



**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION  
90 SOUTH 100 WEST  
RICHMOND, UTAH 84333**

**AGENDA**

Public Notice is given that the Richmond City Council will meet in a regularly scheduled meeting at 90 South 100 West, Richmond, Utah, on **Tuesday, June 16, 2026**. The meeting will begin at 6:30 PM.

Welcome and Opening Ceremonies by Joel Draxler

1. Approval of the city council meeting minutes from May 19, 2026.
2. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2026-04, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 12-000 “Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)”, Chapter 12-3000 “Permitted Use Matrix”.
3. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2026-06, an Ordinance establishing a monthly billing and rate schedule for culinary water service.
4. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2026-06.
5. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Resolution 2026-04, a Resolution establishing a monthly billing rate for solid waste/garbage service.
6. Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 2026-04.
7. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2026-07, an Ordinance establishing a monthly billing rate and schedule for the sanitary sewer system and treatment.
8. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2026-07.
9. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Resolution 2026-05, a Resolution amending the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget which is the period of July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026.
10. Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 2026-05.
11. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2026-05, an Ordinance establishing compensation increases for the city council members, mayor and appointed officials.
12. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2026-05.
13. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Resolution 2026-06, a Resolution adopting

the Fiscal Year 2027 Budget which is the period of July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027.

14. Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 2026-06.
15. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2026-09, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code Title 6-000 “Finances and Taxation”, Parts 6-410 “Impact Fees”, and 6-420 “Culinary Water Impact Fees”.
16. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2026-09.
17. Initial discussion on Ordinance 2026-08, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Manual of Design & Construction Standards, Chapter 6.0 “Irrigation Water Design”, Section 6.01 “General”.
18. Initial discussion on the speed limit on Main Street from 200 West to 300 East.

Adjournment

**\*\*\*Items on the agenda may be considered earlier than shown on the agenda.\*\*\***

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodation for this meeting should contact the City Office at (435) 258-2092, at least 3 days before the date of the meeting.



## RICHMOND CITY COUNCIL MEETING May 19, 2026

The regular meeting of the Richmond City Council was held at the Park Community Center located at 90 South 100 West, Richmond, Utah, on Tuesday, May 19, 2026. The meeting began at 6:30 p.m. Mayor Jeff Young was in the chair.

Welcome and Opening Remarks by Daryl Black

**Council Members Present:** Daryl Black, Joel Draxler, Bryce Wood

**Council Members Excused:** Lyle Bair, Fran Schumman

**Staff Present:** Justin Lewis (City Recorder), HollyJo Karren (City Administrator), Weston Bellon (City Engineer), Austin Hinckley, John Harris, Melissa Titensor (City Treasurer)

**Others Present:** Jennifer Erickson, Coleen Fenton, Todd Smith, Cindy Allen, Lisa Aedo, Debbie Zilles, Adrienne Wall

### Approval of the April 21, 2026 City Council meeting minutes

**\*\*\*Councilmember Wood moved to approve the April 21, 2026, City Council meeting minutes as submitted. Councilmember Black seconded the motion. The motion was approved 3-0. \*\*\***

**Yes Vote: Black, Draxler, Wood**

**No Vote: None**

**Absent: Bair, Schumann**

### Discussion and possible vote on the special event application request by Jennifer Erickson to host a “Richmond Kids Bazaar” at the city park on Friday, June 19, 2026.

Mrs. Erickson submitted an application to host a children’s market event at 176 West 100 South on June 19, 2026, from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. The event is designed for and operated by children, who are responsible for product sales and related business decisions, to teach the value of hard work and entrepreneurship. Mrs. Erickson noted this will be the third year for the event, which will again be held in the city park.

Mrs. Erickson confirmed to Councilmember Wood and Councilmember Black that there were no changes from last year and that no issues occurred previously.

Mayor Young expressed support for entrepreneurial opportunities for youth and stated that a reduced event fee or an appropriate in-kind contribution would be reasonable. He commented that the event helps children learn valuable lessons about time, money, and work.

Mrs. Erickson stated that community involvement has been limited and that most sales occur between booth participants. She indicated that if an event fee is required, the event

may need to be canceled. Mayor Young stated that waiving the fee would be sensible under the circumstances and noted that the discussion could be revisited if the event grows.

Councilmember Wood asked how the event was being promoted and suggested that the promotion may be contributing to lower attendance. Mrs. Erickson responded that she purchased a banner, placed small yard signs, and promoted the event on social media. She noted that the first year was more successful, with approximately 40 booths, whereas last year had 22. She has also attempted to encourage food truck participation, but vendors are generally reluctant to attend because of smaller crowds.

**\*\*\*Councilmember Black moved to approve the special event application request by Jennifer Erickson to host a “Richmond Kids Bazaar” at the city park on Friday, June 19, 2026, including waiving the registration fee. Councilmember Wood seconded the motion. The motion was approved 3-0.\*\*\***

**Yes Vote: Black, Draxler, Wood**

**No Vote: None**

**Absent: Bair, Schumann**

**Discussion and possible approval of Hazel Maxfield as a member of the Richmond City Library Board.**

Mr. Lewis said Library Director Lora Smith has submitted Hazel to serve on the board as the youth representative; this request requires Council approval.

**\*\*\*Councilmember Draxler moved to approve Hazel Maxfield as a member of the Richmond City Library Board. Councilmember Wood seconded the motion. The motion was approved 3-0.\*\*\***

**Yes Vote: Black, Draxler, Wood**

**No Vote: None**

**Absent: Bair, Schumann**

**Discussion on culinary water capital improvement projects.**

Mayor Young reviewed prior discussions regarding a potential culinary water well at the park adjacent to the Park Community Center building. He stated that data collected from locations throughout the City indicated the site was a logical location for further exploration. The aquifer in the area feeds the WDCI well, the largest-producing well on the west side of the city.

Councilmember Draxler stated the item had been discussed during a previous meeting and referenced the aquifer area outlined on the topographic map presented to the Council. He explained that the proposal was to conduct a test well on City-owned property where electrical service is already available. The purpose of the test well would be to

determine the feasibility, quantity, and quality of water available at the site. The project could improve the City's pressurized water system and provide needed support to the southeast section of the City, where water pressure concerns currently exist. He also noted that future discussions regarding limiting additional development in that area may be necessary due to current pressure limitations.

A discussion was held regarding project funding. It was noted that the test well could be funded through the Water Enterprise Fund. Long-term impact and dedication fees may be available to cover future project costs; however, current impact fees cannot be used on the test well because the project does not qualify as adding system capacity.

Weston Bellon, City Engineer, explained that the test well would consist of a 6-inch well with casing and a pump installed. He stated that testing would be conducted to determine water levels, pumping capacity, and potential impacts to the water table. Information gathered from testing would help determine the appropriate size for a future production well. The test well would remain in place following testing, similar to the existing well Lewiston City utilizes by the Cub River Sports Complex, while a separate production well and associated infrastructure would eventually be constructed nearby. He further stated that the hydrologist did not believe the project would negatively impact the WDCI well.

Austin Hinckley reported that water levels at the WDCI well have remained stable, even during dry years, and that the well has consistently performed since approximately 1932. He noted that while the quality of the water is hard, there have been no issues with sand or silt.

Councilmember Black inquired about potential noise associated with the project. Mr. Bellon stated that noise should not present a significant issue. Mr. Hinckley added that minimal noise is heard outside the existing well houses.

Mayor Young stated that continued growth in the northern portion of the City necessitates additional water system upgrades and improvements to existing storage tanks. He reiterated the benefits of the proposed location.

In response to a question from Councilmember Wood, Mr. Bellon estimated that the test well process would take approximately 12 to 18 months, with full project completion estimated within three to five years.

Mayor Young asked about the anticipated project footprint. Mr. Bellon stated that the permanent footprint would be relatively small with an approximate 100-foot radius. Construction activities will be noticeable. If successful, the Council would determine the final drilling location within the park based on the drilling specialist's recommendations.

Councilmember Black suggested using the existing shed/bathroom at the site, and Mayor Young agreed.

Mr. Hinckley stated that if the water remains untreated, the test well could be used for park irrigation, similar to the existing use of the test well at the Cub River Sports Complex.

Following the discussion, the Council expressed consensus to proceed with the test well project. Mr. Lewis stated that the project would be included in the new upcoming fiscal year budget, with work anticipated to begin in the next fiscal year.

**Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2026-03, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 12-000 “Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)”, Chapter 12-3000 “Permitted Use Matrix”.**

Mr. Lewis explained that the proposal is to add in Section 12-3000 Permitted Use Matrix the words “*Mortuary, Crematorium*” in the Death Care Services section, and add a new line item of “*Taxidermy Studio/Shop*”. For taxidermy studio/shop the matrix would be as follows:

Permitted: A-10, A-5, CBD, HC, MLI  
Conditional-Use Permit: RE-1, RE-2  
Not Allowed: RLD, RMD, RMF, NC

The allowed use zones for Death Care Services are not changing; the words Mortuary and Crematorium would be added for ease of searching and clarification.

The Planning Commission reviewed the Ordinance and has recommended approval.

**\*\*\*Councilmember Black moved to adopt Ordinance 2026-03, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 12-000 “Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)”, Chapter 12-3000 “Permitted Use Matrix”. Councilmember Wood seconded the motion. The motion was approved 3-0.\*\*\***

**Yes Vote: Black, Draxler, Wood**

**No Vote: None**

**Absent: Bair, Schumann**

**Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Resolution 2026-03, a Resolution amending the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget which is the period of July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026.**

Mr. Lewis highlighted some of the larger proposed increases to the Fiscal Year 2026 budget.

**General Fund Revenue:**

\$495,616 revenue increase

- \$15,000 increase in property tax
- \$106,000 Local sales tax including an increase on the expense side for the Lee’s Marketplace Sales Tax Rebate

- \$40,000 Franchise Tax which is Enbridge Gas, Rocky Mountain Power and Comcast
- \$22,000 Mass Transit Tax which also increases expenses because it is a pass-through tax
- \$32,675 Transportation Planning Grant
- \$8,000 Local Road Tax, also an increase in expenses
- \$20,000 Class “C” Road Funds, also increase on expenses
- \$10,200 donation for the Library of which \$10,000 was a Carnegie donation
- \$14,600 sponsorships for Black & White Days

General Fund Expenses:

\$495,616 expense increase

- \$15,000 increase to Sales Tax Rebate
- \$3,400 increase to the Central Dispatch/911 fee
- \$15,000 increase to prosecutor/attorney
- \$20,000 increase to Class “C” Road Funds
- \$8,000 increase to Local Road Funds
- \$22,000 increase to Mass Transit Tax
- \$5,746 increase to RTIF Tax
- \$22,000 increase to wages in the Streets Department
- \$20,000 increase to benefits in the Streets Department
- \$19,137 increase to Black & White Days celebration
- \$11,000 increase to Library Maintenance which is utilizing the funds from the Carnegie Donation
- \$4,066 increase for a Library CLEF Grant
- \$7,000 increase for Library wages
- \$2,000 increase for Library benefits
- \$288,762 transfer from the General Fund to Capital Projects Fund in order to help keep within the state requirement for the Unreserved Fund Balance. This is not an expense; it is a transfer of funds from one fund to another. The Capital Projects Fund pays for large ticket items such as large building projects and major equipment.

Water Enterprise Fund

Revenue

- \$34,700 Bureau of Reclamation Grant
- \$11,000 Interest Earnings

- \$56,690 Impact Fees
- \$2,325 Water Meter Installs
- \$10,000 Water Dedication Payments
- \$130,000 Water Utility Charge

Expenses

- \$8,000 Wages
- \$10,000 Benefits

Sewer Enterprise Fund

Revenue

- \$100,000 Sewer Utility Charge
- \$25,335 Impact Fees
- \$50,000 Community Impact Board Grant
- \$5,000 Interest Earnings

Expenses

- \$3,500 Benefits
- \$10,000 Maintenance & Repair
- \$20,000 Engineering
- \$7,000 Sampling

Capital Projects Fund

Revenue

- \$288,762 Transfer from General Fund
- \$15,000 Interest Earnings

Solid Waste Enterprise Fund

Revenue

\$4,000 Solid Waste Utility Charge

Expenses

\$5,000 IT Equipment/Service

Mr. Lewis noted that this will be reviewed again next month as Fiscal Year 2026 comes to a close on June 30th.

Mr. Lewis explained that the City is in the process of reviewing and evaluating IT needs, which will be discussed further next month to determine how to include some of the projects in the budget.

Councilmember Wood briefly reviewed the discussion held during the previous month regarding AllTech and the cybersecurity concerns and system needs currently being addressed to help ensure the City's network and data remain secure and safe.

Mayor Young stated that another entity had recently experienced a significant cybersecurity breach, resulting in catastrophic service disruptions until repairs were completed. He noted that Richmond City is taking a proactive approach to help prevent similar issues and strengthen system security.

### **7:13 p.m. Public Hearing Opened**

There were not any comments or questions.

### **7:14 p.m. Public Hearing Closed**

#### **Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 2026-03**

**\*\*\*Councilmember Black moved to adopt Resolution 2026-03, a Resolution amending the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget, which is the period of July 1, 2025, through June 30, 2026. Councilmember Draxler seconded the motion. The motion was approved 3-0.\*\*\***

**Yes Vote: Black, Draxler, Wood**

**No Vote: None**

**Absent: Bair, Schumann**

#### **Staff Reports and Monthly Financial Review**

Mrs. Karren thanked all the staff and volunteer groups for all their hard work during Black & White Days. It was a very successful event. There will be a post-event meeting next week to discuss how it went and what things can be improved or changed moving forward.

Two zoning clearances were issued last month; one on 500 East and the last lot in the Johnson View Subdivision on 300 East.

The tree that fell during the windstorm was quickly cleared, and no one was injured. She thanked the staff for their work in cleaning off the debris from the area where the large pine tree broke off halfway up and had to be removed in its entirety.

She provided an update on the Community Building remodel/update project. The gym floor is complete and cured, security cameras and key fobs will be installed at the end of the week. The stainless-steel backsplash will be installed this Friday. All appliances should be in by next Wednesday. She is working with Mayor Young on a possible ribbon-cutting celebration.

Mr. Lewis highlighted the following in the current budget.

Income Statement for the ten months ending 4/30/26:

- (3130) Local Sales Tax was \$59,172 for the month and \$499,292 for the fiscal year.
- (4194) Sales Tax Rebate \$54,686 so far for the fiscal year as part of the agreement with Lee's Marketplace.
- (3356) Income-Class C Road Funds - \$31,002 allocation received.
- (3677) Income –Celebrations includes the Halloween Carnival, Holiday Festival, and Black & White Days activities totals \$8,545 so far for the fiscal year.
- (3837) Donation Black & White Days totals \$3,350 in sponsorship fees received through the end of April.
- The water impact fee study can now be finalized where the council has decided to include the new well in the study. There will be a public hearing and a vote by the Council at a future council meeting after the study is completed.
- (4280) Bldg – Community Building remodel has expenditures of \$107,444 through the end of April. A RAPZ tax reimbursement request will be submitted when the project is completed.
- (4825) Library Maintenance and Repair is where the Carnegie donation is being spent.
- (3715) Revenue – Water Dedication Payments are \$15,000
- (5295) Sewer Line Cleaning & Inspection totals \$21,822 through the end of April.

**NEW Budget – Fiscal Year 2027**

- There will be a public hearing and vote to adopt in June, and the following items were highlighted:
- Have preliminary approval for RAPZ Tax funding for the pickleball courts. The amount will be added to the budget once the funds are officially awarded.
- Utility Fees, beginning in July: increase of \$1.00 per month for water, \$1.00 per month for sewer, and \$2.00 per month for garbage. The garbage rate has not been changed since 2023.

- (4000) Capital Projects Fund Projects include the Quonset building remodel for \$57,034 which includes electrical (\$8,325), a new insulated door (\$10,788), cement entryway (\$16,650), insulation (\$15,271) and heating (\$6,000).
- (4001) Capital Projects Fund Equipment of \$82,992 is for the John Deere Gator utility vehicle (\$17,992) and the new Ford F600 truck (\$65,000).
- A Property Tax increase will not be considered this year where there increases to the three utility rates.

Mayor Young provided a brief history of the garbage issue. Years ago, several northern county cities decided to move away from Logan City's service to Econo Waste. This turned out to be a great decision. Garbage fees have not changed since 2023. He also noted that there are no extra charges such as delivery, replacement of cans, overflow, etc. added to the residents' bills. The increase is needed; however, he is grateful that it is relatively small.

Mayor Young also pointed out that the Quonset building improvements will help centralize services for the city employees and work in the area at the parks and city buildings.

The Mayor and Council are working hard to ensure that the budget process is transparent. He encouraged anyone with questions or concerns to reach out. The staff has worked very hard putting this together.

### Council Member and Mayor Reports

#### Councilmember Black

- ✓ The Black & White Days breakfast attendance was down this year. Approximately 450 people were served. Part of it may have been difficulty with parking as the Stampede Bike Race started at the same location. He noted that it took 900 eggs and 32 gallons of milk for the breakfast.
- ✓ The Library Building needs improvement to the exterior brick; there are areas where it is falling off. Bids will be obtained for the council to consider.

#### Councilmember Wood

- ✓ Thanked everyone who helped with Black & White Days especially with the Hamburger Stand, including Lee's Marketplace.

#### Councilmember Draxler

- ✓ The proposed increase to sewer fees is necessary due to the anticipated renovation of the MBR (Membrane Bioreactor) wastewater treatment plant in the coming years, with estimated costs of approximately nine million dollars. Mr. Lewis reported that he has explored a loan forgiveness program to assist with project funding. It was noted that a new bond payment would not be required until the current bond is paid off, which is expected in three years. After review, it was determined that completing the project in phases would result in higher overall costs over time. The Council agreed to let Mr. Lewis proceed with gathering more detailed and specific project information. Any

formal action would return to the Council for a vote at the appropriate time. Mayor Young expressed agreement with the approach and expressed appreciation for implementing small, incremental increases over time and for the progress since his first term on the Council.

- ✓ There has been discussion about upsizing the sewer line from the diversion box to the lagoons. There is another local city where some bids on projects have come in lower than expected recently. Now might be a good time to move forward. Councilmember Black asked if this improvement is still needed with the potential upgrade to the MBR plant. Councilmember Draxler, this would be a benefit to that project, helping divert water as needed during times when the plant has to be shut down. A screening box will be put in as well. Mr. Lewis pointed out that, based on the engineering estimates, the City would be able to pay cash for the upsize project. Mr. Bellon clarified that this would be a standalone project, separate from the plant upgrade. The Council gave consent for Mr. Lewis and Mr. Bellon to proceed with further research and bring back more information.

#### Mayor Young

- ✓ There will be a post-event meeting and wrap up for Black & White Days.
- ✓ Staff reported the canvas of the circus tent that was damaged can be salvaged, but the posts are beyond repair.

#### Secondary Water Discussion

Mayor Young explained there are ongoing concerns regarding the City's secondary water system Ordinance for new subdivisions. He stated that many private laterals are not maintained and that connecting the City to those systems would be expensive due to infrastructure, maintenance, and repair costs. He questioned whether requiring a secondary system by Ordinance is necessary, noting that most new subdivisions are not currently connected to one. Elk Meadows subdivision is expected to tie into the system which would be the first newer subdivision to be connected since the Ordinance was adopted.

Mayor Young expressed interest in further discussion regarding how the City's water system is structured, how water dedication payment's function, and how water shares and beneficial use requirements apply.

Mr. Bellon explained that municipalities are generally not at risk of losing beneficial use of water shares unless there is an adjudication process through the State Engineer's Office. He stated that privately owned shares not used within seven years could lose their rights. The City updates its 40-year Water Master Plan every three to five years to outline water use projections and planning.

Mayor Young confirmed that the City owns 98 irrigation water shares. Mr. Bellon clarified that the City's water rights differ from those of individual shareholders.

Councilmember Black noted that City Creek water eventually flows to the Bear River and ultimately the Great Salt Lake if unused. He questioned why the City pays to pump water and whether water allocations could be used more efficiently by storing additional water in

tanks. Mr. Hinckley explained that the water in the tanks must be mixed for corrosion control. Mr. Bellon added that the spring has a separate culinary water right. At the same time, the irrigation rights owned by the City cannot legally be used for drinking water and therefore cannot be diverted into culinary storage tanks.

Mayor Young stated there is concern regarding insufficient water storage capacity in the city.

Mr. Bellon encouraged the Council to consider the long-term vision for the irrigation system. Mayor Young noted that many cities without secondary systems eventually submit change applications to convert irrigation water rights to municipal use. He referenced Nibley as an example and stated that as agricultural land transitions to residential development, it seems logical for water use to transition as well.

Councilmember Black stated the discussion appeared to be centered on whether to continue requiring secondary systems in new developments. He said he could see merit in both perspectives and described the issue as “not a problem until it is a problem.” He also acknowledged the purpose and mission behind the Cache Water District’s establishment.

Mayor Young agreed that Councilmember Black raised an important point regarding water rights, water shares, and the need to demonstrate beneficial water use adequately.

Mr. Bellon explained that the City’s water rights are cataloged and that submitting a change application would allow water to be diverted where needed. He noted that the rights are currently tied to a specific well.

Mr. Draxler questioned the lifespan of buried, unused pipes. He expressed concern that not requiring a secondary system could become problematic as water becomes more valuable and the City continues to grow.

Mr. Bellon responded that while he did not know the exact lifespan of buried pipe, underground infrastructure does avoid UV damage. He said another important consideration is the expense of operating and maintaining both culinary and irrigation systems simultaneously, including installing connections and ensuring the systems function effectively and conveniently.

Mr. Hinckley stated that irrigation water meters cost more than culinary water meters.

Mr. Bellon explained that the typical advantage of a secondary system is lower cost because the water does not require treatment; however, he stated that in Richmond, the cost of maintaining two separate systems may outweigh those benefits. He added that treatment costs are relatively manageable in Richmond’s case and that all City water rights can be used for both irrigation and culinary purposes. Based on the Water Master Water Plan, he stated his opinion is that a secondary system may not provide substantial benefit to Richmond in certain cases.

Mayor Young stated the City must determine the appropriate path forward. He reiterated that connecting to and maintaining a secondary system would be expensive, particularly if the City assumes responsibility for repairing and maintaining private laterals. He also

noted that capped laterals limit the City's flexibility in balancing water shares between systems; however, he acknowledged that the system could become beneficial over time.

Councilmember Draxler stated that using culinary water to irrigate residential landscaping significantly increases residents' costs. He expressed concern about future growth relying on drinking water for outdoor watering purposes.

Mayor Young stated that the City would likely eventually become the primary owner of all laterals. He said he understood the Cache Water District's original concerns about balancing water shares with development needs, such as allocating sufficient shares for a 50-home development.

Councilmember Black noted that legislation passed approximately four years ago requiring all secondary systems to have meters installed; however, there is currently no reporting entity collecting the data. He also said that all users connected to a lateral should share responsibility if a lateral breaks.

Mayor Young asked how many water shares had been brought to the table over the past five years. Mr. Lewis responded that 86 units have been paid for and 12 water shares received. He added that the 86 units were paid as water dedication fees.

Councilmember Black suggested that, rather than eliminating the option for secondary water systems, the City could modify the requirement so that if an existing secondary system is present on a property, access to that line should be provided.

Mr. Hinckley stated that if that approach is recommended, developers could install only the secondary line and valves rather than extending the main line all the way to each meter. He explained that this would eliminate the need for irrigation boxes at every home, which are often unnecessary and susceptible to damage.

Councilmember Draxler stated that under that approach, property owners who want irrigation service would need to install the line during home construction, similar to how water service lines are installed. Mayor Young agreed that the proposal made sense. Mayor Young stated that if water shares are traded, access to the system must remain available. He added that shares should be equitably distributed within a development; however, he noted that if shares are not actively used, the City still needs to use those water resources.

Mayor Young requested that the item be placed on next month's agenda for further discussion. Mr. Lewis stated that a new Ordinance would be drafted for Council review based on the discussion held during the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Next scheduled meeting: June 16, 2026

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION**

---

Jeffrey D. Young, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

---

Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION  
ORDINANCE 2026-04**

WHEREAS, the City Council of Richmond has the responsibility for the general welfare of the City; and  
WHEREAS, such responsibility includes but is not limited to, establishment of best management practices;  
and  
WHEREAS, management practices may evolve over the passage of time:

NOW THEREFORE, the City Council of Richmond City, County of Cache, State of Utah, hereby adopts, passes and publishes the following:

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE RICHMOND CITY MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 12-000  
“LAND USE, DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT (LUDMO), CHAPTER 12-3000  
“PERMITTED USE MATRIX”.**

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF RICHMOND CITY, CACHE COUNTY, UTAH AS FOLLOWS:

1. Sections shall be amended such that the highlighted areas below shall be added and the ~~strikeout~~ areas shall be deleted.

**12-3000 PERMITTED USE MATRIX**

Proposed new item: **Tattoo/Piercing Studio/Shop**

Permitted: CBD, HC, MLI  
Conditional-Use Permit: A-10, A-5, RE-1, RE-2, RLD, RMD, RMF, NC

Proposed new item: **Commercial Storage Unit(s)**

Conditional-Use Permit: MLI

- 
2. Should any section, clause, or provision of this Ordinance be declared by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, in whole or in part, the same shall not affect the validity of the Ordinance as whole, or any other part thereof.
  3. All ordinances, and the chapter, clauses, sections, or parts thereof in conflict with provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed, but only insofar as is specifically provided for herein.
  4. This ordinance shall become effective after the required public hearing and upon its posting as required by law.

THIS ORDINANCE shall be attached as an amendment to the Richmond City Municipal Code above referred to.

ADOPTED AND PASSED by the Richmond City Council on this 16th day of June, 2026.

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey D. Young, Mayor

Ordinance 2026-04

**ATTEST:**

---

Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION  
ORDINANCE 2026-06**

WHEREAS, the City of Richmond is required by the State of Utah to account for all culinary water; and

WHEREAS, an efficient metering system has proven to be the most reliable means of such accountability; and

WHEREAS, Title 14-000 entitled “Utilities” of the Richmond City Municipal Code, Chapter 14-100 and Chapter 14-500, Part 14-520 establish the authority and responsibility of the Richmond City Council to set forth water rates; and

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility and obligation of the Richmond City Council to ensure that the Water Enterprise Fund remains solvent through periodic review and adjustment of rates;

NOW THEREFORE, the City Council of Richmond City, County of Cache, State of Utah, hereby adopts, passes, and publishes the following:

**AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING A MONTHLY BILLING AND  
RATE SCHEDULE FOR CULINARY WATER FROM THE  
RICHMOND CITY CULINARY WATER SYSTEM WITH  
ADDITIONAL CHARGES AUTHORIZED BY TITLE 14-000,  
CHAPTER 14-500 OF THE RICHMOND CITY MUNICIPAL CODE.**

- A. All charges contained herein shall be based upon the number of gallons of water passing through the authorized water meter installed by, or under the direct supervision of, Richmond City in a given period.
  - 1) Unless precluded by snow cover or other extenuating circumstances, meters shall be read on a monthly basis by an authorized representative of Richmond City.
  - 2) A monthly bill indicating the number of gallons of water passing through said meter shall be provided each customer on a monthly basis.
    - a) The monthly water bill may be incorporated into a general utilities bill reflecting all charges generated by Richmond City plus any charges passed through by Cache County.
  
- B. Rates will be applied equally to all culinary water users no matter what the ultimate use of said water may be.
  - 1) The monthly water rate is established as follows:
    - a) From zero (0) to ten thousand (10,000) gallons will be \$66.00 per month starting on July 1, 2026.

- b) From zero (0) to ten thousand (10,000) gallons will be \$67.00 per month starting on July 1, 2027.
  - c) From zero (0) to ten thousand (10,000) gallons will be \$68.00 per month starting on July 1, 2028.
  - d) From zero (0) to ten thousand (10,000) gallons will be \$69.00 per month starting on July 1, 2029.
  - e) From zero (0) to ten thousand (10,000) gallons will be \$70.00 per month starting on July 1, 2030.
- C. Effective July 1, 2026, the following surcharges are established.
- 1) The surcharge water rate is established as follows:
    - a) A surcharge of \$1.00 (one dollar) per one thousand (1,000) gallons for metered water from ten thousand one (10,001) gallons through and to one hundred thousand (100,000) gallons.
    - b) A surcharge of \$2.00 (two dollars) per one thousand (1,000) gallons for metered water from one hundred thousand one (100,001) gallons to maximum usage.
- D. In the case of Multiple Family Dwellings and Mobile Home Parks, i.e., trailer courts, the following provisions shall prevail:
- 1) If there is a single meter, the legal owner/operator will be charged for the total water used as recorded by water meter and billed as outlined in “C” above as well as the base rate outlined in “B” per unit. For example, a 4-plex would be billed four (4) units plus actual water usage per month.
    - a) Richmond City will not bill tenants individually in such instances.
    - b) If each tenant or space has its own meter, billing will be as outlined in “B” and “C” above.
- E. In the case of sub-rentals in a Commercial/Industrial complex, unless separate meters are installed for each sub-rental location, the legal owner/operator will be charged the total water used as recorded by meter under the rates outlined in “B” and “C” above.
- F. Shut-off and Turn-on Fees.
- 1) Should it become necessary to shut-off water to a customer due to failure to pay per Title 14-000, Chapter 14-500, Part 14-521, a fee of twenty-five dollars (\$25.00) shall be added to the delinquent account.

- 2) When the water is turned on following a delinquency shut-off, an additional fee of twenty-five dollars (\$25.00) shall be added to the account for the turn-on service.

THIS ORDINANCE shall be attached as an amendment to the Richmond City Municipal Code above referred to.

ADOPTED AND PASSED by the Richmond City Council on this 16th day of June, 2026.

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION**

---

Jeffrey D. Young, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

---

Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder

**RESOLUTION 2026-04**

**RICHMOND CITY’S PREVAILING FEE SCHEDULE**

**WHEREAS**, Richmond City, being an incorporated City, desires to provide a combined and complete schedule of fees charged by the City; and,

**WHEREAS**, Richmond City has referenced several assessed fees throughout the Municipal Code as being identified on the most current prevailing fee schedule; and,

**WHEREAS**, these fees are changed from time to time; and,

**WHEREAS**, in the process of daily administration of the City, it is deemed to be more efficient to consolidate all assessed fees on one schedule,

**NOW, THEREFORE**, be it resolved;

That the Richmond City Prevailing Fee Schedule be adopted setting forth the fees to be charged from July 1, 2026 until a future update by the city council for the following:

---

Effective: July 1, 2026

Garbage Can – 60 Gallon      \$21.50

Garbage Can – 90 Gallon      \$24.00

Effective: July 1, 2027

Garbage Can – 60 Gallon      \$22.50

Garbage Can – 90 Gallon      \$25.00

Effective: July 1, 2028

Garbage Can – 60 Gallon      \$23.50

Garbage Can – 90 Gallon      \$26.00

Approved and signed this 16th day of June, 2026.

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION**

---

Jeffrey D. Young, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

---

Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION  
ORDINANCE 2026-07**

WHEREAS the City of Richmond is responsible for ensuring that its citizens are provided as safe and clean of an atmosphere as possible; and

WHEREAS a Sanitary Sewer System has been in place and operating since 1972 in the city of Richmond; and

WHEREAS Title 14-000 entitled “Utilities” of the Richmond City Municipal Code, Chapter 14-200 and Chapter 14-500, Part 14-530 establish the authority and responsibility of the Richmond City Council to set forth water and sewer rates; and

WHEREAS growth in the population of Richmond City and increasing demands by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the State of Utah Division of Environmental Quality have necessitated the construction and operation of an active wastewater treatment plant instead of the traditional lagoon system; and

WHEREAS it is the responsibility and obligation of the Richmond City Council to ensure that the Sewer Enterprise Fund remains solvent through periodic review and adjustment of rates;

NOW THEREFORE the City Council of Richmond City, County of Cache, State of Utah, hereby adopts, passes, and publishes the following:

**AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING A MONTHLY BILLING AND RATE SCHEDULE FOR THE RICHMOND CITY SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM AND TREATMENT AS AUTHORIZED BY TITLE 14-000 “UTILITIES”, CHAPTER 14-500 “FINANCE, FEES AND CHARGES” OF THE RICHMOND CITY MUNICIPAL CODE.**

- A. All charges contained herein shall be based upon:
- 1) The number of gallons of culinary water which passes through an authorized Richmond City water meter per the provisions of Title 14-000, Chapter 14-100, Section 14-124(C), or
  - 2) The number of gallons of actual wastewater as measured by an authorized sonic meter per the provisions of Title 14-000, Chapter 14-540(C).
  - 3) The monthly sewer bill may be incorporated into a general utilities bill reflecting all charges generated by Richmond City plus any charges passed through Cache County.
- B. Residential and Public Buildings rates will be based as outlined below.
- 1) The sewer rate is established as follows:

- a) Starting on July 1, 2026 the base rate will be \$83.00 per month.
  - b) Starting on July 1, 2027 the base rate will be \$85.00 per month.
  - c) Starting on July 1, 2028 the base rate will be \$87.00 per month.
  - d) Starting on July 1, 2029 the base rate will be \$89.00 per month.
  - e) Starting on July 1, 2030 the base rate will be \$91.00 per month.
- 2) Residential customers metered to be using in excess of twenty-thousand (20,000) gallons of culinary water per month for five (5) or more consecutive months will be subject to a surcharge.
- a) Twenty thousand one (20,001) to and including the maximum usage gallons will be charged one-dollar (\$1.00) per thousand (1,000) gallons of metered culinary water.
- C. Commercial, Industrial, and Agriculture rates will be based upon the following readings and criteria:
- 1) The sewer rate is established as follows:
- a) Starting on July 1, 2026 the base rate will be \$83.00 per month.
  - b) Starting on July 1, 2027 the base rate will be \$85.00 per month.
  - c) Starting on July 1, 2028 the base rate will be \$87.00 per month.
  - d) Starting on July 1, 2029 the base rate will be \$89.00 per month.
  - e) Starting on July 1, 2030 the base rate will be \$91.00 per month.
- 2) The following surcharge rates will apply to gallonage in excess of 20,000 gallons of culinary water use per month.
- a) Twenty thousand one (20,001) to and including the maximum usage gallons will be charged one-dollar (\$1.00) per thousand (1,000) gallons of metered culinary water.
- D. In the case of Multiple Family Dwellings and Mobile Home Parks, i.e. trailer courts, the following provisions shall prevail:
- 1) If there is a single culinary water meter the legal owner/operator will be charged at the rate of one (1) base rate per tenant or space. For example, a 4-plex would be

charged four (4) base rates per month. Richmond City will not bill tenants individually.

- 2) If each tenant or space has its own meter, the billing will be as outlined in “B” above.
- E. In the case of sub-rentals in a Commercial/Industrial complex, unless separate meters are installed for each sub-rental location, the legal owner/operator will be charged based upon the total water used as recorded by the culinary water meter under the rates as outlined in “C” above.
- F. In the case of users who introduce into the wastewater system excessive amounts of Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD), Total Suspended Solids (TSS), Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN), Total Phosphorous (TP) or other elements detrimental to the wastewater system, a monthly surcharge will be incurred.
- 1) The threshold numbers that will initiate additional surcharges for treatment are:
    - a) Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) 228 mg/L
    - b) Total Suspended Solids (TSS) 200 mg/L
    - c) Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN) 35 mg/L
    - d) Total Phosphorous (TP) 8 mg/L
  - 2) If the user’s wastewater flow is based upon the ERU per culinary water received and through sampling it is determined that excessive BOD, TSS, TKN and/or TP is being introduced at that source, surcharge for excess treatment will be based upon one random sample per month with the resulting beyond threshold numbers plus any sampling costs times the total ERU.
    - a) Should more than one sample be taken during a given billing period, the average of the multiple samples shall determine the threshold and basic measuring point.
  - 3) If the user’s wastewater flow is based upon a sonic meter, the charges will be based upon one random sample per month with the resulting beyond threshold numbers plus any sampling costs times the actual wastewater flow total.
    - a) Should more than one sample be taken during a given billing period, the average of the multiple samples shall determine the threshold and basic measuring point.
  - 4) Surcharge amounts will be charged as follows:
    - a. As listed in the Prevailing Fee Schedule of the City.
  - 5) These surcharges are added onto the charges listed in “B” and “C” above.
- G. Calculation of Surcharge Fees.

- 1) The total excess flow (culinary water meter) or total sewer flow (sonic meter) divided by one million (1,000,000) multiplied by the excess unit measurement less the threshold number times 8.34 (conversion factor mg/L to lbs/MGal) times the cost of treatment plus any associated handling charges.

Example:  $\text{Flow}/1,000,000 \times (\text{Grab minus threshold}) \times 8.34 \times \text{Treatment} + \text{Handling} = \text{Surcharge}$

- 2) The above process will be followed for each item found to exceed the threshold, with the total of all excesses comprising the final surcharge per billing unit.

THIS ORDINANCE shall be attached as an amendment to the Richmond City Municipal Code above referred to.

ADOPTED AND PASSED by the Richmond City Council on this 16th day of June, 2026.

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION**

---

Jeffrey D. Young, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

---

Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder

**RESOLUTION 2026-05**

**A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FISCAL YEAR 2026 BUDGET FOR THE CITY OF RICHMOND, UTAH.**

**BE IT ORDAINED** by the City Council Members of the City of Richmond, Utah, that the Fiscal Year 2026 budget be amended to include increases/(decreases) within the General Fund and Enterprise Funds.

**GENERAL FUND**

Revenue	\$301,722
<u>Expenses</u>	
Administration	\$9,420
Building	3,000
Public Safety	0
Streets	31,000
Parks	19,643
Fire	425
Library	1,984
Planning	0
Capital Projects	236,250
Total	\$301,722

**WATER ENTERPRISE FUND**

Revenue	\$16,803
Expense	\$33,745

**SEWER ENTERPRISE FUND**

Revenue	\$5,631
Expense	\$10,570

**CUB RIVER SPORTS COMPLEX SPECIAL REVENUE FUND**

Revenue	\$2,143
Expense	\$2,143

<b>CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND</b>
------------------------------

Revenue	\$236,250
Expense	\$0

<b>SOLID WASTE ENTERPRISE FUND</b>
------------------------------------

Revenue	\$0
Expense	\$0

PASSED AND APPROVED this 16th day of June, 2026.

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey D. Young, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder

**ORDINANCE 2026-05**

**AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING COMPENSATION INCREASES FOR CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS, MAYOR AND APPOINTED OFFICIALS**

**WHEREAS**, the Utah State Legislature during the 2024 General Session passed S.B. 91;  
and

**WHEREAS**, S.B. 91 amended Utah Code Section 10-3-818 regarding City employee salaries; and

**WHEREAS**, Richmond City must now publish notice and hold a separate public hearing on proposed compensation increases for executive municipal officers before adopting those increases, and

**WHEREAS**, the Richmond City Council finds that enacting the proposed compensation increases as set forth in this Ordinance will comply with Utah Code requirements.

**NOW; THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF RICHMOND CITY, UTAH, THAT:**

Compensation increases for executive municipal officers, city council members and the mayor proposed for inclusion in the City’s Fiscal Year 2027 Budget be as follows:

	<u>Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA)</u>
Mayor	3.50%
City Council	3.50%
City Administrator	0.00%
City Recorder	3.50%
Library Director	3.50%
City Treasurer	3.50%

Adopted and passed by the City Council of Richmond City, Utah and signed this 16th day of June, 2026.

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey D. Young, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_

Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder

**RESOLUTION 2026-06**

**A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE FISCAL YEAR 2027 BUDGET FOR THE CITY OF RICHMOND, UTAH.**

**BE IT ORDAINED** by the City Council Members of the City of Richmond, Utah, that the Fiscal Year 2027 budget be adopted to include increases/(decreases) within the General Fund and Enterprise Funds.

**GENERAL FUND**

Revenue	\$2,223,671
<u>Expenses</u>	
Administration	\$217,113
Building	192,460
Public Safety	187,060
Streets	855,222
Parks	329,145
Fire	116,520
Library	129,170
Planning	95,713
Cub River Sports	25,000
Capital Projects	76,268
Total	\$2,223,671

**WATER ENTERPRISE FUND**

Revenue	\$1,029,480
Expense	\$1,113,776

**SEWER ENTERPRISE FUND**

Revenue	\$1,105,840
Expense	\$1,173,610

**CUB RIVER SPORTS COMPLEX SPECIAL REVENUE FUND**

Revenue	\$50,000
Expense	\$50,000

<b>CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND</b>
------------------------------

Revenue	\$176,268
---------	-----------

Expense	\$152,838
---------	-----------

<b>SOLID WASTE ENTERPRISE FUND</b>
------------------------------------

Revenue	\$338,524
---------	-----------

Expense	\$338,524
---------	-----------

PASSED AND APPROVED this 16th day of June, 2026.

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey D. Young, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder

**RICHMOND CITY BUDGET  
JULY 1, 2026 - JUNE 30, 2027  
BUDGET**

GL ACCOUNT #	BUDGET FY27	DEC	MAY	JUNE	REVISED BUDGET	FY26	+/(-)
<b>REVENUE</b>							
3110 INCOME - PROPERTY TAXES	\$ 423,131				423,131	\$ 369,394	53,737
3111 INCOME - FEE IN LIEU OF	\$ 26,000				26,000	\$ 24,000	2,000
3112 GAIN (LOSS) ON SALE	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
3130 INCOME - LOCAL SALES TAX	\$ 640,000				640,000	\$ 612,000	28,000
3140 INCOME - FRANCHISE TAX	\$ 280,000				280,000	\$ 250,000	30,000
3150 INCOME - MASS TRANSIT TAX	\$ 118,000				118,000	\$ 100,000	18,000
3210 INCOME - BUSINESS LICENSES	\$ 2,200				2,200	\$ 2,000	200
3225 INCOME - DOG LICENSES	\$ 2,000				2,000	\$ 2,600	(600)
3355 INCOME - LOCAL ROAD TAX	\$ 66,000				66,000	\$ 60,000	6,000
3356 INCOME - CLASS C ROAD FUNDS	\$ 180,000				180,000	\$ 160,000	20,000
3353 INCOME - COG GRANT - 400 WEST	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
3354 INCOME - RTIF ROAD TAX	\$ 67,000				67,000	\$ 62,000	5,000
3364 INCOME - LIBRARY CLEF GRANT					-	\$ -	-
3365 INCOME - LIBRARY TECH GRANT					-	\$ -	-
3510 INCOME - JUSTICE COURT FINES	\$ 2,500				2,500	\$ 1,500	1,000
3559 INCOME - LIB HOTSPOT GRANT	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
3610 INCOME - INTEREST EARNINGS	\$ 45,000				45,000	\$ 40,000	5,000
3611 INCOME - PENALTY INTEREST	\$ 5,500				5,500	\$ 5,000	500
3614 RENT - CINGULAR TOWER SPACE	\$ 16,833				16,833	\$ 16,833	-
3620 RENT - POST OFFICE	\$ 14,040				14,040	\$ 13,000	1,040
3621 RENT - PARK	\$ 600				600	\$ 600	-
3628 INCOME - RENTAL EQUIPMENT	\$ 5,266				5,266	\$ -	5,266
3656 INCOME - CEMETERY CONTRACT	\$ 78,605				78,605	\$ 76,317	2,288
3663 INCOME - LIBRARY MISC	\$ 100				100	\$ 50	50
3662 INCOME - CHILD BOOK GRANT	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
3666 INCOME - GRAVE DIGGING	\$ 6,000				6,000	\$ 6,000	-
3673 INCOME - ROAD IMPROVEMENTS	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
3677 INCOME - CELEBRATIONS	\$ 6,000				6,000	\$ 6,000	-
3684 INCOME - YOUTH BASEBALL	\$ 3,000				3,000	\$ 3,000	-
3690 INCOME - KUED LIBRARY GRANT	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
3692 INCOME - PLANNING FEES	\$ 7,000				7,000	\$ 7,000	-
3693 RENT - CITY BUILDINGS (PRIVATE)	\$ 45,000				45,000	\$ 45,000	-
RENT - CITY BUILDINGS (CITY)	\$ 10,000				10,000	\$ 10,000	-
3694 INCOME - SUNDRY REVENUES	\$ 250				250	\$ 250	-
3695 INCOME - RAPZ TAX COLLECTED	\$ 105,000				105,000	\$ 135,000	(30,000)
3658 INCOME - UDOT GENERAL PLAN GRANT	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
3697 COLLECTION FEE - CENTRAL DISPATCH	\$ 39,646				39,646	\$ 38,500	1,146
3823 DONATION - STREETS	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
3835 DONATION - DUP	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
3830 DONATION - LIBRARY	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
3837 DONATION - BLACK & WHITE	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
3841 DONATION - SENIOR PROGRAM	\$ 13,000				13,000	\$ 15,000	(2,000)
3107 TRANSFER FROM CAPITOL PROJECT FUND	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
3105 USE OF CLASS C ROAD FUNDS	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
3104 USE OF RTIF ROAD TAX	\$ 16,000				-	\$ -	-
3109 USE OF FUND BALANCE	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>\$2,223,671</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>2,223,671</b>	<b>\$2,061,044</b>	<b>162,627</b>

**RICHMOND CITY BUDGET  
JULY 1, 2026 - JUNE 30, 2027**

**GL ACCOUNT #**  
-----

<b>DIRECT EXPENSES</b>	<b>BUDGET FY27</b>	<b>DEC</b>	<b>MAY</b>	<b>JUNE</b>	<b>REVISED BUDGET</b>	<b>FY26</b>	
<b>DIRECT COSTS</b>							
4111 ADM - WAGES	\$ 23,056				23,056	\$ 22,919	137
4113 ADM - BENEFITS	\$ 3,302				3,302	\$ 3,342	(40)
4120 ADM - MILEAGE & CONVENTION EXPENS	\$ 5,000				5,000	\$ 6,000	(1,000)
4122 ADM - ADVERTISING	\$ 300				300	\$ 600	(300)
4123 ADM - SUBSCRIPTIONS & MEM	\$ 1,500				1,500	\$ 1,600	(100)
4124 ADM - OFFICE EXPENSE	\$ 7,000				7,000	\$ 7,000	-
4126 ADM - UTILITIES	\$ 700				700	\$ 1,000	(300)
4129 ADM - CREDIT/DEBIT CARD FEES	\$ 6,500				6,500	\$ 7,000	(500)
4131 ADM - AUDITOR FEES	\$ 6,000				6,000	\$ 6,000	-
4132 ADM - ATTORNEY FEES	\$ 5,000				5,000	\$ 4,000	1,000
4149 ADM - PROPERTY TAX CELL PHONE TOWER	\$ 817				817	\$ 887	(70)
4151 ADM - INSURANCE	\$ 3,075				3,075	\$ 2,664	411
4156 ADM - YOUTH COUNCIL	\$ 5,000				5,000	\$ 5,000	-
4159 ADM - CELEBRATIONS	\$ 15,000				15,000	\$ 6,500	8,500
4160 ADM - BAD CHECK EXPENSE	\$ 1,000				1,000	\$ 1,000	-
4162 ADM - ELECTION EXPENSE	\$ -				-	\$ 7,487	(7,487)
4163 ADM - SUNDRY	\$ 2,500				2,500	\$ 2,500	-
4188 ADM - IT EQUIP & SERVICE	\$ 39,113				39,113	\$ 30,000	9,113
4194 ADM - SALES TAX REBATE	\$ 90,000				90,000	\$ 80,000	10,000
4195 ADM - EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS	\$ 1,000				1,000	\$ 1,000	-
4198 ADM - AMERICAN LEGION	\$ 1,250				1,250	\$ 1,250	-
<b>TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE</b>	<b>\$ 217,113</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>217,113</b>	<b>\$ 197,749</b>	<b>19,364</b>

						<b>FY26</b>	
4211 BLDG - WAGES	\$ 45,376				45,376	\$ 50,293	(4,917)
4213 BLDG - BENEFITS	\$ 4,009				4,009	\$ 4,461	(452)
4225 BLDG - MAINTENANCE	\$ 45,000				45,000	\$ 45,000	-
4226 BLDG - UTILITIES	\$ 52,000				52,000	\$ 52,000	-
4251 BLDG - INSURANCE	\$ 3,075				3,075	\$ 2,908	167
4289 BLDG - PARK SCHOOL RENOVATION	\$ 15,000				15,000	\$ 15,000	-
4282 BLDG - SENIOR PROGRAM	\$ 28,000				28,000	\$ 28,000	-
4292 BLDG - B&W REMODEL (RAPZ)	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
4280 BLDG - COMM BLDG REMODEL (RAPZ)	\$ -				-	\$ 150,000	(150,000)
<b>TOTAL BUILDING EXPENSE</b>	<b>\$ 192,460</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>192,460</b>	<b>\$ 347,662</b>	<b>(155,202)</b>

**GL ACCOUNT #**  
-----

	<b>BUDGET FY27</b>	<b>DEC</b>	<b>MAY</b>	<b>JUNE</b>	<b>REVISED BUDGET</b>	<b>FY26</b>	
4311 PUBLIC SAFETY - WAGES	\$ 12,536				12,536	\$ 11,202	1,334
4313 PUBLIC SAFETY - BENEFITS	\$ 1,108				1,108	\$ 994	114
4332 PUBLIC SAFETY - ATTORNEY FEE	\$ 50,000				50,000	\$ 38,000	12,000
4351 PUBLIC SAFETY - INSURANCE	\$ 100				100	\$ 93	7
4366 PUBLIC SAFETY - DOG POUND FEE	\$ 300				300	\$ 300	-
4367 PUBLIC SAFETY - DOG CATCHER SERVICE	\$ 11,250				11,250	\$ 10,425	825
4371 PUBLIC SAFETY - COMMUNICATION CENTER	\$ 39,646				39,646	\$ 39,600	46
4380 PUBLIC SAFETY - POLICE PROTECTION	\$ 72,120				72,120	\$ 67,312	4,808
<b>TOTAL PUBLIC SAFETY EXPENSE</b>	<b>\$ 187,060</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>187,060</b>	<b>\$ 167,926</b>	<b>19,134</b>



GL ACCOUNT #	BUDGET	DEC	MAY	JUNE	REVISED	FY26	
	FY27				BUDGET		
4811 LIBRARY - WAGES	\$ 70,945				70,945	\$ 67,595	3,350
4813 LIBRARY - BENEFITS	\$ 10,770				10,770	\$ 10,620	150
4820 LIBRARY - MILEAGE & CONVENTION EXPENSE	\$ 1,200				1,200	\$ 1,200	-
4823 LIBRARY - SUBSCRIPTIONS & MEMBERSHIPS	\$ 350				350	\$ 350	-
4824 LIBRARY - OFFICE EXPENSE	\$ 1,500				1,500	\$ 1,200	300
4825 LIBRARY - MAINTENANCE	\$ 1,200				1,200	\$ 1,200	-
4826 LIBRARY - UTILITIES	\$ 6,800				6,800	\$ 6,000	800
4827 LIBRARY - PROCESSING SUPPLIES	\$ 800				800	\$ 800	-
4835 LIBRARY - AUTOMATION	\$ 1,800				1,800	\$ 1,800	-
4837 LIBRARY - COMPUTER UPGRADE	\$ 2,000				2,000	\$ 4,000	(2,000)
4839 LIBRARY - TECHNOLOGY	\$ 10,930				10,930	\$ 3,200	7,730
4841 LIBRARY - TECHNOLOGY GRANT	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
4851 LIBRARY - INSURANCE	\$ 3,075				3,075	\$ 3,033	42
4855 LIBRARY - PROGRAMS	\$ 3,000				3,000	\$ 3,000	-
4863 LIBRARY - SUNDRY	\$ 1,500				1,500	\$ 1,200	300
4866 LIBRARY - OTHER MATERIALS	\$ 800				800	\$ 800	-
4864 LIBRARY - ELECTRONIC MATERIALS	\$ 5,000				5,000	\$ 3,000	2,000
4865 LIBRARY - PRINT MATERIALS	\$ 7,500				7,500	\$ 7,500	-
4880 LIBRARY - HOTSPOT GRANT					-	\$ -	-
4881 LIBRARY - ILL GRANT					-	\$ -	-
4889 LIBRARY - CLEF GRANT					-	\$ -	-
4885 LIBRARY - KUED GRANT					-	\$ -	-
					-	\$ -	-
					-	\$ -	-
<b>TOTAL LIBRARY EXPENSE</b>	<b>\$ 129,170</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>129,170</b>	<b>\$ 116,498</b>	<b>12,672</b>
4911 PLANNING - WAGES	\$ 42,541				42,541	\$ 45,909	(3,368)
4913 PLANNING - BENEFITS	\$ 21,065				21,065	\$ 18,178	2,887
4920 PLANNING - TRAINING	\$ 2,500				2,500	\$ 2,500	-
4924 PLANNING - OFFICE SUPPLIES	\$ 500				500	\$ 500	-
4931 PLANNING - COUNTYWIDE PLANNING	\$ 2,186				2,186	\$ 2,186	-
4932 PLANNING - ATTORNEY	\$ 6,000				6,000	\$ 5,000	1,000
4933 PLANNING - ENGINEERING	\$ 15,000				15,000	\$ 24,000	(9,000)
4951 PLANNING - INSURANCE	\$ 3,075				3,075	\$ 2,849	226
4981 PLANNING - TRAILS COORDINATOR	\$ 1,046				1,046	\$ 1,046	-
4996 PLANNING - PLANNING COMMISSION STIPEND	\$ 1,800				1,800	\$ 1,800	-
					-	\$ -	-
					-	\$ -	-
<b>TOTAL PLANNING EXPENSE</b>	<b>\$ 95,713</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 95,713</b>	<b>\$ 103,968</b>	<b>(8,255)</b>
50001 TRANSFER TO SPEC REV FUND SPORTS COMPLEX	\$ 25,000				25,000	\$ 25,000	-
50000 TRANSFER TO CAPITAL PROJECT FUND	\$ 76,268				76,268	\$ 1,215	75,053
APPROPRIATED INCREASE IN FUND BALANCE					-	\$ -	-
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>\$ 2,223,671</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>2,223,671</b>	<b>\$ 2,061,044</b>	<b>162,627</b>
	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>			

GL ACCOUNT # -----	BUDGET FY27	DEC	MAY	JUNE	REVISED BUDGET	FY26	
<b>WATER ENTERPRISE FUND</b>							
3711 WATER - MONTHLY CHARGE	\$ 879,480				879,480	\$ 772,252	107,228
3715 WATER - DEDICATION PAYMENT					-		-
3716 WATER - METER CONNECTION FEE					-		-
3717 WATER - IMPACT FEE					-		-
3718 WATER - GAIN ON SALE					-		-
3719 WATER - SUNDRY REVENUES					-	\$ -	-
3725 WATER - ARPA FUNDS					-		-
3720 WATER - INTEREST	\$ 150,000				150,000	\$ 130,000	20,000
					-		-
					-		-
<b>TOTAL WATER ENTERPRISE REVENUE</b>	<b>\$ 1,029,480</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>1,029,480</b>	<b>\$ 902,252</b>	<b>127,228</b>
5111 WATER - WAGES	\$ 193,376				193,376	\$ 191,326	2,050
5113 WATER - BENEFITS	\$ 99,410				99,410	\$ 87,334	12,076
5114 WATER - PENSION EXPENSE	\$ 10,000				10,000	\$ 10,000	-
5120 WATER - MILEAGE & CONVENTION EXPENSE	\$ 5,000				5,000	\$ 5,000	-
5121 WATER - BAD DEBT	\$ 1,000				1,000	\$ 1,000	-
5122 WATER - ADVERTISING	\$ -				-	\$ 100	(100)
5123 WATER - SUBSCRIPTIONS & MEMBERSHIPS	\$ 2,500				2,500	\$ 2,300	200
5124 WATER - OFFICE EXPENSE	\$ 8,000				8,000	\$ 8,000	-
5125 WATER - MAINT & REPAIR	\$ 50,000				50,000	\$ 50,000	-
5126 WATER - UTILITIES	\$ 50,000				50,000	\$ 40,000	10,000
5127 WATER - GAS & OIL	\$ 10,000				10,000	\$ 10,000	-
5129 WATER - CREDIT/DEBIT CARD FEES	\$ 6,500				6,500	\$ 7,000	(500)
5131 WATER - AUDITOR	\$ 6,000				6,000	\$ 6,000	-
5132 WATER - ATTORNEY FEE	\$ 2,000				2,000	\$ 2,000	-
5133 WATER - ENGINEERING	\$ 30,000				30,000	\$ 40,000	(10,000)
5145 WATER - DEPRECIATION EXPENSE	\$ 260,000				260,000	\$ 280,000	(20,000)
5148 WATER - SUPPLIES	\$ 50,000				50,000	\$ 50,000	-
5151 WATER - INSURANCE	\$ 24,600				24,600	\$ 23,669	931
5160 WATER - EQUIP RENTAL	\$ 2,633				2,633	\$ -	2,633
5189 WATER - BLDG RENT	\$ 5,000				5,000	\$ 5,000	-
5163 WATER - SUNDRY	\$ 2,000				2,000	\$ 2,000	-
5164 WATER - SAMPLES	\$ 9,000				9,000	\$ 9,000	-
5175 WATER - IRRIGATION SHARE FEES	\$ 4,000				4,000	\$ 3,600	400
5178 WATER - INTEREST WATER TANK	\$ 72,757				72,757	\$ 78,532	(5,775)
WATER - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	\$ 150,000				150,000	\$ -	150,000
5188 WATER - IT SERVICE & EQUIP	\$ 30,000				30,000	\$ 30,000	-
5196 WATER - METERS	\$ 30,000				30,000	\$ 30,000	-
					-	\$ -	-
<b>TOTAL WATER EXPENSE</b>	<b>\$ 1,113,776</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>1,113,776</b>	<b>\$ 971,861</b>	<b>141,915</b>

GL ACCOUNT # -----	BUDGET FY27	DEC	MAY	JUNE	REVISED BUDGET	FY26	
<b>SEWER ENTERPRISE FUND</b>							
3731 SEWER - MONTHLY SERVICE FEE	\$ 1,035,840				1,035,840	\$ 925,648	110,192
3734 SEWER - IMPACT FEE	\$ -				-		-
3750 SEWER - ARPA FUNDS	\$ -				-		-
3746 SEWER - INTEREST	\$ 70,000				70,000	\$ 70,000	-
<b>TOTAL SEWER ENTERPRISE FUND</b>	<b>\$ 1,105,840</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>1,105,840</b>	<b>995,648</b>	<b>110,192</b>
5211 SEWER - WAGES	\$ 244,297				244,297	\$ 197,437	46,860
5213 SEWER - BENEFITS	\$ 92,080				92,080	\$ 72,529	19,551
5214 SEWER - PENSION EXPENSE	\$ 10,000				10,000	\$ 10,000	-
5220 SEWER - MILEAGE & CONVENTION EXPENSE	\$ 5,000				5,000	\$ 7,500	(2,500)
5221 SEWER - BAD DEBT	\$ 1,000				1,000	\$ 1,000	-
5222 SEWER - ADVERTISING	\$ -				-	\$ 100	(100)
5223 SEWER - SUBSCRIPTIONS & MEMBERSHIPS	\$ 2,000				2,000	\$ 2,000	-
5224 SEWER - OFFICE EXPENSE	\$ 8,000				8,000	\$ 7,000	1,000
5225 SEWER - MAINTENANCE & REPAIR	\$ 90,000				90,000	\$ 50,000	40,000
5226 SEWER - UTILITIES	\$ 100,000				100,000	\$ 100,000	-
5227 SEWER - GAS & PROPANE	\$ 20,000				20,000	\$ 20,000	-
5229 SEWER - CREDIT/DEBIT CARD FEES	\$ 6,500				6,500	\$ 7,000	(500)
5231 SEWER - AUDITOR	\$ 6,000				6,000	\$ 6,000	-
5232 SEWER - ATTORNEY FEE	\$ 2,000				2,000	\$ 3,000	(1,000)
5233 SEWER - ENGINEERING	\$ 50,000				50,000	\$ 50,000	-
5245 SEWER - DEPRECIATION	\$ 360,000				360,000	\$ 382,000	(22,000)
5248 SEWER - SUPPLIES	\$ 70,000				70,000	\$ 70,000	-
5251 SEWER - INSURANCE	\$ 24,600				24,600	\$ 21,445	3,155
5260 SEWER - EQUIP RENTAL	\$ 2,633				2,633	\$ -	2,633
5289 SEWER - BLDG RENT	\$ 5,000				5,000	\$ 5,000	-
5263 SEWER - SUNDRY	\$ 1,500				1,500	\$ 1,500	-
5264 SEWER - SAMPLES	\$ 13,000				13,000	\$ 11,000	2,000
5288 SEWER - IT SERVICE & EQUIP	\$ 30,000				30,000	\$ 30,000	-
5295 SEWER - LINE CLEANING	\$ 30,000				30,000	\$ 25,000	5,000
<b>TOTAL SEWER EXPENSE</b>	<b>\$ 1,173,610</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>1,173,610</b>	<b>\$ 1,079,511</b>	<b>94,099</b>

GL ACCOUNT # -----	BUDGET FY27	DEC	MAY	JUNE	REVISED BUDGET	FY26	
<b>SPECIAL REVENUE FUND (CUB RIVER SPORTS COMPLEX)</b>							
<b>REVENUES</b>							
3153 INCOME - LEWISTON CITY	\$ 25,000				25,000	\$ 25,000	-
3154 INCOME - RAPZ TAX COLLECTED	\$ -				-		-
3764 INCOME - MISC	\$ -				-		-
OTHER SOURCES							
3550 INCOME - TRANSFER FROM CITY GENERAL FUND	\$ 25,000				25,000	\$ 25,000	-
3549 USAGE OF BEGINNING FUND BALANCE					-	\$ -	-
TOTAL REVENUE & OTHER SOURCES	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	50,000	\$ 50,000	-
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>							
5311 CUB RIVER - WAGES					-	\$ -	-
5313 CUB RIVER - BENEFITS					-		-
5325 CUB RIVER - MAINTENANCE	\$ 50,000				50,000	\$ 50,000	-
5393 CUB RIVER - INFRASTRUCTURE					-		-
5395 CUB RIVER - RAPZ TAX	\$ -				-		-
5392 CUB RIVER - EQUIPMENT					-	\$ -	-
BUDGETED INCREASE IN FUND BALANCE							
TOTAL EXPENDITURES & OTHER USES	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	50,000	\$ 50,000	-
<b>CAPITOL PROJECTS FUND</b>							
<b>REVENUES</b>							
50003 TRANSFER FROM GENERAL FUND	\$ 76,268				76,268	\$ 1,215	75,053
3687 INCOME - INTEREST	\$ 100,000				100,000	\$ 90,000	10,000
OTHER ADDITIONS							
TOTAL REVENUE	\$ 176,268	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 176,268	\$ 91,215	85,053
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>							
50004 TRANSFER TO GENERAL FUND					-	\$ -	-
4000 CPF - PROJECTS	\$ 69,846				69,846	\$ 8,800	61,046
4001 CPF - EQUIPMENT	\$ 82,992				82,992	\$ 16,314	66,678
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$ 152,838	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	152,838	\$ 25,114	127,724

<b>SOLID WASTE ENTERPRISE FUND</b>		<b>BUDGET</b>	<b>DEC</b>	<b>MAY</b>	<b>JUNE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>FY26</b>	
		<b>FY27</b>				<b>BUDGET</b>		
<b>REVENUES</b>								
3696	COLLECTION FEE - GARBAGE	\$ 338,024				338,024	\$ 289,025	48,999
3699	INTEREST EARNINGS	\$ 500				500	\$ 1,000	(500)
						-		-
	<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>\$ 338,524</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	338,524	290,025	48,499
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>								
5611	SOLID WASTE - WAGES	\$ 34,168				34,168	\$ 22,919	11,249
5613	SOLID WASTE - BENEFITS	\$ 4,161				4,161	\$ 3,342	819
5624	SOLID WASTE - OFFICE SUPPLIES	\$ 3,200				3,200	\$ 3,000	200
5626	SOLID WASTE - UTILITIES	\$ 420				420	\$ -	-
5629	SOLID WASTE - CREDIT/DEBIT CARD FEES	\$ 6,500				6,500	\$ 6,000	-
5631	SOLID WASTE - AUDITOR	\$ 6,000				6,000	\$ 6,000	-
5632	SOLID WASTE - LEGAL & PROFESSIONAL	\$ -				-	\$ -	-
5651	SOLID WASTE - INSURANCE	\$ 3,075				3,075	\$ 2,664	411
5670	SOLID WASTE - LOGAN SERVICE AREA	\$ 55,000				55,000	\$ 51,300	3,700
5630	SOLID WASTE - CARRIER EXPENSE	\$ 198,000				198,000	\$ 172,800	25,200
5688	SOLID WASTE - IT EQUIP/SERVICE	\$ 18,000				18,000	\$ 12,000	6,000
5699	SOLID WASTE - GARBAGE CANS	\$ 10,000				10,000	\$ 10,000	-
	<b>TOTAL EXPENSE</b>	<b>\$ 338,524</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 338,524	\$ 290,025	48,499

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION  
ORDINANCE 2026-09**

WHEREAS the City Council of Richmond has the responsibility for the general welfare of the City; and

WHEREAS the City Council of Richmond is directly responsible for the judicious and responsible management of the financial aspects of the City; and

WHEREAS Utah Code Annotated Title 11, Chapter 36a establishes the process and procedure wherein cities may impose Impact Fees; and

WHEREAS the City of Richmond has complied with all requirements found within said provisions cited above; and

WHEREAS on-going capital improvements of a major nature to the Richmond City culinary water and sewer systems are resulting in the incurrence of major expenses; and

WHEREAS Richmond City contracted with competent and licensed engineers and financial experts to evaluate the respective cost, impacts, and reasonable mitigation relative to said capital improvements;

NOW THEREFORE the City Council of Richmond City, County of Cache, State of Utah, hereby adopts, passes, and publishes the following:

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE RICHMOND CITY MUNICIPAL  
CODE TITLE 6-000 “FINANCES AND TAXATION”, PARTS 6-410  
“IMPACT FEES” AND 6-420 “CULINARY WATER IMPACT FEES”.**

- A. All fees listed in their respective schedule will go into effect on June 17, 2026 after passage of this ordinance.
- B. The Richmond City Council may adjust the impact fee in the event of:
  - 1. Response to unusual circumstances in specific cases; or
  - 2. Respond to a request for a prompt and individualized impact fee review for the development activity of the State or a school district or charter school and an offset or credit for a public facility for which an impact fee has been or will be collected; or
  - 3. Ensure that the impact fees are imposed fairly; and
  - 4. In the event of a particular development that:
    - (a) permits adjustment of the amount of the fee based upon studies and data submitted by the developer; and

- (b) allows a developer, including a school district or charter school, to receive a credit against or proportionate reimbursement of an impact fee if the developer dedicates land for a system improvement; builds and dedicates some or all of a system improvement; or dedicates a public facility that the Richmond City Council and the developer agree will reduce the need for a system improvement; and
- (c) grants a credit against impact fees for any dedication of land for, improvement to, or new construction of, any system improvements provided by the developer, if the facilities are system improvements, or are dedicated to the public; and offset the need for an identified system improvement.

C. The text of Chapter 6-400 shall now read as follows:

- 1. Sections/Parts shall be amended such that the highlighted areas below shall be added and the ~~strikeout~~ areas shall be deleted.

**CHAPTER 6-400 IMPACT FEES AND HOOK-UP FEES FOR CULINARY WATER AND THE SEWER SYSTEM.**

**PART 6-410 IMPACT FEES**

~~A. Based upon engineered data contained in the Final Water and Wastewater Impact Fees Analyses prepared by Emily S. Sim, Public Sector Economics and accepted by the Richmond City Council on December 10, 2019 for wastewater and on January 21, 2020 for culinary water the following base impact fee schedules are hereby established.~~

A. Based upon engineered data contained in the Water Impact Fees Analyses prepared by Zions Public Finance, Inc. in May 2026, the following base impact fee schedules for culinary water are hereby established.

B. Based upon engineered data contained in the Wastewater Impact Fee Analyses prepared by Emily S. Sim, Public Sector Economics, and accepted by the Richmond City Council on December 10, 2019 for wastewater the following base impact fee schedules are hereby established.

**PART 6-420 CULINARY WATER IMPACT FEES**

A. Engineering, including the use of a computerized culinary water model, has ascertained that there is but a single culinary water service district within the bounds of Richmond City.

**June 17 – December 31, 2026**

Meter Size	
<u>In Inches</u>	<u>Cost Per Unit</u>
3/4	\$8,028
1.0	\$13,408
1.5	\$26,735
2.0	\$42,793
3.0	\$85,667
4.0	\$200,720
6.0	\$428,177
8.0	\$749,329

**Calendar Year 2027**

Meter Size	
<u>In Inches</u>	<u>Cost Per Unit</u>
3/4	\$8,058
1.0	\$13,457
1.5	\$26,835
2.0	\$42,952
3.0	\$85,985
4.0	\$201,464
6.0	\$429,765
8.0	\$752,108

**Calendar Year 2028**

Meter Size	
<u>In Inches</u>	<u>Cost Per Unit</u>
3/4	\$8,091
1.0	\$13,512
1.5	\$26,943
2.0	\$43,126
3.0	\$86,333
4.0	\$202,280
6.0	\$431,505
8.0	\$755,154

### **Calendar Year 2029**

Meter Size	
<u>In Inches</u>	<u>Cost Per Unit</u>
3/4	\$8,126
1.0	\$13,571
1.5	\$27,061
2.0	\$43,315
3.0	\$86,711
4.0	\$203,167
6.0	\$433,397
8.0	\$758,465

### **Calendar Year 2030**

Meter Size	
<u>In Inches</u>	<u>Cost Per Unit</u>
3/4	\$8,165
1.0	\$13,635
1.5	\$27,189
2.0	\$43,519
3.0	\$87,120
4.0	\$204,125
6.0	\$435,441
8.0	\$762,042

### **Calendar Year 2031**

Meter Size	
<u>In Inches</u>	<u>Cost Per Unit</u>
3/4	\$8,206
1.0	\$13,705
1.5	\$27,328
2.0	\$43,742
3.0	\$87,566
4.0	\$205,168
6.0	\$437,666
8.0	\$765,936

### **Calendar Year 2032**

Meter Size	
<u>In Inches</u>	<u>Cost Per Unit</u>
3/4	\$8,251
1.0	\$13,779
1.5	\$27,477
2.0	\$43,979
3.0	\$88,041
4.0	\$206,283
6.0	\$440,044
8.0	\$770,098

### **Calendar Year 2033**

Meter Size	
<u>In Inches</u>	<u>Cost Per Unit</u>
3/4	\$8,299
1.0	\$13,859
1.5	\$27,636
2.0	\$44,235
3.0	\$88,554
4.0	\$207,483
6.0	\$442,604
8.0	\$774,578

### **Calendar Year 2034**

Meter Size	
<u>In Inches</u>	<u>Cost Per Unit</u>
3/4	\$8,351
1.0	\$13,946
1.5	\$27,809
2.0	\$44,512
3.0	\$89,108
4.0	\$208,781
6.0	\$445,373
8.0	\$779,424

**Calendar Year 2035**

Meter Size	
<u>In Inches</u>	<u>Cost Per Unit</u>
3/4	\$8,406
1.0	\$14,039
1.5	\$27,994
2.0	\$44,807
3.0	\$89,699
4.0	\$210,166
6.0	\$448,327
8.0	\$784,593

2. Should any section, clause, or provision of this Ordinance be declared by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, in whole or in part, the same shall not affect the validity of the Ordinance as whole, or any other part thereof.
3. All ordinances, and the chapter, clauses, sections, or parts thereof in conflict with provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed, but only insofar as is specifically provided for herein.
4. This ordinance shall become effective after the required public hearing and upon its posting as required by law.

THIS ORDINANCE shall be attached as an amendment to the Richmond City Municipal Code above referred to.

ADOPTED AND PASSED by the Richmond City Council on this 16th day of June, 2026.

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION**

---

Jeffrey D. Young, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

---

Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder



Prepared by  
**Zions Public Finance, Inc**  
for  
**Richmond City**

# Water Impact Fee Analysis

May 2026



**RICHMOND**  
**— UTAH —**  
*Home of Black & White Days*

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive Summary .....	2
Water System Overview .....	2
Level of Service – Equivalent Residential Connection .....	2
Growth in Demand .....	2
Water Service Area .....	2
Existing Excess Capacity .....	2
New Construction Costs .....	2
Water Impact Fee Calculation .....	3
Non-Standard Demand Adjustments .....	5
Chapter 1: Overview of the WATER Impact Fees .....	6
Summary .....	6
Costs to be Included in the Impact Fee .....	6
Utah Code Legal Requirements .....	6
Notice of Intent to Prepare Impact Fee Analysis .....	6
Preparation of Impact Fee Analysis .....	7
Certification of Impact Fee Analysis .....	8
Chapter 2: Impact From Growth Upon the City’s Facilities and Level of Service .....	9
Service Area .....	9
Water Demand .....	9
Existing and Proposed LOS Analysis .....	9
Chapter 3: Impact on Capacity from Development Activity .....	11
Excess Capacity .....	11
Chapter 4: System Improvements Required from Development Activity .....	12
Future 10-Year Water Capital Projects .....	12
Chapter 5: Proportionate Share Analysis .....	13
Maximum Legal Water Impact Fee per ERC .....	13
Existing Excess Capacity .....	13
New Construction Costs .....	14
Consultant Fees .....	14
Summary of Impact Fee .....	14
Non-Standard Demand Adjustments .....	16
Certification .....	17

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

This water impact fee analysis (IFA) for Richmond City (City) is performed in accordance with Utah State Code §11-36a. An impact fee is a payment of money imposed upon new development activity to mitigate the impact of new development on public infrastructure. In conjunction with this project, J-U-B Engineers prepared the *Richmond Water Master Plan* (Master Plan) dated July 2025.

The recommended impact fee structure presented in this IFA represents the maximum impact fees that the City may assess. The City will be required to use revenue sources other than impact fees to fund any projects identified in the Master Plan that constitute repair and replacement, cure any existing deficiencies, or increase the level of service for existing users.

### Water System Overview

---

#### Level of Service – Equivalent Residential Connection

Level of service (LOS) defines the water demands that a typical residential user, expressed as an Equivalent Residential Connection (ERC), will require and should pay for through impact fees. Impact fee law prohibits the use of impact fees to increase the LOS above the current service levels. The Master Plan identifies specific service levels for source, storage and distribution that comply with State requirements and current service levels in Richmond.

#### Growth in Demand

In 2025 the City served 1,095 water ERCs and is anticipated to grow to approximately 1,436 ERCs by 2035, for an increase of 341 ERCs over the 10-year period. A residential unit is equated to one ERC and non-residential properties are converted to the appropriate number of ERCs based on water meter sizes as shown later in this IFA.

#### Water Service Area

---

The service area covers the entire City for the purpose of calculating impact fees. Based on the Master Plan, it also assumes that the City would annex approximately 125 acres of land on the southeast side of the city and 20 acres around the Lees development.<sup>1</sup>

#### Existing Excess Capacity

---

The Master Plan identifies existing excess capacity in source and storage. Source has 16.8 percent of existing excess capacity while storage has 32.8 percent of existing excess capacity. New development can buy in to this existing excess capacity.

#### New Construction Costs

---

The Master Plan identifies four new capital improvement projects required over the next 10 years at a cost of \$9,350,000. Only \$2,082,720 is attributable to new development over the next 10 years, with \$826,080 that will benefit existing development.

---

<sup>1</sup> JUB Richmond Water Master Plan, p. 3.

TABLE 1: NEW CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Project #	Project Type	Project Location	Year	Estimated Cost	Cost to New Development - 10 Yrs	Cost to Existing
1	New 500 gpm Well	South of 400 South and east of State Street	2025-2027	\$4,300,000	\$1,358,800	\$0
2	New 8" PRV	600 South east of State Street	2025-2027	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$0
3	New 1 Million Gallon Tank with PRVs	East of the south side of the city	2027-2030	\$3,500,000	\$0	\$0
4	Create Lower Pressure Zone	West of 200 West	2030-2032	\$1,200,000	\$373,920	\$826,080
				<b>\$9,350,000</b>	<b>\$2,082,720</b>	<b>\$826,080</b>

Source: Richmond Water Master Plan, p. 13

### Water Impact Fee Calculation

The impact fee calculations consist of buy-in to existing excess capacity in the source and storage systems, as well as new improvements, consultant costs and credits for projects that benefit existing development and bond credits.

TABLE 2: PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS – GROSS COST BEFORE CREDITS

Cost Category	Amount
Excess Capacity - Source	\$250.76
Excess Capacity - Storage	\$2,430.74
New Improvements	\$6,103.07
Consultant Costs	\$220.95
<b>Gross Fee per ERC Before Credits</b>	<b>\$9,005.51</b>

Credits must be made for the future projects that will benefit existing development so that new development does not pay twice. There is a total of \$826,080 of new projects that will benefit existing development. There is also the outstanding Series 2012 bond for which credits must be made. A portion of these costs can be offset with the existing fund balance of \$1,175,139.42.<sup>2</sup> These credits are subtracted from the gross fee shown in Table 2.

<sup>2</sup> The fund balance has been used to offset the projects that partially benefit existing development (\$826,000) leaving \$349,059.42 to offset a portion of future bond payments.

**TABLE 3: PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS – MAXIMUM FEES PER ERC**

Year	Gross Fee	Credit for Bond	Maximum Fee per ERC
2026	\$9,005.51	(\$976.69)	\$8,028.82
2027	\$9,005.51	(\$946.91)	\$8,058.60
2028	\$9,005.51	(\$914.28)	\$8,091.23
2029	\$9,005.51	(\$878.80)	\$8,126.71
2030	\$9,005.51	(\$840.48)	\$8,165.04
2031	\$9,005.51	(\$798.76)	\$8,206.76
2032	\$9,005.51	(\$754.16)	\$8,251.35
2033	\$9,005.51	(\$706.16)	\$8,299.35
2034	\$9,005.51	(\$654.24)	\$8,351.28
2035	\$9,005.51	(\$598.86)	\$8,406.66

Single-family and multi-family residential fees will be charged on a per door basis. Nonresidential development will be charged on meter size as follows and fees are calculated by multiplying the meter ratio (as determined by the meter size) by the maximum fee per ERC as shown in Table 3 for the given year. These calculations represent the maximum impact fee that may be charged.

**TABLE 4: MAXIMUM FEES BY METER SIZE, 2026-2029**

Meter Size	Maximum Flow Rate (gpm)	ERCs	2026	2027	2028	2029
3/4	30	1.00	\$8,028.82	\$8,058.60	\$8,091.23	\$8,126.71
1	50	1.67	\$13,408.13	\$13,457.86	\$13,512.35	\$13,571.60
1 1/2	100	3.33	\$26,735.98	\$26,835.13	\$26,943.79	\$27,061.94
2	160	5.33	\$42,793.62	\$42,952.32	\$43,126.25	\$43,315.35
3	320	10.67	\$85,667.52	\$85,985.24	\$86,333.40	\$86,711.97
4	750	25.00	\$200,720.53	\$201,464.94	\$202,280.70	\$203,167.68
6	1600	53.33	\$428,177.04	\$429,765.01	\$431,505.19	\$433,397.30
8	2800	93.33	\$749,329.90	\$752,108.91	\$755,154.31	\$758,465.60

**TABLE 5: MAXIMUM FEES BY METER SIZE, 2030-2035**

Meter Size	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035
3/4"	\$8,165.04	\$8,206.76	\$8,251.35	\$8,299.35	\$8,351.28	\$8,406.66
1"	\$13,635.61	\$13,705.28	\$13,779.76	\$13,859.92	\$13,946.63	\$14,039.12
1 1/2"	\$27,189.57	\$27,328.50	\$27,477.01	\$27,636.85	\$27,809.75	\$27,994.17
2"	\$43,519.64	\$43,742.01	\$43,979.71	\$44,235.56	\$44,512.30	\$44,807.48
3"	\$87,120.93	\$87,566.09	\$88,041.94	\$88,554.12	\$89,108.11	\$89,699.03
4"	\$204,125.90	\$205,168.90	\$206,283.84	\$207,483.87	\$208,781.88	\$210,166.42
6"	\$435,441.37	\$437,666.29	\$440,044.68	\$442,604.60	\$445,373.51	\$448,327.01
8"	\$762,042.81	\$765,936.53	\$770,098.82	\$774,578.80	\$779,424.52	\$784,593.29

### **Non-Standard Demand Adjustments**

The City reserves the right under the Impact Fees Act (Utah Code Ann. § 11-36a-402(1)(c, d)) to assess an adjusted fee to respond to unusual circumstances and to ensure that the impact fees are assessed fairly. The impact fee ordinance should include a provision that permits adjustment of the fee for a development based upon studies and data submitted by the developer that indicate a more realistic and accurate impact on the City's infrastructure. The formula for 2026 would be:

$$(Maximum\ Flow\ Rate \div 30) \times \$8,028.82$$

Each year thereafter the maximum flow rate divided by 30 should be multiplied by the cost for a 3/4" meter as shown in Tables 4 and 5 for that year.

## CHAPTER 1: OVERVIEW OF THE WATER IMPACT FEES

### Summary

An impact fee is intended to recover the City's costs of supplying water capacity from new residential or non-residential development rather than passing these growth-related costs on to existing users through rates.

The Utah Impact Fees Act allows only certain costs to be included in an impact fee so that only the fair cost of expansionary projects or existing unused capacity paid by the City is assessed through an impact fee. Eligible costs include future projects, historic costs of existing assets that still have capacity available to serve growth, future or outstanding debt related to these eligible projects, and certain professional expenses related to planning for growth. Project improvements that only serve a specific development or subdivision cannot be included. System improvements that cure a deficiency or enhance the Level of Service (LOS) cannot be included without an appropriate credit.

The impact fee analysis provides documentation of a fair comparison, or rational nexus, between the impact fee charged to new development and the demands that new growth will have on the system.

### Costs to be Included in the Impact Fee

The impact fees proposed in this analysis are calculated based upon:

- Buy-In to existing excess capacity;
- New construction projects; and
- Professional and planning expenses related to the construction of system improvements that will serve new development.

The costs that cannot be included in the impact fee are as follows:

- Projects that cure system deficiencies for existing users;
- Projects that increase the level of service above that which is currently provided;
- Operations and maintenance costs;
- Costs of facilities funded by grants or other funds that the City does not have to repay;
- Interest costs related to outstanding or future bonds that have been issued to fund non-impact fee eligible projects such as repair and replacement and curing deficiency; and
- Costs of reconstruction of facilities that do not have capacity to serve new growth.

### Utah Code Legal Requirements

Utah law requires that entities prepare an Impact Fee Analysis (IFA) before enacting an impact fee. Utah law also requires that entities give notice of their intent to prepare and adopt an IFA. This IFA follows all legal requirements as outlined below. Zions Public Finance, Inc. (ZPFI) has been retained to prepare this IFA in accordance with legal requirements.

#### Notice of Intent to Prepare Impact Fee Analysis

A local political subdivision must provide written notice of its intent to prepare an IFA before preparing the Plan (Utah Code §11-36a-503). This notice must be posted on the Utah Public Notice website.

### Preparation of Impact Fee Analysis

Utah Code requires that each local political subdivision, before imposing an impact fee, prepare an impact fee analysis. (Utah Code 11-36a-304).

Section 11-36a-304 of the Utah Code outlines the requirements of an impact fee analysis:

- (1) An impact fee analysis shall:
  - (a) identify the anticipated impact on or consumption of any existing capacity of a public facility by the anticipated development activity;
  - (b) identify the anticipated impact on system improvements required by the anticipated development activity to maintain the established level of service for each public facility;
  - (c) demonstrate how the anticipated impacts described in subsections (1)(a) and (b) are reasonably related to the anticipated development activity;
  - (d) estimate the proportionate share of:
    - (i) the costs for existing capacity that will be recouped; and
    - (ii) the costs of impacts on system improvements that are reasonably related to the new development activity; and
  - (e) identify how the impact fee was calculated.
- (2) In analyzing whether or not the proportionate share of the costs of public facilities are reasonably related to the new development activity, the local political subdivision or private entity, as the case may be, shall identify, if applicable:
  - (a) the cost of each existing public facility that has excess capacity to serve the anticipated development resulting from the new development activity;
  - (b) the cost of system improvements for each public facility;
  - (c) other than impact fees, the manner of financing for each public facility, such as user charges, special assessments, bonded indebtedness, general taxes, or federal grants;
  - (d) the relative extent to which development activity will contribute to financing the excess capacity of and system improvements for each existing public facility, by such means as user charges, special assessments, or payment from the proceeds of general taxes;
  - (e) the relative extent to which development activity will contribute to the cost of existing public facilities and system improvements in the future;
  - (f) the extent to which the development activity is entitled to a credit against impact fees because the development activity will dedicate system improvements or public

facilities that will offset the demand for system improvements, inside or outside the proposed development;

- (g) extraordinary costs, if any, in servicing the newly-developed properties; and
- (h) the time-price differential inherent in fair comparisons of amounts paid at different times.

#### Certification of Impact Fee Analysis

Utah Code states that an Impact Fee Analysis shall include a written certification from the person or entity that prepares the Impact Fee Analysis. This certification is included at the conclusion of this analysis.

## CHAPTER 2: IMPACT FROM GROWTH UPON THE CITY'S FACILITIES AND LEVEL OF SERVICE

*Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(a)*

### Service Area

The service area includes all areas within the boundaries of the City for the purpose of calculating impact fees. Based on the Master Plan, it also assumes that the City would annex approximately 125 acres of land on the southeast side of the city and 20 acres around the Lees development.<sup>3</sup>

### Water Demand

The table below shows Equivalent Residential Connection (ERC) growth projections as contained in the Richmond City Water Master Plan dated July 2025.

**TABLE 6: GROWTH IN DEMAND**

Year	Population	ERCs
2025	3,268	1,095
2026	3,358	1,125
2027	3,450	1,156
2028	3,545	1,188
2029	3,643	1,221
2030	3,743	1,254
2031	3,846	1,289
2032	3,951	1,324
2033	4,060	1,360
2034	4,172	1,398
2035	4,286	1,436
<b>Growth, 2025-2035</b>	<b>1,018</b>	<b>341</b>

Source: Richmond Water Master Plan p. 3; ZPFI

### Existing and Proposed LOS Analysis

The City of Richmond has established a LOS for water source and storage as follows:

**TABLE 7: SERVICE LEVELS – SOURCE AND STORAGE**

Category	State Requirements
Average Yearly Demand	146,000 gal/yr/ERC
Indoor Peak Day Demand	800 gal/day/ERC
Outdoor Peak Day Demand	998 gal/day/ERC
Equalization Storage	400 gal/ERC
Fire Flow Storage	3,000 GPM for 3 hours
Emergency Storage	25% of peak day demand

<sup>3</sup> JUB Richmond Water Master Plan, p. 3.

Category	State Requirements
Source: Richmond Water Master Plan, p. 5	

**TABLE 8: SERVICE LEVELS – DISTRIBUTION**

Category	Flow Requirements	Pressure Requirements
Peak Day Demand	1,092 GPM	40 psi
Peak Hour Demand	1,638 GPM	30 psi
Residential Fire Flow	1,500 GPM	20 psi
Commercial Fire Flow	3,000 GPM	20 psi
Source: Richmond Water Master Plan, p. 5		

## CHAPTER 3: IMPACT ON CAPACITY FROM DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

*Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(b)(c)*

### Excess Capacity

The Master Plan identifies excess capacity in the source and storage systems that will be consumed by new development between 2025 and 2035.

**TABLE 9: EXCESS SOURCE CAPACITY CONSUMPTION**

Source	Amount
Source Cost	\$508,245
Total GPM Capacity	1,644
2025 GPM Used	1,367
Available GPM Capacity 2025	276.8
GPM per ERC	1.25
Additional GPM Capacity Needed, 2025-2035	426.09

**TABLE 10: EXCESS STORAGE CAPACITY CONSUMPTION**

Storage	Amount
Storage Cost	\$3,960,942
Total Storage Capacity - gals	3,000,000
2025 Storage Usage - gals	2,015,929
Available Capacity 2025 - gals	984,071
LOS per ERC - gals	1,841
Gallons Required, 2025-2035 to Maintain Service Levels	628,266

## CHAPTER 4: SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS REQUIRED FROM DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

*Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(b)(c)*

### Future 10-Year Water Capital Projects

The Water Master Plan identifies four new capital improvement projects required over the next 10 years at a cost of \$9,350,000. Only \$2,082,720 is attributable to new development over the next 10 years, with \$826,080 that will benefit existing development.<sup>4</sup>

**TABLE 11: NEW CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS**

Project #	Project Type	Project Location	Year	Estimated Cost	Cost to New Development - 10 Yrs	Cost to Existing
1	New 500 gpm Well	South of 400 South and east of State Street	2025-2027	\$4,300,000	\$1,358,800	\$0
2	New 8" PRV	600 South east of State Street	2025-2027	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$0
3	New 1 Million Gallon Tank with PRVs	East of the south side of the city	2027-2030	\$3,500,000	\$0	\$0
4	Create Lower Pressure Zone	West of 200 West	2030-2032	\$1,200,000	\$373,920	\$826,080
				<b>\$9,350,000</b>	<b>\$2,082,720</b>	<b>\$826,080</b>

Source: Richmond Water Master Plan, p. 13

<sup>4</sup> Richmond Water Master Plan, p. 13

## CHAPTER 5: PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS

The Impact Fees Act requires the Impact Fee Analysis to estimate the proportionate share of the capital costs attributable to new development over the next 10 years. The calculated fees include buy-in costs for excess capacity, new improvements, consulting costs, and credits for fund balances, projects that cure existing deficiencies and for the outstanding Series 2012 bond.

### Maximum Legal Water Impact Fee per ERC

#### Existing Excess Capacity

The Master Plan identifies excess capacity in both the source and storage systems. There is excess of 276.8 gpm in source capacity. New development will require an additional 426.09 gpm by 2035. Therefore, all of the excess capacity will be consumed during the timeframe of this study.

TABLE 12: EXCESS CAPACITY PROPORTIONATE SHARE CALCULATION – SOURCE

Source Proportionate Share	Amount
Source Cost	\$508,245
Total GPM Capacity	1,644
2025 GPM Used	1,367
Available GPM Capacity 2025	276.8
GPM per ERC	1.25
Additional Capacity Needed, 2025-2035	426.09
% of Capacity Available	16.8%
Cost to New Development, 2025-2035	\$85,573.05
Growth in ERCs, 2025-2035	341
<b>Cost per ERC</b>	<b>\$250.76</b>

There is 984,071 gallons of excess capacity in storage. New development will require an additional 628,266 gallons of this capacity by 2035. Therefore, some excess storage capacity will remain after 2035.

TABLE 13: EXCESS CAPACITY PROPORTIONATE SHARE CALCULATION – STORAGE

Storage	Amount
Storage Cost	\$3,960,942
Total Storage Capacity - gals	3,000,000
2025 Storage Usage - gals	2,015,929
Available Capacity 2025 - gals	984,071
LOS per ERC - gals	1,841
Gallons Required, 2025-2035 to Maintain Service Levels	628,266
Cost per Gallon	\$1.32
Cost Required, 2025-2035	\$829,508.95
Growth in ERCs, 2025-2035	341
<b>Cost per ERC</b>	<b>\$2,430.74</b>

### New Construction Costs

The Master Plan shows total new construction costs of \$2,082,720 serving 341 ERCs over the next 10 years.<sup>5</sup>

TABLE 14: PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS-NEW CONSTRUCTION COST

New Improvements	Amount
Cost to New Development 10 Yrs	\$2,082,720
Growth in ERCs, 2025-2035	341
<b>Cost per ERC</b>	<b>\$6,103.07</b>

### Consultant Fees

The Impact Fees Act allows for fees charged to include the reimbursement of engineering and consultant costs incurred in the preparation of the Master Plan and IFA.

TABLE 15: PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS – CONSULTANT FEES

Consultant Cost	Amount
Total Consultant Cost	\$75,400
Growth in ERCs 2025-2035	341
<b>Cost per ERC</b>	<b>\$220.95</b>

### Summary of Impact Fee

The impact fee calculation is shown in the table below and results in a gross cost per ERC, or residential unit.

TABLE 16: PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS – GROSS FEE CALCULATION

Excess Capacity - Source	\$250.76
Excess Capacity - Storage	\$2,430.74
New Improvements	\$6,103.07
Consultant Costs	\$220.95
Fund Balance Credit	\$0.00
<b>Gross Fee per ERC Before Credits</b>	<b>\$9,005.51</b>

Credits must be made for future projects that will benefit existing development so that new development does not pay twice. There is a total of \$826,080 of new projects that will benefit existing development. There is also the outstanding Series 2012 bond for which credits must be made. A

portion of these costs can be offset with the existing fund balance of \$1,175,139.42.<sup>6</sup> These credits are subtracted from the gross fee shown in Table 16.<sup>7</sup>

**TABLE 17: CREDITS ON SERIES 2012 BOND**

Year	Principal	Existing Portion	ERCs	Payment per ERC	NPV*
2026	\$154,000	\$82,951.45	1,125	\$73.73	\$976.69
2027	\$160,000	\$86,983.31	1,156	\$75.24	\$946.91
2028	\$166,000	\$91,015.16	1,188	\$76.62	\$914.28
2029	\$172,000	\$95,047.02	1,221	\$77.87	\$878.80
2030	\$179,000	\$99,750.86	1,254	\$79.54	\$840.48
2031	\$185,000	\$103,782.71	1,289	\$80.54	\$798.76
2032	\$192,000	\$108,486.55	1,324	\$81.94	\$754.16
2033	\$200,000	\$113,862.36	1,360	\$83.70	\$706.16
2034	\$207,000	\$118,566.19	1,398	\$84.82	\$654.24
2035	\$215,000	\$123,942.00	1,436	\$86.30	\$598.86
2036	\$223,000	\$129,317.82	1,476	\$87.63	\$539.51
2037	\$231,000	\$134,693.63	1,516	\$88.83	\$476.16
2038	\$240,000	\$140,741.41	1,558	\$90.33	\$408.76
2039	\$249,000	\$146,789.20	1,601	\$91.69	\$336.82
2040	\$258,000	\$152,836.99	1,645	\$92.92	\$260.28
2041	\$268,000	\$159,556.75	1,690	\$94.40	\$179.08
2042	\$281,000	\$168,292.44	1,737	\$96.91	\$92.73

\*NPV = net present value discounted at 4.5 percent

The bond credits are then subtracted from the gross fee to arrive at the maximum fee per ERC each year.

**TABLE 18: PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS – MAXIMUM FEES PER ERC**

Year	Gross Fee	Credit for Bond	Maximum Fee per ERC
2026	\$9,005.51	(\$976.69)	\$8,028.82
2027	\$9,005.51	(\$946.91)	\$8,058.60
2028	\$9,005.51	(\$914.28)	\$8,091.23
2029	\$9,005.51	(\$878.80)	\$8,126.71
2030	\$9,005.51	(\$840.48)	\$8,165.04
2031	\$9,005.51	(\$798.76)	\$8,206.76
2032	\$9,005.51	(\$754.16)	\$8,251.35
2033	\$9,005.51	(\$706.16)	\$8,299.35
2034	\$9,005.51	(\$654.24)	\$8,351.28
2035	\$9,005.51	(\$598.86)	\$8,406.66

<sup>6</sup> The fund balance has been used to offset the projects that partially benefit existing development (\$826,000) leaving \$349,059.42 to offset a portion of future bond payments.

<sup>7</sup> The remaining fund balance of \$349,059.42 is spread over the 17 years remaining for the bond.

Single-family and multi-family residential fees will be charged on a per-door basis. Nonresidential development will be charged on meter size as follows and fees are calculated by multiplying the meter ratio (as determined by the meter size) by the maximum fee per ERC as shown in Table 18 for the given year. These calculations represent the maximum impact fee that may be charged.

**TABLE 19: MAXIMUM FEES BY METER SIZE, 2026-2029**

Meter Size	Maximum Flow Rate (gpm)	ERCs	2026	2027	2028	2029
3/4	30	1.00	\$8,028.82	\$8,058.60	\$8,091.23	\$8,126.71
1	50	1.67	\$13,408.13	\$13,457.86	\$13,512.35	\$13,571.60
1 1/2	100	3.33	\$26,735.98	\$26,835.13	\$26,943.79	\$27,061.94
2	160	5.33	\$42,793.62	\$42,952.32	\$43,126.25	\$43,315.35
3	320	10.67	\$85,667.52	\$85,985.24	\$86,333.40	\$86,711.97
4	750	25.00	\$200,720.53	\$201,464.94	\$202,280.70	\$203,167.68
6	1600	53.33	\$428,177.04	\$429,765.01	\$431,505.19	\$433,397.30
8	2800	93.33	\$749,329.90	\$752,108.91	\$755,154.31	\$758,465.60

**TABLE 20: MAXIMUM FEES BY METER SIZE, 2030-2035**

Meter Size	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035
3/4"	\$8,165.04	\$8,206.76	\$8,251.35	\$8,299.35	\$8,351.28	\$8,406.66
1"	\$13,635.61	\$13,705.28	\$13,779.76	\$13,859.92	\$13,946.63	\$14,039.12
1 1/2"	\$27,189.57	\$27,328.50	\$27,477.01	\$27,636.85	\$27,809.75	\$27,994.17
2"	\$43,519.64	\$43,742.01	\$43,979.71	\$44,235.56	\$44,512.30	\$44,807.48
3"	\$87,120.93	\$87,566.09	\$88,041.94	\$88,554.12	\$89,108.11	\$89,699.03
4"	\$204,125.90	\$205,168.90	\$206,283.84	\$207,483.87	\$208,781.88	\$210,166.42
6"	\$435,441.37	\$437,666.29	\$440,044.68	\$442,604.60	\$445,373.51	\$448,327.01
8"	\$762,042.81	\$765,936.53	\$770,098.82	\$774,578.80	\$779,424.52	\$784,593.29

### Non-Standard Demand Adjustments

The City reserves the right under the Impact Fees Act (Utah Code Ann. § 11-36a-402(1)(c, d)) to assess an adjusted fee to respond to unusual circumstances and to ensure that the impact fees are assessed fairly. The impact fee ordinance should include a provision that permits adjustment of the fee for a development based upon studies and data submitted by the developer that indicate a more realistic and accurate impact on the City's infrastructure. The formula for 2026 would be:

$$(\text{Maximum Flow Rate} \div 30) \times \$8,028.82$$

Each year thereafter the maximum flow rate divided by 30 should be multiplied by the cost for a 3/4" meter as shown in Tables 4 and 5 for that year.

## CERTIFICATION

---

Zions Public Finance, Inc. certifies that the attached impact fee analysis:

1. includes only the cost of public facilities that are:
  - a. allowed under the Impact Fees Act; and
  - b. actually incurred; or
  - c. projected to be incurred or encumbered within six years after the day on which each impact fee is paid;
  
2. does not include:
  - a. costs of operation and maintenance of public facilities; or
  - b. cost for qualifying public facilities that will raise the level of service for the facilities, through impact fees, above the level of service that is supported by existing residents;
  
3. offset costs with grants or other alternate sources of payment; and
  
4. complies in each and every relevant respect with the Impact Fees Act.

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION  
ORDINANCE 2026-08**

WHEREAS, the City Council of Richmond has the responsibility for the general welfare of the City; and

WHEREAS, such responsibility includes but is not limited to, establishment of best management practices; and

WHEREAS, management practices may evolve over the passage of time:

NOW THEREFORE, the City Council of Richmond City, County of Cache, State of Utah, hereby adopts, passes and publishes the following:

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE RICHMOND CITY MANUAL OF DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS, CHAPTER 6.0 “IRRIGATION WATER DESIGN”, SECTION 6.01 “GENERAL”.**

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF RICHMOND CITY, CACHE COUNTY, UTAH AS FOLLOWS:

1. Sections shall be amended such that the **highlighted** areas below shall be added and the ~~strikeout~~ areas shall be deleted.

<b>6.0 IRRIGATION WATER DESIGN</b>
------------------------------------

<b>6.01 General</b>
---------------------

- A. The Richmond Irrigation & Power Company is the majority owner and operator of both canal/ditch and larger sized pressurized (secondary) irrigation water within Richmond City. The majority of smaller laterals are owned and operated by the Richmond Irrigation & Power Company or private parties. Richmond City owns and operates smaller laterals and meters where said improvements are required as a condition of development.
- B. Richmond Irrigation & Power Company Infrastructure
  - a. All design and construction must comply with the requirements and standards of Richmond Irrigation & Power Company and Richmond City.
  - b. Existing irrigation ditches or canals, of significant flow, must either be piped or fenced on both sides when adjacent to or contained within property to be developed. Unobstructed easements of sufficient width, no less than ten (10) feet in width, to allow maintenance and replacement shall be required.
- C. Richmond City Irrigation Infrastructure

- a. A secondary irrigation system shall be constructed in all subdivisions and dedicated to the City.
- b. One (1) share of water (four (4) acre feet) per platted acre shall be required. Only certificates of shares of capital stock, from an irrigation company operating within the corporate limits of Richmond City, in the name of Richmond City will be considered as a means of satisfying the requirement for four acre-feet (on a normal year) of usable water.
- c. Laterals and services shall be constructed in a manner similar to culinary water mainlines, ~~including meter setters and barrels at each property to be served.~~ An isolation valve and flowmeter shall be furnished and installed by the developer, at the point of connection to the Richmond Irrigation & Power Company mainline(s).
- d. Laterals shall be sized by the developer's engineer, so as to provide adequate service to property(s) but shall be no less than four (4) inches in diameter. ~~Service lines shall be no less than one (1) inch (IPS) in diameter.~~ Designs shall be reviewed and approved by the City.

D. All Irrigation Infrastructure, Whether Publicly or Privately Owned

- e. Clearance between other utilities shall be at least eighteen (18) inches. Closer tolerances require reinforcement concrete cradle or separation. Reinforcement shall be as per the current specifications.
- f. Covers over utilities and between railroad tracks or roadways shall be sufficient to adequately protect such utilities from potential loading of track or roadway either during construction or final finished surface. If cover is insufficient to adequately protect utility, encasement or casings shall be provided to protect affected utility.
- g. New lines must be buried with magnetic locator tape and be shown accurately on drawings given to the City.
- h. New and/or replacement/relocated main lines ( four-inch (4") and larger) shall be purple in color no matter the original color and have a minimum pressure rating as required by the irrigation company or City but no less than 200 psi.
- i. Easements per Section 9 of these standards shall be required. Easements shall be no less than ten (10) feet in width. No buildings, utilities or structures shall be erected or constructed within such easements as to interfere with the activities necessary to properly access and maintain or replace such lines or water structures.

2. Should any section, clause, or provision of this Ordinance be declared by a court of competent

jurisdiction to be invalid, in whole or in part, the same shall not affect the validity of the Ordinance as whole, or any other part thereof.

3. All ordinances, and the chapter, clauses, sections, or parts thereof in conflict with provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed, but only insofar as is specifically provided for herein.
4. This ordinance shall become effective after the required public hearing and upon its posting as required by law.

THIS ORDINANCE shall be attached as an amendment to the Richmond City Municipal Code above referred to.

ADOPTED AND PASSED by the Richmond City Council on this 21st day of July, 2026.

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey D. Young, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder