

NOTICE AND AGENDA

Notice is hereby given that the Millville City Council will hold its regularly scheduled Council Meeting on Thursday, April 9, 2026, at the Millville City Office, 510 East 300 South in Millville, Utah, at 7:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order / Roll Call – Mayor Hair
2. Opening Remarks / Pledge of Allegiance – Councilmember Ripplinger
3. Approval of agenda
4. Approval of minutes of the last City Council Meeting – March 12, 2026
5. Agenda Items—
 - A. Public comment period (2 min/person)
 - B. Cache County Sheriff report – Sheriff Chad Jensen
 - C. Consideration of resolution accepting the updated Law Enforcement Agreement – Councilmember Ames
 - D. Connect (Cache Valley Transit District) Report – Board Member Lieren Hansen
 - E. Request for removal of utility bill late fees – Callie Hanks
 - F. Selection of two planning commissioners to serve on Planning & Zoning – Mayor Hair
 - G. Consideration of ordinance updating residential zoning code and the addition of a 1-acre minimum lot size zone – Development Coordinator Everton
 - H. Consideration of ordinance placing moratorium on zone changes until a new General Plan has been completed – Recorder Twedt
 - I. Discussion on fire protection service costs and changes – Councilmember Ames
 - J. Review of utility bill adjustments made in FY2026 Q3 – Treasurer Dyer
 - K. Review of Budget through FY2026 Q3 – Recorder Twedt
 - L. Tennis court lights – Steffanie and Quentin Casperson
 - M. City Reports: Roads, Parks, Water – Public Works Director Kendrick
 - N. Councilmember reports and other items for future agendas
6. Adjournment.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during public meetings should notify Corey Twedt at (435) 881-2669 at least three days prior to the meeting.

The Millville City Council may enter into a closed session as allowed by Utah Code 52-4-205 to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation, to discuss the individual character, professional competence, or health of an individual, or to discuss land acquisition or the sale of real property.

This agenda was posted on April 4, 2026, to the City posting locations, the City Website, and the Utah Public Meeting Notices Website.



Corey Twedt, Recorder

MILLVILLE CITY COUNCIL MEETING
City Hall – 510 East 300 South – Millville, Utah
March 12, 2026

PRESENT: David Hair, Pamela June, Ryan Zollinger, Jeremy Ward, Darcy Ripplinger, Jacob Ames, Chad Kendrick, Corey Twedt, Megan Dyer, Kyle Scott, Cindy Scott, Dean Stevens, Megan Vincent, Robert G. Scheppard, Jeff Gibson, Jean Culbertson, Matthew Anderson, Kim Ashcroft, Peter Thatcher, Celeste Thatcher, Jim Christensen, Guy Curtis, Brad Brown, Robert Carpenter, Bonnie Farmer, Susan Goldsberry, Roberta Black, Tanya McCormick, Scott Robison, Leslie Robison, Morgan Davis, Linda Crosby, April Swenson, Camie Raymond, Ken Hamilton, Bob Humphreys, Donna Jean Humphreys, Tim Rodebush, Luann Pehrson, Mary Jo Davis, Lisa Aedo, Lynette Dickey, Aubrey Holdaway, Adam Bagley

Call to Order/Roll Call

Mayor David Hair called the City Council Meeting to order for February 12, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. The roll call indicated Mayor David Hair and Councilmembers Jeremy Ward, Ryan Zollinger, Darcy Ripplinger, and Jacob Ames were in attendance at the Millville City Office and Councilmember Pam June attended by phone.

Opening remarks

Councilmember Ward welcomed everyone to the Council Meeting and offered a word of pray. He then turned the time over to Skipper Dean Stevens and the Sea Scouts.

Pledge of Allegiance by Sea Scout Ship 716

The Sea Scouts presented the flag and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Approval of agenda

The agenda for the City Council Meeting of March 12, 2026, was reviewed.

Councilmember Ames motioned to approve the agenda for March 12, 2026.

Councilmember Zollinger seconded. Councilmembers Ward, June, Ripplinger, Zollinger, and Ames voted yes. (A copy of the agenda is included as Attachment “A”.)

Approval of minutes of the previous meeting

The Council reviewed the minutes of the City Council Meeting on January 8, 2026.

Councilmember Ames motioned to approve the minutes for February 12, 2026.

Councilmember Ripplinger seconded. Councilmember June pointed out a correction in the minutes that was fixed during the meeting. Councilmembers Ward, June, Ripplinger, Zollinger, and Ames voted yes.

City Holiday Flag Service with Sea Scout Ship 716

Sea Scout Skipper Dean Stevens turned the time over to Bosun Mate Megan Vincent. Megan addressed the City Council and thanked them for allowing the Sea Scouts to provide the holiday flag service to the community in the past. She said that the Sea Scouts would like to continue the service for another year, which would include putting up eight flags spread around both Millville roundabouts for ten different flag holidays/events throughout the year. The cost would be the same as it was last year. Megan explained that the funds collected from the flag fundraiser are used to help pay for the Sea Scout activities, including the trip to California, where they would sail on the Matthew Turner in the San Francisco Bay.

Councilmember Zollinger said that he appreciates the service from the Sea Scouts and enjoys seeing the flags in the roundabouts each holiday.

Councilmember Zollinger motioned to approve the request from the Sea Scouts to pay for the flags to be hung in the roundabouts again this year. Councilmember Ward seconded. Councilmembers Ward, June, Ripplinger, Zollinger, and Ames voted yes. (A copy of the fundraiser handout from the Sea Scouts is included as Attachment "B".)

Consideration of resolution accepting the Steward Land Company Zone Change Request from Agricultural (A) to mixed Residential (R-1) / Residential (R-2). 35-acre parcel 03-035-0037 at approximately 400 South between 100 East and 200 East

Mayor Hair introduced Brad Brown, the representative from Steward Land Company, and asked him to discuss the zone change being requested. Brad said that they have tried to listen to the comments from the previous request at the end of last year. They are trying to make this work, although they realize that they won't be able to make everyone happy. They know that some people want large lots, but as a developer, they need to do something that works for them as well. They see that Millville is special. They want to try to work with the Council to make something work.

Councilmember Ames said that there have been a lot of the comments made about issues with the water, sewer, and stormwater infrastructure. He said that he wants to briefly explain more about how the process works. During the rezone process, an application is submitted, and the City Council is supposed to determine if the requested zone would be a good fit for the City in that location. This is just a selection for the type of zoning.

Later, if a subdivision is requested, the City requires that the developer goes through the full review process. This includes engineering and environmental reviews and traffic studies if needed for the requested development. Many of the infrastructure questions that have come up regarding this request are not resolved or studied at the time of a zone change. They are done later during the subdivision development process.

Councilmember June said that when this was last reviewed back in November, there was discussion that the ideal development in this area would have a range of lot sizes from 1/3 acre up to 2 acres. She has spoken with a realtor about a development in Hyrum that does

something similar with lot sizes getting progressively larger to try and preserve the agricultural feel. Councilmember June said that in her opinion, something like that would be ideal for this end of the City. She doesn't think that this area is ready for the amount of development that would come if the proposed zoning were approved. She also pointed out that the Planning Commission recommended not approving the zone change and there is still code in place indicating that all subdivisions shall conform to and be in harmony with the General Plan.

Mayor Hair said that he just wanted to clarify something about the water. A lack of enough water keeps coming up and was even recently posted in the local newspaper. This is incorrect. Millville City does have the water to support growth.

Councilmember Ward said that he has spent a lot of time thinking about this and it has been weighing on him. This is a big deal, so he has been making calls to try and learn as much as possible. Most of the City is already 1/3-acre lots. As mentioned last time this property was discussed, he grew up in a small town in Idaho. No one can live there anymore, because decisions were made, pricing everyone out. Councilmember Ward said that he would like to work with a developer that is willing to work with the City and he feels like this developer would be willing to work with the City. He said that if they aren't careful, the City won't be able to play a role in the decisions that happen with the development there. Councilmember Ward said that he would rather work with this developer to figure out a plan that will benefit the City. He loves Millville and how safe it is here. He wants to preserve that and thinks that if the Council is not proactive, they may lose that opportunity.

Councilmember Zollinger said that first, he would like to address the letter sent from someone in the South Fields stating that he has a conflict of interest because his father has a piece of property in the vicinity of the land being discussed for rezone tonight. He read from the City Conflict of Interest Policy. Councilmember Zollinger said that this is not a conflict of interest. He is focused on the best interests for Millville City and is planning to participate in this conversation as is part of his role as a member of the City Council.

Councilmember Zollinger said that he doesn't think things have changed much since the last time this property was discussed. In November, the City Council asked for some time to work through an update to the General Plan. He doesn't think a development that drives a wedge in a community is a good thing. He doesn't feel much different than he did last time. Councilmember Zollinger appreciates the effort to add some larger lots, but he doesn't think this is what is best for the city right now.

Councilmember Ames said that he has gone back and forth on this proposed zone change. There are a lot of good things that could come from a subdivision that would result from the proposed zone change. He has heard a lot of people stating that allowing this subdivision with 1/3-acre lots would change the nature of Millville. He disagrees as the majority of the north side of the City has 1/3-acre lots. Councilmember Ames said that if this property were to be developed with 1/3-acre lots, he thinks it would be fine, but he

also likes the idea of having a diversity of lot sizes throughout the City. He likes the idea of preserving some agricultural land on the south side of Millville.

Councilmember Ripplinger said that the Council has asked for some time to prepare some things. They are working on finding funding to update the General Plan. They are working on adding a new 1-acre residential zone. She doesn't think this request is very different from the last time.

Councilmember June motioned to deny the rezone request. Councilmember Ripplinger seconded. Councilmembers June, Ripplinger, Ames, and Zollinger voted yes. Councilmember Ward voted no. (A copy of the related staff report is included as Attachment "C".)

Mayor Hair recommended that at the next meeting, the Council consider placing a moratorium on zone change requests until the City has completed an update to the General Plan.

Councilmember June left the meeting at this time.

Consideration of resolution updating fees for zone change requests

Recorder Twedt said that the City puts fees in place to cover the costs of development-related actions to ensure that the developer is paying the cost for their land use decisions, and those costs don't need to be covered with City funds.

The costs for zone change requests have increased over time. Those costs escalate with larger zone change applications. Recorder Twedt pointed out that Millville should have fewer zone change requests going forward since zone selection can now be done at the time of annexation and additional zone changes are not required after moving property into the City.

It was discussed that the delineation in costs proposed in the resolution was not tied to the difference between a minor and major subdivision. With larger zone change requests, there is just more work and more public interest. This results in additional costs that are not being captured with the current fee structure.

Councilmember Ames said that he was leaning more to a model like Hyde Park uses where there is a flat fee plus costs. Recorder Twedt said that this is what we do with subdivisions, and it has some issues. We could use that type of cost structure to bill for legal or engineering fees, if they are needed. It could also be used to charge for the cost of renting time at a school for a larger public hearing. It would be hard to bill for the additional time spent by staff. We could potentially bill for the cost of updating the zoning map, but that happens later in the process. Recorder Twedt said that the issue that we often run into is collecting those fees. It is much easier to bill up front, before work has begun on an

application than it is to try and get money after the application has gone through the process. Especially if that application was denied.

Councilmember Ward motioned to adopt Resolution 2026-2. Councilmember Zollinger seconded. Councilmembers Ward, Ames, Ripplinger, and Zollinger voted yes with Councilmember June excused. (A copy of the adopted resolution is included as Attachment “D”).

Consideration for fencing Millville City owned parcel 03-037-0025 to allow animal grazing to reduce fire risk

Councilmember Ripplinger said that she sees value in the City fencing off this parcel to allow for grazing to reduce the fuel for potential fires on the hillside near the homes. She discussed the quote the City had received from a fence vendor and said she feels like the fence would be worth the cost as there have been fires in this area before.

It was discussed that there were two different quotes. One that would allow for horses to graze the property and the other that would work with goats. Councilmember Ripplinger said that she thinks horses would be better for this property. There is a balance between grazing to reduce fire risks and overgrazing that would create drainage problems.

Recorder Twedt said that this project had been discussed about a year ago, but it hadn't been authorized because of the cost. At that time, there was a secondary benefit, in addition to reducing the fire risk. The wildfire agreement that the City has with the Utah Department of Natural Resources in the past has required some financial commitment from the City. The costs of installing this fence would have met the financial commitment requirements of the wildfire agreement, but the City no longer has a financial obligation tied to that agreement, so that is no longer an added benefit.

Councilmember Ames said that he is worried about property management. Who is responsible to make sure that it isn't overgrazed? What happens if a horse gets out? How would we determine who would use it for grazing? Recorder Twedt said that the City fence would tie into the fence of the neighboring property to the north. They had made the request previously to put their horses on this parcel, so they should be able to have their horses graze there if they are interested in doing so. We would want some kind of memo of understanding to work through the other things.

Councilmember Zollinger asked where the money would come from. Recorder Twedt discussed the FY26 budget and two budget line items that could be used to cover nearly all the costs for the installation of this fence if the Council wants to put one in.

Councilmember Ames asked where the location of the access would be. Councilmember Ripplinger said that there would be access from the west near the road. Recorder Twedt said that the quote also included an access on the east side in case fire fighting vehicles needed to get through the property to get closer to the hillside.

Luann Pehrson said that she thinks the cost of the fence would be minimal compared to the potential loss of a house to a fire in that area. She wishes Rocky Mountain Power would also do something to mitigate risk on the parcels they own.

Councilmember Ames motioned to approve the installation of a horse fence around the City-owned property at the amount listed in the quote received. Councilmember Ripplinger seconded.

Councilmember Ward asked how this fence would have affected the fire that happened last year. Director Kendrick said that this wouldn't have helped with previous fires. Councilmember Ward said that this would just act as a fire break. Councilmember Ripplinger said that the City owns the parcel and they should take care of it.

Councilmember Zollinger said that he compares this to some of the other requests that the City receives for the expenditure of funds. He doesn't discount that this would help to some extent with fire mitigation and that the City should be a good steward over the property they own, but this is a lot of money and Millville is a small community. He just wants to consider if this is the best use of Millville funds.

Councilmembers Ripplinger, Ames, and Ward voted yes. Councilmember Zollinger voted no. Councilmember June was excused.

Scott Robison said that he has familiarity with some grants that would be available for this type of project. Councilmember Ripplinger said that she would talk to Scott and then look into the grant funding.

Consideration for the purchase of a used sewer vac truck from Providence

Public Works Director Chad Kendrick said that with the new sewer collection system in town, Millville will eventually need some kind of vac truck. A pull-behind trailer vac truck generally costs around \$150,000. Full vac trucks cost many multiples of that.

Providence City has recently purchased a new vac truck and has offered to sell Millville there old one for a great price. Mayor Hair said that he agreed that this was a great price for that piece of equipment and that he knows people right now that would likely pay double the price that is being offered to Millville City.

The Council and Director Kendrick discussed several uses of a vac truck and about this particular truck from Providence City.

Councilmember Ward motioned that the City purchase the vac truck from Providence City. Councilmember Ames seconded. Councilmembers Ward, Ames, Ripplinger, and Zollinger voted yes with Councilmember June excused.

Consideration for Millville City library survey

Mayor Hair said that there are several conversations going back and forth regarding the future of the Cache County Library in Providence. Nibley has contracted with Hyrum for use of their library for a long time. They may be interested in participating in funding the library in Providence instead of the library in Hyrum.

Recorder Twedt said that after the discussion about the library at the last meeting, he wanted to make sure the Council was okay with a library survey being created and sent out before working on it.

It was discussed that this was difficult since we don't currently have exact numbers or know what it would cost the City. Councilmember Zollinger said that if they see the library as a value to Millville City, they should send out the survey. If there isn't a perceived value, we shouldn't send out a survey.

Mayor Hair said that access to other libraries for programs is permitted without a library card. You just aren't able to check out books.

The benefit of online content from libraries was discussed. Councilmember Ripplinger said that Libby wait times are similar between the Providence County Library and the Hyrum Library, but the selection is better with Hyrum.

Councilmember Ward said that if a survey is sent, he would like it to clearly represent the costs to residents for access to the library in Providence. He also wants to make sure that the City receives enough of a response to a survey to justify making financial decisions for all Millville City residents based on the results.

The consensus from the Council was to have Recorder Twedt make up a survey specific to Millville City residents. The Council asked that the draft survey be sent to them for approval before it is made available to the public.

City Reports

Director of Public Works Chad Kendrick said that things are going well for Public Works. With the warm weather, all of pickleball and tennis courts are now open. The park bathrooms are also open. There are some potholes appearing on the roads that Public Works is fixing as soon as they can after finding out about them. He asked the Council to let him know if they are seeing road issues. The City will begin sharing the Garr Springs water again soon and will be turning on the City wells. Lots of homeowner sewer lateral connections are underway or complete. The sewer is flowing and the lift station is working without any issues.

Councilmember Ward asked if there had been issues with the sewer lateral contractors. Director Kendrick said that things are going good and there are some good crews working in Millville.

Mayor Hair asked Director Kendrick to let him know when he finds out about people that need help with the clean-up of their yards after installing their sewer lateral. Treasurer Dyer said that she has a few names on a list that she will share with Mayor Hair.

Councilmember Ripplinger said that she would like to request that the pickleball lights not be available this early in the year as they affect her home. She said that she thought it was still pretty cold for pickleball. She suggested the lights be available to the public from April through October. Councilmember Zollinger said that it was important to him to be a good neighbor to the homes that live near the park. The Councilmember consensus was to wait until April 1st to turn on the lights this year and then they could discuss later in the year when the lights should be turned off for winter.

Councilmember Reports and Items for Future Agendas

(A copy of the Councilmember Assignments List is included with the minutes as Attachment "E".)

Councilmember Ward said that he thinks the Millville City Youth Council is doing a great job. He said they had an amazing dinner for Millville City veterans. The Youth Council has attended a banquet, and youth council conference at Utah State University, as well as an activity at Bear Lake. He said that the youth are really impressive. The Youth Council is looking for service project ideas.

Councilmember Ward said that he is hearing about a lot of speeding issues. The speed display signs were briefly discussed.

Councilmember Zollinger asked about the status of the grant application submitted to help pay for the creation of a new General Plan. Recorder Twedt said that the grant application indicated that awards would be announced in March and April and then funding would be available in July.

Councilmember Ames said that it was kind of strange that Millville City owns the parcel discussed earlier in the meeting and that it is in the County and not in Millville City. Recorder Twedt said that he had looked at that in the past. Since the City isn't doing anything with that parcel, he hasn't been able to think of any good reason to pay the expense the County charges to move it into Millville City. Also, annexing this parcel would result in the City taking more of the County road going towards Millville Canyon.

Councilmember Ripplinger said that she would be meeting with Jill Gebert next week to begin the planning process for the City Celebration.

Mayor Hair said that he would like to have the Council consider a moratorium on zone changes outside of what is in the current General Plan until the City is able to complete a new General Plan.

Adjournment

Councilmember Ward motioned to adjourn the meeting. Councilmember Zollinger seconded. Councilmembers Ward, Ames, Ripplinger, and Zollinger voted yes with Councilmember June excused. The meeting adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

DRAFT



AGENDA REPORT: LAW ENFORCEMENT CONTRACT

April 9, 2026

Background

Every year, the Cache County Sheriff or a representative comes to the Millville City Council to discuss law enforcement within Millville City as well as the updated contract for law enforcement for the upcoming fiscal year. Sheriff Jensen is planning to attend this meeting to talk to the City Council.

Over the past four years, Millville City has seen increases in costs for law enforcement as the City has been charged for a better representation of the law enforcement hours actually worked in the City. Sheriff Jensen is now seeking to increase the pay per hour for what is charged to Millville City.

The new proposed contract from the Sheriff's Department would set costs for the next three years (FY27 – FY29).

Here is a breakdown of the Millville law enforcement costs from FY22 – FY26 and the proposed costs from the new contract through FY29 (highlighted):

FY22 = \$22,929	FY27 = \$39,840
FY23 = \$26,175	FY28 = \$42,496
FY24 = \$28,792	FY29 = \$45,152
FY25 = \$33,085	
FY26 = \$35,392	

Tonight, the Council will hear from Sheriff Jensen and discuss any concerns they have with law enforcement services or with the new proposed law enforcement contract. The City Council will also consider accepting the new contract through a resolution.

Included Documents

- Letter about new contract from Sheriff Jensen
- Resolution 2026-2 including the new proposed law enforcement contract



CACHE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

D. CHAD JENSEN, SHERIFF
Doyle Peck, Lieutenant
Mikelshan Bartschi, Lieutenant
Roy Hall, Lieutenant
Candice Hatch, Lieutenant
Timothy Ramirez, Lieutenant

EMPATHY FAIRNESS INTEGRITY PROFESSIONALISM RESPECT RESPONSIBILITY TRUSTWORTHINESS

Dear Mayor Hair,

As we begin discussions on the Law Enforcement contracts for this year, we want to thank all our cities for agreeing to last year's one-year contract addendum.

For the past four years, we have worked to match the contracted hours with the hours actually provided. During this time, I have not asked for any hourly rate increases.

Looking ahead to the next three-year budget cycle, I suggest setting the hourly rate to match the real cost of our services. In the past four years, we have raised wages to stay competitive, keep our great deputies, and bring in top candidates. The new rate adjustments will reflect these actual costs.

I have included a summary of each contract city's service hours and hourly rates, along with the proposal for the next three-year contract cycle.

CONTRACT YEAR	CONTRACT HOURS	HOURS PROVIDED	HOURLY RATE	CONTRACT TOTAL
2022-2023	500	1062	\$52.35	\$26,175
2023-2024	550	1219	\$52.35	\$28,792
2024-2025	632	1082	\$52.35	\$33,085
2025-2026	664	387 (to date)	\$56.00	\$37,184
NEW THREE-YEAR PROPOSAL				
CONTRACT YEAR	CONTRACT HOURS	HOURLY RATE	CONTRACT TOTAL	
2026-2027	664	\$60.00	\$39,840	
2027-2028	664	\$64.00	\$42,496	
2028-2029	664	\$68.00	\$45,152	

I appreciate working with each of you and your communities on public safety matters. Maintaining partnerships is the most important and most effective way we can deter crime, solve crimes, and keep our valley and citizens safe. I look forward to meeting with each of you over the next few weeks as we work through this process.

Sincerely,

D. Chad Jensen, Sheriff

**MILLVILLE CITY
RESOLUTION 2026-2**

**RESOLUTION APPROVING AN AGREEMENT WITH THE
CACHE COUNTY SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT FOR LAW
ENFORCEMENT SERVICES**

WHEREAS, the Cache County Sheriff’s Department offers contracted law enforcement services to cities in Cache County; and

WHEREAS, Cache County and Millville City have agreed to the terms outlined in the attached interlocal agreement for law enforcement services for Millville City starting on July 1, 2026, and ending on June 30, 2029;

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Millville City Council that the attached agreement is hereby accepted.

Passed and approved by the Millville City Council this 9th day of April 2026.

SIGNED:

David Hair, Mayor

ATTEST:

Corey Twedt, City Recorder

COUNCILMEMBER	YES	NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
Jacob Ames				
Ryan Zollinger				
Jeremy Ward				
Darcy Ripplinger				
Pamela June				

AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN
CACHE COUNTY
AND
MILLVILLE CITY
FOR
LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICES

This AGREEMENT is made and entered into pursuant to Sections 11-13-101 to -608, Utah Code Annotated, 1953, as amended, commonly referred to as the Interlocal Cooperation Act, by and between Cache County, a body corporate and politic of the State of Utah, hereinafter referred to as the "COUNTY", and Millville City, a municipal corporation of the State of Utah, hereinafter referred to as the "CITY."

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, the CITY is desirous of contracting with the COUNTY for the performance of the hereinafter described law enforcement functions within its boundaries by the County through the Sheriff thereof; and

WHEREAS, the CITY and the COUNTY have determined that it is mutually advantageous to each party to enter into this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, it is anticipated that the services provided will be compensated by the CITY on a cost basis as hereinafter set forth and the respective entities have determined and agreed that the said amount is a reasonable, fair and adequate compensation for the providing of such services.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the promises and in compliance with and pursuant to the terms and provisions of the Interlocal Cooperation Act as herein above set forth, the parties hereby agree as follows:

1. The Cache County Sheriff's Office agrees to furnish all necessary law enforcement protection and to enforce State laws and City ordinances (animal control not included, except for emergencies) within the corporate limits of Millville City, to the extent and in the manner hereinafter set forth.
2. The rendition of such services, the standards of performance, the discipline of deputies, and other matters incident to the performance of such services and the control of personnel

so employed shall remain in the COUNTY. In the event of a dispute between the parties as to the extent of duties and functions to be rendered hereunder, or the minimum level or manner of performance of such services, the determination thereof made by the Sheriff of the COUNTY shall be final and conclusive as between the parties hereto.

3. Without limiting, and in addition to any and all other legal and equitable remedies, the CITY's Mayor and Council or other representatives, shall have an opportunity to meet and confer with the Sheriff and/or his designated contract representative to discuss any problems arising from the Sheriff's Office's performance and the types of deputies who will be performing services under this Agreement, and the anticipated costs for renewing this contract for any successive period(s).
4. It is agreed that the Cache County Sheriff's Office will furnish law enforcement investigation, protection, and service to reasonably enforce State laws, Federal statutes as far as they are applicable, and city ordinances as follows:
 - A. Municipal type police services provided under this Agreement include city ordinance enforcement (animal control not included, except for emergencies), traffic enforcement, routine patrol and minor crime investigation, responding to calls for service, community policing activities, policing public parades and other special public events.
 - B. It is agreed that the Sheriff's Office shall continue to provide to the CITY as a basic level of county-wide service the following: Investigation Division support (major crime investigation), NOVA program, School Resource program, Reserve Deputy Sheriff Corp support, Civil Division support (civil and criminal process), emergency management, search and rescue functions, and Drug Task Force participation.
 - C. It is agreed that the cost per hour for municipal type law enforcement services shall be determined by the Sheriff and the number of hours of service shall be determined by the CITY. The costs and hours of service are detailed in the attached Exhibit A.
 - D. The CITY will insure that all monies allocated to the CITY by the State's Liquor Control Act grant will be forwarded to the COUNTY to be expended on liquor law enforcement activities exclusively within the CITY.

- E. It is agreed that the equipment furnished by the CITY is and shall remain the property of the CITY. If said property is a patrol vehicle it shall be maintained, fueled, and insured by the COUNTY during the period of this Agreement.
- F. The COUNTY will maintain, at the minimum, the following records and provide monthly reports of those records to the CITY pursuant to this agreement:
 - i. The number and type of calls for services (incidents), and
 - ii. The number and type of citations, and
 - iii. The number and type of warnings, and
 - iv. The numbers of hours of service provided.
- 5. For the purpose of performing the services provided herein, the COUNTY shall furnish all necessary labor, administration, equipment, uniforms, insignia, firearms and other equipment necessary and incident to a modern law enforcement agency.
- 6. It is agreed that in all instances where special supplies, stationary, notices, forms, and the like must be issued in the name of the CITY, the same shall be supplied by the CITY at its own expense.
- 7. For the purpose of performing the services and functions pursuant to this agreement;
 - A. For the purpose of giving official status to the performance thereof, every COUNTY sheriff's deputy and employee engaged in performing any such service and function shall be deemed to be an officer or employee of the CITY. For purposes of liability, COUNTY deputies or employees shall not be deemed to be CITY officers or employees and the COUNTY shall be completely responsible for them as provided in paragraphs 8 through 11.
 - B. All sheriff's deputies and employees employed by the COUNTY to perform duties under the terms of this Agreement shall be COUNTY employees, and shall have no right to any CITY pension, civil service, or any other CITY benefits for services provided hereunder.
 - C. The sheriff's deputies and employees to be provided under the terms of this Agreement shall be appointed by the Cache County Sheriff's Office under its normal rules and practices of selection and hiring.
- 8. Subject to the provisions and limitations of the Governmental Immunity Act of Utah, the CITY shall be responsible for all damages to persons or property that occur as a result of

the negligence or fault of the CITY in connection with the performance of this Agreement. The CITY shall indemnify and save the COUNTY free and harmless from all claims that arise as a result of the negligence or wrongful acts of the CITY, its officers, agents or employees.

9. Subject to the provisions and limitations of the Governmental Immunity Act of Utah, the COUNTY shall be responsible for all damages to persons or property that occur as a result of the negligence or fault of the COUNTY in connection with the performance of this Agreement. The COUNTY shall indemnify and save the CITY free and harmless from all claims that arise as a result of the negligence or wrongful acts of the COUNTY, its officers, agents, and employees.
10. Except as herein otherwise specified, the CITY shall not be liable for any worker's compensation claim of any COUNTY employee for injury or sickness arising out of his or her employment, and the COUNTY hereby agrees to hold harmless the CITY against any such claim.
11. Unless sooner terminated as provided for herein, this Agreement shall be effective July 1, 2026 and shall run for a three-year period. With the consent of the Millville City Council, this Agreement may be renewable for successive three-year periods. The Sheriff shall be the administrator of this Agreement.

In the event the CITY desires to renew this Agreement for any succeeding three-year period, the CITY Council, not later than May 1st next preceding the expiration date of this Agreement, shall notify the Sheriff that it wishes to renew the same, whereupon the Sheriff, not later than May 15th, may notify said CITY Council of his or her determination concerning such renewal together with any readjusted rates as provided in paragraph 12 below, otherwise, such agreement shall finally terminate at the end of such three year period.

Notwithstanding the provision of this paragraph hereinbefore set forth, either party may terminate this Agreement at any time by giving sixty (60) days prior written notice to the other party.

12. The CITY agrees to pay the amount set forth in Exhibit A, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, for the services provided pursuant to this Agreement. The rates in Exhibit A may be readjusted to be effective July 1st of 2026, if this agreement is renewed, to reflect the cost of such service as determined by the Sheriff.
13. The CITY agrees to remit the contract amount to the Cache County Executive, 199 North Main Street, Logan, Utah 84321, on or before December 31, 2026 for the first year of the contract; December 31, 2027, for the second year of the contract and December 31, 2028, for the third year of the contract. If such payment is not remitted to the County Executive's Office when due, the COUNTY is entitled to recover interest on any unpaid balance at the rate of one percent (1%) per calendar month for each month that any part of the full contract amount remains unpaid.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Millville , by approval of the Millville City Council, caused this Agreement to be signed by its Mayor and attested by its Clerk, and the County of Cache has caused this Agreement to be signed by the County Executive and Attested by its Clerk and Keeper of the County Seal, all on the day and year appearing below their respective signatures.

Cache County

Approved as to form and as
Compatible with State law:

Legal Counsel

George Daines, County Executive

ATTEST: (seal)

Clerk

CITY OF MILLVILLE

Approved as to form and as
Compatible with State law:

Legal Counsel

Mayor

ATTEST: (seal)

Clerk

EXHIBIT A

This exhibit details the hours contracted for, the cost of those hours, and when they will be delivered. The time frame of the contract will be from July 1, 2026, through June 30, 2029.

- The cost in the 2026-2027 contract year to furnish a full-time deputy sheriff equipped to perform law enforcement patrol services to CITY is \$60.00 per hour. State Liquor Control Funds will be expended at \$60.00 per hour.
- The cost in the 2027-2028 contract year to furnish a full-time deputy sheriff equipped to perform law enforcement patrol services to CITY is \$64.00 per hour. State Liquor Control Funds will be expended at \$64.00 per hour.
- The cost in the 2028-2029 contract year to furnish a full-time deputy sheriff equipped to perform law enforcement patrol services to CITY is \$68.00 per hour. State Liquor Control Funds will be expended at \$68.00 per hour.

CONTRACT YEAR	CATEGORY	HOURS	AMOUNT
2026 - 2027	Contract Funds	664	\$39,840
2027 - 2028	Contract Funds	664	\$42,496
2028 - 2029	Contract Funds	664	\$45,152

In addition to paying the Contract Funds identified above, the CITY will pay to the COUNTY under Section 4.D. of this Agreement all State Liquor Funds that the CITY receives as it receives them. Under Section 4.D. of this Agreement, the County will, in addition to the hours of service identified above, provide hours of liquor law enforcement activities at the rate described above until all State Liquor Funds received by the CITY and forwarded to the COUNTY have been expended.

The COUNTY may supply, at the discretion of the Sheriff, additional patrol coverage to the CITY as available.

When a deputy working for the CITY has an additional deputy in training working with him or her, the CITY will be charged for only one deputy.



AGENDA REPORT: PLANNING COMMISSIONER SELECTION

April 9, 2026

Background

At the City Council meeting held on December 11, 2025, updates were made to how new members of the Millville Planning Commission will be selected. Postings for new planning commissioners are now made so that interested residents can apply for open positions. The process for selecting new planning commissioners was discussed and refined by the City Council at the meeting held on February 12, 2026.

After that meeting, updates were made to the application form so that the Council would have more information in reviewing interested candidates. It was determined that at the City Council meeting in which a new planning commissioner would be selected, each candidate would be given up to two minutes to introduce themselves and provide some brief insight on why they are interested in serving on the Planning Commission. The Council will take what is said by the candidate as well as how they have answered questions on the application form in consideration when making the appointments.

There are currently no term limits. If a planning commissioner incumbent wants to serve additional terms after their term has ended, they are welcome to apply again.

As the current terms have ended for Commissioner Bonnie Farmer and Commissioner Garrett Greenhalgh, the City has posted notice for the two open positions. The term for these positions will run through the end of 2028. Applications submitted to the City have been provided to the City Council for their review. Applicants have been asked to attend the City Council meeting to briefly speak to the Council.

As there are two open positions, motions from a councilmember for appointment of each planning commissioner position should be done separately. After that motion passes or fails, additional motions can be made until two planning commissioners have been selected to fill the open seats.

Planning commissioners will be sworn in by the City Recorder at a future Planning and Zoning meeting.



AGENDA REPORT: RESIDENTIAL ZONING CODE UPDATES

April 9, 2026

Background

At the City Council meeting on November 13, 2025, the Council reviewed and accepted a request from the Planning Commission for the Planning Commission to begin work on the addition of a new residential zone with a minimum density of 1 acre.

During the process of creating a new residential zone, Development Coordinator Everton has combined the residential zones into a single chapter to simplify things, and the Planning Commission has recommended some other small updates and improvements to the code.

On February 5, 2026, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to get input on the draft of the proposed changes to the residential zoning code. Following that hearing and some additional discussion, the Planning Commission has recommended that the City Council approve the code updates.

The City Council initially reviewed these updates during the City Council meeting held on February 12, 2026. The decision was made to allow some additional time for review before consideration of adoption.

The proposed code has been updated to show square footages for lot sizes matching what is in the current zoning code as well as a couple of other updates that were discussed during the review at the February 12, 2026. Although these items were not finalized or agreed upon by the City Council during that meeting, the current draft is meant to reflect the majority opinion from the City Council and can be updated during this meeting if that is the desire of the Council.

Included Documents

- Ordinance 2026-1, including the proposed new *Chapter 17.20 – Single-Family and Two Family Residential*, which will replace *Chapter 17.20A – Single-Family and Two Family Residential (R-1)*, *Chapter 17.20B – Single-Family and Two Family Residential (R-2)*, *Chapter 17.20C – Single-Family and Two Family Residential (R-3)*. Also included are the proposed updates to *Chapter 17.12 – Establishment of Zones*

Note: When making major updates to a section of code, the “redline” updates can get a little confusing. Included with this packet for reference is the existing (old) version of City Code *Chapter 17.20A – Single Family and Two Family Residential (R-1)*.

**MILLVILLE CITY
ORDINANCE 2026-1**

RESIDENTIAL ZONING CODE UPDATES

WHEREAS, Chapters 17.20A, 17.20B, 17.20C, and 17.12 of the Millville City Code cover requirements for single-family and two-family residential zoning; and

WHEREAS, the Millville City Planning Commission has requested and received approval from the City Council to create a new residential zone with a minimum density of 1-acre lots; and

WHEREAS, the Millville City Planning Commission desires to combine and clean up the code for residential zoning and make other small updates and improvements; and

WHEREAS, the Millville City Planning Commission has discussed the proposed updates and held a public hearing on February 5, 2026; and

WHEREAS, on February 5, 2026, the Millville City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council adopt the proposed code changes; and

WHEREAS, at the City Council meetings held on February 12, 2026, and April 9, 2026, the City Council reviewed and made minor updates to the proposed code changes;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Millville City Council hereby adopts, passes, and publishes the modifications shown on the included attachment for City Code Chapter 17.20 – Residential, replacing Chapter 17.20A – Single-Family and Two Family Residential (R-1), Chapter 17.20B – Single-Family and Two Family Residential (R-2), and Chapter 17.20C – Single-Family and Two Family Residential (R-3). The City Council also adopts, passes, and publishes updates shown on the included attachment for City Code Chapter 17.12 – Establishment of Zones.

This ordinance shall become effective immediately upon publication or posting as set forth by State Law.

ADOPTED AND PASSED, by the MILLVILLE CITY COUNCIL this 9th day of April 2026.

MILLVILLE CITY

David Hair, Mayor

ATTEST:

Corey Twedt, City Recorder

COUNCILMEMBER	YES	NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
Jeremy Ward				
Jacob Ames				
Darcy Ripplinger				
Pamela June				
Ryan Zollinger				

POSTED: _____

MILLVILLE CITY CODE
TITLE 17 - ZONING
CHAPTER 17.20 - ~~SINGLE-FAMILY AND TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL~~

[17.20.010: PURPOSE; DEFINITION](#)

[17.20.020: PERMITTED USES](#)

[17.20.030: CONDITIONAL USES](#)

[17.20.040: REGULATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS](#)

[~~17.20A.050: ACCESSORY BUILDINGS~~](#)

[~~17.20A.0650: LOTS LOCATED ON PRIVATE LANES~~](#)

~~17.20A.010: PURPOSE; DEFINITION~~

- A. Purpose: The purpose of ~~the R-1~~ **the residential** zone is to provide appropriate locations where residential neighborhoods may be established, maintained, and protected. The regulations also permit the establishment of, with proper controls, the public and semipublic uses which serve the requirements of families such as churches, schools, libraries, parks, and playgrounds. The regulations are intended to prohibit those uses that would be harmful to a single- and two-family neighborhood.
- B. Definition: "Family" means one or more persons related by blood, adoption, or marriage, living and cooking together as a single housekeeping unit, exclusive of household servants. A number of unrelated adult persons, but not exceeding two (2) and their children related by blood, adoption, or marriage, living and cooking together as a single housekeeping unit, shall be deemed to constitute a family. (Ord. 2000-01: Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)

17.20A.020: PERMITTED USES

Accessory buildings.

Agriculture.

Apartment in owner occupied, single-family dwelling.

Barbershop.

Beauty shop.

Bed and breakfast.

Childcare and/or education.

Craft store.

Duplex.

Household pets.

Municipal facilities.

Personal services.

Pools.

Public utilities.

Single-family dwelling.

Uses not listed as permitted or conditional are not permitted without approval from the city council. (Ord. 2018-6, 2018: Ord. 2009-4, 2009: Ord. 2004-4, 2004: Ord. 2003-5 §§ 1, 2, 2003: Ord. 2000-9 § 1)

17.20A.030: CONDITIONAL USES

The following may be permitted conditional uses after application and approval as specified in section 17.64.070 of this title:

Education services both public and private. (Ord. 2013-2, 2013: Ord. 2009-4, 2009: Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)

17.20A.040: REGULATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS



~~A. One Main Building: Not more than one main building may be placed upon one lot or parcel of land.~~



- ~~1. Lot corners will be marked with five eighths inch ($\frac{5}{8}$ ") rebar (#5 rebar) that is eighteen inches (18") to twenty four inches (24") long, capped with the surveyor's red cap containing the surveyor's name or license number driven down to ground level.~~

A. Space Requirement Chart

	R-14	R-21	R-43	R-87	Duplex ^{4,7}	Accessory Building	External Accessory Dwelling Unit
Approx Lot Size	1/3 Acre	1/2 Acre	1 Acre	2 Acre			
Minimum Lot Area¹ (calculated in square feet)	14,000	21,000	43,000	87,000	20,000		
Lot Frontage	108'	108'	108'	132'	108'		See lot size
Front Setback	30'	30'	30'	30'	30'	30'	30'
Side setback, street	20'	20'	20'	20'	20'	20'	20'
Side setback, interior	15'	15'	15'	15'	15'	5'	15'
Rear setback, corner lot	20'	20'	20'	20'	20'	5'	20'
Rear setback, interior	30'	30'	30'	30'	30'	5'	30'
Maximum Height²	35'	35'	35'	35'	35'	35'	35'
Minimum Building Size³ (calculated in square feet)	960 SF	960 SF	960 SF	960 SF	960 SF	200 ⁵	up to 1200 SF ⁶
Minimum Width Building	20'	20'	20'	20'	20'		

Parking Spots Required	2	2	2	2	4		2
-------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	--	---

1. *Lot slope requirement: All building lots shall be slope class 1, unless a hillside development permit has been issued. See table below for additional Slope Class minimum lot sizes.*
2. *Measured from the main entrance threshold to the highest point of the building roof.*
3. *Not more than one main building may be placed upon one lot or parcel of land. Living area shall be calculated excluding basement, open porches, and garages. Buildings must be attached to a permanent concrete foundation, and meet minimum uniform building code requirements.*
4. *Not more than one duplex may be placed upon one lot or parcel of land. Lots with duplexes shall be a minimum distance of three hundred fifty feet (350'), in any direction, from any other lot with a duplex.*
5. *No building permit will be required for a structure up to and including two hundred (200) square feet, unless required by state statute.*
6. *The total area of an Exterior Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be less than fifty percent (50%) of the total square footage of the primary residence, but not more than 1,200 square feet.*
7. *Duplexes need to be determined at the time of Zoning Clearance. A home cannot be converted into a duplex.*

B. Slope Class Minimum Lot Size Requirements

	R-14	R-21	R-43	R-87	DUPLEX
Class 1 0-20% slope	14,000	21,000	43,000	87,000	20,000
Class 2 20-23% slope	20,000	21,000	43,000	87,000	26,000
Class 3 23-27% slope	26,000	26,000	43,000	87,000	32,000
Class 4 27-30% slope	32,000	32,000	43,000	87,000	38,000
Class 5 30%+ slope	<i>Not Buildable</i>	<i>Not Buildable</i>	<i>Not Buildable</i>	<i>Not Buildable</i>	<i>Not Buildable</i>

1. *In a hillside development area, when a lot has a mix slope of slope classes 1 through 4, and the lot has seventy five percent (75%) or more of the lower slope area, the minimum lot area for the lower slope shall be allowed.*
2. *Hillside Overlay applications have more studies/requirements and can be found in Chapter 17.26.040*

C. Lot corners will be marked with five-eighths inch ($\frac{5}{8}$ " rebar (#5 rebar) that is eighteen inches (18") to twenty four inches (24") long, capped with the surveyor's red cap containing the surveyor's name or license number driven down to ground level.

- D. Space Compliance: No space needed to meet the width, yard, area, coverage, parking, or other requirements for minimum lot size or setback may be sold or leased apart from such lot or building unless other space so complying is provided.
- E. Trash Prohibited Outside Containers: No trash, rubbish, weeds, debris, waste products or other combustible material shall be allowed to remain on any lot outside of approved containers in any residential zone. No junk, abandoned automobiles, automobile parts, or restoration projects shall be stored or allowed to remain on any lot in any residential zone unless such objects are out of visible sight of the public.
- F. Odorous Uses Prohibited: A use shall not be permitted which creates objectionable odor in such quantity as to be readily detectable at the boundaries of the site.
- G. Lot Grading Standards: For residential developments, a plan shall be prepared in a manner that will allow the following conditions to be met prior to, or as part of, actual building construction. If necessary, individual lot grading plans will be required prior to issuance of building permits:
1. A minimum fall of six inches (6") in the first ten feet (10') away from any building is required;
 2. A maximum gradient of twenty one percent (21%) within four feet (4') of the foundation;
 3. Usable minimum yard area of three hundred (300) square feet with a maximum slope of five percent (5%);
 4. A minimum foundation exposure of six inches (6") above finished grade;
 5. Slopes of three to one (3:1) and steeper must be sodded and will be accepted only when the developer and engineer can show this to be the most feasible approach;
 6. Driveway grades should be maintained between 0.5 percent (0.5%) and five percent (5%) when possible;
 7. Entry walks shall not exceed 5 percent (5%);
 8. Lots should be graded so that a minimum slope of two percent (2%) can be maintained between the sewer flow line in the street and the finished grade of the lowest floor elevation;
 9. Minimum depth of any sewer line shall be five feet (5').

H. Legal Nonconforming Status: Vacant lots which do not meet the current frontage requirement, but can provide division and deed history showing they met historic requirements, may be granted "legal nonconforming" status and receive building permits. Such documentation is to be provided to the development coordinator who shall provide documentation to the planning and zoning commission, mayor and/or city council if needed.

I. Orientation: Any residence constructed on any buildable parcel must be accessed from a "public street", as defined in Ordinance 17.08.020 "STREET, PUBLIC". Said residence shall have the property entrance located to face the public street to which its address was assigned. (Ord. 2026-1, 2026: Ord. 2025-7, 2025: Ord. 2018-8, 2018: 2018-6, 2018: Ord. 2012-2, 2012: Ord. 2008-3, 2008: Ord. 2004-6, 2004: Ord. 2004-4, 2004: Ord. 2004-2, 2004: Ord. 2003-2, 2003: Ord. 2002-6 § 1, 2002: Ord. 2002-5 § 1, 2002: Ord. 2002-2 § 3, 2002: Ord. 2000-16 §§ 1, 2: Ord. 2000-9 § 1: Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)

¶
¶

~~B. Minimum Conditions: Minimum conditions for a single family dwelling shall include, but not be limited to:~~

¶

~~1. Lot area: Minimum fourteen thousand (14,000) square feet for slope class 1 lots (see definitions in this title).¶~~

¶

~~Minimum twenty thousand (20,000) square feet for slope class 2 lots.¶~~

¶

~~Minimum twenty six thousand (26,000) square feet for slope class 3 lots.¶~~

¶

~~Minimum thirty two thousand (32,000) square feet for slope class 4 lots.¶~~

¶

~~2. Lot frontage: Minimum one hundred eight feet (108') of clear ownership of the lot the dwelling is built on.~~

¶

~~3. Lot slope requirement: All building lots shall be slope class 1, unless a hillside development permit has been issued. In a hillside development area, when a lot has a mix slope of slope classes 1 through 4, and the lot has seventy five percent (75%) or more of the lower slope area, the minimum lot area for the lower slope shall be allowed.~~

¶

~~C. Front Yard Setback: Minimum thirty feet (30') from the lot line.¶~~

¶

~~D. Side Yard Setback:¶~~

¶

~~1. Interior lots:¶~~

¶

~~a. Minimum fifteen feet (15') from the side property line.~~

~~b. Accessory buildings: Minimum five feet (5') from the property line.~~

~~2. Corner lots:~~

~~a. Minimum fifteen feet (15') from the property line common to an interior lot.~~

~~b. Minimum twenty feet (20') from the property line adjacent to the street.~~

~~c. Accessory buildings: Minimum five feet (5') from the property line common to an interior lot, with a minimum twenty feet (20') from the property line adjacent to the street.~~

~~E. Rear Yard Setback:~~

~~1. Interior lots:~~

~~a. Minimum thirty feet (30') from the rear property line.~~

~~b. Accessory buildings: Minimum five feet (5') from the rear property line.~~

~~2. Corner lots:~~

~~a. Minimum twenty feet (20') from the rear property line.~~

~~b. Accessory buildings: Minimum five feet (5') from the rear property line.~~

~~F. Building Height:~~

~~1. Maximum thirty five feet (35').~~

~~2. Height shall be measured from the highest point of the building roof to the main entrance threshold.~~

~~G. Distance Between Buildings: Corrals, barns, stables, coops, kennels and other buildings used for the accommodation of animals (except for household pets) must be located at least seventy five feet (75') from owner's existing structure and at least fifty feet (50') from a property line.~~

~~H. Building Size: The finished living area of any dwelling shall be a minimum of nine hundred sixty (960) square feet for a single story dwelling. Living area shall be calculated excluding basement, open porches, and garages.~~

~~I. Space Compliance: No space needed to meet the width, yard, area, coverage, parking, or other requirements for minimum lot size or setback may be sold or leased apart from such lot or building unless other space so complying is provided.~~

~~J. Minimum Conditions: Minimum conditions for a duplex shall include, but not be limited to:~~

~~1. Lot Area: Minimum twenty thousand (20,000) square feet for slope class 1 lots (see definitions in this title).~~

~~Minimum twenty six thousand (26,000) square feet for slope class 2 lots.~~

~~Minimum thirty two thousand (32,000) square feet for slope class 3 lots.~~

~~Minimum thirty eight thousand (38,000) square feet for slope class 4 lots.~~

~~2. Lot Frontage: One hundred twenty four foot (124') minimum.~~

~~3. Minimum Parking: Parking spaces for a minimum of four (4) cars shall be provided.~~

~~4. Exterior Elevations: Exterior elevations shall resemble a single family dwelling.~~

~~5. Living Area: Each living unit shall have at least nine hundred sixty (960) square feet of living area exclusive of porches, garages, and carports.~~

~~6. More Than One Prohibited: Not more than one duplex may be placed upon one lot or parcel of land.~~

~~7. Minimum Distance: Lots with duplexes shall be a minimum distance of three hundred fifty feet (350'), in any direction, from any other lot with a duplex.~~

~~8. Repealed.~~

~~9. Lot Slope Requirement: All building lots shall be slope class 1, unless a hillside development permit has been issued. In a hillside development area when a lot has a mix slope of slope classes 1 through 4, and the lot has seventy five percent (75%) or more of the lower slope area, the minimum lot area for the lower slope shall be allowed.~~

~~K. Minimum Dimension: All dwellings for human occupancy shall have a minimum dimension of twenty feet (20') (measured wide or deep), be attached to a permanent concrete foundation, and meet minimum uniform building code requirements.~~

~~¶~~

~~L. Trash Prohibited Outside Containers: No trash, rubbish, weeds, debris, waste products or other combustible material shall be allowed to remain on any lot outside of approved containers in any residential zone. No junk, abandoned automobiles, automobile parts, or restoration projects shall be stored or allowed to remain on any lot in any residential zone unless such objects are out of visible sight of the public.¶~~

~~¶~~

~~M. Odorous Uses Prohibited: A use shall not be permitted which creates objectionable odor in such quantity as to be readily detectable at the boundaries of the site.¶~~

~~¶~~

~~N. Lot Grading Standards: For residential developments, a plan shall be prepared in a manner that will allow the following conditions to be met prior to, or as part of, actual building construction. If necessary, individual lot grading plans will be required prior to issuance of building permits:¶~~

~~¶~~

~~1. A minimum fall of six inches (6") in the first ten feet (10') away from any building is required;¶~~

~~¶~~

~~2. A maximum gradient of twenty one percent (21%) within four feet (4') of the foundation;¶~~

~~¶~~

~~3. Usable minimum yard area of three hundred (300) square feet with a maximum slope of five percent (5%);¶~~

~~¶~~

~~4. A minimum foundation exposure of six inches (6") above finished grade;¶~~

~~¶~~

~~5. Slopes of three to one (3:1) and steeper must be sodded and will be accepted only when the developer and engineer can show this to be the most feasible approach;¶~~

~~¶~~

~~6. Driveway grades should be maintained between 0.5 percent and five percent (5%) when possible;¶~~

~~¶~~

~~7. Entry walks shall not exceed 5.0 percent;¶~~

~~¶~~

~~8. Lots should be graded so that a minimum slope of two percent (2%) can be maintained between the sewer flow line in the street and the finished grade of the lowest floor elevation;¶~~

~~¶~~

~~9. Minimum depth of any sewer line shall be five feet (5').¶~~

¶

~~O. Legal Nonconforming Status: Vacant lots which do not meet the current frontage requirement, but can provide division and deed history showing they met historic requirements, may be granted "legal nonconforming" status and receive building permits. Such documentation is to be provided to the development coordinator who shall provide documentation to the planning and zoning commission, mayor and/or city council if needed.¶~~

¶

~~P. ORIENTATION: Any residence constructed on any buildable parcel must be accessed from a "public street", as defined in Ordinance 17.08.020 "STREET, PUBLIC". Said residence shall have the property entrance located to face the public street to which its address was assigned. (Ord. 2025-7, 2025: Ord. 2018-8, 2018: 2018-6, 2018: Ord. 2012-2, 2012: Ord. 2008-3, 2008: Ord. 2004-6, 2004: Ord. 2004-4, 2004: Ord. 2004-2, 2004: Ord. 2003-2, 2003: Ord. 2002-6 § 1, 2002: Ord. 2002-5 § 1, 2002: Ord. 2002-2 § 3, 2002: Ord. 2000-16 §§ 1, 2: Ord. 2000-9 § 1: Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)¶~~

¶

~~17.20A.050: ACCESSORY BUILDINGS~~¶

~~No building permit will be required for a structure up to and including two hundred (200) square feet, unless required by state statute. ¶~~

¶

~~A. All accessory building structures shall be located behind the front yard setback.¶~~

¶

~~B. Setback: There is a minimum setback of five feet (5') from all property lines, except for those that are on a corner lot and must have a minimum twenty feet (20') setback from the line abutting a street. (Ord. 2025-7, 2025: Ord. 2018-6, 2018: Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)¶~~

~~17.20A.0650: LOTS LOCATED ON PRIVATE LANES~~

A. Public Street Systems Encouraged: Public street systems shall be encouraged for access to all residential dwelling sites. However, the City recognizes that there are cases where it is impossible or impractical to develop a lot according to normal subdivision standards. In situations where insufficient land access exists for a public street system, the Planning Commission may allow for a building lot using frontage from a private lane, with the exception of the bulb of a cul-de-sac. The bulb of a cul-de-sac is defined as the circular area at the end of a dead-end residential street.

B. Subdivisions on private lanes may be developed when the following conditions have been met:

1. Development on a private lane would not impede the extension of any adjacent public right-of-way either now or in the foreseeable future; and
2. The development does not impede the necessary access from adjoining properties as required by the master transportation plan.
3. Rights-of-way shall be of sufficient design to service the projected use of property and adjoining properties that may have access across such rights-of-way. All new private lanes shall be fully improved with a hard-packed maintainable surface with a minimum of twenty feet (20') of surface width. Curb and gutter or other appropriate storm drainage methods may be required.
4. Improvements shall include a strategically located turnaround to accommodate emergency vehicles. The turnaround configuration may be in any form compliant with the appropriate fire codes, as determined by the fire marshal or designee. Additional clearance may be required to accommodate emergency vehicle access.
5. Private lanes shall satisfy the frontage requirements for no more than one lot.
6. All necessary public utility easements shall be dedicated on all lots, including full access where required by city officials and workers. Public services, such as garbage collection, will be at the dedicated street only.
7. Minimum yard setback requirements as defined for public streets shall apply to all buildings and uses adjoining private rights-of-way, with setbacks measured from edge of required private lane width or from the width of the future city road in that location.
8. No portion of the private lane may be counted towards required driveway dimensions on individual lots.
9. No portion of the private lane may be counted towards the minimum required building lot size.
10. Private lane area shall not be included in the calculation of buildable area for an individual lot, including determination of allowed square footage for primary and accessory structures.
11. A driveway approach with a minimum of twenty feet (20') by twenty feet (20') of three inches (3") minimum thickness of permanent asphalt from the public street to the lane is required.

12. All lots shall be provided with standard utility connections, furnished by the property owner, including approved fire protection infrastructure. All utilities underneath a private right-of-way shall be deemed private utilities for ownership and maintenance purposes.
13. Private lanes shall be named and identified by means of a suitable permanent street marker according to Millville City standards, to be installed prior to issuance of building permits.
14. All required infrastructure, including road improvements and stormwater controls shall be installed prior to occupancy being granted on a building lot.
15. Each access easement right-of-way shall be recorded with the County Recorder. Such easement shall include all parties with interest in the parcel(s) containing the access easement right-of-way as grantors and all parties retaining access from the access easement right-of-way as grantees. The easement shall extend and connect to Millville City's public street infrastructure to provide clear access from all building lots or parcels to a public right-of-way.
16. There shall be a written and recorded road maintenance agreement that assigns maintenance responsibility for the private lane to the properties the private lane traverses and serves. The City shall have the right to compel enforcement of the road maintenance agreement between the property owners. Should the City be unable to compel enforcement of the agreement, the City may, at its sole discretion, maintain the private lane and assess the property owners the costs associated with such maintenance.
17. Change of Private Right-Of-Way to Public Ownership: Private lanes shall be clearly annotated on the subdivision plat as a private lane. A note shall be placed on all subdivision plats that contain a private lane that states the following: "The road annotated on this plat as "private lane" was allowed alternative construction standards from adopted public or private streets standards. Millville City shall not take control of said lane unless it is first deemed by the City Council that there is a compelling public interest, the street is brought to public standards and all landowners accessing the street have consented to the dedication."

C. The creation of a private lane is a subdivision of property and follows the same requirements outlined in Chapter 16.16: Subdivision Application Requirements. The Application Review Procedure can be found in Chapter 16.20. A public hearing is required before Final Plat approval. (Ord. 2026-1, 2026: Ord. 2025-7, 2025: Ord. 2023-6: 2023)

MILLVILLE CITY CODE
TITLE 17 - ZONING
CHAPTER 17.12 - ESTABLISHMENT OF ZONES

[17.12.010: ESTABLISHMENT OF ZONES](#)

[17.12.020: DETERMINATION OF ZONING DISTRICT BOUNDARIES](#)

[17.12.030: ANNEXED AREAS](#)

[17.12.040: ZONES ESTABLISHED](#)

[17.12.050: PURPOSE OF ZONING DISTRICTS](#)

[17.12.060: APPLICATION OF DISTRICT REGULATIONS](#)

[17.12.070: OFFICIAL ZONING MAP](#)

17.12.010: ESTABLISHMENT OF ZONES

The city is divided into zones as shown on the map entitled zoning/city of Millville, which map and boundaries, notations, references, and other information shown thereon shall be as much a part of this title as if the information and matters set forth by the map were all fully described herein. (Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)

17.12.020: DETERMINATION OF ZONING DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

Where uncertainty exists with respect to the boundaries of the various zones, the following rules shall apply:

- A. Where the indicated boundaries on the zoning map are approximately street, public rights of way, or alleyways, the centerline of the street, public right of way, or alley shall be construed to be the zone district boundaries unless otherwise indicated.
- B. Where the indicated boundaries are approximately lot lines, the lot lines shall be construed to be the zoning district boundaries unless otherwise indicated.

- C. Boundaries indicated as approximately following city limits shall be construed as following such city limits.
- D. Boundaries indicated as approximately following centerlines of streams or canals shall be construed to follow such centerlines.
- E. Boundaries indicated as parallel to or extensions of features indicated above shall be so construed. Distances not specifically indicated on the official zoning district map shall be determined by the scale of the map.
- F. Where a district boundary line divides a lot which was in single ownership at the time of passage of this title, the planning commission shall recommend to the city council, as a special exception, the extension of the regulations for either portion of the lot beyond the district line into the remaining portion of the lot.
- G. Where physical or cultural features existing on the ground are at variance with those shown on the official zoning district map, or in other circumstances not covered in the aforementioned rules, the planning commission shall recommend to the city council the district boundaries.
- H. Where land has not been subdivided into lots and/or blocks, the zoning district boundaries shall be determined by use of the scale measurement shown on the map unless otherwise indicated.
- I. Where uncertainty continues to exist, the planning commission shall recommend its interpretation of the map to the city council. If the council upholds interpretation, then that interpretation may be appealed to the appeal authority. (Ord. 2025-5, 2025: Ord. 2018-9, 2018: 2007-8, 2007: Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)

17.12.030: ANNEXED AREAS

At the time of the annexation of new territory to the city, the City Council, with a recommendation from the Planning Commission, shall classify such territory for zoning. The City shall consider the following when determining zoning for the annexed territory.

- A. The General Plan, including the future land use map and Millville City Master Plans,
- B. Surrounding land use,
- C. The request of the applicant, and

D. Any applicable State law or regulations (Ord. 2023-8, 2023: Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)

17.12.040: ZONES ESTABLISHED

For the purpose of this title, the following zones are created and the land within the corporate limits of the city is divided into zoning districts. The boundaries for the zoning districts are shown on the official zoning map of the city. The classification of zoning districts is as follows:

A	Agricultural zone (Allows One single- and two-family residential unit per 5 acres)
R-14	Single- and two-family residential zone (minimum 14,000 square foot lot size)
R-21	Single- and two-family residential zone (minimum 21,000 square foot lot size)
R-43	Single- and two-family residential zone (minimum 43,000 square foot lot size)
R-87	Single- and two-family residential zone (minimum 87,000 square foot lot size)
CG	Commercial general zone
OS	Open space zone
TC	Commercial town center
HO	Hillside development overlay zone

(Ord. 2026-1, 2026: Ord. 2020-1, 2020: Ord. 2018-6, 2018: Ord. 2012-4, 2012: Ord. 2000-16 § 1: Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)

17.12.050: PURPOSE OF ZONING DISTRICTS

In addition to the general purposes of this title identified in chapter 17.04 of this title, the various zoning districts each serve a more specific individual purpose, as described below.

- A. The A (agricultural) zoning district is proposed to provide areas for agricultural and related uses, along with very low density residential uses. This designation shall be applied to land with appropriate topographical conditions where the intrusion of urban uses would be inappropriate or untimely, due to lack or need of urban services and facilities.
- B. The R (residential) zoning districts are created to provide for the diverse needs and desires of the people of the city. These districts shall also allow for other compatible uses which may complement the primarily residential functions of the districts, under certain conditions. Basic urban services and utilities would be available in these zones:
 - 1. The R-14 ~~(single-family and two-family residential)~~ zone is intended to provide areas for single-family and two-family ~~detached~~ dwellings with a minimum lot size of 14,000 square feet.
 - 2. The R-21 ~~(single-family and two-family residential)~~ zone is intended to provide areas for single-family and two-family ~~detached~~ dwellings with a minimum lot size of 21,000 square feet.
 - 3. The R-43 zone is intended to provide areas for single-family and two-family dwellings with a minimum lot size of 43,000 square feet.
 - 4. The R-87 zone is intended to provide areas for single-family and two-family dwellings with a minimum lot size of 87,000 square feet.
- C. The CG (commercial general) district is intended to provide various commercial uses.
- D. The OS (open space) zone is intended to provide for open space land within the city and to provide for the accommodation of natural features or hazards.
- E. The TC (commercial town center) district is intended to provide a “downtown” feel and provide residents a place to shop, eat and do business.
- F. The HO (hillside development overlay) zone is established to protect and preserve the hillside areas of the city. The goal is to minimize adverse effects of development within

these areas. (Ord. 2026-1, 2026: Ord. 2020-1, 2020: Ord. 2018-6, 2018: 2012-4, 2012: Ord. 2000-16 § 1: Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)

17.12.060: APPLICATION OF DISTRICT REGULATIONS

- A. No building or part thereof or other structure shall be erected, altered, added to, or enlarged, nor shall any land, building, structure, or premises be used, designated, or intended to be used for any purpose or in any manner other than is included among the uses hereinafter listed as permitted in the district in which such building, land, or premises are located.
- B. No building or structure or part thereof shall be erected, reconstructed, or structurally altered to exceed in height the limit hereinafter designated for the district in which such building is located, unless building height exception is expressly allowed.
- C. No building, structure, or part thereof shall be erected, nor shall any existing building be altered, enlarged, rebuilt, or moved into any district, nor shall any open space be encroached upon or reduced in any manner, except in conformity to the yard, building site area, and building location regulations hereinafter designated for the land use and the district in which such building or open space is located.
- D. No yard or other open space provided about any building for the purpose of complying with provisions of this title shall be considered as providing a yard or open space for any other building, and no yard or other open space on one building site shall be considered as providing a yard or open space for a building on any other building site. (Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)

17.12.070: OFFICIAL ZONING MAP

- A. The boundaries of the districts established in section 17.12.040 of this chapter are established as shown on the official zoning map, which together with all explanatory matter thereon is adopted by reference and declared to be part of this title.
- B. The official zoning map shall be identified by the signature of the mayor of the city, attested by the city recorder, and shall bear the seal for the city under the following words:

This is to certify that this map is the official zoning map for the City of Millville, Utah, referred to in Section 17.12.070, Millville City Ordinances,

together with the date of the adoption of this title.

- C. No changes of any nature shall be made on the official zoning map except in conformity with the procedures set forth in this title. Any unauthorized change of whatever kind by any person or persons shall be considered a violation of this title and punishable as provided under chapter 17.84 of this title.
- D. Regardless of the existence of purported copies of the official zoning map, which may from time to time be made or published, the official zoning district map, which shall be located in the planning commission hearing room, shall be the final authority as to the current status of zoning districts.
- E. In the event that the official zoning map becomes damaged, destroyed, lost, or difficult to interpret because of the nature or number of changes and additions, the city council may, by resolution, adopt a new official zoning map or any subsequent amendment thereof. The new official zoning map shall be identified by the signature of the mayor of the city, attested by the city recorder, and shall bear the seal of the city of Millville, Utah, under the following words:

This is to certify that this official zoning map supersedes and replaces the official zoning map dated adopted (date of adoption of map being replaced) as part of Ordinance No. of the City of Millville, Utah, dated .

Unless the prior official zoning map has been lost or has been totally destroyed, the prior map or any significant remaining parts thereof shall be preserved together with all available records pertaining to its adoption or amendment. (Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)

Old existing code for reference

MILLVILLE CITY CODE

TITLE 17 - ZONING

CHAPTER 17.20A - SINGLE-FAMILY AND TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-1)

[17.20A.010: PURPOSE; DEFINITION](#)

[17.20A.020: PERMITTED USES](#)

[17.20A.030: CONDITIONAL USES](#)

[17.20A.040: REGULATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS](#)

[17.20A.050: ACCESSORY BUILDINGS](#)

[17.20A.060: LOTS LOCATED ON PRIVATE LANES](#)

17.20A.010: PURPOSE; DEFINITION

- A. Purpose: The purpose of the R-1 zone is to provide appropriate locations where residential neighborhoods may be established, maintained, and protected. The regulations also permit the establishment of, with proper controls, the public and semipublic uses which serve the requirements of families such as churches, schools, libraries, parks, and playgrounds. The regulations are intended to prohibit those uses that would be harmful to a single- and two-family neighborhood.

- B. Definition: "Family" means one or more persons related by blood, adoption, or marriage, living and cooking together as a single housekeeping unit, exclusive of household servants. A number of unrelated adult persons, but not exceeding two (2) and their children related by blood, adoption, or marriage, living and cooking together as a single housekeeping unit, shall be deemed to constitute a family. (Ord. 2000-01: Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)

17.20A.020: PERMITTED USES

Accessory buildings.

Agriculture.

Apartment in owner occupied, single-family dwelling.

Barbershop.

Beauty shop.

Bed and breakfast.

Childcare and/or education.

Craft store.

Duplex.

Household pets.

Municipal facilities.

Personal services.

Pools.

Public utilities.

Single-family dwelling.

Uses not listed as permitted or conditional are not permitted without approval from the city council. (Ord. 2018-6, 2018: Ord. 2009-4, 2009: Ord. 2004-4, 2004: Ord. 2003-5 §§ 1, 2, 2003: Ord. 2000-9 § 1)

17.20A.030: CONDITIONAL USES

The following may be permitted conditional uses after application and approval as specified in section 17.64.070 of this title:

Education services both public and private. (Ord. 2013-2, 2013: Ord. 2009-4, 2009: Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)

17.20A.040: REGULATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

- A. One Main Building: Not more than one main building may be placed upon one lot or parcel of land.
1. Lot corners will be marked with five-eighths inch ($\frac{5}{8}$ ") rebar (#5 rebar) that is eighteen inches (18") to twenty four inches (24") long, capped with the surveyor's red cap containing the surveyor's name or license number driven down to ground level.
- B. Minimum Conditions: Minimum conditions for a single-family dwelling shall include, but not be limited to:
1. Lot area: Minimum fourteen thousand (14,000) square feet for slope class 1 lots (see definitions in this title).

Minimum twenty thousand (20,000) square feet for slope class 2 lots.

Minimum twenty six thousand (26,000) square feet for slope class 3 lots.

Minimum thirty two thousand (32,000) square feet for slope class 4 lots.
 2. Lot frontage: Minimum one hundred eight feet (108') of clear ownership of the lot the dwelling is built on.
 3. Lot slope requirement: All building lots shall be slope class 1, unless a hillside development permit has been issued. In a hillside development area, when a lot has a mix slope of slope classes 1 through 4, and the lot has seventy five percent (75%) or more of the lower slope area, the minimum lot area for the lower slope shall be allowed.
- C. Front Yard Setback: Minimum thirty feet (30') from the lot line.
- D. Side Yard Setback:
1. Interior lots:

- a. Minimum fifteen feet (15') from the side property line.
- b. Accessory buildings: Minimum five feet (5') from the property line.

2. Corner lots:

- a. Minimum fifteen feet (15') from the property line common to an interior lot.
- b. Minimum twenty feet (20') from the property line adjacent to the street.
- c. Accessory buildings: Minimum five feet (5') from the property line common to an interior lot, with a minimum twenty feet (20') from the property line adjacent to the street.

E. Rear Yard Setback:

1. Interior lots:

- a. Minimum thirty feet (30') from the rear property line.
- b. Accessory buildings: Minimum five feet (5') from the rear property line.

2. Corner lots:

- a. Minimum twenty feet (20') from the rear property line.
- b. Accessory buildings: Minimum five feet (5') from the rear property line.

F. Building Height:

- 1. Maximum thirty five feet (35').
- 2. Height shall be measured from the highest point of the building roof to the main entrance threshold.

G. Distance Between Buildings: Corrals, barns, stables, coops, kennels and other buildings used for the accommodation of animals (except for household pets) must be located at least seventy five feet (75') from owner's existing structure and at least fifty feet (50') from a property line.

- H. Building Size: The finished living area of any dwelling shall be a minimum of nine hundred sixty (960) square feet for a single-story dwelling. Living area shall be calculated excluding basement, open porches, and garages.
- I. Space Compliance: No space needed to meet the width, yard, area, coverage, parking, or other requirements for minimum lot size or setback may be sold or leased apart from such lot or building unless other space so complying is provided.
- J. Minimum Conditions: Minimum conditions for a duplex shall include, but not be limited to:
1. Lot Area: Minimum twenty thousand (20,000) square feet for slope class 1 lots (see definitions in this title).

Minimum twenty six thousand (26,000) square feet for slope class 2 lots.

Minimum thirty two thousand (32,000) square feet for slope class 3 lots.

Minimum thirty eight thousand (38,000) square feet for slope class 4 lots.
 2. Lot Frontage: One hundred twenty four foot (124') minimum.
 3. Minimum Parking: Parking spaces for a minimum of four (4) cars shall be provided.
 4. Exterior Elevations: Exterior elevations shall resemble a single-family dwelling.
 5. Living Area: Each living unit shall have at least nine hundred sixty (960) square feet of living area exclusive of porches, garages, and carports.
 6. More Than One Prohibited: Not more than one duplex may be placed upon one lot or parcel of land.
 7. Minimum Distance: Lots with duplexes shall be a minimum distance of three hundred fifty feet (350'), in any direction, from any other lot with a duplex.
 8. Repealed.
 9. Lot Slope Requirement: All building lots shall be slope class 1, unless a hillside development permit has been issued. In a hillside development area when a lot has a mix slope of slope classes 1 through 4, and the lot has seventy five percent (75%) or more of the lower slope area, the minimum lot area for the lower slope shall be allowed.

- K. Minimum Dimension: All dwellings for human occupancy shall have a minimum dimension of twenty feet (20') (measured wide or deep), be attached to a permanent concrete foundation, and meet minimum uniform building code requirements.
- L. Trash Prohibited Outside Containers: No trash, rubbish, weeds, debris, waste products or other combustible material shall be allowed to remain on any lot outside of approved containers in any residential zone. No junk, abandoned automobiles, automobile parts, or restoration projects shall be stored or allowed to remain on any lot in any residential zone unless such objects are out of visible sight of the public.
- M. Odorous Uses Prohibited: A use shall not be permitted which creates objectionable odor in such quantity as to be readily detectable at the boundaries of the site.
- N. Lot Grading Standards: For residential developments, a plan shall be prepared in a manner that will allow the following conditions to be met prior to, or as part of, actual building construction. If necessary, individual lot grading plans will be required prior to issuance of building permits:
1. A minimum fall of six inches (6") in the first ten feet (10') away from any building is required;
 2. A maximum gradient of twenty one percent (21%) within four feet (4') of the foundation;
 3. Usable minimum yard area of three hundred (300) square feet with a maximum slope of five percent (5%);
 4. A minimum foundation exposure of six inches (6") above finished grade;
 5. Slopes of three to one (3:1) and steeper must be sodded and will be accepted only when the developer and engineer can show this to be the most feasible approach;
 6. Driveway grades should be maintained between 0.5 percent and five percent (5%) when possible;
 7. Entry walks shall not exceed 5.0 percent;
 8. Lots should be graded so that a minimum slope of two percent (2%) can be maintained between the sewer flow line in the street and the finished grade of the lowest floor elevation;
 9. Minimum depth of any sewer line shall be five feet (5').

- O. Legal Nonconforming Status: Vacant lots which do not meet the current frontage requirement, but can provide division and deed history showing they met historic requirements, may be granted "legal nonconforming" status and receive building permits. Such documentation is to be provided to the development coordinator who shall provide documentation to the planning and zoning commission, mayor and/or city council if needed.

- P. ORIENTATION: Any residence constructed on any buildable parcel must be accessed from a "public street", as defined in Ordinance 17.08.020 "STREET, PUBLIC". Said residence shall have the property entrance located to face the public street to which its address was assigned. (Ord. 2025-7, 2025: Ord. 2018-8, 2018: 2018-6, 2018: Ord. 2012-2, 2012: Ord. 2008-3, 2008: Ord. 2004-6, 2004: Ord. 2004-4, 2004: Ord. 2004-2, 2004: Ord. 2003-2, 2003: Ord. 2002-6 § 1, 2002: Ord. 2002-5 § 1, 2002: Ord. 2002-2 § 3, 2002: Ord. 2000-16 §§ 1, 2: Ord. 2000-9 § 1: Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)

17.20A.050: ACCESSORY BUILDINGS

No building permit will be required for a structure up to and including two hundred (200) square feet, unless required by state statute.

- A. All accessory building structures shall be located behind the front yard setback.

- B. Setback: There is a minimum setback of five feet (5') from all property lines, except for those that are on a corner lot and must have a minimum twenty feet (20') setback from the line abutting a street. (Ord. 2025-7, 2025: Ord. 2018-6, 2018: Ord. 99-02-18-01 § 2)

17.20A.060: LOTS LOCATED ON PRIVATE LANES

- A. Public Street Systems Encouraged: Public street systems shall be encouraged for access to all residential dwelling sites. However, the City recognizes that there are cases where it is impossible or impractical to develop a lot according to normal subdivision standards. In situations where insufficient land access exists for a public street system, the Planning Commission may allow for a building lot using frontage from a private lane.

- B. Subdivisions on private lanes may be developed when the following conditions have been met:

1. Development on a private lane would not impede the extension of any adjacent public right-of-way either now or in the foreseeable future; and
2. The development does not impede the necessary access from adjoining properties as required by the master transportation plan.
3. Rights-of-way shall be of sufficient design to service the projected use of property and adjoining properties that may have access across such rights-of-way. All new private lanes shall be fully improved with a hard-packed maintainable surface with a minimum of twenty feet (20') of surface width. Curb and gutter or other appropriate storm drainage methods may be required.
4. Improvements shall include a strategically located turnaround to accommodate emergency vehicles. The turnaround configuration may be in any form compliant with the appropriate fire codes, as determined by the fire marshal or designee. Additional clearance may be required to accommodate emergency vehicle access.
5. Private lanes shall satisfy the frontage requirements for no more than one lot.
6. All necessary public utility easements shall be dedicated on all lots, including full access where required by city officials and workers. Public services, such as garbage collection, will be at the dedicated street only.
7. Minimum yard setback requirements as defined for public streets shall apply to all buildings and uses adjoining private rights-of-way, with setbacks measured from edge of required private lane width or from the width of the future city road in that location.
8. No portion of the private lane may be counted towards required driveway dimensions on individual lots.
9. No portion of the private lane may be counted towards the minimum required building lot size.
10. Private lane area shall not be included in the calculation of buildable area for an individual lot, including determination of allowed square footage for primary and accessory structures.
11. A driveway approach with a minimum of twenty feet (20') by twenty feet (20') of three inches (3") minimum thickness of permanent asphalt from the public street to the lane is required.

12. All lots shall be provided with standard utility connections, furnished by the property owner, including approved fire protection infrastructure. All utilities underneath a private right-of-way shall be deemed private utilities for ownership and maintenance purposes.
13. Private lanes shall be named and identified by means of a suitable permanent street marker according to Millville City standards, to be installed prior to issuance of building permits.
14. All required infrastructure, including road improvements and stormwater controls shall be installed prior to occupancy being granted on a building lot.
15. Each access easement right-of-way shall be recorded with the County Recorder. Such easement shall include all parties with interest in the parcel(s) containing the access easement right-of-way as grantors and all parties retaining access from the access easement right-of-way as grantees. The easement shall extend and connect to Millville City's public street infrastructure to provide clear access from all building lots or parcels to a public right-of-way.
16. There shall be a written and recorded road maintenance agreement that assigns maintenance responsibility for the private lane to the properties the private lane traverses and serves. The City shall have the right to compel enforcement of the road maintenance agreement between the property owners. Should the City be unable to compel enforcement of the agreement, the City may, at its sole discretion, maintain the private lane and assess the property owners the costs associated with such maintenance.
17. Change of Private Right-Of-Way to Public Ownership: Private lanes shall be clearly annotated on the subdivision plat as a private lane. A note shall be placed on all subdivision plats that contain a private lane that states the following: "The road annotated on this plat as "private lane" was allowed alternative construction standards from adopted public or private streets standards. Millville City shall not take control of said lane unless it is first deemed by the City Council that there is a compelling public interest, the street is brought to public standards and all landowners accessing the street have consented to the dedication."

C. The creation of a private lane is a subdivision of property and follows the same requirements outlined in Chapter 16.16: Subdivision Application Requirements. The Application Review Procedure can be found in Chapter 16.20. A public hearing is required before Final Plat approval. (Ord. 2025-7, 2025: Ord. 2023-6: 2023)

**MILLVILLE CITY
ORDINANCE 2026-2**

MORATORIUM ON ZONING CHANGES

WHEREAS, the last General Plan for Millville City was created in 2016 and there is a critical need to get resident feedback and create a new General Plan as Millville has gone through extensive changes over the past ten years; and

WHEREAS, the Millville City Council feels that the acceptance of additional zone changes in Millville City before a new General Plan has been adopted would constitute a compelling, countervailing public interest, and that immediate action is required to determine the desires of Millville residents for zoning throughout Millville City boundaries and the future annexation area as part of the process of creating a new General Plan; and

WHEREAS, Millville City is in the process of seeking grant funding to help pay for a portion of the costs to generate a new General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Millville City Council plans to begin the process of working on an updated General Plan as soon as funding has been secured; and

WHEREAS, a temporary land use regulation is necessary to preserve the existing character of Millville City and to prevent potentially incompatible land uses while the City undertakes a formal and public input process;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Millville City Council imposes a moratorium on all zone change requests until a new General Plan has been completed and published.

This ordinance shall become effective immediately upon publication or posting as set forth by State Law.

ADOPTED AND PASSED, by the MILLVILLE CITY COUNCIL this 9th day of April 2026.

MILLVILLE CITY

David Hair, Mayor

ATTEST:

Corey Twedt, City Recorder

COUNCILMEMBER	YES	NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
Jeremy Ward				
Jacob Ames				
Darcy Ripplinger				
Pamela June				
Ryan Zollinger				

POSTED: _____



AGENDA REPORT: FIRE SERVICE CHANGES

April 9, 2026

Background

The Cache Fire District was formed in 1965 but has never really functioned as a district. All cities in Cache County are part of the District with the exception of Logan City. Cache County has provided some financial support to the various municipal fire departments, but this support is not evenly distributed to all Cache County taxpayers as Logan City residents receive no benefit from their tax dollars that go to the County that are spent on fire-related expenses. The current plan from Cache County is to impose a Fire District Mill Levy for participating cities. This would essentially be an additional tax to residents in participating cities, collected by the County, and distributed to the cities to pay for EMS and Fire services in whatever way the City determines is best for their population. Please read the included memo from County Executive George Daines for more information on this.

Millville City and Nibley City have contracted fire protection services from Hyrum City for decades. The last agreement that Millville and Nibley have with Hyrum was done in 2010. The Millville City cost for fire protection services has been a dollar amount for each Millville resident. For the past several years (at least), that rate has increased by \$0.50 per person per year. Here is a summary of the Millville City cost for fire services over the past five years:

- FY22: \$11/person; Total cost = \$25,586
- FY23: \$11.50/person; Total cost = \$26,749
- FY24: \$12/person; Total cost = \$28,992
- FY25: \$12.50/person; Total cost = \$30,850
- FY26: \$13/person; Total cost = \$32,370

Millville City currently contracts with Cache County for EMS/Ambulance services separately from the fire service provided by Hyrum. For FY26, the cost for this is \$48,282.

Mayor Hair, Councilmember Ames, and Recorder Twedt met with Hyrum City on March 31, 2026, to discuss fire and figure out what Hyrum would be charging Millville City in FY27, starting July 1, 2026. Millville was told that the rate going forward would increase to \$40/person per year with no clarity on when and how this rate would increase in subsequent years.

Although the final cost would depend on which population estimate is used, the Millville cost for fire protection for FY27 would be approximately \$102,920. As you can see, this is more than a 3x increase in cost with only a few months' notice. As a reference, the total property tax revenue that Millville will receive in FY26 will be approximately \$165,000.

Hyrum is saying that their fire service is costing much more than the revenue they are receiving from the contracted cities and this drastic increase is needed. Hyrum also plans to add additional full-time staff to their fire station which would decrease response times to everyone who uses their services.

Hyrum City is also working on getting licensed and equipment for ambulance services in their City. This may be offered to neighboring cities in the future, but it would be an additional cost from what they are billing for fire services.

The Millville City Council will need to begin to discuss how they want to proceed to provide fire service to Millville residents going forward. Will Millville participate in the voucher program proposed by Cache County and if not, how will the City cover the costs for fire services? Will Millville contract with Hyrum going forward or look at other options for fire protection services?

At the City Council meeting tonight, the Council will just discuss the current situation. No contracts will be before them for signatures or final decisions.

Included Documents

- *Alternatives for Fire District* memo from Cache County Executive Daines dated March 26, 2026 including voucher system mill levy estimated revenue by city
- Millville City 2010 fire service interlocal agreement with Hyrum City

CACHE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

N. GEORGE DAINES

To: Fire Board Members, Mayors & Chief Brady
From: N. George Daines, County Executive
Date: March 26, 2026
Re: Alternatives for Fire District

Background. The Cache Fire District was organized some 60 years ago (1965) but has not been functioning as a District operationally or financially. The Cache Fire District area includes all of Cache County except for Logan City which opted out of the Fire District at its inception. Most recently, the District has been reactivated by Cache County with a Board composed of two mayors from the Cities in the South County, two mayors from the Cities in the North County, two Cache County Councilmembers and the County Executive.

Current Fire/EMS Service. The 19 Cities in the District have either maintained their own municipal fire departments or contracted with other Cities to provide that coverage. Cache County has supported these municipal fire departments with equipment purchases and some services (burn permits, fire inspections, training, etc.). Smithfield City has an EMS operation with a service area that covers the northern part of the Fire District. Cache County has an EMS operation with a service area that covers the southern part of the Fire District. All of the funding for all of the Fire/EMS operations in the Fire District is currently coming from the General Funds of the Cities or Cache County.

Double Taxation Problem. The Cache County funding of all Fire/EMS services comes from the County as a whole (property taxes and sales taxes). But the County Fire/EMS services and equipment are not being provided to the County as a whole. Cache County is currently using this funding to provide EMS service to just the South area of the District and also to make equipment purchases for the municipal fire departments outside of Logan.

County Preparations for a Unified Fire District. Cache County over the last 2-3 years has been preparing to activate the Fire District with the goal of making it a true Unified Fire District with centralized management and operations providing Fire/EMS service throughout the Fire District. This was planned to be overseen by what would eventually be a separately elected Fire Board. This Unified Fire District would be supported by its own Fire District tax levy. Cache County has been preparing

for this transition. The County organized the current interim Fire District Board composed of elected county and city officials. The County has added additional staff in its Cache County Fire Department. This interim Fire Board has initiated studies with respect to the financial underpinning of operating a Unified Fire District composed of all 19 Cities and the unincorporated areas of Cache County. While the details were never fully refined that organization would result in the eventual merger of the various municipal Fire/EMS operations into the “Unified” Fire District. At this point, progress in that direction has stalled – the current interim Fire District Board is reconsidering whether it should proceed with the plans for a Unified Fire District.

Since the last District Board meeting I have focused on finding a way forward for the Cache County Fire District. I have listened to and discussed a range of issues with Chief George, mayors, county council members, etc. Hearing their concerns and suggestions has been helpful. There is a fair amount of disagreement, and some opinions are strongly held. I have also perused what studies we have, county and city budgets, etc. I note that we should have more current financial information shortly. Everyone has been respectful and open about their views. The common goal is to improve the Fire/EMS efforts in Cache County. And, in addition, Cache must resolve its double taxation problem.

I have come to the firm opinion that any alternative that centralizes operational control in a new Unified Fire District will not be acceptable to most of the cities and particularly the two cities that are most deeply involved, Hyrum and Smithfield. I have concluded that forcing this centralization alternative on the Cities would split support and result in many Cities making an exit from the Fire District. To keep all of the Cities involved, I believe an acceptable plan must include leaving substantial (if not all) operational control with the Cities and their existing Fire/EMS departments. And, as to the Cities, not having fire departments, Hyde Park, North Logan, Providence, Nibley, etc., most of those Cities want to retain the right to contract for such services. The Board members should determine whether they share these conclusions.

The Fire Board needs to consider the alternatives and arrive at a conclusion as to how it will proceed. The Cities are finalizing their budgets for their 2026-27 budget year. The County is continuing to invest substantial funding in the preparing for a Unified Fire District. The County can no longer avoid confronting its double taxation program. The time to make decisions has arrived.

Here are two alternatives that the Board has and the problems with each:

1. **Maintain the Status Quo.** Cache County cannot accept this alternative. The mismatch between revenue and services (double taxation) cannot be continued. Cache County collected approximately \$4MM last year¹ for its County Fire/EMS services. Logan, North Logan, Providence, and River Heights received virtually no services from County Fire/EMS yet their share of the \$4MM paid in was 54% or \$2.16MM. The Cities in the North part of the District received their EMS services from Smithfield not Cache County – another part of the mismatch. Irrespective of the desires of the Cities, Cache County can no longer operate in this unfair manner. There is some leeway between

¹ 25 Mills on County Taxable Value

funding and services but this level of disparity is not supportable. The County will not participate in a continuation of the status quo.

2. Continue Formation of a Cache County Unified Fire District. This alternative involves the centralization of management and control in a single “Unified Fire District.” It presupposes over period of time (shorter or longer) the existing municipal fire departments and EMS operations will be merged into the “Unified Fire District.” This operation would be overseen by a board elected from the County. The Board would appoint the Cache County Fire District Chief and he would assume overall control of the Fire/EMS operations. The Unified Fire District Board would set a county-wide mill levy and the same would fund the Unified Fire District. This is the direction the County was proposing to the Cities. A number of the Cities including both Hyrum and Smithfield have rejected this alternative and have indicated they are prepared to take the steps necessary to exit the Fire District. A number of other Cities (but not all) that contract for services have indicated that they wish to continue to contract for services and would likewise exit. It appears that with this level of exiting members, a Unified Fire District is not feasible.

3. The Voucher Alternative.

CACHE COUNTY FIRE DISTRICT VOUCHER ALTERNATIVE

1. Participating Cities would retain complete operational control of Fire/EMS services in their City.
2. Participating Cities retain the right to contract for Fire and/or EMS at a negotiated price.
3. The Fire Board would remain as it is now; city and county representation would continue.
4. Participating Cities meet annually to determine jointly a single baseline Fire District Mill Levy.
5. The County Fire Board would adopt the Fire District Mill Levy recommended by the Cities. Truth in Taxation, if required, would be handled by the County or Fire Board.
6. The County would add the Levy to the Property Tax Notice as a County Fire District Levy.
7. County would issue each City a voucher in the full amount (100%) collected from each City. County would only retain the funds collected from the unincorporated areas.
8. The voucher funds could only be used for Fire/EMS (operations or contracted services).

9. Cities could hold voucher funds, year to year, segregated for Fire/EMS capital projects (buildings/equipment) or Fire/EMS future use.
10. County would contract with adjacent cities to provide Fire/EMS to the unincorporated areas. These funds would come from the County Fire District Levy on the unincorporated areas. These funds would greatly assist rural fire departments.
11. South Cities would decide for how long the Fire Board should operate its South EMS operation. This service would be funded by those South Participating Cities at the rate of 50% of their voucher funds until such time as other arrangements are made by the South Cities.
12. County and Fire Board assets (buildings and equipment) would be equitably divided or liquidated, except to the extent and for the time period some may be needed for ongoing South EMS service and/or for the unincorporated areas.
13. Fire District Levy would be on the 2026 Tax Notices, collected with 2026 property taxes and then distributed. Cities would budget accordingly in June 2026.
14. Cities can leave the Fire District at any time. The statutory process would need to be followed.
15. If Cities leave the Fire District, it would continue to operate for those remaining. Even if all Cities opt out, the Fire District would still be needed by and used for the unincorporated area.
16. These rules would be binding included in the Interlocal Agreements between all parties.

BENEFITS OF CHOOSING THE VOUCHER ALTERNATIVE.

Avoiding Centralization & Maintaining Local Control.

County Fire Boards typically have an elected representative board which selects and supervises a County Fire Chief who manages the Fire/EMS operations and personnel throughout the Fire District. The effect is to centralize control under this county wide Board and Fire Chief.

Most of the Cities have already told me that they will not support this centralization. These Cities do not want to give up local control which has been the Cache County system for 100+ years. They are concerned that this centralization will not adequately address their different circumstances and needs. For example, Hyrum has had a good volunteer fire department for 80+ years and Hyrum does not want a centralized bureaucracy telling them how to replace it or how to run it.

The Voucher Alternative entirely sidesteps operational and management centralization. Each City is free to run their own Fire/EMS service as they choose or alternatively contract for such service.

Creating a Baseline Funding County-Wide for Fire/EMS Services Paid by Everyone.

Cache County collectively (including Logan City) has very substantial Fire/EMS capabilities. We have good Fire/EMS facilities staffed with well trained and dedicated full time firemen, volunteer firemen and EMS professionals. They are well led and well trained. Supporting facilities are scattered throughout the valley, but more concentrated in population centers. We also have excellent medical care with multiple hospitals, medical facilities, etc. We are all blessed by these collective capabilities. If any one of us or a large number of victims need help, we trust that all of these collective resources would come to our aid, whether it be a health emergency, a fire, or some serious criminal or natural disaster. The fact is, our collective Fire/EMS capabilities back up all of us. We are neighbors and neighbors help neighbors. What this means is when there is a serious fire in Richmond, you will see fire trucks as needed roll in from Logan. The Pepperidge Plant in Richmond is a County asset and the whole Fire/EMS system supports it. Any serious multi-car accident in Sardine Canyon will bring ambulances from everywhere depending on how many are needed and who can get there the fastest. The need defines who comes - not city boundaries. We all know this. We also know that those that serve us are trained and dedicated to focus, in the event, on helping irrespective of boundaries.

That is as good a description as exists of a common good – one that benefits all of us equally. That availability in an emergency is a benefit to every person in this valley. Every person is equally blessed, but some pay more and some pay much less for this universal protection. A citizen of Logan or Hyrum or Smithfield through their City general fund pays a substantial tax for their Fire/EMS coverage. Nibley City has a contract to pay Hyrum for fire coverage. In practice, the Fire coverage cost for a Hyrum home has been 2X to 3X the cost for a Nibley home. This pricing is a matter of negotiation between the two cities. But what if Nibley City refused to pay anything at all; does anyone believe the Hyrum City Fire Department wouldn't still come to help. A citizen in Mount Sterling pays nothing directly to Hyrum City or Wellsville City for fire coverage, but they can still rely on these fire departments in an emergency.

Having a baseline Fire Board Levy on all property in the County is probably the fairest way to share the cost of this common good. Using this Voucher Alternative, everybody pays based on their property taxable value. The owners of commercial properties and second homes pay a higher rate than primary residential properties and farmland owners pay an even lower rate. The proposed Voucher Alternative has the Cities collectively determining what a fair rate is for a baseline Fire/EMS levy. We can count on the Cities collectively to set what they determine is the fair cost for this service. Giving the Cities direct control of the voucher funds means they will also be used efficiently to provide Fire/EMS service. Lewiston City will decide what is best for that city. Lewiston may decide it is best to double down on their volunteer fire service and cross train some of those volunteers to provide some EMS capabilities. Providence City will decide what is best for that City and maybe that will be

to continue to buy all of those services from Logan. But maybe at some point River Heights, Providence, Nibley and Millville will decide to collectively use their vouchers to build their own Fire/EMS capability. By having a uniform baseline Fire District Levy, we are essentially spreading the cost of this common good equally on the property throughout the County trusting each of the Cities to use their voucher money wisely. That is the best choice we have to avoid the Tragedy of the Commons.

Permanently Resolves the Double Taxation Problem of County Fire/EMS Funding.

The County is legally bound to reasonably measure and allocate use of county funds; double taxation is expressly prohibited by its organic act. At this point, Cache County is paying all of its Fire/EMS expenses from its General Fund which is collected by property taxes on all county properties. But the County Fire/EMS services are not being provided to all areas of the county equally. Double taxation is a problem that must be addressed forthwith.

In 2025 the County Fire/EMS budget was approximately \$4MM. These Cache County expenses were primarily incurred providing EMS services to just the southern end of the county. Sporadically, the County has purchased and provided Fire/EMS equipment, training, backup and some funding and other services to various municipal fire departments. (but nothing to Cities not having fire departments).

No County Fire/EMS services, equipment or facility money has been provided by the County to Logan.² The cities of North Logan, River Heights and Providence contract with Logan City for all their Fire/EMS services, paying for these Logan provided services from their general funds. These four cities collectively provide approximately 54% of the property tax revenue of the Cache General Fund. The disproportionate coverage of Cache EMS services also results in double taxation for Smithfield and other North Cities which have their own or contracted EMS coverage.

There is no justification for the continuation of this double taxation; it must be addressed and changed. As a result of that required change, there would be a necessary reallocation of Fire/EMS expenses irrespective of how the Fire Board chooses to proceed. This reallocation would result in most of the individual citizens (city by city) experiencing increases or decreases in their property taxes. That change is inevitable.

The County must solve this double taxation problem. The Voucher Alternative solves that problem even if some or all of the Cities choose to leave the Fire Board now or in the future.

² Cache County does pay Logan approximately \$100,000 per year to cover unincorporated areas in Logan Canyon and College Ward areas.

Flexibility is Preserved.

The Voucher Alternative does have the Cities collectively setting a single baseline Fire District Levy, but a City could choose to add additional funds for Fire/EMS services from their General Fund if desired. For example, Cities could hold some portion of the voucher funds for several years and then join together to build their own facility adding additional funds from their general funds. The assets purchased will belong to the Cities not the Fire District.

The Fire District levy acts as a baseline not a limit. All the Voucher Alternative really does is set a county wide minimum that will be collected and distributed. It will help benchmark the minimum cost of the service and aid in making sure all Cities are equally contributing at a baseline for Fire/EMS services. It would be expected that the Cities would be conservative in setting the county wide baseline Fire/EMS Levy.

Cities can contract between each other or with other services be they Logan or a private ambulance company.

No City Is Required to Remain in the Fire District.

It is in the County's best interest to keep the Fire District intact even if that District consists of no more than just the unincorporated areas. A statutory remedy is available for any city which decides it is in their best interest to opt out either now, or at any future date.

FIRE DISTRICT ESTIMATES - VOUCHER SYSTEM (@ 80 MILLS)								
Entity	Taxable Value	Txbl %	Total Mill	Total \$	Fire Mill	Fire Share	EMT Mill	EMT Share
NORTH LOGAN CITY	1,779,242,950	15.8%	0.0008000	\$1,423,394	0.0004000	\$711,697	0.0004000	\$711,697
SMITHFIELD CITY	1,528,835,385	13.5%	0.0008000	\$1,223,068	0.0004000	\$611,534	0.0004000	\$611,534
UNINCORORATED COUNTY	1,527,375,767	13.5%	0.0008000	\$1,221,901	0.0004000	\$610,950	0.0004000	\$610,950
PROVIDENCE CITY	1,316,720,590	11.7%	0.0008000	\$1,053,376	0.0004000	\$526,688	0.0004000	\$526,688
HYRUM CITY	1,064,308,615	9.4%	0.0008000	\$851,447	0.0004000	\$425,723	0.0004000	\$425,723
HYDE PARK CITY	958,419,010	8.5%	0.0008000	\$766,735	0.0004000	\$383,368	0.0004000	\$383,368
NIBLEY CITY	864,273,840	7.7%	0.0008000	\$691,419	0.0004000	\$345,710	0.0004000	\$345,710
WELLSVILLE CITY	464,944,640	4.1%	0.0008000	\$371,956	0.0004000	\$185,978	0.0004000	\$185,978
RICHMOND CITY	355,970,270	3.2%	0.0008000	\$284,776	0.0004000	\$142,388	0.0004000	\$142,388
MILLVILLE CITY	314,261,665	2.8%	0.0008000	\$251,409	0.0004000	\$125,705	0.0004000	\$125,705
LEWISTON CITY	263,876,605	2.3%	0.0008000	\$211,101	0.0004000	\$105,551	0.0004000	\$105,551
RIVER HEIGHTS CITY	236,850,305	2.1%	0.0008000	\$189,480	0.0004000	\$94,740	0.0004000	\$94,740
MENDON CITY	163,481,410	1.4%	0.0008000	\$130,785	0.0004000	\$65,393	0.0004000	\$65,393
PARADISE TOWN	141,205,395	1.3%	0.0008000	\$112,964	0.0004000	\$56,482	0.0004000	\$56,482
NEWTON TOWN	82,521,655	0.7%	0.0008000	\$66,017	0.0004000	\$33,009	0.0004000	\$33,009
CLARKSTON TOWN	74,431,355	0.7%	0.0008000	\$59,545	0.0004000	\$29,773	0.0004000	\$29,773
AMALGA TOWN	68,809,455	0.6%	0.0008000	\$55,048	0.0004000	\$27,524	0.0004000	\$27,524
TRENTON TOWN	57,942,080	0.5%	0.0008000	\$46,354	0.0004000	\$23,177	0.0004000	\$23,177
CORNISH TOWN	29,997,100	0.3%	0.0008000	\$23,998	0.0004000	\$11,999	0.0004000	\$11,999
TOTAL	11,293,468,092	100%		\$9,034,774		\$4,517,387		\$4,517,387
FIRE DISTRICT ESTIMATES - VOUCHER SYSTEM (@ 70 MILLS)								
Entity	Taxable Value	Txbl %	Total Mill	Total \$	Fire Mill	Fire Share	EMT Mill	EMT Share
NORTH LOGAN CITY	1,779,242,950	15.8%	0.0007000	\$1,245,470	0.0003500	\$622,735	0.0003500	\$622,735
SMITHFIELD CITY	1,528,835,385	13.5%	0.0007000	\$1,070,185	0.0003500	\$535,092	0.0003500	\$535,092
UNINCORORATED COUNTY	1,527,375,767	13.5%	0.0007000	\$1,069,163	0.0003500	\$534,582	0.0003500	\$534,582
PROVIDENCE CITY	1,316,720,590	11.7%	0.0007000	\$921,704	0.0003500	\$460,852	0.0003500	\$460,852
HYRUM CITY	1,064,308,615	9.4%	0.0007000	\$745,016	0.0003500	\$372,508	0.0003500	\$372,508
HYDE PARK CITY	958,419,010	8.5%	0.0007000	\$670,893	0.0003500	\$335,447	0.0003500	\$335,447
NIBLEY CITY	864,273,840	7.7%	0.0007000	\$604,992	0.0003500	\$302,496	0.0003500	\$302,496
WELLSVILLE CITY	464,944,640	4.1%	0.0007000	\$325,461	0.0003500	\$162,731	0.0003500	\$162,731
RICHMOND CITY	355,970,270	3.2%	0.0007000	\$249,179	0.0003500	\$124,590	0.0003500	\$124,590
MILLVILLE CITY	314,261,665	2.8%	0.0007000	\$219,983	0.0003500	\$109,992	0.0003500	\$109,992
LEWISTON CITY	263,876,605	2.3%	0.0007000	\$184,714	0.0003500	\$92,357	0.0003500	\$92,357
RIVER HEIGHTS CITY	236,850,305	2.1%	0.0007000	\$165,795	0.0003500	\$82,898	0.0003500	\$82,898
MENDON CITY	163,481,410	1.4%	0.0007000	\$114,437	0.0003500	\$57,218	0.0003500	\$57,218
PARADISE TOWN	141,205,395	1.3%	0.0007000	\$98,844	0.0003500	\$49,422	0.0003500	\$49,422
NEWTON TOWN	82,521,655	0.7%	0.0007000	\$57,765	0.0003500	\$28,883	0.0003500	\$28,883
CLARKSTON TOWN	74,431,355	0.7%	0.0007000	\$52,102	0.0003500	\$26,051	0.0003500	\$26,051
AMALGA TOWN	68,809,455	0.6%	0.0007000	\$48,167	0.0003500	\$24,083	0.0003500	\$24,083
TRENTON TOWN	57,942,080	0.5%	0.0007000	\$40,559	0.0003500	\$20,280	0.0003500	\$20,280
CORNISH TOWN	29,997,100	0.3%	0.0007000	\$20,998	0.0003500	\$10,499	0.0003500	\$10,499
TOTAL	11,293,468,092	100%		\$7,905,428		\$3,952,714		\$3,952,714
FIRE DISTRICT ESTIMATES - VOUCHER SYSTEM (@ 60 MILLS)								
Entity	Taxable Value	Txbl %	Total Mill	Total \$	Fire Mill	Fire Share	EMT Mill	EMT Share
NORTH LOGAN CITY	1,779,242,950	15.8%	0.0006000	\$1,067,546	0.0003000	\$533,773	0.0003000	\$533,773
SMITHFIELD CITY	1,528,835,385	13.5%	0.0006000	\$917,301	0.0003000	\$458,651	0.0003000	\$458,651
UNINCORORATED COUNTY	1,527,375,767	13.5%	0.0006000	\$916,425	0.0003000	\$458,213	0.0003000	\$458,213
PROVIDENCE CITY	1,316,720,590	11.7%	0.0006000	\$790,032	0.0003000	\$395,016	0.0003000	\$395,016
HYRUM CITY	1,064,308,615	9.4%	0.0006000	\$638,585	0.0003000	\$319,293	0.0003000	\$319,293
HYDE PARK CITY	958,419,010	8.5%	0.0006000	\$575,051	0.0003000	\$287,526	0.0003000	\$287,526
NIBLEY CITY	864,273,840	7.7%	0.0006000	\$518,564	0.0003000	\$259,282	0.0003000	\$259,282
WELLSVILLE CITY	464,944,640	4.1%	0.0006000	\$278,967	0.0003000	\$139,483	0.0003000	\$139,483
RICHMOND CITY	355,970,270	3.2%	0.0006000	\$213,582	0.0003000	\$106,791	0.0003000	\$106,791
MILLVILLE CITY	314,261,665	2.8%	0.0006000	\$188,557	0.0003000	\$94,278	0.0003000	\$94,278
LEWISTON CITY	263,876,605	2.3%	0.0006000	\$158,326	0.0003000	\$79,163	0.0003000	\$79,163
RIVER HEIGHTS CITY	236,850,305	2.1%	0.0006000	\$142,110	0.0003000	\$71,055	0.0003000	\$71,055
MENDON CITY	163,481,410	1.4%	0.0006000	\$98,089	0.0003000	\$49,044	0.0003000	\$49,044
PARADISE TOWN	141,205,395	1.3%	0.0006000	\$84,723	0.0003000	\$42,362	0.0003000	\$42,362
NEWTON TOWN	82,521,655	0.7%	0.0006000	\$49,513	0.0003000	\$24,756	0.0003000	\$24,756
CLARKSTON TOWN	74,431,355	0.7%	0.0006000	\$44,659	0.0003000	\$22,329	0.0003000	\$22,329
AMALGA TOWN	68,809,455	0.6%	0.0006000	\$41,286	0.0003000	\$20,643	0.0003000	\$20,643
TRENTON TOWN	57,942,080	0.5%	0.0006000	\$34,765	0.0003000	\$17,383	0.0003000	\$17,383
CORNISH TOWN	29,997,100	0.3%	0.0006000	\$17,998	0.0003000	\$8,999	0.0003000	\$8,999
TOTAL	11,293,468,092	100%		\$6,776,081		\$3,388,040		\$3,388,040

INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES

THIS AGREEMENT, made and entered into as of the 1st day of July, 2010, by and between HYRUM CITY, a municipal corporation of the State of Utah, hereinafter referred to as "Hyrum", and MILLVILLE, a municipal corporation of the State of Utah, hereinafter referred to as "Millville".

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, Millville is desirous of providing for adequate fire protection within its own territorial limits, and

WHEREAS, Hyrum operates a municipal fire department, and

WHEREAS, Section 11-7-1, Utah Code Annotated, 1953, provides that municipalities may enter into an agreement whereby fire protection services are furnished and received, respectively, and

WHEREAS, both parties to this Agreement are desirous of cooperating to their mutual advantage and to the advantage of the residents of their respective cities by providing the most effective and economical fire protection, and

WHEREAS, this Agreement is deemed to be in the best interests and to promote the general welfare of both parties.

NOW, THEREFORE, based upon the mutual covenants and consideration set forth below, it is agreed as follows:

1. Hyrum agrees to provide fire protection services, which services do not include annual or periodic fire inspections of commercial buildings or other structures, and to fight all fires located within the corporate limits of Millville, subject to the conditions contained in this Agreement.
2. It is understood that Hyrum is at this same time under contract with Cache County to provide fire protection services to areas within Hyrum's zone of the Cache County Fire Protection District. Said contract allows for Hyrum to enter into separate agreements such as this one for providing fire protection services to other municipalities. In providing the services required by this Agreement, it is understood and agreed that Hyrum is required to act in accordance with the procedures and priorities outlined in the Cache County contract and all other applicable ordinances, statues, regulations and procedures relating to the provision of fire protection services by Hyrum and to situations involving multiple fires, substations, stand-by stations, and all others which may arise by reason of Hyrum's participation in the County's Fire Protection District.
3. Millville shall pay to Hyrum a sum set forth annually by resolution, to which both parties are in agreement, for fire fighting and fire protection services

within the corporate limits of Millville, said sum to be used by Hyrum in the fighting, controlling and prevention of fires, training of personnel and the purchasing of necessary fire fighting equipment as is needed for fighting and controlling fires by Hyrum's fire department. The population figure of Millville, upon which the payment herein required to be made shall be based, shall be determined by mutual agreement between the parties as of July 1, 2010, and as of each July 1 thereafter for renewals, by reference to the best information sources available in each year. Inasmuch as such information shall be primarily within the control of Millville officials, Millville agrees to cooperate and put forth its best effort in gathering available information so as to enable the parties to arrive at a population figure that is as accurate as possible. It is recognized, however, that an exact population count will be difficult to obtain at any given time and that the mutually agreed figure shall represent the best estimate of the parties which shall be accepted for purposes of this agreement.

4. The parties agree to cooperate and coordinate in their fire fighting programs and to cooperate with each other through their respective fire fighting officials to secure effective and efficient fire protection throughout all areas of Hyrum and Millville, and Hyrum covenants and agrees that its within the corporate limits of Millville upon proper notification of the same and subject to the conditions set forth in paragraph two (2), above.
5. Hyrum covenants and agrees to bear all costs for fire fighting and fire protection services except as to the sums received from Millville as provided for in paragraph three (3) of this Agreement, which sums shall be expended as also therein provided. Hyrum shall also be responsible for training its personnel and maintaining the fire equipment within its jurisdiction. The City agrees to mutually cooperate with the other communities within the County in training and other fire protection systems and programs deemed to be in the best interests of all involved.
6. It is understood and agreed that in the event that is request is made to Hyrum to fight fires outside Hyrum's fire zone area and outside Millville, Hyrum is obligated to respond to such call to the extent possible without jeopardizing fire protection within Hyrum's and Millville's corporate limits, and direction of the County through the County's responsible officials for such call.
7. The provisions of Utah Code Sections 11-7-3 and 11-7-4 relating to privileges and immunities from liability for departments fighting fires outside its territorial limits and the death or injury of a fireman while fighting a fire outside of his department's territorial limits shall apply to this Agreement, as shall all others which are applicable but not enumerated herein.
8. It is agreed that the sums paid by Millville to Hyrum herein shall be paid on a calendar year basis on or before the 1st day of July each year.
9. This Agreement supercedes any previous agreements entered into by and between the parties hereto, and this Agreement shall commence at 12:01 a.m., July 1, 2010 and shall continue for a period of one (1) year and expire on June 30, 2011. This agreement can be extended for additional (1) one year periods

by mutual agreement between the parties and subject to any changes in the terms and provisions as negotiated between the parties.

10. The parties verify that the undersigned officials have been duly authorized to execute this Agreement on behalf of the parties.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement in duplicate, each of which shall be deemed an original, with the effective date hereof being July 1, 2010.

(Seal)

CITY OF HYRUM
A Municipal Corporation

by Dean Howard
Mayor

ATTEST:

Stephanie Bess
City Recorder

(Seal)

CITY OF MILLVILLE
A Municipal Corporation

by _____
Mayor

ATTEST:

City Recorder

by mutual agreement between the parties and subject to any changes in the terms and provisions as negotiated between the parties.

10. The parties verify that the undersigned officials have been duly authorized to execute this Agreement on behalf of the parties.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement in duplicate, each of which shall be deemed an original, with the effective date hereof being July 1, 2010.

(Seal)

CITY OF HYRUM
A Municipal Corporation

by _____
Mayor

ATTEST:

City Recorder

(Seal)

CITY OF MILLVILLE
A Municipal Corporation

by 
Mayor

ATTEST:



City Recorder



AGENDA REPORT: BUDGET REVIEW

April 9, 2026

Background

Every quarter, the City Council reviews the fiscal year-to-date budget for an update on revenue and expenses so far in the year.

The budget review at this meeting will include the FY26 budget through the third quarter (July 2025 – March 2026).

Staff will discuss the accounts that are highlighted blue and then the Council can ask questions or discuss anything else you would like concerning the budget.

Included Documents

- FY26 Budget with progress and percentage of the total through Q3

MILLVILLE CITY BUDGET - REVENUE		ORIGINAL	REVIEW	
Account Description		FY26 Budget	FY26 Q3	% of Total
GENERAL	Property Tax	\$165,000	\$144,929	88%
	Sales Tax	\$400,000	\$313,884	78%
	Motor Tax	\$900	\$876	97%
	In Lieu Fees - UTV Recreation Fees	\$10,000	\$8,427	84%
	Comcast Franchise	\$8,700	\$6,535	75%
	Energy Sales and Use Tax	\$190,000	\$117,447	62%
	Animal Licenses	\$4,100	\$3,247	79%
	Ambulance / EMS	\$45,600	\$31,254	69%
	Fines / Court	\$800	\$539	67%
	Business Licenses	\$3,800	\$7,804	205%
	Sanitation	\$200,000	\$154,181	77%
	9-1-1 Service	\$29,500	\$20,596	70%
	Class "C" Roads	\$200,000	\$169,362	85%
	Appro. Fund Bal. Class "C" Rd	\$0	\$0	100%
	Appropriated Fund Balance	\$0	\$0	100%
	Park Impact Fee	\$26,600	\$31,980	120%
	Park Impact Appropriated FB	\$0	\$0	100%
	Road Impact Fee	\$8,800	\$10,560	120%
	Road Impact Appropriated FB	\$41,200	\$0	0%
	Restaurant/RAPZ Tax Awarded	\$59,100	\$7,115	12%
	Youth Council	\$800	\$800	100%
	Park Rentals	\$10,000	\$10,179	102%
	Building Permits	\$5,000	\$7,106	142%
	Development Review Fees	\$2,000	\$9,150	458%
	Reimbursed Fees; Eng. & Dev.	\$5,000	\$341	7%
	Interest	\$50,000	\$54,723	109%
	COG Grant (reimbursement)	\$0	\$86,380	-%
Misc. Revenue	\$500	\$23,916	4783%	
Mass Transit Sales Tax/CVTD	\$44,000	\$31,561	72%	
TOTAL GENERAL		\$1,511,400	\$1,252,891	

\$0

STORM WATER	Charges for Stormwater	\$34,000	\$24,114	71%
	Stormwater Construction Fees	\$1,500	\$1,650	110%
	Interest	\$3,000	\$3,522	117%
	Transfer from General Fund	\$0	\$0	100%
	Appropriated Fund Balance	\$0	\$0	100%
	TOTAL STORMWATER		\$38,500	\$29,286

CPT PROJ.	Interest	\$60,000	\$57,079	95%
	Appropriated Fund Balance	\$0	\$0	100%
	Transfer from General Fund	\$129,000	\$0	0%
	TOTAL CAPITAL PROJECT		\$189,000	\$57,079

MILLVILLE CITY BUDGET - REVENUE	ORIGINAL	REVIEW	
Account Description	FY26 Budget	FY26 Q3	% of Total

WATER & SEWER	Charges for Water Service ...	\$550,000	\$411,808	75%
	Miscellaneous Income	\$2,500	\$4,356	174%
	Interest Income (Water)	\$40,000	\$43,991	110%
	Interest Income (Sewer)	\$20,000	\$77,041	385%
	Water Impact Fee	\$15,200	\$18,300	120%
	Water Connection Fees	\$400	\$950	238%
	Charges for Sewer Service	\$694,000	\$523,092	75%
	Sewer Impact Fee	\$43,800	\$52,560	120%
	Grant Proceeds (Sewer)	\$2,000,000	\$3,356,897	168%
	TOTAL WATER AND SEWER	\$3,365,900	\$4,488,995	

TOTAL	\$5,104,800	\$5,828,251
--------------	--------------------	--------------------

MILLVILLE CITY BUDGET - EXPENSES		ORIGINAL	Review	
Account Description		FY26 Budget	FY26 Q3	% of Total
GENERAL	General Government	\$44,500	\$17,830	40%
	Auditor (General) ...	\$17,500	\$17,000	97%
	Financial Consulting & IT (General) ...	\$14,500	\$12,034	83%
	Insurance (General)	\$22,000	\$15,841	72%
	Elected Officials (General)	\$21,500	\$13,993	65%
	General Non-Category Payroll	\$122,300	\$96,256	79%
	P&Z ...	\$9,900	\$7,152	72%
	Legal (General) ...	\$14,000	\$7,968	57%
	Engineering (General) ...	\$30,000	\$1,970	7%
	Building (General) ...	\$14,700	\$5,283	36%
	Law Enforcement	\$35,400	\$17,696	50%
	Animal Control ...	\$4,500	\$2,213	49%
	Fire	\$33,800	\$32,539	96%
	First Responders and EMS	\$48,000	\$24,141	50%
	Elections ...	\$6,700	\$2,915	44%
	Roads - General ...	\$142,600	\$83,909	59%
	Roads Class "C" Regular ...	\$190,000	\$0	0%
	Roads Class "C" Capital Outlay	\$10,000	\$8,824	88%
	COG Road Project (Reimbursable)	\$0	\$69,572	-%
	Road Impact Fee Capital Outlay	\$50,000	\$8,543	17%
	Parks (General) ...	\$174,000	\$93,010	53%
	Parks/Recreation - Other ...	\$11,500	\$2,835	25%
	Park Capital Improv. RAPZ (Reimbursable)	\$46,900	\$31,408	67%
	Park Impact Fees ...	\$0	\$0	100%
	Park Impact Fees - Designated Future	\$26,600	\$0	0%
	Sanitation	\$202,000	\$138,246	68%
	9-1-1 Service	\$31,000	\$19,904	64%
	Disaster Relief	\$4,000	\$0	0%
	Public Safety/Emergency Preparedness ...	\$6,000	\$0	0%
	Youth Council ...	\$4,500	\$2,518	56%
	Designated for Future Use	\$0	\$0	100%
	Mass Transit Tax Distribution/CVTD	\$44,000	\$0	0%
Transfer to Capital Project Fund	\$129,000	\$0	0%	
Transfer to Water-Sewer Fund	\$0	\$0	100%	
TOTAL GENERAL	\$1,511,400	\$733,598		

MILLVILLE CITY BUDGET - EXPENSES		ORIGINAL	Review	
Account Description		FY26 Budget	FY26 Q3	% of Total
STORM WATER	Salaries/Benefits	\$23,500	\$18,865	80%
	Special Dept. Supplies (SW) ...	\$9,000	\$1,826	20%
	Capital Outlay	\$5,000	\$0	0%
	Appropriated for Future Use	\$1,000	\$0	0%
	TOTAL STORMWATER	\$38,500	\$20,691	

CPT PROJECT	Capital Outlay - Gen Government	\$173,200	\$51,983	30%
	Capital Projects	\$0	\$0	100%
	Transfer to Water-Sewer Fund	\$0	\$0	100%
	Designated Future Use	\$15,800	\$0	0%
	TOTAL CAPITAL PROJECT	\$189,000	\$51,983	

WATER & SEWER	General (Water/Sewer) ...	\$71,900	\$58,860	82%
	Salary/Benefit (Water) ...	\$176,300	\$120,177	68%
	Legal (Water) ...	\$10,000	\$2,229	22%
	Engineering (Water)	\$15,000	\$0	0%
	Auditor (Water) ...	\$15,000	\$12,900	86%
	Financial Consulting & IT (Water) ...	\$9,000	\$8,940	99%
	Insurance (Water)	\$9,000	\$8,285	92%
	Special Department Supplies - Water ...	\$55,000	\$24,934	45%
	Special Department Supplies - Sewer	\$20,000	\$853	4%
	City Sewer - Nibley/Hyrum	\$270,000	\$60,506	22%
	Sewer Capital Projects	\$2,000,000	\$2,980,380	149%
	Water Bond (2006) - Water Storage Tank	\$93,000	\$92,112	99%
	Bond (2000) - Parker Well	\$44,800	\$33,570	75%
	USDA Sewer Rev Bond	\$338,300	\$253,692	75%
	Cap. Facility Rplcmnt Fund Reserve	\$45,000	\$0	0%
Designated for Future Use - Sewer	\$193,600	\$0	0%	
TOTAL WATER AND SEWER	\$3,365,900	\$3,657,438		

TOTAL	\$5,104,800	\$4,463,709	
--------------	--------------------	--------------------	--

Councilmember Assignments 2026

Councilmember Jeremy Ward

- Car Show for City Celebration
- Youth Council

Councilmember Ryan Zollinger

- Sewer
- School District
- Parade

Councilmember Jacob Ames

- Fire/EMS/Emergency Preparedness
- Law Enforcement/Animal Control
- Resident Hardship Fund

Councilmember Pamela June

- P&Z
- Ordinance Enforcement

Councilmember Darcy Ripplinger

- City Celebration
- Trails
- Wildfire