RICHMOND UTAH
Home of Black & White Days

RICHMOND CITY COUNCIL MEETING
June 16, 2026

The regular meeting of the Richmond City Council was held at the Park Community Center located at 90 South 100 West, Richmond, Utah, on Tuesday, June 16, 2026. The meeting began at 6:30 p.m. Mayor Jeff Young was in the chair.

Welcome and Opening Remarks by Joel Draxler

Council Members Present: Lyle Bair, Daryl Black, Joel Draxler, Fran Schumann

Council Members Excused: Bryce Wood

Staff Present: Justin Lewis (City Recorder), HollyJo Karren (City Administrator), Melissa Titensor (City Treasurer), Josie DeMann

Others Present: Una & Elbert Sweeten, Mike Hite, Martin Rigby, Richard Anderson, Nic Aslett, Terrie Wierenga, Paul Thatcher, Kaden Spackman, Eric Oman, Coleen Fenton, Jessica Dunyon, Jana Saunders, Brock & Lynzi Meacham, Kenlee Brown, Stan Butler, Kelly Brown, Stephanie Mortensen, Shawn Platt, Norton Thurgood, Debbie Zilles

Approval of the city council meeting minutes from May 19, 2026.

*****Councilmember Black moved to approve the May 19, 2026, City Council meeting minutes as submitted. Councilmember Draxler seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0. *****

Yes Vote: Bair, Black, Draxler, Schumann
No Vote: None
Absent: Wood

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2026-04, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 12-000 “Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)”, Chapter 12-3000 “Permitted Use Matrix”.

Mr. Lewis explained that this Ordinance will add a new item in Section 12-3000 “Permitted Use Matrix”: Tattoo/Piercing Studio/Shop, which would be a permitted use in CBD, HC, MLI, and a conditional-use in A-10, A-5, RE-1, RE-2, RLD, RMD, RMF, and NC.

When the last update was made, it accidentally deleted Commercial Storage Unit(s), which are permitted only by conditional-use in the MLI zone, so those will be added back in.

The Planning Commission has reviewed and recommended approval.

*****Councilmember Black moved to adopt Ordinance 2026-04, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 12-000 “Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO), Chapter 12-3000 “Permitted Use**

Matrix". Councilmember Bair seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0. ***

Yes Vote: Bair, Black, Draxler, Schumann
No Vote: None
Absent: Wood

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2026-06, an Ordinance establishing a monthly billing and rate schedule for culinary water service.

Mr. Lewis explained that the proposed Ordinance would increase the culinary water base rate by $1.00 per month per year for the next five years, beginning July 1, 2026. The current base rate is $65.00 per month.

The rates will apply equally to all culinary water users, regardless of use.

The proposed monthly water rate is established as follows:

a) From 0-10,000 gallons, $66.00/month starting July 1, 2026.
b) From 0-10,000 gallons, $67.00/month starting July 1, 2027.
c) From 0-10,000 gallons, $68.00/month starting July 1, 2028.
d) From 0-10,000 gallons, $69.00/month starting July 1, 2029.
e) From 0-10,000 gallons, $70.00/month starting July 1, 2030.

Effective July 1, 2026, the following surcharges are established which are the same as currently charged.

1) The surcharge water rate is established as follows:
   a) A surcharge of $1.00 per 1,000 gallons for metered water from 10,001 gallons through to 100,000 gallons.
   b) A surcharge of $2.00 per 1,000 gallons for metered water from 100,001 gallons to maximum usage.

The City Council has decided to move forward with a new culinary water well, potentially west of the Park Community Center. The estimated cost is $150,000 for a test well and approximately $4,300,000 for a production well and related infrastructure. An 8-inch pressure-reducing station is also needed near 800 South 100 East to address pressure issues, at an estimated cost of $350,000. The increase will not affect the tiered rate system. Impact fees will be used for the production well and pressure-reducing station, but not for the test well.

Mayor Young said the City Council carefully balances costs among current residents, future residents, and system needs. He said the City Council prefers smaller increases over time rather than one large increase, while also considering impact fees and revenue from new development.

6:39 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

Mike Hite asked that all budget-related agenda items be discussed before votes are taken so residents can understand the overall financial impact. Mayor Young said each item would be introduced, followed by a public hearing, discussion, and vote.

Terrie Wierenga asked how payments on the existing well bond would affect the proposed new well and related improvements. Mr. Lewis said the City intends to complete the new well and infrastructure without issuing a new bond. He noted that the City currently owes $2,094,179 on the existing bond.

Mayor Young explained that the proposed water and sewer impact fees for new development are based on the outstanding debt and excess capacity associated with those utility funds. He noted that if the Council chooses to make no changes, the City's impact fees will decrease as the bonds are paid off, eventually becoming one of the lowest in Cache County. He expressed concern that significantly lower impact fees could encourage unprecedented growth, reiterating his earlier comments about the importance of maintaining a balanced approach to growth and development.

Martin Rigby asked whether the City had completed a formal cost-of-service rate study. Mr. Lewis said no study was commissioned because staff, the Council, and Mayor Young, determined that the improvements would not be bonded and that a formal rate study was unnecessary. Mr. Rigby also asked whether any portion of the increase related to a settlement or consent decree from a prior discharge violation. Mr. Lewis answered no.

6:45 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2026-06.

Councilmember Bair said the $1.00 monthly increase has been discussed for some time and is intended to keep pace with rising costs rather than require a larger one-time increase down the road.

> ***Councilmember Bair moved to adopt Ordinance 2026-06, an Ordinance establishing a monthly billing and rate schedule for culinary water service. Councilmember Draxler seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.***
>
> **Yes Vote: Bair, Black, Draxler, Schumann**
> **No Vote: None**
> **Absent: Wood**

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Resolution 2026-04, a Resolution establishing a monthly billing rate for solid waste/garbage service.

Mr. Lewis reviewed the City's solid waste contract history, noting that Richmond contracted with Econo Waste, now Republic Waste, after cities outside Logan were required to secure their own garbage service. He explained that rates have not changed since January 2023, while tipping and service costs have increased each year. Through the end of May, the garbage fund had a year-to-date deficit of $8,152 and ended Fiscal Year 2025 with a negative net income, prompting the proposed rate increase. The current monthly rates are $19.50 for 60-gallon garbage service and $22.00 for 90-gallon garbage service. The following is being proposed:

Effective: July 1, 2026
Garbage Can – 60 Gallon $21.50
Garbage Can – 90 Gallon $24.00

Effective: July 1, 2027
Garbage Can – 60 Gallon $22.50
Garbage Can – 90 Gallon $25.00

Effective: July 1, 2028
Garbage Can – 60 Gallon $23.50
Garbage Can – 90 Gallon $26.00

Mr. Lewis pointed out that no property tax increase is being proposed due to the increase in the utility rates.

The garbage service contract may be reviewed and rebid when it expires in 2028.

This will not affect commercial garbage, which is handled under private contracts.

Mayor Young said the proposal appeared to be the best available option and price point after comparison with other cities and service providers.

Mr. Lewis noted that Richmond City owns the garbage cans and does not charge for new, overflowing, lid-up, or damaged cans.

6:52 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

Terrie Wierenga asked whether the City intends to phase out 60-gallon cans. Mr. Lewis said existing 60-gallon cans will remain in use, but replacement cans will be 90 gallons, and no new 60-gallon cans will be issued. Ms. Wierenga asked the Council to consider hardship exceptions for residents on fixed incomes, those serving on military deployment, or senior citizens who may use less garbage.

Norton Thurgood asked about Logan City's rate increase. Mr. Lewis said they will now be charging $40 per ton versus the current $38 per ton. He said the carrier contract has typically gone up 4.00% annually, and the City, up to this point, has covered that increase. He also said other cities can differ on what they charge depending on the services they offer and their populations.

Mike Hite asked whether a resident whose 60-gallon can breaks and is replaced with a 90-gallon can would pay the higher rate. Mr. Lewis confirmed that replacement cans will be 90-gallon and will be charged at the 90-gallon rate. He also noted that Econo Waste charges the same amount per household, regardless of how full a can is.

6:58 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 2026-04.

Councilmember Schumann asked if the City had ever considered varying costs based on weight. Mr. Lewis said it had not because the rate for the can(s) would remain the same for the carrier charge.

Councilmember Black asked whether residents could opt out of having a garbage can. Mr. Lewis said City Code requires each residence to have garbage service. Councilmember Black said he understood the intent and need but questioned whether alternatives were available.

Councilmember Black moved to adopt Resolution 2026-04, a Resolution establishing a monthly billing rate for solid waste/garbage service. Councilmember Draxler seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.

Yes Vote: Bair, Black, Draxler, Schumann
No Vote: None
Absent: Wood

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2026-07, an Ordinance establishing a monthly billing rate and schedule for sanitary sewer system and treatment.

Mr. Lewis explained that the proposal would increase the monthly sewer base rate by $2.00 per month each year for five years, as follows:

1) The sewer rate is established as follows:
   a) Starting on July 1, 2026, the base rate will be $83.00 per month.
   b) Starting on July 1, 2027, the base rate will be $85.00 per month.
   c) Starting on July 1, 2028, the base rate will be $87.00 per month.
   d) Starting on July 1, 2029, the base rate will be $89.00 per month.
   e) Starting on July 1, 2030, the base rate will be $91.00 per month.

Mr. Lewis explained that the current Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) plant bond balance is approximately $588,000 and is expected to be paid off within three years. The proposed increase is intended to prepare for long-term significant MBR plant upgrades. Last year, the City applied for Water Quality Board funding and received an offer that included $1,700,000 in principal forgiveness and a $6,250,000 loan at 1.2%, with an estimated annual payment of $368,000. The new payment would not begin until the current bond is paid off.

If approved, the MBR improvements will take several years to complete. Impact fees will cover part of the cost, but the City has determined the upgrades cannot be completed effectively in phases.

The City is currently working on a new Sewer Impact Fee Study.

In the case of users who introduce excessive amounts into the wastewater system Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD), Total Suspended Solids (TSS), Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN), Total Phosphorous (TP), or other elements detrimental to the wastewater system, a monthly surcharge will be incurred as listed below, and these rates will remain at the current level:

1) The threshold numbers that will initiate additional surcharges for treatment are:
   a) Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) 228 mg/L
   b) Total Suspended Solids (TSS) 200 mg/L
   c) Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN) 35 mg/L
   d) Total Phosphorous (TP) 8 mg/L

Mayor Young said sewer infrastructure has been a long-standing issue for the City. He noted that last year, the Council discussed a possible $15.00 monthly increase. After he became Mayor in January, he asked Councilmember Draxler to review why an increase was needed and what improvements were necessary.

Councilmember Draxler said J-U-B Engineers provided short-, mid-, and long-term recommendations for the MBR plant. The estimated cost to renovate and improve the plant is approximately $9,000,000, which would have required a $15.00 monthly increase if bonded immediately. After reviewing alternatives, the Council determined that waiting until the current bond is paid off and then pursuing the proposed funding approach was the best option.

Mr. Lewis responded that an adjustment had been made six years earlier because the fund was operating at a deficit.

7:11 p.m. <u>Public Hearing Opened</u>

Kenlee Brown asked for a layperson's explanation of the need for the upgrades. Councilmember Draxler said the MBR plant and related components have a life expectancy and are beginning to wear out. He explained that some membranes will no longer be manufactured, flows have fallen below required levels, and larger flow lines would help the plant operate more efficiently. Mayor Young added that State regulations for lagoon ponds continue to become more restrictive. Mr. Brown asked why new residents are not covering a larger share of the expenses. Mayor Young said impact fees and growth-related costs are regulated by the State, and the Council is trying to balance those costs. Mr. Lewis said the City needs to raise approximately $1,300,000 in cash for the project, and part of the increase will help cover that amount.

Shawn Platt asked whether the current system is at full capacity, whether it could fail, and whether the upgrades are necessary. Councilmember Draxler said the upgrades are primarily needed to address capacity. Councilmember Black said the system is not at full capacity, but State requirements prevent it from operating at 100% due to redundancy requirements. He explained that two basins feed the plant, and if one basin goes offline, the other one must continue operating. Part of the original bid included a $1,100,000 retrofit to prepare the ponds for construction; however, the City's sewer crew researched alternatives and found a Colorado company that could extend the lagoons life by approximately 10 years for $44,000. He added that, with 3% inflation, the proposed increase would equal approximately $2.33 per month, which is more than the proposed $2.00 monthly increase, and that operating costs must also be considered. Mayor Young clarified that the plant is engineered for a specific number of hookups, or equivalent residential units (ERUs). He noted a discrepancy between the physical plant and the State's engineered specifications, which are required by the bond. With already approved homes included, the current estimate is that 88 units remain available. He said the City's system is older, Version 1, while Version 4 is now in use, which is why replacement parts are unavailable. A benefit of the newer system is that portions can be replaced while the plant remains operational. Mr. Platt said he appreciated the information and better understood the need. Councilmember Draxler said the Council does not want to burden the community with unnecessary expenses and has spent considerable time researching the issue. He also noted frustration with State requirements that the City cannot control. Mr. Lewis said the information comes from the Water Master Plan and Sewer Master Plan, both completed within the past year.

Una Sweeten asked whether Richmond is at capacity for the impact fees it can charge based on what the State requires. Mayor Young said it depends on the comparison area(s). Richmond City is currently just above average. Councilmember Draxler pointed out that impact fees must be used to increase capacity. Mr. Lewis said Richmond City is charging the maximum allowable amount per connection as previously approved by the city council. He explained that the sewer is a split system in regard to impact fees; the north section is $8,442, and the south section is $5,631.

Lynzi Meacham asked how many years it will take to pay off the new bond. Mr. Lewis said the new bond will be for 20 years. Mayor Young said that this is the estimated longevity of the plant improvements. The original plant was put in 15 years ago, and the current bond will be paid off in three years. There may be other communities using different systems, but none of them are cheap. The current system is quite effective.

7:33 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2026-07.

Mayor Young said prior long-term planning and maintenance have helped the City well. He noted that Richmond's estimated $9,000,000 upgrade serves more than 1,049 hookups, while a nearby city with approximately 350 hookups anticipates a $12,000,000 cost due to capacity issues.

Councilmember Bair said it was prudent to pay off the current bond before taking on the next loan. He noted that some high-flow readings occur during spring runoff and may be caused by sump pumps discharging into the sewer, a practice that is illegal and difficult to track. Councilmember Draxler agreed that those flows reduce plant efficiency.

*****Councilmember Draxler moved to adopt Ordinance 2026-07, an Ordinance establishing a monthly billing rate and schedule for the sanitary sewer system and treatment. Councilmember Black seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0. *****

Yes Vote: Bair, Black, Draxler, Schumann
No Vote: None
Absent: Wood

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Resolution 2026-05, a Resolution amending the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget which is the period of July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026.

Mr. Lewis explained that the amendments close out the current budget year ending June 30, 2026. He highlighted the following changes:

General Fund changes total $301,722, including increased franchise tax, local road tax, Class "C" road funds, interest earnings, and Black & White Days donations and sponsorships. Expense changes include mass transit tax, road funds, legal fees, and a $236,250 transfer to the Capital Projects Fund to comply with unreserved fund balance requirements.

Water & Sewer Enterprise Fund changes include revenue from a water dedication payment, impact fees, and new meter installs, as well as engineering expenses for the sewer plant and water well projects.

Cub River Sports Complex – adding in $2,143 for use fees and interest. Lewiston City pays 50%, and Richmond pays 50% of the costs associated with this venue.

7:42 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

Terrie Wierenga asked whether the General Fund transfer to the Capital Improvement Fund was related to reduced snow removal costs. Mr. Lewis said some of the contributing factors for the transfer were due to increased sales tax, franchise tax, interest earnings, and other revenue being higher than initially projected.

7:44 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 2026-05.

*****Councilmember Draxler moved to adopt Resolution 2026-05, a Resolution amending the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget which is the period of July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026. Councilmember Bair seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.*****

Yes Vote: Bair, Black, Draxler, Schumann
No Vote: None
Absent: Wood

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2026-05, an Ordinance establishing compensation increases for the City Council Members, Mayor and appointed officials.

Mr. Lewis explained that Utah Senate Bill 91, adopted in 2024, requires a publicly noticed hearing and vote for changes to compensation for elected and appointed positions.

The proposed Fiscal Year 2027 compensation increases for executive municipal officers, City Council members, and the Mayor were presented as follows:

<u>Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA)</u>
Mayor, 3.5%
City Council, 3.5%
City Administrator, 0.0%
City Recorder, 3.5%
Library Director, 3.5%
City Treasurer, 3.5%

The current annual salary for:
Mayor, $7,499.18
City Council, $2,972.84
City Recorder, $37,964.16
Library Director, $32,961.76
City Treasurer, $27.60 per hour

7:47 p.m. <u>Public Hearing Opened</u>

Kenlee Brown expressed appreciation for the Mayor and City Council but said many residents are struggling financially. He said elected officials chose to run for office and should be mindful of the financial burden on residents.

Shawn Platt said online search results showed higher compensation figures for the Mayor and Council and asked what the 3.5% increase was based on. Councilmember Draxler said it matched the employee increase approved by the Council based on inflation estimates. Mr. Platt questioned whether elected-official compensation should increase when many residents are not receiving similar increases. Ms. Dunyon noted from the audience that online search results are not an official source of salary information. Terrie Wierenga said Utah's transparency website provides official salary and compensation information. She noted that the Mayor and Council members attend many meetings, handle resident calls, and perform many uncompensated public service duties.

Una Sweeten thinks 3.5% is excessive, since she is not aware of anyone else getting that increase.

7:57 p.m. <u>Public Hearing Closed</u>

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2026-05.

Councilmember Bair said that during his 11 years on the City Council, his annual compensation has increased by only $50 per month. He noted that even modest compensation is helpful but said he is comfortable leaving it as proposed or removing the increase for the city council.

Councilmember Schumann said she did not know council members were compensated when she ran for office and serves because she wants to. She said she supports increases for the department heads.

Councilmember Draxler said he also did not initially know council members were compensated. He said he does not believe the City Council should receive a raise but does believe employees deserve one.

Councilmember Black is willing to forgo a raise for the City Council but also supports the proposed increase for employees.

Mayor Young said this was based on the original proposal. He does not support automatic COLA increases and does not personally want one, as he chose to run for elected office.

Councilmember Draxler asked whether the City Administrator had received a pay increase in the past 12 months and said he would support a 3.5% increase for that position. Mayor Young said the position did not receive an increase because he believed the current wage was adequate and would not support an increase at this time.

> ***Councilmember Black moved to adopt Ordinance 2026-05, an Ordinance establishing compensations increases for City Council Members, Mayor and Appointed Officials, amending the increase for the City Council and Mayor from 3.5% to 0.0%. Councilmember Bair seconded the motion. The motion was approved 3-1.***
>
> **Yes Vote: Bair, Black, Schumann**
> **No Vote: Draxler**
> **Absent: Wood**

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Resolution 2026-06, a Resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 2027 Budget which is the period of July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027.

Mr. Lewis highlighted several changes from the previous month’s budget discussion:

3110 Income – Property Tax finalized at $423,131 with no proposed change to the property tax rate for the new fiscal year.

3695 Income – RAPZ Tax for $105,000 which is for the pickleball courts project.

4411 Expense Street Wages - one minor change due to a typographical error

50003 Transfer from General Fund to Capital Projects Fund - $76,268.

General Fund Revenue – proposing $2,223,671

Water Enterprise Fund – showing a negative overall balance due to work on the new test well. Test well estimated to cost approximately $150,000.

Sewer Enterprise Fund – showing negative at the start of the year, which is typical as depreciation expense is not being fully funded.

The enterprise funds do not need to balance but the General Fund has too.

Capital Project Funds Revenue of $176,268

Solid Waste Enterprise Fund Revenue and Expense of $338,524

8:14 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

Terrie Wierenga expressed appreciation for no increase in property taxes, especially with other taxes increasing this year.

Paul Thatcher asked how the Park Bench (Senior Center) is funded. Mr. Lewis said it is included in the Building Fund and budgeted as usual, with program expenses budgeted at $28,000 for the fiscal year not including the employee wages of $49,385 and a total budget of $77,385.

Lynzi Meacham asked what Cub River Sports Complex Special Revenue Fund is. Councilmember Bair said it is the sports facility located by Casper's Ice Cream for baseball and soccer. She also asked about the location of the proposed pickleball courts. Mayor Young said it will be where the tennis courts currently are located and will be funded through RAPZ tax and one other possible grant.

8:18 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 2026-06.

*****Councilmember Draxler moved to adopt Resolution 2026-06, a Resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 2027 Budget which is the period of July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027. Councilmember Schumann seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.*****

Yes Vote: Bair, Black, Draxler, Schumann
No Vote: None
Absent: Wood

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2026-09, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code Title 6-000 "Finances and Taxation", Parts 6-410 "Impact Fees", and 6-420 "Culinary Water Impact Fees".

Mr. Lewis explained that J-U-B Engineers completed the water system analysis, and Zions Public Finance completed the impact fee study. The proposed water impact fee is based on system data and represents the maximum allowable charge, though it is lower than the current fee. The fee will apply only to new homes and businesses and will take effect immediately because it decreases the existing charge. If the fee was increasing it would not go into effect until 90 days after approval.

The following wording is proposed to be added to the Ordinance:

A. Based upon engineered data contained in the Water Impact Fees Analyses prepared by Zions Public Finance, Inc. in May 2026, the following base impact fee schedules for culinary water are hereby established.
B. Based upon engineered data contained in the Wastewater Impact Fee Analyses prepared by Emily S. Sim, Public Sector Economics, and accepted by the Richmond City Council on December 10, 2019, for wastewater, the following base impact fee schedules are hereby established.

Mayor Young said the proposal illustrates the City's effort to balance fees and expenses.

8:21 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

There were not any questions or comments.

8:22 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2026-09.

*****Councilmember Draxler moved to adopt Ordinance 2026-09, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code Title 6-000 "Finances and Taxation", Parts 6-410 "Impact Fees" and 6-420 "Culinary Water Impact Fees". Councilmember Black seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0. *****

Yes Vote: Bair, Black, Draxler, Schumann
No Vote: None
Absent: Wood

Initial discussion of Ordinance 2026-08, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Manual of Design & Construction Standards, Chapter 6.0 "Irrigation Water Design", Section 6.01 "General".

Mr. Lewis explained that the discussion applies only to new subdivisions and is preliminary. The original proposed Ordinance would have removed the requirement that secondary irrigation systems be constructed in all new subdivisions and dedicated to the City. The current proposal would instead remove the requirements for meter setters, barrels, and a minimum one-inch service line, while still requiring the main irrigation line. This approach would avoid installing unused stubs.

Mr. Lewis said the proposed Ordinance reflects input from the Mayor and City Council over the past several months as this topic was discussed. If the City Council agrees, the item will go to the Planning Commission for review and recommendation before returning to the City Council for a vote.

Mayor Young was in a meeting regarding the Elk Meadows subdivision, one of the first subdivisions submitted following the initial discussion of this issue. He noted that the subdivision includes the secondary irrigation line but does not have all of the hookups installed, which reflects the situation currently under consideration. He was not aware that the barrels could deteriorate over time if they are not used. He explained that the current proposal intends to allow the secondary irrigation mainline to be installed and tapped at a later time, if necessary. He commented that this approach is more practical and expressed his support for the proposal.

Councilmember Black suggested a change to 6.01 General Section C, Subsection A to read “All secondary irrigation systems shall be constructed in subdivisions with existing irrigation usage dedicated to the City”. This will prohibit having to run irrigation lines to areas where they have never existed.

Mayor Young said it is important that the decision can be applied fairly across the board in all situations. Councilmember Black said it would depend on existing irrigation usage, and shares can be dedicated to the City.

Councilmember Bair asked whether developers could have the option to pay a water dedication fee instead of dedicating water shares, thereby eliminating the requirement to install secondary irrigation piping. Councilmember Black responded that it would not make sense for a developer to pay a dedication fee while retaining ownership of the water shares to sell to someone else. He explained that when agricultural land with an existing irrigation system is developed, the irrigation water should remain with that property. As an example, he noted that the Johnson View subdivision installed a secondary irrigation system even though the property had not previously been irrigated.

Mayor Young asked how the standard would be applied and who would make that determination. Mr. Lewis said residential subdivisions are administrative decisions under state law and do not require Planning Commission or City Council review or approval.

Mayor Young asked what standard would determine whether secondary irrigation is required, including cases where irrigation is available but has not been used for many years. He said the ordinance should provide a clear path for when a secondary system is required and when it is not.

Councilmember Bair said that if irrigation laterals are installed, the City will own the main part of them, and the question is how responsibility and maintenance expenses will be handled. At some point, the City has avenues to develop additional culinary water, so if irrigation shares are returned to the property, they would be under someone else’s control.

Mayor Young said many cities convert irrigation water shares to culinary use as development occurs. Richmond City has 40 years to establish beneficial use, which supports future planning and requires the City to determine how shares will eventually be used.

Councilmember Bair said, to Councilmember Black's point, that there is merit to his concerns.

Mayor Young noted that in the last five years, the City has received 12% of actual water shares; the rest are paying water dedication payments in regard to new subdivisions. The majority are not going into a secondary system.

Councilmember Draxler said it seems it should either be required for all or not at all.

Mayor Young said most cities that are reliant on a secondary system do not rely on an old, outdated system that they must tap into. They typically have the sources all the way to the main source. One of his biggest concerns was addressed by Councilmember Bair, including the maintenance and upkeep expenses the City would be responsible for.

Councilmember Black stated that the homeowner, or whoever uses the pipeline, would be responsible for purchasing the associated water share. Councilmember Bair questioned whether the City would incur costs if it required the installation while also owning the pipeline.

Mayor Young responded that the City cannot sell water shares. Councilmember Black provided an example in which a developer owns 10 water shares that are subsequently divided among homeowners as a subdivision is developed.

Councilmember Bair then asked whether the City would sell the pipeline to the homeowners. Councilmember Black expressed the opinion that the City should not own the pipeline. Mayor Young noted that this discussion highlighted an important concern regarding how such a system would be structured. He explained that if the City mandates the installation, ownership of the pipeline located beneath the street could become the City's responsibility. He added that the discussion had raised several valid concerns that would need to be addressed before moving forward. Mayor Young also cautioned that assuming these costs could create significant financial obligations for the City and potentially burden other residents who may never benefit from the infrastructure.

Mayor Young believes the secondary system is unnecessary. Councilmember Black agreed; he understood that the HOA might be the responsible party, owning and maintaining the system; he also agreed that he did not want to see the City incur additional costs.

Mayor Young explained that this is why the water dedication fee was established. The City knew this would make sense because the money collected is helping pay for the new well.

Councilmember Black was originally a proponent of keeping the secondary system because he was concerned about water usage and water shares. Mow that he knows the City may be saddled with future debt and obligations to maintain the system, he no longer agrees with his initial position.

Mayor Young said additional discussion is needed before a decision is made. He recommended removing the secondary irrigation system mandate from the ordinance and revisiting the issue for possible action at the next meeting. He said water shares should remain in the ordinance, with other options allowed. Mr. Lewis said Ordinance 2026-02, which was previously tabled, will be reconsidered at the next council meeting based on the recommendation of the City Council.

Initial discussion on the speed limit on Main Street from 200 West to 300 East.

Mayor Young said speed limits are typically discussed in areas with repeated speeding concerns. Main Street was historically posted at 30 miles per hour (mph) and was changed to 25 mph a couple of years ago through an administrative process. He said future changes should be discussed and decided by the City Council. In his view, returning Main Street and State Street to 30 mph would improve consistency and traffic flow.

Councilmember Schumann expressed concern about increasing speeds because The Park Bench Senior Center is being relocated onto Main Street and more residents will cross the street in that area.

There were some resident comments about traffic not slowing down anyway. Mayor Young said traffic controlled by “what-ifs” is hard to govern.

Councilmember Bair asked if there is a history of the number of citations issued in that area and what they were. Mayor Young said most complaints he has heard concern speeders who are well above the speed limit.

Mr. Lewis cited Richmond City Municipal Code 11-323(B), which states that, absent a posted speed limit, the prima facie speed limit is 30 miles per hour. He noted that another Code section appears to conflict by referencing 25 miles per hour.

Councilmember Draxler suggested waiting until the current transportation study is completed. Mayor Young agreed that it was a valid consideration. Councilmember Draxler said the study focuses on traffic flow but may help identify where speed limits should be adjusted, while pedestrian safety should also be considered. Mr. Lewis said a separate speed study would cost several thousand dollars, and the current transportation study is expected in September or October 2026.

The City’s front desk receives many calls about speeding vehicles. By White Pine Elementary, 100 North, is an area noted for having continuous speeding related concerns.

Councilmember Bair suggested that adding touch-activated pedestrian signal crossings could help improve pedestrian safety and accessibility. Mr. Lewis said that flashing signs, which can be solar powered, with two buttons can cost in the range of $16,000-$18,000.

Mayor Young noted that the City employs school crossing guards to help children cross at several designated areas. Mr. Lewis said the annual cost for the crossing guards is approximately $13,700 in wages plus any supplies they need.

Mayor Young said consistency is the primary concern regarding speed limits and suggested further discussion once the transportation study is completed and The Park Bench relocation is addressed.

Mayor Young thanked everyone for their attendance and participation in the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Next scheduled meeting: Tuesday, July 21, 2026

RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION

____

Jeffrey D. Young, Mayor

ATTEST:

____

Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder