AGENDA
MORGAN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
August 18th, 2020 — 7:00 p.m.
Morgan, Utah

Notice of Electronic Participation
This meeting will be held electronically pursuant to Utah Code 52-4-20, and pursuant to Governor Herbert’s March 18, 2020 Executive Order.
Public Invited to Attend by: YouTube recording on morgancityut.org

7:00 p.m.  PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES APPROVAL:  April 21st, 2020

AGENDA ITEMS

ITEM #1  Review and Discussion-Request for Proposal (RFP) General Plan Update submittal.
ITEM #2  Planning Commission project update.

In compliance with the American’s With Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and service) during this meeting should notify the Morgan City Office, 801-829-3461, at least twenty-four hours prior to the meeting. This meeting will be held electronically please contact Morgan City office to participate.

Posted this 5th day of August 2020

Teresa Shope, Planning & Zoning Secretary
Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes of Morgan City Planning Commission WORK and GENERAL meeting held in open public session electronically on April 21st, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.

MINUTES APRIL 21ST, 2020 6:30 PM MORGAN CITY COUNCIL ROOM

MEETING CALLED BY Chair Nathan McClellan.


EXCUSED George Hopkin, Dave Carter.

CITY STAFF Mayor, Ray Little; Council Member, Tony London; City Council Member David Alexander; City Planner, Weston Applinie; City Planning Attorney, Steve Garside; City Manager, Ty Bailey.

OTHERS PRESENT John Patterson, Tom Harding.

INTRODUCTION Chair, Nathan McClellan welcomed all that joined from the electronic meeting room. Nathan advised the group that the meeting will be a video as well as audio recording. That the video and audio will be on the Morgan City website as well as you tube account and will be a permanent record. During the meeting, Nathan asked to please mute the participants location, raise hand and unmute to participate in a discussion. This will avoid talking over each other Voting will be by the raise of a hand.

WORK SESSION

Minutes- The Commission discussed the minutes from March 17th, 2020 with no corrections.

Historic Overlay Guideline Review-Signage-157 Commercial Street. Nathan opened the discussion indicating the submitted documents are located on the Morgan City website for review and reference. John Patterson is the applicant and Nathan invited Mr. Patterson to address the Commission with a background as well as reasoning behind the particular sign design submittal.

John Patterson discussed the History of the building. In the mid 1900’s the building was thriving as the First National Bank. The submittal is a replica of the sign during that time period. The difference is that “First National Bank” was above the clock. John chose to change that part of the sign to have the building address numbers. The wording on the building is in keeping with the historical use of the building.

Nathan referred to the staffing notes regarding lighting; The Historic Commercial Overlay Zone restricts signfrom having internal illumination. The reason for this restriction is outlined in Section 10.14.090(K)(7) of the Morgan City Municipal Code which states, “Historically, signs used on Commercial Street were relatively simple. The earliest signs had no lighting. In later years, an indirect lighting source was typical. These historic sign characteristics should be continued”.

Staffing notes also stated; The Planning Commission is authorized to apply and interpret the provisions of the Historic Overlay zone. Section 10.14.090 (K)(8) of the Morgan City Municipal code state that, “Design guidelines for the rehabilitation of existing properties should be compatible with the style of the main building. Each case should be reviewed on an individual basis, taking into consideration the unique circumstances of each building”.

Nathan stated the Commission has a say on the sign and would like the members of the Commission to start a discussion regarding; the staffing notes, application and options. Jim Brown stated he would be in favor of the lighting on the sign and asked the applicant which part of the sign would be lighted. Mr. Patterson stated the numbers above the clock as well as the clock would be lighted. Jim asked if there would be lighting on the building that would be directed on the flush mounted sign. John indicated there would not be any other lighting but the illuminated clock and numbers.
Lance questioned the accuracy of the building numbers. Clarification indicated the buildings official number addressing is that of 157 Commercial Street.

City Council member, David Alexander questioned the prominence, is putting the sign flush on the building promoting First National Bank when that is not what is in the building. John stated he had talked to the local bank and since they do not use "First National Bank" they didn't see a problem. The name is just the building name such as; the Wells Fargo building. David Alexander has retired with his career being in banking. David explained that there is protocol when it comes to banks and names. For example, to have "National" in a bank name, there is permission from a Federal agency with accompanying guidelines. The Treasury department could have a problem. John along with staff and Commission members discussed changing the flush sign to letters such as; FNB Building. John indicated he understands the dilemma and is good with changing the name.

Wes Woods commended John Patterson on the thoroughness of submittal. Wes stated the submittal had before and after pictures with detail of the project. Wes would like this to become the "standard" especially those requesting approval of the History Guideline overlay review.

**Final Approval-Pheasant Run**—The subject property is located at approximately 175 North 525 West. This project was before the Commission in February 2020 and received preliminary plan approval. Since that time, the applicant has worked with staff in preparing the plat for final approval. Nathan asked the members if they had any thoughts on the project submittal.

Wes Woods asked regarding the required documents stated in the staffing notes, when are they reviewed and are they to be recorded. Weston stated yes, they are to be recorded. Ty indicated Pheasant Run if recommended for approval, will be on next Tuesday’s City Council meeting. Staff has been preparing the documents with City Council being the approving legislative body for the required documents. Those documents will be approved in conjunction with final approval of the subdivision.

Lance asked about access to the fire lane for residential use questioning if it is emergency access and gated, is it not for public use. Steve Garside asked for clarification on the easement being that of 20ft when the City was requiring a 60ft width for the future public roadway. Weston stated the parcel has had lot line adjustments to accommodate the future road width of 60ft. The 20ft access easement will be for this project and maintained using a maintenance agreement with the current parcel owner. Steve stated since this is a Morgan City service access, Morgan City uses are public.

**Historic Overlay Guideline Review-Façade for 145 N. Commercial Street**—Work Session only had a few minutes left. Hence, no discussion occurred.

---

**GENERAL SESSION**

**MINUTES APPROVAL**

**MARCH 17TH, 2020**

**DISCUSSION**

Nathan opened for discussion regarding the minutes from March 17th, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. No discussion on the minutes.

**MOTION**

Lance Prescott moved to approve the minutes of March 17th, 2020 Planning Commission meeting as presented.
Second: Wes Woods
Unanimous
**ITEM #1  HISTORIC OVERLAY GUIDELINE REVIEW-SIGNAGE 157 COMMERCIAL STREET**

The applicant, John Patterson, is requesting a historic design review for an attached projecting sign as well as a flush mount sign. This property is located at 157 North Commercial Street and is a historic property that fronts Commercial Street. Signs within this zone require a historic design review and approval by the Planning Commission.

Chair, Nathan McClellan invited applicant, John Patterson to address the Commission. John Patterson stated he has purchased the old bank building which he is remodeling and refurbishing. In the mid 1900’s the building was thriving as the First National Bank. The submittal is a replica of the sign during that time period. John indicated issues came up in the work session regarding the flush mount sign of First National Bank and that a suggestion was made to possibly change the working to read FNB building. Mr. Patterson stated he understands the reasoning and is good with the change.

Nathan stated the code does not favor internal illumination of signs. The Code is as follows; The Historic Commercial Overlay Zone restricts signs from having internal illumination. The reason for this restriction is outlined in Section 10.14.090(K)(7) of the Morgan City Municipal Code which states, “Historically, signs used on Commercial Street were relatively simple. The earliest signs had no lighting. In later years, an indirect lighting source was typical. These historic sign characteristics should be continued”.

The code also mentions; The Planning Commission is authorized to apply and interpret the provisions of the Historic Overlay zone. Section 10.14.090 (K)(8) of the Morgan City Municipal code state that, “Design guidelines for the rehabilitation of existing properties should be compatible with the style of the main building. Each case should be reviewed on an individual basis, taking into consideration the unique circumstances of each building”.

Lance Prescott stated the design is that of the era when Commercial Street was thriving. The applicant has produced a replica of the sign used at that time. The quality of the signage is good, and Mr. Prescott believes the submitted sign will fit well in bringing back an historic theme. The illumination of the clock and numbers should be considered. Commission member, Wes Woods stated the type of submitted sign really upgrades the look of the business inside as well as being classy. The applicant has put in some time to do research and presented the Commission with a complete application. The submittal has before and proposed after pictures with renderings from a sign company able to produce the replica. The internal illumination of the sign is appropriate.

Jim Brown questioning the paint schedule, it is to be determined or is the red the finished product. Mr. Brown also asked the applicant if red is his final coloring, what was the reasoning. John Patterson indicated the paint schedule presented will be the finished product. The reasoning behind the red color is to compliment the historic signage that of Buzzy’s and the Country Café. John understanding the color will not be an exact match and yet Mr. Patterson is with the understanding the current owner of those buildings is hoping to refurbish the original signs.

Nathan still questioned why the Ordinance discourages internal illuminated signs. Steve Garside stated when viewing historic photos, signage was not lit. As time went by, goose neck type lighting had been added. The Ordinance reflects the historic time of Morgan City. We can say with this building, the City would like to reflect the vibrant era which has internal illuminated signs. The Planning Commission is authorized to apply and interpret the provisions of the Historic Overlay zone. Section 10.14.090 (K)(8) of the Morgan City Municipal code.

**MOTION**

Lance Prescott moved to approval the submitted proposed signage for 157 Commercial Street as presented with the exception of wording change to the flush mounted sign which changes the wording from bank to building with appropriate verbiage change suggesting FNB Building or something to that effect. That the verbiage change will be reviewed by staff for approval.

Second: Jim Brown

Discussion on the motion: A recommendation to include approval of the coloring.

Lance Prescott accepted the recommendation to include approval of submitted coloring.

Second: Jim Brown second the recommendation.

Vote: Unanimous
### ITEM #2

**FINAL APPROVAL-PHEASANT RUN SUBDIVISION**

The subject property is located at approximately 175 North 525 West. This project was before the Commission in February 2020 and received preliminary plan approval. Since that time, the applicant has worked with staff in preparing the plat for final approval.

Nathan stated the items was open for discussion with the Commission. Lance Prescott indicated it's been a long road to get to final approval on this project and stated his surprise that someone with the project is not at the meeting. It is possible that the developer is watching and not contributed to the electronic meeting invitation.

The Commission along with staff reiterated some of the challenges discussed in previous meetings regarding this project i.e.; second access, change in planners, applicant submitting storm drain system not to city standards, frontages, cul de sac, transitioning, General Plan, etc. The project does meet current Code and City Standards. The City received a grant to amend the General Plan. Nathan stated as the Commission revisits the General Plan, this will be a great opportunity for the Commission to review and have input on the future Land use Plan for Morgan City.

Nathan stated Pheasant Run Engineering notes indicate the project has completed the requirements with the exception of documents to be approved by the Legislative Body. That from the Planning staffing notes, the project meets City Code. Nathan stated City Council Members request that the project be complete with not pending items. Even though the developer is not present, the Commission can make a motion. The motion would be that of a recommendation of approval or denial to the City Council for consideration and not an approval or denial of the Commissioning body.

Nathan stated he still had concerns regarding the layout of the subdivision and did not like the design. Ty Bailey discussed that the developer had challenges which required roads to be in specific areas, widths, etc. That a request was made by the Commission regarding cul de sac to increase frontages. That request would have increased density as well as create challenges for City staff with maintaining the roads not to mention more hard surface requiring a larger retention basin for storm water.

**MOTION**

Jay Ackett moved to recommend Final approval of Pheasant Run Subdivision to the City Council for consideration.

Second: Lance Prescott

No discussion on the motion.

Vote: Unanimous

### ITEM #3

**Historic overlay guideline review-Façade-145 N. Commercial St.**

The applicant, Doug Wickliffe was advised any changes or modifications to the façade of a building in the Historic Overlay Zone is required to be approved by the Planning Commission prior to the changes or modifications. Staff asked the applicant to provide renderings such as; current pictures, modification design, product to be use, brochures, etc. so that the City Planner could review and submit staffing notes to Commission. The renderings were not received for the City Planner to review. The applicant received an invite to the electronic Planning Commission meeting. At that time, Mr. Wickliffe provided an email with a current picture of the façade of the building with an additional picture of the type of windows to be installed and a written description of the changes. Mr. Wickliffe was again asked to present product and or brochures for review. This time, at the scheduled meeting.

Nathan read the email from Mr. Wickliffe. Doug Wickliffe is not present on the electronic meeting.

The applicant has been in front of the Commission at a prior meeting. Wes Woods stated again, it seems like the project is happening “off the cuff”. There is not enough information for a proper review. Mr. Woods indicated there has to be a standard for an application. At this meeting, the Commission has two reviews with one review providing a complete application with a design that the Commission does not have to interpret the intent. Wes stated this application is of the current façade and a written description of what the applicant is thinking of doing. Wes impression is that the applicant wants a blank approval, to just trust him that it will look good.

Lance Prescott stated there is no information of the color palate for the doors and trim nor a sample of the product to be used for the façade. Colors vary from product to product. For example, one companies hard board color can be different than same color in their competitor’s product. The quality of the product can vary from distributor to distributor.
Nathan stated a good working relationship is communication. With no product samples and no applicant present, is an opportunity for miscommunication. Lance checked the email with the invite to the electronic meeting and Doug Wickliffe was on the email. Nathan indicated the Commission needs more clarity on the intent. Jim Brown stated for an example; the pictures shows a double door but the written explanation is referring to a single door. Jim stated there is a lot of assumption in the submittal with not applicant to discuss.

Ty Bailey asked Mr. Garside if the Commission could approve the application with conditions subject to staff approval. Mr. Bailey stated he is not asking specifically for this application. Steve stated it was possible with clear clarity of the conditions set forth by the Commission.

Jay Ackett stated the prior applicant brought a detailed sign rendering and during the hotel review of the façade, that applicant brought in specific product to be use. It is not unreasonable to request the same from this applicant. Nathan agreed stating Jay has a good standpoint. The applicant does have a trusted track record but too many unknowns.

Wes Woods stated how many of us have home improvement projects. On our own projects, we go to Home Depot or Lowe's and gather paint samples, brochures, product samples, etc. Wes indicated his point is that these items are available and should be presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION/DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wes Woods moved to table Historical review of façade at 145 North Commercial Street until the applicant can provide a more complete application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second: Jim Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanimous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADJOURNMENT:

This meeting was adjourned at 8:30 pm

Teresa Shope, Secretary

These minutes were approved at the meeting.
Morgan City and Morgan County – Request for Proposals

General Plan Update 2020 – 2021

Issue Date: August 15, 2020
Submission Deadline: September 11, 2020

Morgan City
Attention: Ty Bailey
90 W Young Street
Morgan, UT 84050
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I. BACKGROUND

Morgan City and Morgan County are seeking proposals for Independent Contractor Services from individuals and firms ("Consultant") to prepare a comprehensive update to the Morgan County and Morgan City General Plans.

The focus of this project is to respond to changes in the City and County and in circumstances that affect the future direction of the City and County. The Consultant shall conduct field studies and research as necessary, provide comprehensive update to the General Plan, and ensure that each element of the General Plan conforms to State and Federal Law. The updated General Plan will be based upon the results of a comprehensive visioning process and public engagement to ensure that all facets of the community participate and are fully represented in shaping Morgan City and County’s future. The comprehensive updates to the General Plans are intended to be a guide for the next twenty (20) years.

The current City General Plan was adopted in 1999 and the County General Plan in 2010 and they have guided the City/County through substantial growth and change.

II. PROPOSED PROJECT

Morgan City and Morgan County, acting through their Planning Departments are requesting proposals from qualified consultants with expertise in drafting General Plans to assist City and County staff in the preparation of a comprehensive update to the City and County’s General Plans. The Consultant shall have a proven ability to assess the City and County’s current conditions and demonstrate knowledge of current State and Federal regulations as it applies to the completion of General Plan updates.

III. TERM OF AGREEMENT

The comprehensive updates of the respective General Plans shall be approved by Morgan City and Morgan County no later than one (1) year from contract execution. This time frame may be extended for a short period of time through written documentation agreeable to both parties.

IV. SCOPE – OBJECTIVES

The Independent Contractor Services sought in this RFP are intended for Consultant to take charge of the comprehensive update to the General Plan for Morgan City and Morgan County. City and County staff will assist as quality control and support. Updates to the General Plan are intended to address current growth in Morgan City and Morgan County and Morgan’s future, as well as, provide a succinct document that is user-friendly and practical.

The existing General Plan contains the below ten (10) elements as well as a land use map. During the process of updating the General Plan, some elements may be redrafted, removed, or additional elements added. The current General Plan will be a guide and resource, but not a template for the updated document.

1. Land Use
2. Housing- including a moderate-income housing
3. Environmental
4. Transportation
5. Public Services
6. Economic Development
7. Land Use Map

The City/County looks forward to suggestions from Consultant for unique and concise approaches to how these elements are presented (design and format) to maximize usability of the document and information. Furthermore, creativity and innovation utilizing the latest planning techniques is essential to the process.

V. SCOPE – REQUIREMENTS

The chosen Consultant must be able to manage a comprehensive update to the City and County’s General Plans. Due to time constraints of current staff in all City/County departments, staff time to lend assistance on the project will be limited. However, staff is most familiar with the day-to-day issues faced by Morgan County and Morgan City and will need to work with implementation of the General Plan long after its preparation and adoption. Therefore, the consultant schedule and budget should include appropriate time and work sessions with City and County staff. Staff will read and edit all administrative and final draft products prepared by the consultant. Staff will also attend all public meetings and presentations and will be available for questions.

Requirements include but are not limited to:

- Facilitating a comprehensive process to update the City and County’s General Plans to provide a blueprint for the next 20 years.
- Updating the plans to reflect changes in conditions and demographics
- Engaging the public to ensure a comprehensive engagement in creating a vision for the City and County’s future
- Ensuring that the official land use map is updated and complies with the general plan
- Identifying trends that should be considered in planning for the future
- Identifying and correcting areas of non-compliance with State Law (USC § 17-27a-4)
- Conducting community meetings (in addition to regular public hearings) to present the General Plan to the general public
- Conducting work group meetings to present the General Plan to the Planning Commissions and Councils
- Producing one (1) digital PDF, and one (1) Word version

Other resources available to Consultant are:

Morgan County General Plan
Morgan City General Plan
Area Plans
Transportation Plan
Resource Management Plan

VI. QUALIFICATIONS
The respondent must illustrate that it has the necessary facilities, ability, and resources to provide the services specified herein in a satisfactory manner. The following lists the minimum qualification requirements of the respondent(s):

- Three (3) references
- At least five (5) years of experience drafting General Plans

VII. PROPOSAL FORMAT

Each submittal should contain no more than 25 double-sided 8½ x 11 pages (not counting dividers, exhibits, and any relevant appendices). Respondents are encouraged to submit clear and concise responses to the RFP. All submittals must follow the format described below:

A. Part 1: Cover Letter/Executive Summary (up to 5 points)

The Cover Letter and Executive Summary shall include:

1. Business organization including the date established, Tax Identification Number, number of employees, and brief history of the firm.
2. Contact information (legal name, address, telephone number, and email address)
3. The names of key members of the consultant team
4. A summary of the consultant’s General Plan update experience and qualifications
5. Signature of authorized representative

B. Part 2: Experience and Qualifications of Consultant/Team (up to 10 points)

Provide detail relating to the experience and qualifications of the members of the consultant team by including the following information:

1. Brief resumes demonstrating the training, experience, and qualifications of the key personnel who will be assigned to this project.
2. Experience of proposed consultant team working together as a team on similar scope and type of projects.
3. The ability of the consultant team to produce a compact, user-friendly plan.
5. Understanding of the legal requirements, use and intent and organization structure of the requested General Plan.

6. A statement of conflict (if any) that proposing entity or key employees may have regarding these services. The statement should include conflicts, as well as any working relationship that may be perceived by disinterested parties as a conflict. If no potential conflicts of interest are identified, please indicate as such.

7. Any other information that would assist the review team in understanding the consultant team’s capacity to efficiently and effectively complete the project.
C. Part 3: Understanding of Project Scope (up to 10 points)

Each respondent shall demonstrate its capacity to deliver comprehensive, professional General Plan documents. Respondents should outline methodology and logistics capable of meeting the goals outlined in the project scope. Respondents should draw from previous advanced planning experience and demonstrated competence to articulate how their capabilities are distinct, comprehensive, and add value. References to previously completed General Plan documents (including links to digital examples) are recommended.

D. Part 4: Public Engagement Plan (up to 10 points)

Each respondent must present a Public Engagement Plan that will captivate a well-rounded public participation for the visioning process. This plan will identify specific approaches and tools the respondent will use to ensure a healthy mix of the entire general population is represented throughout the process. This plan will also outline the respondent’s communication strategy, listing methods of public communication along with a schedule of outreach activities.

E. Part 5: Commitment to Project Budget and Detailed Work Plan (up to 10 points)

Consultant shall provide a total base fee for the project. Each responding consultant shall include an acknowledgement that it can effectively complete this project within the budget indicated. Each respondent should provide a proposed work plan for development and implementation of the General Plan documents as described in the scope of work. Each respondent should clearly explain in this section the methods and process it will use to ensure the project is within budget and that the City will be getting the best value within the budgeted amount. Information in this section shall include anticipated tasks undertaken during the course of the project, including anticipated administrative and logistical costs. In addition, an hourly fee schedule shall be submitted for each team member and any sub-consultants.

Proposed fee structure/budget (can be specified as rate per hour of assistance in general, rate per hour for specific assistance type, monthly retainer, or other structure).

F. Part 6: Delivery Schedule and Timeline (up to 10 points)

Discuss in this section the steps the consultant team proposes to use to deliver the project on time. Clearly outline the delivery schedule and timeline of each component of the project. Specific dates should be used assuming an award to this RFP and an executed agreement in July 2020. Consultant shall be prepared to begin work within two (2) weeks of the Notice to Proceed. Completion of this assessment in a timely fashion will be a factor in scoring this section. Indicate in the proposed schedule, the necessary involvement and various decision points required of the City and County.

G. Part 7: Reference Review (up to 10 points)

The review team will conduct a background reference review of each respondent. Please include the following information for three (3) projects that the proposed consultant team worked on together:

1. Name of the project/study
2. Location of the project/study
3. Name, title, and contact information for the client
4. Project budget
5. Project timeline and date of completion of the project

VIII. TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RELEASE RFP</td>
<td>August 15, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSALS DUE</td>
<td>September 11, 2020 at 4:00 pm MST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION OF SUBMISSIONS</td>
<td>September 14, 2020 – October 2, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCE CHECKS IF NEEDED</td>
<td>September 14, 2020 – September 25, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT AWARDED – EXECUTED</td>
<td>October 5, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IX. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS AND SELECTION PROCESS

The City and County will review and evaluate each qualification and proposal submission. The City and County reserve the right to obtain clarification or request additional information. Proposals will be evaluated and ranked according to the following criteria:

Criteria Points

  Cover Letter/Executive Summary 1 – 5
  Experience and Qualifications 1 – 10
  Understanding of Project Scope 1 – 10
  Public Engagement Plan 1 - 10
  Commitment to Project Budget & Detailed Work Plan 1 – 10
  Delivery Schedule and Timeline 1 – 10
  Reference Review 1 – 10
  TOTAL 65 points

After evaluation of submissions and reference checks (if needed), the selected company will be notified. After a mutually acceptable agreement between each jurisdiction and the selected company has been negotiated; the consultant will be given a Notice to Proceed with the project, and consultant shall proceed as required.

If the City/County and selected company cannot agree on a satisfactory agreement, the City/County reserves the right to terminate negotiations. The City/County may then negotiate an agreement with another company or the City/County may submit another RFP.
The City and County reserve the right to reject any and all proposals. In addition, the City and County will not reimburse costs associated with the preparation or presentation of the proposals.

X. RIGHTS TO PROPOSALS

All proposals, upon submission to Morgan City and Morgan County, shall become the City and County's property for its use as deemed appropriate. By submitting a proposal, the consultant covenants not to make any claim for or have any right to damages because of any misinterpretation or misunderstanding of the specification, or because of any misinformation or lack of information. Nothing contained in this RFP shall create any contractual relationship between the consultant and Morgan City and Morgan County. The County accepts no financial responsibility for costs incurred by any consultant in responding to this RFP.

Morgan City and Morgan County have the following prerogatives with regard to proposals submitted:

- To accept or reject any or all proposals
- To award all or part of the project at its discretion
- To adopt any or all parts of a proposal
- To utilize any or all ideas from proposals submitted to request additional information for the purposes of clarification
- To request additional information for the purposes of clarification
- To correct any arithmetic errors in any or all proposals submitted
- To change the deadline for submitting proposals upon appropriate notification to all consultants receiving the RFP
- To accept or negotiate any modifications to the scope and fee of any proposal following the deadline for receipt of all proposals and prior to contract award
- To waive any irregularity or any non-conformity of proposals with this RFP, whether of a technical or substantive nature

XI. DISCLOSURE OF CONTENTS

Upon award of contract, all proposals accepted by the City and County shall become a matter of public record and shall be regarded as public, with the exception of those elements of each proposal that are identified by the consultant as business or trade secrets and plainly marked as “trade secret,” “confidential,” or “proprietary.” Each element of a proposal that the consultant desires not to be considered a public record must be clearly marked. Any blanket statement (i.e. regarding entire pages, documents, or other non-specific designations) shall not be sufficient and shall not bind the City or County in any way whatsoever. If disclosure is required under the Utah Government Records Access Management Act (GRAMA) or otherwise by law (despite the consultant’s request for confidentiality), the City and County shall not in any way be liable or responsible for the disclosure of any such records or part thereof.

XII. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS
Interested firms or individuals are requested to submit one (1) electronic copy, in PDF format, submitted by email of their proposal to Marcus Wager mwager@boxeldercounty.org. Proposals must be received to Morgan City by 4:00 pm on September 11, 2020.

XIII. PROPOSAL COORDINATOR

The City and County’s coordinator for this project will be Ty Bailey at Morgan City. Questions concerning the scope and specifications of services should be directed to:

Ty Bailey
Morgan City Manager
90 W. Young Street
Morgan, UT 84050
801-829-3461
tbailey@morgancityut.org

Note that email is the preferred method of communication.