

## 1 Logan Municipal Council

Logan, Utah

November 7, 2023

3 Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Municipal Council convened in regular session on  
4 Tuesday, November 7, 2023, in the Logan Municipal Council Chambers located at 290  
5 North 100 West, Logan, Utah 84321 at 5:30 pm. Logan Municipal Council Meetings are  
6 televised live as a public service on Channel 17 and the City of Logan YouTube channel  
7 at: [https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCFLPAOK5eawKS\\_RDBU0stRQ](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCFLPAOK5eawKS_RDBU0stRQ)

9 Council Members present at the beginning of the meeting: Chairman Ernesto López, Vice  
10 Chair Amy Z. Anderson, Councilmember Jeannie F. Simmonds, and Councilmember  
11 Mark A. Anderson. Administration present: Mayor Holly H. Daines, City Attorney Craig  
12 Carlston, Finance Director Richard Anderson, City Recorder Teresa Harris, and Deputy  
13 Recorder Esli Morales.

14 Excused: Councilmember Tom Jensen.

15 Chairman Ernesto López welcomed those present. There were approximately 25 in  
16 attendance at the beginning of the meeting.

## **17 OPENING CEREMONY:**

18 Wallace (Wally) Odd, a veteran of the Air Force with 26 years of service provided the  
19 opening ceremony and led the audience in the pledge of allegiance.

21 Mr. Odd said we all serve how we can, we don't have to be veterans to do so. We are  
22 ordinary people who do things. He presented his background in the Military starting in  
23 the ROTC at Logan High School, and then at USU eventually joining the Air Force.

25 Chairman López thanked Mr. Odd for his service as well as all those who serve in the  
26 military and their families who support them.

27  
28 **Meeting Minutes.** Minutes of the Council meeting held on October 17, 2023 were  
29 reviewed.

30  
31 **Meeting Agenda.** Chairman López announced there are two public hearings scheduled  
32 for tonight's Council meeting.

33  
34 Agenda item 8. A. "Willow Ski Lakes Rezone" has been continued by the applicant to  
35 the December 5, 2023 Council meeting.

36  
37 **ACTION.** Motion by Vice Chair A. Anderson seconded by Councilmember M.  
38 Anderson to approve the October 17, 2023, minutes as presented and tonight's  
39 agenda. Motion carried by roll call vote.

40      **A. Anderson: Aye**  
41      **M. Anderson: Aye**  
42      **Jensen: Absent**  
43      **López: Aye**  
44      **Simmonds: Aye**

45  
46      **Meeting Schedule.** Chairman López announced that regular Council meetings are held  
47      on the first and third Tuesdays of the month at 5:30 p.m. The next regular Council  
48      meeting is Tuesday, November 21, 2023.

49  
50      The council meeting on December 19 has been cancelled.

51  
52      **QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FOR MAYOR AND COUNCIL:**

53  
54      Chairman López explained that any person wishing to comment on any item not otherwise  
55      on the agenda may address the City Council at this point by stepping to the microphone  
56      and giving his or her name and address for the record. Comments should be limited to not  
57      more than three (3) minutes unless additional time is authorized by the Council Chair.  
58      Citizen groups will be asked to appoint a spokesperson. This is the time and place for any  
59      person who wishes to comment on non-agenda items. Some items brought forward to the  
60      attention of the City Council will be turned over to staff to respond to outside of the City  
61      Council meeting.

62      Josh Molitor, a resident of Logan asked if Councilmember M. Anderson during his tenure  
63      on the City Council has received any government contracts. He emphasized his concern  
64      regarding the Woodsonia project and whether it was reckless or careless.

65      Councilmember M. Anderson said that there are no contracts with the City. As a business  
66      entity, there has been some work done for the city, and there are some city employees who  
67      purchase items from Anderson Seed and Garden. However, there are no ongoing contracts  
68      with the city.

69      Richard Anderson, Finance Director said employees are not prohibited from shopping at  
70      Anderson Seed and Garden. The definition of a contract or how it is referenced could be  
71      further clarified.

72      Erin Bennet, a resident of Logan inquired regarding plastic waste management on the fact  
73      that ten cents will be charged for a bag. She expressed concerns regarding microplastics in  
74      the environment.

75      Vice Chair A. Anderson responded that the plastic bag was rescinded prior to the  
76      implementation date and offered to further explain and show documentation after the  
77      meeting.

78 Marilyn Griffin, a resident of Logan thanked staff for putting the flashing light on 700  
79 North 200 East. It has been a great benefit to the neighborhood.

80 Keaton Papke, a resident of Logan is in opposition to the proposed Woodsonia  
81 development. He would be in favor of continued discussion and indicated that the City  
82 Council meetings may not be the proper venue since he feels the city knows more than is  
83 being said. He is not against the site being revamped but is concerned about various  
84 elements of the mall such as the high-density complex on the premises and the resulting  
85 increase in traffic on already congested streets.

86 There were no further comments or questions for the Mayor or Council.

87 **MAYOR/STAFF REPORTS:**

88  
89 **Open & Public Meetings Act Training – Craig Carlston, City Attorney (28:35)**  
90  
91 City Attorney Craig Carlston addressed the Council and gave an update on the Annual  
92 Open and Public Meetings Act training which is required by law to be completed  
93 annually. He stated the Open and Public Meetings Act was enacted upon the premise that  
94 the State, its agencies, and its political subdivisions exist to aid in the conduct of the  
95 people's business. As such, a public body should deliberate and act openly. The Open and  
96 Public Meetings Act requires that members of a public body be provided with annual  
97 training on the requirements of the Open and Public Meetings Act.

98  
99 Mr. Carlston, for the benefit of the public clarified that the municipal employee ethics  
100 act permits employees and elected officials to contract with the City, so long as there is  
101 prior disclosure.

102  
103 Mr. Carlston also said the public notice requirement of 24-hour notice is still the same,  
104 but there is a requirement of a Class A notice. The requirements are satisfied by posting  
105 the notice on the Utah Public Notice Website, the city's website, and is no longer required  
106 to be posted in various public locations beyond City Hall.

107  
108 Councilmember Simmonds requested confirmation that the Councilmember's  
109 participation will be sent to the State to meet with requirements set by the State.

110  
111 Mr. Carlston confirmed that he would confirm their participation with the State.

1. Intent of the Act:
  - a. Public bodies “exist to aid in the conduct of the people’s business.”
  - b. Public bodies should “take their actions openly; and conduct their deliberations openly.” (Utah Code Ann. §52-4-102)
2. Definition of a Meeting:
  - a. The convening of a public body, with a quorum present (whether in person or by electronic means), “for the purpose of discussing, receiving comments from the public about, or acting upon a matter over which the public body...has jurisdiction or advisory power.”
  - b. “Meeting” does not mean a chance or social gathering. Cannot use a chance meeting or social gathering to circumvent the purpose of the Open and Public Meetings Act. (Utah Code Ann. §§52-4-103(6), 52-4-208)
3. Definition of a Quorum: “Quorum” means a simple majority of the membership of a public body, unless otherwise defined by law. (Utah Code Ann. §52-4-103 (11))
4. Public Notice for a Meeting:
  - a. At least 24-hour notice of the meeting, including the agenda, date, time, and location of the meeting.
  - b. Notice must be posted at the principal office of the public body and on the Utah Public Notice website and newspaper or local media correspondent.
  - c. The schedule of regularly scheduled meetings must also be noticed once a year.
  - d. Emergency meetings once approved by a majority of the public body require the best notice practicable. (Utah Code Ann. §52-4-202)
5. Agenda for Meeting:
  - a. Agenda items should have reasonable specificity to notify the public.
  - b. Items raised by the public, but not on the agenda, may be discussed but no action may be taken. (Utah Code Ann. §52-4-202)
6. Written Minutes/ Meeting Recording:
  - a. Written minutes of an open meeting include the date, time, and place of the meeting; the names of the members present and absent; and the substance of the matters discussed; a record of each vote taken; a summary of public comments.
  - b. A recording of an open meeting shall be a complete and unedited record of the open meeting. (Utah Code Ann. §52-4-203)
7. Closed Meeting:
  - a. A closed meeting may be held if a quorum is present; the meeting starts out as an open meeting for which proper notice has been given; two-thirds of the members' present vote to approve closing the meeting; the reasons for closing the meeting are entered into the record of the public portion of the meeting; a recording of the closed meeting is kept (exception for discussion on individual or for security issues).

113 **Logan City School District Update – Superintendent Frank Schofield ([31:00](#))**

114

115 Superintendent Frank Scofield addressed the Council.

116

117 He stated there are 5,416 students, 2 preschools, 6 elementaries, 1 middle school, and 1  
118 high school. Out of the student body, 50% are non-Caucasian and 50% of students live in  
119 poverty. An increasing number of students come from refugee backgrounds.

120

121 The graduation rate in 2022 was 91.2% at Logan High School. Presently, there are three  
122 national merit semi-finalists. There is competitive employee compensation with help  
123 from the legislature, RDA, and school district permitting for the 3<sup>rd</sup> highest starting salary  
124 in the State of Utah. As a result, there are highly engaged employees. There is an ongoing  
125 Aggie Up initiative for first-generation students. There is quality instruction in early  
126 literacy programs that commence in kindergarten in collaboration with Utah State.

127

128 Statewide there is a challenge with consistent attendance and getting children to school.  
129 However, 25% of students are missing 10% or more of school attendance. The School  
130 District is working with parents and students to encourage attendance, but they are  
131 limited in what they can do for truancy based on state law.

132

133 The former Municipal Pool will be turned into the Indoor Athletic Facility at some point  
134 in the future.

135

136 Councilmember M. Anderson asked what the impact of full-day kindergarten is.

137

138 Mr. Scofield answered that the amount of information does not change, but how it is  
139 shown has changed. The content is being reinforced for a five-year-old.

140

141 Vice Chair A. Andreson inquired what is the utilization of the Family Resource Center.

142

143 Mr. Scofield responded that the appointment slots are always being utilized or full. There  
144 are two full-time staff members, and the district has applied for a grant to increase the  
145 total number of staff to three.

146

147 Chair López asked if the staff members speak any other languages than English.

148

149 Mr. Scofield replied all staff members speak Spanish, but it would be great to have staff  
150 members speak other languages as well.

151

152 Councilmember M. Anderson inquired how much funding the School District receives  
153 from the recently closed RDAs.

154 Mr. Scofield answered that \$465,000 of new revenue for the School District is received  
155 every year going forward.

156  
157 Mayor Daines thanked Mr. Scofield and the School Board members for their continued  
158 support, including the most recent RDA.

159  
160 **Board Reappointment (Parks and Recreation Advisory Board) – Mayor Daines**  
161 [\*\*\(53:24\)\*\*](#)

162 Mayor Daines asked the Council for ratification to reappoint Eric Eliason to serve on the  
163 Parks and Recreation Advisory Board.

164  
165 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Councilmember M.**  
166 **Anderson to approve ratification of Eric Eliason as presented. Motion carried by**  
167 **roll call vote.**

168  
169 **A. Anderson: Aye**  
170 **M. Anderson: Aye**  
171 **Jensen: Absent**  
172 **López: Aye**  
173 **Simmonds: Aye**

174  
175 **Dignity Index – Mayor Daines** [\*\*\(54:23\)\*\*](#)

176 Mayor Daines addressed the Council regarding the Dignity Index that the Utah League  
177 City and Towns has provided. The organization is trying to promote civility and  
178 cooperation in politics. Government Cox has also started ‘Disagree Better’ in the  
179 Government Association.

180  
181 No further Mayor/Staff Reports were presented.

182  
183 **COUNCIL BUSINESS:**

184  
185 **Planning Commission Update – Councilmember Simmonds** [\*\*\(55:40\)\*\*](#)

186 Councilmember Simmonds reported that the Planning Commission did not meet.

187  
188 No further Council Business were presented.

189  
190  
191 **ACTION ITEMS:**

194 (Continued to December 5, 2023) – PUBLIC HEARING - REZONE – Consideration  
195 of a proposed ordinance to rezone from current Traditional Neighborhood  
196 Residential (NR-6) to Mixed Use (MU) comprised of four properties located along  
197 1100 South West – Willow Ski Lakes (Woodruff Neighborhood) – Ordinance 23-33  
198 – Tanya Rice, Planner ([56:00](#))

199  
200 Chairman López announced that the applicant of Ordinance 23-33 requested a  
201 continuance to the December 5, 2023 Council meeting.

202  
203 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Vice Chair A.**  
204 **Anderson to continue Ordinance 23-33 to the December 5, 2023 Council meeting as**  
205 **presented.** Motion carried by roll call vote.

206 A. Anderson: Aye  
207 M. Anderson: Aye  
208 Jensen : Absent  
209 López : Aye  
210 Simmonds : Aye

211  
212 PUBLIC HEARING – CODE AMENDMENTS – Consideration of a proposed  
213 ordinance amending the Land Development Code to allow Moderate Income  
214 Housing density bonuses in the MR-9, MR-12, MR-20, MR-30, TC-2, and  
215 Commercial (COM) zones, add Micro Living Units to Table 17.08.040 and Table  
216 17.11.030, create Chapter 17.35 for Micro Living Unit Housing, and amend  
217 definitions to modify occupancy thresholds for residential dwelling units –  
218 Ordinance 23-32 – Mike DeSimone, Community Development Director ([57:05](#))

219  
220 At the October 17, 2023 Council meeting, Community Development Director Mike  
221 DeSimone addressed the Council regarding the proposed code amendments.

222  
223 He stated that on September 14, 2023, the Planning Commission recommended to the  
224 Municipal Council **approval** of the following Land Development Code Amendments:

225  
226 **LDC Chapter 17.07: Specific Development Standards: Residential Zones**  
227 Added Moderate Income Housing Density Bonuses in the MR-9, MR-12, MR-20 & MR-  
228 30 Zones.

229  
230 **LDC Chapter 17.08: Neighborhood Residential Uses**  
231 Added Micro Living Units as a land use type and updated reference of residential  
232 occupancy.  
233 **LDC Chapter 17.10: Specific Development Standards: District and Corridor Zones**  
234 Added Moderate Income Housing Density Bonuses in the TC-2 and Commercial Zones.

235 **LDC Chapter 17.11: District and Corridor Uses**

236 Added Micro Living Units as a land use type.

237

238 **LDC Chapter 17.34: Residential Density and Height Bonus**

239 Added Moderate Income Housing Density Bonus standards.

240

241 **LDC Chapter 17.35: New- “Micro Living Units”**

242 New Section for Micro Living Unit Housing.

243

244 **LDC Chapter 17.62: Definitions**

245 Updated the definition of Family, changed occupancy thresholds for a family to a family  
246 plus one unrelated individual, and changed occupancy from three unrelated individuals to  
247 four unrelated individuals.

248

249 The Planning Commission voted (6-1) E. Peterson voted nay.

250

## 251 **REQUEST**

252 This is a proposal to amend the Land Development Code to provide more opportunities  
253 and incentives for Moderate Income Housing by adding density bonuses for affordable  
254 housing in certain zones, allowing efficiency living units, and increasing the maximum  
255 occupancy rates for residential dwelling units.

256

## 257 **SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL**

258 Logan City adopted a new Moderate-Income Housing (MIH) Plan on November 15,  
259 2022, in response to House Bill (HB) 462 which was passed by the State Legislature  
260 during the 2022 State legislative session. HB 462 amended UCA 10-9a-403 requiring all  
261 local governments to provide for moderate-income housing in their communities by  
262 implementing a certain number of housing strategies from a specific list generated by the  
263 State. Each year, the City is required to work towards meeting specific strategies for  
264 increasing the supply of moderate-income housing and then report that progress annually  
265 to the State. Failing to adopt a MIH Plan, make any progress in addressing the lack of  
266 affordable housing, or reporting to the State will result in a loss of significant  
267 transportation funding to the community.

268

269 One of the goals of the City’s 2022 MIH Plan is to evaluate or consider changes to the  
270 City’s Land Development Code that could be implemented to encourage more Moderate-  
271 Income Housing, and which is identified as Goal 5 in the Plan. Goal 5 includes four  
272 specific objectives that reflect a number of State-identified strategies from which we were  
273 required to choose and implement. This specific LDC amendment target Objectives 2 – 4  
274 while Objective 1 (Residential Parking) will be addressed in 2024 through a separate  
275 evaluation & process.

276 Goal 5: Evaluate the City's Land Development Code to determine if there are short-term  
277 regulatory changes that the City could make to encourage more Moderate-Income  
278 Housing  
279 Objective 1: Evaluate parking requirements for residential uses, including MIH uses.  
280 Objective 2: Evaluate a MIH density bonus provision in all Mixed Use, Commercial and  
281 Town Center Zones  
282  
283 Objective 3: Evaluate the City's current occupancy limitations to determine whether a  
284 permit system for increasing the occupancy limit for residential units could be increased  
285 from three to four, and under what circumstances.  
286 Objective 4: Evaluate single-room occupancy development standards State Strategies  
287 being addressed:  
288 (H) amend land use regulations to eliminate or reduce parking requirements for  
289 residential development where a resident is less likely to rely on the resident's own  
290 vehicle, such as residential development near major transit investment corridors or senior  
291 living facilities; (Related)  
292 (I) amend land use regulations to allow for single-room occupancy developments;  
293 (J) implement zoning incentives for moderate-income units in new developments;  
294 (W) create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, multifamily residential  
295 dwellings compatible in scale and form with detached single-family residential dwellings  
296 and located in walkable communities within residential or mixed-use zones;  
297 (X) demonstrate implementation of any other program or strategy to address the housing  
298 needs of residents of the municipality who earn less than 80% of the area median income,  
299 including the dedication of a local funding source to moderate-income housing or the  
300 adoption of a land use ordinance that requires 10% or more of new residential  
301 development in a residential zone be dedicated to moderate-income housing;  
302  
303 Density Bonuses for Moderate Income Housing (Objective 2)  
304 Amend LDC Chapters 17.34, 17.07, & 17.10 to include a density bonus for Moderate  
305 Income Housing in the MR-9, MR-12, MR-20, MR-30, TC-1, TC-2, and Commercial  
306 (COM) zones.  
307  
308 Chapter 17.34 provides the standards for when a density bonus is available while 17.08 &  
309 17.10 are language changes in the individual zoning designation spec sheets referencing  
310 a potential density bonus for MIH. The density bonus is only available for projects with a  
311 minimum size of three (3) acres and is limited to the multi-family zones or mixed-use  
312 zones.  
313  
314 §17.34.070. General Requirements, Limitations and Eligibility for Moderate Income  
315 Housing/Affordable Housing Residential Density Bonuses

316 A. All residential density bonus considerations require approval through the Track 2  
317 Design Review process.

318 B. Projects seeking a density bonus are still subject to the applicable height and setback  
319 transition standards.

320 C. The application of a density bonus to a project does not eliminate nor vary any other  
321 standard applicable to a project, e.g., parking, landscaping, open space, setbacks, design  
322 requirements, etc.

323 D. An applicant shall provide all necessary graphics, calculations, buildings plans, site  
324 plans, vicinity maps, and other materials required to adequately demonstrate compliance  
325 with the density bonus standards.

326 E. A covenant (development agreement, deed restriction, contract, etc.) shall be  
327 submitted in writing and approved by the City to ensure that any systems, features, or  
328 affordable units developed and installed to obtain a bonus will be functionally and  
329 aesthetically maintained in perpetuity, that the timing of the construction and/or  
330 installation of said features is sufficient to guarantee their construction and/or installation  
331 at the front end of a project and ultimate completion prior to the issuance of a Certificate  
332 of Final Occupancy by the City, and such covenant shall require that any systems or  
333 features be replaced or renewed if failure or partial failure occurs for the system or  
334 feature considered for a bonus.

335 F. Moderate Income Housing/Affordable Housing Units. On project sites larger than  
336 three acres, the total residential density may be increased by up to 25% if at least 5% of  
337 the total residential units are designated and deed-restricted as affordable units (serving  
338 residents who are at or below the 80% AMI income threshold).

339

340 **Micro Living Unit Housing (Objective 4)**

341 Amend LDC 17.35 to include provisions for Micro Living Unit Housing in the MR-20,  
342 MR-30, TC- 1, TC-2, Commercial and Mixed-Use Zones. Micro Living Units are smaller  
343 living units by design in order to provide affordable residential space for lower income  
344 residents. There is not a standard size; rather, the specific size of an MLU is determined  
345 by the jurisdiction where they are proposed for use, but should generally be  
346 approximately 50% of a “typical” apartment size. We are proposing a range of 150  
347 square feet – 400 square feet in order to accommodate the conversion of an older  
348 hotel/motel with typically smaller rooms to an MLU or new construction that may go  
349 larger with studio & 1-bedroom units. We have also restricted these to be located near a  
350 high-traffic volume corridor (Main Street) with access to transit, or near large employers  
351 and access to transit. The goal is that this type of housing will be targeted toward a wider  
352 range of residents across a broad economic spectrum with close proximity to employment  
353 and transit opportunities and is limited to the higher-density zones.

354

355 Summary of Changes from 8/10/23:

356 Changed title from Efficiency Living Units to Micro Living Units. Changed the language  
357 in 17.35.40 & 17.62 regarding the composition of income ranges represented in these  
358 types of projects. Removed TC-1 from 17.35.050 (Conversion of Existing Buildings to  
359 MLU's).

360

361 The proposed LDC 17.35 language is attached.

362

363 Increase the Maximum Residential Occupancy Standard (Objective 3)  
364 The proposal is to increase the maximum residential occupancy for a residential dwelling  
365 unit from three (3) to four (4) individuals and allow for a “family” to have one (1)  
366 additional person in the household (renter, boy/girlfriend, etc.). The current occupancy  
367 limitations for residential occupancy is either three (3) individuals or one (1) family may  
368 occupy a residential unit. This is based on Utah Municipal Code 10-9a-505.5 which  
369 allows a municipality, with a state university within its boundary, to limit individual  
370 occupancy to three (3) rather than four (4) for other municipalities throughout the State.  
371 The number of occupants constituting a family is not limited provided those family  
372 members meet the definition of Family.

373

374 Summary of Changes from 8/10/23:

375 Updated the definition of “Family” in LDC 17.62 as shown below:

376

377 Proposed

378 “Family” means persons related by blood, adoption, marriage, legal guardianship, or  
379 similar legal relationship, or two unrelated persons and their children, living and cooking  
380 together as a single housekeeping unit.

381

382 Existing

383 “Family” means persons related by blood, adoption, or marriage, living and cooking  
384 together as a single housekeeping unit, exclusive of household servants; or a number of  
385 unrelated adult persons, but not exceeding two and their children related by blood,  
386 adoption, or marriage, living and cooking together as a single housekeeping unit, shall be  
387 deemed to constitute a family. Students who are visiting a family for the purpose of  
388 attending grades kindergarten through high school are considered temporary family  
389 members and therefore part of a family even though they may or may not be related by  
390 blood, adoption, or marriage.

391

392 Students must be actively attending a school grade K-12 and living with a family related  
393 by blood, adoption, or marriage.

394

395 We originally planned to link an increase in occupancy to some type of permit system  
396 that required additional bedrooms, parking, etc., but realized an approach tying housing

397 with bedroom counts, dwelling size, parking stalls, etc., could violate fair housing  
398 requirements, so we dropped it. Parking concerns will be managed through current  
399 methods of enforcement and permitting. The proposed language is as follows:  
400  
401 “Occupancy Limits, Residential” means the number of persons legally allowed to occupy  
402 a residential dwelling unit for living and sleeping purposes shall be either:  
403 A. One (1) family as defined in this Chapter and not more than one (1) additional person;  
404 or  
405 B. No more than four (4) individuals.  
406

407 All of these three elements could contribute to more affordable housing in a relatively  
408 quick manner. While not without issues or controversy, increasing the occupancy  
409 allowance is the quickest and easiest way to “legally” get more people into housing,  
410 while the other two approaches would be implemented over time with new projects.  
411

#### 412 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND SUMMARY**

413 As described above, the purpose of these proposed amendments is to encourage the  
414 availability of additional Moderate Income Housing options consistent with the City’s  
415 adopted MIH plan.  
416

#### 417 **GENERAL PLAN**

418 The Land Development Code was prepared and adopted to implement the vision  
419 expressed in the General Plan. The purpose of these code changes relative to Moderate  
420 Income Housing would encourage the provision of additional, affordable housing for  
421 Logan residents. Well thought out and well executed projects will have minimal impacts  
422 to existing neighborhoods and will continue to implement the vision of, and are  
423 consistent with, the General Plan.  
424

#### 425 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

426 We sent this information out to the chairperson for each of the Neighborhood and sent it  
427 out to the neighborhood email distribution maintained by the City that residents can sign  
428 up for. Comments that have been received are included as an attachment. Any other  
429 comments will be forwarded to the Planning Commission.  
430

#### 431 **PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**

432 Legal notices were published in the Herald Journal on 7/1/23, posted on the City’s  
433 website and the Utah Public Meeting website on 7/3/23, and noticed in a quarter page ad  
434 on 6/29/23.  
435

#### 436 **AGENCY AND CITY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

437 As of the time the staff report was prepared, no comments have been received.

438 **RECOMMENDED FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL**

439 The Planning Commission bases its decisions on the following findings:

440 1. Utah State Law authorizes local Planning Commission to recommend ordinance  
441 changes to the legislative body (Municipal Council).

442 2. The Code Amendments are done in conformance with the requirements of Title 17.51  
443 of the Logan Municipal Code.

444 3. The proposed Code Amendments are consistent with the Logan City General Plan.

445 4. The proposed Code Amendments are consistent with the Logan City Moderate Income  
446 Housing Plan and further efforts to provide additional moderate income housing  
447 opportunities for Logan residents.

448 5. No public comment has been received regarding the proposed amendments.

449 A memo was included in the Council packet which reads:

450 *A notice has been sent via the Neighborhood Newsletter email distribution list to  
451 residents who have registered for emails, the Neighborhood Councils, and the  
452 Neighborhood Chairs, has been posted on Facebook, and advertised with the Council  
453 Agenda. Comments received through November 2, 2023 will be included in this packet  
454 while any later comments will be emailed out to the Council. I have also included a copy  
455 of the presentation from the Council's (10/17/23) workshop with this packet.*

456 *The bulk of the comments received thus far are focused on a change in occupancy, and  
457 more so with the 3 to 4 then with adding one unrelated to a family. Some see this as a  
458 threat to the overall integrity and character of Logan's residential neighborhoods, others  
459 are concerned about parking, while others see this as a windfall opportunity for  
460 landlords thereby driving up rents and overall housing prices leading to further  
461 degradation in neighborhoods. There have also been a few comments in favor of the  
462 proposed occupancy change. We have also heard that an expansion of the ADU program  
463 to permit both internal & detached ADU's citywide (provided they are still owner  
464 occupied) rather than expanding individual occupancy is more palatable and less  
465 intrusive to neighborhoods.*

466 *There was discussion at the Council workshop about the proposed density bonuses for  
467 Moderate Income Housing. The proposed 25% density bonus for 5% LMI restricted  
468 housing is patterned after the current Mixed Use affordable housing density bonus  
469 language in the LDC. Section 17.34.060.A.6 allows an additional 5 units per acre in the  
470 MU zone, which has a base density of 20 units/acre, if at least 5% of the total housing in  
471 the project is restricted based on income (80% of AMI).*

472 *There was also discussion regarding the number of Short-Term Rentals (STR) in Logan.  
473 There are 21 permitted STR's in the residential neighborhoods as follows: Adams (7),  
474 Ellis (5), Wilson (3), Woodruff (2), Hillcrest (4), and Bridger (0). There are two STR*

479 applications on the 11/9/23 PC agenda. There are 10 STR's located in the  
480 Commercial/Town Center zones. We currently have pending enforcement action against  
481 15 suspected short-term rentals.

482  
483 In regard to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU), 5 internal ADU's have been permitted  
484 since the City adopted the new ADU rules: Adams (0), Ellis (2), Wilson (2), Woodruff (0),  
485 Hillcrest (0), and Bridger (0). Since the last Council discussion of ADU's, we have  
486 logged 24 inquiries from homeowners interested in locating an ADU on their site, and  
487 with the exception of Bridger, the inquiries represent all neighborhoods.

488  
489 Mike DeSimone, Community Development Director reminded the Council that it is  
490 mandated by the State under UCA 10-9a-403.2 a/b (LUDMA) (Utah's Land Use,  
491 Development, and Management Act) to review Moderate-Income Housing (MIH) criteria  
492 and comply with the City's moderate-income housing plan or the State requirements.  
493 Otherwise, the City jeopardizes the State Transportation Funding that is tied to MIH.

494  
495 Councilmember M. Anderson inquired about the reason why the increase in density  
496 bonuses will not be applied in Mixed-Use areas.

496  
497  
498 Mr. DeSimone responded that the density bonus already exists in Mixed-Use zones, the  
499 percentage being used is based on the current mixed-use density bonus.

500  
501 Councilmember Simmonds requested clarification that the proposal is based on 80%  
502 AMI.

503  
504 Mr. DeSimone clarified that the proposal is based on 50% AMI and a recommendation  
505 made by the Planning Commission.

506  
507 Councilmember Simmonds requested confirmation that the density bonus will not be  
508 available in a mixed-use project as the targeted income is for 50% AMI.

509  
510 Mr. DeSimone responded that the targeted income range is different in the proposed  
511 zones to that of mixed-use. The target of a mixed-use area is 80% AMI, but for these  
512 targeted areas it is 50% AMI.

513  
514 Vice Chair A. Anderson requested confirmation that micro-living is another term for  
515 ELU's, (Efficiency Dwelling Units or Efficiency Living Units).

516  
517 Mr. DeSimone confirmed that is correct as micro-living, however, ELU's is the old term  
518 used for micro-living units.

519 Vice Chair A. Anderson requested confirmation on whether the commercial space is still  
520 required on the lower floor as part of the density bonus.

521  
522 Mr. DeSimone replied that commercial space is not a requirement of the density bonus.  
523 The example is that of an old hotel which generally will not have commercial on the first  
524 floor. The idea is that these underutilized buildings can be reutilized into housing.  
525

526 Vice Chair A. Anderson asked if micro-living units located in the TC-2 zone will not be  
527 required to have commercial requirements.  
528

529 Mr. DeSimone confirmed that there will be no commercial requirements in TC-2 for  
530 micro-living units.  
531

532 Chairman López asked in terms of a micro-living unit relocating near a business  
533 institution employing more than 100 employees, what does near mean in terms of  
534 distance.  
535

536 Mr. DeSimone answered within a quarter of a mile, which is two blocks.  
537

538 Councilmember Simmonds inquired why Main Street was identified as one of the  
539 relocation points as the intent was to relocate near transit-oriented locations.  
540

541 Mr. DeSimone explained the decision to make Main Street one of the locations to  
542 relocate is because it is near transit and there are a large number of employers in that  
543 corridor. The second option is to put micro-units near a business that offers employment  
544 and nearby transit options such as utilizing bus services or a bike or within walkable  
545 distance.  
546

547 Councilmember Simmonds pointed out the fact that most of the large employers are in  
548 the industrial zone.  
549

550 Mr. DeSimone clarified that in some locations it may be appropriate to rezone but in  
551 others, it will be far from appropriate if there are no means of transportation such as a bus  
552 stop.  
553

554 Vice Chair A. Anderson requested confirmation that in theory, a developer may request  
555 to rezone an area to permit micro-living units to be put in an industrial zone.  
556

557 Mr. DeSimone clarified that a requirement would be a change in zoning and the  
558 requirement of approval of the location as well to ensure it is deemed suitable for micro-  
559 living units.

560 Councilmember Simmonds requested confirmation that every single university town in  
561 the State already permits three unrelated individuals to reside in a residential dwelling.  
562

563 Mr. DeSimone confirmed that is the case in the rest of the State.  
564

565 Chairman López asked regarding the ongoing developments how many have received a  
566 density bonus or have requested a density bonus.  
567

568 Mr. DeSimone responded that none of the current projects have received or inquired on  
569 how to acquire a density bonus.  
570

571 Councilmember Simmonds stated the Planning Commission expressed concerns  
572 regarding the ability to enforce the increase to four unrelated individuals residing in a  
573 residential dwelling. It may be prudent to reconsider in light of a broader enforcement  
574 issue.  
575

576 Mayor Daines pointed out the statistics presented in the monthly neighborhood report.  
577 The number of cases opened and generated by staff needing enforcement. There is an  
578 ongoing effort and staff follow up with complaints made by citizens.  
579

580 Mr. DeSimone added staff follows up with all reports, but there needs to be reasonable  
581 proof to make a report. The burden is on staff to prove there is a need.  
582

583 Vice Chair A. Anderson asked if there would be issues in adopting only a portion of the  
584 ordinance.  
585

586 Mr. DeSimone clarified that the Council could adopt nothing should they desire. The  
587 Council may adopt all of the ordinance or only a portion. The State does require that the  
588 Council consider or evaluate any regulatory change that may encourage moderate-income  
589 housing.  
590

591 Chairman López said the Planning Commission recommended approval of the ordinance  
592 and inquired what was the final vote of the Planning Commission.  
593

594 Mr. DeSimone stated that the vote was 6 to 1 as the Planning Commission understands  
595 that there is a housing shortage and moreover a concern for affordable housing.  
596

597 Councilmember Simmonds wondered if it would be possible to increase three to four  
598 unrelated individuals in a fourplex or larger dwelling and not in a residential  
599 neighborhood.

600 Mr. DeSimone answered there is a different occupancy for campus residential since it is  
601 geared toward students. The easiest approach is to keep it as fundamental as possible.  
602

603 Vice Chair A. Anderson requested confirmation on whether a section of residential can  
604 be carved out and where it does not such as the Foothill Lofts.  
605

606 Mr. DeSimone replied that it would be possible, but it would make enforcing that much  
607 more problematic with the possibility of an argument of discrimination.  
608

609 Councilmember M. Anderson commented as a landlord indicated that for an extra  
610 individual, why lower the prices when more can be made with another tenant. An  
611 example is \$600 per individual for three is \$1,800 with another that can go up to \$2,400.  
612 There is nothing to prevent a landlord from increasing the cost.  
613

614 Mr. DeSimone said it the application of economics, if there are more units available that  
615 can house more individuals the demand will naturally drop if there is more supply than  
616 demand, and the cost will be forced to drop as a direct result.  
617

618 Chairman López inquired regarding parking complaints and how many are non-student  
619 related.  
620

621 Mr. DeSimone answered that it would be a mix of both.  
622

623 Chairman López opened the meeting to a public hearing. ([1:30:00](#))  
624

625 Dr. Gail B. Yost, a resident of Logan asked if micro-housing units will expand in the  
626 future to tiny houses such as bungalows for veterans or the homeless population, and why  
627 are tiny houses not related to neighborhood residential.  
628

629 Christine Lord, a resident of Logan and president of Maple Grove's homeowner's  
630 association is opposed to the increase of four unrelated individuals in a residential  
631 dwelling. Due to past negative experiences, she is vehemently opposed.  
632

633 Frank Stewart, a resident of Logan expressed the concern of absentee homeowners, it is a  
634 blight in the single-family neighborhoods. He is in opposition to the increase in the  
635 proposal.  
636

637 Thomas Edward, a resident of Logan, is opposed to the increase to four unrelated  
638 individuals in residential dwelling homes. He requested the Council dismiss this portion  
639 of the clause and pass the rest of the ordinance.  
640

641 Andrew Sinfield, a resident of Logan, thanked the Council for their service. He is  
642 opposed to the amendment of the increase in a number of unrelated occupants in  
643 residential units.

644

645 Stephanie Carter, a resident of Logan is also in opposition to the increase in occupancy in  
646 residential dwellings of unrelated individuals.

647

648 Cole Checketts, a resident of Logan thanked the Council for all their work. He is in  
649 opposition to the increase of unrelated occupants in residential dwellings.

650

651 Bonnie Hoth, a resident of Logan, is in opposition to the increase of unrelated occupants  
652 in residential dwellings. However, she proposed should the ordinance pass, she requested  
653 that a requirement be one car per person per bed and not per unit.

654

655 Steve Wells, a resident of Logan opposed the increase to four unrelated occupants in  
656 residential dwelling homes. The City responds quickly to overoccupancy complaints but  
657 said he is frustrated as a homeowner for the need to register a complaint in order to have  
658 it enforced.

659

660 Marilyn Griffin, a resident of Logan opposed the increase to four unrelated occupants in  
661 residential dwelling homes. She expressed her concern over residential neighborhoods  
662 being further degraded rather than being improved.

663

664 Ray Ann Hansen, a resident of Logan is the Adams Neighborhood Chair. She opposed  
665 the increase to four unrelated occupants in residential dwelling homes.

666

667 Andrew Semadeni, a resident of Logan opposed the increase to four unrelated occupants  
668 in residential dwelling homes. He also expressed concerns regarding housing availability  
669 and affordability.

670

671 Josh Smith, a resident of Logan thanked the city staff for all the work they do and did not  
672 oppose the increase to three occupants in residential dwelling homes.

673

674 Cheryl Semadeni, a resident of Logan opposed the increase to four occupants in  
675 residential dwelling homes.

676

677 Sue Sorenson, a resident of Logan, opposed the increase to three occupants in residential  
678 dwelling homes. She requested that the Council continue the ordinance before making a  
679 decision.

680

681 Joe Needham, a resident of Logan, opposed the increase to three occupants in residential  
682 dwelling homes and the detrimental impact this would have on the city.  
683

684 Erin Bennett, a resident of Logan expressed concerns regarding micro-living units that  
685 they may become the equivalent of modern mobile home parks.  
686

687 Glen A., a resident of Logan opposed the increase to four occupants in residential  
688 dwelling homes for the sake of the community.  
689

690 There were no further comments and Chairman López closed the public hearing.  
691

692 Chairman López thanked the public for their feedback both from those for and against  
693 portions of the ordinance.  
694

695 Councilmember Simmonds clarified that she is not in opposition to the ordinance but  
696 feels that the increase in occupancy in residential dwellings to four unrelated individuals  
697 should not occur.  
698

699 Vice Chair A. Anderson said upon reviewing the letters and emails received along with  
700 the comments made by the public, she concluded that goal number two of the ordinance  
701 related to the increase of occupancy is not compatible with the idea of maintaining and  
702 increasing home ownership in the community. It would not achieve that goal along with  
703 an increase in enforcement issues.  
704

705 Chairman López inquired if there was a desire for subdividing the change in occupancy.  
706

707 Vice Chair A. Anderson offered an amendment of the definition 17.62 B to "remain as  
708 three occupants" and in Table 17.08.040 the chart reference matches 17.62 B and does  
709 not increase unrelated occupants to four.  
710

711 Councilmember M. Anderson remarked that the Council needs to remember that not  
712 everyone desires a home. Yet in that same breath, there are those that do. There is a valid  
713 concern for affordable housing that needs to be addressed.  
714

715 Chairman López spoke on behalf of Councilmember Jensen, who is absent, and relayed  
716 his message of being against the increase of unrelated occupants from three to four and  
717 would prefer it remain at three individuals.  
718

719 Councilmember Simmonds referenced the use Table for Section 17.10.060 regarding  
720 height increase. "Building Height Bonus as per Chapter 17.34 permits an additional 24'

721 of building height," in TC-1 (Town Center 1). She requested Mr. DeSimone expand on  
722 the topic.

723  
724 Mr. DeSimone explained the density building height already exists and instead, he put a  
725 direct reference in the spec sheet with a direct reference to the location where the  
726 standards are already in existence. Chapter 17.34. The language in Chapter 17.34  
727 currently permits density and height bonuses in TC-1 with a base zone, based density of  
728 70 units to the acre and a density bonus of 15 units for superior design, 30 units for  
729 structured parking, and 40 units for superior design and structured parking. The  
730 maximum density is 85 to 115 units in total. The height is 55 to 80 feet with a height  
731 bonus of 12 to 24 feet with a maximum total height of 104 feet.

732  
733 Councilmember Simmonds asked if the affordable housing density bonus would be an  
734 add-on or if only one of the density bonuses could be added at a time. She requested  
735 clarification on whether the density bonus can be added together with a height bonus.

736  
737 Mr. DeSimone confirmed that the density bonus could not be added together with the  
738 affordable housing nor with the height bonus.

739  
740 Chairman López inquired if the Council preferred the 5% requirement with the developer  
741 receiving a 25% density increase or the second option of a 10% affordable housing  
742 requirement and a 20% density bonus.

743  
744 Councilmember Simmonds and Councilmember M. Anderson preferred the 20-10 option.

745  
746 Vice Chair A. Anderson requested confirmation that the income restriction for affordable  
747 housing would be for 80% AMI.

748  
749 Mr. DeSimone clarified that it will be for 50% AMI or below in mixed-use. The 80%  
750 AMI is applicable to other zones.

751  
752 Chairman López asked if there would be an issue with the parking requirements of micro-  
753 living units only having three-quarters of vehicle parking per unit.

754  
755 Vice Chair A. Anderson answered with this particular population, it should not be an  
756 issue. This is a lower income threshold; a car is a luxury. Hence, one of the requirements  
757 is to be close to employers and have access to transportation options.

758  
759 Mr. DeSimone expanded the idea of the proposal to target a lower-income population that  
760 cannot afford a car or market-rate rent.

762 The Council discussed what they were or were not in favor of. They did not oppose  
763 micro-living units as they would be in mixed-used areas and not in residential areas.  
764 Neither did they oppose the increase in density bonus in dwelling units for low-income  
765 affordable housing. Their concern primarily lies in the increase of occupancy in  
766 residential dwellings to four occupants.  
767

768 The Council had the option of 10% housing requirements, or 20% density bonus based on  
769 income units built. The Council was in favor of the 20-10 for density bonus and 10% of  
770 units will be income restricted to 50% AMI. They would commence there and may  
771 change it as needed.  
772

773 The Council discussed whether micro-living units will possibly be built. There may be  
774 projects that will come, but they will need to see how the type of units develop. With the  
775 restrictions in place, micro-units will not occur in residential areas. There are specific  
776 requirements that are within walkable distance to employment and have access to  
777 transport such as the bus system. Twenty-five percent of micro-living units will be  
778 market-rate units which will have parking stalls. The intent and hope are tenants of these  
779 units will eventually move into market-rate housing.  
780

781 The proposed 17.62 B change is "Occupancy Limits, Residential' means the number of  
782 persons legally allowed to occupy a residential dwelling unit for living and sleeping  
783 purposes shall be either: (a) One (1) family as defined in this chapter and not more than  
784 one (1) additional person: or (b) no more than four (4) individuals." Portion (b) is to  
785 remain as previously or rather be amended as "no more than *three (3) individuals.*"  
786

787 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Vice Chair A.**  
788 **Anderson to adopt Ordinance 23-32 with the removal of four individuals to three**  
789 **occupants and density bonus of 20% and 10% housing requirement as amended.**  
790 Motion carried by roll call vote.

791 **A. Anderson: Aye**  
792 **M. Anderson: Aye**  
793 **Jensen: Absent**  
794 **López: Aye**  
795 **Simmonds: Aye**  
796

797 **PUBLIC HEARING - Budget Adjustments FY 2023-2024 appropriating: \$396 a**  
798 **grant the Library received from the State of Utah to be used to pay for the renewal**  
799 **of wi-fi hotspots at the Library; \$11,610 funds the Police Department received for**  
800 **the Bulletproof Vest Partnership to purchase vests for police officers; \$6,250**  
801 **contributions received for the Public Works training event; \$248,584**

802     **Communication radio reserves (293010) toward the purchase of radio equipment -**  
803     **Resolution 23-45 – Richard Anderson, Finance Director (2:30:30)**

804  
805     At the October 17, 2023 Council meeting, Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed  
806     the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustments.

807  
808     Chairman López opened the meeting to a public hearing.

809  
810     Gail B. Yost, a resident of Logan asked how many bulletproof vests will be purchased  
811     with the proposed amount. She would like to see more grants or funding for bulletproof  
812     vests for the police.

813  
814     Assistant Chief Hooley responded the cost of each bulletproof vest is \$1,200.

815  
816     Councilmember Simmonds responded that bulletproof vests are rotated every year and  
817     purchased every few years on rotation.

818  
819     Assistant Chief Hooley clarified that all officers have and wear bulletproof vests.

820  
821     There were no further comments and Chairman López closed the public hearing.

822  
823     **ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair A. Anderson seconded by Councilmember**  
824     **Simmonds to approve Resolution 23-45 as presented. Motion carried by roll call**  
825     **vote.**

826     **A. Anderson: Aye**

827     **M. Anderson: Aye**

828     **Jensen: Absent**

829     **López: Aye**

830     **Simmonds: Aye**

831  
832     **WORKSHOP ITEMS:**

833  
834     **Consideration of a proposed resolution approving fees for the Parks and Recreation**  
835     **Department (Plaza Ice Rink, Ice Skate Rental fees and Logan River Golf Course**  
836     **Fees) – Resolution 23-49 – Russ Akina, Parks & Recreation Director (2:35:03)**

837  
838     Parks and Recreation Director Russ Akina addressed the Council regarding the proposed  
839     fee increases. These will be administering fees for recreational, special event programs,  
840     and services such as ice skate rental fees. The ice-skating sessions will be 90-minutes for  
841     skate loops. The staff recommendation is for 60-minutes for skate loops.

843 Vice Chair A. Anderson inquired about the maximum occupancy of skaters that can be  
844 on the ice rink.

845

846 Mr. Akina responded that the maximum number of skaters on the ice is estimated  
847 between 120 to 150 during any given session.

848

849 Mr. Akina remarked that prior to opening the ice rink to the public, they will do a test run  
850 with city employees.

851

852 Councilmember Simmonds said the determination to be made by the Council is whether  
853 to keep 90-minute sessions or the 60-minute staff recommendation.

854

855 Mr. Anderson interjected the staff recommendation is 60-minutes per session.

856

857 Councilmember Simmonds requested further information on the Monday Family Night as  
858 the fee reads as \$3/up to 5 members.

859

860 Mr. Akina clarified that is \$3 per person for up to 5 family members and any more  
861 individuals will pay full price. An example given is if a family of twelve arrives for the  
862 first five people, they will pay \$15 for the first five and \$21 for the rest of the remaining  
863 seven family members.

864

865 Mayor Daines asked if there would be group rates available.

866

867 Mr. Akina responded there have been numerous inquiries made, staff are still making  
868 calculations in regard to group rates.

869

870 Vice Chair A. Anderson requested confirmation that the Council is only approving the  
871 rate and the price of fees.

872

873 Mr. Akina confirmed that this is the case, what is being proposed are the fees for public  
874 time to ice skate on the ice rink.

875

876 Chairman López inquired if there would be a student discount.

877

878 Mr. Akina answered not at this time.

879

880 Councilmember Simmonds asked why the junior driving range requires a season golf  
881 pass when no other ranges do.

882

883 Mr. Akina replied he would verify the reasoning prior to the next council meeting and  
884 report back.

**City of Logan**  
**Parks and Recreation Department**  
**2023 Proposed Fees**  
Laub Plaza Ice Rink

Location Fee Hours

**Laub Plaza Ice Rink** \$5/person (90-min. session) M – F: 4p – 9:30p  
\$3/person, 60+, Military, -3 yrs. (90-min. sess.) Sat.: 12p – 9:30p  
\$15 Monday Family Night (90-min session) Sun.: 12p – 5:30p  
(\$3/up to 5 members); Free Skate Rental Hours may vary for special events.

Ice Skate Rental \$3/skates

Skate Trainer – Walker \$3/upon request – limited supply  
Helmet \$1/upon request – limited supply

**Eccles Ice Center** \$8/8 yrs. & older Public Hours Vary

\$7/up to 8 yrs., 55 yrs. +  
\$50 Family Night – 8 people

Ice Skate Rental \$2/skates

Skate Trainer – Walker \$2.50  
Helmet \$1

**Bountiful Ice Ribbon** \$7/Adult M – F: 4p – 9p

\$5/Child Sat.: 1p – 9p  
Sun.: 2p – 7p  
Ice Skate Rental \$3/skates Hours may vary  
Skate Trainer -Walker \$6

**Gallivan Center** \$12/Adult M – TH: 4p – 10p

\$11/Seniors, Military F-S: 12p – 12a  
\$10/Children (12 yrs. And under) Sun.: 12p – 9p

Fee includes ice skate rental.

**Millreek Commons Skate Loop** \$7/All Ages (90-min. session) M – S: 11a – 10p

Group Discount for 25+  
5-Punch Pass \$25  
10-Punch Pass \$50

Ice Skate Rental \$5

**South Davis Recreation Center** \$7/Adult (18 yrs. +) 3 1hr. 45 min sessions

\$5/Senior (60+) 10 am to 12 pm  
\$5/3 yrs. – 17 yrs. 12:15 pm to 2 pm  
6:30 pm to 8:15 pm  
Ice Skate Rental \$3  
Skate Trainer – Walker \$6

885  
886 The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the November 21,  
887 2023, Council meeting.

888      **Budget Adjustments FY 2023-2024 appropriating: \$80,000 a reimbursement for**  
889      **special inspection services; \$20,329 funds received for police overtime shift**  
890      **reimbursements; \$100,000 a loan forgiveness grant from the State of Utah for the**  
891      **Water Lead Service Line Inventory Project; \$32,784 public works engineering for**  
892      **traffic studies related to development; \$800,000 contingent legal fees associated with**  
893      **the Woodsonia development; \$60,000 funds for increased credit card fees, supplies,**  
894      **maintenance, and capital projects; \$390,000 a grant to Parks & Recreation**  
895      **Afterschool Program to be used to support After School Programs for Adams,**  
896      **Bridger, Ellis and Woodruff Elementary, and the Logan City School District -**  
897      **Resolution 23-47 – Richard Anderson, Finance Director ([2:47:48](#))**

898  
899      Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget  
900      adjustments. He explained that the water lead service line inventory loan forgiveness is a  
901      grant, but the way it is processed by the State is, as a loan.

902  
903      Mayor Daines asked if the grant money for the After School Program is federal funds.

904  
905      Mr. Anderson responded he was uncertain as several of the grants come through every  
906      year.

907  
908      Vice Chair A. Anderson inquired for the benefit of the public, if there is a differentiation  
909      of funding between the different schools.

910  
911      Mr. Anderson referred the question to Mr. Akina.

912  
913      Mr. Akina explained that the six elementary schools are under contract with the State.  
914      The funding is federal money that passes through the Department of Workforce Services  
915      for the State. The funding is on two different schedules, but all six schools do participate,  
916      and an equal amount of funding goes to each school. There are different levels of  
917      participation, but they are the same program.

918  
919      The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the November 21,  
920      2023, Council meeting.

921  
922      **Consideration of a proposed ordinance amending Sections 2.48.010, 2.48.020,**  
923      **2.48.030, 2.48.040, 2.48.050, 2.48.060, 3.04.010, 3.04.020, 3.04.030, 3.04.040, 3.04.050,**  
924      **3.04.060, and 3.04.070 of the Logan Municipal Code – Ordinance 23-34 – Richard**  
925      **Anderson ([2:52:29](#))**

926  
927      Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed  
928      ordinance. It has been ten years since the purchasing thresholds have been updated and it

929 is time to do so again. He emphasized the change will permit flexibility and should there  
930 be any concerns of abuse as by increasing the thresholds, there will be more effective  
931 monitoring. It is an appropriate adjustment, and it will be monitored.

933 *Current purchasing ordinance thresholds are the following:*

935	\$0 to \$5,000	Department documentation of 3 quotes
936	5,001 to 50,000	Department submits to Purchasing documentation of at least 3
937	bids, PO	
938	50,001+	Formal bidding by Purchasing

#### 940 *Proposed changes to purchasing ordinance thresholds:*

942 \$0 to \$5,000 Department obtains best value  
943 \$5,001 to \$10,000 Department documentation of 3 quotes  
944 \$10,001 to \$100,000 Department submits to Purchasing documentation of at least 3  
945 bids, PO  
946 100,001+ Formal bidding by Purchasing

949 Councilmember Simmonds inquired when things are purchased through a State  
950 purchasing contract will that eliminate the need for the threshold process.

952 Mr. Anderson answered that portions of the threshold requirements will be eliminated. A  
953 purchase order will still be required along with legal and statutory requirements.

955 The proposed ordinance will be an action item and public hearing at the November 21,  
956 2023, Council meeting.

## OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

960 Councilmember M. Anderson addressed the previous statement made by Ms. Bennett and  
961 said now that the City has only just split with the County, staff can readdress the ban on  
962 plastic bags.

964 No further items were discussed.

966 **ADJOURNED.** There being no further business, the Logan Municipal Council adjourned  
967 to a meeting of the Logan Redevelopment Agency at 8:27 p.m.

968 Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Redevelopment Agency convened on Tuesday,  
969 November 7, 2023, in the Logan Municipal Council Chambers located at 290 North 100  
970 West, Logan, Utah 84321 at 8:27 pm.

971  
972 Council Members present at the beginning of the meeting: Chairman Ernesto López, Vice  
973 Chair Amy Z. Anderson, Councilmember Jeannie F. Simmonds, and Councilmember  
974 Mark A. Anderson. Administration present: Mayor Holly H. Daines, City Attorney Craig  
975 Carlston, Richard Anderson, Economic Development Director Kirk Jensen,  
976 City Recorder Teresa Harris and Deputy Recorder Esli Morales.

977  
978 Excused: Councilmember Tom Jensen.

979 Chairman López welcomed those present. There were approximately 10 in attendance at  
980 the beginning of the meeting.

981  
982 **ACTION ITEM:**

983  
984 **A resolution approving Agency Assistance to Woodsonia Cache Valley, LLC for its  
985 Redevelopment Project in the 1400 North Main Community Reinvestment Project  
986 Area – Resolution 23-46 RDA – Kirk Jensen, Economic Development Director  
987 [\(3:01:37\)](#)**

988 Economic Development Director Kirk Jensen addressed the Council regarding the  
989 proposed resolution. He explained the City of Logan has adopted policies for assistance  
990 in projects and improvements in Community Reinvestment Project Areas.

991  
992 The redevelopment project of Woodsonia Cache Valley, LLC is approximately a 25.5  
993 acre site located at approximately 1300 North Main Street in the 1400 North Main  
994 Community Reinvestment Project Area (“CRPA”), consisting of a mixed-use  
995 development, consisting of an approximately 150,000 square-foot commercial building  
996 occupied by a national retailer; an approximately 98,000 square-foot, four-story  
997 hotel/retail building; and a multi-family apartment complex consisting of four, four-story  
998 buildings totaling approximately 364,000 square feet and including approximately 346  
999 residential units with 10% of the units qualifying as affordable housing, contributes  
1000 significantly to the achievement of the City’s economic goals, including: the  
1001 revitalization of an underutilized site; the fiscal growth of the City through property and  
1002 sales taxes; the creation of new jobs; the creation of additional and affordable housing; an  
1003 additional economic return for the City in terms of the Project serving as a catalyst,  
1004 encouraging additional development in the 1400 North Main Community Reinvestment  
1005 Project Area.

1006  
1007

1008 The City of Logan has agreed to reimburse Woodsonia for various fees and other  
1009 expenses with an estimated value of \$3,811,000. The Economic Development Committee  
1010 has reviewed the proposed investment and recommended its approval.

1011

1012 The proposed incentive package is the following:

1013

1014 Woodsia will receive 100% of the available property tax increment generated by its  
1015 Project annually during the life of the CRPA, not to exceed \$10,010,000. Available tax  
1016 increment is defined as the total tax increment generated by the Project during the life of  
1017 the CRPA and received by the Agency minus 10% that is required to be allocated for  
1018 affordable housing and 5% which is used for administrative costs.

1019

1020 Woodsonia will also receive 100% of the affordable housing reserves generated by its  
1021 Project annually during the life of the CRPA, not to exceed \$1,180,000. Woodsonia will  
1022 also receive \$500,000 from the Agency's affordable housing reserve.

1023

1024 All construction plans are to be approved by the City of Logan.

1025

1026 Additionally, the Agency encourages Woodsonia to utilize local contractors and vendors  
1027 whenever possible.

1028

1029 Councilmember Simmonds, for the benefit of the public, said that the public may be  
1030 taken aback by how things may appear or occur without their knowledge. She explained  
1031 that when the City contracts with a developer, the developer negotiates for a retailer or  
1032 other entity to fill the commercial space. Typically, the City does not know who the  
1033 developer is in the process of negotiation as the City is not part of that process. The  
1034 developer does not disclose to anyone until they have secured the appropriate  
1035 commitments from the entity in question.

1036

1037 Kirk Jensen, Economic Development Director confirmed that typically is the case.  
1038 However, in relation to the big box stores, it will be stipulated in the Development  
1039 Agreement with the current developer Woodsonia. If it is not a specific retailer that has  
1040 been discussed the entire agreement between the agency and the developer would need to  
1041 be renegotiated. The City in this specific instance would be aware but would not be at  
1042 liberty to say at this point in time.

1043

1044 Councilmember Simmonds requested confirmation that this type of exception will not  
1045 apply to the hotel nor the 21,000 square feet of commercial space.

1046

1047 Mr. Jensen confirmed that is the case, the City will not be part of the developer's  
1048 negotiations with the hotel nor any of the entities that may occupy the 21,000 square feet  
1049 of commercial space. It is up to the developer to do so.

1050  
1051 Councilmember Simmonds asked if the project's affordable housing is at 80% AMI. In  
1052 addition, once the developer has received the reserves from the agency, the developer  
1053 will still be required to have affordable housing for years to come.

1054  
1055 Mr. Jensen responded that affordable housing would be at the 80% AMI income level.  
1056 The developer is required to maintain affordable housing as part of the project for the  
1057 duration of the RDA which is twenty years. The project will consist of 10% of affordable  
1058 housing units which is 34 units.

1059  
1060 Mayor Daines clarified the contract stipulates the developer is required to do so for the  
1061 period of the RDA but may elect to not do so after that period has passed.

1062  
1063 Chairman López referred to the scheduled annual amounts that are projected to be  
1064 generated by the developer. "Woodsonia will receive 100% of the available property tax  
1065 increment generated by its Project annually during the life of the CRPA, not to exceed  
1066 \$10,010,000." He asked if that would all be at one time or would be up to that amount.

1067  
1068 Mr. Jensen answered that the amount will be a cumulate cap over the entire duration of  
1069 the project and is the maximum increment that can be generated during the life of the  
1070 RDA.

1071  
1072 **ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair A. Anderson seconded by Councilmember M.**  
1073 **Anderson to approve Resolution 23-46 RDA as presented. Motion carried by roll**  
1074 **call vote.**

1075 **A. Anderson: Aye**  
1076 **M. Anderson: Aye**  
1077 **Jensen: Absent**  
1078 **López: Aye**  
1079 **Simmonds: Aye**

1080  
1081 **WORKSHOP ITEM:**

1082  
1083 **Budget Adjustment FY 2023-2024 appropriating: \$500,000 affordable housing**  
1084 **reserves (292108) toward the Woodsonia development - Resolution 23-48 RDA -**  
1085 **Kirk Jensen (3:11:46)**

1086 Economic Development Director Kirk Jensen addressed the Council regarding the  
1087 proposed resolution. He summarized the assistance package that had been presented  
1088 during the public hearing just before the workshop.  
1089

1090 Chairman López inquired about the duration of time it took to collect affordable housing  
1091 funds.  
1092

1093 Mr. Jensen replied these are funds that have been earned and accumulated over several  
1094 years. There have been multiple project areas throughout the City such as South Main,  
1095 Auto Mall, and so forth. Not all of the RDA's had statutory affordable housing  
1096 requirements. For those that had a requirement, 10% of funds have been set aside for  
1097 affordable housing. This will continue with future RDAs including the Woodsonia  
1098 project.  
1099

1100 Mr. Anderson confirmed that will not be the end of affordable housing funds but will end  
1101 with the completion of an RDA.  
1102

1103 The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the November 21,  
1104 2023, Council meeting.  
1105

1106 **ADJOURNED.** There being no further business, the Logan Redevelopment Agency  
1107 adjourned at 8:39 p.m.  
1108  
1109  
1110  
1111 Esli Morales, Deputy City Recorder