equipment, school transportation, pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians, and emergency responders. The need, timing, feasibility, funding, responsibility, and long-term maintenance of any improvement should be evaluated through applicable County, State, and development-review processes.

Wasatch Peaks Ranch development and primary public access are generally associated with the Peterson area and Morgan Valley Drive. Any proposed transportation, utility, recreation, or development connection that could increase traffic or infrastructure demands on Milton roads warrants careful review because of its potential effects on Milton's rural character, roadway safety, emergency access, agricultural operations, water resources, and public-facility capacity.

Water and Wastewater

Milton relies primarily on private wells, septic systems, irrigation infrastructure, groundwater, surface-water resources, local streams, and drainage systems. The availability, quality, protection, and long-term management of culinary water, secondary water, irrigation water, groundwater, streams, drainageways, and watershed resources are fundamental planning considerations throughout the Milton Community Area.

The absence of centralized water and sewer systems is a defining local condition. Private-well and onsite-wastewater reliance affect the density, pattern, location, and long-term feasibility of development. Water availability, water rights where applicable, well capacity, septic suitability, soil conditions, depth to groundwater, drainage, flood hazards, cumulative effects, access, and long-term operation and maintenance all influence whether individual sites can safely accommodate development.

Water-quality protection is particularly important in the Deep Creek area and other foothill or watershed locations. Recreational use, temporary structures, wastewater practices, erosion, drainage, agricultural activity, and land disturbance may affect groundwater, streams, irrigation facilities, surface water, and downstream resources. These conditions require coordination among landowners, recreational users, water-rights holders, irrigation companies,

DRAFT

the Weber-Morgan Health Department, County staff, state agencies, and other relevant service providers.

The Countywide capacity and water-resource policies, Milton Policies, health-department regulations, water-rights requirements, and applicable State and County regulations provide the operative standards for determining water and wastewater feasibility, protecting existing users, and avoiding unacceptable cumulative effects.

Natural Resources and Hazards

Milton contains important natural resources, including productive agricultural lands, working farms and ranches, irrigation systems, the Weber River, Dalton Creek, Deep Creek, local streams, drainageways, foothills, watershed areas, wildlife habitat, scenic valley landscapes, and open views. These resources support Milton's agricultural economy, rural identity, environmental health, scenic quality, and quality of life.

Waterways, irrigation facilities, drainage corridors, flood-prone areas, foothills, steep slopes, watershed lands, wildlife habitat, scenic resources, and utility corridors are significant site constraints in different parts of the community. The location, design, intensity, and infrastructure needs of development can affect drainage, erosion, flood conditions, water quality, agricultural operations, utility access, wildlife, vegetation, scenic character, and the ability to provide reliable emergency and public services.

Flooding, drainage, and erosion are ongoing considerations in Milton, particularly along creeks, rivers, culverts, drainageways, and low-lying agricultural areas. Local conditions may require site-specific information related to soils, topography, flood hazards, drainage patterns, erosion potential, culvert and bridge capacity, wildfire exposure, vegetation, water quality, utility facilities, access, and long-term maintenance. The appropriate level of review depends on the location, scale, and potential impacts of a proposal.

The community also includes utility facilities, irrigation systems, water-delivery infrastructure, and agricultural access routes that require consideration during land-use and infrastructure planning. State, County, utility-provider, water-rights, and irrigation requirements govern activities such as water impoundment, drainage alteration, utility separation, maintenance access, and protection of irrigation and agricultural operations.

Recreation and Community Facilities

Milton Park is an important community gathering place and recreation resource. Its amenities include a playground, bowery, restrooms, fire pit, riding arena, open lawn, and basketball court. The park has benefited from substantial local support, resident contributions, and prior grant-funded improvements. It contributes to Milton's rural identity and provides a setting for community gatherings, family recreation, youth activities, and informal social connection.

The park's maintenance, safe access, service capacity, and long-term operation are important local considerations. Future park or community-facility decisions may involve available funding, ownership, maintenance responsibility, volunteer

DRAFT

capacity, liability, accessibility, visitor demand, and compatibility with surrounding agricultural and rural residential uses.

Residents have identified interest in maintaining Milton Park and in improving safe access, trails, bicycling and walking opportunities, and other modest community-serving amenities where feasible. The feasibility of such improvements depends on land ownership, traffic and parking conditions, sanitation, construction cost, operations, maintenance, public safety, private-property impacts, agricultural compatibility, and long-term responsibility.

Recreation in the broader Milton area includes rural roads, agricultural landscapes, foothills, waterways, trails, and private lands. Recreation activity, events, trails, bike facilities, visitor-serving uses, and other amenities may affect traffic, access, parking, sanitation, emergency-service capacity, water quality, agricultural operations, private property, maintenance obligations, and the quiet rural character valued by residents.

The Countywide fair-share, public-facility, transportation, and engagement policies, together with Milton Policies 1.7 and 1.8, provide the applicable direction for evaluating whether development, recreation activity, capital improvements, or new amenities create demands for park, trail, public-facility, or service improvements.


DRAFT

Mountain Green Community

Mountain Green Community Vision

Mountain Green is an evolving mountain community in a rural setting, with established neighborhoods, an emerging village center, and a strong connection to the scenic, recreational, and open-space resources that define the area. The community will guide and phase future growth so it is deliberate, well-designed, compatible with established neighborhoods, and supported by adequate water, transportation, public-safety services, utilities, and other essential infrastructure. Mountain Green will preserve open spaces and sensitive lands; expand trails; minimize light pollution and preserve the area's nighttime character; and create a cohesive, walkable village center with appropriately scaled services, gathering places, and a balanced range of housing opportunities.

DRAFT



MORGAN COUNTY

0 1,000 2,000 Feet

October 2026

DRAFT

MOUNTAIN GREEN FUTURE LAND USE

- Morgan County Boundary
- Interchange

Future Land Use

- Large Parcel Agricultural (LP-AG)
- Agricultural/Working Lands (AG)
- Rural Living (RL)
- Rural Corridor (RC)
- Residential Neighborhood (RN)
- Village Residential Neighborhood (VRN)
- Village Commercial Center (VCC)
- Commercial Centers & Corridors (CC)
- Employment & Industrial (EI)
- Civic (CIV)
- Airport Overlay (AO)



Planning Outpost

JUB ENGINEERS, INC.

Mountain Green Community Policies

The following policies supplement the Countywide Land Use Policies and provide direction specific to the Mountain Green Community Area. They are intended to guide future land-use, infrastructure, capital-planning, and development-review decisions and should be considered together with the Community Vision, Future Land Use Map, Community Planning Context, and applicable County regulations.

Mountain Green Policy 1.1 — Maintain Mountain Green's mountain-community identity.

Maintain Mountain Green as an evolving mountain community in a rural setting, distinguished by established neighborhoods, open lands, agricultural remnants, recreation opportunities, scenic foothills and ridgelines, and a strong local identity. Mountain Green is not intended to become an extension of conventional suburban development from the Wasatch Front or Ogden Valley. Land-use decisions should preserve the relationship between developed valley areas and the surrounding mountain landscape and avoid development patterns that unnecessarily urbanize the community, fragment meaningful open land, or diminish its scenic, quiet, and community-oriented character.

Mountain Green Policy 1.2 — Phase growth to demonstrated local capacity.

Phase future development to the demonstrated capacity of Mountain Green's water, wastewater, fire-flow, transportation, drainage, emergency-response, park, trail, school, and other community-serving systems. In applying Countywide capacity and cumulative-effects policies, evaluate growth in relation to existing approvals, pending projects, reasonably foreseeable development, and the timing of committed improvements, not solely the capacity or mitigation of an individual application. Do not rely on speculative or unfunded future facilities as the basis for increased development intensity.

Mountain Green Policy 1.3 — Direct housing to appropriate locations, forms, and neighborhood transitions.

Direct housing to the locations and intensities shown on the Future Land Use Map, with higher-intensity or mixed-use residential development focused in the Village Center and other specifically designated areas. Outside those areas, require new housing to transition appropriately to established neighborhoods in terms of lot pattern, building scale, height, massing, access, open space, and visual character. Avoid an incremental default pattern of townhomes, condominiums, short-term-rental-oriented projects, or other higher-intensity forms that, individually or cumulatively, would change the character of established neighborhoods or compromise Mountain Green's mountain-community identity.

Mountain Green Policy 1.4 — Establish a cohesive Village Center.

Concentrate commercial, civic, service, gathering, and appropriately scaled mixed-use development within the designated Village Center rather than dispersing commercial uses along Old Highway Road, Trappers Loop Road, or other corridors. The Village Center should serve Mountain Green residents

DRAFT

through local shops, restaurants, services, public spaces, parks or plazas, pedestrian connections, and, where appropriate, neighborhood-scaled housing.

Require coordinated planning of streets, blocks, building placement, architecture, parking, access, landscaping, lighting, signage, public spaces, pedestrian circulation, and transitions to surrounding neighborhoods. Avoid strip-commercial development, big-box retail, visually dominant self-storage, and generic or highly uniform commercial forms that do not contribute to an identifiable mountain-community center.

Mountain Green Policy 1.5 — Apply mountain-context design and visual-resource standards.

Apply site-planning and design standards that protect Mountain Green's prominent viewsheds, foothills, ridgelines, visible hillsides, and night-sky character. Development in the Village Center, along major corridors, and on visible sites should fit natural topography; minimize extensive grading, retaining walls, and skyline intrusion; preserve important public views; and use building placement, height, massing, materials, colors, landscaping, lighting, and signage compatible with the mountain setting.

Particular attention should be given to views from Interstate 84, Old Highway Road, Trappers Loop Road, established neighborhoods, public trails, and other prominent viewpoints. Design standards should produce durable, varied, and cohesive mountain-oriented development rather than generic suburban forms or low-quality, highly uniform buildings.

Mountain Green Policy 1.6 — Protect connected open space and sensitive mountain lands.

Protect foothills, ridgelines, visible hillsides, stream corridors, wetlands, floodplains, wildlife habitat, agricultural remnants, and other sensitive lands as connected systems that define Mountain Green's landscape and long-term livability. Open space associated with development should serve an identifiable public, environmental, agricultural, scenic, drainage, habitat, or trail-connection function; it should not consist principally of isolated remnants, narrow buffers, steep unusable areas, or leftover land.

Use clustering, conservation easements, coordinated planning among adjoining properties, and other voluntary conservation tools~~, where appropriate~~, to protect interconnected open space, viewsheds, trails, habitat, agricultural lands, and natural-resource systems. Where consistent with the mapped development pattern, clustering may help arrange otherwise supported development but will not independently justify additional dwelling units or density.

Mountain Green Policy 1.7 — Build a safe, connected local mobility network.

Plan and implement a connected system of local roads, sidewalks, pathways, trails, crossings, trailheads, and bicycle facilities linking neighborhoods, schools, parks, the Village Center, recreation areas, transit opportunities where feasible, and regional trail systems. Prioritize access, circulation, and safety

improvements along Old Highway Road, Cottonwood Canyon Road, Trappers Loop Road, Highland Drive, and other critical local connections.

Coordinate with the Utah Department of Transportation, developers, schools, emergency-service providers, utility providers, and affected residents on Interstate 84 interchange access and operations, intersection safety, regional traffic, pedestrian crossings, trail connections, and the prevention of unsafe cut-through traffic. Protect agricultural, emergency, and neighborhood access in the design and phasing of transportation improvements.

Mountain Green Policy 1.8 — Provide public-serving parks, trails, and gathering places.

As Mountain Green grows, prioritize publicly accessible parks, gathering spaces, trail connections, pathways, and recreation facilities that are integrated with neighborhoods and available to the broader community rather than limited to private homeowner-association amenities. Maintain and improve existing recreation assets, including Kent Smith Memorial Park, and evaluate opportunities for community-serving facilities such as youth recreation, indoor recreation, library or service access, and other amenities identified through public engagement.

New development should support the park, trail, recreation, and public-space needs it creates through applicable County fair-share, phasing, and long-term maintenance tools.

Mountain Green Policy 1.9 — Limit light, noise, and visual impacts.

Preserve Mountain Green's night-sky visibility, quiet setting, and scenic nighttime character through locally appropriate lighting, signage, site-design, screening, and operational standards. Require lighting to be fully shielded, downward-directed, appropriately scaled, and designed to minimize glare, light trespass, sky glow, excessive brightness, and visual effects from neighborhoods, public roads, trails, and scenic viewpoints.

For uses with the potential to affect nearby residences or sensitive natural areas, address noise, vibration, dust, truck traffic, outdoor storage, hours of operation, screening, and other operational impacts through location, design, and enforceable mitigation.

Mountain Green Policy 1.10 — Limit intensive uses outside appropriate locations.

Direct commercial, employment, recreation-oriented, storage, utility, and other intensive uses to locations identified by the Future Land Use Map and the Village Center strategy as suitable for their scale and impacts. Mountain Green is not intended to accommodate dispersed commercial strips, excessive self-storage, heavy industrial activity, or other intensive uses that undermine the Village Center, scenic quality, dark-sky character, open-space systems, or residential livability.

DRAFT

Where intensive uses are appropriate, require context-sensitive access, buffering, landscaping, building and site design, lighting, operating standards, and transitions to nearby homes, trails, open lands, and public spaces.

Mountain Green Policy 1.11 — Community Plan Consistency Review.

For significant land-use and infrastructure decisions affecting Mountain Green, Morgan County staff will apply Countywide LU Policy 1.0 and identify the applicable Mountain Green Community Vision, Community Policies, Future Land Use Map direction, and relevant Community Planning Context. Staff reports should address growth phasing, water and wastewater capacity, established-neighborhood transitions, the Village Center framework, mountain design, open space, trails, lighting and nighttime character, transportation, public facilities, and visual/environmental conditions.

DRAFT

Mountain Green Character & Values

Community Character

Mountain Green is an evolving mountain community in a rural setting. It includes established neighborhoods and residential subdivisions, an emerging village center, local businesses and employment uses, agricultural remnants, recreation areas, and extensive mountain and open-space resources. The community has changed substantially since adoption of the prior plans, but its residents continue to value the scenic mountain landscape, open lands, views, dark skies, recreation opportunities, family-oriented neighborhoods, and strong local identity that distinguish Mountain Green from more conventional suburban communities.

Mountain Green's character is defined in part by the relationship between its developed valley areas and the surrounding foothills, canyons, ridgelines, waterways, and public lands. The Weber River corridor, tributary creeks, agricultural lands, open fields, visible hillsides, wildlife habitat, trails, and views of the Wasatch Mountains are important components of the community's identity and quality of life. These resources should not be treated merely as undeveloped land awaiting conversion; they are lasting community assets that help define the value and livability of Mountain Green.

Community Values

Mountain Green residents value a cohesive, appropriately scaled village center with local services, restaurants, shops, gathering places, parks, trails, and other amenities that help meet everyday needs within the community. Residents want a village center that strengthens Mountain Green's identity and offers clear public benefits, rather than development that simply adds residential units or commercial floor area.

At the same time, residents do not want Mountain Green to become a conventional growth center marked by dispersed commercial strips, big-box retail, excessive storage facilities, generic suburban design, or an overconcentration of townhomes, condominiums, and short-term-rental-oriented housing. They value a community pattern that retains meaningful open space, established-neighborhood character, mountain views, dark skies, and an appropriate relationship between development and the surrounding landscape. Residents also value development patterns that avoid unnecessary noise, light, dust, traffic, and visual impacts on nearby neighborhoods, trails, open space, and scenic views.

Residents place particular importance on responsible stewardship of reliable water supplies and fire-flow capacity, safe and functional roads, connected trails and recreation opportunities, and the community facilities and public spaces needed to serve growth. They value development that is deliberate, well designed, infrastructure-ready, and compatible with established neighborhoods and Mountain Green's mountain setting.

DRAFT

Mountain Green Planning Context

The following community planning context identifies the local conditions, resources, infrastructure, facilities, and development considerations that should guide future decisions in the Mountain Green Community Area. It should be considered together with the Community Vision, Policies, Future Land Use Map, Countywide Land Use Policies, and applicable County regulations.

Land Use and Growth Pattern

The community has experienced substantial residential development since adoption of the prior area plan. It now includes numerous established subdivisions and a more developed residential character than many other areas of Morgan County. Residents have expressed concern that recent development has occurred too rapidly, has not always been matched with water, transportation, public facilities, parks, trails, schools, emergency services, and other infrastructure, and has relied too heavily on townhomes, condominiums, and similar attached-housing products.

The community's geography and infrastructure affect the amount, location, and intensity of development that can reasonably be accommodated. The Weber River corridor, floodplains, steep and visible hillsides, geologically constrained land, tributary drainages, utility corridors, airport considerations, limited roadway access, water and wastewater capacity, existing neighborhoods, and open-space resources all affect site suitability. Not all vacant or undeveloped land is equally suitable for residential, commercial, employment, recreation, or other development.

Recent development activity, existing approvals, and the location of remaining undeveloped land require the County to evaluate future proposals in relation to cumulative infrastructure demand, neighborhood transitions, environmental constraints, and the intended Village Center framework. Residents value deliberate growth that is compatible with established neighborhoods, scenic and visual resources, dark skies, water and infrastructure capacity, transportation conditions, public facilities, parks, trails, and the community's mountain setting. Residents have also expressed concern about incremental amendments, isolated rezonings, and piecemeal approvals that may cumulatively change the community's development pattern, increase infrastructure demands, or erode the qualities that distinguish Mountain Green from more conventional suburban communities.

Village Center and Commercial Form

Mountain Green's emerging village center is intended to serve as the community's principal focal point for local services, retail, restaurants, professional offices, civic and gathering spaces, parks or plazas, trails, pedestrian activity, and appropriately scaled housing. A cohesive center may improve access to daily services, create opportunities for gathering and community life, and reduce pressure for scattered commercial development along Old Highway Road, Trappers Loop Road, and other corridors.

DRAFT

Residents have expressed interest in a genuine village environment where people can gather, walk, shop, dine, recreate, and access community services. At the same time, public input identifies concern about generic commercial forms, low-quality or highly uniform building designs, excessive signage, large-format retail, scattered self-storage, visually dominant storage facilities, nighttime visual impacts, and commercial development that primarily serves pass-through traffic without contributing to Mountain Green's identity.

The village-center area presents localized considerations related to building form, site planning, architecture, circulation, pedestrian connections, parking, landscaping, shared access, lighting, signage, public spaces, active ground-floor uses where appropriate, and transitions to surrounding neighborhoods. These considerations are central to whether development reinforces a cohesive mountain-community center or contributes to a dispersed, auto-oriented, visually inconsistent pattern.

Commercial, employment, storage, utility, data-processing, recreation-oriented, industrial, and other potentially intensive uses may create particular effects related to traffic, water demand, wastewater, lighting, noise, outdoor storage, operational hours, air quality, scenic visibility, public safety, and compatibility with homes, public spaces, trails, and open lands.

Growth, Capacity, and Public Decision-Making

Mountain Green residents have expressed a clear preference for future development to proceed more deliberately than in recent years. Residents do not view vacant land, prior approvals, or the technical feasibility of an individual project as sufficient reasons by themselves to support additional growth. They want decisions to account for the cumulative effects of approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable development.

Local concerns include water supply and fire flow, wastewater capacity, traffic and road safety, public facilities, parks and trails, neighborhood compatibility, natural resources, scenic views, dark skies, school and emergency-service capacity, the timing of infrastructure, and the long-term character of the community. Public feedback also indicates a desire for better documentation of water availability, enforceable development commitments, more deliberate phasing, stronger design standards, improved trails and public amenities, and transparent review of proposals that could alter Mountain Green's character or create new public infrastructure demands.

Development agreements, conditions of approval, phasing plans, infrastructure agreements, mitigation measures, capital planning, and fair-share arrangements are particularly important in Mountain Green because growth and infrastructure needs are interconnected. The availability of facilities, the timing of improvements, responsibility for construction and maintenance, and the relationship between development impacts and public benefits are all relevant to whether future growth is consistent with adopted policy.

Existing and Approved Developments

DRAFT

Existing subdivisions, approved development agreements, prior land-use approvals, phasing commitments, utility extensions, transportation improvements, public-facility commitments, open-space arrangements, and other recorded obligations form part of Mountain Green's current development context. These existing and approved commitments may affect the timing, cumulative impacts, infrastructure demands, and available capacity relevant to later proposals.

For significant applications, the County's consistency-review process should identify relevant approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable development; associated infrastructure commitments; development-agreement obligations; phasing conditions; and the relationship between a new proposal and existing public-service, transportation, water, wastewater, open-space, and recreation demands.

Transportation and Access

Interstate 84, Old Highway Road, Trappers Loop Road, Cottonwood Canyon Road, Highland Drive, local subdivision streets, the railroad corridor, and the Mountain Green and Peterson interchanges form the principal transportation framework for Mountain Green. These facilities serve daily residents, local businesses, school traffic, emergency responders, recreational users, regional travel between the Wasatch Front and Ogden Valley, and traffic associated with Snowbasin and other destinations.

The concentration of local and regional traffic on a limited number of routes creates constraints on local circulation, pedestrian safety, emergency response, development access, neighborhood livability, and the capacity of key intersections. Old Highway Road functions as the principal local east-west collector through much of Mountain Green. Trappers Loop Road provides a major regional connection to Ogden Valley and Snowbasin. Cottonwood Canyon Road, Highland Drive, and other local roads distribute traffic to established neighborhoods and community facilities.

The prior area plan identified the Old Highway Road/Cottonwood Canyon Road intersection as a significant safety concern because of its geometry and visibility limitations. Interstate access, interchange function, roadway capacity, access spacing, sight distance, school access, trail crossings, bicycle and pedestrian safety, drainage, utility conflicts, winter conditions, rights-of-way, and long-term maintenance remain relevant considerations in transportation and land-use planning.

The anticipated full-access diamond interchange on Interstate 84, including eastbound and westbound on- and off-ramps and the extension of Trappers Loop Road to the new interchange, is expected to affect regional and local circulation, safety, connectivity, and cut-through traffic patterns. The timing, final design, funding, construction, operation, and local effects of this transportation work remain important considerations for future land-use, access, and capital-facility planning.

Mountain Green's transportation network requires coordination among Morgan County, the Utah Department of Transportation, developers, utility providers, emergency-service

DRAFT

agencies, schools, residents, and other affected parties.

Water and Wastewater

Mountain Green relies on several public and private water systems, wells, springs, groundwater resources, irrigation facilities, and water infrastructure associated with the Weber River corridor. Culinary-water availability, reliability, fire-flow capacity, system storage, distribution capacity, source protection, water quality, drought resilience, and long-term management are fundamental constraints on future development.

Public feedback repeatedly identifies concern that development may have moved faster than demonstrated water capacity. Residents have raised questions about whether available water rights, water sources, storage, treatment, distribution systems, pressure, and fire-flow capability can serve existing approvals and additional residential, commercial, village-center, or employment development. This Plan does not identify a specific water-supply or system-capacity deficiency in Mountain Green; capacity must be evaluated using current information from the providers serving the location of a proposed development.

Mountain Green is served in part by the Mountain Green Sewer Improvement District and in part by private or decentralized wastewater systems. Sewer-system capacity, potential expansion, septic suitability, soils, groundwater conditions, drainage, lot configuration, treatment needs, and long-term ownership, operation, maintenance, repair, and replacement obligations all affect development feasibility and the appropriate intensity of land use.

Wells, groundwater, springs, irrigation facilities, the Weber River, Cottonwood Creek, Dry Creek, Gordon Creek, Strawberry Creek, wetlands, and other water resources are interconnected components of Mountain Green's natural and infrastructure systems. Land-use change, grading, drainage alteration, utility construction, increased impervious surface, wastewater disposal, and higher-intensity development may affect water quality, groundwater recharge, stream conditions, flood risk, irrigation operations, wetlands, existing users, and downstream properties.

Major development proposals may require early coordination with affected water providers, the Sewer Improvement District, irrigation companies, the Weber-Morgan Health Department, fire-service providers, State agencies, affected property owners, and other appropriate entities.

Natural Resources and Hazards

Mountain Green contains important natural and visual resources, including the Weber River, Cottonwood Creek, Dry Creek, Gordon Creek, Strawberry Creek, wetlands, springs, irrigation facilities, foothills, ridgelines, wildlife habitat, open lands, agricultural remnants, scenic vistas, and dark night skies. These resources define the community's mountain setting, provide recreation and ecological value, contribute to property values and community identity, and influence the location, intensity, design, and feasibility of future development.

DRAFT

The prior area plan identified geologic, slope, erosion, drainage, and flooding concerns in portions of Mountain Green. The foothills and canyon areas include steep terrain, erodible soils, unstable or potentially unstable slopes, drainageways, and locations susceptible to erosion, landslides, debris flows, flooding, and related hazards.

Cottonwood Creek and its watershed present particular flood and debris-flow considerations. Development near Gordon Creek, Dry Creek, Strawberry Creek, and other drainageways may involve runoff, channel, streambank, floodplain, drainage, slope-stability, erosion, emergency-access, and maintenance considerations. The relationship between development and the watershed is particularly important because drainage conditions, slope stability, vegetation, and land disturbance can affect both on-site and downstream risk.

Waterways, riparian areas, wetlands, floodplains, drainage corridors, steep slopes, unstable soils, wildfire-prone areas, foothills, ridgelines, wildlife habitat, visible hillsides, and other sensitive lands are significant site conditions within Mountain Green. Depending on a project's location and scale, relevant information may include soils, geotechnical conditions, grading, drainage, erosion, flood risk, wildfire exposure, water quality, habitat, vegetation, visual effects, access, utility feasibility, maintenance responsibility, and emergency response.

Visible hillsides, ridgelines, and skyline locations are particularly important to Mountain Green's mountain-community character. Development in these areas may affect views from Interstate 84, Old Highway Road, Trappers Loop Road, established neighborhoods, public trails, and other prominent viewpoints. Site placement, topography, vegetation, grading, retaining walls, lighting, architecture, and the visual relationship of structures to the skyline are all relevant contextual considerations.

Recreation and Community Facilities

Mountain Green residents value access to parks, trails, open space, the Weber River corridor, foothill recreation, and connections to regional recreation opportunities. Kent Smith Memorial Park, existing pathways, community recreation areas, local trails, and access to nearby public lands provide a foundation for community recreation and gathering.

The prior area plan identified an integrated system of parks, public open spaces, pedestrian and equestrian trails, trailheads, and connections to the Weber River corridor, surrounding communities, Forest Service lands, and Snowbasin-area trails. Public input strongly supports more usable parks, trails, sidewalks, gathering places, youth amenities, and community-serving facilities.

Residents have identified needs and interests related to safer pedestrian connections between neighborhoods and the village center, wider or more complete pathways, improved park facilities, places for children and teenagers to gather and recreate, improved fields, a community center, indoor recreation space, a pool, gymnasium, library or service access, dog park, pump track, and related amenities. These comments identify community priorities and

DRAFT

potential future opportunities; they do not, by themselves, establish a commitment to construct every requested facility.

Future development, public-facility planning, and capital planning may involve park sites, trail easements, pathway connections, sidewalks, open-space linkages, pedestrian crossings, gathering spaces, recreation facilities, and related amenities. Feasibility depends on land ownership, lawful access, public benefit, construction cost, funding, development contributions, operations, maintenance, liability, utility capacity, site conditions, environmental constraints, compatibility with adjacent homes and agricultural remnants, and long-term governance.


DRAFT

Peterson Community

Peterson Community Vision

Peterson will remain a rural and scenic community shaped by farms, open space, water resources, and the Weber River corridor. Growth will be carefully scaled to protect these assets and maintain Peterson's quiet small-town character, while allowing limited, well-designed housing and commercial opportunities that are compatible with the community's natural setting and infrastructure capacity.

DRAFT



MORGAN COUNTY

0 1,250 2,500
Feet

October 2026

DRAFT

PETERSON FUTURE LAND USE

- Morgan County Boundary
- Interchange

Future Land Use

- Large Parcel Agricultural (LP-AG)
- Agricultural/Working Lands (AG)
- Rural Living (RL)
- Rural Corridor (RC)
- Village Residential Neighborhood (VRN)
- Village Commercial Center (VCC)
- Recreation/Resort (REC)

Planning Outpost

JUB ENGINEERS, INC.

Peterson Community Policies

The following policies supplement the Countywide Land Use Policies and provide direction specific to the Peterson Community Area. They are intended to guide future land-use, infrastructure, capital-planning, and development-review decisions and should be considered together with the Community Vision, Future Land Use Map, Community Planning Context, and applicable County regulations.

Peterson Policy 1.1 — Maintain Peterson's rural agricultural setting and village-oriented growth pattern.

Maintain Peterson as a rural agricultural community defined by irrigated farms, open fields, established rural neighborhoods, waterways, foothills, and mountain and valley views. Direct modestly more compact residential and community-serving development to the village-oriented area shown on the Future Land Use Map near 4300 North and the Interstate 84 interchange. Retain the surrounding agricultural, rural residential, foothill, river-corridor, and open-space lands as predominantly lower-intensity areas.

Avoid strip, leapfrog, back-lot, second-tier, and scattered development patterns that would blur the distinction between the village area and Peterson's surrounding agricultural and rural landscape.

Peterson Policy 1.2 — Protect the Weber River and interconnected agricultural-water system.

Protect the Weber River, Peterson Creek, Dalton Creek, Gateway Canal, local springs, irrigation ditches, wetlands, groundwater, and associated riparian areas as interconnected components of Peterson's agricultural, environmental, drainage, and scenic systems. Development and infrastructure near these resources should maintain irrigation operations, ditch and canal access, riparian function, flood and drainage capacity, water quality, and long-term maintenance access.

Peterson Policy 1.3 — Do not assume a public-sewer extension.

Public culinary-water availability in Peterson does not establish the availability or feasibility of public wastewater service. Do not base increased development intensity on an assumed future sewer extension unless the County has verified a feasible route, including any Interstate 84 crossing; capacity; engineering; permitting; financing; ownership; operation; maintenance; and construction timing.

Until public sewer service is operational and available to a site, evaluate development under the applicable onsite-wastewater, public-health, groundwater-protection, and long-term maintenance requirements.

Peterson Policy 1.4 — Coordinate village growth with constrained crossings and rural access.

Plan development in and around the village-oriented growth area in relation to Peterson's limited transportation network, including Morgan Valley Drive, Peterson Creek Road, Gateway Canal Street, local bridges, canal crossings, private lanes, farm-access routes, Interstate 84, and the Union Pacific

DRAFT

Railroad corridor. Preserve needed rights-of-way and avoid land-use patterns that would overburden constrained crossings, impede farm operations, or rely on private lanes and rural roads not designed for increased traffic or dependable emergency access.

Peterson Policy 1.5 — Limit commercial development to the village and established transportation corridors.

Direct community-serving and traveler-serving commercial uses to the designated village area and other appropriate locations near existing commercial activity, Morgan Valley Drive, Interstate 84, and established transportation corridors. Peterson is not intended to develop as a continuous highway-commercial strip. Commercial uses should remain modest in scale and compatible with nearby homes, farms, waterways, and rural views.

Avoid commercial encroachment into productive agricultural land, foothill areas, river corridors, or interior rural residential areas when it is not necessary to serve the community or traveling public.

Peterson Policy 1.6 — Manage the relationship between Peterson and Wasatch Peaks Ranch.

Recognize that Wasatch Peaks Ranch is a privately owned, master-planned resort and residential development governed by its separate approval and development-agreement framework. Its private infrastructure, utility systems, roads, amenities, and access arrangements do not establish public infrastructure capacity, public recreation access, development entitlement, or service obligations for the surrounding Peterson Community Area.

When reviewing proposals affecting Peterson, evaluate whether resort-related growth, traffic, access, utility, drainage, visual, environmental, or public-service effects would compound existing constraints or conflict with Peterson's agricultural land, rural neighborhoods, transportation network, water resources, and planned village-oriented growth pattern.

Peterson Policy 1.7 — Pursue voluntary public recreation and river-access opportunities only when feasible.

Recognize that recreation and resort lands in Peterson are predominantly private. Consider public trail, park, river-access, or community-facility opportunities only where access is voluntary or otherwise lawfully secured and where ownership, parking, safety, water and environmental conditions, agricultural compatibility, funding, operations, maintenance, liability, and long-term management can be reasonably addressed.

As development occurs in the village area, seek practical opportunities for publicly accessible neighborhood parks, trails, pedestrian connections, and gathering spaces consistent with the applicable County fair-share and maintenance framework.

DRAFT

Peterson Policy 1.8 — Community Plan Consistency Review.

For significant land-use and infrastructure decisions affecting Peterson, Morgan County staff will apply Countywide LU Policy 1.0 and identify the applicable Peterson Community Vision, Community Policies, Future Land Use Map direction, and relevant Community Planning Context. Staff reports should address agricultural land; the Weber River, Peterson Creek, Dalton Creek, and Gateway Canal corridors; public water and wastewater limitations; Interstate 84 and rail-related access constraints; irrigation facilities; commercial-node direction; the relationship to Wasatch Peaks Ranch; and voluntary recreation/access considerations.

DRAFT

Peterson Character & Values

Community Character

Peterson is a rural agricultural community in western Morgan County along the Weber River and Interstate 84. The community area generally extends from Dalton Creek on the south to the Weber River and the Morgan–Davis County line on the north and west. It includes established rural neighborhoods, irrigated farmland, foothills, waterways, and the developed areas associated with Peterson Creek, Morgan Valley Drive, Gateway Canal, and the surrounding valley floor. The Bohman dry farm and homestead east of Interstate 84 are also within the community area.

Irrigated farms, open fields, rural homes, mountain and valley views, and the Weber River corridor give Peterson its distinct character. Long-established neighborhoods sit alongside agricultural operations, irrigation systems, rural roads, and limited commercial activity near Morgan Valley Drive and Interstate 84. The interstate and railroad are prominent features of the area but do not define its rural identity. Wasatch Peaks Ranch is a large private mountain resort and residential development in the Wasatch Mountains above and west of the Peterson valley.

Community Values

Residents value Peterson's small-town atmosphere, working agricultural lands, open views, established neighborhoods, and connection to the broader Morgan Valley. They want growth to respect the community's rural scale and maintain a clear distinction between agricultural and rural residential lands and the locations identified for village-oriented or more intensive activity.

Residents also value safe local roads, reliable water and wastewater arrangements, and compatibility between homes and nearby highway, railroad, commercial, employment, or industrial uses. They expect these considerations to shape decisions about where and how Peterson grows.

Peterson Planning Context

The following community planning context identifies the local conditions, resources, infrastructure, facilities, and development considerations that should guide future decisions in the Peterson Community Area. It should be considered together with the Community Vision, Policies, Future Land Use Map, Countywide Land Use Policies, and applicable County regulations.

Land Use and Growth Pattern

Peterson's existing land-use pattern includes rural neighborhoods and farms, limited commercial activity, transportation corridors, and large areas of agricultural and open land. Public culinary-water facilities, private wells, irrigation works, rural roads, bridges, and canal crossings support these uses. They also affect how additional development can be served.

The Future Land Use Map identifies a more village-oriented growth pattern around the properties at 4300 North near the Interstate 84 interchange. This area is intended to accommodate modestly higher residential

DRAFT

densities and a community commercial focus in an organized location. Lower-density rural residential and agricultural lands extend outward from the village area. Maintaining a legible transition among these areas, the foothills, and the river and creek corridors is central to Peterson's growth pattern.

The location and scale of future development depend on water and wastewater service, agricultural and irrigation operations, road and bridge capacity, limited crossing opportunities, emergency access, drainage, and the Weber River corridor. Changes to density, lot configuration, access, or utilities should also be considered in relation to nearby development, including their cumulative effects on traffic, public facilities, water resources, and the intended distinction between Peterson's village and rural areas.

Wasatch Peaks Ranch Context

A substantial portion of the mountain land west of Peterson is part of Wasatch Peaks Ranch, a private resort and residential development of approximately 12,700 acres, with roughly 11,500 acres in Morgan County and the remainder in Davis County. The 2019 Resort Special District approval and associated development agreement established the framework for a private ski, golf, residential, and recreation development, including up to 750 dwelling units.

Wasatch Peaks Ranch represents a significant change from the historic land-use pattern reflected in earlier Peterson planning documents, which identified extensive surrounding lands for forestry, multiple-use, agriculture, and very low-density development. The resort is a private, master-planned development area with its own approved development framework, infrastructure systems, access arrangements, amenities, and long-term operational responsibilities.

The Wasatch Peaks Ranch Utility District provides infrastructure for the development, including roads, water systems, sewer service, and utilities. The resort's private infrastructure and service arrangements do not by themselves establish comparable public-service capacity, utility availability, recreation access, development entitlement, or infrastructure obligations for the surrounding Peterson Community Area.

Wasatch Peaks Ranch may generate taxable value, employment, and private infrastructure investment. Its scale has also prompted concerns about changes to open-land character, traffic, visual and environmental effects, recreational access, and the relationship between resort development and the needs of existing Peterson residents. Together with Peterson's location, transportation access, and public culinary-water service, the resort forms part of the context for future development pressure. Decisions affecting Peterson should distinguish the resort's approved development area from the village, agricultural lands, rural neighborhoods, waterways, and infrastructure serving the broader community.

Commercial Uses

Peterson has limited commercial activity, generally associated with Morgan Valley Drive, Interstate 84, and existing transportation corridors. The community is not characterized by

DRAFT

extensive retail development or a broad highway-commercial strip. The Future Land Use Map identifies a limited village-oriented commercial focus near the planned village area.

Commercial development in Peterson can affect traffic, driveway access, parking, water and wastewater systems, drainage, emergency access, agricultural land, scenic resources, lighting, noise, building scale, signage, landscaping, buffering, and compatibility with nearby homes, farms, waterways, and rural land. These considerations are especially important because commercial activity may occur near established neighborhoods, agricultural operations, highway and railroad infrastructure, irrigation facilities, and the Weber River corridor.

The I-84 interchange area, Morgan Valley Drive, and other existing transportation corridors may present more practical locations for certain community-serving or traveler-serving commercial activity than rural agricultural, foothill, river-corridor, or interior residential areas. At the same time, the limited road network, environmental conditions, agricultural setting, and rural character require careful attention to the cumulative effects of commercial uses and related traffic.

Transportation and Access

Morgan Valley Drive, Peterson Creek Road, Gateway Canal Street, local rural roads, Interstate 84, the Union Pacific Railroad corridor, bridges, canal crossings, private lanes, and farm-access routes form Peterson's transportation and access system. These facilities serve rural residences, working farms, irrigation systems, commercial activity, school transportation, emergency responders, visitors, and through traffic.

Interstate 84 and the Union Pacific Railroad corridor create major physical barriers within and around Peterson. Access is concentrated at a limited number of roads, bridges, canal crossings, railroad-related facilities, and connections. This setting limits opportunities for new or expanded access and makes the location, design, ownership, capacity, funding, maintenance, and emergency function of crossings and connections important considerations in future land-use and infrastructure decisions.

Additional development may increase traffic on roads that also serve farms, rural homes, school buses, commercial users, emergency responders, and regional travel. Site access, driveway location, sight distance, road geometry, bridge and crossing capacity, drainage, rights-of-way, pedestrian conditions where appropriate, agricultural-equipment movement, emergency access, and the relationship between development traffic and local road capacity are therefore important local considerations.

Private lanes, farm-access routes, and roads not designed or maintained for higher traffic volumes may have limited ability to serve substantial additional development. Existing access conditions can also affect the feasibility of new lots, more intensive development, commercial activity, public facilities, and emergency response. The Countywide and Peterson policy framework provides the applicable standards for access, circulation, road impacts, rights-of-way, drainage, and

DRAFT

proportionate responsibility for development-related improvements.

~~These local conditions provide the factual basis for applying Peterson Policies 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, and 1.8; Countywide LU Policies 4.0, 8.0, and 9.0; and applicable County, State, railroad, canal, bridge, and development-review requirements.~~

Water and Wastewater

Peterson has public culinary-water service through the Peterson Pipeline Association, as well as private wells, irrigation ditches, springs, secondary-water facilities, Gateway Canal, and other local water infrastructure. Water supply, water quality, wellhead protection, spring protection, irrigation-system preservation, and groundwater protection remain central community concerns.

The public culinary-water system may be an important resource for existing residents and for future development in areas identified by the Future Land Use Map. However, water-system service, water rights, source capacity, storage, distribution, pressure, fire-flow needs where applicable, system extensions, peak demand, connection availability, and effects on existing users remain relevant factors in determining the practical capacity of individual sites and the broader community.

The availability of public culinary water does not mean that public wastewater service is readily available. Peterson does not have a comprehensive public sewer system serving the community area. A future sewer extension would require substantial planning, engineering, permitting, funding, and coordination because it may need to cross beneath Interstate 84 and connect to a distant wastewater system.

The potential alignment, cost, capacity, ownership, regulatory approvals, financing method, operating responsibility, maintenance responsibility, and timing of any future sewer extension remain important feasibility considerations. Unless and until public sewer service is fully implemented, site feasibility is influenced by onsite wastewater conditions, including soils, lot configuration, separation from wells and water resources, groundwater protection, drainage, flood hazards, cumulative septic density, applicable health-department requirements, and long-term operation and maintenance.

Wells, springs, irrigation systems, groundwater, the Weber River, Peterson Creek, Dalton Creek, Gateway Canal, private ditches, and other water resources are interconnected local assets. Land-use, infrastructure, drainage, and development decisions may affect water quality, irrigation operations, flood and drainage conditions, agricultural productivity, downstream properties, and the reliability of existing water systems.

Natural Resources and Hazards

Peterson's natural and agricultural setting includes the Weber River corridor, Peterson Creek, Dalton Creek, local springs, irrigation systems, riparian areas, wetlands, open fields, foothills, wildlife habitat, and mountain and valley views. These resources contribute to the community's agricultural productivity, environmental health, scenic value, rural identity, and quality of life.

DRAFT

The Weber River corridor is a defining feature of Peterson and a longstanding local priority. It is closely connected to floodplain conditions, riparian resources, water quality, irrigation operations, wildlife habitat, scenery, recreation interest, agricultural land, and nearby residential development. Peterson Creek, Dalton Creek, Gateway Canal, private ditches, wetlands, springs, groundwater resources, and other local waterways are similarly important components of the community's water and agricultural systems.

Development near waterways, irrigation facilities, drainageways, flood-prone areas, foothills, steep slopes, and other sensitive lands may involve flood hazards, erosion, unstable soils, drainage limitations, wildfire exposure, wildlife habitat, geotechnical conditions, limited access, utility conflicts, and the need to protect irrigation and water infrastructure. The appropriate level of technical analysis depends on a proposal's location, scale, infrastructure demands, and potential effects.

Floodplain, drainage, erosion, water quality, irrigation access, canal and ditch maintenance, agricultural access, emergency response, and long-term maintenance are interconnected site-planning considerations within Peterson. The Countywide and Peterson policy framework provides the applicable direction for evaluating potential impacts and determining whether risks can be avoided, reduced, or adequately addressed.

Recreation and Community Facilities

Recreation and resort properties in the Peterson area include Wasatch Peaks Ranch and other predominantly private lands and facilities. Private resort amenities do not necessarily provide public access, public park space, trail access, river access, or community gathering facilities for Peterson residents. Potential public recreation, trail, park, river-access, or gathering-space opportunities therefore need to be considered independently of private resort facilities.

Potential public recreation opportunities may involve questions of property ownership, voluntary access, safe parking, river safety, environmental conditions, agricultural operations, water resources, construction cost, funding, operations, maintenance, liability, long-term management, and compatibility with nearby homes and private property. The Weber River corridor, agricultural lands, irrigation facilities, highway and railroad barriers, and limited road access are particularly relevant to the feasibility of public recreation improvements.

The village-oriented growth area may provide opportunities for neighborhood-serving parks, trails, pedestrian connections, gathering spaces, or other community facilities as development occurs. The timing, location, design, ownership, construction, funding, operation, maintenance, public accessibility, and relationship to development impacts are matters for the County's applicable policies, development-review procedures, and lawful fair-share tools.


DRAFT

Porterville Community

Porterville Community Vision

Porterville will preserve its rural agricultural character, open space, working farms and ranches, scenic canyon and mountain setting, natural resources, and historic heritage. Growth will be limited, carefully managed, and directed only to locations where it can be accommodated without materially compromising the area's agricultural lands, water supplies, environmental resources, scenic qualities, or rural levels of service.

DRAFT



MORGAN COUNTY

0 1,250 2,500
Feet

October 2026

DRAFT

PORTERVILLE FUTURE LAND USE

Morgan County Boundary

Future Land Use

- Large Parcel Agricultural (LP-AG)
- Agricultural/Working Lands (AG)
- Rural Living (RL)

Future Land Use - Expanded Village Area

- Large Parcel Agricultural (LP-AG)
- Agricultural/Working Lands (AG)



Planning Outpost

JUB ENGINEERS, INC.

Porterville Community Policies

The following policies supplement the Countywide Land Use Policies and provide direction specific to the Porterville Community Area. They are intended to guide future land-use, infrastructure, capital-planning, and development-review decisions and should be considered together with the Community Vision, Future Land Use Map, Community Planning Context, and applicable County regulations.

Porterville Policy 1.1 — Maintain Porterville as a limited-growth agricultural and open-space community.

Maintain Porterville as a low-density rural community defined by working farms and ranches, irrigated land, open space, forest and range lands, creeks and drainageways, foothills, dark skies, and mountain-valley views. Porterville is not intended to become a village, suburban, urban, or conventional growth-center community.

Land-use decisions should prioritize the protection of Porterville's established agricultural, scenic, environmental, and rural-service character over additional residential or commercial development not clearly consistent with the Future Land Use Map and the community's limited-growth direction.

Porterville Policy 1.2 — Retain established rural density and dispersed settlement patterns.

Maintain rural agricultural, rural residential, multiple-use, and forestry/open-space development patterns consistent with the Future Land Use Map and established zoning framework. Avoid supporting rezonings, subdivisions, planned developments, variances, density bonuses, or other actions that would increase the base residential density of property, expand more intensive rural-residential zoning, or establish a precedent for greater density than Porterville's rural infrastructure, agricultural operations, and landscape can support.

Do not designate or encourage small villages, clustered residential enclaves, town- or city-style development, suburban subdivisions, strip development, or linear, back-lot, second-tier, or similarly concentrated housing patterns along rural roads or across agricultural lands.

The County should not support a General Plan amendment, Future Land Use Map amendment, rezoning, Planned Community approval, or development agreement that increases residential density beyond the applicable mapped place type or established rural-density framework unless the County ~~concurrently amends~~ adopts amendments to the applicable Future Land Use Map, Community Area Plan policy direction, or both, as appropriate, and makes specific findings explaining why the change remains consistent with Porterville's limited-growth direction.

DRAFT

Porterville Policy 1.3 — Maintain the East Canyon Reservoir area as a distinct recreation and resort setting.

Recognize East Canyon Reservoir and its associated marina, resort, recreation, public-land, and visitor-serving setting as distinct from Porterville's broader agricultural and rural residential landscape. Evaluate new recreation, resort, event, visitor-serving, or infrastructure proposals in the reservoir area for their relationship to rural-road capacity, traffic, parking, sanitation, emergency response, water quality, wildlife, historic resources, private property, and the limited service capacity of the surrounding community.

Do not use the reservoir or resort setting as a basis for expanding village-scale, suburban, or more intensive development into Porterville's agricultural, rural residential, or open-space areas.

Porterville Policy 1.4 — Protect historic, cultural, and archaeological resources.

Identify, avoid, and appropriately protect known or potentially significant historic, archaeological, Indigenous cultural, and burial resources during land-use review, road and utility work, grading, recreation improvements, reservoir-area activity, and other ground-disturbing projects. These resources include the Mormon Trail, California/Oregon Trail, Pony Express route, historic structures, cemeteries, and other documented or discovered cultural sites.

Where a proposal may affect such resources, coordinate early with affected property owners, tribal representatives as appropriate, the State Historic Preservation Office, local preservation organizations, and other relevant agencies or specialists. Use site-specific documentation, avoidance, preservation, interpretation, access management, or mitigation measures as warranted by the resource and project.

Porterville Policy 1.5 — Use voluntary conservation tools to retain Porterville's working landscape.

Support voluntary conservation easements, agricultural-preservation programs, purchase or transfer of development rights, and other mutually agreed-upon tools that protect farms, ranches, productive soils, open space, scenic views, habitat, and water resources while respecting private-property rights. Prioritize tools that help retain larger, connected working-land and open-space systems rather than isolated parcels.

Porterville Policy 1.6 — Community Plan Consistency Review.

For significant land-use and infrastructure decisions affecting Porterville, Morgan County staff will apply Countywide LU Policy 1.0 and identify the applicable Porterville Community Vision, Community Policies, Future Land Use Map direction, and relevant Community Planning Context. Staff reports should address the limited-growth and rural-density direction; agricultural operations; water and wastewater limitations; rural roads and emergency access; scenic and environmental resources; the East Canyon Reservoir recreation/resort setting; and historic and cultural resources.

DRAFT

Porterville Character & Values

Community Character

Porterville is a rural agricultural community set among irrigated fields, working farms and ranches, creek corridors, foothills, and forested and range lands. Open views from the valley floor toward surrounding ridgelines are a defining part of its landscape. Homes and agricultural buildings are dispersed across the area rather than concentrated in a town center. Local roads, private wells and septic systems, and agricultural water facilities support daily life and the continued use of the land.

Community Values

The community values quietness, dark skies, open space, agricultural viability, scenic beauty, stewardship of land and water, wildlife, and the retention of a distinct rural identity. Residents have consistently expressed a preference for maintaining established rural zoning and avoiding small villages, cluster developments, higher-density residential development, and urban or suburban growth patterns. The community seeks to retain sufficient flexibility for lawful rural uses and carefully compatible development while ensuring that future land-use decisions do not compromise the agricultural, environmental, scenic, cultural, and infrastructure conditions that make Porterville distinctive.

Porterville Planning Context

The following community planning context identifies the local conditions, resources, infrastructure, facilities, and development considerations that should guide future decisions in the Porterville Community Area. It should be considered together with the Community Vision, Policies, Future Land Use Map, Countywide Land Use Policies, and applicable County regulations.

Land Use and Growth Pattern

Agriculture is Porterville's predominant land-use pattern. Working farms and ranches, irrigated fields, grazing areas, and agricultural-supportive uses operate alongside dispersed rural homes. These activities depend on land that remains usable for cultivation and livestock, reliable irrigation facilities, farm access, and roads that accommodate agricultural equipment as well as residents and recreation traffic.

New homes and land divisions can affect that pattern even when each proposal is relatively small. Additional lots, driveways, and roads may divide working parcels, complicate irrigation and livestock movement, or place homes closer to routine agricultural activity. Over time, these changes can reduce operational flexibility and alter the open landscape that supports both agriculture and Porterville's rural character.

Porterville's future land-use pattern distinguishes among agricultural and rural residential lands, open-space and resource areas, and the limited recreation and resort setting near East Canyon Reservoir. The Future Land Use Map identifies where these different patterns are intended, rather than treating the broader community as an area for village-scale or suburban expansion.

Historic and Cultural Resources

DRAFT

Porterville is associated with significant historic and cultural resources, including pioneer travel routes, the Mormon Trail, California/Oregon Trail, Pony Express route, historic structures, cemeteries, Native American cultural resources and burial locations, and areas with potential prehistoric, Indigenous, pioneer, archaeological, or historic significance.

These resources are important to Porterville's identity and may be affected by land-use change, road construction, utility installation, grading, recreation improvements, reservoir-area activity, resort-related development, and other ground-disturbing work. The type, location, visibility, accessibility, and significance of a resource may not always be fully known in advance, particularly where archaeological or Indigenous cultural resources have not been comprehensively documented.

Where known resources are present, or where a site has a reasonable potential to contain significant historic, archaeological, or cultural materials, early coordination and site-specific evaluation may be needed. Relevant parties may include affected landowners, tribal representatives, the State Historic Preservation Office, local historical and preservation organizations, County staff, State and federal agencies, and other appropriate entities.

Transportation and Access

South Morgan Valley Drive and other rural County roads, private lanes, agricultural access routes, and canyon roads serve Porterville residents, farms, ranches, recreational traffic, emergency responders, school transportation, utility providers, and visitors to East Canyon Reservoir and surrounding public lands.

The Porterville road network is rural in character and is closely connected to the community's agricultural function, dispersed settlement pattern, canyon geography, recreation access, and emergency-service needs. Some roads, lanes, and access routes may have limited width, constrained geometry, limited shoulders, drainage needs, winter-maintenance considerations, bridge or culvert limitations, restricted visibility, wildfire-evacuation concerns, or limited ability to accommodate additional traffic.

The same routes may be used by passenger vehicles, agricultural equipment, livestock-related traffic, trailers, school buses, emergency responders, recreation users, service vehicles, and visitors traveling to East Canyon Reservoir and public lands. Increased residential density, commercial activity, resort traffic, visitor-serving uses, or more intensive use of private roads and farm-access lanes may affect road safety, emergency access, snow removal, drainage, maintenance, farm-equipment movement, school transportation, bridge and culvert capacity, and the ability of fire and emergency-response vehicles to reach remote properties.

Road access, driveway location, road geometry, intersection safety, rights-of-way, drainage, maintenance responsibility, emergency response, wildfire evacuation, and the relationship between land-use intensity and transportation capacity are therefore important local considerations in Porterville. The Countywide and Porterville policy framework provides the operative standards for

DRAFT

evaluating access, circulation, emergency response, transportation effects, and proportionate responsibility for development-related improvements.

Water and Wastewater

Porterville's water resources are essential to its agricultural economy, rural residential pattern, scenic landscape, environmental quality, and long-term development capacity. Culinary water is supplied in part through private wells and limited community water systems. Irrigation water is provided through local water rights, ditches, gravity-flow pipelines, Hardscrabble Creek, East Canyon Reservoir, and related agricultural distribution systems.

The community does not have a comprehensive public sewer system. Septic systems remain the primary form of wastewater disposal for much of the Porterville Community Area. As a result, site feasibility is influenced by lot size, soils, depth to groundwater, septic suitability, well separation, cumulative wastewater effects, groundwater protection, drainage conditions, water-source capacity, water rights where applicable, and Weber-Morgan Health Department requirements.

Private wells, limited community water systems, springs, irrigation facilities, water rights, streams, groundwater, agricultural users, and downstream resources are interconnected components of Porterville's water system. Land-use change, lot division, wastewater disposal, drainage modifications, road construction, recreation activity, and resort-related uses may affect water quality, water availability, irrigation operations, groundwater recharge, agricultural productivity, and the reliability of existing water sources.

The Countywide capacity and water-resource policies, Porterville Policies, water-provider requirements, water-rights requirements, health-department standards, and applicable State and County regulations provide the operative direction for evaluating development feasibility, wastewater disposal, water quality, drainage, irrigation protection, and long-term maintenance responsibilities.

Natural Resources and Hazards

Porterville contains significant environmental and scenic resources, including East Canyon and Hardscrabble Creek drainages, wetlands, riparian corridors, floodplains, productive soils, agricultural lands, wildlife habitat, migration corridors, foothills, ridgelines, steep slopes, scenic views, forested and range lands, and mountain landscapes. These resources contribute to Porterville's agricultural economy, rural identity, environmental health, recreation value, scenic quality, and quality of life.

The Porterville area includes lands subject to flood, drainage, slope, erosion, geologic, wildfire, and access constraints. The presence and severity of these constraints vary by site and can affect the suitability, location, design, infrastructure needs, emergency response, long-term maintenance, and cumulative impacts of development, roads, utilities, recreation facilities, resort-related activity, and other land-disturbing uses.

Wildlife habitat and seasonal range for elk, deer, moose, wild turkey, waterfowl, and other species

DRAFT

have been identified in the Porterville area. Bald Eagle nesting areas and spawning streams for native cutthroat trout have also been identified. These resources, along with migration corridors, wetlands, riparian areas, floodplains, and productive agricultural soils, are important considerations in development, subdivision, road, utility, recreation, and resort review.

Development in or near floodplains, natural drainageways, steep slopes, unstable soils, wetlands, riparian areas, ridgelines, wildlife habitat, or other sensitive lands may involve risks and constraints related to public safety, erosion, water quality, downstream effects, habitat function, scenery, wildfire response, roadway access, drainage, and long-term maintenance. The appropriate level of technical information depends on the location, scale, and potential effects of a proposal.

Recreation and Community Facilities

East Canyon Reservoir is a major recreational resource within the Porterville Community Area. It provides opportunities for boating, fishing, camping, picnicking, wildlife viewing, and other outdoor recreation. The reservoir, marina, resort facilities, surrounding canyon landscape, and nearby public lands attract both local residents and visitors and provide access to trails, equestrian activity, hunting, snowmobiling, and other seasonal recreational opportunities.

East Canyon Reservoir and associated recreation activity contribute to the community's identity and regional appeal. They also create local planning considerations involving traffic, road safety, parking, sanitation, emergency response, water quality, recreation access, seasonal visitation, noise, wildlife, private-property impacts, operations, maintenance, and the capacity of rural roads and services.

The reservoir and resort context is distinct from Porterville's broader agricultural and rural residential landscape. The relationship between the reservoir area, visitor-serving facilities, recreation access, surrounding public lands, private property, water resources, wildlife habitat, historic resources, and local roads is therefore important when evaluating recreation-related land use, infrastructure, capital improvements, events, resort activity, or visitor-oriented services.

The Countywide and Porterville policy framework provides the operative direction for the location, scale, access, infrastructure, environmental compatibility, safety, public-facility needs, and long-term maintenance responsibilities associated with recreation and resort-related improvements. Any public-facility, trail, access, park, or recreation improvement also depends on ownership, legal access, available funding, construction, operations, maintenance, liability, environmental conditions, and coordination with landowners, agencies, residents, and service providers.


DRAFT

Richville Community

Richville Community Vision

Richville will preserve its quiet rural farming-community character, open landscapes, agricultural lands, scenic valley and mountain views, and natural resources by limiting growth to locations where it can be accommodated without materially compromising agricultural lands, open landscapes, natural resources, scenic views, water resources, scenic quality, rural levels of service, or the community's established character.

DRAFT



MORGAN COUNTY

0 1,800 3,600
Feet

October 2026

DRAFT

RICHVILLE FUTURE LAND USE

Morgan County Boundary

Future Land Use

- Large Parcel Agricultural (LP-AG)
- Agricultural/Working Lands (AG)
- Rural Living (RL)
- Recreation/Resort (REC)



Planning Outpost

JUB ENGINEERS, INC.

Richville Community Policies

The following policies supplement the Countywide Land Use Policies and provide direction specific to the Richville Community Area. They are intended to guide future land-use, infrastructure, capital-planning, and development-review decisions and should be considered together with the Community Vision, Future Land Use Map, Community Planning Context, and applicable County regulations.

Richville Policy 1.1 — Maintain Richville as a rural farming community.

Maintain Richville as a low-density rural farming community defined by working farms and ranches, agricultural lands, irrigation systems, open space, rural residences, scenic valley views, and surrounding hillsides and ridgelines. Richville is not intended to become an urban, suburban, highway-strip, village, town, or city-style growth area.

Land-use and zoning decisions should preserve the relationship between farms, rural residences, open land, and the community's scenic valley setting. Avoid development patterns that fragment productive agricultural land, interrupt irrigation or farm access, create visually intrusive development, or shift the community away from its established rural agricultural character.

Richville Policy 1.2 — Retain low density and avoid incompatible residential forms.

Maintain the rural agricultural and rural-residential density framework shown on the Future Land Use Map and implemented through the County's zoning regulations. Avoid supporting rezonings, subdivisions, planned developments, variances, density bonuses, or other actions that increase base residential density or establish a precedent for development intensity beyond the capacity and character of Richville's rural setting.

Do not designate or encourage condominium projects, large clustered residential developments, villages, town- or city-style development, suburban subdivisions, or crowded, uniform, linear, back-lot, second-tier, or similarly concentrated residential forms. New development should retain a dispersed rural pattern, provide workable transitions to farms and open land, and avoid premature extension of more intensive development into agricultural or rural areas.

The County should not support a General Plan amendment, Future Land Use Map amendment, rezoning, Planned Community approval, or development agreement that increases residential density beyond the applicable mapped place type or established rural-density framework unless the County ~~concurrently amends~~ adopts an amendment to the applicable Future Land Use Map, Community Area Plan policy direction, or both, as appropriate, and makes specific findings explaining why the change remains consistent with Richville's rural farming-community character.

DRAFT

Richville Policy 1.3 — Protect the Richville Pioneer Cemetery and cultural resources.

Identify, avoid, and appropriately protect the Richville Pioneer Cemetery and known or potentially significant historic, archaeological, Indigenous cultural, and burial resources during land-use review, road and utility work, grading, subdivision, agricultural improvements, and other ground-disturbing projects.

Where a project may affect these resources, coordinate early with affected property owners, tribal representatives as appropriate, the State Historic Preservation Office, local historical organizations, and other relevant agencies or specialists. Use site-specific documentation, avoidance, preservation, interpretation, access management, or mitigation measures as warranted by the resource and project.

Richville Policy 1.4 — Use voluntary conservation tools to retain the working landscape.

Support voluntary conservation easements, agricultural-preservation programs, purchase or transfer of development rights, and other mutually agreed-upon tools that retain working farms and ranches, productive soils, irrigation systems, open space, habitat, scenic views, and connected rural landscape systems while respecting private-property rights.

Richville Policy 1.5 — Community Plan Consistency Review.

For significant land-use and infrastructure decisions affecting Richville, Morgan County staff will apply Countywide LU Policy 1.0 and identify the applicable Richville Community Vision, Community Policies, Future Land Use Map direction, and relevant Community Planning Context. Staff reports should address the rural farming pattern; agricultural lands and irrigation systems; water and wastewater limitations; State Route 66 and Morgan Valley Drive access conditions; scenic valley and hillside resources; avoidance of incompatible higher-density housing; the Richville Pioneer Cemetery and other cultural resources where applicable; and voluntary conservation opportunities.

DRAFT

Richville Character & Values

Community Character

Richville is a small farming community in the Morgan Valley along State Route 66 and Morgan Valley Drive, south of Morgan City. Working farms and ranches, irrigated fields, rural homes, and open land shape the valley floor, with mountain and hillside views forming the backdrop. Its dispersed development pattern and quiet setting distinguish Richville from more developed areas of the County.

Community Values

Residents value Richville's working agricultural landscape, low-density rural lifestyle, scenic views, and the space and quiet that come with them. They favor deliberate growth that fits the existing settlement pattern and have expressed clear opposition to condominiums, village or cluster development, and other higher-density forms that would change the character of the valley. Residents have also questioned whether some of those housing types would be affordable or suited to local households.

The continued viability of farms and irrigation systems, protection of water and natural resources, safe rural roads, respect for private-property rights, and meaningful participation in land-use decisions are important to residents as Richville changes.

Richville Planning Context

The following community planning context identifies the local conditions, resources, infrastructure, facilities, and development considerations that should guide future decisions in the Richville Community Area. It should be considered together with the Community Vision, Policies, Future Land Use Map, Countywide Land Use Policies, and applicable County regulations.

Land Use and Growth Pattern

Development in Richville is shaped by the location and function of State Route 66 and Morgan Valley Drive; the configuration of existing parcels, roads, private lanes, and agricultural access routes; working agricultural land and irrigation facilities; private-property ownership; and environmental conditions that include floodplains, drainageways, slopes, wetlands, riparian areas, and scenic hillside locations.

Residents have expressed clear opposition to condominiums and other higher-density residential forms in Richville. Public input reflects concern that condominium, village, cluster, town, city-style, suburban, or other more intensive residential development could be inconsistent with the community's rural character, agricultural setting, scenic quality, traffic conditions, limited infrastructure, and established development pattern. Residents also questioned whether some higher-density forms would provide housing that is affordable or appropriate for local households.

Richville's rural character depends on the continued function of farms, ranches, irrigation systems, open lands, and rural roads. Changes in density, lot configuration, land use, access, or infrastructure can affect agricultural operations, farm equipment movement, irrigation facilities,

DRAFT

drainage, scenery, private wells, septic systems, road maintenance, and the long-term ability of residents and property owners to maintain necessary facilities and services.

Not all vacant or undeveloped land has the same physical capacity or suitability for additional development. Site conditions, existing access, utilities, drainage systems, agricultural uses, water and wastewater limitations, hazards, and cumulative development effects are significant considerations in determining whether a particular property can accommodate additional development without changing the broader rural pattern of the community.

Historic and Cultural Resources

Richville's early agricultural settlement is associated with historic and cultural resources, including the Richville Pioneer Cemetery and potential Indigenous cultural resources. These resources contribute to the community's history, identity, and connection to the larger Morgan Valley.

Historic, archaeological, cemetery, and cultural resources may be affected by land-use changes, road or utility work, grading, subdivision, agricultural improvements, recreation facilities, and other ground-disturbing activity. The presence and significance of a resource may not always be fully known in advance, particularly where potential archaeological or Indigenous cultural materials have not been comprehensively documented.

Where known resources are present, or where a site has a reasonable potential to contain significant cultural or historic materials, project-specific coordination and evaluation may be needed. Relevant parties may include affected landowners, tribal representatives, local historical organizations, the State Historic Preservation Office, County staff, State agencies, and other appropriate entities.

The Countywide hazard and natural-resource framework, the Richville Community Plan consistency-review process, applicable State and federal requirements, and project-review procedures provide the relevant mechanisms for identifying, documenting, protecting, or mitigating effects on historic and cultural resources.

Transportation and Access

State Route 66 and Morgan Valley Drive provide the principal transportation framework for Richville. These routes serve residents, farms and ranches, school transportation, emergency services, visitors, and travel between Morgan City, the southern Morgan Valley, and the East Canyon area. Local roads, private lanes, farm-access routes, driveways, and irrigation crossings also play important roles in reaching rural homes, agricultural operations, irrigation facilities, open lands, and community resources.

Richville's transportation system is rural in character. Local roads and access routes may not have the width, geometry, shoulders, intersection design, drainage capacity, maintenance structure, or traffic capacity needed to accommodate substantial increases in traffic, density, more intensive housing types, or development-generated trips. The movement of farm equipment, school buses, emergency vehicles,

DRAFT

service vehicles, resident traffic, and visitors must often occur on the same limited network.

Additional development can affect local road conditions, driveway access, traffic volumes, farm-equipment movement, emergency response, school transportation, road maintenance, drainage, snow removal, visibility, safety, and the relationship between rural residential uses and agricultural operations. The cumulative effects of multiple small subdivisions, new driveways, private-lane use, or more intensive housing forms may be particularly important in a community with limited road and service capacity.

Transportation improvements, where needed, may involve practical questions of right-of-way, drainage, property impacts, funding, ownership, maintenance, road character, emergency access, and compatibility with agricultural uses. The Countywide and Richville policy framework provides the operative standards for evaluating safe access, road impacts, circulation, maintenance responsibility, and development-related improvements.

Water and Wastewater

Richville's water resources are essential to its agricultural economy, rural residential pattern, scenic landscape, and environmental quality. Culinary water is supplied in part through private wells and limited community water systems. Irrigation water is provided through local water rights, ditches, gravity-flow pipelines, Hardscrabble Creek, and related agricultural distribution systems.

The community does not have a comprehensive public sewer system, and septic systems remain the primary method of wastewater disposal. Development capacity is therefore affected by lot size, soils, depth to groundwater, septic suitability, separation from wells and water resources, cumulative wastewater effects, groundwater protection, drainage conditions, water-source capacity, water rights where applicable, and Weber-Morgan Health Department requirements.

Private wells, community water systems, irrigation facilities, water rights, Hardscrabble Creek, groundwater, drainage systems, agricultural users, and downstream resources are interconnected. Land-use change, lot division, new wells, wastewater disposal, drainage modifications, road construction, and development intensity may affect water quality, groundwater recharge, septic performance, irrigation operations, agricultural productivity, and the reliability of existing water sources.

Because Richville relies heavily on private and limited-scale water and wastewater systems, development feasibility is fundamentally site-specific. A proposal's relationship to existing wells, water rights, irrigation infrastructure, soils, groundwater conditions, septic capacity, drainage, flood hazards, emergency access, and long-term operation and maintenance arrangements is central to understanding its potential effects on the community.

The Countywide capacity and water-resource policies, Richville Policies, water-provider requirements, irrigation-company requirements, Weber-Morgan Health Department standards,

DRAFT

and applicable State and County regulations provide the operative direction for evaluating water supply, wastewater feasibility, drainage, water-quality protection, and long-term maintenance.

Natural Resources and Hazards

Richville is part of a rural valley and mountain landscape that includes productive agricultural soils, open fields, scenic views, hillsides, ridgelines, flood-prone land, natural drainageways, wetlands, riparian areas, wildlife habitat, and migration corridors. These resources contribute to Richville's farming-community character, environmental health, scenic quality, open landscape, and quality of life. They also affect the suitability and capacity of some land for additional development.

Floodplains, natural drainage patterns, steep slopes, ridgelines, wetlands, riparian corridors, unstable soils, wildlife habitat, migration corridors, scenic resources, and water quality are important planning constraints in Richville. The relationship between development and these resources may affect public safety, drainage, erosion, flood risks, water quality, habitat function, agricultural uses, emergency access, visual character, and long-term maintenance responsibilities.

Prior planning identified the importance of retaining rural, agricultural, and open-space uses in flood-prone areas; avoiding inappropriate increases in development intensity within FEMA 100-year floodplains; treating steep slopes and ridge-top development carefully; protecting wildlife habitat and migration corridors; and ensuring that land-use decisions are compatible with natural systems. Those principles remain relevant, subject to current mapping, applicable law, site-specific conditions, and the adopted Countywide and Richville policy framework.

Development in or near floodplains, drainageways, wetlands, riparian areas, steep slopes, unstable soils, ridgelines, wildlife habitat, migration corridors, and other sensitive lands may involve location-specific concerns related to flood hazards, runoff, erosion, water quality, habitat, scenery, emergency access, geotechnical conditions, utility feasibility, and long-term maintenance. The appropriate level of technical information depends on the location, scale, and potential impacts of a proposal.

Recreation and Community Facilities

The larger Porterville/Richville area includes recreation opportunities associated with East Canyon Reservoir, trails, wildlife viewing, hunting, fishing, boating, and other low-impact outdoor uses. These activities are part of the broader mountain-and-valley setting and contribute to the area's recreation value and regional appeal.

Recreation activity or regional recreation expansion can affect Richville even when facilities are located outside the immediate community area. Potential effects include increased traffic on rural roads, road-safety concerns, parking demand, emergency-response needs, sanitation needs, water-resource impacts, wildlife disturbance, private-property impacts, agricultural conflicts, maintenance responsibilities, and demands on limited rural infrastructure.

DRAFT

Richville residents value a quiet rural setting, working agricultural landscape, scenic views, and limited infrastructure. Potential recreation amenities near or affecting Richville may therefore involve considerations of location, scale, ownership, legal access, construction cost, funding, operation, maintenance, liability, traffic, parking, sanitation, emergency response, water quality, wildlife, agricultural compatibility, and long-term service responsibility.

Possible low-intensity opportunities may include trail connections, walking routes, lawful access to open-space areas, small gathering spaces, or other rural-scale facilities. Whether any such opportunity is feasible depends on landownership, voluntary access arrangements, available funding, environmental conditions, private-property rights, agricultural operations, road capacity, maintenance capability, and coordination with affected residents, landowners, agencies, and service providers.

The Countywide and Richville policy framework provides the operative direction for evaluating public facilities, recreation needs, transportation effects, environmental compatibility, fair-share responsibility, and community engagement.

Richville residents value a quiet rural setting, working agricultural landscape, scenic views, and limited infrastructure. Potential recreation amenities near or affecting Richville may therefore involve considerations of location, scale, ownership, legal access, construction cost, funding, operation, maintenance, liability, traffic, parking, sanitation, emergency response, water quality, wildlife, agricultural compatibility, and long-term service responsibility.

Possible low-intensity opportunities may include trail connections, walking routes, lawful access to open-space areas, small gathering spaces, or other rural-scale facilities. Whether any such opportunity is feasible depends on landownership, voluntary access arrangements, available funding, environmental conditions, private-property rights, agricultural operations, road capacity, maintenance capability, and coordination with affected residents, landowners, agencies, and service providers.

The Countywide and Richville policy framework provides the operative direction for evaluating public facilities, recreation needs, transportation effects, environmental compatibility, fair-share responsibility, and community engagement.


DRAFT

Round Valley Community

Round Valley Community Vision

Round Valley will preserve its scenic rural character, open space, recreation assets, quiet residential areas, and natural setting by directing only limited, infrastructure-compatible growth to appropriate locations. Future land-use decisions will protect local roads and water resources, avoid retail and other intensive development that would increase through-traffic or erode community character, and reflect the values of local residents

DRAFT



MORGAN COUNTY

0 1,300 2,600 Feet

October 2026

DRAFT

ROUND VALLEY FUTURE LAND USE

Morgan County Boundary

Future Land Use

- Large Parcel Agricultural (LP-AG)
- Agricultural/Working Lands (AG)
- Rural Living (RL)
- Rural Corridor (RC)

Future Land Use - Expanded Village Area

- Large Parcel Agricultural (LP-AG)



Planning Outpost

JUB ENGINEERS, INC.

Round Valley Community Policies

The following policies supplement the Countywide Land Use Policies and provide direction specific to the Round Valley Community Area. They are intended to guide future land-use, infrastructure, capital-planning, and development-review decisions and should be considered together with the Community Vision, Future Land Use Map, Community Planning Context, and applicable County regulations.

Round Valley Policy 1.1 — Maintain a rural, recreation-oriented valley landscape.

Maintain Round Valley as a low-density rural community defined by agricultural and grazing lands, river-bottom open space, the Weber River corridor, foothills, springs, dispersed homes, scenic mountain views, and the Round Valley Resort and golf course. Direct residential, resort-related, and community-serving development to locations identified on the Future Land Use Map that can be served without altering the area's rural landscape or placing new demands on constrained roads, bridges, water resources, or emergency access.

Avoid urban, suburban, strip-commercial, or visually intrusive development patterns and avoid increased intensity in flood-prone, steep-slope, remote, river-corridor, or infrastructure-constrained areas.

Round Valley Policy 1.2 — Protect Como's springs and small-scale character.

Maintain Como as a small, established rural community with a distinct relationship to Morgan City, existing residences, limited locally serving businesses, recreation-related uses, and sensitive spring and groundwater resources. Projects near Como's springs, related rock formations, or recharge areas should be evaluated for potential effects from blasting, excavation, grading, road widening, utility work, drainage alteration, or other ground disturbance on spring flow, water quality, groundwater recharge, geologic stability, and water-dependent uses.

Do not rely on Como's partial connection to Morgan City sewer service as a basis for substantially increasing density, commercial activity, or traffic without addressing local road capacity, spring protection, drainage, parking, emergency access, and compatibility with established homes and surrounding rural land.

Round Valley Policy 1.3 — Limit retail and intensive commercial development.

Round Valley is not planned as a retail-oriented, highway-commercial, or intensive commercial growth area. Consider only limited community-serving, agricultural-supportive, recreation-supportive, or home-based uses that are compatible with the rural setting, local access conditions, and the Future Land Use Map.

DRAFT

Do not support retail-oriented, highway-oriented, or other traffic-generating commercial development that would create substantial new regional traffic, visual clutter, dispersed commercial strips, or an urbanized development pattern.

Round Valley Policy 1.4 — Keep Taggarts small-scale and interchange-compatible.

Maintain Taggarts as a small, established rural interchange community with existing lawful residences and locally serving businesses. Future decisions should respect the area's limited developable land, private-well and septic reliance, constrained water and wastewater conditions, highway access and safety concerns, and relationship to the surrounding rural landscape.

Do not support broad commercial expansion, intensive highway-commercial development, or land-use changes that would exceed the practical capacity of Taggarts' land area, water and wastewater systems, road network, or emergency-access conditions.

Round Valley Policy 1.5 — Require safe primary and secondary access for major Resort-area development.

Major Resort, lodging, golf-course, residential, or similar development in the Round Valley Resort area should not be supported unless it provides safe, reliable primary and secondary access consistent with County standards and the site's floodplain, bridge, railroad, terrain, and emergency-response constraints. Access planning should identify the design, ownership, funding, permitting, construction timing, operation, maintenance, and long-term responsibility for necessary improvements.

The private one-lane Como bridge is not suitable as public access for additional Round Valley development and should not be relied upon to serve increased development intensity. Development and transportation planning should avoid routing substantial regional or development-generated through-traffic onto 100 South or other local residential streets in Morgan City.

Round Valley Policy 1.6 — Maintain the Resort and golf-course area as a coordinated recreation and open-space setting.

Treat the Round Valley Resort and golf course as a coordinated recreation, tourism, and open-space setting rather than a conventional retail or highway-commercial center. Any future resort-area housing, lodging, golf-course expansion, events, recreation facilities, or visitor-serving improvements should be planned as part of an integrated framework that addresses access, open-space preservation, the Weber River and floodplain setting, water and wastewater feasibility, drainage, emergency response, operations, and compatibility with nearby homes, agricultural land, and rural roads.

This policy does not support using the Resort area as a basis for dispersed commercial growth or more intensive development elsewhere in the Round Valley Community Area.

DRAFT

Round Valley Policy 1.7 — Community Plan Consistency Review.

For significant land-use and infrastructure decisions affecting Round Valley, Morgan County staff will apply Countywide LU Policy 1.0 and identify the applicable Round Valley Community Vision, Community Policies, Future Land Use Map direction, and relevant Community Planning Context. Staff reports should address the rural and recreation-oriented land-use pattern; Como springs and groundwater conditions; Taggarts' small-scale interchange setting; resort/golf-course development and access; Weber River and floodplain conditions; water and wastewater feasibility; road, bridge, railroad-crossing, and emergency-access conditions; and the avoidance of intensive traffic-generating commercial development and through-traffic on 100 South.

DRAFT

Round Valley Character & Values

Community Character

Round Valley is a rural community northeast of Morgan City defined by the Weber River valley, open agricultural and grazing lands, dispersed homes, floodplain areas, foothills, mountain views, springs, and the Round Valley Resort and golf course. The community area also includes the small rural settlement of Como to the west and Taggarts to the east near the I-84 interchange. Although these areas share a relationship to the Weber River canyon, Interstate 84, and Morgan Valley, they have distinct development patterns, infrastructure conditions, and planning considerations.

Round Valley's character is shaped by its low-density residential pattern, agricultural and range lands, river-bottom open space, private wells and septic systems, limited road access, and close relationship to Morgan City. The rural landscape includes productive and historic agricultural lands, flood-prone areas along the Weber River, foothills and slopes, and recreation-related open space associated with the Round Valley Resort and golf course. These features create an attractive and distinctive setting but also limit the locations and intensity of development that can be safely supported.

Community Values

Round Valley residents value a scenic rural way of life shaped by open space, agricultural and grazing lands, the Weber River corridor, springs, foothills, recreation assets, quiet residential living, and strong local character. Residents recognize the distinct identities of Round Valley, Como, the Round Valley Resort, and Taggarts, and want future decisions to respect the qualities that make each of these areas part of the broader Round Valley community.

Residents recognize that change may occur over time, but favor limited and orderly growth that fits available transportation, water, wastewater, and emergency-service capacity. They value the protection of rural character, scenic quality, water resources, established neighborhoods, and locally serving businesses, and do not want incremental changes that create unwanted urban, suburban, retail-oriented, highway-commercial, or other intensive development patterns. Residents are particularly concerned about development that would increase through-traffic on 100 South or other local residential streets.

Round Valley Planning Context

The following community planning context identifies the local conditions, resources, infrastructure, facilities, and development considerations that should guide future decisions in the Round Valley Community Area. It should be considered together with the Community Vision, Policies, Future Land Use Map, Countywide Land Use Policies, and applicable County regulations.

Land Use and Growth Pattern

Round Valley's existing development pattern includes dispersed rural residences, agricultural and grazing lands, open space, river-bottom lands, the Round Valley Resort and golf course, Como's established residences and locally serving business uses, and the small community

DRAFT

of Taggarts. The location, scale, and intensity of future development are affected by the Weber River corridor, floodplain conditions, foothills and slopes, Interstate 84, railroad facilities, county roads, private roads, springs, wells, septic systems, emergency access, and limited opportunities for additional safe transportation connections.

The rural landscape includes productive and historic agricultural lands, grazing areas, flood-prone areas along the Weber River, foothills, slopes, visible hillsides, springs, recreation-related open space, and the Resort and golf course. These features create an attractive and distinctive setting but also limit the locations and intensity of development that can be safely served, protected, and maintained.

Residents recognize that change may occur over time but favor limited and orderly growth that fits transportation, water, wastewater, drainage, emergency-service, and public-facility capacity. Residents value rural character, scenic quality, water resources, established neighborhoods, locally serving businesses, agricultural and grazing lands, recreation assets, and the distinct identities of Round Valley, Como, the Resort, and Taggarts. Public input does not support incremental changes that create an urban, suburban, retail-oriented, highway-commercial, or other intensive development pattern.

Como Area

Como is a small rural community located between Morgan City and Round Valley. It is distinguished by its springs, river-valley setting, established residences, recreation-related uses, and connection to the Morgan City sewer system. Historic and existing land uses in the area have included homes, restaurant uses, fish raising, bottled-water-related activity, and recreation.

Como's springs, groundwater conditions, and related geologic formations are defining community resources. They provide water-related, scenic, environmental, and community value, but they also create specialized planning considerations related to water quality, groundwater recharge, road construction, blasting, excavation, grading, drainage changes, utility work, and development near sensitive rock formations.

Residents have expressed concern that blasting, roadway widening, excavation, or other ground-disturbing activity near rock outcroppings could affect the underground formations that supply Como's springs. Site-specific information regarding spring flow, groundwater quality, geologic stability, drainage, utility locations, road conditions, and water-dependent uses may be necessary when projects are proposed near the springs or related formations.

Como also has an established residential pattern, limited commercial or locally serving activity, limited developable land, and a close relationship to Morgan City. Its location near Morgan City provides some access to services, including sewer service, but does not eliminate the need to consider local road capacity, spring protection, drainage, parking, emergency access, water quality, property ownership, and compatibility with established homes and nearby rural lands.

DRAFT

Round Valley Resort and Golf Course

The Round Valley Resort and golf course are important recreation, tourism, open-space, and economic resources within the Community Area. Constructed in the mid-1960s, the Resort provides recreation and tourism opportunities while also preserving a substantial open landscape near the Weber River. Together with hunting, fishing, river-related recreation, agricultural and grazing lands, and the broader mountain setting, the Resort contributes to the identity and quality of life of the Round Valley area.

The Resort and golf course are distinct from a conventional retail or highway-commercial center. The area functions as a coordinated recreation and open-space setting with substantial green space near the Weber River, golf facilities, private property interests, and potential recreation-related opportunities. Past discussions have included additional housing, townhomes, golf-course expansion, lodging, recreation facilities, and open-space preservation.

Transportation access and the lack of a safe, reliable secondary access route are significant local constraints on major Resort-area development. Other considerations include roadway and bridge conditions, floodplain and river conditions, water and wastewater capacity, parking, emergency response, drainage, environmental protection, operations, maintenance, and the relationship between Resort activity and nearby residences, agricultural lands, open space, and local roads.

The Resort may provide a focal point for carefully planned recreation-related improvements. Its location and relationship to the Weber River corridor, floodplain lands, open space, rural residences, agricultural areas, and limited transportation network are central to evaluating the feasibility and potential effects of any future change.

Taggarts

Taggarts is a small, established rural interchange community east of Round Valley near the Interstate 84 interchange. It contains long-established residences and locally serving businesses and has historically included a mix of highway-commercial, residential, and rural land-use designations.

Taggarts' location near Interstate 84 creates both access opportunities and constraints. The community has limited developable land, private wells and septic systems, road-safety considerations, existing homes and businesses, and a relationship to the Interstate 84 interchange and surrounding rural landscape. These conditions affect the type, scale, and infrastructure demands of potential land-use change.

The community's existing homes and locally serving businesses are an important part of Taggarts' established character. At the same time, the limited land area, water and wastewater conditions, road access, highway-related traffic, public-safety needs, and relationship to nearby rural land create practical limits on more intensive or broadly expanded development patterns.

DRAFT

Transportation and Access

Road access and transportation safety are central constraints on future growth in the Round Valley Community Area. Existing roads, bridges, railroad crossings, private roads, local residential streets, agricultural access routes, and highway connections serve residents, agricultural operations, Resort users, recreation visitors, businesses, school transportation, emergency responders, and travel between Morgan City, the Weber River canyon, Interstate 84, Como, Taggarts, and Round Valley.

Much of this transportation system was not designed to accommodate substantial increases in residential density, Resort activity, retail activity, regional through-traffic, or other traffic-generating land uses. The practical capacity and reliability of local routes are affected by the Weber River, floodplain conditions, steep or unstable terrain, groundwater, drainage, railroad crossings, bridge conditions, right-of-way limitations, private-road ownership, road geometry, emergency access, construction responsibility, funding, and long-term maintenance.

Potential road and bridge improvements in Round Valley have historically involved significant physical, legal, financial, and environmental constraints. In some locations, road or bridge construction may require substantial excavation, stabilization, drainage improvements, floodplain analysis, coordination with railroad interests, utility coordination, property acquisition, or other engineering and permitting work.

The private, one-lane Como bridge is not suitable as public access for additional Round Valley development. This is a critical local access limitation and should be recognized in transportation, land-use, emergency-response, and development-review decisions.

100 South is a particularly important local concern because it is a residential street and school-access route in Morgan City. Retail or other traffic-generating development in the Round Valley area could direct additional East Canyon-to-Interstate 84 traffic or other regional traffic onto 100 South. Residents are particularly concerned about potential through-traffic effects on neighborhood safety, school access, pedestrian conditions, emergency response, and the quiet residential character of this corridor.

The County's applicable policy framework governs the safety, capacity, access, circulation, bridge, drainage, right-of-way, funding, maintenance, emergency-response, and fair-share issues associated with transportation improvements and development-related impacts. Coordination may involve Morgan City, affected landowners, emergency-service providers, transportation agencies, utility providers, railroad interests, developers, and other relevant parties.

Water and Wastewater

Water supply, groundwater protection, spring protection, and wastewater capacity are fundamental planning considerations in the Round Valley Community Area. Round Valley is generally served by private wells and septic systems, while Como is connected in part to Morgan City's sewer system. The area also

DRAFT

includes springs near Como, the Resort, the Fairgrounds, Interstate 84, and Fry Hollow.

Water availability and system feasibility are influenced by water rights where applicable, source capacity, well capacity, water quality, storage, distribution, pressure, fire-flow needs where applicable, groundwater conditions, wellhead protection, spring protection, aquifer recharge, irrigation systems, and the relationship between development and existing water users.

Much of Round Valley lacks centralized wastewater collection and treatment. Except for areas served by existing sewer arrangements, development feasibility is influenced by septic-system suitability, lot configuration, soils, depth to groundwater, drainage, flood hazards, cumulative septic density, well-separation requirements, health-department standards, and long-term ownership, operation, maintenance, and replacement responsibilities.

The combination of springs, private wells, groundwater resources, onsite wastewater systems, floodplain conditions, agricultural and grazing land, recreation activity, and limited infrastructure makes water-resource protection a central issue in Round Valley. The Countywide and Round Valley policy framework provides the operative standards for determining whether individual proposals have adequate water and wastewater capacity and can avoid unacceptable impacts on springs, wells, aquifers, surface water, existing water users, and public health.

Natural Resources and Hazards

The Round Valley Community Area contains important natural resources and hazard areas, including the Weber River, floodplains, springs, groundwater resources, irrigated and dry agricultural lands, grazing lands, foothills, steep slopes, mountain views, wildlife habitat, river-bottom open space, wetlands, drainageways, and scenic rural landscapes. These features are central to the community's scenic quality, rural identity, recreation value, environmental health, agricultural function, and long-term development capacity.

Flooding and drainage are significant planning concerns, particularly along the Weber River and in low-lying river-bottom areas. Floodplain conditions, natural drainage patterns, surface runoff, groundwater, erosion, culvert and bridge capacity, access limitations, and the relationship between development and downstream properties can affect the feasibility, safety, and maintenance requirements of roads, bridges, utilities, recreation facilities, and private development.

Steep slopes, unstable soils, groundwater conditions, visually prominent hillsides, constrained valley-bottom areas, and sensitive geologic features may limit the feasibility of roads, bridges, utilities, and development. In portions of the Como and Round Valley area, infrastructure construction may require substantial excavation, stabilization, drainage improvements, retaining structures, or other engineering measures. These conditions can affect costs, construction impacts, visual character, water resources, environmental effects, and long-term maintenance obligations.

The Weber River corridor, floodplain lands, springs, wetlands, riparian areas, grazing land,

DRAFT

agricultural soils, foothills, wildlife habitat, and scenic open space are interconnected resources. Their presence is a key reason that physical capacity, environmental conditions, drainage, access, scenery, water quality, habitat, and long-term stewardship must be considered together rather than as isolated site issues.

The Como springs and related geologic formations warrant particular attention because residents have identified concern that blasting, road widening, utility work, grading, excavation, altered drainage, or development near rock outcroppings could affect spring flows, groundwater quality, geologic stability, and water-dependent uses. Site-specific information may be needed to understand the relationship between proposed work and the underground conditions supporting the springs.

Recreation and Community Facilities

The Round Valley Resort and golf course, hunting, fishing, river-related recreation, agricultural and grazing landscapes, open space, and nearby public lands contribute to the area's recreation value and community identity. The Resort provides a substantial open landscape near the Weber River and may offer a focal point for carefully planned recreation-related improvements.

Recreation activity, Resort uses, golf-course operations, lodging, events, trails, river access, outdoor facilities, and visitor-serving amenities may create demands related to traffic, road and bridge safety, parking, water and wastewater capacity, drainage, emergency response, environmental protection, floodplain conditions, public access, operations, maintenance, nearby residences, agricultural uses, and open-space resources.

The Community Area's limited access, private-property interests, rural roads, floodplain conditions, water-resource constraints, and quiet residential setting are particularly important considerations in evaluating recreation-related proposals. The relationship between recreation facilities and potential traffic on 100 South or other local residential streets also requires attention because of concern about regional through-traffic, school access, pedestrian safety, and the quiet character of surrounding neighborhoods.


DRAFT

Stoddard Community

Stoddard Community Vision

Stoddard will remain a safe, scenic, and resilient rural community that reflects the "best of rural America" through clean air and water, open space, agricultural heritage, wildlife habitat, and a strong sense of community. Future growth will be guided to appropriate locations and patterns that respect the area's terrain, water supplies, infrastructure limitations, scenic views, and surrounding foothills.

DRAFT



MORGAN COUNTY

0 1,250 2,500
Feet

October 2026

DRAFT

STODDARD FUTURE LAND USE

Morgan County Boundary

Future Land Use

- Large Parcel Agricultural (LP-AG)
- Agricultural/Working Lands (AG)
- Rural Living (RL)



Planning Outpost

JUB ENGINEERS, INC.

Stoddard Community Policies

The following policies supplement the Countywide Land Use Policies and provide direction specific to the Stoddard Community Area. They are intended to guide future land-use, infrastructure, capital-planning, and development-review decisions and should be considered together with the Community Vision, Future Land Use Map, Community Planning Context, and applicable County regulations.

Stoddard Policy 1.1 — Maintain Stoddard as a historic rural village and agricultural community.

Maintain Stoddard as a distinct historic rural village and agricultural community, rather than an extension of suburban development from Morgan City. Preserve the relationship among rural homes, farms and ranches, livestock operations, irrigation systems, open lands, private hunting lands, foothills, benches, scenic views, and the Weber River setting.

Land-use and zoning decisions should retain the community's agricultural and rural-residential pattern, avoid strip development along Old Highway Road, and prevent unnecessary fragmentation of agricultural or grazing lands. New development should respect the transition between the historic village setting, rural residences, working lands, and surrounding foothills and open space.

Stoddard Policy 1.2 — Direct limited growth to mapped compatible areas.

Direct anticipated residential growth to locations and development forms identified by the Future Land Use Map as compatible with Stoddard's rural village, agricultural, and natural-resource setting. Retain lower-density agricultural, foothill, wildlife-habitat, wetland, drainage, and open-space lands outside those locations.

Avoid dispersed or more intensive development on steep slopes, benches, foothills, agricultural lands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, or areas with limited local access. New development should avoid crowded, uniform, linear, back-lot, or second-tier patterns along rural roads and should provide meaningful transitions to farms, livestock operations, open land, and rural residences.

Stoddard Policy 1.3 — Protect the Old Highway Road and Stoddard Lane rural access system.

Protect the safety, function, and rural character of Old Highway Road, Stoddard Lane, private lanes, farm-access routes, and the limited connections across Interstate 84 and the Union Pacific Railroad. Land-use changes should not rely on road, bridge, crossing, or private-lane capacity that is not available or demonstrably committed.

Give particular attention to the Stoddard Lane I-84/railroad crossing, roadway geometry, drainage, agricultural and livestock movement, school transportation, emergency response, winter maintenance, and long-term access reliability. Avoid development patterns that would create unsafe driveway conflicts, unreasonable traffic burdens, or traffic conditions inconsistent with established rural neighborhoods.

DRAFT

Stoddard Policy 1.4 — Plan a modest community park and Old Highway Road walking connection.

Support planning for a modest community park, gathering space, and walking path or pathway connection along Old Highway Road where feasible. Park and pathway planning should preserve agricultural access and livestock movement and should be coordinated with property-owner willingness, safe road crossings, site conditions, water and drainage constraints, wildlife habitat, funding, ownership, operation, maintenance, and long-term responsibility.

Stoddard Policy 1.5 — Address the former dump-site record in land-use and infrastructure decisions.

Maintain available County records identifying the former dump-site area and use them to inform land-use, subdivision, platting, utility, road, and site-improvement decisions near the location. Where a proposal could be affected by former disposal activity, require appropriate due diligence concerning property history, known records, environmental and public-health conditions, disclosure, investigation, remediation status, and any applicable development constraints.

This policy does not determine the presence, extent, or remediation status of contamination at any particular site; it requires the County to account for available information before supporting potentially affected development or infrastructure improvements.

Stoddard Policy 1.6 — Community Plan Consistency Review.

For significant land-use and infrastructure decisions affecting Stoddard, Morgan County staff will apply Countywide LU Policy 1.0 and identify the applicable Stoddard Community Vision, Community Policies, Future Land Use Map direction, and relevant Community Planning Context. Staff reports should address agricultural and rural-residential transition areas; Old Highway Road, Stoddard Lane, Interstate 84, and railroad-crossing conditions; water and wastewater feasibility; wetlands and wildlife habitat; Morgan City coordination; the former dump-site record where applicable; and recreation, community-facility, or public-health considerations.

DRAFT

Stoddard Character & Values

Community Character

Established in 1860, Stoddard has long functioned as a small crossroads and rural village community. Its character is defined by dispersed rural homes, farms and ranches, livestock operations, irrigated and dryland fields, open views, foothills, benches, the Weber River setting, and the surrounding mountain landscape. Agricultural and livestock uses, including irrigation operations, farm access, and livestock movement, remain important elements of the community's identity and working landscape.

The community's natural setting is central to its identity. The Weber River corridor, mountain springs, wetlands, foothills, wildlife habitat, deer and elk winter range, and scenic views contribute to both the area's rural character and its environmental sensitivity. These resources, together with groundwater and irrigation-water supplies, require careful stewardship as land-use decisions are made.

Community Values

Stoddard residents value their way of life as "The Best of Rural America." That identity includes clean air and water, public safety, natural beauty, agricultural and livestock traditions, open land, wildlife, and a strong connection to the surrounding landscape. Residents want Stoddard to remain a distinct rural community rather than become an extension of suburban development from Morgan City or other parts of Morgan County.

Residents recognize that change and some residential growth may occur, but they favor deliberate growth that fits Stoddard's established rural setting and the practical limits of local water, wastewater, road access, drainage, emergency response, and other essential services. They generally support maintaining agricultural and low-density rural land-use patterns across the broader community area, particularly where water supply, access, terrain, or environmental conditions limit the ability to safely accommodate more intensive development.

Residents also value early, clear, and meaningful opportunities to participate in decisions affecting their community. They expect understandable information and genuine local input when significant land-use, development, infrastructure, or Future Land Use Map decisions could affect Stoddard's character, resources, or quality of life.

Stoddard Planning Context

The following community planning context identifies the local conditions, resources, infrastructure, facilities, and development considerations that should guide future decisions in the Stoddard Community Area. It should be considered together with the Community Vision, Policies, Future Land Use Map, Countywide Land Use Policies, and applicable County regulations.

Land Use and Growth Pattern

Stoddard is primarily a rural residential and agricultural community rather than a suburban growth area or a commercial corridor. Its built

DRAFT

environment consists largely of rural homes, agricultural and accessory structures, livestock operations, irrigation systems, private wells, septic systems, rural roads, private lanes, farm-access routes, and modest community-serving uses. Home-based, agricultural-supportive, and locally serving uses may occur within this rural setting, while more intensive retail, highway-commercial, industrial, institutional, utility-scale, or similar uses can have substantially different effects on agricultural land, water resources, local roads, traffic, visual character, public safety, and established rural neighborhoods.

Agriculture and ranching are central to Stoddard's economy, land stewardship, heritage, and community identity. Farming and ranching may involve livestock, irrigation diversions and ditches, agricultural equipment, farm access, livestock movement, dust, odors, noise, seasonal activity, and animals moving on or across rural roads. These activities are normal components of Stoddard's working landscape and may be affected by the location, density, design, access, and infrastructure demands of new development.

Stoddard's physical setting limits the amount, location, and intensity of land that can reasonably support additional development. Steep and rocky terrain, foothills, benches, drainage corridors, wetlands, wildlife habitat, agricultural operations, private wells, septic-system constraints, limited road connections, emergency-access considerations, and other infrastructure limitations affect the suitability and capacity of individual sites for residential and nonresidential use.

Residents have expressed a clear preference for retaining agricultural land and avoiding future land-use designations or development patterns that would create suburban or small-lot growth. Public input identified concern about new residential development in agricultural areas with limited water and road access, development behind existing homes, incremental conversion of rural land, and future land-use changes that could diminish Stoddard's distinct rural character.

Transportation and Access

Old Highway Road and Stoddard Lane are the principal local roads serving Stoddard residents, agricultural operations, rural businesses, school transportation, emergency response, and travel within the north Morgan Valley. Stoddard Lane crosses Interstate 84 and the Union Pacific Railroad and provides the principal connection between Stoddard, Milton, and the west side of the valley.

The community also includes private lanes and farm-access roads serving rural residences, livestock operations, irrigation facilities, agricultural land, and open space. These routes are important to the daily operation of farms and ranches, access to homes, school transportation, delivery and service vehicles, emergency response, and rural mobility.

Stoddard has limited direct access to Interstate 84. The I-84 and Union Pacific Railroad crossing, local bridges, drainage facilities, private lanes, and road connections are central infrastructure constraints. Substantial additional traffic, new or expanded driveway access, more intensive development, or poorly located land-use

DRAFT

changes may affect roadway safety, emergency response, school-bus operations, agricultural-equipment movement, livestock movement, drainage, winter maintenance, driveway conflicts, road maintenance, and the livability of established rural neighborhoods.

Private lanes and farm-access roads may not be designed, dedicated, improved, or maintained for significant increases in traffic or more intensive land uses. Their ownership, legal access, width, geometry, drainage, emergency-access function, construction standards, maintenance responsibility, funding, and long-term condition may affect the practical capacity of individual sites and the surrounding road system.

Potential transportation and capital-facility needs include roadway maintenance, drainage improvements, bridge and crossing evaluation, visibility and signage improvements, safe agricultural and emergency access, and coordination of land-use decisions with existing rural road capacity. The need, timing, design, funding, ownership, maintenance, and responsibility for any improvement are matters for the County's applicable transportation, capital-planning, development-review, and fair-share processes.

Water and Wastewater

Stoddard's water resources are essential to its rural residential pattern, agricultural operations, environmental quality, and long-term development capacity. Culinary water is supplied primarily through private wells and a limited public culinary-water system. Irrigation and secondary water are provided through the Weber River, mountain springs, local water rights, and ditch systems serving agricultural lands and some residences.

The community does not have a comprehensive public sewer system, and septic systems remain the primary method of wastewater disposal. Site feasibility is therefore influenced by lot size, soils, slope, depth to groundwater, septic suitability, well separation, cumulative wastewater effects, groundwater protection, drainage conditions, water-source capacity, irrigation infrastructure, water rights where applicable, and Weber-Morgan Health Department requirements.

Private wells, public culinary-water facilities, springs, irrigation systems, water rights, wetlands, groundwater, the Weber River, ditches, agricultural users, and downstream resources are interconnected. Land-use change, lot division, new wells, wastewater disposal, drainage modifications, road construction, and increased development intensity may affect water quality, groundwater recharge, septic performance, irrigation operations, agricultural productivity, wetland conditions, and the reliability of existing water resources.

Stoddard's water and wastewater limitations are especially relevant in areas with steep slopes, foothill conditions, shallow or variable groundwater, wetlands, drainage corridors, limited emergency access, or existing agricultural and irrigation operations. The Countywide capacity and water-resource policies, Stoddard Policies, water-provider requirements, water-rights requirements, irrigation-company requirements, Weber-Morgan Health Department standards, and applicable State and

DRAFT

County regulations provide the operative direction for evaluating water supply, wastewater feasibility, drainage, protection of existing users, and long-term maintenance responsibilities.

Natural Resources and Hazards

Stoddard contains important natural resources, including the Weber River corridor, mountain springs, wetlands, riparian areas, agricultural lands, foothills, benches, wildlife habitat, deer and elk winter range, scenic mountain and valley landscapes, and open land. These features contribute to Stoddard's rural identity, agricultural function, hunting and recreation opportunities, environmental health, scenic quality, and quality of life.

Wildlife, hunting, open land, and the natural setting are meaningful components of the community's character. Elk, deer, moose, black bear, mountain lions, foxes, coyotes, upland game, waterfowl, sandhill cranes, songbirds, and other wildlife are present in the area. The eastern benches and foothills have historically been identified as important wintering areas for deer and elk. Wetland and riparian areas provide nesting and seasonal habitat for waterfowl and other species.

The Weber River corridor, wetlands, springs, drainage areas, rocky terrain, foothills, steep slopes, benches, wildlife habitat, winter range, and scenic open lands create location-specific constraints for development, roads, utilities, recreation facilities, and other land-disturbing activities. These conditions can affect flood hazards, erosion, slope stability, drainage, groundwater recharge, water quality, wildfire exposure, geotechnical conditions, habitat function, emergency access, utility feasibility, visual character, and long-term maintenance needs.

The appropriate level of technical information depends on a proposal's location, scale, infrastructure demands, and potential impacts. Depending on site conditions, relevant information may include soils, slope stability, drainage, erosion, flood hazards, wildfire risk, water quality, groundwater recharge, wildlife and vegetation, utilities, access, and long-term maintenance.

The Stoddard Community Area includes a former dump-site area. This historic condition is relevant to land-use, subdivision, platting, infrastructure, and site-improvement decisions near the location. Property history, known records, environmental and public-health considerations, disclosure obligations, investigation needs, remediation status, and applicable land-use constraints may affect site suitability and future decision-making.

Recreation and Community Facilities

Stoddard does not currently have a public park. Residents rely on facilities in nearby communities and on informal access to rural open lands, although much of the surrounding land is privately owned. A future community park and a walking path along Old Highway Road have been identified through past planning and community discussion as desired amenities.

The lack of a local park, the rural road setting, private-property ownership, agricultural activity, water resources, wildlife habitat, and limited

DRAFT

infrastructure affect the feasibility and design of potential recreation facilities. Potential opportunities for a modestly scaled community park, walking path, trail connection, or gathering space involve questions of community benefit, location, safe access, parking, property-owner willingness, site suitability, water and drainage conditions, agricultural compatibility, infrastructure needs, construction cost, funding, ownership, operation, maintenance, liability, and long-term responsibility.

Recreation facilities, trails, walking routes, and gathering spaces can provide local benefits but may also affect adjacent homes, agricultural operations, wildlife habitat, water resources, traffic, sanitation, noise, safety, and maintenance needs. The County's applicable policy framework provides the operative direction for determining whether a recreation or community-facility opportunity is feasible, appropriately scaled, safely accessible, and compatible with the rural setting.

The existing gun range has also been identified as a community-facility issue. Residents have expressed concern that a replacement location should be identified and established before the existing range is closed or decommissioned. This concern is relevant to future County capital planning, site selection, public safety, and facility-transition decisions.

Potential gun-range relocation or a new range site involves considerations of public safety, access, topography, noise, environmental conditions, surrounding land uses, ownership, funding, operations, maintenance, enforcement, and long-term management. The Context does not itself establish a mandate to acquire or construct a replacement range; any future action remains subject to County authority, funding, site feasibility, applicable regulations, and separate public decision-making.

DRAFT

OUR IMPLEMENTATION, OUR GOALS

~~Excerpt of the Implementation Chapters of the Morgan County General Plan~~ This section establishes how Morgan County will put the General Plan's vision, guiding principles, goals, and policies into practice. It identifies priorities for consistent development review, infrastructure coordination, updates to County regulations, capital planning, resource stewardship, and transparent public decision-making. The recommendations connect countywide direction with the needs of individual communities and provide a framework for assigning responsibilities, coordinating with partners, and identifying funding and next steps. Implementation will focus on practical actions that preserve the County's rural character, address community needs, and hold future decisions accountable to the adopted Plan.

Community Implementation Goals & Policies

The following recommendations support implementation of the Countywide Community Area Policies and the individual Community Area Plans. They are intended to guide future work by Morgan County, service providers, partner agencies, property owners, developers, and community organizations. Recommendations will be implemented as priorities, funding, staffing, legal authority, technical information, interagency coordination, and development activity allow. The recommendations do not create an obligation to construct a specific facility or approve a particular development, but they identify actions that will help the County apply the General Plan consistently and respond to common community priorities.

1. Establish a Community Area Plan consistency-review process

Morgan County will use a standard Community Area Plan consistency-review process for significant land-use and infrastructure decisions, including General Plan and Future Land Use Map amendments, rezonings, subdivisions, planned developments, development agreements, conditional uses, major commercial or industrial proposals, resort proposals, utility projects, major transportation projects, and significant public-facility investments.

The review process will identify the applicable Countywide Land Use Policies, Community Area Plan vision, area-specific policies, Future Land Use Map designations, key constraints, public-facility needs, and potential cumulative effects. The level of review and required information should be proportional to the scale, location, and likely impacts of the proposal.

DRAFT

TABLE X: Staff Report Contents for applications should incorporate the following analysis:

Review item	Required staff finding
Applicable Community Vision	Quote or summarize the applicable vision language and explain consistency
Applicable Community Policies	Identify every material policy, including policies that support or oppose the proposal
Future Land Use Map	Identify the mapped place type or designation and explain the proposal's consistency
Local planning context	Identify relevant roads, water/wastewater conditions, hazards, agriculture, recreation, facilities, or resource constraints
Cumulative effects	Describe relevant approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable development
Conflicts	Clearly identify each conflict; do not simply omit unfavorable policies
Recommended response	State whether the conflict warrants denial, redesign, conditions, agreement terms, phased improvements, or a plan/map amendment
Public input	Summarize material public comments and explain how they were considered

2. Adopt a coordinated capacity-verification protocol

Morgan County will develop and maintain a coordinated process for verifying the availability, timing, funding, and long-term maintenance of essential facilities before supporting significant new development or increased development intensity.

As applicable to the proposal, the process should address:

- Culinary-water rights, source capacity, treatment, storage, distribution, pressure, and fire flow.
- Secondary-water availability, irrigation-water protection, ditch systems, and conversion or replacement of agricultural-water facilities.
- Sewer service, wastewater-treatment capacity, onsite wastewater feasibility, septic density, soils, groundwater conditions, and long-term ownership and maintenance.
- Roadway capacity, safe access, intersections, emergency access, bridges, drainage crossings, private roads, rights-of-way, and long-term road maintenance.

DRAFT

- Fire protection, law enforcement, emergency medical response, evacuation, public facilities, parks, trails, schools, and other service demands.
- Drainage, floodplain, geotechnical, wildfire, environmental, and utility-corridor conditions.

The County should coordinate this process with water providers, irrigation companies, the Weber-Morgan Health Department, fire and emergency-service providers, road agencies, utility providers, affected municipalities, and other appropriate agencies.

3. Align land-use decisions with capacity and phasing

Morgan County will use the Future Land Use Map, zoning, subdivision regulations, development agreements, phasing plans, capital-improvement planning, and other lawful tools to ensure that the pace and location of development remain consistent with available infrastructure, public safety, environmental conditions, and the applicable Community Area Plan.

The County will not rely on speculative or unfunded future infrastructure as the sole basis for supporting increased development intensity. Where improvements are needed to serve development, the County will seek enforceable commitments addressing funding, design, permitting, construction timing, ownership, operation, maintenance, replacement, and responsibility for incomplete improvements.

4. Update development-review standards

Morgan County will periodically review and update the Land Use Management Code, subdivision standards, design standards, and administrative-review procedures to implement the Community Area Plans and Countywide Land Use Policies.

Priority topics for review include:

- Safe access, driveway spacing, intersection design, internal circulation, emergency access, and private-road design, ownership, maintenance, snow removal, and funding.
- Water availability, fire-flow capacity, wastewater feasibility, septic density, wellhead protection, irrigation-system protection, drainage, and long-term utility maintenance.
- Floodplain, drainageway, alluvial-fan, steep-slope, wildfire, geologic-hazard, wetland, riparian-corridor, and wildlife-habitat review standards.
- Agricultural compatibility, irrigation facilities, rural access, livestock movement, farm-equipment access, right-to-farm disclosures, and subdivision design that avoids unnecessary fragmentation of working lands.

DRAFT

- Evaluate the feasibility of a limited rural homesite option consistent with Countywide LU Policy 4.1 and determine whether implementing regulations should be pursued.
- Requirements for meaningful open space, park land, trails, pedestrian connections, public gathering areas, and long-term ownership and maintenance.
- Site design, landscaping, lighting, signage, screening, noise, outdoor storage, truck traffic, operating hours, and buffering standards for commercial, industrial, extraction, utility, storage, recreation, resort, and other potentially intensive uses.
- Design standards for village centers, commercial nodes, mountain settings, rural communities, scenic corridors, visible hillsides, and other places where community character is a central concern.

5. Integrate Community Area Plans into capital planning

Morgan County will use the Community Area Plans to inform the County's Capital Improvements Program, transportation planning, park and recreation planning, water and wastewater coordination, public-safety planning, and interagency funding requests.

Priority planning topics include:

- Rural road maintenance, roadway safety, bridge condition, drainage facilities, shoulder improvements, visibility, signage, striping, guardrails, pedestrian crossings, and emergency access.
- Community parks, trails, pathways, sidewalks, trailheads, river or recreation access, gathering places, and other modest public amenities.
- Water-system capacity, storage, fire flow, secondary-water systems, wastewater solutions, and related capital improvements.
- Hazard-mitigation projects involving drainageways, flood-prone areas, alluvial fans, culverts, bridges, debris basins, erosion control, and wildfire resilience.
- Infrastructure and public-facility projects needed to implement development phasing, improve safety, or protect community character.

Capital-planning decisions should distinguish between improvements needed to serve existing residents, improvements needed because of new development, and projects that serve broader County or regional needs.

DRAFT

6. Apply fair-share and long-term maintenance tools

Morgan County will use lawful impact fees, development agreements, exactions, improvement districts, reimbursement agreements, performance guarantees, phasing conditions, and other authorized mechanisms to ensure that development provides or funds its proportionate impacts.

When considering a development proposal, the County should identify:

- The infrastructure, mitigation, amenities, and public services required because of the proposal.
- The timing by which each improvement must be designed, funded, constructed, dedicated, and operational.
- The responsible entity for ownership, operations, maintenance, repair, and eventual replacement.
- The extent to which the proposal benefits existing residents, future residents, or regional users.
- Whether the proposal creates disproportionate financial, safety, or maintenance obligations for current residents, taxpayers, water providers, road agencies, or other service providers.

7. Protect water, watersheds, and agricultural infrastructure

Morgan County will coordinate with water providers, irrigation companies, agricultural operators, state agencies, and affected landowners to protect culinary water, groundwater, springs, wells, streams, wetlands, irrigation systems, ditches, pipelines, water rights, drainage systems, and watershed functions.

The County should support coordinated water, secondary-water, and wastewater solutions where they are technically feasible, legally available, financially sustainable, and protective of existing users and natural resources. Development review should avoid land-use patterns that create excessive dependence on individual wells, unsustainable septic density, unmitigated groundwater contamination risk, or avoidable disruption to water rights and irrigation infrastructure.

8. Protect rural land, open space, and sensitive areas

Morgan County will use the Future Land Use Map, development-review standards, voluntary conservation tools, and coordinated planning to protect agricultural land, grazing areas, river corridors, wetlands, floodplains, drainageways, foothills, hillsides, ridgelines, wildlife habitat, scenic resources, cultural resources, and other sensitive lands.

Where appropriate and feasible, the County should evaluate voluntary conservation easements, trail easements, ~~clustered development, purchase of development rights, transfer of development rights, agricultural-preservation programs, and other tools that respect private-property rights while protecting connected open-space systems and community-defining resources.~~ purchase of

development rights, transfer of development rights, agricultural-preservation programs, and other tools that respect private-property rights while protecting connected open-space systems and community-defining resources. Clustered development may be evaluated only where supported by the applicable Community Area Plan and within the otherwise supported overall density.

Open space associated with development should serve a meaningful function, such as protecting a resource, creating a trail connection, preserving views, providing recreation, maintaining drainage, or preserving agricultural or habitat value, and should not consist primarily of isolated, inaccessible, hazardous, narrow, or leftover land.

9. Plan transportation, access, and emergency response by corridor

Morgan County will prepare, maintain, or coordinate corridor- and area-based transportation and access strategies for locations experiencing development pressure, safety concerns, constrained access, recreation impacts, industrial traffic, or regional travel demands.

Strategies should consider:

- Interstate access, state highways, county roads, local streets, bridges, railroad crossings, private roads, and agricultural-access routes.
- Access management, driveway spacing, intersection operations, sight distance, roadway width, shoulders, drainage, snow removal, rights-of-way, and maintenance responsibilities.
- Safe routes for pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians, school transportation, farm equipment, emergency responders, and recreational users.
- Evacuation and emergency access in canyon, foothill, wildfire-prone, flood-prone, or single-access areas.
- Effects of regional recreation traffic, heavy trucks, extraction uses, resort development, commercial activity, and new residential development.
- Coordination with UDOT, municipalities, railroad interests, emergency-service providers, school representatives, property owners, developers, and other affected entities.

10. Create targeted plans for special areas

Morgan County should prepare focused subarea plans, management strategies, feasibility studies, or regulatory updates when a location has distinct and complex issues that cannot be adequately resolved through a general countywide policy.

Priority examples identified in the community-area chapters include:

DRAFT

Special area or issue	Recommended County action
Lost Creek Reservoir and Croydon/Lost Creek corridor	Coordinate a recreation-management strategy addressing visitor capacity, traffic, parking, sanitation, enforcement, emergency response, road safety, resource protection, and fair allocation of recreation-related service costs
Enterprise foothills and drainage areas	Map and apply appropriate review standards for alluvial fans, canyon mouths, debris-flow areas, drainageways, ditches, and related road/bridge capacity conditions
Mountain Green Village Center	Prepare or maintain a village-center implementation framework addressing land use, building form, architecture, streets, parking, landscaping, lighting, signage, public spaces, pedestrian circulation, phasing, and transition to adjacent neighborhoods.
Mountain Green water, wastewater, and public facilities	Coordinate a long-range capacity and capital strategy with water providers, sewer district, fire providers, developers, and County departments
Deep Creek	Maintain a mapped management framework distinguishing the improved-road frontage area from the remote ranches; evaluate access, temporary recreational use, seasonal structures, wastewater, water quality, erosion, and enforcement needs
Round Valley/Como	Evaluate safe primary and secondary access, bridge/road alternatives, railroad and river-crossing constraints, emergency access, utility feasibility, Morgan City coordination, and future resort/golf-course development conditions
Peterson	Coordinate a water/wastewater and transportation feasibility strategy, including I-84-crossing needs, access, agricultural-water infrastructure, and the relationship between future public sewer capacity and development phasing
Porterville & Richville	Develop a rural and agricultural preservation strategy that includes East Canyon Reservoir resort-area planning, historic/cultural-resource coordination, water and wastewater constraints, rural roads, open space, and voluntary conservation options
Porterville & Richville	Investigate the feasibility of a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) or Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) programs or conservation easement programs that may provide opportunities for permanent open space preservation.

DRAFT

Stoddard	Coordinate planning for Old Highway Road, Stoddard Lane, the I-84/railroad crossing, wetlands/wildlife areas, rural-residential transition, recreation needs, the former dump-site record, and any future gun-range replacement planning

11. Maintain a transparent decision and engagement process

Morgan County will establish and maintain standard project-information materials and engagement procedures for significant planning, development, and infrastructure decisions.

For major proposals, the County should provide:

- A readable location map, Future Land Use Map extract, and description of requested approvals.
- A plain-language project summary explaining the proposed development, intensity, phasing, infrastructure needs, and decision process.
- A concise explanation of applicable countywide and community-area policies.
- Available information regarding water, wastewater, roads, drainage, hazards, environmental conditions, public facilities, fiscal responsibilities, mitigation measures, and expected public benefits.
- Early opportunities for affected residents, property owners, agricultural operators, service providers, public agencies, and other stakeholders to review materials and submit comments before staff recommendations and final action.
- A public record of major commitments made through development agreements, conditions of approval, phasing plans, infrastructure agreements, and mitigation measures.

DRAFT

Amending the General Plan

The General Plan is the County's long-range policy guide for growth, land use, public investment, and community priorities. Because the plan is intended to provide steady direction over time, amendments should be considered carefully and should not be used to respond to short-term development pressure or to make frequent, piecemeal changes. Amendments should be evaluated in light of the General Plan as a whole, with attention to consistency between land use, transportation, trails, utilities, public facilities, housing, emergency planning, and other adopted County policies and plans.

~~The County should periodically review the General Plan and monitor whether updates are needed to respond to changing conditions, new information, adopted public priorities, or changes in state or federal law. **To the extent practical, discretionary amendments to the General Plan should be considered through a consolidated annual review process so proposed changes can be evaluated together and in the context of cumulative impacts, County priorities, and the long-term community vision.** This policy is intended to promote consistency and orderly review, while allowing the County to address limited off-cycle issues when necessary.~~

Purpose and use of amendments

The County will periodically review the General Plan and monitor whether updates are needed to respond to changing conditions, new information, adopted public priorities, or changes in State or federal law. **Public hearings and consideration of proposed General Plan and Future Land Use Map amendments will occur only during a designated annual amendment cycle**, consistent with Countywide LU Policy 2.0. Proposed amendments will be evaluated together to assess their combined effects on community character, infrastructure, public services, natural resources, and the General Plan as a whole. Amendment requests will not be scheduled for separate public hearings or consideration outside the designated annual cycle.

The County strongly discourages General Plan amendments that establish new Recreation/Resort areas, expand existing resort boundaries, or materially increase supported resort development intensity. Any recommendation to approve such an amendment should include specific findings explaining the demonstrated community need, why the proposal cannot reasonably be accommodated within existing supported development areas, its consistency with affected Community Area Plans, and how cumulative traffic, rural-character, environmental, and public-service effects will be addressed. Developer-funded infrastructure and anticipated economic benefits should not, by themselves, establish sufficient justification for the amendment.

DRAFT

When an amendment may be appropriate

The County should generally consider a General Plan amendment only when one or more of the following circumstances exist:

- There is significant new information, a material change in conditions, or a demonstrated community need that was not adequately addressed when the General Plan was adopted or last updated.
- An amendment is needed to correct an inconsistency, error, or omission in the General Plan text or maps.
- An amendment is needed to implement an adopted County priority, respond to a regional issue, or address a change in state or federal law.
- A proposed change would clearly advance the public interest and can be evaluated in a coordinated manner with transportation, infrastructure, public services, environmental constraints, and fiscal considerations.
- A major change in land use pattern, growth area, or development intensity is proposed and the County determines that a coordinated planning effort, such as a small area plan, station area plan, master plan, or similar planning process, is appropriate to support that change.

How to evaluate a proposed amendment

When considering a proposed amendment, the County should evaluate whether the change:

- Supports the overall vision, goals, and direction of the General Plan rather than undermining them.
- Maintains internal consistency among all relevant elements, maps, goals, and policies of the General Plan.
- Can be served by existing or planned transportation facilities, trails, utilities, public facilities, and emergency services.
- Avoids creating unreasonable impacts related to access, public safety, natural hazards, environmental constraints, or the cost of public services.
- Provides a clear public benefit and is not based solely on a site-specific request for additional entitlement or development potential.

Avoiding piecemeal changes

The County should be cautious about frequent site-specific amendments, especially when the proposed change primarily benefits a single property and is not supported by a broader planning rationale. Where a proposal would substantially change land use patterns, development intensity, or service demands, the County should encourage review through a more comprehensive planning effort rather than through a narrow amendment request.

Updates to supporting plans and references

Updates to references, links, titles, or citations to other adopted plans, studies, or supporting documents do not by themselves require a

DRAFT

General Plan amendment. For example, updating references to the Transportation Plan, Trails Plan, emergency management plans, utility plans, capital planning documents, or similar adopted documents should not be treated as a General Plan amendment unless the text, maps, goals, policies, or other substantive content of the General Plan itself must be revised.

Likewise, the County may update or replace supporting plans and implementation documents from time to time without automatically amending the General Plan, so long as those updates remain consistent with the General Plan or do not require changes to its adopted text or maps. If a supporting plan update reveals the need to revise the General Plan's own language, goals, or policies, then the County should consider whether a formal General Plan amendment is appropriate.

Limited exceptions

Nothing in this section is intended to prevent the County from considering an amendment outside the annual review cycle when needed to address an urgent public health or safety issue, comply with a legal requirement, or correct a clear error in the General Plan. Even in those cases, amendments should remain the exception rather than the rule.

General Plan amendment. For example, updating references to the Transportation Plan, Trails Plan, emergency management plans, utility plans, capital planning documents, or similar adopted documents should not be treated as a General Plan amendment unless the text, maps, goals, policies, or other substantive content of the General Plan itself must be revised.

Likewise, the County may update or replace supporting plans and implementation documents from time to time without automatically amending the General Plan, so long as those updates remain consistent with the General Plan or do not require changes to its adopted text or maps. If a supporting plan update reveals the need to revise the General Plan's own language, goals, or policies, then the County should consider whether a formal General Plan amendment is appropriate.

Limited exceptions

Nothing in this section is intended to prevent the County from considering an amendment outside the annual review cycle when needed to address an urgent public health or safety issue, comply with a legal requirement, or correct a clear error in the General Plan. Even in those cases, amendments should remain the exception rather than the rule.

DRAFT

DRAFT

APPENDIX A:

Water Use & Preservation Element

MORGAN COUNTY

Water Use and Preservation Element

December 2, 2025

1. Purpose and Overview

Water is among the county's most valuable and limited natural resources. This element establishes goals, objectives, and implementation measures to ensure that water resources are used efficiently, preserved for future generations, and planned for in coordination with the county's projected growth. This element fulfills the requirement of Utah Code § 17-27a-403(2)(a)(v), which directs counties to include an analysis of the effect of permitted development on water demand and to identify strategies for reducing per-capita water use in both existing and future development.

2. Existing Conditions Summary

Morgan County has historically pursued the vision of safeguarding clean and abundant water resources for future generations by conserving and reusing water whenever possible.

Encourages the use of existing centralized water service systems for new development in preference to individual wells. This provides flexibility in lot sizes, encourages better subdivision design, and provides greater system efficiency.

State of Utah requires water conservation plans of water providers that serve over 500 connections. Morgan County does not provide water services, however, a number of private and municipal water companies serve the majority of the residents and businesses within the County. These water providers are listed in Table 1, with the publicly available additional information regarding the water provider's, number of connections, volume of water rights and annual water usage in Table 2.

Table 1 Water Providers[1]

Amrize	Industrial
Central Enterprise Water Association	Public
Cottonwood Mutual Water Company	Public
Croydon Pipeline Company	Public
East Canyon Resort	Public
East Canyon Resort (Irrigation)	Secondary
Hidden Hollow Water Company	Public
Highlands Water Company	Public
Lost Creek State Park	Public
Monte Verde Water Association	Public
Morgan Secondary Water Association	Secondary
Mountain Green Highway Rest Stop (UDOT)	Public
Mountain Green Secondary Water Company	Secondary
Mountain Green Water Association	Public
Northwest Irrigation Company	Secondary
Peterson Pipeline Association	Public
Richville Pipeline Company	Public
South Robinson Spring Water Users	Public
Wasatch Peaks Ranch	Secondary
Wasatch Peaks Ranch (Culinary)	Public

[1] Water providers that have been identified as having a residential connection in the County.

Table 2 Water Supplier Water Rights Volume, Annual Usage and Connections.

Rights Vol AF	Supplier Name	System	Connections	ANN_USE	YEAR
	Amrize	Industrial		106	2024
132.3	Central Enterprise Water Co.	Public	107	91.0	2024
425.3	Cottonwood Mutual	Public	897	314.5	2024
307.9	Croydon Pipeline Corp.	Public	33	9.7	2024
256.9	East Canyon Resort	Public	12	11.5	2024
	East Canyon Resort (Irrigation)	Secondary	4		2024
13.0	Hidden Hollow Water Co.	Public	35	4.8	2024
850	Highlands Water Co. (Morgan)	Public	596	266.9	2024
	Lost Creek	Public			2024
35.0	Monte Verde	Public		27.5	2024
37.4	Morgan County	Secondary	7		2024
1,888.22	Morgan Secondary Association	Secondary	869		2024
200	Mountain Green Water Association	Public	18	13.5	2024
213.82	Mountain Green Secondary Water Association	Secondary	624		2024
1,614.63	Northwest Irrigation Company	Secondary	78		2024
2.6	Peterson Pipeline Assoc.	Public	168	106.2	2024
374.29	Richville Pipeline Co.	Public	62	17.7	2024
	South Robinson Spring Water Users	Public	12	17.5	2024
2,000	Wasatch Peaks Ranch	Secondary			2024
	Wasatch Peaks Ranch (Culinary)	Public	19	25.34	2024

Division of Water Rights reported data is incomplete, resulting in inconsistent data.

Rights Vol - The sum of the water rights volume for each water right owned in acre feet
ANN_USE - Annual water use reported by the water system in acre feet
YEAR - Year of the reported use

Budget

The County's water budget is determined by comparing expected future use with known rights and reliably available sources of water. The number of expected units by land use type is analyzed, particularly development units that have already been approved through the County land use approval process. Current water use is compared with historic data to estimate dependable availability and sustainability of surface water and well water yields.

Total Rights Volume in Acre Feet for reporting suppliers (excluding Morgan City) = 8,351.35 AF

Total Reported Usage 2024 for all suppliers = 820.6 AF

A projected surplus of at least 7,530.75 AF is available in unincorporated water provider systems.

Future Development

Morgan County's projected growth through the next several decades is provided below.

Table 3

	2020*	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050	2055	2060
Number of Households	3574	4162	4832	5606	6310	7084	7899	8715	9578
Household Size	3.46	3.29	3.12	2.96	2.88	2.79	2.70	2.61	2.53
Morgan City	4,071	5,323	5,936	6,648	7,394	8,180	8,939	9,573	10,170
Mountain Green CDP	4,231	4,886	5,283	5,684	6,115	6,501	6,866	7,324	7,790
Balance of County	3,065	3,487	3,862	4,257	4,675	5,094	5,497	5,863	6,237
Total County Population	**12,295**	**13,462**	**15,080**	**16,590**	**18,184**	**19,775**	**21,301**	**22,772**	**24,207**

2020-2060 AARC = 2.42%

2020-2060 total change = 96.88%

**2020 Census*

County projections from U of U Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute 2022 Long-Range County Population Projections

Municipal/Area projections from Wasatch Front Regional Council 2023 Household and Job Forecast, Unified Transportation Plan

Over time, the average household size in Utah and Morgan County has been decreasing. In contrast to the average household size decreasing by up to 26% by 2050, the total number of household increases by 167%, even when total population only grows by 97%. Smaller households will use less water per capita for indoor uses, but more overall units will potentially use more water for outdoor landscaping irrigation. Water use projections should therefore be weighted towards addressing household needs and not per-capital needs.

Anticipated commercial and residential development reported by Morgan County Planning and Development Department is expected to add 5,276 lots to unincorporated areas, according to currently approved developments and proposals that have entered the county land use approval process. Based on an expected division of land use between roughly 65% housing and 35% commercial development, these lots are projected to consume an additional 3,825 Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs) of water.

Utah Division of Water Resources defines an ERU as 800 gallons per day of home water use at peak day demand. One ERU is equivalent to one single-family unit and approximately 0.9 acre feet of water used annually. This equates to the anticipated development requiring 3,442.59 acre-feet of water to reach buildout without additional conservation or water preservation measures.

Adequate water rights are available to meet projected demand, however the suppliers holding those rights and the actual availability of water are not consistent throughout the county. Morgan County has a role to play in communicating and coordinating with water suppliers on the determination of reliably available water and development around reliable sources.

3. Water Use and Preservation Goals and Objectives

Morgan County water providers are generally small and resources available to dedicate towards proactive water conservation have been limited. Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, Cottonwood Mutual Water Company, and Morgan City have Water Conservation Plans, as mandated by Utah's Water Conservation Act which requires Water Conservation Plans for providers with more than 500 connections. Outside of these conservation plans, details on current water conservation programming are limited and this water element may not be inclusive of all existing conservation efforts in Morgan County.

Goal 1. Integrate Land Use and Water Planning

Objective 1.1: Coordinate closely with water providers when making land use and development decisions.

Policies and Actions:

• Require a Water Supply and Infrastructure Adequacy Report for all large subdivisions and zone changes.

• Maintain GIS mapping of service areas, water sources, and infrastructure to guide land use decisions.

Goal 2. Reduce Per-Capita Water Consumption

Objective 2.1: Decrease countywide municipal and industrial water use by 20% by 2030 relative to 2015 levels.

Objective 2.2: Decrease countywide municipal and industrial water use by 24% by 2040 relative to 2015 levels.

Policies and Actions:

• Encourage all public water suppliers to adopt and report annual water conservation plans consistent with Utah DWR standards.

• Promote installation of smart irrigation controllers and water-efficient fixtures through incentive programs.

• Support implementation of the Utah Water Conservation Plan Act requirements at the municipal and district level.

Goal 3. Promote Water-Efficient Development and Landscaping

Objective 3.1: Reduce outdoor water use in new development by 30%.

Policies and Actions:

• Adopt a Water-Wise Landscaping Ordinance requiring drought-tolerant plants, drip irrigation, and limits on turf coverage.

• Require new commercial and institutional projects to use non-potable water for landscape irrigation where feasible.

• Implement turf conversion programs for public rights-of-way, medians, and parks.

Goal 4. Protect and Preserve Critical Water Resources

Objective 4.1: Safeguard groundwater recharge areas, surface water sources, and riparian corridors from contamination and overuse.

Policies and Actions:

• Designate Watershed Protection Overlay Zones that restrict incompatible uses.

• Coordinate with state and federal partners to protect drinking water source protection zones (DWSPZs).

• Develop stormwater infiltration and recharge projects to enhance aquifer sustainability.

Goal 5. Support Efficient Water Use and System Performance

Objective 5.1: Work with public and private providers to encourage a 10% reduction in water losses from community systems by 2030.

Policies and Actions:

- Encourage water providers to conduct annual water loss audits consistent with AWWA methods.
- Promote replacement or rehabilitation of aging distribution infrastructure to reduce leakage.
- Encourage universal metering of secondary (outdoor) water connections.
- Apply water-use performance standards to County-maintained facilities and promote similar standards for other major water users.

Goal 6. Enhance Drought Resilience and Public Awareness

Objective 6.1: Increase community preparedness and awareness of water scarcity and drought response.

Policies and Actions:

• Develop and adopt a County Drought Contingency Plan with clear trigger levels and demand-reduction measures.

• Provide educational programs on water-wise landscaping, irrigation scheduling, and leak detection.

• Collaborate with Utah State University Extension and local conservation districts for community outreach and training.

4. Implementation Plan

The County's Water Use and Preservation Implementation Plan is outlined in Table 4.

Table 4

Action	Lead Agency	Partners	Timeline	Performance Measure
Adopt Water-Wise Landscaping Ordinance	County Planning Dept.	Water District, Cities	2026	Ordinance adopted
Establish Water-Land Use Coordination Protocol	County Planning, Water Conservancy District	Municipalities	2025	Policy adopted
Develop Drought Resilience Plan	Emergency Management	Water Providers	2027	Plan completion
Replace Aging Water Infrastructure	Public Works	Providers	Ongoing	% loss reduction
Conduct Public Education Campaign	County Extension, Conservation District	USU Extension	Annual	# workshops held

5. Monitoring and Evaluation

Progress on the water goals will be monitored through annual reporting of water use metrics, five-year reviews of this element, and coordination meetings with water providers and conservancy districts to assess data and adjust targets.

6. Water Provider Consultation & Public Outreach

The water companies who were identified as having residential connections were notified that the County was updating their General Plan to include a Water Use and Preservation Chapter in compliance with State Code requirements. The companies were notified both via email and a letter mailed to the contact and address available from the State of Utah's Division Water Rights. The communication invited the water providers to attend one of two virtual meetings that were held on Friday, November 7, 2025 and Monday 10, 2025. They were also invited to participate in a comment review period.

The County held a comment review period from November 5, 2025 through November 21, 2025, where the proposed plan was posted to the General Plan project website (www.morgancounty.planitusa.com) and water providers or County residents could provide feedback by submitting their comments through an online form.

Through the virtual meetings the County was apprised of the following:

- Updating connection numbers
- Many of the public water providers already had conservation plans they were following and the County's plan was also consistent with the State's goals
- Some of the secondary water providers have all of their connections metered

During the comment review period we received three comments that were about the metering they had on their system, request for the County to consider being the provider of utilities, and then there was support that the County was promoting conservation efforts.

7. References

• Utah Division of Water Resources – Integrated Water and Land Planning Guidance (2024)
• Utah Code § 17-27a-403(2)(a)(v)
• Utah State University Extension – Water-Wise Landscaping and Policy Toolkit (2023)
• Water Suppliers – Regional Water Conservation Plans (latest versions)

DRAFT

APPENDIX B:

Amendments to the 2017 Resource Management Plan

Amendments to the 2017 Resource Management Plan

Morgan County originally adopted its Resource Management Plan (RMP) in 2017 to establish policies, objectives, and findings related to the management and use of public lands and natural resources within the County. Since that time, the Utah Legislature has enacted additional requirements, including updates in 2021 that expand and clarify the elements to be addressed in county resource management planning.

This chapter does not replace the 2017 RMP; rather, it amends the existing plan to bring it into alignment with current State Code. The following table summarizes these additions and amendments. Except as expressly amended by this chapter, the remainder of the 2017 Resource Management Plan remains unchanged.

No.	Section/Page	Change Type	Amended To/Description
1	Public Land Access — Section 4.12, "Land Access," pp. 24–25	Amended and expanded existing section	Retitles the section "Public Land Access" and expands the findings to address access for mineral development, utilities, and emergency response in addition to recreation and livestock grazing. Adds policy direction supporting maintenance and improvement of access to federal, state, and SITLA lands; opposing closure or restriction of historic routes without site-specific data, environmental review, and meaningful consultation with the County; documenting and defending valid existing rights-of-way, including RS 2477 routes; and acquiring mutually agreed easements to improve connectivity. Clarifies respect for private property rights when planning trail access.
2	Utility Corridors — No separate section in the 2017 plan; related material in Section 4.6, "Energy Resources," p. 18	Added new section	Adds definitions, findings, economic considerations, objectives, and policies specifically addressing utility corridors. Establishes direction for preserving existing corridors, planning new corridors, coordinating with utilities and public agencies, maintaining access, and improving capacity, reliability, and redundancy. Addresses electrical transmission, pipelines, telecommunications, water delivery, and related infrastructure, together with wildfire prevention, resource protection, and compatibility between facilities.

DRAFT

No.	Section/Page	Change Type	Amended To/Description
3	Pipelines & Other Infrastructure — No separate section in the 2017 plan; related material in Sections 4.4, "Ditches and Canals," pp. 16–17; 4.6, "Energy Resources," p. 18; 4.11, "Irrigation," pp. 23–24; and 4.25, "Water Rights," pp. 45–46	Added new section	Adds a dedicated section addressing electrical transmission; natural gas, oil, hydrogen, and water pipelines; telecommunications; wastewater and stormwater systems; and transportation and rail infrastructure. Provides findings, economic considerations, objectives, and policies supporting infrastructure development, maintenance, and access; water storage and aquifer recharge; water conservation and delivery efficiency; energy-grid resilience; and coordination across agencies and land ownerships.
4	Mineral Resources — Section 4.16, p. 30	Amended and expanded existing section; new map	Retains the existing mineral-resource definition and general support for mineral exploration and development. Adds definitions of critical minerals and rare earth elements and a finding concerning Morgan County's potential dolomite resources and the absence of rare earth extraction activities identified in the cited 2020 source. Adds policy direction recognizing critical-minerals development as a high-priority use, encouraging predictable and streamlined permitting consistent with environmental laws, and supporting reclamation technologies and post-mining beneficial uses.
5	Energy Resources — Section 4.6, pp. 17–18	Amended and expanded existing section	Retains the definition covering renewable and nonrenewable resources and the existing policies addressing federal coordination and energy conservation. Adds an "all-of-the-above" energy policy expressly including renewable resources alongside conventional fuels. Expands the existing renewable-energy policy to favor previously disturbed areas where feasible and avoid or minimize conflicts with prime agricultural lands, key wildlife habitat, and important viewsheds. Adds direction for federal and state agencies to consider County-identified priority areas and constraints when designating renewable-energy zones or reviewing rights-of-way applications.

DRAFT

PUBLIC LAND ACCESS

Definition: The ability to physically and legally access a given parcel of land, typically in the context of roads, rights-of-way (ROWs) and property inholdings. The term "access" also conveys administrative restrictions on the methods or timing of land access, as in non-motorized or seasonal.

OVERVIEW + FINDINGS

The ability to enter on public lands is an important County resource management issue. Access to public lands is directly connected to not only resource management and preservation but it also influences a number of quality-of-life amenities and other County interests.

Access to public lands for recreation purposes, livestock grazing, mineral development, utilities, and emergency response is important to Morgan County. The 2003 Revised Wasatch-Cache National Forest Plan provides various access management goals and policy statements. Additionally, the Morgan County General Plan contains several access-related statements.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN POLICIES

- Encourage Federal land agencies and managers to adopt and implement policies and rules that support continued access to public lands for multiple uses and users. The county supports maintaining and, where needed, improving public access to federal, state, and SITLA lands for recreation, grazing, timber, mineral development, and other multiple uses, subject to safety and resource protection.
- Work with the Federal land agencies and managers to ensure long term access to public lands for agricultural and open space uses. The County opposes closure, decommissioning, or restriction of historic access routes on public lands unless supported by site-specific data, NEPA analysis, and meaningful conversation with the county governing body.
- Require all Federal land agencies and managers to recognize and protect existing access to public lands. The County will assert, document, and defend valid existing rights-of-way, including RS 2477 routes, through coordination, administrative processes, and litigation where necessary and appropriate.
- Maintain access to public lands to support a variety of activities including recreational uses, agricultural and grazing activities, and access to private land. The County encourages acquisition of new easements or rights-of-way across private lands, where mutually agreed, to maintain or improve connectivity to public lands and private inholdings.

ADOPTED AND SUPPORTING MORGAN COUNTY GOAL AND POLICY STATEMENTS:

- *Objective*: Identify, protect and conserve high value wildlife habitat and recreational open space areas (p. 41).
- Provide and protect existing and future access to the Weber River and public lands.
- *Objective*: Provide for a wide range of non-motorized and motorized trail uses including hiking, equestrian, mountain biking, and off-highway vehicles recognizing the substantial amount of privately owned land in the

DRAFT

County and with respect for private property rights.
- Provide for public access to all trails by coordinating with local, state, and federal agencies and private developers to ensure that appropriate public trail connections and access points are planned, constructed, and maintained (p. 42).

PRIORITY DATA SOURCES

Revised Forest Plan Wasatch-Cache National Forest (Rep.). (2003, February). United States Forest Service. <https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5347083.pdf> Accessed 1 April 2017.

UTILITY CORRIDORS

Definition:

Utility corridors are linear tracts of land set aside for the placement of the above and below-ground infrastructure that transports and conveys raw materials, processed materials, and energy. Utility corridors include the areas necessary for the maintenance and access of utilities infrastructure. Common infrastructure found in utility corridors includes electrical transmission lines, petroleum pipelines, natural gas pipelines, water pipelines, and telecommunications conduit.

Overview + Findings

a. Corridors for utility infrastructure are commonplace in Morgan County, crossing private, state, and federal lands.

b. On Forest Service lands, existing utility corridors are identified in the forest plan of each individual national forest.

c. Lands owned by state entities, such as Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA), Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, or private landowners, utility corridors are typically identified as easements on land-title documents. This information can be found at individual county recorder's offices.

d. New utility corridors on state lands, such as those owned by SITLA, the office may issue easements for up to 30-year terms. Utility corridors on private lands require negotiation with individual landowners to establish specific conditions, recordable easement deeds and financial compensation.

e. Establishing a new utility corridor on or through federal land for electrical transmission, pipelines, and other utility infrastructure is a major undertaking that may require years to complete. The design, analysis, public involvement, and documentation required by federal regulations are very complicated. Consider also that regulations and compliance can vary between jurisdictions, regions, and even within agencies. Navigating these processes and protocols can be extremely challenging.

f. Recognizing the complex nature of placing utility corridors on public lands, and considering the growing need for

DRAFT

energy grid improvements, Congress passed the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Section 368 of the act directs federal agencies to: (1) designate energy corridors on federal lands in 11 western states; (2) establish procedures to ensure that additional corridors are identified and designated as necessary; and (3) expedite applications to construct or modify oil, gas, and hydrogen pipelines and electricity transmission and distribution facilities. These corridors are referred to in this document as "Section 368" energy corridors.

g. Standard NEPA analysis procedures must occur again before any utility infrastructure is permitted for construction. The new round of analyses will use specific information about structure types, placement, and disturbance limits to determine potential impacts from the proposed project.

h. Utah's utility corridors and their capacity to accommodate existing and future utility needs was identified as a concern by Utah's Public Lands Policy Coordination Office. The issue of electrical transmission was examined in the 2021 Utah Transmission Study, which concluded that (under scenarios of high renewable energy buildout in southern Utah) transmission needs might exceed transmission capacity (Energy Strategies 2021).

i. Electrical transmission projects under development will largely meet projected future transmission demands according to their most-likely future demand scenario. However, under some scenarios, future need for new electricity transmission in Utah might exceed the capacity of Section 368 energy corridors, especially when considering the future demand for renewable energy development and transmission (O'Neill et al. 2018).

j. Co-location of pipelines within corridors brings new issues of require significant separation distances between pipeline, which may lead to congested corridors with only a few projects. For example, according to NREL, "The location of steel pipelines in the vicinity of AC transmission facilities results in mutual electrical interference problems that can produce damaging effects on both facilities and potentially the public," (BLM ND).

Economic Considerations

1. Power generation in the western United States is transitioning from carbon-based fossil fuels to renewable energy. While power plants in Utah still use coal and natural gas to supply a significant portion of energy generation, the amount of wind and solar power generated is increasing every year. Policies to increase the component of renewable energy coming from the federal, state, and local governments as well as consumer demands, are likely to increase the demand of renewable energy over the coming decade.
2. Morgan County has abundant potential for renewable energy generation, as identified in

DRAFT

the Utah Renewable Energy Zone study. However, these resources are not always near existing transmission infrastructure. As power generators move to develop these resources, there is a need to simultaneously develop the transmission infrastructure needed to convey power to the electric grid.

3. Primary economic consideration for utility corridors is the lengthy time periods and high costs required to navigate the federal permitting and compliance processes to place utilities on federal lands. The recent experience of PacifiCorps' development of the Gateway South transmission project (which crossed federal lands both within and outside of Section 368 energy corridors) took over 10 years to complete (Cox 2021). Such long time periods reduce the ability of utility companies to respond to rapidly changing energy policies, such as carbon reduction goals and development of Utah's renewable energy.
4. The challenging nature of placing utilities across federal lands has economic implications for Morgan County and local governments. For communities that have only one supply line for utilities (e.g., electricity, natural gas, fiber optic), increasing the capacity within an existing utility corridor to provide for growing communities is problematic. Also, attempts to provide redundant utilities to increase robustness and reliability of a given service can be hampered by the lack of multiple utility corridors to connect infrastructure.

Relevant existing policies

Pacificorp Integrated Resources Plan: https://www.pacificorp.com/energy/integrated-resource-plan.html

Morgan County Objectives

a. Proactively plan, coordinate, and provide for the maintenance of existing corridors and future development of new utility corridors across federal and state lands to meet projected county growth and demand.

   1. Meet often with utility companies, cooperatives, the Utah Division of Public Utilities and other applicable state and federal agencies to coordinate efforts related to existing and future utility corridors.
   2. Protect access for utility companies to maintain and improve infrastructure and corridors.
   3. Expedite federal approval processes and policies for the maintenance of utility corridors and new construction projects.
   4. Maintain and update wildland fire protection plans to reduce the risk of wildfire in utility corridors.
   5. Avoid, minimize, and mitigate challenges that utility corridors may present to cultural resources and threatened, endangered, and sensitive species.
   6. Provide redundancy and physical separation for utility facilities needed to serve all populated areas of Morgan County.

DRAFT

7. Work with federal agencies to identify opportunities to increase disturbance caps and seek out additional mitigation opportunities related to threatened, endangered, and sensitive species by providing proactive management and habitat improvements.
8. Support participation in the Section 368 corridor planning process and development.
9. Ensure that sufficient utility corridors are available to provide essential utilities to rural areas of the county including areas with current or future federal designations (e.g., national monuments and roadless areas).
10. Promote feasibility studies for different types of utility transmission, distribution, and collection infrastructure.
11. Support innovation to make existing and future utility corridor infrastructure more efficient, reliable, safe, climate resilient, and sustainable.
12. Support a network of utility corridors for the distribution of crude and refined petroleum products to foreign and domestic markets.
13. Support the development of rail systems where gaps in service exist.
14. Provide access to fiber optic resources in rural Morgan County communities, or equivalent.
15. Ensure that needed water resources are capable of being delivered through existing and future utility corridors to meet the needs of the county's citizens.
16. Support the preservation of the ability to provide a supply of hydrogen to highway arteries, potentially via natural gas pipelines.
17. Utility corridors are needed in Morgan County to maintain affordable, reliant, abundant, and dispatchable energy.

Morgan County Policies

1. The State of Utah is an "all-of-the-above" energy state and utility corridors must be preserved and developed to transport the complete range of energy resources.
2. Morgan County supports the Office of Energy Development's recommendations provided in the Utah Transmission Study and other reports.
3. Morgan County supports expedited corridor planning and approvals to address critical infrastructure needs (refer to Executive Order 13807, Section 5(g)).
4. Support development of utility corridors to accommodate pipelines from the natural gas and crude oil producing areas to refineries, export facilities or to other transportation networks.
5. Federal agencies shall recognize and aid utilities in implementing wildland fire protection plans required of qualified

DRAFT

utilities under Title 54-24-201 of the Utah Code.

6. Interstate transmission lines should provide access for utilization of energy by citizens of the county or supply significant and continual incentives that benefit the citizens of the county.
7. Morgan County will support minimizing impacts to prime and unique soils and irrigable acres to the maximum extent possible when new utility corridors are being considered.
8. Morgan County discourages natural gas vent lines (e.g., pig lines) near electrical transmission and distribution lines, or other non-compatible operations.
9. Every effort should be made to ensure that wildland fires are not caused by utility providers.
10. Support the development and maintenance of effective rail system corridors to support efficient commercial material and energy distribution to markets and diversify economies.
11. Morgan County supports federal appropriations for methane capture while maintaining safety protocols.
12. Morgan County recognizes the economic and educational importance of internet access.
13. Morgan County recognizes that utility infrastructure within established corridors and along major highways is becoming congested, and new areas need to be analyzed and established as corridors to facilitate future growth and demand.

PIPELINES & OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE

Definition:

1. **Electrical Transmission:** Infrastructure used to convey high-voltage electricity from a generation source to load-center substations, where it's transformed into lower-voltage electricity for distribution to end-users.
2. **Hydrogen Pipelines:** Transported manufactured products through networks of pipes and pump stations from production areas to consumers.
3. **Natural Gas Pipelines:** Move natural gas from production areas to end users.
4. **Oil Pipelines:** Transported products that are extracted from the earth through networks of pipes and pump stations from production areas to consumers.
5. **Other Infrastructure:** Other infrastructure includes mechanical wastewater treatment facilities, sewer collection systems, sewage lagoons, and stormwater systems.
6. **Telecommunications:** The infrastructure used to transmit and distribute electronic information. Broadband infrastructure, typically transmitted through fiber optic cable, to connect consumers to the Internet, which allows large quantities of

DRAFT

digital information to be transmitted at high speeds.

7. **Transportation Infrastructure:** Network of major roads, highways, railroads, and other infrastructure used to transport goods and services within and across Utah.
8. **Water Pipelines:** Consist of substantial infrastructure projects used to transport large quantities of water over long distances through varying terrain and elevations from reservoirs and rivers to major population centers and agricultural users

Related Resources:

1. Water Rights
2. Irrigation
3. Canals & Ditches
4. Water Quality
5. Land Use
6. Land Access

Findings

a. Overview: Electrical Transmission

i. The majority of electricity generation and bulk energy transmission capacity in Utah is owned by PacifiCorp (note: Rocky Mountain Power is owned by PacifiCorp). According to company statistics, PacifiCorp serves 948,000 customers in Utah across 26 counties (Cox 2021). Other power generators and distributors in Utah include the Utah Rural Electric Cooperative Association (URECA), Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems, and Intermountain Power Agency (IPA).

1. The URECA is a collective of nine local power generators and transmission companies from six states. Utah members of the cooperative include Deseret Power Electric Cooperative, Dixie Power, Garkane Energy, and Moon Lake Electric Association. Combined, they service about 70,000 utility meters and 250,000 consumers in Utah (J. Peterson, URECA, personal communication, 10/28/2021).
2. UAMP serves one municipality and one public agency in Morgan County – Morgan City and Weber Basin Water Conservancy District. UAMPS generates approximately 25% of the electricity it supplies to its members, purchasing the balance from wholesale providers.
3. The IPA sells power to 23 municipal customers across the state as well as URECA members in Utah, Nevada, and Wyoming. They also sell power to municipal customers in California. These power co-ops and associations purchase transmission capacity on PacifiCorp's transmission infrastructure to provide power to their customers without having to install their own transmission lines. The majority of future planned utility transmission infrastructure in Utah will be owned by PacifiCorp.

DRAFT

ii. Resilience and redundancy of electrical transmission are issues that have been identified by stakeholders. Many rural locations in Utah are served by single transmission lines, referred to as "radial transmission lines." Radial transmission lines are the least costly option for providing some remote locations with electrical power, but they also leave those areas vulnerable to utility disruptions because of their lack of redundancy. Additional transmission connections are costly not only because of their construction costs, but also due to the expense and time required to place utility corridors on federal lands.

b. Natural Gas

i. Production in Utah is located primarily in Uintah and Grand counties (Vanden Berg 2020). Multiple interstate pipelines cross through Utah to transport natural gas from principal producing basins in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, to consumer markets in other states, and for export to foreign markets around the world. The majority of local natural gas transmission infrastructure in Utah is provided by Dominion Energy. The company owns 20,189 miles of transmission and distribution lines and has 1,090,000 customers (Dominion Energy 2020). Dominion Energy produces a large portion of the gas it sells to customers, but it also purchases natural gas from other interstate pipeline companies for delivery to residential, commercial, and industrial customers. around the world. Natural gas can also be produced from renewable sources to create a product known as "renewable natural gas" (RNG).

c. Oil Pipelines

i. According to the Utah Geologic Survey (UGS), Utah is consistently one of the top 15 oil-producing states in the United States (Chidsey 2021). There are Currently no oil pipelines in Morgan County. Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Crude Oil Pipelines, HGL Pipelines, and Petroleum Pipelines (EIA 2020b).

d. Hydrogen Pipelines

i. Presently, Utah has no pipelines designated for transporting compressed hydrogen because the demand for hydrogen as a fuel source is limited. HF Sinclair Midstream operates a 4.48 mile 6" hydrogen pipeline at their Woods Cross refinery within the refinery's operational footprint. But broader use of hydrogen, such as for motor vehicles and freight transport, is uncertain at this time. Wide-spread adoption of hydrogen as a transportation fuel would require a distribution network, either through pipelines or by tanker trucks, to fueling stations throughout the state to alleviate drivers' "range anxiety."

e. Water Pipelines

i. Morgan Aqueduct from Weber Canyon to the North Morgan Water Treatment Plant

f. Telecommunications

i. The State of Utah is committed to deploying and expanding broadband and making it accessible across the entire state. To this end, the 2020 Utah

Broadband Plan identifies a series of goals to meet that goal. The widespread access to high-speed Internet service across rural Utah is due in large part to the UDOT Fiber Program. For the last 20 years, UDOT has been working to install a robust fiber optic network along state highways to connect traffic cameras, digital road signs, weather stations, and other sensors to provide real-time traffic updates (UDOT ND). This fiber-optic backbone also provides access for private companies to connect to broadband Internet networks and provide high-speed Internet to their customers. UDOT established a Public Private Partnership with private telecom companies to connect communities while expanding UDOT's Intelligent Transportation System.

g. Other Infrastructure

i. There are 41 mechanical water-treatment plants in Utah with 2 in Morgan County. These range in capacity from 0.25 million gallons per day (mgd) in Oakley City to 75 mgd at the Central Valley Water Reclamation Facility in Salt Lake City. Statewide, wastewater treatment plants are operating at 65 percent of capacity (WFWQC 2019). A 2019 study of existing sewer pipelines across Utah estimated there are 12,202 miles of sewer pipeline in the state with an average age of 35 years. The same study estimates that 7,320 miles of pipeline will need to be relined or replaced by 2060, and an additional 2,567 miles of new pipeline will need to be installed in the same timeframe (Forsgren 2019). A 2019 study of stormwater pipes across Utah estimated there are 4,673 miles of existing stormwater pipes in the state with an average age of 29 years. The study estimates that 2,395 miles of this pipeline will need to be replaced by 2060, and another 956 miles will need to be installed in the same time period to accommodate new population growth (Forsgren 2019). Water discharged into state waterways from mechanical wastewater treatment plants, sewage lagoons, and stormwater systems are subject to clean-water standards established by the EPA and the Utah Division of Water Quality. Those standards are defined here.

h. Transportation Infrastructure

i. The planning, construction, and maintenance of US interstate highways, state highways, and some local roads in Morgan County are completed through collaboration with UDOT. Roadway planning occurs during the compilation of the Unified Transportation Plan and TransPlan50. The planning process is a unification of multiple transportation plans across the county including local governments, rural planning organizations metropolitan planning organizations, transit districts/authorities, WFRC and UDOT. Construction of new roadways and bridges as well as upgrades to existing infrastructure is prioritized during the planning process.

DRAFT

    i. Railroads

i. The Utah Freight Plan addresses issues and needs specific to the statewide highway and multimodal freight networks. The UDOT, in conjunction with the Utah Transit Authority, also compiled the Utah State Rail Plan, a plan for freight and passenger rail transportation in Utah.

Economic Consideration

a. Electronic Transmission – Rocky Mountain Power and its parent company PacifiCorp employs more than 1,800 people in Utah. Lack of sufficient generation resources during peak demand puts utilities and customers at risk of high prices from the energy market during emergencies. This happened in Texas during February 2021, during which a winter storm and freezing temperatures disrupted one third of Texas's power generation capacity, resulting in astronomical power costs over just two days (Hersher 2021). A robust transmission system can reduce the potential for this kind of problem because transmission connects multiple generation sources across large regions.
b. Natural-gas – distribution companies employ as many as 700 employees in Utah (DWS 2021) with Questar Gas (now Dominion Energy) being the largest natural gas company in the state.
c. Oil Pipelines – Sinclair Oil in Salt Lake City employs 1,200 people (Kolmar 2021).
d. Hydrogen – has only limited use within Utah. This may change in the future if hydrogen is adopted as a transportation fuel or as a large-scale component of utility-scale electricity generation.
e. Water Pipelines – According to the 2020 Statewide Water Infrastructure Plan, over the next 50 years, the State of Utah and municipal water providers will need to spend $20.6 billion to repair and replace existing infrastructure and another $17.6 billion for new infrastructure and to develop new water supplies for future growth (BRWCD et al. 2020). The five river basins with the highest estimated costs are Bear River Basin, Kanab Creek/Virgin River Basin, Weber River Basin, Utah Lake Basin, and the Jordan River Basin. The construction cost of the Pine Valley Pipeline Project is estimated at $254 million. The Bear River Development Project could cost between $1.5 billion and $2.8 billion, depending on the ultimate project design constructed (UDWR 2019). The Lake Powell Pipeline is estimated to cost between $1.5 billion and $3.2 billion (Utah Water Law 2016.).
f. Telecommunications – The Utah Broadband Advisory Council considers broadband essential to economic success (UBAC 2020). Broadband is essential for Utah businesses because it allows them to be nationally and internationally competitive. The technology also promotes entrepreneurship, attracts investments, and supports state and municipal governments. The partnerships developed through the UDOT Fiber Program have saved the state an estimated $105.8 million while connecting many parts of Utah to high-speed Internet service.

DRAFT

g. Other Infrastructure – The present value of existing wastewater treatment facilities in Utah is estimated to be $4 billion (Reclaim 60 ND). However, wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities must be maintained to operate effectively. Utah faces an additional cost of $5.3 billion for infrastructure renewal and replacement, and another $1.3 billion for upgrades to meet future regulatory requirements. New infrastructure required to meet the needs of population growth across Utah is expected to cost $2.1 billion. Over the next 40 years, the total cost for wastewater treatment has been estimated to be $8.7 billion (Reclaim 60 ND). (Recent study by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality) In addition to wastewater treatment facility costs, other infrastructure must be replaced or upgraded over the next 40 years. Wastewater pipelines represent a cost of $4.3 billion, sewer lagoons are expected to cost $432 million, and stormwater-collection systems are estimated to cost $1.3 billion (Reclaim 60 ND).
h. Transportation Infrastructure – The Unified Plan determined a total of $108.5 billion would be needed between 2019 and 2050 to fund the maintenance of current infrastructure, to expand capacity of existing roads, and to build new roads. This estimate also includes funds for upgrading transit and railway infrastructure (UDOT et al. 2021). Funding for the construction and maintenance of major highway infrastructure is provided by federal and state funds, which are generated from fuel taxes, vehicle registrations, and general funds.

Relevant Existing Policies

1. Weber Basin Water Conservancy District Water Conservation Plan
2. Utah Digital Access and Connectivity Plan https://connecting.utah.gov/digital-connectivity-plan/
3. Wasatch Front Regional Council Regional Transportation Plan

Morgan County Objectives

1. Considering Utah's arid environment and the world's changing climate conditions, the need for sufficient and reliable water, energy, and critical resources, the need for storage and related infrastructure is ever increasing. Therefore, to ensure Utah's ongoing drought resilience, energy security, and to provide for current and future needs, the county supports efforts to build and invest in necessary infrastructure, including additional pipelines, dams, reservoirs, above and below-ground storage facilities, and other feasible infrastructure.

1. Provide countywide economic opportunities and resilience for Morgan County communities.
2. Develop and allow pipelines and sufficient infrastructure to meet Morgan County's current and future needs.
3. Ensure that project continuity issues on public lands do not inhibit project implementation.
4. Explore opportunities for above and below-ground water storage at different

DRAFT

scales, finalize projects that have been proposed and vetted, and complete appropriate projects that were never constructed.

5. Conduct feasibility studies to prioritize water storage and pipeline projects and become proactive to capitalize on high water flows during flood years.
6. Improve techniques and the utilization of aquifer storage and recovery.
7. Efficient and timely delivery of water and energy resources without damaging infrastructure.
8. Support innovative and proven technologies to line earthen and concrete canals to reduce water loss and increase transportation efficiency.
9. Increase pipeline capacity and availability to decrease evaporation and unnecessary loss.
10. Form partnerships with stakeholders and obtain funding from the Bureau of Reclamation to form partnerships that benefit communities.
11. Apply for grants to improve water delivery systems.
12. There may be a future need to supply hydrogen along major highway arteries. There are several different methods of utilizing hydrogen opportunities that need to be further studied and strategically implemented. Avoid hydrogen production that requires excessive water consumption.
13. Investigate and strategically support and implement hydroelectric production by using new technology such as in-pipe hydro systems within existing and future pipelines.
14. When feasible, and in the best interest of the local communities, encourage the maintenance required to avoid decommissioning hydroelectric power facilities.
15. Develop infrastructure projects aimed at recharging depleted aquifers.
16. Encourage xeriscaping policies, incentive programs, and educational campaigns to reduce water usage and reliance on public lands.
17. Increase watershed yields through active management of forests and other vegetated areas.
18. Support programs like Shared Stewardship and the Watershed Restoration Initiative to enhance water yields.
19. Support the implementation of the Utah State Water Plan on public lands.
20. Strategically promote watershed restoration and flood abatements after wildfires to improve soil retention, improve water quality, and reduce downstream impacts caused by flooding, siltation, and debris flows.

DRAFT

21. Incorporate silt traps and other mechanisms to trap silt upstream and keep it from entering water treatment plants and downstream reservoirs that will ultimately need to be dredged when their storage capacity is reduced.
22. Mitigate the "use-it-or-lose-it mentality" by providing alternative options to water consumers (e.g. water banking) on public lands.
23. Support innovation to make existing and future water storage and delivery systems more efficient, reliable, safe, climate friendly, and sustainable.
24. Support a network for the distribution of natural gas, crude oil, and refined petroleum products to domestic and foreign markets.
25. Develop agreements with federal agencies to make it possible to maintain and improve dams, impoundments, and other facilities on federal lands with limited access in a timely and economically feasible manner.
26. Encourage the use of Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) to quickly identify water leaks reducing wasted water. The technology also allows remote monitoring and manipulation (valves, flow rates, pressure, etc.) of water conveyance infrastructure.
27. Strengthen the backbone of Utah's energy grid for future energy loads
28. Improve interstate energy market connections through the Western EIM
29. Change generation sources to include greater renewable contingents.

Morgan County Policies

1. The County supports coordinated efforts across all agencies, governments, tribal nations, and other land ownerships on infrastructure projects to minimize delays.
2. The County encourages and requests federal appropriations for water infrastructure, including pipelines, water storage, and aquifer recharge.
3. The County supports active forest management to increase water yields and water quality.
4. The County supports active forest management to decrease water quality issues from wildfire, flooding, etc., which impacts water storage, water treatment, and water delivery systems.
5. The County supports the plans and strategies presented by the Shared Stewardship Program, Watershed Restoration Initiative, and the Utah Division of Water Resources.
6. The County will support the Utah Watershed Council Act.
7. The County encourages water conservation measures, education, and incentives.

DRAFT

8. The County supports maintaining access to water in the Colorado River and its access to state and county owned shares that have not been fully exercised because of access and transportation limitations.
9. The County supports the development of pipelines from the natural gas and crude oil producing areas to refineries, export terminals, or to other associated transportation systems.
10. The County discourages natural gas vent pipes (e.g., pig lines) near electrical transmission and distribution lines, or any other non-compatible operations.
11. The County supports federal appropriations for methane capture while maintaining safety protocols.
12. The County supports the effort to conserve water by creating hydrogen through natural gas, coal, and other sources.
13. The County supports creating a strategy to provide consumers with hydrogen access along major transportation arteries, if or when, markets support this energy transference option in the future.
14. The County supports and encourages the maintenance and development of pipelines and infrastructure that improve the county's market share and improve the quality of life for Utahns, provided such can be maintained and developed in a sustainable manner.
15. The County opposes the creation of pipelines and infrastructure to remove water resources from the state of Utah to transport it to other states.
16. The County expects pass-through pipelines and associated infrastructure to continually benefit the citizens of Utah and communities.
17. The County desires unimpeded and timely access to water storage facilities on federal lands to feasibly improve and maintain infrastructure to address water storage needs.
18. The County supports the completion of the Central Utah Project as originally proposed to fulfill all promises made to Uintah Basin counties to mitigate for the transfer of water to the Wasatch Front.
19. The County supports projects that conserve water by the lining of ditches and canals.
20. The County supports the preservation of existing hydroelectric facilities and construction of new facilities, including in-pipe hydro systems and other innovative technologies.
21. The County supports the construction and operation of pipelines and other infrastructure to enable the production and transportation of mineral resources from federal lands.

DRAFT

MINERAL RESOURCES

DEFINITION:

Known geologic deposits and either located on the ground surface or below and used for the benefit of society through various processes.

"Critical minerals" are defined by the US Geological Survey as those necessary for economic or national security and have a supply chain vulnerable to disruption.

"Rare earth elements" are defined by the USGS as a group of 17 naturally occurring metallic elements with highly similar physical and chemical properties. Despite their name, they are neither rare nor earths. Rather, they are relatively abundant in the Earth's crust but are difficult to extract because they are rarely found in concentrated or easily accessible deposits.

OVERVIEW + FINDINGS

In 2020, Morgan County was identified by the Utah Geological Survey as a potential source of dolomite, but no rare earth mineral extraction activities were then extant within the County (https://doi.org/10.34191/c-129).

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN POLICIES

- Mining and mineral resource exploration and development occurring on public lands is consistent with the multiple use philosophy for management of public lands. The County will encourage Federal land agencies and managers to adopt and implement policies and rules that support continued use of public lands for mineral resource benefits.
- Federal agencies should recognize critical minerals development as a high-priority use and consider streamlined, predictable permitting processes, consistent with environmental laws and subject to best management practices for reclamation, water quality, and habitat protection.
- The development of mining and mineral resources shall be conducted in a manner that minimizes, to a reasonable and feasible extent, adverse impacts to air and water quality in accordance with local, state, and federal standards. The County encourages use of up-to-date reclamation technologies to restore disturbed lands and support post-mining beneficial uses.

ENERGY RESOURCES

DEFINITION:

Renewable or nonrenewable resources utilized by private and public utilities to obtain energy.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN POLICIES:

- The County supports an "all-of-the-above" energy portfolio that includes renewable resources alongside conventional fuels, consistent with state policy. The County will coordinate and cooperate with Federal land agencies and managers on the permitting and location of any energy generation and transmission facilities, including power, gas, and petroleum products, to insure such facilities are located as determined appropriate by Morgan County. The County will, as necessary, become a cooperating or a

DRAFT

coordination agency in all Federal processes as required or allowed under the National Environmental Policy Act, or any other federal statute or rule.

- Promote renewable energy development on public lands uses previously disturbed areas, where feasible, and avoids or minimizes conflict with prime agricultural lands, key wildlife habitat, and important viewsheds.
- Promote the efficient use of natural resources and the conservation of energy on public lands.
- Federal and state agencies should consider county-identified priority areas and constraints when designating renewable energy zones or processing ROW applications.
- The county supports timely and coordinated permitting for renewable generation and associated transmission where local land-use, environmental, and cultural resource concerns are addressed.

DRAFT

OUR LAND, OUR COMMUNITIES

Excerpt of the Land Use Element of the Morgan County General Plan

Land Use Element

Future Place Types

The Future Place Types chapter establishes the County's long-range framework for the type, scale, character, and general location of future development and conservation throughout unincorporated Morgan County. The place types are applied on each Community Area Future Land Use Map and provide a common vocabulary for residents, property owners, developers, staff, and decision-makers to discuss what kinds of land uses and development patterns may be appropriate in different parts of the County.

~~They~~ Future Land Use Place Types are intended to guide thoughtful planning and early evaluation of development concepts before a specific application is submitted, helping proposals respond to community character, infrastructure capacity, natural resources, access, public facilities, and other local conditions. The place types range from agricultural, rural, conservation, and open-space areas to residential neighborhoods, village and commercial centers, employment and industrial areas, recreation and resort areas, civic facilities, and overlays or planned-community frameworks. Place types are not zoning districts or development entitlements; rather, they guide future zoning, development review, capital planning, and decisions regarding whether a proposal is consistent with the General Plan and the applicable Community Area Plan.

The County recognizes residents' strong preference to preserve existing rural conditions and avoid additional growth. This Plan does not establish a growth target or broadly support increased rural residential density. It retains limited opportunities for compatible development within the prevailing rural framework and through specifically identified locations or narrowly defined, adopted exceptions. These opportunities are intended to remain limited in their cumulative effect and should not become a basis for incremental conversion of agricultural lands or continuous development along rural roads.

DRAFT

Place Type Implementation

The zoning districts associated with each Future Place Type identify potential implementation options, not an expectation that every listed district or lot size will be appropriate on every property. Where a place type includes a range of rural lot sizes, the predominant pattern described for that place type will guide County decisions. Consideration of smaller lots will depend on the proposal's location, arrangement, relationship to surrounding lands, and consistency with the applicable Community Area Plan. A mapped designation alone does not establish support for a particular rezoning, density, or development configuration.

The predominant implementation column identifies districts that may maintain the intended character of a place type; it does not establish support for increasing the residential density of every property within that designation. The limited or location-specific implementation column identifies additional options that may be considered only where supported by location-specific Community Area Plan direction or a separately adopted exception framework. Such direction or framework should identify eligible locations or circumstances, allowable density or development scale, and approval criteria. A general place-type designation on the Future Land Use Map does not, by itself, establish that eligibility.

The following table identifies each Future Place Type, its predominant implementing zoning districts, and any limited or location-specific implementation options available within Morgan County's Development Code.

~~The following table lists the future land use place-type and the implementing zoning district of the place type that currently exists in Morgan County's Development Code.~~

DRAFT

Morgan County PLACE TYPE	~~Implementing Zoning District~~Baseline Implementation & Existing Density Framework	Limited & Location Specific Implementation
LP-AG **Large Parcel Agriculture**	F-1: Forestry District MU-1 60: Multiple Use District	*None identified.*
Large rural parcels used for agriculture, grazing, forestry, conservation, and other low-intensity activities. These areas often include steep terrain, watersheds, habitat, and scenic landscapes. Development should remain very limited and secondary to working-land, natural-resource, and rural-character objectives~~Areas kept largely free of development to protect natural features, steep slopes, waterways, and habitat, and to provide trails and passive recreation. Includes public parks, greenways, conservation easements, and other lands where open space is the primary, long-term use.~~		
AG **Agricultural/Working Lands**	F-1: Forestry District MU-1 60: Multiple Use District A-20: Agriculture District	*None identified.*
Large contiguous areas of active farming and ranching with farmsteads, irrigation infrastructure, and associated ag support uses. Residential uses are very low density and clearly secondary so that crop production, pasture, grazing, and related operations remain the dominant use and visual character.		
RL **Rural Living**	A-20: Agricultural District	~~RR-1: Rural Residential District~~ RR-2.5: Rural Residential District RR-5: Rural Residential District RR-10: Rural Residential District

DRAFT

Morgan County PLACE TYPE	~~Implementing Zoning District~~Baseline Implementation & Existing Density Framework	Limited & Location Specific Implementation
~~Large-lot homes and hobby farms that maintain a landscape-dominated, with a rural and "country" character. Lots typically allow limited animals and small-scale agriculture, with rural road standards and reduced urban services compared to suburban neighborhoods.~~ Low-density rural areas defined by larger parcels, rural homes, open fields, pasture, small-scale agriculture, and meaningful separation between homes. A-20 is the baseline implementing district where it is the existing zoning. Existing lawful rural residential zoning and development are recognized, but the Rural Living designation does not, by itself, establish support for increased residential density or extension of smaller-lot zoning onto adjoining properties. Retain the existing density framework unless a change is supported by location-specific Community Area Plan direction or an adopted exception framework identifying eligible locations or circumstances, allowable density, and approval criteria. New rezonings to RR-10, RR-5, or RR-2.5 that increase residential density may be considered only under that direction or framework; these districts are not the expected outcome throughout mapped Rural Living areas. Infrastructure availability, site suitability, nearby smaller lots, or an applicant's intended family use should not, by themselves, justify increased density. Development should retain the open rural landscape, protect agricultural operations and irrigation facilities, and preserve meaningful separation between homes and working lands. Avoid continuous frontage-lot, linear, second-tier, or suburban-style development patterns that would incrementally convert rural or agricultural areas into continuous residential development.		
RC **Rural Corridor**	RR-5: Rural Residential District RR-10: Rural Residential District	R1-20: Residential District RR-1: Rural Residential District RR-2.5: Rural Residential District

DRAFT

Morgan County PLACE TYPE	~~Implementing Zoning District~~Baseline Implementation & Existing Density Framework	Limited & Location Specific Implementation
		CH: Highway Commercial District NC: Neighborhood Commercial
~~Linear patterns of rural residential, agricultural, and small-scale commercial or service uses fronting a rural highway or main road. Primarily auto-oriented, with scattered businesses that support nearby residents and agricultural activity while retaining a largely open, rural setting.~~ Established rural highway and main-road areas containing rural residences, agricultural properties, and limited commercial or service uses. The intended development pattern varies by corridor segment. Specifically identified locations may accommodate additional rural residential development or limited commercial activity, while other areas should retain existing larger-parcel density, working lands, and open frontages. Existing one-acre zoning along rural roads is recognized as part of the established zoning framework, but it should not be treated as the preferred future development pattern for the entire corridor. The Rural Corridor designation does not support extending that zoning onto adjoining agricultural lands, deepening narrow roadside zoning strips, or creating additional tiers of smaller-lot development behind them. New discretionary zoning and development decisions should avoid perpetuating continuous one-acre or half-acre frontage development and should preserve meaningful open-land separation, agricultural operations, and safe, coordinated access. A general Rural Corridor designation does not, by itself, establish support for increased residential density or commercial zoning. Changes to the existing density framework or land-use pattern should be supported by location-specific Community Area Plan direction or an adopted exception framework identifying eligible locations or circumstances, allowable density or development scale, and approval criteria. Existing zoning, infrastructure availability, nearby smaller lots, or existing businesses should not independently justify additional intensity or extension of a supported development pattern beyond its identified location. Commercial development should be concentrated in supported locations rather than distributed continuously along the corridor.		

DRAFT

Morgan County PLACE TYPE	~~Implementing Zoning District~~Baseline Implementation & Existing Density Framework	Limited & Location Specific Implementation
~~SN~~- RN ~~Suburban~~ Residential **Neighborhood**	R1-8: Residential District R1-12: Residential District	R1-20: Residential District
Predominantly single-family residential areas on standard ~~suburban~~ residential lots in a mostly auto-oriented street pattern. These neighborhoods provide conventional detached-home development at a lower intensity than Village Residential Neighborhoods. May include some small parks, schools, and churches, and other compatible civic uses, with connectivity to nearby commercial areas and modest sidewalks or trails where appropriate.		
VRN **Village Residential Neighborhood**	R1-8: Residential District R1-12: Residential District RM-7: Multiple Residential District	RM-15: Multiple Residential District NC: Neighborhood Commercial
Neighborhoods with a mix of house-scale housing types, such as small lots, cottages, townhomes, and small multifamily, in a walkable pattern. Overall ~~D~~densities are slightly higher than typical single-family ~~suburbs~~ but still neighborhood-scaled, often near a Village ~~Mixed Use~~Commercial Center. The limited commercial will typically be small-scale commercial nodes embedded in or next to neighborhoods that provide daily goods and services. Uses might include convenience retail, cafes, and personal services sized to serve nearby residents, with building and site design compatible with the neighborhood context. Residential densities in this place type will not exceed more than15 dwelling units per acre.		
VCC **Village Commercial Center**	NC: Neighborhood Commercial District CS: Commercial Shopping District	TC: Town Center District

DRAFT

Morgan County PLACE TYPE	~~Implementing Zoning District~~Baseline Implementation & Existing Density Framework	Limited & Location Specific Implementation
Generally more compact, walkable commercial centers with shops, services, civic uses, and optional housing organized around streets and public spaces. Primary character is commercial and civic; housing may be included consistent with the center's role and approved through base zoning or Planned Community tools and will be at residential densities of not more than 15 dwelling units per acre.		
CC **Commercial Centers & Corridors**	CS: Commercial Shopping District CH: Highway Commercial District GC: General Commercial District BP: Business Park District TPC: Technical and Professional Campus District	*None identified*
Larger commercial areas and corridors with shopping centers, restaurants, offices, and auto-oriented services drawing customers from across the community or region. Often located along major roads or at key intersections, with higher traffic volumes, shared access, and opportunities for reinvestment or partial retrofits toward more walkable patterns.		
EI **Employment & Industrial**	LM: Light Manufacturing District I: Industrial District BP: Business Park District CB: Commercial Buffer District	*None identified*
Areas reserved for job-producing uses such as offices, light and general industrial, warehousing, logistics, and the airport. Sometimes they may be in business park or campus settings. Non-industrial uses are limited so the district remains primarily		

DRAFT

Morgan County PLACE TYPE	~~Implementing Zoning District~~Baseline Implementation & Existing Density Framework	Limited & Location Specific Implementation
employment-focused, with site design managing truck access, noise, and screening next to more sensitive areas.		
REC **Recreation/Resort**	RSD: Resort Special District *Existing lawful zoning & approvals only*	*No additional resort zoning or expansion supported by this designation alone*
~~Resort, recreation, and tourism-focused areas with lodging, second homes, and recreation facilities such as ski areas, golf courses, or destination parks. These places often combine visitor lodging with amenities and significant open space and can generate seasonal population and traffic peaks.~~ Areas recognizing existing lawful resort zoning, approved resort development, and associated recreation uses. This designation is not intended to establish new resort growth areas or encourage additional destination-oriented residential, lodging, or commercial development. The County strongly discourages new Resort Special District zoning, expansion of existing resort areas, and discretionary increases in approved development intensity that would increase through-traffic, compromise rural character, or place additional demands on surrounding communities. Existing lawful zoning, approvals, and applicable development agreements should guide development within established resort areas. Private ownership, restricted access, and developer-funded infrastructure do not, by themselves, establish a public recreation benefit or justify additional resort development. Any proposal requiring new zoning, a geographic expansion, or development intensity beyond that supported by the Plan should be considered through the applicable General Plan amendment and public-review processes.		
CIV **Civic**	VARIES	*None identified*
Sites for public and quasi-public uses such as schools, government buildings, emergency services, utilities, libraries, and other community facilities. These areas		

DRAFT

Morgan County PLACE TYPE	~~Implementing Zoning District~~Baseline Implementation & Existing Density Framework	Limited & Location Specific Implementation
provide essential services, gathering spaces, and institutions that support the broader community and surrounding neighborhoods.		
AO **Airport Overlay**	AOZ: Airport Overlay Zone	*None identified*
Areas within and around the airport where additional land use, height, and design standards apply to protect aviation operations, public safety, and noise-sensitive uses. Underlying place types and zoning remain in effect, but are modified by overlay regulations to retain compatible uses in relation to airport flight paths and facilities.		
PC **Planned Community**	PC: Planned Community Zoning District	*None identified*
Any Planned Community (PC) Zoning District can implement any of the County's Future Place Type Land Uses. Planned Community should not be used to circumvent the purpose of the Future Land Use Map, infrastructure requirements, natural-resource protections, or compatibility standards applicable to the site.		

DRAFT

Morgan County Zoning Districts' Average Densities

Zoning District	Minimum Area	Avg Density
MU-160	160 AC	<0.1 DU/AC
F-1	¼ section	<0.1 DU/AC
A-20	20 AC	<0.1 DU/AC
RR-10	10 AC	<1 DU/AC (0.1 DU/AC)
RR-5	5 AC	<1 DU/AC (0.2 DU/AC)
RR-2.5	2.5 AC	<1 DU/AC (0.4 DU/AC)
RR-1	1 AC	1 DU/AC
R1-20	20,000 SF	2 DU/AC
R1-12	12,000 SF	3.6 DU/AC
R1-8	8,000 SF	5.5 DU/AC
RM-7	7,000 SF/6K SF/5K SF	6.2 to 8.8 DU/AC
RM-15	8,000 SF/3.5K SF/3.5K SF	~11 DU/AC

DRAFT

DRAFT

Agricultural and rural places

LP-AG — Large Parcel Agriculture

The Large Parcel Agriculture place type is intended for the County's most rural, expansive, and resource-sensitive landscapes. These areas generally include large tracts with significant topographic constraints, forested lands, watersheds, waterways, wildlife habitat, steep slopes, scenic viewsheds, or other natural features that make intensive development inappropriate or undesirable. The place type is also appropriate for lands whose long-term value lies in maintaining open landscapes, passive recreation opportunities, trail connections, conservation areas, and rural separation between more developed communities.

Development within Large Parcel Agriculture areas should remain very limited and carefully located. Where development occurs, it should avoid sensitive lands; preserve the prevailing open character; minimize grading, vegetation removal, and visual impacts; and maintain access to public lands, waterways, trails, and other natural resources where appropriate. Agricultural, forestry, open-space, conservation, recreation, and similarly low-intensity uses are characteristic of this place type. Residential development, if permitted, should occur at very low densities and should be secondary to the preservation of land, natural systems, and rural character.

The F-1 Forestry District and MU-160 Multiple Use District are the principal zoning tools that may implement this place type. These districts generally support densities below 0.1 dwelling unit per acre and are intended to retain large, predominantly undeveloped parcels.

AG — Agricultural/Working Lands

The Agricultural/Working Lands place type is intended to sustain Morgan County's working farms, ranches, grazing lands, farmsteads, irrigation systems, and other lands that contribute to the County's agricultural economy, history, landscape, and identity. These areas are characterized by large, contiguous parcels that can support crop production, pasture, livestock operations, hay production, orchards, agricultural processing and storage, and related agricultural-support activities.

Maintaining the long-term viability of agriculture is the central purpose of this place type. Land-use decisions should seek to limit fragmentation of productive agricultural

DRAFT

ground, protect irrigation infrastructure and water access, reduce conflicts between agricultural operations and nearby nonagricultural development, and preserve the open views and working-land character that distinguish Morgan County. New residential development should remain very low density, should be clearly subordinate to agricultural use, and should be designed to avoid unnecessarily converting productive land or constraining normal agricultural practices.

Appropriate implementing districts include the F-1 Forestry District, MU-160 Multiple Use District, and A-20 Agriculture District. These districts provide for large parcels and very low average residential densities, generally below 0.1 dwelling unit per acre, while allowing the agricultural and natural-resource uses that define this place type.

RL — Rural Living

~~The Rural Living place type provides for large-lot residential development in settings where a country character, open landscape, and lower level of public infrastructure are important community objectives. These areas commonly include homes on parcels large enough to accommodate limited agricultural activity, gardens, animals, outbuildings, hobby farms, and other uses compatible with a rural lifestyle. The visual character is defined more by open land, vegetation, agricultural features, and separation between homes than by continuous suburban streetscapes.~~

~~Development in Rural Living areas should preserve the appearance and function of a rural landscape. New subdivisions and individual homes should be designed to respect natural topography, drainage patterns, agricultural uses, scenic resources, and the capacity of roads, water systems, wastewater facilities, and emergency services. Rural roadway standards, limited curb-and-gutter improvements, and reduced levels of urban service may be appropriate where they are consistent with public health, safety, and environmental protection. Development should avoid creating expectations for urban services that are inconsistent with the intended rural character of the area.~~

~~The RR-1, RR-2.5, RR-5, and RR-10 Rural Residential Districts may implement this place type. These districts support lot sizes from approximately one to ten acres and average residential densities ranging from about one dwelling unit per acre in RR-1 to roughly 0.1 dwelling unit per acre in RR-10.~~

DRAFT

Rural Living is intended to retain Morgan County's established low-density rural settlement pattern, where larger residential parcels, open fields, pasture, small-scale agriculture, and meaningful separation between homes remain defining features. The designation recognizes rural residential use within a landscape that remains predominantly open and agricultural in character. It is not intended to establish a general growth area, encourage conversion of working agricultural land into residential subdivisions, or signal that smaller rural lots will become appropriate as infrastructure becomes available.

A-20 is the baseline implementing district where it is the existing zoning. Existing lawful RR-10, RR-5, RR-2.5, and other rural residential zoning and development are recognized, but their presence does not establish support for extending those districts onto adjoining properties. The Rural Living designation identifies the intended rural character of an area; it does not establish a general transition from agricultural zoning to rural residential zoning or independently support increased residential density.

The County should not support discretionary changes to RR-10, RR-5 or RR-2.5 unless the applicable Community Area Plan and Future Land Use Map expressly identify the location for that pattern, or separately adopted Community Area Plan provisions or County regulations establish a narrowly defined exception framework. Any such framework should identify eligible locations or circumstances, allowable density, approval criteria, and measures to protect the surrounding rural and agricultural landscape. Where no applicable location or exception framework has been adopted, a proposal seeking smaller-lot zoning will require adoption of the necessary General Plan amendments before the requested rezoning.

Adequate water, wastewater disposal, road access, or other infrastructure is necessary for development but does not independently justify increased density. Site suitability, proximity to existing smaller lots, an applicant's intended family use, or the ability to construct additional infrastructure should not, by themselves, establish support for smaller-lot zoning or a more intensive development pattern.

Where development is consistent with existing zoning or an expressly supported development opportunity, its location and arrangement should protect working agricultural land, irrigation facilities, natural drainageways, scenic views, and meaningful open-land separation. Avoid repetitive frontage lots, linear or second-tier residential

DRAFT

development along rural roads, and subdivision patterns that cumulatively convert the surrounding landscape into a continuous residential area. New roads, driveways, grading, and utility extensions should be limited to those necessary to serve the supported development pattern and should not create a basis for additional intensification.

Clustering, Planned Community zoning, and development agreements should not independently establish support for additional dwelling units, smaller-lot zoning, or a departure from the applicable Community Area Plan. Where a community plan supports an alternative lot arrangement, that arrangement should remain within the supported overall density and provide meaningful, durable protection of agricultural or open land. Where community policies discourage clustering or concentrated residential forms, those policies should guide the development pattern.

RC — Rural Corridor

~~The Rural Corridor place type recognizes established linear development patterns along rural highways, arterial roads, and other important transportation routes. These areas may include a mix of rural residences, agricultural properties, small businesses, service uses, and limited neighborhood-serving commercial activity. Rural Corridors are generally auto-oriented because of their highway or main-road location, yet they should retain the open setting, agricultural context, and scenic qualities that distinguish Morgan County from more urbanized areas.~~

~~Future growth in Rural Corridors should be carefully managed to avoid continuous strip commercial development, unsafe access patterns, excessive signage, and visual clutter. Commercial and service uses should be limited in scale and selected based on their ability to serve nearby residents, travelers, and agricultural operations without undermining the rural setting. Shared driveways, coordinated access, appropriate setbacks, landscaping, screening, and context-sensitive building design should be encouraged. Residential development should remain compatible with the corridor's transportation function, nearby agricultural activity, and surrounding rural neighborhoods.~~

~~The RR-1 and RR-2.5 Rural Residential Districts, R1-20 Residential District, CH Highway Commercial District, and NC Neighborhood Commercial District may be used to~~

DRAFT

~~implement this place type, depending on the corridor's specific location, land-use pattern, infrastructure, and access conditions.~~

Rural Corridor recognizes the varied conditions along established rural highways, main roads, and arterial routes, where rural homes, agricultural properties, existing businesses, and transportation functions may occur together. Its purpose is to guide development according to the intended character of each designated corridor segment—not to establish a continuous growth strip or make all land along a roadway eligible for smaller-lot residential or commercial development.

The development pattern supported within Rural Corridor areas should be established by the applicable Community Area Plan policies and Future Land Use Map. Some designated locations may accommodate a more complete rural residential or limited commercial development pattern. Other corridor areas should retain larger parcels, working agricultural land, open frontages, and limited development. The designation does not establish the same development intensity or mix of uses throughout a community or across the County.

Retain the existing density framework unless a change is supported by location-specific Community Area Plan direction or an adopted exception framework identifying eligible locations or circumstances, allowable density, and approval criteria. RR-10 and RR-5 may implement the existing or specifically supported rural pattern for a corridor segment, but their listing does not establish general support for increasing density on larger-parcel agricultural land. RR-2.5, RR-1, and R1-20 are limited or location-specific implementation options. New rezonings to any of these districts that increase residential density should meet the location-specific direction or adopted exception framework described above.

Existing one-acre zoning along rural roads is recognized as part of the established zoning framework, but it should not be treated as the preferred future development pattern for the entire corridor. The Rural Corridor designation does not support extending that zoning onto adjoining agricultural lands, deepening narrow roadside zoning strips, or creating additional tiers of smaller-lot development behind them. New discretionary zoning and development decisions should avoid perpetuating continuous one-acre or half-acre frontage development and should preserve meaningful open-land separation, agricultural operations, and safe, coordinated access.

DRAFT

A general Rural Corridor designation on the Future Land Use Map does not, by itself, identify a property as eligible for increased residential density. Existing zoning, nearby smaller lots, site suitability, or infrastructure availability should not independently establish that eligibility. Where no applicable location-specific direction or exception framework exists, a proposal seeking increased density will require the adoption of the necessary General Plan and, where applicable, Future Land Use Map amendments before the requested rezoning.

Where additional development is supported by location-specific Community Area Plan direction or an adopted exception framework, proposals should remain within the supported geographic extent or eligible circumstances, density, scale, and mix of uses. Support for development in one corridor segment should not establish support for comparable development elsewhere or justify extending the designated development area along the roadway. Development should provide coordinated access, appropriate transitions to nearby homes and working lands, and protection of waterways, irrigation facilities, scenic resources, and meaningful separation between communities.

Commercial development should be confined to locations supported by the applicable Community Area Plan and Future Land Use Map. CH and NC are potential implementation tools for those locations, not a basis for continuous commercial zoning along the corridor. The scale and operation of commercial uses should reflect the role assigned to the location, whether serving nearby residents, travelers, or agricultural activities. Safe access, coordinated circulation, parking, lighting, signage, noise, and transitions to adjoining properties should be addressed without expanding commercial activity into surrounding rural or agricultural lands.

Sustainable water supply, wastewater disposal, road capacity, drainage, and emergency access must be demonstrated for any supported development. Infrastructure availability or proposed improvements should not independently justify a more intensive land-use pattern than the Plan supports. Planned Community zoning, development agreements, and alternative site arrangements should implement the applicable corridor direction and should not serve as an independent basis for additional density, expanded commercial uses, or development beyond the identified area.

DRAFT

Neighborhood places

~~SN~~ RN — ~~Suburban~~ Residential Neighborhood

The ~~Suburban~~ Residential Neighborhood place type is intended for predominantly single-family residential areas developed at more conventional suburban-like densities ranging from about 2 dwelling units per acre up to roughly 5.5 dwelling units per acre . These neighborhoods are generally characterized by standard residential lots, detached homes, local streets, and a development pattern that is primarily automobile-oriented. They may include neighborhood amenities such as parks, schools, churches, trails, stormwater facilities, and small areas of common open space.

~~Suburban~~ Residential Neighborhoods should provide stable, safe, and attractive places for families and households while maintaining appropriate connections to community facilities, commercial areas, employment centers, and regional transportation routes. New development should incorporate internal street connectivity where feasible, safe pedestrian and bicycle facilities, usable neighborhood open space, and transitions to adjoining rural, agricultural, commercial, or higher-density residential areas. Site and subdivision design should respond to terrain, drainage, viewsheds, and the County's need to provide services efficiently.

The R1-8 and R1-12 Residential Districts are the principal implementing districts for this place type. Their typical average densities are approximately 5.5 dwelling units per acre and 3.6 dwelling units per acre, respectively. The R1-20 district may also implement this place type where appropriate to the location and surrounding development pattern.

VRN — Village Residential Neighborhood

The Village Residential Neighborhood place type is intended for compact, neighborhood-scaled residential areas that offer a greater range of housing choices than conventional single-family suburban development. These areas may include detached homes on smaller lots, cottages, duplexes, townhomes, accessory dwelling opportunities where permitted, and small-scale multifamily buildings that are compatible in height, mass, and design with a residential setting. The overall character should remain human-scaled, walkable, and appropriate to Morgan County's community context.

DRAFT

Village Residential Neighborhoods are generally appropriate near Village Commercial Centers, established community areas, public facilities, and locations where residents can conveniently reach services, parks, trails, schools, and community gathering places. Limited neighborhood-serving commercial activity may be appropriate when located in small, carefully designed nodes or at the edges of neighborhoods. Such uses may include convenience retail, cafés, personal services, and similar daily-needs businesses, provided that their scale, hours, access, lighting, signage, and design are compatible with nearby homes.

Development should emphasize connected streets, sidewalks or pathways, pedestrian-scale design, neighborhood open space, transitions to lower-density areas, and a variety of housing options without creating an urban intensity that is out of character with the County. Residential density in this place type should not exceed 15 dwelling units per acre. The R1-8, R1-12, RM-7, and RM-15 districts may implement Village Residential Neighborhoods, with the applicable district and development standards selected based on site context and infrastructure capacity.

The NC Neighborhood Commercial District may also be used on a limited basis to implement small, neighborhood-serving commercial nodes; however, its location, size, permitted uses, access, and relationship to adjoining residences should be subject to careful review and public discussion to ensure that commercial activity remains compatible with the residential character, scale, and walkability of the surrounding Village Residential Neighborhood.

Centers and employment areas

VCC — Village Commercial Center

The Village Commercial Center place type is intended for compact, identifiable centers of daily community activity. These places may include shops, restaurants, personal and professional services, offices, civic facilities, gathering spaces, and where appropriate, housing. The defining character is a concentration of commercial and civic uses organized around connected streets, public spaces, walkable blocks, and a recognizable village-scale center rather than a conventional highway-oriented commercial strip.

Village Commercial Centers should serve nearby residents and surrounding rural areas with everyday goods, services, and community amenities. Development should be

DRAFT

designed to create an inviting public realm through building placement, sidewalks, pedestrian connections, landscaping, public gathering areas, active storefronts where appropriate, and coordinated parking and access. Buildings should reflect a scale and form compatible with Morgan County's communities and should transition sensitively to adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Housing may be incorporated into a Village Commercial Center when it supports the vitality and walkability of the center and is compatible with its commercial and civic role. Residential development may occur under base zoning or through Planned Community tools, but densities should not exceed 15 dwelling units per acre. The NC Neighborhood Commercial, CS Commercial Shopping, and TC Town Center Districts may implement this place type.

CC — Commercial Centers and Corridors

The Commercial Centers and Corridors place type is intended for larger-scale retail, restaurant, office, service, entertainment, and automobile-oriented commercial uses that serve a broad community or regional market. These areas are generally located along major transportation routes, at prominent intersections, near interchanges, or in other locations with suitable roadway access and visibility. They may include shopping centers, restaurants, professional offices, vehicle-oriented services, business parks, and similar employment-generating commercial uses.

Because these locations can generate substantial traffic and have a strong visual presence, development should prioritize coordinated access, safe circulation, shared driveways, appropriate parking design, pedestrian safety, landscaping, signage control, and transitions to nearby neighborhoods or rural lands. Reinvestment and redevelopment should be encouraged where it can improve site design, enhance connectivity, reduce conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians, and introduce more walkable or mixed-use characteristics where appropriate. The objective is not to eliminate the auto-oriented function of these areas, but to ensure that commercial growth is orderly, attractive, safe, and compatible with adjacent land uses.

The CS Commercial Shopping, CH Highway Commercial, GC General Commercial, BP Business Park, and TPC Technical and Professional Campus Districts may be used to implement this place type.

DRAFT

EI — Employment and Industrial

The Employment and Industrial place type is intended to preserve and expand areas for job-producing uses, including offices, research and technology uses, business parks, light manufacturing, general industrial activity, warehousing, distribution, logistics, contractor yards, airport-related businesses, and other employment-supporting development. These areas provide opportunities for economic diversification, local employment, and businesses that require sites with access to major roads, utilities, freight movement, or the airport.

Land uses in Employment and Industrial areas should remain primarily employment-focused. Nonindustrial and nonemployment uses should be limited when they would reduce the supply of suitable job lands, interfere with industrial operations, or create land-use conflicts. Site design should address truck circulation, loading areas, access management, noise, lighting, outdoor storage, screening, drainage, and transitions to homes, schools, parks, and other sensitive uses. Where employment areas adjoin residential or rural lands, buffers, landscaping, building placement, and operational standards should be used to minimize impacts.

The LM Light Manufacturing, I Industrial, BP Business Park, and CB Commercial Buffer Districts may implement this place type.

Recreation, civic, and overlay areas

REC — Recreation/Resort

~~The Recreation/Resort place type is intended for areas focused on recreation, tourism, lodging, seasonal visitation, and destination-oriented development. Typical uses may include resort lodging, second homes, recreation facilities, ski areas, golf courses, destination parks, event facilities, trail systems, and supporting commercial or service uses. These areas can provide important economic benefits and recreational opportunities while also creating distinctive demands related to traffic, utilities, emergency response, workforce needs, environmental stewardship, and seasonal population changes.~~

~~Development within Recreation/Resort areas should be planned as an integrated destination rather than as a collection of unrelated projects. Master planning should address transportation access, peak-season traffic, parking, pedestrian and trail~~

~~connections, water and wastewater capacity, wildfire risk, slope stability, natural-resource protection, open space, and compatibility with neighboring communities and rural lands. Resort development should preserve the natural and scenic features that attract visitors while providing the services and infrastructure necessary to support its full buildout.~~

~~The RSD Resort Special District is the primary zoning district identified to implement this place type.~~

The Recreation/Resort place type recognizes existing lawful resort zoning, approved resort development, and associated recreation uses. Its primary purpose is to guide the relationship between established resort areas and the County's surrounding rural communities, working lands, natural resources, and public facilities. It is not intended to establish additional resort growth areas or signal general support for new ski resorts, private destination communities, resort lodging, second-home developments, or associated commercial complexes.

The County strongly discourages creation of additional Resort Special District zones, geographic expansion of existing resort areas, and discretionary increases in resort residential density, lodging capacity, commercial intensity, or visitation that would materially increase through-traffic, erode rural character, fragment working lands, or create additional burdens for surrounding communities. Existing resort zoning or development should not establish a precedent for comparable development on other properties. A mapped Recreation/Resort designation does not, by itself, establish support for additional density, expanded uses, or development beyond existing lawful approvals.

Existing lawful zoning, land-use approvals, applicable development agreements, and vested rights should be respected. Proposals requiring discretionary changes beyond that framework should be evaluated against the applicable Community Area Plan and the County's rural-preservation direction. Where a proposal would establish a new resort area, expand a mapped resort boundary, or introduce a development pattern or intensity not supported by the Plan, the County would need to adopt the necessary General Plan and Future Land Use Map amendments before the requested zoning or approval changes. Any recommendation to support such a change should specifically

DRAFT

explain why it is warranted despite the Plan's direction discouraging additional resort development.

Evaluation of discretionary resort proposals should address effects beyond the project boundary, including through-traffic on rural roads, intersections and bridges, construction traffic, seasonal and peak-period travel, emergency response, wildfire evacuation, water resources, drainage, wildlife habitat, scenic views, lighting, noise, and compatibility with agricultural operations and nearby homes. Review should consider the cumulative effects of existing, approved, and proposed resort development rather than evaluate each proposal in isolation.

Construction and funding of a project's own infrastructure do not, by themselves, demonstrate compatibility with the surrounding community. Private roads, utilities, recreation facilities, and other project improvements may address internal development needs without resolving off-site traffic, rural-road safety, environmental effects, emergency-service demands, or changes to community character. Proposed mitigation should address the identified effects and establish clear responsibilities for implementation, funding, operation, and long-term maintenance.

Private recreation facilities should not be represented as public parks, public trails, public access, or community recreation benefits unless those benefits are secured through documented, enforceable arrangements. Public recreation needs should be evaluated separately from amenities reserved for resort residents, members, or guests. The County should prioritize appropriate public and community-serving recreation opportunities without relying on additional resort residential development as the means of providing them.

For proposals involving General Plan amendments, resort rezonings, or other significant discretionary changes, the County should provide understandable information and meaningful opportunities for affected residents to participate before recommendations and decisions are made. Review materials should identify the requested changes, existing approvals, anticipated full-buildout effects, off-site impacts, proposed mitigation, and consistency or conflicts with the applicable Community Area Plan. Staff reports should summarize significant public concerns and explain how they were addressed. Proposed amendments are also subject to the resort-specific review

DRAFT

direction in the "Recreation/Resort amendments" subsection of "Amending the General Plan."

The RSD Resort Special District is the principal implementing district for established resort areas. Its identification here recognizes existing lawful zoning and approvals; it does not establish support for additional RSD zoning or expansion. Planned Community zoning and development agreements should not be used to circumvent this place type's limits on additional resort development.

This direction does not preclude appropriately scaled hotels or similar lodging within commercial locations supported by a Community Area Plan and Future Land Use Map or where permitted by the applicable zoning. Such lodging should be evaluated as commercial development rather than as a basis for new Recreation/Resort designations or Resort Special District zoning. A hotel proposal should not establish support for an associated resort residential community, private destination complex, or expansion of development into adjoining rural or agricultural lands.

CIV — Civic

The Civic place type identifies public and quasi-public facilities that provide essential services, community gathering opportunities, education, public safety, infrastructure, and institutional functions. Civic uses may include schools, government offices, fire and emergency services facilities, libraries, parks, utilities, public works facilities, religious and community institutions, and similar facilities that serve the County or surrounding neighborhoods.

Civic sites should be located and designed to provide convenient access, safe circulation, adequate parking and loading, compatibility with adjacent land uses, and opportunities for shared use where appropriate. Because civic facilities vary widely in size, service area, and operational needs, the appropriate zoning district will depend on the nature of the facility and the context of the surrounding place type. Civic uses may occur within many areas of the County, provided that their design and operation are compatible with nearby development and that needed infrastructure and services are available.

DRAFT

AO — Airport Overlay

The Airport Overlay applies to lands within and around the airport where special land-use, height, safety, and design considerations are necessary to protect aviation operations and the public. The overlay is intended to reduce hazards to aircraft, protect airport approaches and airspace, minimize exposure of people and sensitive uses to airport-related noise and safety impacts, and preserve the airport's long-term operational capacity.

PC — Planned Community

The Planned Community designation recognizes that large, coordinated developments may require a master-planned approach that integrates multiple land uses, infrastructure systems, open-space networks, transportation improvements, public facilities, and development phases. A Planned Community is not a separate future land-use outcome in the same sense as an agricultural, residential, commercial, or industrial place type. Instead, it is an implementation and development framework that may be used to carry out one or more of the County's Future Place Types.

A Planned Community should demonstrate how its land-use mix, residential densities, development pattern, circulation system, public facilities, utility infrastructure, open-space preservation, phasing, and design standards advance the policies of the General Plan. The PC District may implement any Future Place Type shown on the Future Land Use Map, but the applicable place type should continue to guide the appropriate scale, intensity, character, and mix of uses. Planned Community approvals should not be used to circumvent the purpose of the Future Land Use Map, infrastructure requirements, natural-resource protections, or compatibility standards applicable to the site.

DRAFT

COMMUNITY AREA PLANS

Community Area Plans refine the County General Plan for geographically distinct communities and planning areas. They express locally specific conditions, priorities, future land-use direction, and implementation actions. Area-plan policies are to be read together with countywide General Plan goals, policies, and maps. Where an area plan provides more specific direction for a defined location, that direction should guide County land-use and capital-facility decisions, subject to applicable law and the County's adopted development regulations

Upon adoption, this General Plan and its Community Area Plan chapters supersede prior Morgan County area plans, area-plan amendments, committee recommendations, and similar planning documents to the extent they are inconsistent with this Plan. Historical documents may be retained as background and engagement records but do not independently establish current County land-use policy.

place → values → land-use direction → implementation

Each Community Area Plan follows a consistent structure that moves from place to action. It begins by defining the community's location, boundaries, existing character, and distinguishing features; identifies the values, priorities, and area-specific policies expressed by residents and the County; translates that direction into an existing and future land-use strategy and Future Land Use Map; and concludes with the key issues, development constraints, priority actions, and coordination needed to implement the plan. This format allows each area to retain its distinct identity and priorities while providing a clear, consistent framework for future land-use and infrastructure decisions.

DRAFT

Countywide Land Use Policies

~~The following Countywide Community Area Policies apply to all Community Area Plans and should be considered together with the Countywide General Plan, Future Land Use Map, applicable Community Area Plan vision and policies, and adopted County regulations.~~ The following Countywide Land Use Policies apply throughout unincorporated Morgan County and should be read together with the applicable Community Area Plan, Future Land Use Map, and County regulations. These policies establish a consistent framework for evaluating land-use decisions, infrastructure investments, development proposals, and plan amendments throughout unincorporated Morgan County, while allowing each Community Area Plan to provide more specific direction based on its distinct character, growth strategy, natural resources, infrastructure conditions, and community priorities.

Countywide LU Policy 1.0 — Consistency Review for Significant Land-Use Decisions.
For proposed General Plan amendments, Future Land Use Map amendments, rezonings, planned developments, development agreements, major subdivisions, conditional uses, and other applications identified by County ordinance, Morgan County staff reports and recommendations will identify the applicable Countywide Land Use Policies, Community Area Plan vision and policies, Future Land Use Map designations, and other relevant General Plan direction.

Staff reports will explain how the proposal is consistent with that direction. Where staff identifies that a proposal conflicts with one or more adopted policies, map designations, or other applicable General Plan direction, the staff report will identify the conflict and explain whether it can be addressed through denial, project modification, conditions of approval, a development agreement, or an ~~concurrent~~ amendment to the General Plan or Future Land Use Map.

Countywide LU Policy 2.0 — Cumulative Effects and Plan Consistency.
Morgan County will evaluate proposed General Plan amendments, Future Land Use Map amendments, rezonings, subdivisions, development agreements, and other significant land-use decisions for consistency with the adopted General Plan and applicable

Community Area Plan. Review will consider the cumulative effects of existing approvals, pending proposals, reasonably foreseeable development, infrastructure capacity, public-service demands, natural-resource impacts, and changes to community character.

The County will schedule public hearings and consider proposed General Plan and Future Land Use Map amendments only during a designated annual amendment cycle. This coordinated process will allow related requests to be evaluated together and their combined effects assessed before individual decisions are made.

Countywide LU Policy 3.0 — Community Character and Compatibility.
Morgan County will maintain the distinct character of its communities. The County will evaluate proposed growth, redevelopment, infrastructure investments, and land-use changes for consistency with the applicable Community Area Plan vision, policies, Future Land Use Map, natural setting, and established development pattern.

Countywide LU Policy 4.0 — Growth and Infrastructure Capacity.
Morgan County will support development only when adequate water, wastewater, fire protection, emergency access, roads, drainage facilities, public services, and long-term maintenance arrangements are available or are secured through enforceable, development-funded commitments concurrent with development.

Countywide LU Policy 4.1 — Limited Rural Homesite Options

Morgan County will evaluate whether to establish a limited rural homesite option that allows modest lot divisions without opening agricultural and rural lands to broader residential intensification. Any such option will be established through adopted County regulations with consistent eligibility criteria, limits on additional dwelling units and repeat divisions, protection of remaining agricultural and open lands, and clear access, water, wastewater, and maintenance requirements. An applicant's intended family use will not substitute for compliance with those standards.

Commented [VC4]: May need to be just a recommendation instead of policy.

Countywide LU Policy 4.2 — Rural Living Pattern and Development

Morgan County will maintain Rural Living areas as low-density rural landscapes characterized by larger parcels, rural homes, open land, agricultural activity, rural views, and meaningful separation between homes. The designation recognizes the intended rural character of an area; it does not establish a general transition from agricultural zoning to rural residential zoning or, by itself, support increased residential density.

A-20 is the baseline implementing district where it is the existing zoning. Existing lawful rural residential zoning and development are recognized, but their presence will not, by itself, establish support for extending smaller-lot zoning onto adjoining properties. The County will retain the existing density framework unless a change is supported by location-specific Community Area Plan direction or an adopted exception framework identifying eligible locations or circumstances, allowable density, and approval criteria.

New rezonings to RR-10, RR-5, or RR-2.5 that increase residential density may be considered only under that direction or framework. These districts are limited implementation options, not the expected outcome throughout mapped Rural Living areas. A general Rural Living designation on the Future Land Use Map does not establish eligibility for increased density. Where no applicable direction or exception framework exists, a proposal seeking increased density will require adoption of the necessary General Plan and, where applicable, Future Land Use Map amendments before the requested rezoning. RR-1 is not identified as an implementing district for Rural Living.

Sustainable water supply, lawful wastewater disposal, safe road and emergency access, drainage, wildfire protection, and adequate public-service capacity are necessary considerations for development. Infrastructure availability, site suitability, nearby smaller lots, or an applicant's intended family use will not, by themselves, justify increased density. Development should protect agricultural operations, irrigation facilities, natural features, meaningful open land, and the rural separation that defines the area.

The County will not support new discretionary zoning or development approvals that create or extend continuous frontage-lot, linear, second-tier, or suburban-style development patterns inconsistent with the area's rural character. Particular attention should be given to avoiding strip or "tunnel" development along highways and major roads, cumulative fragmentation of agricultural lands, unnecessary driveway access, and extension of smaller-lot development into adjoining rural areas.

Where supported by the applicable Community Area Plan, clustering, Planned Community zoning, and development agreements should implement the intended rural character and supported development pattern. These tools will not, by themselves, establish support for additional density or development beyond the locations or circumstances identified by the Plan.

DRAFT

For rezoning, subdivision, development-agreement, Planned Community, and General Plan or Future Land Use Map amendment applications affecting Rural Living areas, staff reports shall identify the existing zoning and density framework, the applicable place-type and Community Area Plan direction, and any adopted exception provisions. Reports shall distinguish development consistent with existing zoning from requests for discretionary increases in density; identify the policy basis for any recommended increase; and evaluate cumulative effects on agricultural lands, open-land separation, access, infrastructure, public services, and rural character.

Countywide LU Policy 4.3 — Rural Corridor Pattern and Development

Morgan County will manage Rural Corridor areas as established rural highway and main-road settings containing rural residences, agricultural properties, and limited commercial or service uses. The intended development pattern varies by corridor segment and will follow the applicable Community Area Plan direction. Specifically identified locations may accommodate additional rural residential development or limited commercial activity, while other areas should retain the existing density framework, working lands, and open frontages. Rural Corridor is not intended to establish continuous residential or commercial growth along rural roads.

Existing one-acre zoning along rural roads is recognized as part of the established zoning framework, but it will not be treated as the preferred future development pattern for the entire corridor. The Rural Corridor designation does not support extending that zoning onto adjoining agricultural lands, deepening narrow roadside zoning strips, or creating additional tiers of smaller-lot development behind them. New discretionary zoning and development decisions should avoid perpetuating continuous one-acre or half-acre frontage development and should preserve meaningful open-land separation, agricultural operations, scenic character, and safe, coordinated access.

A general Rural Corridor designation does not, by itself, establish support for increased residential density or commercial zoning. Discretionary changes to the existing density framework or land-use pattern should be supported by location-specific Community Area Plan direction or an adopted exception framework identifying eligible locations or circumstances, allowable density or development scale, and approval criteria. Where no applicable direction or exception framework exists, a proposal seeking such a change

DRAFT

will require adoption of the necessary General Plan amendments and, where applicable, Future Land Use Map amendments before the requested rezoning.

RR-10 and RR-5 are potential baseline implementing districts where consistent with the existing zoning or the rural pattern established for the particular corridor segment by the applicable Community Area Plan. Their listing does not establish general support for rezoning larger-parcel agricultural land to those districts. RR-2.5, RR-1, and R1-20 are limited or location-specific implementation options. New rezonings to any of these districts that increase residential density should meet the location-specific direction or adopted exception framework described above. Existing lawful zoning and development are recognized, but they will not independently establish support for comparable zoning or development on other properties.

CH and NC may implement limited commercial or service locations supported by the applicable Community Area Plan and Future Land Use Map. Safe access, an established intersection, nearby businesses, or a demonstrated market opportunity will not, by themselves, establish support for commercial zoning. Commercial development should be concentrated in supported locations rather than distributed continuously along the corridor. Its scale, operation, setbacks, landscaping, screening, lighting, signage, and building design should preserve the corridor's rural character and provide appropriate transitions to nearby homes, agricultural operations, and open lands.

Sustainable water supply, lawful wastewater disposal, road capacity, drainage, emergency access, and public-service capacity must be addressed for supported development. Infrastructure availability, site suitability, nearby smaller lots, existing businesses, or an applicant's intended family use will not independently justify additional intensity or extension of a supported development pattern beyond its identified location. Development should provide coordinated access, limit unnecessary direct driveways, and avoid unsafe turning movements, agricultural fragmentation, and visual clutter.

Planned Community zoning and development agreements should implement the applicable Rural Corridor character and Community Area Plan direction. These tools will not, by themselves, establish support for additional density, expanded commercial uses, or development beyond the locations or circumstances supported by the Plan.

DRAFT

For rezoning, subdivision, development-agreement, Planned Community, and General Plan or Future Land Use Map amendment applications affecting Rural Corridor areas, staff reports shall identify the existing zoning and density framework, the direction applicable to the particular corridor segment, and any adopted exception provisions. Reports shall distinguish existing lawful development opportunities from proposed discretionary changes; identify the location-specific policy basis for additional residential or commercial intensity; and evaluate cumulative effects on traffic, access, agricultural lands, open frontages, scenic character, infrastructure, public services, and adjoining rural communities.

Countywide LU Policy 5.0 — Water Quality, Water Supply, and Rural Wastewater Systems.
Morgan County will protect culinary-water supplies, groundwater, private wells, secondary-water resources, irrigation systems, water rights, surface waters, and rural wastewater systems. The County will support development only when an adequate, reliable, and sustainable culinary-water supply; secondary water where needed; lawful wastewater disposal; protection of groundwater and existing wells; and long-term operation and maintenance arrangements are available or secured through enforceable commitments. The County will not support development that would overburden existing water or wastewater systems, create unacceptable cumulative septic impacts, threaten surface-water or groundwater quality, interfere with irrigation systems or water rights, or create unreasonable risks to existing wells and water users.

Countywide LU Policy 6.0 — Natural Resources and Hazard Resilience.
Morgan County will protect water resources, waterways, wetlands, floodplains, drainageways, agricultural soils, wildlife habitat, scenic resources, slopes, and other sensitive lands. The County will avoid directing development to hazard-prone or environmentally sensitive locations unless site-specific analysis demonstrates that impacts and risks can be avoided or adequately mitigated without transferring unreasonable risks or long-term costs to adjacent property owners, residents, or public agencies.

Countywide LU Policy 7.0 — Agriculture, Irrigation, and Rural Stewardship.
Morgan County will protect agricultural operations, grazing, irrigation systems, ditch

infrastructure, rural access, and customary agricultural practices as essential economic, cultural, and environmental assets. New development will be expected to be designed and located to avoid or minimize conflicts with existing agricultural operations and to preserve agricultural access and irrigation infrastructure where feasible.

Countywide LU Policy 8.0 — Transportation, Access, and Public Safety.
Development will be expected to provide safe access, internal circulation, emergency response, and proportionate mitigation for its transportation, road-maintenance, drainage, and public-safety impacts. Morgan County will protect local roads, agricultural access, and community livability from unsafe or unmitigated development impacts.

Countywide LU Policy 9.0 — Public Facilities and Fair-Share Responsibility.
Development will be expected to provide, construct, dedicate, or proportionately fund the infrastructure, public facilities, amenities, mitigation, and long-term maintenance needed to serve its impacts. Morgan County will use lawful planning, financing, phasing, development-agreement, impact-fee, exaction, and performance tools to ensure that growth does not impose disproportionate costs on existing residents, property owners, service providers, or taxpayers.

Countywide LU Policy 10.0 — Intensive-Use Compatibility.
Morgan County will direct commercial, industrial, extraction, storage, resort, utility, and other potentially intensive uses to locations identified as appropriate by the Future Land Use Map and applicable Community Area Plans. Such uses will be expected to demonstrate compatibility with water and wastewater capacity, safe access, public safety, nearby neighborhoods, agriculture, natural resources, scenic character, and public facilities, and to mitigate traffic, noise, dust, lighting, visual, environmental, and other foreseeable impacts.

Countywide LU Policy 11.0 — Transparent Decisions and Community Engagement.
Morgan County will provide early, clear, and accessible notice for significant planning, land-use, development, and infrastructure decisions. Notice materials will include legible maps, a plain-language description of the request and decision process, relevant Community Area Plan policies, likely public benefits and potential impacts, and meaningful opportunities for affected residents, property owners, service providers, and other stakeholders to provide input before recommendations and final decisions are made.

DRAFT

OUR IMPLEMENTATION, OUR GOALS

~~*Excerpt of the Implementation Chapters of the Morgan County General Plan*~~ *This section establishes how Morgan County will put the General Plan's vision, guiding principles, goals, and policies into practice. It identifies priorities for consistent development review, infrastructure coordination, updates to County regulations, capital planning, resource stewardship, and transparent public decision-making. The recommendations connect countywide direction with the needs of individual communities and provide a framework for assigning responsibilities, coordinating with partners, and identifying funding and next steps. Implementation will focus on practical actions that preserve the County's rural character, address community needs, and hold future decisions accountable to the adopted Plan.*

Community Implementation Goals & Policies

Countywide Community Area Recommendations

The following recommendations support implementation of the Countywide Community Area Policies and the individual Community Area Plans. They are intended to guide future work by Morgan County, service providers, partner agencies, property owners, developers, and community organizations. Recommendations will be implemented as priorities, funding, staffing, legal authority, technical information, interagency coordination, and development activity allow. The recommendations do not create an obligation to construct a specific facility or approve a particular development, but they identify actions that will help the County apply the General Plan consistently and respond to common community priorities.

Countywide recommendations

1. Establish a Community Area Plan consistency-review process

Morgan County will use a standard Community Area Plan consistency-review process for significant land-use and infrastructure decisions, including General Plan and Future Land Use Map amendments, rezonings, subdivisions, planned developments, development agreements, conditional uses, major commercial or industrial proposals, resort

DRAFT

proposals, utility projects, major transportation projects, and significant public-facility investments.

The review process will identify the applicable Countywide Land Use Policies, Community Area Plan vision, area-specific policies, Future Land Use Map designations, key constraints, public-facility needs, and potential cumulative effects. The level of review and required information should be proportional to the scale, location, and likely impacts of the proposal.

Staff Report Contents for significant applications should incorporate the following analysis:

Review item	Required staff finding
Applicable Community Vision	Quote or summarize the applicable vision language and explain consistency
Applicable Community Policies	Identify every material policy, including policies that support or oppose the proposal
Future Land Use Map	Identify the mapped place type or designation and explain the proposal's consistency
Local planning context	Identify relevant roads, water/wastewater conditions, hazards, agriculture, recreation, facilities, or resource constraints
Cumulative effects	Describe relevant approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable development
Conflicts	Clearly identify each conflict; do not simply omit unfavorable policies
Recommended response	State whether the conflict warrants denial, redesign, conditions, agreement terms, phased improvements, or a plan/map amendment
Public input	Summarize material public comments and explain how they were considered

2. Adopt a coordinated capacity-verification protocol

Morgan County will develop and maintain a coordinated process for verifying the availability, timing, funding, and long-term maintenance of essential facilities before supporting significant new development or increased development intensity.

DRAFT

As applicable to the proposal, the process should address:

- Culinary-water rights, source capacity, treatment, storage, distribution, pressure, and fire flow.
- Secondary-water availability, irrigation-water protection, ditch systems, and conversion or replacement of agricultural-water facilities.
- Sewer service, wastewater-treatment capacity, onsite wastewater feasibility, septic density, soils, groundwater conditions, and long-term ownership and maintenance.
- Roadway capacity, safe access, intersections, emergency access, bridges, drainage crossings, private roads, rights-of-way, and long-term road maintenance.
- Fire protection, law enforcement, emergency medical response, evacuation, public facilities, parks, trails, schools, and other service demands.
- Drainage, floodplain, geotechnical, wildfire, environmental, and utility-corridor conditions.

The County should coordinate this process with water providers, irrigation companies, the Weber-Morgan Health Department, fire and emergency-service providers, road agencies, utility providers, affected municipalities, and other appropriate agencies.

3. Align land-use decisions with capacity and phasing

Morgan County will use the Future Land Use Map, zoning, subdivision regulations, development agreements, phasing plans, capital-improvement planning, and other lawful tools to ensure that the pace and location of development remain consistent with available infrastructure, public safety, environmental conditions, and the applicable Community Area Plan.

The County will not rely on speculative or unfunded future infrastructure as the sole basis for supporting increased development intensity. Where improvements are needed to serve development, the County will seek enforceable commitments addressing funding, design, permitting, construction timing, ownership, operation, maintenance, replacement, and responsibility for incomplete improvements.

DRAFT

4. Update development-review standards

Morgan County will periodically review and update the Land Use Management Code, subdivision standards, design standards, and administrative-review procedures to implement the Community Area Plans and Countywide Land Use Policies.

Priority topics for review include:

- Safe access, driveway spacing, intersection design, internal circulation, emergency access, and private-road design, ownership, maintenance, snow removal, and funding.
- Water availability, fire-flow capacity, wastewater feasibility, septic density, wellhead protection, irrigation-system protection, drainage, and long-term utility maintenance.
- Floodplain, drainageway, alluvial-fan, steep-slope, wildfire, geologic-hazard, wetland, riparian-corridor, and wildlife-habitat review standards.
- Agricultural compatibility, irrigation facilities, rural access, livestock movement, farm-equipment access, right-to-farm disclosures, and subdivision design that avoids unnecessary fragmentation of working lands.
- Evaluate the feasibility of a limited rural homesite option consistent with Countywide LU Policy 4.1 and determine whether implementing regulations should be pursued.
- Requirements for meaningful open space, park land, trails, pedestrian connections, public gathering areas, and long-term ownership and maintenance.
- Site design, landscaping, lighting, signage, screening, noise, outdoor storage, truck traffic, operating hours, and buffering standards for commercial, industrial, extraction, utility, storage, recreation, resort, and other potentially intensive uses.
- Design standards for village centers, commercial nodes, mountain settings, rural communities, scenic corridors, visible hillsides, and other places where community character is a central concern.

DRAFT

5. Integrate Community Area Plans into capital planning

Morgan County will use the Community Area Plans to inform the County's Capital Improvements Program, transportation planning, park and recreation planning, water and wastewater coordination, public-safety planning, and interagency funding requests.

Priority planning topics include:

- Rural road maintenance, roadway safety, bridge condition, drainage facilities, shoulder improvements, visibility, signage, striping, guardrails, pedestrian crossings, and emergency access.
- Community parks, trails, pathways, sidewalks, trailheads, river or recreation access, gathering places, and other modest public amenities.
- Water-system capacity, storage, fire flow, secondary-water systems, wastewater solutions, and related capital improvements.
- Hazard-mitigation projects involving drainageways, flood-prone areas, alluvial fans, culverts, bridges, debris basins, erosion control, and wildfire resilience.
- Infrastructure and public-facility projects needed to implement development phasing, improve safety, or protect community character.

Capital-planning decisions should distinguish between improvements needed to serve existing residents, improvements needed because of new development, and projects that serve broader County or regional needs.

6. Apply fair-share and long-term maintenance tools

Morgan County will use lawful impact fees, development agreements, exactions, improvement districts, reimbursement agreements, performance guarantees, phasing conditions, and other authorized mechanisms to ensure that development provides or funds its proportionate impacts.

When considering a development proposal, the County should identify:

- The infrastructure, mitigation, amenities, and public services required because of the proposal.

DRAFT

- The timing by which each improvement must be designed, funded, constructed, dedicated, and operational.
- The responsible entity for ownership, operations, maintenance, repair, and eventual replacement.
- The extent to which the proposal benefits existing residents, future residents, or regional users.
- Whether the proposal creates disproportionate financial, safety, or maintenance obligations for current residents, taxpayers, water providers, road agencies, or other service providers.

7. Protect water, watersheds, and agricultural infrastructure

Morgan County will coordinate with water providers, irrigation companies, agricultural operators, state agencies, and affected landowners to protect culinary water, groundwater, springs, wells, streams, wetlands, irrigation systems, ditches, pipelines, water rights, drainage systems, and watershed functions.

The County should support coordinated water, secondary-water, and wastewater solutions where they are technically feasible, legally available, financially sustainable, and protective of existing users and natural resources. Development review should avoid land-use patterns that create excessive dependence on individual wells, unsustainable septic density, unmitigated groundwater contamination risk, or avoidable disruption to water rights and irrigation infrastructure.

8. Protect rural land, open space, and sensitive areas

Morgan County will use the Future Land Use Map, development-review standards, voluntary conservation tools, and coordinated planning to protect agricultural land, grazing areas, river corridors, wetlands, floodplains, drainageways, foothills, hillsides, ridgelines, wildlife habitat, scenic resources, cultural resources, and other sensitive lands.

Where appropriate and feasible, the County should evaluate voluntary conservation easements, trail easements, ~~clustered development, purchase of development rights, transfer of development rights, agricultural preservation programs, and other tools that respect private property rights while protecting connected open space systems and community defining resources.~~ purchase of development rights, transfer of

DRAFT

development rights, agricultural-preservation programs, and other tools that respect private-property rights while protecting connected open-space systems and community-defining resources. Clustered development may be evaluated only where supported by the applicable Community Area Plan and within the otherwise supported overall density.

Open space associated with development should serve a meaningful function, such as protecting a resource, creating a trail connection, preserving views, providing recreation, maintaining drainage, or preserving agricultural or habitat value, and should not consist primarily of isolated, inaccessible, hazardous, narrow, or leftover land.

9. Plan transportation, access, and emergency response by corridor

Morgan County will prepare, maintain, or coordinate corridor- and area-based transportation and access strategies for locations experiencing development pressure, safety concerns, constrained access, recreation impacts, industrial traffic, or regional travel demands.

Strategies should consider:

- Interstate access, state highways, county roads, local streets, bridges, railroad crossings, private roads, and agricultural-access routes.
- Access management, driveway spacing, intersection operations, sight distance, roadway width, shoulders, drainage, snow removal, rights-of-way, and maintenance responsibilities.
- Safe routes for pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians, school transportation, farm equipment, emergency responders, and recreational users.
- Evacuation and emergency access in canyon, foothill, wildfire-prone, flood-prone, or single-access areas.
- Effects of regional recreation traffic, heavy trucks, extraction uses, resort development, commercial activity, and new residential development.
- Coordination with UDOT, municipalities, railroad interests, emergency-service providers, school representatives, property owners, developers, and other affected entities.

DRAFT

10. Create targeted plans for special areas

Morgan County should prepare focused subarea plans, management strategies, feasibility studies, or regulatory updates when a location has distinct and complex issues that cannot be adequately resolved through a general countywide policy.

Priority examples identified in the community-area chapters include:

Special area or issue	Recommended County action
Lost Creek Reservoir and Croydon/Lost Creek corridor	Coordinate a recreation-management strategy addressing visitor capacity, traffic, parking, sanitation, enforcement, emergency response, road safety, resource protection, and fair allocation of recreation-related service costs
Enterprise foothills and drainage areas	Map and apply appropriate review standards for alluvial fans, canyon mouths, debris-flow areas, drainageways, ditches, and related road/bridge capacity conditions
Mountain Green Village Center	Prepare or maintain a village-center implementation framework addressing land use, building form, architecture, streets, parking, landscaping, lighting, signage, public spaces, pedestrian circulation, phasing, and transition to adjacent neighborhoods.
Mountain Green water, wastewater, and public facilities	Coordinate a long-range capacity and capital strategy with water providers, sewer district, fire providers, developers, and County departments
Deep Creek	Maintain a mapped management framework distinguishing the improved-road frontage area from the remote ranches; evaluate access, temporary recreational use, seasonal structures, wastewater, water quality, erosion, and enforcement needs
Round Valley/Como	Evaluate safe primary and secondary access, bridge/road alternatives, railroad and river-crossing constraints, emergency access, utility feasibility, Morgan City coordination, and future resort/golf-course development conditions

DRAFT

Peterson	Coordinate a water/wastewater and transportation feasibility strategy, including I-84-crossing needs, access, agricultural-water infrastructure, and the relationship between future public sewer capacity and development phasing
Porterville & Richville	Develop a rural and agricultural preservation strategy that includes East Canyon Reservoir resort-area planning, historic/cultural-resource coordination, water and wastewater constraints, rural roads, open space, and voluntary conservation options
Porterville & Richville	Investigate the feasibility of a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) or Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) programs or conservation easement programs that may provide opportunities for permanent open space preservation.
Stoddard	Coordinate planning for Old Highway Road, Stoddard Lane, the I-84/railroad crossing, wetlands/wildlife areas, rural-residential transition, recreation needs, the former dump-site record, and any future gun-range replacement planning

11. Maintain a transparent decision and engagement process

Morgan County will establish and maintain standard project-information materials and engagement procedures for significant planning, development, and infrastructure decisions.

For major proposals, the County should provide:

- A readable location map, Future Land Use Map extract, and description of requested approvals.
- A plain-language project summary explaining the proposed development, intensity, phasing, infrastructure needs, and decision process.
- A concise explanation of applicable countywide and community-area policies.

DRAFT

- Available information regarding water, wastewater, roads, drainage, hazards, environmental conditions, public facilities, fiscal responsibilities, mitigation measures, and expected public benefits.
- Early opportunities for affected residents, property owners, agricultural operators, service providers, public agencies, and other stakeholders to review materials and submit comments before staff recommendations and final action.
- A public record of major commitments made through development agreements, conditions of approval, phasing plans, infrastructure agreements, and mitigation measures.

DRAFT

Amending the General Plan

Purpose and use of amendments

The General Plan is the County's long-range policy guide for growth, land use, public investment, and community priorities. Because the plan is intended to provide steady direction over time, amendments should be considered carefully and should not be used to respond to short-term development pressure or to make frequent, piecemeal changes. Amendments should be evaluated in light of the General Plan as a whole, with attention to consistency between land use, transportation, trails, utilities, public facilities, housing, emergency planning, and other adopted County policies and plans.

~~The County should periodically review the General Plan and monitor whether updates are needed to respond to changing conditions, new information, adopted public priorities, or changes in state or federal law. **To the extent practical, discretionary amendments to the General Plan should be considered through a consolidated annual review process so proposed changes can be evaluated together and in the context of cumulative impacts, County priorities, and the long-term community vision.** This policy is intended to promote consistency and orderly review, while allowing the County to address limited off-cycle issues when necessary.~~

The County will periodically review the General Plan and monitor whether updates are needed to respond to changing conditions, new information, adopted public priorities, or changes in State or federal law. **Public hearings and consideration of proposed General Plan and Future Land Use Map amendments will occur only during a designated annual amendment cycle**, consistent with Countywide LU Policy 2.0. Proposed amendments will be evaluated together to assess their combined effects on community character, infrastructure, public services, natural resources, and the General Plan as a whole. Amendment requests will not be scheduled for separate public hearings or consideration outside the designated annual cycle.

The County strongly discourages General Plan amendments that establish new Recreation/Resort areas, expand existing resort boundaries, or materially increase supported resort development intensity. Any recommendation to approve such an amendment should include specific findings explaining the demonstrated community need, why the proposal cannot reasonably be accommodated within existing supported

development areas, its consistency with affected Community Area Plans, and how cumulative traffic, rural-character, environmental, and public-service effects will be addressed. Developer-funded infrastructure and anticipated economic benefits should not, by themselves, establish sufficient justification for the amendment.

When an amendment may be appropriate

The County should generally consider a General Plan amendment only when one or more of the following circumstances exist:

- There is significant new information, a material change in conditions, or a demonstrated community need that was not adequately addressed when the General Plan was adopted or last updated.
- An amendment is needed to correct an inconsistency, error, or omission in the General Plan text or maps.
- An amendment is needed to implement an adopted County priority, respond to a regional issue, or address a change in state or federal law.
- A proposed change would clearly advance the public interest and can be evaluated in a coordinated manner with transportation, infrastructure, public services, environmental constraints, and fiscal considerations.
- A major change in land use pattern, growth area, or development intensity is proposed and the County determines that a coordinated planning effort, such as a small area plan, station area plan, master plan, or similar planning process, is appropriate to support that change.

How to evaluate a proposed amendment

When considering a proposed amendment, the County should evaluate whether the change:

- Supports the overall vision, goals, and direction of the General Plan rather than undermining them.
- Maintains internal consistency among all relevant elements, maps, goals, and policies of the General Plan.

DRAFT

- Can be served by existing or planned transportation facilities, trails, utilities, public facilities, and emergency services.
- Avoids creating unreasonable impacts related to access, public safety, natural hazards, environmental constraints, or the cost of public services.
- Provides a clear public benefit and is not based solely on a site-specific request for additional entitlement or development potential.

Avoiding piecemeal changes

The County should be cautious about frequent site-specific amendments, especially when the proposed change primarily benefits a single property and is not supported by a broader planning rationale. Where a proposal would substantially change land use patterns, development intensity, or service demands, the County should encourage review through a more comprehensive planning effort rather than through a narrow amendment request.

Updates to supporting plans and references

Updates to references, links, titles, or citations to other adopted plans, studies, or supporting documents do not by themselves require a General Plan amendment. For example, updating references to the Transportation Plan, Trails Plan, emergency management plans, utility plans, capital planning documents, or similar adopted documents should not be treated as a General Plan amendment unless the text, maps, goals, policies, or other substantive content of the General Plan itself must be revised.

Likewise, the County may update or replace supporting plans and implementation documents from time to time without automatically amending the General Plan, so long as those updates remain consistent with the General Plan or do not require changes to its adopted text or maps. If a supporting plan update reveals the need to revise the General Plan's own language, goals, or policies, then the County should consider whether a formal General Plan amendment is appropriate.

Limited exceptions

Nothing in this section is intended to prevent the County from considering an amendment outside the annual review cycle when needed to address an urgent public health or safety issue, comply with a legal requirement, or correct a clear error in the

DRAFT

General Plan. Even in those cases, amendments should remain the exception rather than the rule.

DRAFT

October 6, 2026

4:00 PRESENTATIONS & 5:00 REGULAR MEETING

PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that the MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION will hold a regular Commission meeting in the Commission meeting room at 48 West Young Street, Morgan, Utah.

Note: Commissioner Wilson will attend remotely.

COUNTY COMMISSION
Commission Chair Matt Wilson (attended remotely)
Commissioner Mike Newton
Commissioner Raelene Blocker
Commissioner Blaine Fackrell
Commission Vice Chair Vaughn Nickerson

OTHER EMPLOYEES
IT Director Jeremy Archibald
Administrative Manager Kate Becker (CAM)
County Attorney Garrett Smith (CA)
County Clerk/ Auditor Leslie Hyde
Deputy Clerk/Auditor Chloe Adams
Deputy Clerk/ Auditor Penny Butler
Planner Kent Page
Attorney Janet Christofferson
County Recorder Shaun Rose
County Assessor Janell Walker
Surveyor Devron Andersen
Library Director Erin Bott

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE
Debbie Sessions
Tina Kelley
Lisa Wright
Abby Beattie
Emily Pfeiffer
Beatriz Prince
Kelly Waight
Jeff Mathews
Danna Bauer
Jill Boss
Shawn Green
Jacie Wordie
Wade Warner
Robyn Casper
Avery Walsh
Libby Oseguera
Annessa Odum

4:00 PRESENTATIONS

Morgan Valley Arts Council: Abby Beattie, Lisa Wright, & Emily Pfeifer; Presentation on a possible revamp of the Morgan County Administration Building Auditorium

Lisa Wright and Abby Beattie (Co-Presidents, Morgan Valley Arts Council), joined by Artistic Director Emily Pfeiffer, proposed partnering with the County to renovate the auditorium in the County Administration Building into a small performing arts venue seating roughly 150 to 250. Abby Beattie explained that the Utah Division of Arts and Museums has identified Morgan County as well below the state average for arts opportunities, that the high school auditorium is the only performance venue in the county and is overscheduled, and that community music, choir, and student groups have no suitably sized place to perform. The auditorium is already county owned and operated, centrally located, and well proportioned for acoustics. Proposed improvements include building out the stage, basic lighting and sound, acoustic treatment, new flooring, and flexible seating that would keep the room available for its existing uses. The County would continue to own, operate, and maintain the building, and the Arts Council, as a nonprofit with access to grants and foundation funding, is prepared to lead fundraising for the project.

The Arts Council asked the County to fund a feasibility study by a firm specializing in performance spaces, either a basic remote study or a full on-site assessment that would evaluate the building systems and produce plans and a detailed budget. The Commission discussed the recreation, arts, museums, and parks (RAMP) tax,

which is currently committed to the County's recreation program and will be before voters for renewal in 2028, as well as the age of the building and staffing for a venue of this size.

No action was taken. The Commission reached consensus to place the feasibility study on the next meeting agenda as an action item, expressed a preference for the full on-site study, and asked staff to research whether recreation tax fund balance may be used to pay for it.

Utah Developmental Disabilities Council: Avery Walsh; Presentation on their Rural Transportation Project

The presenters were delayed by traffic and gave an abbreviated presentation. **Libby Oseguera (Executive Director, Utah Developmental Disabilities Council)** explained that the Council is a governor-appointed, federally funded board that works to ensure people with intellectual and developmental disabilities have the resources and supports to participate in their communities. **Avery Walsh** reported that transportation is consistently the highest unmet need for people with disabilities, particularly in rural areas without fixed-route service, described voucher, shared-ride, and contracted accessible van programs other Utah counties are using, and stated that the Council's goal is to learn what Morgan County is working on and help build local partnerships.

No action was taken. The Commission expressed interest in having the Council return for a full presentation, and **Kate Becker (CAM)** will coordinate dates with the presenters.

5:00 COMMENCEMENT OF MEETING

Commission Vice Chair Nickerson conducted the meeting. Commission Chair Wilson attended remotely.

(A) Opening Ceremonies

1. Welcome
2. Invocation and/or Moment of Reflection: **Hon. Commissioner Nickerson**
3. Pledge of Allegiance

(B) Consent Agenda Items

1. Approval of the Morgan County Commission Minutes from September 15th, 2026.
2. Approval of the Morgan County Commission Minutes from September 22nd, 2026.
3. Approval of a contract with the State of Utah for the Governor's Office of Economic Development Rural County Grant. Contract Number 270633108 (No County funds required)
4. Approval of a Professional Services Agreement with SAFEbuilt, LLC for plans examining and building inspecting services as approved by the Morgan County Commission at their May 5th meeting in 2026.

In response to a question on consent item 4, **Kate Becker (CAM)** clarified that the Commission approved three firms for these services on May 5 following a request for qualifications, and that the SAFEbuilt agreement is the first to complete legal review.

Commissioner Newton moved to approve the consent agenda items.

Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye

The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

(C) Commissioner Declarations of Conflict of Interest
There were none.

(D) Public Comments (please limit comments to 3 minutes)
Tina Kelley, Mountain Green, stated that a prior effort to establish a bus loop serving the county was never completed, that residents still need the service, and that many aging veterans who no longer drive rely on neighbors to reach VA facilities. She asked that this need be considered as the County looks at transportation for the disabled community.

(E) Action Items

1. Erin Bott – Discussion/ Decision – Morgan County Library Director
Discussion and decision on a budget adjustment for the Historical Society moving monies from Historical Society fund balance to purchase additional inventory for the Depot.

Erin Bott (Library Director) requested that funds be moved from the visitor center fund balance so the Historical Society can purchase additional souvenir items to sell at the visitor center. **Kate Becker (CAM)** clarified that the fund balance consists of revenue from prior inventory sales, which has exceeded the budgeted amount.

Commissioner Newton moved to approve the fund balance transfer of $2,500 from the visitor center fund balance to the special department line.

Seconded by Commissioner Blocker

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

2. Hon. Shaun Rose – Discussion/ Decision – Morgan County Recorder
Discussion and decision on Morgan County **Resolution CR 26-49** appointing Devron Andersen, PLS as the interim nonelected Morgan County Surveyor and assigning applicable powers and duties.

Shaun Rose (Recorder) requested that Devron Andersen be appointed as the nonelected County Surveyor, giving him the formal authority to sign documents that require the County Surveyor's signature. **Garrett Smith (CA)** noted that the resolution number on the agenda, CR 26-43, had already been assigned to a prior resolution; the resolution was renumbered CR 26-49.

Commissioner Newton moved to approve Resolution CR 26-49 appointing Devron Andersen as the interim nonelected Morgan County Surveyor and assigning applicable powers and duties.

Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell

VOTE:

Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

3. Hon. Morgan County Commission – Discussion/Decision – Commissioner Travel & Training
Discussion and decision on who the County Administrative Manager shall register for the Fall Utah State Association of County Commissioners & Councilmen (USACCC) November 19-20, 2026 in Salt Lake City. Early-bird registration is $300, no agenda is available at this time.

Commission Vice Chair Nickerson, Commissioner Newton, Commissioner Blocker, and Commissioner Fackrell indicated they plan to attend. **Kate Becker (CAM)** will follow up with Commission Chair Wilson. No formal vote was required or taken.

4. Kate Becker – Discussion/ Decision – Morgan County Tourism
Discussion and decision on a budget adjustment to pay for the 2024-2025 Utah Transit Authority (UTA) service to the Mountain Green Bus Stop Location in the amount of $6,175.

Kate Becker (CAM) explained that the County signed a new ski bus stop agreement with UTA in 2024 but was never billed for the 2024-2025 season. UTA is still researching whether a stop operated in the 2025-2026 season, which may require a separate adjustment.

Commissioner Newton moved to approve the budget adjustment to pay for the 2024-2025 UTA service for the Mountain Green ski bus stop in the amount of $6,175.

Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

5. Kate Becker – Discussion/Decision – Morgan County Tourism
Discussion and decision on a stop service agreement with the Utah Transit Authority for the 2026-2027 season for service to the Mountain Green Bus Stop Location.

Garrett Smith (CA) explained that the agreement is for one year with up to four additional one-year options, and that language was added during legal review requiring UTA to exercise each option by written notice to the County. The County remains responsible for snow removal at the stop.

Commissioner Fackrell moved to approve the stop service agreement with the Utah Transit Authority for the 2026 season and forward according to the terms of the contract.

Seconded by Commissioner Blocker

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

6. Kate Becker – Discussion/ Decision – Morgan County Tourism
Discussion and decision on approving a contract with the State of Utah for the Traditional Marketing Co-Op (TMCOOP) grant contract #270633086. County will match the grant award out of Transient Room Tax revenues in the amount of $56,700.

Kate Becker (CAM) reported that the required County match is already budgeted. **Garrett Smith (CA)** requested that the contracting party be listed as Morgan County rather than "Morgan County Economic Development," which is not a separate legal entity.

Commissioner Newton moved to approve the Traditional Marketing Co-Op grant contract #270633086 and the matching funds budgeted from Transient Room Tax revenues in the amount of $56,700.

Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

7. Kate Becker – Discussion/Decision – Morgan County Administrative Manager
Discussion and decision on a ground lease agreement between Morgan County and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints for the purpose of public open space, spanning 10-years, concerning 3.1 acres located in Mountain Green at the corner of N Silverleaf Drive and W Harvard Drive; Parcel 00-0074-8701.

Kate Becker (CAM) reported that the lease was modified during legal review and the revised language has not yet been approved by the Church. A donor is expected to fund park improvements on the parcel. **Garrett Smith (CA)** stated that the lease still needs to be reviewed against the Cottonwoods development agreement and state law regarding conditions attached to the donation. The Commission directed Kate Becker (CAM) to prepare a survey of school-age children throughout the county on what they would like to see in the park.

Commissioner Newton moved to postpone Action Item 7 pending review of the agreement by both the Church and the County.

Seconded by Commissioner Blocker

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye

Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

8. Kate Becker – Discussion/Decision – Morgan County Administrative Manager
Discussion and decision on an amendment to our Fire Station and Services Agreement. This specifies that the cost of the improvements in overnight accommodations will be the responsibility of WPR Road and Fire District and adds clarity to the Staffing and Subsidy sections of the agreement.

Kate Becker (CAM) requested that the item be postponed. The District plans to build living quarters at the station, and the County has requested an amendment stating that the improvements are at no cost to the County. Legal counsel is not comfortable with the District's version as drafted.

Commissioner Newton moved to postpone Action Item 8 to a future meeting.

Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

9. Morgan County Board of Equalization – Discussion/Decision – 2026 BOE Appeals
(a) Discussion and decision on Morgan County Resolution **CR 26-04-BOE** approving homesteader credit abatements.
(b) Discussion and decision on Morgan County Resolution **CR 26-05-BOE** approving 2026 stipulations and hearing officer recommendations.
(c) A request to hold a special BOE hearing in early November**.**

Commissioner Newton moved to adjourn the public meeting and convene as the Morgan County Board of Equalization.

Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

Penny Butler (Deputy Clerk/Auditor) presented Resolution CR 26-04-BOE, covering two applicants for the homesteader credit abatement. She reported that both applicants met the criteria and asked whether the Board wished to approve the full abatement of 20 percent plus half of the tax due, or a partial amount. The Board favored approving the full amount for both applicants. **Kate Becker (CAM)** noted that the exhibit attached to

the resolution still references an outdated resolution number rather than the resolution the Commission most recently adopted, and stated that the exhibit will be corrected and reprinted before it is signed.

Commissioner Newton moved to approve Resolution CR 26-04-BOE granting both applicants the full abatement of 20 percent plus half of the tax due.

Seconded by Commissioner Blocker

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

Janell Walker (County Assessor) answered questions about Resolution CR 26-05-BOE and explained how the list of 2026 appeals is organized. **Chloe Adams (Deputy Clerk/Auditor)** explained that the first entry on the list contained an error that has since been corrected, and it was noted that the entry reflects a change from secondary to primary residential status, which changes the taxable value but not the market value. The Board chose to act on the stipulations and the hearing officer recommendations together rather than separately.

Commissioner Fackrell moved to approve Resolution CR 26-05-BOE approving the 2026 stipulations and the hearing officer's recommendations.

Seconded by Commissioner Newton

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

Kate Becker (CAM) explained that the Board of Equalization must issue its decision on each appeal within 60 days of the application, and that because no Commission meeting is scheduled between the end of October and November 17, the Clerk/Auditor's office requested a special meeting so the remaining appeals can be decided within the deadline. After checking availability for a quorum, the Board agreed on Tuesday, November 10, 2026 at 5:00 p.m., and **Chloe Adams (Deputy Clerk/Auditor)** estimated the meeting will last about half an hour. **Leslie Hyde (Clerk/Auditor)** noted that the election audit is scheduled for 12:15 p.m. that same day, that a commissioner is needed to take part in it, and that no one has been selected yet. Chloe Adams also informed the Board, as members had previously requested, that hearing officer hearings were scheduled for the following day from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., with a representative of the State in attendance, that additional hearing dates will follow, and that Board members are welcome to observe.

Commissioner Newton moved to approve a special Board of Equalization meeting on November 10, 2026 at 5:00 p.m.

Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

Commissioner Newton moved to adjourn as the Morgan County Board of Equalization and reconvene as the Morgan County Commission.

Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

10. Kate Becker – Discussion/ PUBLIC HEARING/ Decision – County Planning and Zoning
Warner Future Land Use Map Amendment (FLUMA) & Rezone: A request for approval of County Ordinance **CO 26-20** changing 51.299 acres from the future land use map designation of Ranch Residential 5 to Village Low Density Residential and to rezone from A-20 to R1-20 at approximately 4970 West 6100 North located in the Mountain Green area in unincorporated Morgan County.

Kent Page (Planner) reported that the Planning Commission held a public hearing on September 10 and voted three to one to recommend approval. The Planning Commission was concerned about slopes and soils, as much of the property is too steep to build on, and staff found on a conceptual basis that facilities are likely adequate to serve the rezone.

Wade Warner and other members of the Warner family, the applicants, stated that they have not yet engaged a developer or engineer, that because of the topography they expect most of the property to remain in lots of five acres or more with a small number of smaller lots in the few buildable areas, and that they hope to keep the property in the family.

The Commission expressed concern that rezoning the entire parcel to R1-20 would establish half-acre entitlements across all 51 acres regardless of the applicants' intent, and noted that the current future land use map designates the area as a buffer between higher-density development and agricultural land. The Commission suggested that the applicants work with planning staff and return with a request that zones the portions suited to smaller and larger lots accordingly.

Commissioner Fackrell moved to go into a public hearing.

Seconded by Commissioner Blocker

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye

Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

Danna Bauer, Rollins Ranch, stated that the request is premature and raised concerns about the single access serving the future phase of Rollins Ranch, the stability of the hillside, and drainage.

Annessa Odum, Rollins Ranch, supported preserving the buffer zone and asked that roads, parks, and infrastructure keep pace before more homes are approved.

Commissioner Newton moved to go out of the public hearing and reconvene the public meeting.

Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

Kate Becker (CAM) advised that postponing to a date certain avoids re-noticing the public hearing, and the applicants requested a postponement to the December 1 Commission meeting to revise the request.

Commissioner Newton moved to postpone Action Item 10, the Warner future land use map amendment and rezone, Ordinance CO 26-20, to the December 1, 2026 meeting.

Seconded by Commissioner Blocker

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

11. Janet Christofferson, Esq. – Discussion/PUBLIC HEARING/Decision – Deputy Attorney
Comcast Franchise Agreement: A request for approval of County **Ordinance CO 26-19** granting a nonexclusive cable television franchise to Comcast Cable Communications Management, LLC; executing the Franchise Agreement approved at the September 15th Commission meeting; And establishing an effective date of October 6th, 2026.

Janet Christofferson (Attorney) explained that the Commission approved the Comcast franchise agreement on September 15 and that an ordinance is needed so the franchise is adopted and recorded.

Commissioner Newton moved to adjourn the public meeting and convene a public hearing for Action Item 11.

Seconded by Commissioner Blocker

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

There were no public comments.

Commissioner Newton moved to adjourn the public hearing and reconvene the public meeting.

Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

Garrett Smith (CA) and **Kate Becker (CAM)** confirmed for the record that the ordinance's approval and signature dates and footers were updated to October 6, 2026, and that references to the September 15 approval of the franchise agreement remain unchanged.

Commissioner Newton moved to approve Ordinance CO 26-19 granting a franchise agreement with Comcast Cable.

Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

(F) Commissioner Comments
Comments from Commissioners Newton, Blocker, and Fackrell were given during the 4:00 session.

Commissioner Blocker proposed re-establishing an official County Facebook page limited to public notices and election information, with comments turned off, since residents often report learning of public notices too late. The Commission reached consensus to have staff bring back a resolution amending the County's social media policy to allow these postings by IT Director Jeremy Archibald. No formal vote was taken.

Commissioner Newton reported that work has begun on the grant-funded pavilion at the fairgrounds.

Commissioner Fackrell reported from the recent Utah Association of Counties conference on a food security grant program for food producers and processors, which has been forwarded to local producers and the CEO Board, and noted that Morgan County currently receives the lowest payment in lieu of taxes (PILT) in the state. At the close of the meeting, he asked about the County's political sign regulations. **Garrett Smith (CA)** and **Janet Christofferson (Attorney)** explained that the sign ordinance was amended in 2024 to treat political signs as temporary signs, that the online code does not appear to reflect the amendment, and that no signs are currently required to be removed. Janet Christofferson (Attorney) will follow up with the County's code publisher.

Commission Vice Chair Nickerson had nothing further to report.

Commission Chair Wilson thanked the Commission for its handling of the Warner rezone request and reported attending an affordable housing seminar, with information to be shared at a future meeting.

Commissioner Fackrell moved to go into closed session for the purpose of discussing the acquisition or disposition of real property.

Seconded by Commissioner Newton

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

Commissioner Fackrell moved to leave closed session at 6:57 pm.

Seconded by Commissioner Blocker

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

APPROVED: _____ DATE: _____
Morgan County Commission Chair

ATTEST: _____ DATE: _____

Morgan County Deputy Clerk/Auditor

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons needing auxiliary services for these meetings should call Kate Becker at 435-800-8724 at least 24 hours prior to this meeting. This meeting is streamed live.
If you want to participate virtually in any public comment listed on this agenda, you need to contact Jeremy@morgancountyutah.gov at least 48 hours before the scheduled meeting.

MORGAN
COUNTY

Dear Grant Review Committee, October 2, 2026

On behalf of Morgan County, we are pleased to offer our full support for Morgan City's application for the RCOG grant. We appreciate the opportunity to endorse this significant effort to expand and enhance outdoor recreation opportunities for our residents and visitors.

Morgan City has demonstrated strong leadership and long-term vision through its work over the past several years to establish an urban fishery that enhances quality of life while promoting tourism. The development of the new fishpond as an extension of the Mickelson Mile represents an important milestone in this effort. Once completed, the trail network will connect the fishpond to Riverside Park, the Morgan County Fairgrounds, the pickleball courts, and the end of Commercial Street in our Morgan City Historic Downtown. This connectivity will create a vibrant recreation corridor, the City is calling the "Emerald Necklace" that strengthens both community wellness and economic vitality.

Morgan County severely lacks public land and accessible outdoor recreation areas. This project addresses that need directly by creating a welcoming destination where residents from across the county, as well as visitors, can gather and enjoy the outdoors. The proposed fishpond and surrounding amenities will provide year-round recreational opportunities, including fishing, kayaking, paddle boarding, and even ice skating during the winter months.

We are especially encouraged by the partnership with the Utah Division of Natural Resources, which will stock and manage the fish population to ensure a sustainable and high-quality urban fishery. This collaboration demonstrates thoughtful planning and long-term stewardship.

Morgan County strongly supports this application and believes this project will serve as a transformative investment in recreation, tourism, and community well-being. We respectfully encourage favorable consideration of Morgan City's request.

Sincerely,
Morgan County Commission

_____

Matthew Wilson,
Morgan County Commission Chair

SPENCER J. COX
Governor
DEIDRE M. HENDERSON
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
JAMIE BARNES
Commissioner
Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands
BRIANNE EMERY
Acting *State Forester/Director*

Fire Restriction Rescindment of Order #WFCLO2619

Moderated fire danger indices and improved weather conditions have resulted in reduced wildfire hazard across Northern Utah. As a result, Stage 1 fire restrictions enacted by Closure Order #WFCLO2619 is hereby rescinded within the areas described below beginning October 1, 2026, at 0001 hours.

Area Description: All unincorporated private and all state lands within **Morgan County**, Utah. This order does not affect private lands within incorporated towns or city limits.

Effective Date: 12:01 a.m., 1st day of October, 2026

Brett Ostler

Brett Ostler, State Fire Management Officer

Brianne Emery
Brianne Emery (Sep 29, 2026 10:57:54 MDT)

Brianne Emery, Acting State Forester/Director

1594 West North Temple, Suite 3520, PO Box 145703, Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5703
telephone (801) 538-5418 • *www.forestry.utah.gov*

Forestry, Fire & State Lands

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Rodeo Stock Contractor Services

Morgan County Fair and RMPRA Rodeo 2027-2029

1. Overview and Event Details

Rodeo name: Morgan County Fair and RMPRA Association Rodeo

Contact person / phone / email: Jon Cannon 801-920-1144 joncannon7@gmail.com Bret Heiner 801-821-1475 bheiner@morgancountyutah.gov

Venue and address: 750 E Como Springs Rd Morgan, UT 84050

Sanctioning body: RMPRA

Contract term: [Multi-year] 3 year Contract

2. Scope of Work

The selected contractor will provide the following livestock, personnel, and services. Quantities are per performance/day unless otherwise stated.

2.1 Rough Stock (per performance/day)

Event	Quantity
Bulls	16
Bareback horses	10
Saddle broncs	10

2.2 Timed Event Livestock (per performance/day)

Event	Quantity
Tie-down calves	8
Team roping steers	8
Steer wrestling (bulldogging) steers	6
Breakaway calves	8

2.3 Slack

The contractor shall supply all timed-event cattle for slack. Slack head counts are separate from the performance numbers above.

Number of head for slack: [Insert]

Number of runs: [Insert]

Slack date and time: [Insert]

2.4 Personnel

Position	Quantity
Announcer	1
Bullfighters	2
Secretary	1
Pickup men	2
Judges	2
Timers	2
Flank man	1

Note: Bidders should state which personnel are included in their bid. If the committee or sanctioning body will hire the secretary, judges, and timers, this will be confirmed before bids are due.

3. Livestock Standards

- Stock must meet sanctioning body quality and weight requirements, or the standards set by the committee.
- Health documentation required: brand inspection, health certificates, and any required vaccinations or testing.
- Replacement and reride policy: contractor must keep extra head on site and describe the policy in the bid.
- All livestock must be handled humanely and in line with animal welfare standards.
- Livestock must arrive by [date/time] before the first performance, with a plan for pens, water, and feed.

4. Equipment and Arena Responsibilities

Check who provides each item so bids are comparable.

Item	Contractor	Committee
Bucking chutes	[ ]	[ ]
Timing equipment and scoreboard	[ ]	[ ]
Flank straps	[ ]	[ ]
Sound system	[ ]	[ ]
Roping boxes and barriers	[ ]	[ ]

Item	Contractor	Committee
Cattle-handling equipment	[ ]	[ ]

5. Contractor Qualifications

Each bid must include:

- Years of experience and a list of rodeos produced, with references.
- Sanctioning memberships and any awards or finals qualifications.
- Proof of insurance: general liability (typically $1M to $2M) and workers' compensation.
- A sample of the stock string or a roster with notable animals.

6. Pricing and Payment

- Bids must be itemized.

- Payment schedule:
- Hauling and lodging:

7. Insurance, Liability, and Contract Terms

- Indemnification and hold-harmless language:
  From Attorney
- Cancellation and force majeure terms (weather, injury, disease outbreaks):

- Penalties for no-shows or substandard stock: [Insert].

8. Submission and Evaluation

Bid deadline: 10-22-2026 2:00pm

Delivery method and format: Email

Questions contact: Jon Cannon 801-920-1144 Bret Heiner 801-821-1475

Question cutoff date: 10-22-2026 12:00pm

Evaluation Criteria (suggested weights)

Criterion	Weight
Bulls	
Bareback horses	
Saddle broncs	
Tie-down calves	
Team roping steers	
Steer wrestling (bulldogging) steers	
Breakaway calves	

Rodeo Dates 08-06-2027 08-07-2027

Rodeo dates 08-04-2028 08-05-2028

Rodeo dates 08-03-2029 08-04-2029

Rodeo dates are subject to change with fair board and contractors agreement.

Rodeo Committee to provide feed for stock .

Utah Retirement Systems

Employer Services Department

PO Box 1590 | Salt Lake City, UT 84110-1590
801-366-7318 | 800-753-7318
www.urs.org

October 6, 2026

Ms. Leslie Hyde
Morgan County
48 W Young St.
Morgan, UT 84050-0886

Employer No. 215

Dear Ms. Leslie Hyde

We have completed the compliance audit of Morgan County administration of the Utah Retirement Systems' Public Employees' Contributory and Noncontributory, Public Safety Contributory and Noncontributory, and Firefighters' Retirement Systems. Enclosed is the compliance audit report.

In this report, we have included two recommendations, two findings and one repeat critical finding which requires your immediate attention.

Morgan County is required to take corrective action for the finding and critical repeat finding immediately. A follow-up audit will be conducted within 6 months to determine if corrective action has been taken. Failure to take corrective action for the finding subjects Morgan County to penalties outlined under, Utah Code § 49-11-601 and Utah Code § 49-11-604(2) including continuing follow up audits at the County expense.

Please sign the attached memo acknowledging the receipt of the attached report and return it to me at zach.garling@urs.org by October 9th, 2026.

We appreciate your efforts in assuring compliance with employer responsibilities in the administration of the Utah Retirement Systems' Public Employees' Contributory and Noncontributory, Public Safety Contributory and Noncontributory, and Firefighters' Retirement Systems.

Please call me at 801-366-3932 if you have any questions about the compliance audit report.

Sincerely,

Zach Garling

Zach Garling & Gordon Tesch
Compliance Auditor
Employer Services

Enclosure

Cc: Katherine Becker

Utah Retirement Systems

Employer Services Department

PO Box 1590 | Salt Lake City, UT 84110-1590
801-366-7318 | 800-753-7318
www.urs.org

COMPLIANCE AUDIT REPORT

Employer	Morgan County PO Box 886 Morgan, UT 84050	**Report Date**	October 6, 2026
		Interview Conducted	September 21, 2026
Employer No.	215	**Prepared By**	Zach Garling
Contact	Ms. Leslie Hyde	**Reviewed By**	Gordon Tesch

Purpose

For this compliance audit, we examined Morgan County's (county) policies and procedures for administering the Utah Retirement Systems' (URS) Public Employees' Contributory and Noncontributory, Public Safety Contributory and Noncontributory, and Firefighters' Retirement Systems in accordance with Title 49, the Utah State Retirement and Insurance Benefit Act. Compliance requirements for the administration of the URS administered public employees' retirement benefits include policies for defining eligibility for coverage; calculation, reporting, and payment of appropriate contributions; documentation processes for the enrollment, change in status, and leave periods of members; and management of plan related records for members.

Summary

This round 5 compliance audit covered the period of January 1, 2025, through August 8, 2026.

In conducting this audit, we researched records and discussed policies and procedures with county staff. We found that Morgan County has policies and procedures in place and staff utilize these policies in administering the defined benefit and defined contribution retirement plans.

We have included two recommendations, two findings and one repeat critical finding in the Compliance Audit Results section of this report.

- Recommendations:
  - Process improvements related to ineligible employees
  - Process improvements related to terminated employees
- Findings:
  - Process improvements related to correct reporting of retirement eligible compensation
  - Process improvements related to reporting correct reporting of public safety declared hours

Summary (Continued)

- Repeat Critical Finding:
  - Process improvements related to correct reporting of retirement eligible compensation

    This finding was identified in the round 3 compliance audit and is, therefore, considered a repeat finding. Morgan County is required to take corrective action for the repeat finding immediately.

Compliance Audit Results

The results of our audit indicate Morgan County staff administers the URS Public Employees' Contributory and Noncontributory, Public Safety Contributory and Noncontributory, and Firefighters' Retirement Systems. We assessed the following areas as part of the audit:

A. Documentation Required Under Title 49

Utah Code 49-22-102(6)(b) requires employers to officially designate Tier 2 elected officials and appointive officer positions as full-time eligible or part-time ineligible. The documentation can be a personnel policy or a board resolution.

At the time of the audit, Morgan County had this documentation on file.

B. Status Notifications

During the audit process, it was discovered that Morgan County had ineligible employees who had not been certified with URS. Certifying an employee with an ineligible status provides documentation that may protect employers from liability on claims for benefits made in the future.

Recommendation

1. **County staff are required to complete the Certification of Ineligibility process on the URS Employer Portal when an employee is hired as a Tier 1 or Tier 2 ineligible employee or moves from a position covered by a retirement benefit to a position not covered by a retirement benefit while continuing employment. County staff can reference Utah Code § 49-11-603 in Title 49.**

   County staff can certify each ineligible employee individually or by submitting a file via the batch upload process which has been provided for certifying many ineligible employees at one time.

Compliance Audit Results (Continued)

During the audit process it was discovered that Morgan County had employees who had terminated employment but had not been terminated with URS. Employers are required to complete the *Employee Separation Notice* on the URS Employer Portal when an employee terminates employment.

Recommendation

2. **County staff is required to separate all terminated employees on URS Employer Portal by completing an *Employee Separation Notice* for all employees who terminate employment, including ineligible employees.**

   County staff can separate each terminated employee individually or by submitting a file via the batch upload process which has been provided for terminating many employees at one time.

We encourage county staff to continue to use the Employment Wizard to certify all employees, including elected and appointed officials, and to terminate each as they separate from employment. URS strives to document precise employment periods for all members. By documenting clear and precise employment periods, employers will be aware of the employees' status with URS. Knowing an employee's status with URS is important for all types of employees, especially if the employer were to hire a retiree receiving a benefit from our office. With the Employment Wizard, staff can print confirmation notices for their records.

C. Contribution Reporting

In testing contribution reporting cycles, we found that county staff appear to consistently submit contribution reporting files to URS within the 30-day established timeframe. We recommend county staff for reporting contribution files in a timely and consistent manner.

In testing payroll records for members of the Public Employees' Retirement System, it was discovered that county staff had not been including pay codes 3-03 PTO Pay,6-01 Fire Pay, 7-02 Miscellaneous Pay, 7-07 Christmas Bonus, and 7-08 Jury Duty as retirement-eligible compensation when reporting retirement contributions to URS. All earnings and cash payments made to participants in the Public Employees' Retirement System are considered retirement-eligible compensation for which retirement contributions should be remitted.

Finding

1. County staff are required to update pay codes to include pay codes 3-03 PTO Pay, 6-01 Fire Pay, 7-02 Miscellaneous Pay, 7-07 Christmas Bonus, and 7-08 Jury Duty as retirement-eligible compensation. County staff can refer to Utah Code § 49-13-102 for additional information on retirement-eligible compensation.

   County staff is required to identify all members of the Public Employees' Retirement System and review contribution reporting to include pay codes 3-03 PTO Pay,6-01 Fire Pay, 7-02 Miscellaneous Pay, 7-07 Christmas Bonus, and 7-08 Jury Duty as retirement eligible compensation. County staff is required to make corrections on the URS Employer Portal dating back to October 6, 2022.

Compliance Audit Results (Continued)

In testing payroll records for members of the Public Safety Retirement System, it was discovered that county staff had not been reporting the declared base hours to be consistent with the *Declaration of Regularly-Scheduled Work Period* on file with URS. State law requires consistent reporting of the declared base hours.

Finding

2. County staff is required to update contribution reporting processes to consistently report the declared base hours for employees in the Public Safety Retirement System when reporting retirement-eligible compensation to URS. Staff can reference Utah Code § 49-15-102 and Utah Code § 49-16-102 for additional information on reportable compensation for public safety employees.

   County staff is required to review contribution reporting dating back to October 6, 2022, for all members of the Public Safety Retirement System and identify all public safety employees for whom declared hours have not been correctly and consistently reported to URS, based on the *Declaration of Regularly-Scheduled Work Period* currently on file. If reporting inconsistencies are found for public safety employees, county staff is required to make corrections on the URS Employer Portal.

In testing payroll records for members of the Public Employees' Retirement System, it was discovered that county staff had not been including code 6-10 EMT Pay as retirement-eligible compensation when reporting retirement contributions to URS. All earnings and cash payments made to participants in the Public Employees' Retirement System are considered retirement-eligible compensation for which retirement contributions should be remitted.

Repeat Critical Finding

1. County staff are required to update pay codes to include pay code 6-10 EMT Pay as retirement-eligible compensation. County staff can refer to Utah Code § 49-13-102 for additional information on retirement-eligible compensation.

   County staff is required to identify all members of the Public Employees' Retirement System and review contribution reporting to include pay code 6-10 EMT Pay as retirement eligible compensation. County staff is required to make corrections on the URS Employer Portal dating back to October 6, 2018.

   Morgan County is required to take corrective action for the repeat critical finding immediately. A follow-up audit will be conducted within 6 months to determine if corrective action has been taken. Failure to take corrective action for the finding subjects Morgan County to penalties outlined under Utah Code § 49-11-601 and Utah Code § 49-11-604(2), including continuing follow up audits at Morgan County's expense.

Morgan County staff is required to complete 2025-2026 adjustments on the URS Employer Portal. County staff is required to contact a URS Account Analyst for further instruction on completing all adjustments required prior to January 1, 2025.

Name	Title	Email	Phone
Jay Burton	Manager	jay.burton@urs.org	801-366-7455
Virginia Clark	Account Analyst	virginia.clark@urs.org	801-366-7453
Kim Jerman	Account Analyst	kim.jerman@urs.org	801-366-7394
Larry Williams	Account Analyst	larry.williams@urs.org	801-366-3962
Michelle Campbell-Nosack	Account Analyst	michelle.campbell-nosack@urs.org	801-366-7337
Aimee Woolsey	Account Analyst	aimee.woolsey@urs.org	801-366-7385

D. Employer Training

Morgan County staff would continue to benefit from reviewing information from URS and applying changes to the processes they manage as needed.

URS strives to provide educational opportunities to all employers. URS offers various trainings throughout the year. Upcoming trainings are listed below. Employers will receive an email each time new trainings become available. Staff can also reference the Employer Portal to view upcoming trainings.

Date	Training	Location
At Your Convenience	**Knowledge Corner on the Employer Portal**	**Webinars**
October 21, 2026	**Comprehensive Employer Training**	**Webinar**
November 18, 2026	**Verification of Termination**	**Webinar**

Final Remarks

URS staff are available to help Morgan County staff in their efforts of continued compliance in performing their defined benefit and defined contribution retirement plan related responsibilities.

Resource Numbers	
Employer Services	**801-366-7318**
Retirement	**801-366-7770**
Defined Contribution	**801-366-7720**
Marketing: Investment Advice	**801-366-7414**
All Other	**801-366-7700**

This audit and the resulting report are intended as a general review of your current policies and procedures regarding retirement administration. It is not a certification or guarantee that there may not be errors or omissions that would need to be corrected in the future if discovered.

Utah Retirement Systems

Employer Services Department
PO Box 1590 | Salt Lake City, UT 84110-1590
801-366-7318 | 800-753-7318
www.urs.org

MEMORANDUM

To: Ms. Leslie Hyde
Morgan County, EN215

From: Zach Garling & Gordon Tesch

Date: October 5, 2026

Subject: Acknowledgement of Compliance Audit Report Received

This memo acknowledges receipt of the Round 5 Compliance Audit Report dated October 6, 2026.

The report contains two recommendations, two findings and one repeat critical finding which require your immediate attention.

Please sign below, acknowledging receipt of the attached report, and return the signature page to me by October 9th, 2026, with any questions you may have.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Leslie A Hyde
Ms. Leslie Hyde, Business Administrator

10.7.2026
Date



Limit of 3 Minutes

***Please do not repeat previously stated comments**

***The Commission cannot respond – This is not a Q & A**

***Please Be Respectful**

Thank you for being here!

County Commission Agenda Request Form

All Agenda items, including back-up materials, must be submitted to:

Morgan County
Attn: Kate Becker
48 West Young Street
P O Box 886
Morgan, UT 84050
Phone: 801.845.4013
Email kbecker@moragncountyutah.gov

****ALL DOCUMENTATION IS DUE ON OR BEFORE 12:00 PM ON THE TUESDAY PRIOR TO A SCHEDULED COUNTY commission MEETING****

This form must be submitted, along with any required documentation, or the Agenda Item will not be scheduled until the next County commission Meeting

commission Meeting Date: 10-20-2026 **Time Requested:** 20:00 Min

Name: Bret Heiner **Phone:** 801-821-1475

Address: 380 No Industrial Dr Morgan Ut 84050

Email: bheiner@morgancountyutah.gov **Fax:** 801-845-4046

Associated County Department: Fairgrounds


PURPOSE FOR THE AGENDA ITEM - MUST BE SPECIFIC:

Trail Ex from the pickle ball courts to the end of the county property along the river .

Bret Heiner

WILL YOUR AGENDA ITEM BE FOR:

DISCUSSION
DECISION
BOTH x
INFORMATION ONLY



Fairgrounds Trail Extenstion Project
Construction Cost Estimate

Morgan County

				Engineer's Estimate	
	Description	**Quantity**	**Units**	**Unit Price**	**Amount**
1	Mobilization	1	L.S	$ 8,600.00	$ 8,600.00
2	Fine Grading and Subgrade Preparation (STA. 0+00 to STA. 7+50)	11,250	S.F.	$ 1.20	$ 13,500.00
3	Granular Borrow with Excavation (STA. 7+50 to STA. 20+14)	1,420	Tons	$ 30.00	$ 42,600.00
4	Untreated Base Course (6" Thick)	1,060	Tons	$ 35.00	$ 37,100.00
5	Hot Mix Asphalt (3" Thick)	380	Tons	$ 150.00	$ 57,000.00
6	Remove Tree	1	L.S.	$ 2,200.00	$ 2,200.00
7	8' X 20' Pedestrian Bridge	1	L.S.	$ 24,000.00	$ 24,000.00
TOTAL					**$ 185,000.00**
Contingency					
Total					**$ 185,000.00**

BID FORM

DATE: 9/11/2026

Fairgrounds Trail Extenstion Project

Morgan County

Bid Opening Date: TBD, Time: 2:00 PM

To: Morgan County,

The undersigned, having examined the proposed Contract Documents titled: **Fairgrounds Trail Extenstion Project**, and having visited the site and examined the conditions affecting the work, hereby proposes and agrees to furnish all labor, equipment, and materials and perform all operations necessary to complete work as required by said proposed Contract Documents, for that portion of the work identified in this Bid Form and for the sums stipulated below:

	Description	Quantity	Units	Unit Price	Amount
1	Mobilization	1	L.S		
2	Fine Grading and Subgrade Preparation (STA. 0+00 to STA. 7+50)	11250	S.F.		
3	Granular Backfill Borrow (STA. 7+50 to STA. 20+14)	660	Tons		
4	Untreated Base Course (6" Thick)	1060	Tons		
5	Hot Mix Asphalt (3" Thick)	380	Tons		
6	Remove Tree	1	L.S.		
7	8' X 20' Pedestrian Bridge	1	L.S.		
TOTAL					

Measurement & Payment

September 11, 2026

Bid Item 1 – Mobilization:

Measurement shall be by lump sum. Payment will be made according to the percentage of the total contract work completed (i.e., 50% paid when 50% of the work is completed). Payment includes the following work and items:

A. Secure permits, bonds, and insurance;
B. Move equipment and personnel to and from the job site;
C. Provide notice to existing residents as applicable;
D. Provide traffic control, barricades, signs, and devices; and
E. Complete all other miscellaneous responsibilities and operations not generally attributed to any other single bid item.

Bid Item 2 – Fine Grading and Subgrade Preparation (STA. 0+00 to STA. 7+50:

Measurement shall be by the square foot of the trail subgrade. The payment width is 15 feet. Payment shall be full compensation for all the labor, equipment, and materials to complete the fine grading and subgrade preparation for the trail. Payment includes the following work and items:

A. Coordinate with Owner and Engineer for survey control where applicable;
B. Grade to a smooth, consistent subgrade elevation;
C. Compact the subgrade; and
D. Complete all other work and times necessary for grading and subgrade preparation.

Note: Any excess materials from grading can be disposed by grading it out on-site adjacent to the trail location. The existing subgrade surface is generally asphalt millings.

Bid Item 3 – Granular Borrow Backfill and Excavation (STA. 7+70 to STA. 20+14):

Bid Item 4 – Untreated Base Course:

Bid Item 5 – Hot Mix Asphalt:

Measurement shall be by the ton as determined from weigh tickets. Weigh tickets shall include a gross weight, tare weight, designation of the material, date, and time. Payment shall be full compensation for all the labor, equipment, and materials to place the structural pavement for the trail. Payment includes the following work and items:

A. Provide material submittals prior to beginning work. Include gradations and testing for hot mix asphalt;
B. Excavate and place and compact granular borrow in the indicated areas;
C. Place and compact 6” thick UTBC as per the design drawings;
D. Place and compact 3-inch thick hot mix asphalt (PG 58-28, 15% maximum RAP, SP 3/8, 50 Nd);

E. Protect existing improvements, including the drainage swale, utilities, driveways, and any other permanent fixtures;
F. Provide cleanup or excess or spilled material;
G. Restore all existing improvements or utilities damaged during construction; and
H. Complete all other tasks and activities necessary for the trail pavement construction.

Bid Item 6 – Remove Tree:

Measurement shall be a lump sum to remove the tree. Payment shall be full compensation for all the labor, equipment, and materials to remove the existing tree and stump. Payment includes the following work items:


A. Remove tree, including all branches, trunk, and stump;
B. Load and haul the waste materials to a legal disposal or recycling facility;
C. Pay all disposal fees and costs;
D. Backfill excavations with suitable fill material;
E. Protect existing improvements, including fences, utilities, or other features; and
F. Complete all other appurtenant activities necessary to remove and dispose of the trees.

Bid Item 7 – 8' X 20' Pedestrian Bridge:

Measurement shall be by lump sum. Payment shall be full compensation for all labor, materials, and equipment to furnish and install the prefab bridge. Payment includes the following work and items:

A. Submit a complete design package for a prefabricated steel truss pedestrian bridge. Design shall meet or exceed the following requirements:
    - 8 ft wide by 20 ft span
    - Design load of 60 pounds per square foot
    - Powder coated finish for all exposed steel surfaces
    - Composite decking or equivalent
B. Site clearing (tree removal paid separately);
C. Excavate and prepare footing foundations;
D. Construct concrete footings and install the bridge per manufacturer's requirements;
E. Grade transitions to the bridge deck;
F. Complete all other tasks necessary for installation of the bridge.

TRAIL CROSS SECTION (TYP)



NOTES:

1. CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH MORGAN COUNTY STANDARDS (APWA, CURRENT EDITION).
2. MORGAN COUNTY IS CONSTRUCTING SPORTS FIELDS IN THE TRAIL AREA. COORDINATE ACCESS AND CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WITH THE LANDSCAPING CONTRACTOR.
3. LOCATE ALL EXISTING UTILITIES DURING CONSTRUCTION BY BLUE STAKES MARKING. NOTIFY THE COUNTY AND ENGINEER IF EXISTING UTILITIES CONFLICT WITH WORK.
4. NOTIFY THE ENGINEER IF ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE ACTUAL CONDITIONS AND THE DESIGN DRAWINGS BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.
5. PROVIDE QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL AS REQUIRED TO VERIFY COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY STANDARDS AND PROJECT SPECIFICATIONS.

MORGAN COUNTY

REV.	DATE	APPR.

WASATCH CIVIL
CONSULTING ENGINEERING
1118 DEPOT DRIVE, SUITE 250, ODGEN, UT 84404
(801) 779-9191 WASATCHCIVIL.COM

SITE PLAN

MORGAN COUNTY
FAIRGROUNDS TRAIL
EXTENSION

DRAWN: D.L.C.
DESIGNED:
CHECKED:

SEPT. 04, 2026

SHEET: 1

P:\09-MC\700-MISC\FAIRGROUNDS TRAIL PROJECT\CAD\BASE-DRAWINGS\BASE-PHASE 2.DWG 9/11/2026 2:41:12 PM

e. The Commission suggested potential solutions like speed signs, yield signs, and speed bumps to address traffic issues. And also moving a stop sign to be more visible to oncoming traffic that isn't currently very visible.
f. Lonnie also discussed the need for a drainage pipe to address flooding issues, noting previous promises and the impact of irrigation changes on water flow for a ditch near her home.
g. The Public Works Director commented on the flooding stating that that an engineer's estimate exists for installing a pipe, which would help manage normal runoff but would not fully control extreme flood events. He clarified that no funding had previously been designated for the project, though flood mitigation funds could be considered.
h. The Commissioners directed staff to move the project forward by putting it out to bid, with the intent of completing the work before winter if possible.

Discussion only, no motion taken.

2. **Bret Heiner** – Discussion/Decision – Morgan County Public Works Director
   Discussion and approval of a backup generator for the Public Works building and another for the County Library.
   a. The CAM stated that the item was placed back on the agenda at the Commissioner's request to ensure unused capital improvement funds were reconsidered, as current projects will not be completed this year and are budgeted for 2026. Therefore the money is available this year to purchase a generator.
   b. The Commission would like bids on a mobile generator to better facilitate more buildings to include Public Works Building and the Library and Fairgrounds.

Commissioner Fackrell moved to postpone this item.
Seconded by Commissioner Blocker
VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson AYE
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson AYE
Commissioner Newton AYE
Commissioner Blocker AYE
Commissioner Fackrell AYE
The Vote was unanimous. The Motion passed.

3. **Bret Heiner** – Discussion/Decision – Morgan County Public Works Director
   Discussion and decision on Phase II of the Fairgrounds Trail project.
   a. The CAM introduced this stating that the Public Works Director obtained an engineer's estimate for Phase Two of the trail and inquired about moving the project forward. It was noted that funding for the trail was not included in the FY26 budget and that the priority remains completing the multi-use fields planned for the same area. The final decision on project order rests with the Commission. Additionally, The Recreation Director raised concerns regarding the proposed trail route.
   b. The Recreation Director stated her concern relates to if the fields are the priority are routing the trail differently.
   c. The Commission agreed that the multi use fields will come first before the trail due to budgeting.

Commissioner Newton moved to postpone this item to our next meeting.
Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell
VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson AYE

Commission Vice Chair Nickerson AYE
Commissioner Newton AYE
Commissioner Blocker AYE
Commissioner Fackrell AYE
The Vote was unanimous. The Motion passed.

4. **Lydia Hebdon, Morgan Recreation Director** – Discussion/Decision – Multi-Use Fields
   Discussion and decision on applying for a permanent transfer of water shares for the well at the multi-use fields.
   a. The Recreation Director provided an update on the multi-use fields, noting coordination with the Utah State Engineer's Office to identify a water right with availability that could support a permanent change to the shallow well at the fairgrounds. An application has been prepared, requiring only a signature to proceed. It was clarified that this application is the first step in the process and does not itself transfer the rights. The State will conduct a review, including public notice and impact evaluation, to determine if the change can be approved.

Commissioner Blocker moved to approve the application for permanent water with State of Utah.
Seconded by Commissioner Newton
VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson AYE
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson AYE
Commissioner Newton AYE
Commissioner Blocker AYE
Commissioner Fackrell ABSTAIN
The Vote was 4 AYE, 1 ABSTAIN. The Motion passed.

5. **Kate Becker, Morgan Administrative Manager** – Discussion/Decision – UOT COOP
   Discussion and decision on a grant agreement within the Utah Cooperative Marketing Program through the State of Utah: Utah Office of Tourism. This is a matching grant and Morgan County would be committing 1:1 match funds from its tourism tax revenue. Contract Number: 260632789.
   a. The CAM introduced this stating requests approval to receive a $73,906 grant from the UOT Co-Op, with matching funds budgeted from tourism tax advisory board funds.

Commissioner Fackrell moved to approve the agreement of the Utah Cooperative Marketing Program grant.
Seconded by Commissioner Blocker
VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson AYE
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson AYE
Commissioner Newton AYE
Commissioner Blocker AYE
Commissioner Fackrell AYE
The Vote was unanimous. The Motion passed.

6. **Josh Cook, Planning & Development Director** – Discussion/Decision – Rollins Ranch

County Commission Agenda Request Form

All Agenda items, including back-up materials, must be submitted to:

Morgan County
Attn: Kate Becker
48 West Young Street
P O Box 886
Morgan, UT 84050
Phone: (435) 800.8724

Email: kbecker@morgancountyutah.gov

****ALL DOCUMENTATION IS DUE ON OR BEFORE 12:00 PM ON THE TUESDAY PRIOR TO A SCHEDULED COUNTY commission MEETING****

This form must be submitted, along with any required documentation, or the Agenda Item will not be scheduled until the next County commission Meeting

Commission Meeting Date: 10/20/'26 **Time Requested:** 10 min

Name: Kate Becker **Phone:** (801) 845-4015

Address: 48 W. Young Street

Email: jcook@morgancountyutah.gov **Fax:**

Associated County Department: Planning and Development Department

PURPOSE FOR THE AGENDA ITEM - MUST BE SPECIFIC:

Public Meeting/Discussion/Decision – *Wasatch Peaks Ranch Plat 1, Third Amendment:* consolidating two lots (C15 & C16).

WILL YOUR AGENDA ITEM BE FOR:

DISCUSSION	✔	**PUBLIC HEARING**	✔
DECISION	✔	**PUBLIC MEETING**	✔
BOTH	✔		
INFORMATION ONLY			

MORGAN COUNTY
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

COUNTY COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

Wasatch Peaks Ranch (WPR) Plat 1, 3rd Amendment (C15 & C16 Lot Consolidation)

April 23, 2026

WPR Plat 1, 3rd Amendment,
October 20, 2026
Public Meeting
File #26.024

Applicant/Owner:	Brian Nestoroff
Project Location:	3667 N. Peaks View Drive in unincorporated Morgan County.
Parcel Numbers:	00-0090-3155; 00-0090-3156
Serial Number:	12-WPR1C-0015; 12-WPR1C-0016
Current Zoning:	Resort Special District
Acreage:	3.9 acres; 3.0 acres

REQUEST: A request to amend the Wasatch Peaks Ranch Plat 1 by consolidating Lot C15 and C16. (This is the 3rd amendment to Plat 1.)

ATTORNEY GUIDANCE

Administrative Review: Administrative land use decisions are governed by applicable County ordinances. If an application complies with those ordinances, it must be approved.

The role of the Planning Commission and County Commission is not to determine whether they like or dislike a proposal, but whether the application complies with the County ordinances governing the application. Administrative applications are not discretionary policy decisions. Policy decisions are legislative matters addressed through the adoption, amendment, or repeal of ordinances. Administrative review is the application of existing County ordinances to a specific application.

Applicable Law: Under Utah Code § 17-79-508, an applicant is entitled to approval of a land use application if the application conforms to the applicable land use regulations, land use decisions, and development standards in effect when a complete application is submitted and all required fees are paid.

In exceptional circumstances, Utah courts have recognized that an otherwise compliant application may be denied where substantial evidence demonstrates that approval would seriously threaten public health, safety, or welfare. See *Western Land Equities, Inc. v. City of Logan*, 617 P.2d 388 (Utah 1980).

Review Framework

When reviewing an administrative land use application:

1. Determine Ordinance Compliance
    - Confirm the application complies with all applicable County ordinances.
2. Evaluate Evidence
    - Decisions should be based on applicable County ordinances and substantial evidence in the record.
    - The role of the Planning Commission and County Commission is to apply adopted ordinances, not create new standards during the review process.
3. Evaluate Conditions
    - Any conditions imposed should be required by, authorized by, or reasonably related to applicable County ordinances.

Decision Standards

Approval

- An administrative land use application must be approved if it complies with applicable County ordinances.

Denial

- An administrative land use application may be denied only if it does not comply with applicable County ordinances.
- In exceptional circumstances, an otherwise compliant application may be denied where substantial evidence demonstrates that approval would seriously threaten public health, safety, or welfare.

Findings

The record should clearly identify:

- The applicable ordinance provisions.
- The evidence relied upon, not merely the conclusions reached.
- Any conditions imposed and the legal basis for those conditions.
- The basis for approval or denial.

Important Considerations

- Administrative land use applications are not discretionary policy decisions.
- Public support, opposition, or public clamor is not a legal basis for approval or denial and does not, by itself, constitute substantial evidence.
- Do not rely on speculation, assumptions, or unsupported concerns.
- Apply ordinance provisions consistently to all applicants.
- The role of the Planning Commission is to apply adopted ordinances, not create new standards during the review process.

Personal preferences, policy concerns, or a desire for different requirements must be addressed legislatively through the adoption, amendment, or repeal of ordinances, not through review of an individual administrative application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

County Staff has reviewed the application for this 3rd amendment to Phase 1 of WPR. Staff is hereby recommending approval of the requested amendment based on the following findings and with conditions listed below:

Findings:

1. *That the subdivision is in conformance with the current land uses of the area.*
2. *That the proposal complies with applicable zoning and subdivision regulations.*
3. *That the proposal is not detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the public.*

Conditions:

1. *That all outsourced consultant fees are paid current prior to final plat recordation.*
2. *That all other local, state, and federal laws are adhered to.*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant is seeking approval to amend WPR Plat 1 by consolidating Lot C15 and Lot C16.

Plat 1 was recorded in May 2022. The consolidation of these two lots will not affect any rights-of-way, easements, or utilities.

ANALYSIS

These two lots have previously been reviewed and approved for preliminary and final approval as part of the WPR Plat 1. The consolidation of these two lots does not violate any Morgan County Code (MCC) or WPR Development Agreement. The consolidated lot will have a Building Area Envelope just like the previous lots.

PUBLIC NOTICE, MEETINGS, COMMENTS

- ✓ Public Notice was submitted to the State of Utah Public Notice website on or before September 28, 2026; a minimum of 10 days prior to the scheduled meeting. (Morgan County Code § 155.032 (C)).
- ✓ A Public Notice was posted at the County on or before September 28, 2026.
- ✓ Notices to property owners within 1000' feet of the proposed use were mailed a Public Notice on or before September 28, 2026.
- ✓ A sign was posted on the site on or before September 28, 2026.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

On October 8, 2026 the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the WPR Plat 1, 3rd Amendment.

Recommended Motions

Recommended Motion for *Approval* – "I move we approve the WPR Plat 1, 3rd Amendment, application number 26.024, allowing for the consolidation of Lot C15 and Lot C16, located at 3667 N. Peaks View Drive in unincorporated Morgan County, based on the findings and with the conditions listed in the staff report dated October 20, 2026."

Recommended Motion for *Approval* with *Conditions* – "I move we approve the WPR Plat 1, 3rd Amendment, application number 26.024, allowing for the consolidation of Lot C15 and Lot C16, located at 3667 N. Peaks View Drive in unincorporated Morgan County in unincorporated Morgan County, based on the findings and with the conditions listed in the staff report dated October 20, 2026, and with the following additional conditions:"

1. List any additional conditions

Recommended Motion for *Denial* – "I move we deny the WPR Plat 1, 3rd Amendment, application number 26.024, allowing for the consolidation of Lot C15 and Lot C16, located at 3667 N. Peaks View Drive in unincorporated Morgan County, based on the following findings:"

1. List any additional findings

Supporting Information

Exhibit A: Vicinity Map
Exhibit B: Wasatch Peaks Ranch Plat 1, Third Amendment

Exhibit A: Vicinity Map





Exhibit B: Wasatch Peaks Ranch Plat 1, Third Amendment

Click here to view a full-size .pdf version



MORGAN COUNTY RESOUTION CR 26-45

A RESOLUTION OF THE MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION APPOINTING CRAIG CALL AS THE ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING OFFICER TO HEAR APPEALS UNDER MORGAN COUNTY CODE TITLE 15, CHAPTER 154, SURVEYING AND SURVEY MONUMENTS.

WHEREAS, Morgan County Code Title 15, Chapter 154 establishes an administrative appeal process for certain discretionary decisions made by the Morgan County Recorder/Surveyor's Office; AND

WHEREAS, Morgan County Code § 154.54(E) explicitly authorizes the Morgan County Commission to appoint an Administrative Hearing Officer to hear and decide those administrative appeals under Chapter 154; AND

WHEREAS, the Morgan County Commission finds that appointing a qualified professional as an Administrative Hearing Officer will provide an impartial, fair, and efficient administrative review process consistent with the mandates of Chapter 154; AND

WHEREAS, Craig Call possesses extensive expertise in land use, local government, and administrative law necessary to execute these specific duties;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION AS FOLLOWS:

1. **Appointment.** The Morgan County Commission hereby appoints Craig Call to serve as the Administrative Hearing Officer for appeals filed pursuant to Morgan County Code § 154.54.

2. **Authority and Scope.** The Administrative Hearing Officer shall conduct hearings, review administrative records, and issue written decisions containing findings of fact and conclusions of law strictly in accordance with Morgan County Code Chapter 154 and applicable Utah State law.

3. **Term.** The Hearing Officer shall serve at the Commission's pleasure. The Commission may appoint a successor or revoke this appointment by resolution upon thirty (30) days' written notice to the Hearing Officer, unless the parties mutually agree in writing to an earlier effective date.

4. **Compensation.** Compensation for services rendered shall be governed by a separate professional services agreement approved by the Morgan County Commission attached as "Exhibit A."

5. **E ective Date.** This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of October 2026.

MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION:

_____

Matthew Wilson,
Morgan County Commission Chair

ATTEST:

_____

Leslie A. Hyde,
Morgan County Clerk/Auditor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____

Garrett Smith,
Morgan County Attorney

COMMISSION MEMBER VOTES:

	AYE:	NAY:	ABSENT:
Michael Newton	____	____	____
Vaughn Nickerson	____	____	____
Blaine Fackrell	____	____	____
Raelene Blocker	____	____	____
Matthew Wilson	____	____	____

EXHIBIT A

MONUMENT APPEALS HEARING OFFICER SERVICES AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT is entered into by and between Morgan County, a political subdivision of the State of Utah ("County"), and Craig Call ("Hearing Officer"), effective as provided below.

WHEREAS, Morgan County Code Chapter 154, Surveying and Survey Monuments, provides for administrative appeals of specified final written decisions of the Morgan County Recorder/Surveyor's Office; and

WHEREAS, the County desires to retain Craig Call as the Administrative Hearing Officer appointed by the Morgan County Commission pursuant to Morgan County Code §154.54(E), and Mr. Call agrees to provide those services;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

1. Appointment and Services. Subject to approval and appointment by the Morgan County Commission, Craig Call shall serve as the Administrative Hearing Officer for appeals authorized by Morgan County Code §154.54. Services include reviewing the appeal and administrative record, preparing for and conducting hearings, considering written requests for stays of enforcement, and issuing written orders and decisions. The Hearing Officer may affirm, reverse, modify, or remand an appealed decision or grant other relief authorized by Chapter 154 and applicable law. His authority is limited to that provided by Chapter 154 and applicable law.

2. Compensation. The County shall compensate the Hearing Officer at $125.00 per hour for services under this Agreement, including preparation, hearings, and preparation of orders and decisions. Travel time shall be compensated at $62.50 per hour. No mileage or other expenses related to travel shall be charged.

3. Availability and Hearing Procedures. The Hearing Officer shall provide services on an as-needed basis and conduct proceedings in accordance with Chapter 154 and applicable Utah law. Unless the parties to the appeal agree otherwise, he shall conduct the hearing within thirty (30) calendar days after receiving the transmitted appeal and administrative record and provide written notice of the hearing date, time, and location to the appellant and the Recorder/Surveyor's Office at least ten (10) calendar days before the hearing. He may establish deadlines for submission and exchange of evidence consistent with §154.54. He shall permit the parties to present relevant testimony, evidence, and argument, personally or through counsel, and apply the

appellant's burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence. He shall issue a written decision containing findings of fact and conclusions supporting the decision within thirty (30) calendar days after the close of the hearing unless the parties to the appeal agree otherwise. The written decision constitutes the County's final administrative action under Chapter 154.

4. Referral and Impartiality. The Recorder/Surveyor's Office shall receive appeals, determine completeness, and transmit complete appeals and the administrative record in accordance with §154.54(D). The County shall promptly notify the Hearing Officer of a filed appeal for scheduling purposes without substantive ex parte communications. The Hearing Officer shall not hear an appeal in which he participated in the underlying decision or has a conflict requiring disqualification under applicable law. He shall promptly disclose any such conflict and decline the assignment so the Commission may appoint a substitute. He shall not advise or represent the Recorder/Surveyor's Office in a matter he is hearing. Substantive communications concerning an appeal shall include all parties.

5. County Support. The County shall provide support services reasonably necessary for the Hearing Officer's responsibilities, including preparation and delivery of notices at his direction, files, dockets, clerical support during hearings, transcription of dictated notes, audio recording of hearings, delivery of written decisions, and collection of fees and fines. The County shall retain the hearing recording and all exhibits in accordance with applicable records retention requirements. The Hearing Officer shall provide the County with all official hearing records and decisions in his possession. County staff shall not direct or control his findings, conclusions, or decisions.

6. Independent Contractor. The Hearing Officer is an independent contractor. This Agreement does not create an employment relationship or entitle him to County employee benefits. The County shall not make tax withholdings from payments, and the Hearing Officer is responsible for applicable taxes. This provision does not limit his authority to act in his appointed adjudicative capacity under Chapter 154.

7. Term and Termination. This Agreement shall continue for one (1) year from its effective date and automatically renew for successive one-year terms unless either party terminates it for any reason upon thirty (30) days' written notice to the other party. The parties may terminate this Agreement at any time by mutual written consent. Upon termination, the Hearing Officer shall promptly deliver all pending case files and official hearing records to the County for transfer to a substitute appointed by the Commission.

8. Invoices and Payment. The Hearing Officer shall invoice the County for services provided, identifying each appeal, the dates of service, hours worked, and a description of the services. Payment is due within thirty (30) days after receipt of an invoice.

9. Separate Agreement; Modification. This Agreement governs only monument appeal services under Chapter 154. It does not amend or replace the parties' April 16, 2024 Appeals Hearings Officer Appointment Agreement for land use appeals and variances. This is the entire agreement regarding the services described herein and may be modified only by a writing signed by both parties.

10. Effective Date. This Agreement becomes effective on the later of execution by both parties and the effective date of the County ordinance establishing the Chapter 154 appeal procedure, subject to Commission approval and appointment of Craig Call under §154.54(E).

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement.

MORGAN COUNTY **CRAIG CALL**

By: _____ _____
Matthew Wilson, County Commission Chair Craig Call

Date: _____ Date: _____

ATTEST:

_____
Leslie Hyde, Morgan County Clerk/Auditor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
Garrett Smith, Morgan County Attorney

Morgan County Resolution CR 26-48

A RESOLUTION OF THE MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION AFFIRMING AND REAPPOINTING CERTAIN TRUSTEES AND TERMS OF OFFICE FOR THE BOARDS OF TRUSTEES FOR ROAM PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE DISTRICT NO. 1 AND ROAM PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE DISTRICT NO. 2.

WHEREAS, Morgan County, Utah (the "County") previously established the ROAM Public Infrastructure District No. 1 and ROAM Public Infrastructure District No. 2 (collectively, the "Districts") pursuant to the Public Infrastructure District Act, Title 17D, Chapter 4 of the Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended (the "PID Act"); AND

WHEREAS, at the Morgan County Commission meeting held on May 16, 2023, the Commission approved **Resolution CR-23-07**, which appointed **Holton Hunsaker** and **Walker Ward** to fill positions on the ROAM PID Boards, replacing former members Tony Hill and Greg Day; AND

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has requested that the Commission formally affirm the appointments, transition structures, and remaining terms of office for the current board members to ensure strict continuity of governance, public infrastructure development, and legal compliance; AND

WHEREAS, the Morgan County Commission is empowered by the Special District Act, Title 17B, Chapter 1 of the Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended; the PID Act; and the Governing Document of the Districts, to appoint trustees to the Districts' Boards of Trustees.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Affirmation of Board of Trustees and Terms for ROAM Public Infrastructure District No. 1

The Commission hereby formally confirms, affirms, and/or appoints the following individuals to serve as the Board of Trustees for ROAM Public Infrastructure District No. 1, with their respective terms of office established as follows:

- **Trustee 1: Holton Hunsaker** (originally appointed via Resolution CR-23-07), to serve a term expiring on **January 1, 2028**.
- **Trustee 2: Walker Ward** (originally appointed via Resolution CR-23-07), to serve a term expiring on **January 1, 2028**.

- **Trustee 3: Seth Robertson**, who is hereby reappointed to a transitional term expiring at **11:59 a.m. on January 1, 2028**. Pursuant to the Governing Document of the Districts and Utah law, this seat will transition to an elected position to be chosen during the next scheduled general municipal election, with the elected person taking office at noon on January 1, 2028.

Section 2. Affirmation of Board of Trustees and Terms for ROAM Public Infrastructure District No. 2

The Commission hereby formally confirms, affirms, and/or appoints the following individuals to serve as the Board of Trustees for ROAM Public Infrastructure District No. 2, with their respective terms of office established as follows:

- **Trustee 1: Holton Hunsaker** (originally appointed via Resolution CR-23-07), to serve a term expiring on **January 1, 2028**.
- **Trustee 2: Walker Ward** (originally appointed via Resolution CR-23-07), to serve a term expiring on **January 1, 2028**.
- **Trustee 3: Seth Robertson**, who is hereby reappointed to a full four (4) year term calculated from the conclusion of his prior term, officially expiring on **January 1, 2030**.

Section 3. Registered Voter Status
As required by the PID Act, each of the foregoing Trustees shall maintain their status as registered voters at their respective primary residence during the time of their service.

Section 4. Severability and Conflict
If any section, paragraph, clause, or provision of this Resolution shall for any reason be held to be invalid or unenforceable, the invalidity or unenforceability of such provision shall not affect any of the remaining sections of this Resolution. All resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

Section 5. Effective Date
This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its passage, approval, and adoption by the Morgan County Commission.

RESOLUTION CR 26-44

A RESOLUTION OF THE MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION TO WAIVE CERTAIN PLANNING AND ZONING FEES FOR THE FAIRGROUNDS PAVILION; PERMIT #0442401.

WHEREAS, the Morgan County Fairgrounds Board functions as an Advisory Board to the County Commission Administrator, who acts under the direction of the County Commission, AND

WHEREAS, said Advisory Board was awarded a grant to add a pavilion to the Morgan County Fairgrounds, AND

WHEREAS, the Morgan County Commission may waive or adjust fees for projects that serve a public purpose.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Morgan County Commission hereby approves the waiving of the permitting fees association with permit #0442401, commonly known as the Fairgrounds Pavilion.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of October 2026.

ATTEST:

MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION:

_____ _____

Matthew Wilson, County Commission Chair Leslie A. Hyde, Morgan County Clerk/Auditor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____

Garrett Smith, Morgan County Attorney

COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTING:

	AYE	NAY	ABSENT
Michael Newton	____	____	____
Vaughn Nickerson	____	____	____
Blaine Fackrell	____	____	____
Raelene Blocker	____	____	____
Matthew Wilson	____	____	____

Morgan County - Planning & Development Services

26-234 MC Accessory 750 Como Springs Road

09/28/2026 - 03/26/2027

Building Permit

General

Application Status

Complete

Printed: 10/02/2026

Permit/License #

0442401

Reference Number

982d7480-b60a-11f1-9f97-23b31cb415d6

Status

Active

Application Review Status

Pre-Review	Approved
The Zoning Administrator may take a project out of Pre-Review Status to allow the County Engineer to review to determine that all submittal items contain the required information necessary to be considered a complete application. While the application may be out of pre-review this does not constitute a complete application until such time as the County Engineer provides a memo stating all items are present.	
Building Official	Approved
Office Manager/Permit Tech	Approved
Weber-Morgan Health Department *NOT REQUIRED*	Reviewing
Morgan County Fire Department	Approved
Code Compliance Officer	Approved
Senior Planner	Approved
Final-Review	Approved

Date Submitted

09/21/2026

Date Approved/Denied

09/28/2026

Fees

There are no fees

Payments

There are no payments

Application Form Data

(Empty fields are not included)

Applicant First Name
Korey-Morgan County-Morgan Fairgrounds Pavilion #2

Applicant Last Name
Adams-Morgan County-Morgan Fairgrounds Pavilion #2

Phone Number
(801) 694-3262

Contact Email
koreyadams@adamsconstructionservicesut.com

Are you the property owner?
No

Owner First Name
Morgan County-Morgan County Fairgrounds

Owner Last Name
Morgan County-Morgan Fairgrounds

Phone Number
(435) 800-8724

Email
kBecker@morgancountyutah.gov

Applicant Mailing Street Address
PO Box 136

City
Morgan

State
UT

Zip Code
84050

Project Street Address
26-234 MC Accessory 750 Como Springs Road

Unit #
Morgan County Fairgrounds

City
Morgan

State
UT

Zip Code
84050

Does the property derive access from a State Right of Way?
Yes

What fire district is this located in?
Morgan County

What water district is this project in?
Well(s)

What Sewer District is this project in?
Septic

Zone
Town Center (TC)

Section
Morgan County Fairgrounds

Range
Morgan County Fairgrounds

Subdivision Name
Morgan County Fairgrounds

Lot #
Morgan County Fairgrounds

Parcel #
Morgan County Fairgrounds

Project Type
Accessory Building

Is this a residential or commercial project?
Commercial

Is a sprinkler system required?
No

Please state the type of land use or construction intended

This is a pavilion for the Morgan County Fairgrounds.

Previous Use of Land Structure

Morgan County Fairgrounds

Will any part of this structure be used for a business?

No

Total Square Footage of Project

3000

Calculated Project Valuation

718830

Will a contractor be completing the work?

Yes

General Contractor First Name

Korey

General Contractor Last Name

Adams

Phone Number

(801) 694-3262

Email

koreyadams@adamsconstructionservicesut.com

Business Name

Adams Construction Services

Contractors License #

10761620-5501

General Contractor Mailing Street Address

PO Box 136

City

Morgan

State

UT

Zip Code

84050

Will there be any additional contractors?

No

Will there be an architect/engineer working on this project?

No

Please List Other Buildings Now on Lot

NA

Building Dimensions

30 ft by 100 ft

Is this a restricted lot?

No

Will there be retaining walls?

No

Please select the type of fire protection system you will be using

Other

Occupancy Group

A-4 Assembly, arenas

Construction Type (Leave this blank if aren't sure. Most residential dwellings will be VB):

VB

Upload Plans (including Stamped Structural Plans)

20260902 22-274.01 ACS Morgan Fairgrounds Pavilion #2-Final Plan.pdf

Upload a Memorandum of Understanding

Memorandum+of+Understanding.pdf

Is a Land Use Permit required?

No

Is Geoscoping Required?

No

Signature

I agree to comply with all County and State Building laws and ordinances, and the representation in this application of a building permit are true and accurate, and any misrepresentations or errors herein are the sole responsibility of the applicant, and in no way shall incur or accrue the liability or obligation to enforcing officers or agents. This permit becomes null and void if work on construction authorized is not commenced within 180 days, or if construction or work is suspended or abandoned for a period of 180 days at any time after work is commenced.

USE OR OCCUPANCY OF A STRUCTURE IS PROHIBITED UNTIL AFTER FINAL INSPECTION IS APPROVED AND "CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY" IS ISSUED.

Electronically Signed
Korey Adams - 09/21/2026 4:20 pm

Messages

09/28/2026 8:38 am - Brynnlee Savage

Your permit has been issued! Please feel free to move forward with work, and please call us at 801-845-4015 to schedule any necessary inspections! Your permit number is 26-234 or 0442401. Best of luck! - Brynnlee S

09/22/2026 8:26 am - Brynnlee Savage

Thank you for your application *for* Morgan County :D you will be the point of contact for this permit! Everything looks good to go so I'll move you over to plan review! Thank you - Brynnlee S

Internal Notes

09/21/2026 16:36 pm - Brynnlee Savage

Fees waived, County project

09/22/2026 8:38 am - Chris Tremea

@{{user||64822fb3e24f53b4cb4ab064||Dustan Little}}, I was thinking that Jonathan could take care of this one.

09/25/2026 10:15 am - Chris Tremea

@{{user||6a2ad801b507b4b288ff09ac||Brynnlee Savage}}- Please give a Building Permit and P Drive update along with your final approval to the permit

10/02/2026 12:14 pm - Chris Tremea

Kate is taking to County Commission for a Fee Waiver

October 6, 2026

4:00 PRESENTATIONS & 5:00 REGULAR MEETING

PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that the MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION will hold a regular Commission meeting in the Commission meeting room at 48 West Young Street, Morgan, Utah.

Note: Commissioner Wilson will attend remotely.

COUNTY COMMISSION
Commission Chair Matt Wilson (attended remotely)
Commissioner Mike Newton
Commissioner Raelene Blocker
Commissioner Blaine Fackrell
Commission Vice Chair Vaughn Nickerson

OTHER EMPLOYEES
IT Director Jeremy Archibald
Administrative Manager Kate Becker (CAM)
County Attorney Garrett Smith (CA)
County Clerk/ Auditor Leslie Hyde
Deputy Clerk/Auditor Chloe Adams
Deputy Clerk/ Auditor Penny Butler
Planner Kent Page
Attorney Janet Christofferson
County Recorder Shaun Rose
County Assessor Janell Walker
Surveyor Devron Andersen
Library Director Erin Bott

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE
Debbie Sessions
Tina Kelley
Lisa Wright
Abby Beattie
Emily Pfeiffer
Beatriz Prince
Kelly Waight
Jeff Mathews
Danna Bauer
Jill Boss
Shawn Green
Jacie Wordie
Wade Warner
Robyn Casper
Avery Walsh
Libby Oseguera
Annessa Odum

DRAFT

4:00 PRESENTATIONS

Morgan Valley Arts Council: Abby Beattie, Lisa Wright, & Emily Pfeifer; Presentation on a possible revamp of the Morgan County Administration Building Auditorium

Lisa Wright and Abby Beattie (Co-Presidents, Morgan Valley Arts Council), joined by Artistic Director Emily Pfeiffer, proposed partnering with the County to renovate the auditorium in the County Administration Building into a small performing arts venue seating roughly 150 to 250. Abby Beattie explained that the Utah Division of Arts and Museums has identified Morgan County as well below the state average for arts opportunities, that the high school auditorium is the only performance venue in the county and is overscheduled, and that community music, choir, and student groups have no suitably sized place to perform. The auditorium is already county owned and operated, centrally located, and well proportioned for acoustics. Proposed improvements include building out the stage, basic lighting and sound, acoustic treatment, new flooring, and flexible seating that would keep the room available for its existing uses. The County would continue to own, operate, and maintain the building, and the Arts Council, as a nonprofit with access to grants and foundation funding, is prepared to lead fundraising for the project.

The Arts Council asked the County to fund a feasibility study by a firm specializing in performance spaces, either a basic remote study or a full on-site assessment that would evaluate the building systems and produce plans and a detailed budget. The Commission discussed the recreation, arts, museums, and parks (RAMP) tax,

which is currently committed to the County's recreation program and will be before voters for renewal in 2028, as well as the age of the building and staffing for a venue of this size.

No action was taken. The Commission reached consensus to place the feasibility study on the next meeting agenda as an action item, expressed a preference for the full on-site study, and asked staff to research whether recreation tax fund balance may be used to pay for it.

Utah Developmental Disabilities Council: Avery Walsh; Presentation on their Rural Transportation Project

The presenters were delayed by traffic and gave an abbreviated presentation. **Libby Oseguera (Executive Director, Utah Developmental Disabilities Council)** explained that the Council is a governor-appointed, federally funded board that works to ensure people with intellectual and developmental disabilities have the resources and supports to participate in their communities. **Avery Walsh** reported that transportation is consistently the highest unmet need for people with disabilities, particularly in rural areas without fixed-route service, described voucher, shared-ride, and contracted accessible van programs other Utah counties are using, and stated that the Council's goal is to learn what Morgan County is working on and help build local partnerships.

No action was taken. The Commission expressed interest in having the Council return for a full presentation, and **Kate Becker (CAM)** will coordinate dates with the presenters.

5:00 COMMENCEMENT OF MEETING

Commission Vice Chair Nickerson conducted the meeting. Commission Chair Wilson attended remotely.

(A) Opening Ceremonies

1. Welcome
2. Invocation and/or Moment of Reflection: **Hon. Commissioner Nickerson**
3. Pledge of Allegiance

(B) Consent Agenda Items

1. Approval of the Morgan County Commission Minutes from September 15th, 2026.
2. Approval of the Morgan County Commission Minutes from September 22nd, 2026.
3. Approval of a contract with the State of Utah for the Governor's Office of Economic Development Rural County Grant. Contract Number 270633108 (No County funds required)
4. Approval of a Professional Services Agreement with SAFEbuilt, LLC for plans examining and building inspecting services as approved by the Morgan County Commission at their May 5th meeting in 2026.

In response to a question on consent item 4, **Kate Becker (CAM)** clarified that the Commission approved three firms for these services on May 5 following a request for qualifications, and that the SAFEbuilt agreement is the first to complete legal review.

Commissioner Newton moved to approve the consent agenda items.

Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye

DRAFT

Why the County Commission cannot use Morgan County RAMP revenues for a feasibility study converting the Morgan County Auditorium into a recital hall.

The proposition placed before the voters of Morgan County and the subsequent Ordinance CO 18-11 imposing a .1% local sales and use tax, limited the purpose to funding recreational programs and facilities within Morgan County. This intentionally excluded language from Utah Code Title 59, Chapter 12, Part 7 that would have additionally allowed for funding of Botanical, Cultural, and Zoological Organizations or Facilities.

In UCA 59-12-702 Definitions

" "**Recreational facility**" means a publicly owned or operated park, campground, marina, dock, golf course, playground, athletic field, gymnasium, swimming pool, trail system, or other facility used for recreational purposes."

""**Cultural facility**" means any publicly owned or operated museum, theater, art center, music hall, or other cultural or arts facility."

Because the language in **Morgan County Ordinance No. CO-18** strictly limits funding to **"recreational programs and facilities"** and omits the "cultural" and "arts" wording found in the Sales and Use Tax Act; A recital hall or an arts auditorium study cannot be easily categorized as a recreational facility. Legally, it remains a cultural arts facility.

<u>Possible other funding mechanisms:</u>

- Tourism Tax
- Economic Development- Rural Economic Opportunity Grant
- General Fund Balance
- Private Donation

The reason Capital Projects is not listed above is due to the funds already committed for 2027 and no remaining fund balance is available to pull from.

- establish a state-controlled process that allows persons with certain illnesses to acquire and use medical cannabis and, in certain limited circumstances, to grow up to six cannabis plants for personal medical use;
- authorize the establishment of facilities that grow, process, test, or sell medical cannabis and require those facilities to be licensed by the state; and
- establish state controls on those licensed facilities, including:
  - electronic systems that track cannabis inventory and purchases; and
  - requirements and limitations on the packaging and advertising of cannabis and on the types of products allowed?

Initial Fiscal Impact Estimate:
The Governor's Office of Management and Budget estimates the law proposed by this initiative would result in total fiscal expenses of $2,900,000 ($1,800,000 ongoing and $1,100,000 one-time).

Fee collections would cover about $1,400,000 of ongoing costs. General state revenues would be required for remaining ongoing costs ($400,000) and all onetime costs ($1,100,000).

Under the proposed sales tax exemption, the state and local governments may initially forego $1,600,000 in sales tax revenue. Foregone revenue could increase over time if consumption and taxable sales increase in the later years following implementation.

Consumer and firm behavior different than assumed would alter these estimates.

In addition, the cost of posting information regarding the initiative in Utah's statewide newspapers and for printing the additional pages in the voter information packet is estimated at $30,000 in one-time funds.

◯ FOR
◯ AGAINST

rate by 0.15%, resulting in a 3.191% increase in the current tax rate.

Initial Fiscal Impact Estimate:

The Governor's Office of Management and Budget estimates that this proposed initiative would, in fiscal year 2021 (upon full phase-in of the federal Affordable Care Act):

- Result in new state fiscal expenses of about $77,000,000 for Medicaid services
- Increase state sales taxes by about $90,000,000 by increasing the state sales tax rate by 0.15%, from 4.70% to 4.85% (a 3.2% increase from the current tax rate).

Beyond FY 2021, costs could outpace new revenue depending on actual cost and revenue trajectories. Estimates could vary with changes in federal law, federal funding, taxpayer behavior and Medicaid recipient behavior, among other factors.

In addition, the cost of posting information regarding the proposed initiative in Utah's statewide newspapers and for printing additional pages in the voter information pamphlet is estimated at $30,000 in one-time funds.

◯ FOR
◯ AGAINST

PROPOSITION NUMBER 4
Shall a law be enacted to:

- create a seven-member commission to recommend redistricting plans to the Legislature that divide the state into Congressional, legislative, and state school board districts;
- provide for appointments to that commission: one by the Governor, three by legislative majority party leaders, and three by legislative minority party leaders;
- provide qualifications for commission members, including limitations on their political activity;
- require the Legislature to enact or reject a commission-recommended plan; and
- establish requirements for redistricting plans and authorize lawsuits to block implementation of a redistricting plan enacted by the Legislature that fails to conform to those requirements?

Initial Fiscal Impact Estimate:
The Governor's Office of Management and Budget estimates that the law proposed by this initiative would result in a total fiscal expense of approximately $1 million.

In addition, the cost of posting information regarding the initiative in Utah's statewide newspapers and for printing the additional pages in the voter information packet is estimated at $30,000 in one-time funds.

◯ FOR
◯ AGAINST

LOCAL PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSTION #17
Shall a study committee be appointed to consider and possibly recommend a change in the form of government of Morgan County?

◯ YES
◯ NO

PROPOSTION #22
Shall Morgan, Utah, be authorized to impose a .1% sales and use tax for the purpose of funding recreation programs and facilities within Morgan County?

◯ YES
◯ NO

UNOFFICIAL BALLOT

Ent 146576 Bk 348 Pg 192
Date: 03-JAN-2019 4:21:37PM
Fee: NoneFiled By: CB
BRENDA NELSON, Recorder
MORGAN COUNTY
For: MORGAN COUNTY

ORDINANCE No. CO-18-11

AN ORDINANCE IMPOSING A 0.1% LOCAL SALES AND USE TAX FOR THE PURPOSE OF FUNDING RECREATION PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES WITHIN MORGAN COUNTY.

WHEREAS, Title 59, Chapter 12, Part 7 of the Utah Code (the "Act") authorizes counties in Utah to submit to the registered voters of the county the question of whether the county should impose a 0.1% Sales and Use Tax within the county for the limited purpose of funding recreational programs and facilities in the county (the "RAMP Tax"); and

WHEREAS, the County General Election was held on November 6, 2018 where a ballot proposition for the imposition of the RAMP Tax was submitted to the registered voters within the county and a majority of those voters voted in favor of that ballot proposition;

WHEREAS, the County shall contract, prior to the effective date of this Ordinance, with the Utah State Tax Commission to perform all functions incident to the administration or operation of this Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the County Council has determined that a RAMP Tax would be beneficial to the County and its residents through the promotion of recreational programs or facilities in the County;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it ordained by the County Council of Morgan, Utah, as follows:

SECTION 1. The County of Morgan hereby imposes a 0.1% Sales and Use tax, referred to as the "RAMP Tax" pursuant to the County Option Funding for Recreational Programs and Facilities within the County of Morgan. The RAMP Tax will be levied and administered under the terms of the Act.

SECTION 2. The RAMP Tax will be imposed upon the transactions described in Section 59-12-703 of the Act, that are located within the County of Morgan, except as transactions are exempt from sales and use taxes under the Act. The RAMP Tax supplements, but does not replace, any sales and use tax previously established by Morgan County.

SECTION 3. The RAMP Tax will take effect on April 1, 2019 and will remain effective for ten years after that date. For transactions subject to the RAMP Tax pursuant to the Act, the effective date shall be the first day of the billing period that begins after April 1, 2019, if the billing period for the transaction begins before April 1, 2019. For catalogue sales (as defined by the Utah State Tax Commission) where the amount of the tax due is based on tax rates published in the catalogue, the effective date shall be June 1, 2019.

SECTION 4. The County Clerk is directed to deliver a notice in substantially the form attached as Exhibit A to the Utah State Tax Commission. The County Clerk is further directed to publish a summary of this ordinance in a newspaper of general circulation within the county.

SECTION 5. All acts, resolutions and ordinances in conflict with any part of this Ordinance are repealed and superseded by this Ordinance.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 18th DAY OF December, 2018.

ATTEST: MORGAN COUNTY GOVERNING BODY

Stacy Netz Clark
Morgan County Clerk

Ned Mecham, County Council Chair

APPOVED AS TO FORM

Jann L. Farris
Morgan County Attorney

COUNCIL MEMBERS *VOTING*:

	AYE	NAY	ABSENT
Tina Cannon	✓		
Austin Turner			✓
Robert Kilmer	✓		
Daryl Ballantyne	✓		
John Barber	✓		
Roland Haslam	✓		
Ned Mecham	✓		

EXHIBIT A

December 19, 2018

Utah State Tax Commission
210 North 1950 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84134

RE: Notice of Imposition of Local Sales Tax in Morgan County.

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter provides notice as required by Utah Code Section 59-12-703 that on December 18, 2018, the County Council of Morgan County, Utah (the "County") adopted an ordinance imposing a 0.1% local sales and use tax (referred to as the "RAMP Tax") within the County for the purposes of financing parks and recreational programs and facilities within the County. The RAMP Tax will take effect on April 1, 2019, and will remain effective for ten years after that date. For transactions subject to the RAMP Tax pursuant to Section 59-12-703 et seq, the effective date shall be the first day of the billing period that begins after April 1, 2019, if the billing period for the transaction begins before April 1, 2019. For catalogue sales (as defined by the Utah State Tax Commission) where the amount of the tax due is based on tax rates published in the catalogue, the effective date shall be June 1, 2019.

Sincerely,

Stacy Netz Clark
Morgan County Clerk Auditor

UTAH COUNTIES INDEMNITY POOL

October 3, 2025

Leslie Hyde
Morgan County Clerk/Auditor
PO Box 886
Morgan, UT 84050

RE: Annual Membership Meeting

Dear Leslie:

The Utah Counties Indemnity Pool's Annual Membership Meeting will be held at 11:00 a.m. on Wednesday, November 18, 2026, at the Megaplex Theatres at Jordan Commons in Sandy, Utah.

Pursuant to the Pool Bylaws, Article 4.7, *Members shall have the obligation to: (*b) *Designate in writing a representative and one or more alternate representatives for the Membership Meetings. Each representative and alternate representative must be an elected or appointed officer or employee of a Member and must be appointed by majority vote of the governing body or by the county executive or county mayor of the Member to be the Member's official representative for the purposes of the Pool. An alternate representative may exercise all the powers of a representative during a Membership Meeting, in the absence of the representative.*

Please have the Morgan County Governing Body appoint a representative and an alternate representative, who will attend the Membership Meeting on November 18, **by adopting the attached resolution** at the **next Morgan County meeting**. Please email the signed resolution to amichale@ucip.utah.gov no later than November 6, 2026.

The UCIP Board of Directors request that you encourage the Commissioners to attend this Annual Meeting of the Members. Register for the event through Eventbrite.

Sincerely,

Aly Michale

Aly Michale
Executive Administrative Assistant

Resolution CR 26-51

RESOLUTION OF APPOINTMENT OF A MORGAN COUNTY REPRESENTATIVE AND AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE UTAH COUNTIES INDEMNITY POOL ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING.

WHEREAS, the Governing Body of Morgan County, Utah, is the proper authority to appoint a qualified person to act as the official representative for Morgan County at the Utah Counties Indemnity Pool Membership Meeting to be held on November 18, 2026; AND

WHEREAS, the Governing Body of Morgan County, Utah, has been informed that the By-laws of the Utah Counties Indemnity Pool require that the official representative and an alternate representative for Morgan County must be an elected or appointed officer or employee of a Member and must be appointed by majority vote of the Governing Body of the Member to be the Member's official representative for the purposes of the Pool.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Governing Body of Morgan County, Utah, hereby appoints the **Hon. Shaun Rose** (Morgan County Recorder) as the official Morgan County representative for the Utah Counties Indemnity Pool Membership Meeting to be held on November 18, 2026, with **Hon. Janell Walker** (Morgan County Assessor) as an alternate representative.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of October 2026.

MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION:

_____

Matthew Wilson, County Commission Chair

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____

Garrett Smith, Morgan County Attorney

ATTEST:

_____

Leslie A. Hyde, Morgan County Clerk/Auditor

COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTING:

	AYE	NAY	ABSENT
Michael Newton	____	____	____
Vaughn Nickerson	____	____	____
Blaine Fackrell	____	____	____
Raelene Blocker	____	____	____
Matthew Wilson	____	____	____

County Commission Agenda Request Form

All Agenda items, including back-up materials, must be submitted to:

Morgan County
Attn: Kate Becker
48 West Young Street
P O Box 886
Morgan,UT 84050
Phone: 435.800.8724

Email: kbecker@morgancountyutah.gov

****ALL DOCUMENTATION IS DUE ON OR BEFORE 12:00 PM ON THE TUESDAY PRIOR TO A SCHEDULED COUNTY commission MEETING****

This form must be submitted, along with any required documentation, or the Agenda Item will not be scheduled until the next County commission Meeting

commission Meeting Date: 10/20/2026 **Time Requested:**

Name: Matt Wilson **Phone:** (801) 725-4457

Address: 646 S. Highway 66

Email: matt@wilsonspaintandfloors.com **Fax:**

Associated County Department: Commission

PURPOSE FOR THE AGENDA ITEM - MUST BE SPECIFIC:

Reintroducing the approval of the cottonwoods DA

WILL YOUR AGENDA ITEM BE FOR:

DISCUSSION	
DECISION	
BOTH	☑
INFORMATION ONLY	

The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

6. Josh Cook – Discussion/PUBLIC HEARING/Decision – County Planning and Zoning
Cottonwoods at Mountain Green Development Agreement Third Amendment: A request for approval of County Ordinance CO 26-02, a third amendment to the Development Agreement for the Cottonwoods at Mountain Green.
This was noticed for Public Hearing for the February 17th, 2026, Commission meeting and at that meeting was continued to a-date-certain being May 19th, 2026. At the May 19th, 2026, meeting it was continued to a-date-certain being July 7th. At the July 7th, 2026, meeting it was continued to a-date-certain being August 4th, 2026. At the August 4th, 2026, meeting it was continued to a-date-certain being September 1st, 2026. At the September 1st, 2026, meeting it was continued to a-date-certain being September 15th, 2026.

Ray Nettleton, on behalf of the applicants, stated that no presentation was planned because the Commission had reviewed the proposal several times, and offered to answer questions.

In response to questions, the applicant explained that each landowner group has made its own open space commitments: the revised Phase Six property provides at least 40% open space and a new park; the Phase Nine MGI property provides 47% open space, including at least 50 acres of agricultural open space; and the Phase Nine MCC property, which is being added to the agreement, provides approximately 87% open space and guarantees trails and open space in perpetuity. Across the amendment area this averages approximately 67% open space. The total number of dwelling units has been reduced from 253 proposed last November to 222, with no townhomes and no lots smaller than 10,000 square feet.

The revised Phase Six and Phase Nine MGI properties are already within the boundaries of the master HOA. The Phase Nine MCC property is not, and the master HOA must approve its inclusion by a 75% vote. The amendment requires each property to join the master HOA or form an alternate HOA before platting. Two changes were agreed to during discussion: removing the word "commercially" from the provision requiring reasonable and good faith efforts to join the master HOA, and correcting the term provision to state a single termination date of September 2046, removing the alternative termination language. The Deputy County Attorney also confirmed that the references to the "applicable HOA" and the "alternative HOA" carry the same meaning.

Commissioners discussed whether the agricultural open space requirement should read "at least" or "up to" 50 acres. It was clarified that "at least" sets a minimum, and the language remained "at least." The owner of the Phase Nine MGI property stated that he intends to keep as much land open as possible but wants flexibility in lot sizes and layout. It was explained that the agricultural land will be deed restricted and platted as agricultural open space, that the original agreement allows the developer to deed the land to the master HOA if farming ceases, and that recorded covenants would remain in place if the land were sold.

Commissioners also discussed the proposed 104 dwelling units in the revised Phase Six property, compared with 91 units under the overlay report (94 with the three bonus units previously discussed for a park). The applicant stated that the parks, additional trails and open space offered justify the requested density, that density is tied to each property and cannot be transferred between properties, and that if the amendment is not approved the alternative would be to build an equestrian center under the original agreement with 91 units. Additional bonus density for other developers would require a separate amendment to the development agreement.

Commissioner Blocker moved to enter public hearing.

Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Absent
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Absent
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

Public Hearing:

Jennifer Lance, Cottonwoods MOA: Reported that the MOA's legal team spoke with the original developer's counsel, who assured them that the developer's declarant rights would not be used to oppose the MOA's decision to annex the applicants' land, so a separate HOA would not be needed. The MOA's remaining concern is density: the Cottonwoods was approved as a master-planned community, with bonus density granted in exchange for a binding plan that includes density limits, community-wide amenities and 40% native open space. She asked that native open space be protected even if agricultural land is privately held, and that the overlay totals of 91 lots in Phase Six (94 with the three bonus lots already agreed to) and 93 lots in Phase Nine be upheld so that all developers are held to the same standard.

Commission Vice Chair Nickerson joined the meeting remotely.

Zack Burton, Mountain Green: Stated that he is not a member of the MOA. Asked whether the restrictive easements for the agricultural land and trails would remain in perpetuity if the MOA agreement or the 2046 term expires. Stated that he would support the applicants keeping their land in agriculture if the deed restrictions remain permanently in place and the trails are secured by permanent easements. Expressed concern that the requested density in Phase Six exceeds the overlay totals and stated that the maximum should be between 91 and 94 units. Stated that the other elements of the proposal are excellent.

Heidi Doria, Mountain Green: Stated that the previous developer holds a significant amount of native open space in Phase Nine that is separate from the applicants' land, and that land the applicants will farm should remain agricultural. Noted that each phase must still return for planning review and technical studies, so approval of the amendment allows the applicants to plan but is not approval of any individual phase. Stated that she supports the amendment, including the prohibition on moving density between phases, and cautioned about the work involved in maintaining agricultural land.

Janet Christoffersen clarified that the original documents define preserved open space as land that is perpetually left naturally undeveloped or in agricultural use.

Zack Burton, Mountain Green: Stated that the original developer is deeding land to the MOA, and that a portion of the original open space was intended to remain native. Cited the community's past experience with agricultural open space being sold and trails being closed, and asked that agricultural open space be protected long term through deeded easements. Stated that he is comfortable with the applicants' agricultural open space if it is protected in perpetuity.

Eric Plyer, Mountain Green: Stated that the applicants feel they are being held accountable for the actions of a previous developer, and that they will deed restrict land and develop in accordance with the development agreement as they have said. Noted that any future phase must still go through preliminary plat and technical review, that density under the agreement is not fixed to specific parcels, that the overlay report is a living document, and that the applicants are not taking all of the remaining density. Stated that the applicants have given up a great deal and asked for a vote.

Ray Nettleton, applicant: Stated that a representative of the original developer had verbally agreed not to oppose annexation of the MCC property into the master association, and asked that the Commission formalize this by voting to include it in the development agreement area with the rights of a declarant. Noted that the amendment provides approximately 67% open space against a 40% minimum, that the overlay report was not followed when an equestrian center and open space were previously removed, and that the amenities offered justify the requested density. Stated that other developers would need to come before the Commission with their own proposals for any remaining density, and that without the amendment the property would revert to base zoning. Thanked Janet Christoffersen for working over the Labor Day weekend and the Commissioners for their time and negotiation.

Kate Becker, Morgan City: Speaking as a resident, stated that she supports agricultural open space, noting that wildlife favors cultivated crops over unmaintained native brush.

Tina Kelley, Mountain Green: Stated that many different density numbers were being discussed and asked that the Commission use the base density in the original development agreement as its reference point.

Louise Early, Mountain Green: Thanked the Commission and the MOA committee. Stated that the community has learned lessons about density and trails, including that farming operations and insurance concerns can close trails, and that the community maintains its native open space. Asked that native open space and low density be preserved, noting that density in another phase was reduced because of traffic and congestion.

Heidi Nettleton, applicant group: Stated that the theoretical maximum density in the ordinance is much higher than what the applicants are proposing, and that the applicants met with the community many times to address concerns about open space, easements and restrictions. Stated that the trails will be deeded and roughly doubled, and that the community receives more with the amendment than without it.

Ray Nettleton, applicant: Stated that the trails through the agricultural open space will be deeded to the HOA and the public rather than held as easements, so they cannot be removed once recorded, and that the restrictions in the amendment close the loopholes of past agreements.

Commissioner Fackrell moved to close the public hearing and rejoin the regular meeting.

Seconded by Commissioner Blocker

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Absent
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye

The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

The Commission discussed the public comments. Commissioners emphasized that agricultural open space must be protected in perpetuity so that it cannot be developed, while remaining available for farming and grazing, and that trails and parks are valuable amenities for the community. Janet Christoffersen advised that the land will be platted as agricultural open space, that the development agreement runs with the land, and that the County should confirm at the time of platting that trails and easements are properly recorded so that problems experienced in earlier phases do not recur.

Josh Cook clarified that the amendment is a legislative decision and that the Commission may approve it, deny it, or cap density. Density for each phase is set at platting from an overall maximum, and the question before the Commission was whether the amenities offered are equal to or greater in value than the previously planned golf course that supported additional density.

Commissioners discussed the requested density in the revised Phase Six property, including a possible reduction to 94 units. The applicant stated that a reduction would not be acceptable, that the amenities offered justify the requested number, and asked that the Commission proceed to a vote.

Commissioner Fackrell moved to approve County Ordinance CO 26-02, the Third Amendment to the Development Agreement for the Cottonwoods at Mountain Green, together with the supplement to the overlay report, with the modifications discussed during the meeting, including removal of the word "commercially" from the reasonable and good faith efforts provision and correction of the term provision.

Seconded by Commissioner Nickerson

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Nay
Commissioner Newton: Absent
Commissioner Blocker: Nay
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was not unanimous. The motion failed.
Commissioners voting nay stated for the record that they considered the density requested for the revised Phase Six property to be too high, citing input from residents of the community; traffic concerns were also noted.

(G) Commissioner Comments:

Commission Chair Wilson

Reminded everyone that the rifle range has reopened.

Commissioner Blocker

Reported that at the UAC board meeting, counties were asked to join an amicus brief in a federal case concerning jury size. If the federal standard required 12-member juries instead of the eight allowed in Utah, costs would increase and cases on appeal would need to be reappealed. The cost of the brief is being shared by the counties, and Morgan County's share is small. Reported on a tour of the Utah State Hospital, noting its size and the need for additional bed capacity. Recommended that advanced air mobility, which is moving

MORGAN COUNTY

County Commission Agenda Request Form

All Agenda items, including back-up materials, must be submitted to:

****ALL DOCUMENTATION IS DUE ON OR BEFORE 12:00 PM ON THE TUESDAY PRIOR TO A SCHEDULED COUNTY commission MEETING****

Morgan County
Attn: Kate Becker
48 West Young Street
P O Box 886
Morgan,UT 84050
Phone: 435.800.8724

Email: kbecker@morgancountyutah.gov

This form must be submitted, along with any required documentation, or the Agenda Item will not be scheduled until the next County commission Meeting

commission Meeting Date: 10/20/26 **Time Requested:** _____

Name: Leslie A. Hyde **Phone:** _____

Address: 48 W Young Street Morgan UT 84050

Email: _____ **Fax:** _____

Associated County Department: 2027 BUDGET

PURPOSE FOR THE AGENDA ITEM - MUST BE SPECIFIC:

Approval of tentative 2027 Morgan County Budget

WILL YOUR AGENDA ITEM BE FOR:

DISCUSSION	
DECISION	
BOTH	✓
INFORMATION ONLY	

MORGAN COUNTY RESOLUTION CR 26-52

A RESOLUTION OF THE MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION APPROVING THE TENTATIVE COUNTY BUDGET FOR THE 2027 FISCAL YEAR, MAKING THE BUDGET AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION, AND SCHEDULING A PUBLIC HEARING AND FINAL VOTE.

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Utah Uniform Fiscal Procedures Act for Counties, Utah Code Annotated (UCA) 17-63, the Budget Officer of Morgan County has prepared and submitted to the Morgan County Commission a tentative budget for the fiscal year ending December 31, 2027; AND

WHEREAS, UCA 17-63 requires that the Morgan County Commission review, provisionally approve, and place said tentative budget on public file for citizen inspection prior to its formal adoption; AND

WHEREAS, the Morgan County Commission desires to promote transparency and give public notice of the availability of the budget document for review in the Morgan County Clerk/Auditor's office, as well as establish the date for the statutory public hearing and final legislative adoption vote;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION THE FOLLOWING:

Section 1. Provisional Approval of the 2027 Budget. The provisional/tentative Morgan County Budget for the fiscal year 2027 is hereby acknowledged and approved as submitted by the Budget Officer.

Section 2. Public Availability and Inspection. The Morgan County Clerk/Auditor is directed to cause the approved tentative 2027 County Budget to be made immediately and publicly available for open inspection in the Morgan County Clerk/Auditor's office during regular business hours, continuing until the conclusion of the formal public hearing.

Section 3. Notice of Public Hearing and Final Vote. A public hearing to receive public comment regarding the adoption of the final 2027 Morgan County Budget is hereby scheduled to take place during the regular Commission meeting on December 1, 2026 at 6 pm MST. Following the conclusion of the public hearing, the County Commission may consider a final vote to adopt the official 2027 County Budget.

Section 4. Effective Date. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its passage and approval.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Morgan County Commission this 20th day of October 2026.

MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION:

_____
Matthew Wilson,
Morgan County Commission Chair

ATTEST:

_____
Leslie A. Hyde,
Morgan County Clerk/Auditor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
Garrett Smith,
Morgan County Attorney

COMMISSION MEMBER VOTES:

	AYE:	NAY:	ABSENT:
Michael Newton	____	____	____
Vaughn Nickerson	____	____	____
Blaine Fackrell	____	____	____
Raelene Blocker	____	____	____
Matthew Wilson	____	____	____

Effective 11/6/2025

17-63-304 Tentative budget -- Public record before adoption -- Notice of budget hearing -- Public hearing on tentative budget -- Adjustments.

(1)

(a) A tentative budget and all supportive schedules and data are a public record.

(b) A county shall, for at least 10 days before the public hearing to adopt a final budget, make a tentative budget and all supportive schedules and data available for inspection during business hours at the office of the county finance officer.

(2) The governing body shall determine the time and place for the public hearing on the adoption of the budget.

(3) Notice of the hearing described in Subsection (2) shall be published for the county, as a class A notice under Section 63G-30-102, for at least 10 days before the day of the hearing.

(4) The governing body shall hold a public hearing on the budget where all interested individuals shall have an opportunity to be heard for or against the estimates of revenue and expenditures and performance data or any item in any fund.

(5)

(a) Except as provided in Subsection (5)(b), the governing body may make final adjustments to the tentative budget after the public hearing, as the governing body determines are appropriate, giving due consideration to matters discussed at the hearing.

(b) The governing body may not make the following adjustments to a tentative budget before adopting the tentative budget as a final budget:

(i) decrease the amount appropriated, as provided in Section 17-63-305, for the reduction of a deficit; or

(ii) increase any appropriation, if the increase would result in exceeding the estimated revenue for the budget.

Renumbered and Amended by Chapter 13, 2025 Special Session 1

FUND	FY27 REVENUES	FY27 EXPENSES
General	$15,468,669.00	$15,468,669.00
Garbage Enterprise	$1,009,079.00	$1,009,079.00
Road	$950,250.00	$950,250.00
County Mass Transit	$740,000.00	$740,000.00
Capital Projects	$500,000.00	$500,000.00
Recreation	$495,924.00	$495,924.00
Library	$454,936.00	$454,936.00
Additional Transit	$440,000.00	$440,000.00
Tourism	$435,700.00	$435,700.00
County Fair	$430,345.00	$430,345.00
Health Services	$347,000.00	$347,000.00
Impact Fee	$328,108.00	$328,108.00
RAMP Tax	$300,000.00	$300,000.00
Additional Transit Local	$210,000.00	$210,000.00
Economic Development	$200,000.00	$200,000.00
Corridor Preservation	$185,000.00	$185,000.00
Airport	$158,266.00	$158,266.00
Flood Disaster	$37,867.00	$37,867.00
Municipal Building Authority	$15,725.00	$15,725.00
Rifle Range	$15,000.00	$15,000.00
County Parks	$7,150.00	$7,150.00
Greenbelt	$7,000.00	$7,000.00
Opiod	$5,000.00	$5,000.00
Mineral Lease	$2,500.00	$2,500.00
TOTALS	$22,743,519.00	$22,743,519.00

MORGAN COUNTY

County Commission Agenda Request Form

All Agenda items, including back-up materials, must be submitted to:

Morgan County
Attn: Kate Becker
48 West Young Street
P O Box 886
Morgan,UT 84050
Phone: 435.800.8724

Email: kbecker@morgancountyutah.gov

****ALL DOCUMENTATION IS DUE ON OR BEFORE 12:00 PM ON THE TUESDAY PRIOR TO A SCHEDULED COUNTY commission MEETING****

This form must be submitted, along with any required documentation, or the Agenda Item will not be scheduled until the next County commission Meeting

commission Meeting Date: 10/20/26 **Time Requested:**

Name: Leslie A. Hyde **Phone:**

Address: 48 W Young Street Morgan UT 84050

Email: **Fax:**

Associated County Department: 2026 BUDGET

PURPOSE FOR THE AGENDA ITEM - MUST BE SPECIFIC:

6:00 Public Hearing
Discussion/Decision 3rd Qtr amendments to the County's FY 2026 Budget

WILL YOUR AGENDA ITEM BE FOR:

DISCUSSION	
DECISION	
BOTH	✓
INFORMATION ONLY	

RESOLUTION CR-26-50

A RESOLUTION OF THE MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION ADOPTING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO MORGAN COUNTY'S 2026 BUDGET

WHEREAS, the Morgan County Commission has financial responsibility to provide for the health, safety and welfare of the residents of Morgan County; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary to amend the budget from time to time to make routine adjustments; and

WHEREAS, Morgan County held a public hearing at the regularly scheduled meeting on October 20, 2026 after providing public notice as required by UCA.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Morgan County Commission hereby makes the following budget amendments to the 2026 budget:

DEPARTMENT ADJUSTMENTS INCREASE (DECREASE)

- Administrative Manager
  10-4150-520-000 ($1,080.00)
  10-4640-280-000 $1,080.00
  Budget adjustment for cell phone reimbursement

- Public Works
  10-4411-240-000 ($495.00)
  10-4149-310-000 $495.00
  Budget adjustment for adding phone line for Fare Harbor

- Attorney
  10-4145-110-000 ($25,000.00)
  10-4145-370-000 $25,000.00
  Budget adjustment for Dean Saunders/Justice Court

- Building & Grounds/Parks
  10-4161-270-000 ($2,800.00)
  10-4520-270-200 $2,800.00
  Budget adjustment to cover utility costs

FUND BALANCE ADJUSTMENTS GENERAL FUND INCREASE (DECREASE)

- Fire
  10-2951-000-000 ($19,708.80)
  10-4460-250-600 $19,708.80
  Budget adjustment for purchase of CanAm Defender
  County Commission approved 7.21.2026

- Fleet – Ambulance
  10-2951-000-000 ($346,000.00)
  10-4460-250-550 $346,000.00
  Budget adjustment for purchase of ambulance
  County Commission approved 8.18.2026

- Recorder
  10-2951-000-000 ($224,000.00)
  10-4144-110-000 $50,000.00
  10-4144-130-000 $19,200.00
  10-4460-250-900 $31,800.00
  10-4144-230-000 $2,000.00
  10-4144-310-000 $91,000.00
  10-4144-250-000 $15,500.00
  10-4144-480-000 $14,500.00
  Budget adjustment for full time surveyor position
  County Commission approved 1.20.2026

- Fire/Ambulance
  10-2951-000-000 ($109,469.69)
  10-4260-120-100 $109,469.69
  Budget adjustment for unexpended funds received in FY 2025 from WPR-RFD
  County Commission approved September 1, 2026

GRANTS

- Fire
  10-3340-000-000 $8,690.00
  10-4221-740-300 $8,690.00
  Budget adjustment for State Fire Grant

- EMS
  10-3340-000-000 $75,000.00
  10-4260-120-000 $75,000.00
  Budget adjustment for EMS Competitive Grant

- Library
  27-3619-000-000 $4,261.00
  27-4700-240-200 $4,261.00
  Budget adjustment for CLEF Grant

- Library
  27-3630-000-000 $1,250.00
  27-4700-110-000 $1,250.00
  Budget adjustment for Borrower Support Grant

- Library
  27-3630-000-000 $2,500.00
  27-4700-750-000 $2,500.00
  Budget adjustment for ARSL Conference Grant

- Economic Development
  34-3330-000-000 $14,899.29
  34-4510-340-500 $14,899.29
  Budget adjustment for Chamber one time growth grants

- Economic Development
  34-2951-000-000 $14,477.66
  34-4510-340-200 $14,477.66
  Budget adjustment for Fall Cycle Grant

OTHER FUND ADJUSTMENTS INCREASE (DECREASE)

- Predator Control
  71-2229-000-000 $9,700.00
  71-2229-000-000 $9,700.00
  Budget adjustment for Woolgrowers predator control

- Fairgrounds
  33-3840-000-000 $168,250.00
  33-4510-340-000 $168,250.00
  Budget adjustment for DAF Grant for pavilion

- Quilt Sales
  33-2953-000-000 ($28,000.00)
  33-3685-000-000 $28,000.00
  Budget adjustment for windows and paint on Exhibit Building
  County Commission approved May 15, 2026

- Library
  27-2955-000-000 ($2,500.00)
  27-4800-480-000 $2,500.00
  Budget adjustment for Depot Building 100th anniversary
  County Commission approved 10.6.2026

- Tourism
  35-2951-000-000 ($5,000.00)
  35-4510-409-000 $5,000.00
  Budget adjustment for Front Street Festival
  County Commission approved June 16, 2026

- Tourism
  35-2951-000-000 ($6,175.00)
  35-4510-409-000 $6,175.00
  Budget adjustment for UTA Ski Stop Agreement 2024-2025
  County Commission approved 10.6.2026

- Recreation
  32-4510-230-000 ($3,000.00)
  32-4513-740-000 $3,000.00
  Budget adjustment for soccer jersey increase

- Quilt Fund
  33-2953-000-000 ($16,005.99)
  33-4700-340-000 $16,005.99
  Budget adjustment for paint & windows for Exhibit Building
  County Commission approved 5.15.2026

- Capital Projects
  10-2951-000-000 ($300,000.00)
  44-4410-310-100 $300,000.00
  Budget adjustment for building remodel etc
  County Commission approved 8.18.2026

FUND TRANSFERS INCREASE (DECREASE)

- Airport
  10-4150-520-000 ($405.00)
  10-4810-615-000 $405.00
  38-3840-000-000 ($405.00)
  38-4450-280-000 $405.00
  Budget adjustment for phone reimbursement for Airport Manager

Pursuant to Utah Code § 17-63-403(3)–(4), at the request of the finance officer or upon the governing body's own motion, the governing body may by resolution transfer unencumbered or unexpended appropriations between departments within the same fund, subject to statutory minimums. Budget amendments are also authorized under Utah Code § 17-63-402, subject to its public hearing and notice requirements.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of October, 2026.

MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION:

_____

Matthew Wilson, County Commission Chair

ATTEST:

_____

Leslie A. Hyde, Morgan County Clerk/Auditor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____

Garrett Smith, Morgan County Attorney

COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTING:

	AYE	NAY	ABSENT
Michael Newton	____	____	____
Vaughn Nickerson	____	____	____
Blaine Fackrell	____	____	____
Raelene Blocker	____	____	____
Matthew Wilson	____	____	____

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Date	07/27/2026
Department	Administrative Manager
Department Head Signature	
Amount	1,080
Move from GL Account#	10-4150-520-000 Wage Adjustments
Move to GL Account #	10-4640-280-000 Phone [NEW]

Brief Description

Missing phone reimbursement

Clerk/Auditor Use Only

Date Entered:

Date Commission Approved:

MORGAN COUNTY

2026 BUDGET CHANGE REQUEST

Date	07/31/2026
Department	Public Works
Department Head Signature	
Amount	$ 495.00
Move from GL Account#	10-4411-240-000
Move to GL Account #	10-4149-310-000

Brief Description

Adding a Phone line to Public Works for Fare Harbor

Clerk/Auditor Use Only
Date Entered

2026 BUDGET CHANGE REQUEST

Date	8/11/26
Department	Morgan County Attorney's Office
Department Head Signature	Gareth T. Smith
Amount	$25,000
Move from GL Account#	10-4145-110
Move to GL Account #	10-4145-370

Brief Description

Our deputy attorney resigned in March, so we have had to rely on Dean Saunders to cover Justice Court completely since that time. I have also brought on an intern with a year of law school under her belt to fill in the gaps of losing our deputy attorney. Both are doing great work! We will still have a surplus in Permanent Employees (10-4145-110) and Employee Benefits (10-4145-130) at the end of the year. I have borrowed from other GLs as a stop gap.

Clerk/Auditor Use Only
Date Entered

2026 BUDGET CHANGE REQUEST

Date	10/8/2026
Department	Public Works
Department Head Signature	Bret Heiner
Amount	2,800.00
Move from GL Account#	10-4161-270-000
Move to GL Account #	10-4520-270-200

Brief Description

To Cover Cost of Utilities

Clerk/Auditor Use Only

Date Entered

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Date	7/22/2026
Department	Fire
Department Head Signature	B Wilks
Amount	19,708.80
Move from GL Account#	10-2951 fund balance
Move to GL Account #	10-4460-250-600 wildland fleet

Purchase of 2025 CanAm Defender (attached quote) approved by the Commission on 7/21/2026.

Clerk/Auditor Use Only
Date Entered

WELLER RECREATION, LLC

936 W 200 S
Kamas UT 84036
(435) 783-4718

MORGAN COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT

PO BOX 420
Morgan UT 84050
801-807-8822

Order No. 27415
Salesman Kimberlee Black

I hereby agree to purchase the following unit(s) from you under the terms and conditions specified. Delivery is to be made as soon as possible. It is agreed, however, that neither you nor the manufacturer will be liable for failure to make delivery.

Unit Information

New/U	Year	Make	Model	Serial No.	Stock No.	MSRP	Price
New	2025	CAN-AM UTV	Defender PRO DPS HD10	3JB7GAX4XSK000076	C00076	$20,499.00	$15,904.00

Trade Information

Options:

INSTLLED ROOF	$584.99	D
INSTALLED USA Front Windshield	$719.10	D
INSTALLED STREET KIT	$1,210.71	D

Monthly Payment of
$19,708.80

Notes:

Manufacturer Base Price	$20,499.00
Manufacturer Options (M)	$0.00
Customer Discount Savings	**$4,595.00**
Customer Price	$15,904.00
Freight	$1,095.00
Dealer Added Options (D)	$0.00
Customer Added Options	$2,514.80
Dealer Prep	$0.00
Unit Subtotal	$19,513.80
Tire Recycle Fee	$0.00
Aged Base Fees	$0.00
Temp Tag	$0.00
Safety Inspection	$0.00
Delivery Fee	$0.00
Handling	$0.00
SC, TW, DP, Battery, PP, GAP	$0.00
Dealer Fees LO	$0.00
Title/License/Registration Fees	$0.00
Document or Administration Fees	$195.00
Sales Tax	$0.00
Cash Price	$19,708.80
Trade Allowance	$0.00
Payoff	$0.00
Net Trade	$0.00
Net Sale (Cash Price - Net Trade)	$19,708.80
Sub Total (Net Sale + Other Charges)	$19,708.80
Cash Down Payment	$0.00
Amount to Pay/Finance	$19,708.80

NOTICE TO BUYER: (1) Do not sign this agreement before you read it or if it contains any blank spaces to be filled in. (2) You are entitled to a completely filled in copy of this agreement. (3) If you default in the performance of your obligations under this agreement, the vehicle may be repossessed and you may be subject to suit and liability for the unpaid indebtedness evidenced by this agreement.
TRADE-IN NOTICE: Customer respresents that all trade in units described above are free of all liens and encumbrances except as noted.
*With Approved Credit. Interest rates and monthly payment are approximate and may vary from those determined by the lendor.

Customer Signature _____ Dealer Signature _____

Thank You for You Business!

Fire Chief Brad Wilkes explained that a replacement UTV is needed after county staff determined the CanAm previously used by Emergency Management belongs to the Sheriff's Office. Kate Becker clarified that the confusion came from the fact that the vehicle was originally purchased with sheriff funds during a time when Emergency Management leadership was split, and it contains sheriff equipment Emergency Management cannot use. With the CanAm returned to the Sheriff's asset list, Emergency Management and Fire no longer have a suitable unit. The remaining UTV cannot safely carry the fire pump and has failed during recent wildfire responses. Chair Wilson questioned the timing of the request outside the regular budget process and stressed the need for clear communication about department budget constraints. Chief Wilkes said his current budget is already strained because of major repairs and limited maintenance funds. The proposed UTV is a basic model priced about five thousand dollars below retail, and existing equipment including the grant funded pump skid will transfer without additional costs. Commissioners discussed possible wildland fund use and grant opportunities. The vendor is holding the UTV pending the county's decision.

Commissioner Newton moved to approve repurchase of a UTV for use by the emergency management and fire departments that it cost of $19,708.80 and the transition of funds from the general fund balance to the fire and emergency management budget to cover the cost.
Seconded by Commissioner Nickerson
VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

3. **Casey Basaker** – Discussion/Decision – Morgan County Human Resources
Discussion and decision on Resolution **CR 26-39** authorizing the employer pick up for member retirement contributions for Tier 2 Firefighter Employees.

Kate Becker explained that in 2020 the County Commission passed a resolution to cover the Tier Two public safety retirement contribution for ERS employees. At that time, the county had no Tier Two firefighters. The fire department now has one Tier Two firefighter and the same resolution must be adopted for firefighters to ensure consistency. She noted that the original 2020 resolution should have included both public safety and firefighter employees but was titled only as public safety. The annual cost of the adjustment is $430.09 and does not require a budget amendment.

Commissioner Nickerson moved to approve CR-26-39 resolution authorizing the employer, Morgan County, to pick up member retirement contributions for tier two firefighter employees.
Seconded by Commissioner Nickerson
VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

4. **Kent Page** – Discussion /Decision – County Planning & Zoning
Flagship Homes Development Agreement: A request for approval of a development agreement to be consistent with the requirements of the Town Center Zoning in the Mountain Green area.
This item was postponed until the August 4th commission meeting.

5. **Kent Page** – Discussion / **Public Hearing** / Decision – County Planning & Zoning

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Date	08/11/2026
Department	Fleet: Ambulance
Department Head Signature	Kate Becker
Amount	346,000
Move from GL Account#	10-2951-000-000 General Fund Balance
Move to GL Account #	10-4460-250-550 Ambulance Vehicles

Brief Description

Morgan County Commission approved the purchase of a new ambulance during budget meetings in October of 2025. The anticipated delivery date was 18 months from purchase agreement however it is going to be delivered in 2026.

Clerk/Auditor Use Only
Date Entered:
Date Commission Approved:

Oct 2027

Approved to order $346,000 will pay for in 2027

PSS / PROFESSIONAL SALES AND SERVICE, L.C.

Quality Emergency Vehicles Since 1974

August 11, 2025

Morgan County
41 North State Street
Morgan UT, 84050

To Whom It May Concern:

Professional Sales and Service, LC respectfully provides the Morgan County the following proposal for a new ambulance vehicle. We appreciate the opportunity to work with you now and look forward to helping you with your ambulance needs in the future.

The following proposal reflects New Type I ambulances the proposal is as follows:

One 2026 Horton 603 Type I 4x4 Custom Ambulances Mounted on 2026 Ford F-550 4x4 Diesel Chassis

The module body will be 167" long and have an interior height of 72" inches. It will be mounted on a 2026 Ford F-550 4X4 with a Diesel Motor dual rear wheel cab/chassis. This proposal includes Horton's electrical system: The most advanced electrical system available which incorporates solid-state electronics with Multiplexing technology. It also includes weight saving all-aluminum module body, NO-wood construction, aluminum cabinetry, electrical system diagnostic testing, digital computer consoles, privacy windows, LED lighting package and much more. Full specification attached.

Take a look at Horton Emergency Vehicles (HEV) and you will see why they are so well regarded in the ambulance industry and among the finest available anywhere. A Horton emergency vehicle is BUILT TO WITHSTAND the rigors of ambulance service. Horton ambulances are tested and engineered to be incredibly structurally sound which provides the EMS crew and patient with a SAFER WORKING ENVIRONMENT. They are currently the only manufacturer with an ongoing crash simulation testing program to test things like cabinet mounting stability, door structure & latching strength, and body mounting solidity. ALUMINUM CABINETS SAVE PAYLOAD and are much more DURABLE than wood. An ambulance built to a higher quality standard will provide REDUCED OPERATING COSTS over the many years the vehicle is in service!! When it comes to quality, durability, customization, and safety, Horton continues to be a leader in the ambulance manufacturing industry.

PSS SHOWROOM
1720 Indiana Ave, Salt Lake City, UT 84104
(801) 977-3961 Phone <> (801) 977-3969 Fax

PSS / PROFESSIONAL SALES AND SERVICE, L.C.

Quality Emergency Vehicles Since 1974

PRICING PAGE

Ambulance Price	*$310,149.00*
Shipping	*$4,800.00*
Styker Power Load System	*$30,795.00*
Total Delivered Price Each Ambulance	*$345,744.00*

PROPOSAL CONDITIONS

F.O.B. POINT: Morgan UT, 84050

DELIVERY: Do to current and ongoing national supply chain issues specifically in regard to chassis availability. We will be providing estimated delivery times only. Currently Horton standard lead time is approximately 18 months (pending chassis).Please note all delivery times are quoted barring any delays due to strikes, availability of component parts (including chassis), or acts of God

SERVICE: Professional Sales & Service has been selling and servicing ambulances since 1975. We have factory trained technicians and a large inventory of parts, so you know that in the unlikely event of a problem we are only a phone call away.

PAYMENT TERMS: Payment due upon delivery and acceptance of vehicle by the Morgan County

PSS SHOWROOM
1720 Indiana Ave, Salt Lake City, UT 84104
(801) 977-3961 Phone <> (801) 977-3969 Fax

PSS / PROFESSIONAL SALES AND SERVICE, L.C.

Quality Emergency Vehicles Since 1974

** Pre-Payment discounts available upon request.

WARRANTY: Horton Emergency Vehicles feature one of the most progressive, no-nonsense warranties around. Horton does not pro rate their warranties so there are no surprises should you ever need it.

Unless accepted within Sixty (60) days from the above date, the right to withdraw this proposal is reserved. If there are any additions/deletions to our bid, please contact me for pricing details or credits.

We are confident you will be completely satisfied with the quality Horton ambulance and the service which PSS provides.

Respectfully Submitted,

Professional Sales and Service, LC

Jason T. Barrett

Jason Barrett - Utah Sales

Morgan County agrees to purchase the vehicle detailed in this proposal, from Professional Sales and Service, L.C. and understands and agrees with the terms specified within these documents.

Authorized by (Print name)	Signed	Date

Please let us know if you have any questions regarding this proposal. We are happy to assist you in any way that we can.

PSS SHOWROOM
1720 Indiana Ave, Salt Lake City, UT 84104
(801) 977-3961 Phone <> (801) 977-3969 Fax

MORGAN COUNTY

Budget Increase Request

Department: Fleet

Budget Year 2026

GL Account No. 10-4460-250-550

Account Title Ambulance Vehicle Lease

Current Budget Amount 0

Requested Budget Amount 350,000

Increase in Yearly Budget 350,000

Source of funding for increase: WPR RFD

Budget Priority: Low ○ Med ○ High ◉

Brief Description

One-time funding $350,000

Detailed Description

This is a one-time funding for the purchase of a New Ambulance to service all of Morgan County and Morgan City.

Report Criteria:
Includes all accounts
Includes grand totals
Account.Account number = "104460250550"

Account Number	Account Title	2025-25 Original Budget	2025-25 Final Budget	2025-25 YTD Actual	2026-26 Variance	2026-26 Percent Used
General Fund						
Fleet Management						
10-4460-250-550	Ambulance Vehicle Lease	36,500.00	352,954.00	.00	352,954.00-	0.00%
Total Fleet Management:		36,500.00	352,954.00	.00	352,954.00-	0.00%
General Fund Expenditure Total:		36,500.00	352,954.00	.00	352,954.00-	0.00%
Total General Fund:		36,500.00-	352,954.00-	.00	352,954.00	0.00%
Grand Totals:		36,500.00-	352,954.00-	.00	352,954.00	0.00%

Report Criteria:
Includes all accounts
Includes grand totals
Account.Account number = "104460250550"

Licensed Surveyor Position Budget Overview

Position Budget Summary

Category:		Cost:	GL #
Salary	$	50,000.00	10-4144-110-000
Benefits	$	19,200.00	10-4144-130-000
Vehicle / Fleet Cost	$	31,800.00	10-4460-250-900
Travel & Training	$	2,000.00	10-4144-230-000
Software / Surveying Equipment	$	91,000.00	10-4144-310-000
Starting Tech. (computer, phone, etc.)	$	15,500.00	10-4144-250-000
Basic Equipment (shovels, desk, chair, etc.)	$	14,500.00	10-4144-480-000
	$	224,000.00	

Morgan County Recorder
Shaun Rose

5. **Hon. Shaun Rose** – Discussion/Decision – 2026 Budget Adjustment
   Continued discussion and decision on creating a Full-Time Surveyor position within the Morgan County Recorder's office for the budget year of 2026.
   This was discussed at the 01/06/2026 Commission Meeting and further cost speculations were requested by the Commission.

Sean Rose Morgan County Treasurer presented a request for approval to create a new in-house, full-time surveyor position, noting that the proposal had been discussed at several prior commission meetings. Commissioners had previously requested additional data, including cost estimates and budget impacts. He went on to explain that the total estimated cost for the position and associated expenses would be approximately $224,001, including salary, benefits, and operational costs. He noted that in 2025 alone, the county spent approximately $125,000 on contracted surveying services for subdivision review, planning, and PLSS work, much of which is currently pass-through and revenue neutral.

Discussion focused on budgeting, salary range, timing of the hire, and whether equipment and vehicle costs could be phased into a future fiscal year. It was noted that the Community Development budget for surveying services had already been increased for FY 2025 due to consistent monthly expenditures, and that existing surveying contracts are non-exclusive, allowing continued use of outside firms if additional capacity is needed. Commissioners also discussed workspace needs, vehicle and equipment storage, and the potential return on investment of having a licensed surveyor available full-time.

Commissioners expressed support for the position, citing rising costs and delays associated with contracted services. Budget adjustments and equipment purchases will be addressed separately as needed.

Commissioner Fackrell moved to approve full-time surveying potion under the Morgan Recorders office.

Seconded by Commissioner Blocker

VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson
Commissioner Newton
Commissioner Blocker AYE
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson AYE
Commissioner Fackrell AYE
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Date	09/01/2026
Department	Fire
Department Head Signature	
	Kate Becker
Amount	109,469.69
Move from GL Account#	10-2951-000-000 Fund Balance
Move to GL Account #	10-4260-120-100 County Fire

Brief Description

Reimbursement for overpayment

Clerk/Auditor Use Only
Date Entered:
Date Commission Approved:

Class B and C road funds have been collected on that additional 308 feet. Deputy County Attorney Janet Christofferson stated that this is a legal problem, since state administrative rule prohibits collecting such funds on a road segment blocked by a permanent obstruction such as a locked gate, and advised that the gate be removed and the road maintained. Commissioners expressed concern about relocating or removing the gate without first confirming the exact location of the county right-of-way and adjoining property lines, noting inconsistencies between existing maps and GIS data, and agreed a survey should be completed and the affected neighbors consulted before any physical changes are made. Heiner confirmed the County would not install a replacement gate on private property, and that the road already has an asphalt base which would be chip-sealed as part of routine maintenance regardless of the gate's disposition.

Commissioner Fackrell moved that this agenda item be postponed to a future date not yet determined.
Seconded by Commissioner Nickerson.
VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

2. Hon. Matthew Wilson – Discussion/ Decision – Morgan County Commission
Discussion and decision on Morgan County Resolution CR 26-41 appointing Kimberly Bell to the Morgan County Planning Commission representing the area of Stoddard and Milton.

Commissioner Nickerson moved to remove Item F2 from the agenda.
Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell.
VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

3. Kate Becker – Discussion/Decision – Morgan County Administrative Manager
Discussion and decision on a refund of unexpended funds received in FY 2025 from WPR-RFD.

Kate Becker explained that Morgan County contracts with the Wasatch Peaks Ranch Road and Fire District (WPR-RFD) to staff fire and EMS services at that location, with the district reimbursing the County for associated costs. The current agreement, signed in July 2025, funds three firefighter positions; however, staffing was not fully ramped up until the first quarter of 2026, leaving an unexpended payroll balance from FY 2025 that rolled into the County's general fund. Under the agreement, the district may request a subsidy modification 90 days before annual renewal; Becker, Fire Chief Brad Wilkes, and the County Attorney's office met with WPR-RFD and requested that the monthly subsidy not be reduced, in exchange for refunding the unexpended FY 2025 balance. The district agreed and will continue paying the County's full monthly subsidy for FY 2026. Becker noted the parties have since established quarterly financial review meetings to prevent similar timing issues going forward.

Commissioner Nickerson moved to approve.
Seconded by Commissioner Blocker.
VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

4. **Morgan County Board of Equalization – Discussion/Decision – 2026 BOE Appeals**
Discussion and decision on Morgan County Resolution CR 26-03-BOE approving board of equalization changes to date.

Commissioner Newton moved that the Commission adjourn as the County Commission and reconvene as the County Board of Equalization.
Seconded by Commission Vice Chair Nickerson.
VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye

Deputy Clerk/Auditor Chloe Adams presented a first round of adjustments recommended by the County Assessor's office, consisting primarily of reclassifications between primary and secondary residence status. She noted that decision letters would be sent to each applicant, who would retain the right to appeal the Board's decision to the State Tax Commission, and that additional rounds of adjustments are expected in the future.

Commissioner Fackrell moved to approve these adjustments.
Seconded by Commissioner Blocker.
VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

Commissioner Newton moved to adjourn the Board of Equalization and reconvene as the County Commission.
Seconded by Commissioner Nickerson.
VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Grant

Date 8/18/2026

Department ~~Fire~~

Department Head Signature BWilk

Amount 8,690.00

Move from GL Account# 10-3340 (Grants)

Move to GL Account # 10-4221-740-300 (Turnout rotation)

State Fire Grant

Clerk/Auditor Use Only

Date Entered

STATE OF UTAH

DIVISION OF FINANCE - PO BOX 141031
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84114
STATE VENDORS

MARLO M. OAKS
UTAH STATE TREASURER

Warrant Number
F 15488994

PAYABLE ON
UTAH STATE TREASURER
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84414

31-289
1240

PAY Eight Thousand Six Hundred Ninety And 00/100 Dollars

VOID 180 DAYS FROM DATE
05-08-2026

PAY THIS AMOUNT
$8690.00**

TO THE ORDER OF:

MORGAN CO
48 W YOUNG STREET
MORGAN UT 85040

Allyson Brauer
DIVISION OF FINANCE

⑈00154889946⑈ ⑆124002890⑆153100367736⑈

DETACH BEFORE CASHING

06223B

STATE OF UTAH, Division of Finance
PO Box 141031, Salt Lake City UT 84114 (801) 957-7760

Dept	Voucher #	Invoice # / Description	Amount
560	261F001305	04/28/2026 /VFA Payment C/O Brad Wilkes / UT Div. Forestry, Fire &	8,690.00

STATE OF UTAH

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM FOR GRANTS

Date	08/04/26
Department	EMS
Department Head Signature	
Amount	$75,000.00
Revenue GL Account#	10-3340-000
Expenditure GL Account #	10-4260-120

Brief Description

Received EMS Competitive Grant, uses specifically for EMS personnel.

Clerk/Auditor Use Only

Date Entered

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM FOR GRANTS

Date	8/13/2026
Department	Library
Department Head Signature	
Amount	4261.00
Revenue GL Account#	27-3619
Expenditure GL Account #	27-4700-240-200

Brief Description

Please adjust the above revenue and expenditure lines to reflect the 2026 CLEF Grant award.

Clerk/Auditor Use Only

Date Entered

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM FOR GRANTS

Date	8/19/2026
Department	Library
Department Head Signature	
Amount	1250.00
Revenue GL Account#	27-3630
Expenditure GL Account #	27-4700-110-000

Brief Description

Please adjust the above revenue and expenditure lines to reflect the 2026 Borrower Support Grant award. Grant funding will be used to pay for employee time to process inter library loans.

Clerk/Auditor Use Only

Date Entered

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM FOR GRANTS

Date	9/8/2026
Department	Library
Department Head Signature	
Amount	2500.00
Revenue GL Account#	27-3630
Expenditure GL Account #	27-4700-750

Brief Description

Please adjust the above revenue and expenditure lines to reflect the 2026 ARSL Conference Grant

Clerk/Auditor Use Only

Date Entered

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Grant

Date	08/19/2026
Department	Economic Development
Department Head Signature	KB Kate Becker
Amount	14,899.29
Move from GL Account#	34-3330-000-000 Ec Dev Grant
Move to GL Account #	34-4510-340-500 Fall Growth Grant

Brief Description

Chamber one time contribution to growth grants

Clerk/Auditor Use Only
Date Entered:
Date Commission Approved:

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Grant

Date	08/05/2026
Department	Economic Development
Department Head Signature	Kate Becker
Amount	14,477.66
Move from GL Account#	34.2951.000.000 Grant Fund Balance
Move to GL Account #	34.4510.340.200 Blue Print

Brief Description Cover invoice

Clerk/Auditor Use Only

Date Entered:
Date Commission Approved:

Event

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Date	08/11/2026
Department	Predator Control
Department Head Signature	
	Kate Becker
Amount	9,700
GL Account#	71-2229-000-000
GL Account #	71-2229-000-000

Brief Description

The woolgrowers will be paying the county $10,550 for predator control. We have $11,400 in the account but need to increase the budget by $9,700 to cover the pass through $21,100 check.

Clerk/Auditor Use Only

Date Entered:
Date Commission Approved:

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Date	07/27/2026
Department	Fairgrounds
Department Head Signature	Kate Becker
Amount	168,250
Move from GL Account#	33-3840-000-000 Fair: Transfer In
Move to GL Account #	33-4510-340-000 Fairgrounds Improvements

Brief Description

DAF Grant for Pavilion; Invoices will come from ACS

Clerk/Auditor Use Only
Date Entered:
Date Commission Approved:

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Date	07/27/2026
Department	Quilt Sales
Department Head Signature	Kate Becker
Amount	28,000
Move from GL Account#	33-2953-000-000 Quilt Sales Fund Balance
Move to GL Account #	33-3685-000-000 Quilt Sales

Brief Description

Approved by Commission for windows and paint on the Fairgrounds Exhibit Bldg

Clerk/Auditor Use Only

Date Entered:
Date Commission Approved:

(E) Action Items

1. Casey Basaker – Discussion/Decision – Morgan County Human Resources
Discussion and decision on giving Casey authorization to do the tax forms on behalf of the county like Atty. Garret Smith's authorization to sign for the opioid settlements.

Casey Basaker requested approval to complete items 2–6 of the new payroll vendor's welcome packet to ensure a smooth transition. The service agreement will be signed separately once finalized. **Garrett Smith (CA)** recommended approval.

Commissioner Blocker moved to give Casey Basaker permission to do tax documents for the county.
Seconded by Commissioner Nickerson
VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

2. Casey Basaker – Discussion/Decision – Morgan County Human Resources
Discussion and decision on withdrawing from UCIP Worker's Compensation; Commission voted to move to the trust, but we need to send an official withdrawal letter to UCIP.

Kate Becker explained that the county must formally record its withdrawal from the Workers Compensation program, as required by statute. Although the Commission previously voted to join the Trust, a separate action item is needed to document the withdrawal. The notice will reflect an effective date of January 1, 2027. Commissioners discussed timing and past requirements before moving forward with the clarification.

Commissioner Newton moved to approve the letter to USIP to withdraw from the Workers Compensation program
Seconded by Commissioner Nickerson
VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye
Commissioner Blocker: Aye
Commission Vice Chair Nickerson: Aye
Commissioner Fackrell: Aye
The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

3. Bret Heinner – Discussion/Decision – Morgan County Fairgrounds
Discussion and decision on awarding a bid for window replacement of the Morgan County Fairgrounds Exhibit Building using the Quilt Sales Fund.

Commissioner Newton reviewed the history of the Fair Quilt Auction and noted that the dedicated fund currently holds approximately $44,000. **Bret Heiner** outlined needed repairs to the exhibit building, including door replacements, HVAC and swamp cooler updates, and painting. **Chair Willson** indicated he may be able to secure donated paint from a supplier. All work will be completed by county staff except for the window installation.

Commissioner Newton moved to award the low bid to replace the window and other necessary fixes
Seconded by Commissioner Fackrell
VOTE:
Commission Chair Wilson: Aye
Commissioner Newton: Aye

MORGAN COUNTY

2026 ~~2025~~ BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Date	9/21/2026
Department	Library
Department Head Signature	
Amount	2500.00
Move from GL Account#	27-2955-000-000 Fund Balance-Visitor Center
Move to GL Account #	27-4800-480 Special Department Supplies

Brief Description

Requesting that $2500.00 be moved from the Visitor's Center Fund Balance (built from previous years' profits) to cover custom ornaments and other appropriate souvenir items to sell at the Depot Building's 100th anniversary in November, 2026.

Clerk/Auditor Use Only
Date Entered

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Date	08/19/2026
Department	Tourism
Department Head Signature	Kate Becker
Amount	5,000
Move from GL Account#	35-2951-000-000 Fund Balance
Move to GL Account #	35-4510-409-000 Local Event Funding

Brief Description

Had not budgeted for Front Street Festival

Clerk/Auditor Use Only
Date Entered:
Date Commission Approved:

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Date	09/29/2026
Department	Tourism
Department Head Signature	
	Kate Becker
Amount	6,175
Move from GL Account#	35-2951-000-000 Fund Balance
Move to GL Account #	35-4510-409-000 Tourism Events

Brief Description

UTA Ski Stop Agreement 2024-2025

Clerk/Auditor Use Only

Date Entered:

Date Commission Approved: 10.6.2026

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Date 9/8/26

Department Recreation

Department Head Signature

Amount $3,000

Move from GL Account# 32-4510-230

Move to GL Account # 32-4513-140

Soccer Jersey cost increase

Clerk/Auditor Use Only

Date Entered

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Date	08/18/2026
Department	Fair Quilt Fund
Department Head Signature	Kate Becker
Amount	16,005.99
Move from GL Account#	33-2953-000-000 Quilt Fund Balance
Move to GL Account #	33-4700-340-000 Quilt Sales Fairground Improv

Brief Description

Paint & Windows of exhibit building

Clerk/Auditor Use Only

Date Entered:

Date Commission Approved:

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Date 7/21/2026

Department Capital Projects

Department Head Signature

Amount 300,000

Move from GL Account# 10-2951-000 Fund Balance

Move to GL Account # 44-4410-310-100 Capital Projects

Additional monies to cover add ons from the year. Library improvements Asbestos remediation, district court pass through up grades, and any change orders for the building addition

Clerk/Auditor Use Only

Date Entered

2026 BUDGET CHANGE FORM

Date	07/27/2026
Department	Airport
Department Head Signature	Kate Becker
Amount	405
Move from GL Account#	10-4150-520-000 Wage Adjustments
Move to GL Account #	10-4810-615-000 Transfer Out
Move to GL Account #	38-3840-000-000 Airport: Transfer In
Move to GL Account #	38-4450-280-000 Phone [NEW]

Brief Description

Missing phone reimbursement

Clerk/Auditor Use Only

Date Entered:
Date Commission Approved:

County Commission Agenda Request Form

All Agenda items, including back-up materials, must be submitted to:

Morgan County
Attn: Kate Becker
48 West Young Street
P O Box 886
Morgan, UT 84050
Phone: (435) 800.8724

Email: kbecker@morgancountyutah.gov

****ALL DOCUMENTATION IS DUE ON OR BEFORE 12:00 PM ON THE TUESDAY PRIOR TO A SCHEDULED COUNTY commission MEETING****

This form must be submitted, along with any required documentation, or the Agenda Item will not be scheduled until the next County commission Meeting

Commission Meeting Date: 10/20/'26 **Time Requested:** 10 min

Name: Kate Becker **Phone:** (801) 845-4015

Address: 48 W. Young Street

Email: jcook@morgancountyutah.gov **Fax:**

Associated County Department: Planning and Development Department

PURPOSE FOR THE AGENDA ITEM - MUST BE SPECIFIC:

Public Hearing/Discussion/Decision – *Morgan County Code proposed text amendment to section 155.132*: permitting with a Conditional Use Permit issued by the Zoning Administrator Recreational Vehicle Parks in the Town Center (TC) zone.

WILL YOUR AGENDA ITEM BE FOR:

DISCUSSION	✔	**PUBLIC HEARING**	✔
DECISION	✔	**PUBLIC MEETING**	✔
BOTH	✔		
INFORMATION ONLY			

MEMORANDUM

TO: Morgan County Commission

FROM: Morgan County Planning & Development Services Staff

DATE: October 20, 2026

SUBJECT: MCC § 155.132 Code Text Amendment

SUMMARY: A request to allow Recreational Vehicle Parks in the Town Center (TC) Zone

Applicant Skyler Gardner requests to amend the MCC § 155.132 (Use Regulations) to permit with a Conditional Use Permit issued by the Zoning Administrator (C1) Recreational Vehicle Parks in the Town Center (TC) zone. The applicant shares the follow narrative:

> **STATEMENT OF INTENT & PURPOSE**
> The applicant respectfully requests an amendment to Morgan County Code Table 155.132 (Use Regulations) to allow Recreational Vehicle (RV) Parks as a Conditional Use (C1) within the Town Center (TC) zoning district. Currently, RV parks are recognized and allowed in other non-residential commercial zones across the county. Extending C1 classification for RV Parks to the TC zone aligns with the economic and planning goals of Morgan County by promoting local commerce, expanding tourism infrastructure, and ensuring orderly development through site-specific conditional review.
>
> **KEY PERSUASIVE ARGUMENTS**
> 1. Regulatory Alignment and Consistency Across Commercial Districts
> ● Parity with Commercial Zones: RV parks and transient accommodations are already integrated into Morgan County's commercial zoning frameworks. Allowing RV Parks in the TC zone creates regulatory consistency across non-residential commercial districts that accommodate tourist and visitor activities.
> ● Logical Inclusion: The Town Center (TC) district is designed as a focal point for economic activity, pedestrian flow, and community services. Excluding RV parks, which cater directly to visitors seeking access to town services, creates an unnecessary gap in commercial accommodation options within the core commercial hub.
>
> 2. Economic Vitality, Business Support, and Tax Revenue
> ● Direct Local Spending: Visitors staying at RV parks contribute significantly to the local economy. RV park patrons frequent nearby core commercial businesses, including local eateries, retail shops, grocery stores, gas stations, and recreational service providers in the Town Center.
> ● Municipal Tax Base Enhancement: Granting C1 status allows for managed developments that generate both local sales tax and Transient Room Tax (TRT) under Morgan County Code § 35.01–35.02. This provides an additional revenue stream for the county to fund infrastructure, tourism promotion, and public facilities.
>
> 3. Built-In Protection Through Conditional Use (C1) Safeguards
> ● Case-by-Case Oversight: Amending Table 155.132 to a C1 (Conditional Use)—rather

than an outright Permitted (P) use—ensures that the Planning Commission and Zoning Administrator retain full discretionary review over every individual proposal.
● Mitigation of Impacts: Under conditional use review, county officials can evaluate specific site plans and impose reasonable conditions to address traffic flow, access management, noise, utility capacity, and aesthetic compatibility.
● Adherence to RV Park Standards: Any proposed RV park in the TC zone would still be subject to the rigorous development, licensing, and operational guarantees required under Morgan County Code § 155.390(F). The process includes annual business licensing, management plan requirements, and bonding for maintenance and open space.

4. Synergies with Town Center Open Space & Design Goals
● Enhanced Buffering and Landscaping: RV park developments naturally incorporate landscaped open spaces, perimeter buffers, and low-density layouts. This aligns with the visual screening standards (§ 155.345) and Town Center Open Space Corridor preservation requirements (§ 155.270).
● Integration with Trail Networks: Well-designed RV parks can easily incorporate pedestrian paths and connect to broader community trail networks, supporting walkability and outdoor recreation without burdening permanent housing infrastructure.

PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT DETAIL
The proposed change to Morgan County Code Table 155.132 (Use Regulations) is attached hereto. The only change is the addition of "C1" on the Recreation vehicle parks row in the TC column on page 6 of 8.

CONCLUSION
Adding Recreational Vehicle Parks as a C1 conditional use in the Town Center (TC) zone is a logical, revenue-generating, and controllable update to the Morgan County Code. It supports local commerce, provides essential lodging options for visitors, and guarantees full administrative oversight on a project-by-project basis. We respectfully request that the Planning Commission and County Commission approve this text amendment.

§ 155.132 USE REGULATIONS.

No building, structure or land shall be used, and no building or structure shall be hereafter erected, structurally altered, enlarged or maintained in the Commercial and Industrial Districts, except as provided in this subchapter. Accessory uses and buildings customarily incidental to uses authorized by conditional use permit in any district are also authorized by issuance of a conditional use permit in any such district. "Temporary uses," as defined in § 155.008 of this code, are authorized in any district upon issuance of a conditional use permit for the same. All uses prohibited except as stated in the use table.

C1	CUP Zoning Administrator
C2	CUP Planning Commission
C3	CUP County Commission
P	Permitted

CB: Commercial Buffer
NC: Neighborhood Commercial
TC: Town Center
CS: Commercial Shopping
CH: Highway Commercial
GC: General Commercial
BP: Business Park
TPC: Technical and Professional Campus
MGC: Mountain Green Commercial
PC: Peterson Commercial
LM: Light Manufacturing
I: Industrial

	CB	NC	TC	CS	CH	GC	BP	TPC	MGC	PC	LM	I
Residential:												
Recreation vehicle parks	C1	-	**C1**	C1	C1	C1	-	-	-	-	C1	-
Residential care facilities	C1	-	-	C1	C1	C1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Residential live-work	C3	C1	-	C3	P	P	-	-	-	-	-	-
Residential units as part of a mixed-use development	-	-	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retirement home/assisted living	-	C1	-	-	C1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retail trade:												
Auto parts and supply stores	-	-	P	C2	C2	C2	-	-	-	-	P	P
Auto salvage yards (i.e., retailing used auto parts)	-	-	-	C2	C2	C2	-	-	C2	-	C1	P
Automobile dealers, new and used	-	-	-	C2	C2	C2	-	-	-	-	P	P
Camper dealers, recreational	-	-	-	C2	C2	C2	-	-	-	-	P	P
Grocery	-	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	C1	C1
Motor home dealers	-	-	-	C2	C2	C2	-	-	-	-	P	P
Recreational vehicle (RV)	-	-	-	C2	C2	C2	-	-	-	-	P	P

dealers (campers, motor homes, boats, ATV, motorcycles or similar)												
Retail store (not listed elsewhere)	P	P	P	P	P	P	C1	C1	P	P	C1	C1
Transportation:												
Bus terminal or station	C1	C1	P	C1	P	C1	P	C1	C1	C1	P	P

ATTORNEY GUIDANCE

Legislative Review: Legislative Review: Legislative land use decisions involve the adoption, amendment, or repeal of ordinances, zoning maps, development standards, and other land use regulations. Under Utah Code § 17-79-501, these are policy decisions entrusted to the County Commission as the County's legislative body and involve the exercise of legislative judgment and discretion.

The Planning Commission's role is to review the proposal, receive public input, evaluate potential impacts, and make a recommendation to the County Commission. In doing so, the Planning Commission should consider whether the proposal is consistent with Morgan County Code, the General Plan, and applicable provisions of Utah law.

Applicable Law: Utah law grants counties broad authority to regulate land use through legislative action. Historically, legislative land use decisions were generally upheld if it was reasonably debatable that the regulation promoted the public welfare. However, recent amendments to Utah Code § 17-79-801 provide that a legislative land use regulation will be upheld if it is reasonably debatable that the regulation is consistent with LUDMA.

While there is currently limited case law interpreting this revised standard, recommendations and decisions are best supported by the purposes and policies identified in Utah Code § 17-79-102, Morgan County Code, and the General Plan. Doing so provides a stronger basis for legislative action and judicial review. Among other things, Utah Code § 17-79-102 identifies the following land use purposes:

- Protect the public health, safety, and welfare.
- Promote prosperity and economic stability.
- Protect the tax base and secure economy in governmental expenditures.
- Facilitate orderly growth and a variety of housing types.
- Protect property values.
- Foster agricultural and other industries.
- Protect both urban and nonurban development.

• Promote transportation, infrastructure, and public facilities.
• Balance surrounding land uses with private property rights and constitutional protections.

Findings: The record should clearly identify:

• The basis for the recommendation or decision.
• The applicable provisions of Morgan County Code, the General Plan, and Utah law supporting the recommendation or decision.
• The public purposes and policy considerations supporting the recommendation or decision, including any applicable purposes identified in Utah Code § 17-79-102.
• The facts, information, policy considerations, and evidence relied upon in reaching the recommendation or decision.

Examples of Supporting Reasons

"I find the proposal is [consistent/inconsistent] with the goals and policies of the General Plan."

"I find the proposal [appropriately balances/fails to appropriately balance] surrounding land use considerations with the property owner's private property interests and constitutional protections."

"I find the proposal [supports/does not support] the purposes identified in Utah Code § 17-79-102, including orderly growth, infrastructure planning, agricultural preservation, property rights, compatibility with surrounding land uses, public welfare, economic development, housing opportunities, or other applicable statutory purposes."

"I find the proposal is [consistent/inconsistent] with applicable provisions of Morgan County Code."

"I find the proposal [advances/conflicts with] adopted County policies, plans, or planning objectives."

Important Considerations

• Legislative decisions involve policy judgments and the exercise of discretion.
• Public comments may assist in identifying impacts, concerns, and policy considerations. Recommendations should be based on the merits of those considerations, rather than the volume of public support or opposition.
• Recommendations are best supported by identifying the applicable provisions of Morgan County Code, the General Plan, and the purposes identified in Utah Code § 17-79-102.
• A well-supported recommendation provides a stronger basis for County Commission action and judicial review.

PROPOSED TEXT

Table 155.132

	CB	NC	TC	CS	CH	GC	BP	TPC	MGC	PC	LM	I
Residential:												
Recreation vehicle parks	C1	-	**C1**	C1	C1	C1	-	-	-	-	C1	-

STAFF ANALYSIS

The purpose of the Town Center District (TC) is to provide areas in appropriate locations where a combination of business, commercial, entertainment, residential and related activities may be established and maintained. Regulations of this district are designed to provide a compatible environment for commercial and residential uses. The district has strict design standards for architecture, landscaping and other performance requirements as reflected in §§ 155.265 through 155.270 of this code. A mix of commercial and residential uses, in the same building or on the same site is allowed in this zoning district.

The MCC defines "Recreational Vehicle Park (Travel Trailer Park) as: "Any area or tract of land or a separately designated section within a mobile home park where lots are rented or held out for rent to one or more owners or users of recreational vehicles."

Recreation Vehicle Parks can be designed to look and be maintained to a high standard; however, staff assesses from the purpose statement of the Town Center District (TC) (above) and various parts of the Morgan County Code (MCC) that Recreation Vehicle Parks are not the best fit for the Town Center District (TC).

The Town Center Design Standards include design standards (architectural, street front entrances, street facades) for non-residential and mixed-use and multi-family residential; it does not specify residential.

The only reference to "Recreation Vehicle Parks" in the use tables (residential and commercial) is in the commercial use table (§ 155.132) under "Residential":

	CB	NC	TC	CS	CH	GC	BP	TPC	MGC	PC	LM	I
Residential:												
Recreation vehicle parks	C1	-	-	C1	C1	C1	-	-	-	-	C1	-
Residential Care Facilities	C1	-	-	C1	C1	C1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Residential live-work	C3	C1	-	C3	P	P	-	-	-	-	-	-
Residential Units as part of a Mixed-Use Development			P									

Retirement home/assisted living	-	C1	-	-	C1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Under General Regulations in the MCC § 155.366 Conditional Uses (C) recreation vehicle parks do not require a Conditional Use Permit if a site plan is approved.

Under the MCC Supplementary Regulations § 155.334 Recreation Vehicle Courts and Commercial Campgrounds are Conditional Uses with the Planning Commission being the approval authority. A requirement is that they need to be listed as permitted or conditionally permitted in a particular zone. The MCC use table for commercial, and all residential uses does not list "Recreation Vehicle Courts and Commercial Campgrounds." The MCC definitions also do not define this use.

The Town Center District permits the following uses: (if a use is not listed in the § 155.132 table it is not allowed)

1. Accommodation & food services
2. Agriculture (until development)
3. Public Cemetery (C3)
4. General Contractor's Office
5. Educational Services
6. Most Entertainment Uses
7. Finance & Insurance
8. Most Office Uses
9. Only residential in mixed-use development
10. Retail (except Auto Salvage, Auto Dealers, Camper, Mobile Home, & RV Dealers)
11. Animal Clinic and Hospital
12. Automatic Car Wash, Truck Wash
13. Barber Shops
14. Beautician Services
15. Churches
16. Cosmetology Salons or Shops
17. Day Spas
18. Drinking Place (alcoholic beverages)
19. Drive-in Restaurant
20. Esthetician (i.e., skin care)
21. Gasoline service station
22. Laundry Services (laundromat, dry cleaner pick-up only)
23. Liquor, packaged sales (check the state code)
24. Parking Garage
25. Public or quasi-public facilities, or public service facilities. Exception: governmentally operated essential service facilities such as police, fire, ambulance, substations and animal control facilities
26. Radio and television communication facilities (C1)
27. Tailor
28. Tanning Salons

PUBLIC HEARING

One public comment was made. The comment was that the Planning Commission and County Commission probably anticipated that RV parks were similar to other excluded uses in the Town Center zone such as auto salvage, auto dealers, camper dealers, motor home dealers, and RV dealers.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

After a public hearing on October 8, 2026 the Planning Commission unanimously recommended to the County Commission to deny the MCC § 155.132 Code Text Amendment permitting Recreation vehicle parks in the TC zone with a conditional use permit approved by the Zoning Administrator with the following motion:

> I move we recommend denial to the County Commission of the MCC § 155.132 Code Text Amendment permitting Recreation vehicle parks in the Town Center zone with a conditional use permit approved by the Zoning Administrator based on the findings listed in the memorandum dated October 8, 2026, with the following findings: that in general a Conditional Use Permit text change to the Town Center zone would allow RV parks under any of the parcels either currently or in the future zone Town Center and that it would be more appropriate for an RV park in the Town Center zone to come before the Planning Commission and the County Commission as a development agreement so that it can be looked at on a one by one parcel by parcel basis and we can determine at that time whether that fits into the neighborhood, the terrain, whatever it may be for that particular parcel.

RECOMMENDED MOTIONS

Sample Motion for a *Recommendation* for *Approval* – "I move we approve the MCC § 155.132 Code Text Amendment permitting Recreation vehicle parks in the TC zone with a conditional use permit approved by the Zoning Administrator based on the findings listed in the memorandum dated October 20, 2026."

Sample Motion for a *Recommendation* for *Approval* with *Conditions* – "I move we approve the MCC § 155.132 Code Text Amendment permitting Recreation vehicle parks in the TC zone with a conditional use permit approved by the Zoning Administrator based on the findings listed in the memorandum dated October 20, 2026., with the following additional conditions:"

1. List any additional findings and conditions…

Sample Motion for a *Recommendation* for *Denial* – "I move we deny the MCC § 155.132 Code Text Amendment permitting Recreation vehicle parks in the TC zone with a conditional use permit approved by the Zoning Administrator based on the findings listed in the memorandum dated October 20, 2026. with the following findings:"

1. List any additional findings…

ATTACHMENTS:

A: MCC § 155.132 Code Text Amendment Ordinance

Attachment "A": Draft MCC § 155.132 Text Amendment Ordinance

ORDINANCE NO. CO-26-21

AN AMENDMENT TO THE LAND USE MANAGEMENT CODE FOR MORGAN COUNTY TO REVISE MCC § 155.132 USE TABLE PERMITTING RECREATION VEHICLE PARKS IN THE TOWN CENTER DISTRICT (TC) WITH A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT ISSUED BY THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR, AND ESTABLISHING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Morgan County Commission has previously established land use management regulations for Morgan County as Title XV of the Morgan County Code which established, among other things, the requirements for the subdivision approval process; and

WHEREAS, the regulations established by the Morgan County Commission in Title XV of the Morgan County Code have been determined by the Morgan County staff and the Morgan County Commission to be in need of revision to address these concerns; and

WHEREAS, the Morgan County Planning Commission held a public hearing on October 8, 2026, and unanimously recommended denial of the proposed amendment to the Morgan County Commission;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNTY COMMISSION OF

MORGAN COUNTY, STATE OF UTAH:

Section 1. Amendment and Adoption. The Morgan County Code is hereby amended to permit recreational vehicle parks in the Town Center (TC) zoning district with a conditional use permit issued by the Zoning Administrator as more specifically described in Exhibit "A", attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

Section 2. Severability. If any section, part, or provision of this Ordinance is held invalid or unenforceable, such invalidity or unenforceability shall not affect any other portion of this Ordinance, and all sections, parts and provisions of this Ordinance shall be severable.

Section 3. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall become effective after subsequent publication in accordance with State Law, but not before 15 days after its passage.

APPROVED, ADOPTED AND PASSED and ordered published by the Morgan County Commission, this th Day of 2026.

ATTEST:

MORGAN COUNTY GOVERNING BODY

_____
Leslie Hyde
Morgan County Clerk

_____
Matthew Wilson, County Commission Chair

APPROVED AS TO FORM

_____
Garrett Smith
Morgan County Attorney

Commission Members	Voting: AYE	NAY	ABSENT
Vaughn Nickerson	____	____	____
Mike Newton	____	____	____
Raelene Blocker	____	____	____
Matthew Wilson	____	____	____
Blaine Fackrell	____	____	____

Exhibit "A": MCC § 155.132 Code Text Amendment

	CB	NC	TC	CS	CH	GC	BP	TPC	MGC	PC	LM	I
Residential:												
Recreation vehicle parks	C1	-	**C1**	C1	C1	C1	-	-	-	-	C1	-

County Commission Agenda Request Form

All Agenda items, including back-up materials, must be submitted to:

Morgan County
Attn: Kate Becker
48 West Young Street
P O Box 886
Morgan, UT 84050
Phone: (435) 800.8724

Email: kbecker@morgancountyutah.gov

****ALL DOCUMENTATION IS DUE ON OR BEFORE 12:00 PM ON THE TUESDAY PRIOR TO A SCHEDULED COUNTY commission MEETING****

This form must be submitted, along with any required documentation, or the Agenda Item will not be scheduled until the next County commission Meeting

Commission Meeting Date: 10/20/'26 **Time Requested:** 10 min

Name: Kate Becker **Phone:** (801) 845-4015

Address: 48 W. Young Street

Email: jcook@morgancountyutah.gov **Fax:**

Associated County Department: Planning and Development Department

PURPOSE FOR THE AGENDA ITEM - MUST BE SPECIFIC:

Public Hearing/Discussion/Decision – *Morgan County Code proposed text amendment*: clarifying the intent of section 155.426 (C) (5)

WILL YOUR AGENDA ITEM BE FOR:				
	DISCUSSION	✔	**PUBLIC HEARING**	✔
	DECISION	✔	**PUBLIC MEETING**	✔
	BOTH	✔		
	INFORMATION ONLY			

MEMORANDUM

TO: Morgan County Commission

FROM: Morgan County Planning & Development Services Staff

DATE: October 20, 2026

SUBJECT: MCC § 155.426 (C) (5) Code Text Amendment

SUMMARY: To Clarify the Intent of: "The flagpole or panhandle portion of a flag lot shall not be included in calculated gross square footage of a lot;"

Former Planning and Development Director, Josh Cook, who drafted this portion of the code, has brought to our attention the intent of MCC § 155.426 (C) (5). The Morgan County Commission has directed staff to amend this code to reflect the original intent.

This current code reads: "The flagpole or panhandle portion of a flag lot shall not be included in calculated gross square footage of a lot." The intent of this code is that that the zoning entitlements of the flagpole or panhandle portion of flag lot shall not apply to the lot, but that the zoning entitlements of the flag portion shall apply. (It is not infrequent that a flag lot be split by zoning – often RR-1 along the road and A-20 farther back.)

Staff's research has found discussion of including and not including the pole portion in the lot's acreage. The earliest references are to include the pole portion in the acreage; the latter references are to not include the pole portion in the acreage. Staff agrees with the recommended change proposed by the Planning Commission and submits their recommended version to you.

PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT

MCC § 155.426 (C) (5): "The flagpole or panhandle portion of a flag lot shall not be included in calculated gross square footage of a lot. Where the flag portion lies entirely within one zoning district, the minimum lot size and residential density applicable to the lot shall be determined by that district, regardless of the zoning designation of the flagpole or panhandle portion."

ATTORNEY GUIDANCE

Legislative Review: Legislative Review: Legislative land use decisions involve the adoption, amendment, or repeal of ordinances, zoning maps, development standards, and other land use regulations. Under Utah Code § 17-79-501, these are policy decisions entrusted to the County Commission as the County's legislative body and involve the exercise of legislative judgment and discretion.

The Planning Commission's role is to review the proposal, receive public input, evaluate potential impacts, and make a recommendation to the County Commission. In doing so, the

Planning Commission should consider whether the proposal is consistent with Morgan County Code, the General Plan, and applicable provisions of Utah law.

Applicable Law: Utah law grants counties broad authority to regulate land use through legislative action. Historically, legislative land use decisions were generally upheld if it was reasonably debatable that the regulation promoted the public welfare. However, recent amendments to Utah Code § 17-79-801 provide that a legislative land use regulation will be upheld if it is reasonably debatable that the regulation is consistent with LUDMA.

While there is currently limited case law interpreting this revised standard, recommendations and decisions are best supported by the purposes and policies identified in Utah Code § 17-79-102, Morgan County Code, and the General Plan. Doing so provides a stronger basis for legislative action and judicial review. Among other things, Utah Code § 17-79-102 identifies the following land use purposes:

- Protect the public health, safety, and welfare.
- Promote prosperity and economic stability.
- Protect the tax base and secure economy in governmental expenditures.
- Facilitate orderly growth and a variety of housing types.
- Protect property values.
- Foster agricultural and other industries.
- Protect both urban and nonurban development.
- Promote transportation, infrastructure, and public facilities.
- Balance surrounding land uses with private property rights and constitutional protections.

Findings: The record should clearly identify:

- The basis for the recommendation or decision.
- The applicable provisions of Morgan County Code, the General Plan, and Utah law supporting the recommendation or decision.
- The public purposes and policy considerations supporting the recommendation or decision, including any applicable purposes identified in Utah Code § 17-79-102.
- The facts, information, policy considerations, and evidence relied upon in reaching the recommendation or decision.

Examples of Supporting Reasons

"I find the proposal is [consistent/inconsistent] with the goals and policies of the General Plan."

"I find the proposal [appropriately balances/fails to appropriately balance] surrounding land use considerations with the property owner's private property interests and constitutional protections."

"I find the proposal [supports/does not support] the purposes identified in Utah Code § 17-79-102, including orderly growth, infrastructure planning, agricultural preservation,

property rights, compatibility with surrounding land uses, public welfare, economic development, housing opportunities, or other applicable statutory purposes."

"I find the proposal is [consistent/inconsistent] with applicable provisions of Morgan County Code."

"I find the proposal [advances/conflicts with] adopted County policies, plans, or planning objectives."

Important Considerations

- Legislative decisions involve policy judgments and the exercise of discretion.
- Public comments may assist in identifying impacts, concerns, and policy considerations. Recommendations should be based on the merits of those considerations, rather than the volume of public support or opposition.
- Recommendations are best supported by identifying the applicable provisions of Morgan County Code, the General Plan, and the purposes identified in Utah Code § 17-79-102.
- A well-supported recommendation provides a stronger basis for County Commission action and judicial review.

PUBLIC HEARING
No comments received.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION
After a Public Hearing on October 8, 2026 the Planning Commission made the following unanimous recommendation to the County Commission that the original intent of MCC § 155.426 (C) (5) should read as follows:

The flagpole or panhandle portion of a flag lot shall not be included in calculated gross square footage of a lot. Where the flag portion lays entirely within one zoning district, the minimum lot size and residential density applicable to the lot shall be determined by that district regardless of the zoning designation of the flagpole or panhandle portion.

RECOMMENDED MOTIONS

Sample Motion for *Approval* of former Zoning Administrator's recommendation– I move we approve the MCC § 155.426 (C) (5) Text Amendment clarifying the original intent based on the findings listed in the memorandum dated October 20, 2026 with the following amendments:

The zoning entitlements of the flagpole /panhandle portion of a flag lot shall not apply to the lot; the zoning entitlements of the flag portion shall apply to the whole lot ~~be included in calculated gross square footage or a lot~~.

Sample Motion for *Approval* of Planning Commission's recommendation – I move we

approve the MCC § 155.426 (C) (5) Text Amendment clarifying the original intent based on the findings listed in the memorandum dated October 20, 2026., with the following amendment:
The flagpole or panhandle portion of a flag lot shall not be included in calculated gross square footage of a lot. Where the flag portion lays entirely within one zoning district, the minimum lot size and residential density applicable to the lot shall be determined by that district regardless of the zoning designation of the flagpole or panhandle portion.

Sample Motion for *Denial* – "I move we deny the MCC § 155.426 (C) (5) Text Amendment clarifying the original intent based on the findings listed in the memorandum dated October 20, 2026. with the following findings:"

1. List any additional findings…

ATTACHMENTS:

A: MCC § 155.426 (C) (5) Code Text Amendment Ordinance

Attachment A: MCC § 155.426 (C) (5) Text Amendment Ordinance

ORDINANCE NO. CO-26-22

AN AMENDMENT TO THE LAND USE MANAGEMENT CODE FOR MORGAN COUNTY TO REVISE MCC § 155.426 (C) (5) CLARIFYING THE ORIGINAL INTENT, AND ESTABLISHING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Morgan County Commission has previously established land use management regulations for Morgan County as Title XV of the Morgan County Code which established, among other things, the requirements for the subdivision approval process; and

WHEREAS, the regulations established by the Morgan County Commission in Title XV of the Morgan County Code have been determined by the Morgan County staff and the Morgan County Commission to be in need of revision to address these concerns; and

WHEREAS, the Morgan County Planning Commission and Zoning Administrator have reviewed the proposed amendment in accordance with State law and have recommended approval of the same;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNTY COMMISSION OF

MORGAN COUNTY, STATE OF UTAH:

Section 1. Amendment and Adoption. Morgan County Code § 155.426 (C) (5) is hereby amended to clarify its original intent as more specifically described in Exhibit , attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

Section 2. Severability. If any section, part, or provision of this Ordinance is held invalid or unenforceable, such invalidity or unenforceability shall not affect any other portion of this Ordinance, and all sections, parts and provisions of this Ordinance shall be severable.

Section 3. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall become effective after subsequent publication in accordance with State Law, but not before 15 days after its passage.

APPROVED, ADOPTED AND PASSED and ordered published by the Morgan County Commission, this 20th Day of October 2026.

ATTEST:

MORGAN COUNTY GOVERNING BODY

_____
Leslie Hyde
Morgan County Clerk

_____
Matthew Wilson, County Commission Chair

APPROVED AS TO FORM

_____
Garrett Smith
Morgan County Attorney

Commission Members	Voting: AYE	NAY	ABSENT
Vaughn Nickerson	____	____	____
Mike Newton	____	____	____
Raelene Blocker	____	____	____
Matthew Wilson	____	____	____
Blaine Fackrell	____	____	____

Exhibit A

Former Zoning Administrator's recommendation

MCC § 155.426 (C) (5): The zoning entitlements of the flagpole /panhandle portion of a flag lot shall not apply to the lot; the zoning entitlements of the flag portion shall apply to the whole lot ~~be included in calculated gross square footage or a lot~~.

Exhibit B

Planning Commission's recommendation

MCC § 155.426 (C) (5): The flagpole or panhandle portion of a flag lot shall not be included in calculated gross square footage of a lot. Where the flag portion lays entirely within one zoning district, the minimum lot size and residential density applicable to the lot shall be determined by that district regardless of the zoning designation of the flagpole or panhandle portion.

00070064 Bk00119 Pg00352-00353

DEBBIE WEAVER, MORGAN COUNTY RECORDER
1996 APR 19 11:41 AM FEE $.00 BY DBW
REQUEST: MORGAN COUNTY

ORDINANCE NO. 135

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE CREATION OF TRUST FUND ACCOUNTS FOR MOUNTAIN GREEN / KENT SMITH MEMORIAL PARK

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Morgan County has taken over the management of the Mountain Green / Kent Smith Memorial Park in the Morgan County: and

WHEREAS, those recreation parks have deposited funds with the Board of County Commissioners of Morgan County, Utah, ordains as follows:

Purpose: The purpose of this Ordinance is to provide trust fund accounts for each recreation park located in Morgan County which park is under the management of the Board of County Commissioners of Morgan County.

Trust Fund Account Established: A trust fund account is hereby established for Mountain Green / Kent Smith Memorial Park covered by this ordinance to receive funds from contributions of private entities, from funds given to Morgan County upon assuming management of the park and from user fees and other sources that the Board of County Commissioners directs be placed in the trust fund account.

How Funds Are Expended: The monies held in the trust fund account, including principal and interest, shall be used for maintenance and operations and for capital improvements in the Mountain Green / Kent Smith Memorial Park for which the fund is created:

Mountain Green Kent Smith Memorial Park: The Board of County commissioners shall upon recommendations provided by the

area in which the Park is located, appoint a three (3) person board which shall give recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners as to how the funds in the trust fund account are to be expended.

Effective Date: This ordinance shall be in full force and effect on

Passed and adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Morgan County, State of Utah, on this 19 Day May 1992

Herbert K.
Joan M. Atterson
Dee Alan Waldron

00070064 BkM0119 Pg00353

Understanding Proposed Local Option Sales Tax (Utah Code § 59-12-2216)

The Morgan County Commission is reviewing a countywide **0.30% sales and use tax** (3 cents on a $10 purchase) to address escalating demands on emergency infrastructure. This revenue is restricted for public safety and corridor evacuation infrastructure in the percentages specified by the County Commission's allocation resolution.

PROS: Why This Tool Is Being Considered

- **Captures Visitor Dollars:** Property taxes fall solely on local landowners. A sales tax captures revenue from tourists, travelers, and commuters who pass through Morgan County and utilize our emergency services.
- **Property Tax Relief:** Establishing a dedicated sales tax funding stream directly protects local property owners from future permanent property tax hikes (Truth-in-Taxation) to pay for emergency services.
- **Lowers Fire Insurance Premiums:** Investing in advanced fire engines, personnel, and stations directly improves the county's ISO Fire Protection Rating. A superior rating can lower or stabilize annual home fire insurance premiums across the county.
- **Protects Household Essentials:** By state mandate, this tax excludes qualifying food and food ingredients (subject to the statutory bundled-transaction exception) and gasoline subject to Utah's motor fuel excise tax, minimizing the burden on local families.

CONS: The Potential Impacts & Trade-offs

- **Higher Combined Retail Tax:** Adopting the maximum allowed rate shifts the combined retail sales tax from **6.70% to 7.00%** in unincorporated county zones, and from **6.95% to 7.25%** inside Morgan City.
- **Regressive Tax Impact:** Sales taxes naturally absorb a larger percentage of total income from lower-income households compared to wealthier residents.
- **Economic Volatility:** Unlike highly stable property tax receipts, sales tax revenue fluctuates predictably with economic cycles, consumer spending shifts, and regional tourism trends.

ALLOWABLE USES (Where 100% of Funds Stay Local)

- **Operations:** Salaries to recruit and retain high-quality Sheriff's Deputies, Firefighters, and Paramedics.
- **Facilities:** Constructing or upgrading critical fire stations, EMS hubs, and law enforcement buildings.
- **Apparatus:** Purchasing life-saving machinery, ambulances, and wildland-urban interface fire trucks.

- **Evacuation Infrastructure:** Funding traffic signals, streetlights, and corridor safety features that speed up emergency travel or secure public evacuation paths during disasters.

MORGAN COUNTY COMMUNITY INPUT FORM

Public.Safety.Sales.Tax.Proposal.(Utah.Code.° .❶❺_78_887❷)

Your.input.matters.to.the.County.Commission¡.Please.complete.this.form.and.leave.it.in.the. drop_box.at.the.back.of.the.Commission.Chambers.tonight?or.submit.your.thoughts.online¡

1. Which area of Morgan County do you live in?
[ ] Unincorporated Morgan County
[ ] Morgan City Boundaries
[ ] Neighboring County / Visitor

2. Fire protection investments can improve Morgan County's fire safety rating, potentially lowering or stabilizing homeowners' insurance premiums. How concerned are you about your current property/fire insurance rates or coverage availability?
[ ] **Extremely concerned:** Rates have risen drastically or coverage is harder to secure.
[ ] **Moderately concerned:** Rates are increasing, but coverage is stable.
[ ] **Not concerned:** My rates and coverage are currently manageable.

3. Which priority matters most to you regarding public safety? (Rank 1 to 5, with 1 being your highest priority)

- [ ] Shorter response times for ambulances and medical emergencies
- [ ] Increased presence of Sheriff's deputies in neighborhoods
- [ ] Upgrading fire engines, stations, and equipment to reduce local fire insurance premiums
- [ ] Safer road infrastructure and emergency evacuation paths
- [ ] Minimizing all forms of local tax increases

4. Written Record Testimony:
Please.share.your.perspective?concerns?or.specific.questions.you.have.for.the.County. Commission.regarding.this.public.safety.funding.tool.below¿

_____

_____

_____

_____

Optional Contact Information:
Name: _____ Email/Phone: _____

[ ] Check.here.if.you.would.like.to.be.notified.via.email.about.future.public.hearing.dates.regarding.this.tax.option¡

MORGAN COUNTY ORDINANCE 26-XX

AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNTY LEGISLATIVE BODY OF MORGAN COUNTY, ENACTING A LOCAL OPTION SALES AND USE TAX OF THREE-TENTHS OF ONE PERCENT (0.30%) PURSUANT TO UTAH CODE ANN. § 59-12-2216; ESTABLISHING THE TAX RATE AND RETAIL TRANSACTION BASE; SPECIFYING STATUTORY ALLOWABLE USES AND EXCLUSIONS; ESTABLISHING A RESTRICTED REVENUE ACCOUNT FOR PUBLIC SAFETY INVESTMENTS AND TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENTS RELATED TO EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS; ADOPTING PROCEDURES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE TAX BY THE UTAH STATE TAX COMMISSION; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY; AND SETTING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, Morgan County is a legally constituted political subdivision and a county of the fifth class under the laws of the State of Utah; AND

WHEREAS, Utah Code Ann. § 59-12-2216 explicitly authorizes the legislative body of an eligible county to impose a local option sales and use tax of up to three-tenths of one percent (0.30%) across both unincorporated spaces and incorporated municipalities within its jurisdiction; AND

WHEREAS, statutory amendments enacted by the Utah State Legislature authorize eligible third- through sixth-class counties to utilize revenues generated under this section directly for municipal or countywide public safety purposes, blending traditional infrastructure capabilities with acute public safety operations; AND

WHEREAS, Morgan County continues to experience significant population growth and heightened vehicle transit along its key transportation corridors, placing unprecedented stress on the Morgan County Sheriff's Office, local emergency medical services (EMS), and volunteer fire protection apparatus; AND

WHEREAS, the Morgan County Commission finds that upgrading local emergency response infrastructure, retaining high-quality public safety personnel, and expanding rural fire suppression assets are essential to maintaining public welfare and securing favorable regional fire classification metrics that directly stabilize property insurance premium liabilities for local homeowners; AND

WHEREAS, establishing a dedicated local option sales tax vehicle allows Morgan County to capture critical operational funds from visitors, commuters, and tourists utilizing county roads and emergency facilities, thereby mitigating the need for exclusive and permanent property tax hikes via the Truth-in-Taxation framework;

DRAFT

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNTY COMMISSION OF MORGAN COUNTY:

SECTION I: ENACTMENT AND TAX RATE

Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 59-12-2216, there is hereby imposed and levied a countywide local option sales and use tax of three-tenths of one percent (0.30%) on all taxable transactions described under Subsection 59-12-103(1) sourced under Utah Code Ann. §§ 59-12-211 through 59-12-215 to locations within the geographic boundaries of Morgan County, Utah. This tax shall apply uniformly to all such taxable transactions, subject to Section III, within unincorporated Morgan County and inside the corporate municipal limits of Morgan City.

SECTION II: STATUTORY ALLOWABLE USES

One hundred percent (100%) of the net tax revenues distributed to Morgan County under this ordinance shall be legally restricted and expended solely for the purposes authorized under Utah Code Ann. § 59-12-2216 in accordance with a County Commission resolution specifying the percentages allocated to public safety under Subsection 59-12-2216(3)(b) and transportation under Section 59-12-2212.2, with _____% allocated to public safety and _____% allocated to transportation (totaling 100%), strictly limited to the following uses within their respective allocations:

1. **Public Safety Personnel Support:** Recruitment, base compensation, and operational retention funding for field-level law enforcement deputies, fire personnel, and emergency dispatch specialists.
2. **Emergency Capital Assets & Infrastructure:** Acquiring, constructing, or modernizing local public safety facilities, emergency medical service substations, and regional fire stations.
3. **Apparatus & Fleet Upgrades:** Purchasing primary emergency vehicles, advanced life support (ALS) ambulances, communications hardware, and specialized wildland-urban interface (WUI) fire response machinery.
4. **Evacuation & Corridor Traffic Safety:** Engineering and deploying street lighting, automated traffic signaling, pedestrian safety pathways, and connecting highway infrastructure necessary to minimize response times and secure safe public evacuation corridors during natural disasters or wildfire contingencies, funded from the transportation allocation. Before beginning a project on a state highway, the County shall obtain Transportation Commission approval and enter into an interlocal agreement with the Utah Department of Transportation as required by

DRAFT

Subsection 59-12-2216(6). Revenues allocated for a state highway shall be deposited into and expended from the Highway Projects Within Counties Fund as required by Subsection 59-12-2216(9) and Section 72-2-121.1.

SECTION III: BASE EXCLUSIONS AND STATUTORY EXEMPTIONS

As mandated by the Utah Sales and Use Tax Act, the additional 0.30% tax levied by this ordinance is subject to the exclusions and exemptions in Utah Code Ann. § 59-12-2204 and § 59-12-104, including:

1. Amounts paid or charged for food and food ingredients, except bundled transactions taxable under Subsection 59-12-2204(2). Other applicable taxes on food and food ingredients are unchanged.
2. Sales of aviation fuel, motor fuel, and special fuel subject to a Utah state excise tax under Title 59, Chapter 13 of the Utah Code.

SECTION IV: CONTRACT WITH THE STATE TAX COMMISSION

Prior to the formal effective date of this ordinance, the Morgan County Commission shall enter into an updated administrative agreement with the Utah State Tax Commission. The State Tax Commission shall perform all functions incident to the collection, enforcement, auditing, and structural allocation of the sales and use tax enacted herein.

SECTION V: MANDATORY ADMINISTRATIVE NOTICE

The Morgan County Clerk is hereby authorized and instructed to transmit a certified copy of this final adopted ordinance, along with an updated map detailing official county boundaries, to the Utah State Tax Commission **together with written notice stating the enactment, statutory authority, effective date, and tax rate required by Utah Code Ann. § 59-12-2209. The tax shall** take effect on the first day of a calendar quarter after the 90-day period beginning when the State Tax Commission receives compliant notice.

SECTION VI: SEVERABILITY

If any section, subsection, clause, sentence, or phrase of this ordinance is for any reason held to be unconstitutional, unlawful, or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, such a decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance, which shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION VII: EFFECTIVE DATE

DRAFT

This Ordinance shall take effect following its approval by the County Commission and formal publication as required by law. The tax shall take effect on _____, 20____, subject to the calendar-quarter and 90-day notice requirements of Utah Code Ann. § 59-12-2209.

DRAFT

MORGAN COUNTY RESOLUTION NO 26 _____
ALLOCATION OF LOCAL OPTION SALES AND USE TAX REVENUE

WHEREAS, Morgan County is a county of the fifth class authorized under Utah Code § 59-12-2216 to impose a countywide local option sales and use tax of up to three-tenths of one percent (0.30%);

WHEREAS, Morgan County Ordinance No. 26-_____ imposes that tax, subject to applicable statutory notice and effective-date requirements; and

WHEREAS, Utah Code § 59-12-2216 requires the County to specify the percentages of revenue allocated to authorized transportation and public safety purposes;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Morgan County Commission as follows:

1. Allocation. Of the net revenues Morgan County receives from the tax imposed by Ordinance No. 26-_____, _____ percent shall be allocated to public safety purposes authorized by Utah Code § 59-12-2216(3)(b), and _____ percent shall be allocated to transportation purposes authorized by Utah Code § 59-12-2212.2. The allocations shall total one hundred percent (100%).

2. Authorized expenditures. Revenue shall be expended within these allocations in accordance with Ordinance No. 26-_____ and applicable law. Any revenue allocated for a state highway shall be deposited and expended as required by Utah Code § 59-12-2216(9) and § 72-2-121.1, subject to the approvals and agreement required by § 59-12-2216(6).

3. Allocation changes. Any subsequent change to these allocations shall be approved in accordance with Utah Code § 59-12-2216(7).

4. Effective date. This Resolution takes effect upon adoption. The allocations apply beginning on the tax's lawful effective date and do not accelerate the tax's implementation.

ADOPTED by the Morgan County Commission this _____ day of _____, 2026.

MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSION

_____
Chair

ATTEST:

_____
Morgan County Clerk

Commission vote: Ayes _____ Nays _____ Absent _____

DRAFT