

Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Municipal Council convened in regular session on Tuesday, January 20, 2026, in the Logan Municipal Council Chambers located at 290 North 100 West, Logan, Utah 84321 at 5:30 p.m. Logan Municipal Council Meetings are televised live as a public service on Channel 17 and the City of Logan YouTube channel at: bit.ly/LoganCouncilMeetings

Councilmembers present at the beginning of the meeting: Chair Mike Johnson, Vice Chair Ernesto López, Councilmember Jeannie F. Simmonds, Councilmember Katie Lee-Koven and Councilmember Melissa Dahle. Administration present: Mayor Mark A. Anderson, City Attorney Craig Carlston, Finance Director Richard Anderson, and City Recorder Teresa Harris.

Chair Johnson welcomed those present. There were approximately 42 people in attendance at the beginning of the meeting.

OPENING CEREMONY:

Brookelyn Harvey, Point In Time (PIT) Count Coordinator and intern at the Bear River Association of Government (BRAG), presented information about the annual Point in Time (PIT) count. She explained this event involves sending volunteers into the community to seek out and interview persons experiencing homelessness and connect them to resources. The count helps policymakers and program administrators measure progress toward addressing homelessness. Ms. Harvey noted the count dates are January 28th, 29th, and 30th, from midnight until 2:00 AM, with volunteers working in teams of 3-4. She invited council members to participate and left flyers with a QR code for sign-up.

Chair Johnson led the audience in the pledge of allegiance.

Meeting Minutes. Minutes of the Council meeting held on January 6, 2026 were reviewed and approved.

Meeting Agenda. Chair Johnson announced there are five public hearings scheduled for tonight's Council meeting.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Lee-Koven seconded by Councilmember Dahle to approve tonight's agenda and minutes from the January 20, 2026 Council meeting as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).

Dahle: Aye

Johnson: Aye

Lee-Koven: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

Meeting Schedule. Chair Johnson announced that regular Council meetings are held on the first and third Tuesdays of the month at 5:30 p.m. The next regular Council meeting is Tuesday, February 3, 2026.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FOR MAYOR AND COUNCIL: (0:37)

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

Logan resident Joshua Molitor addressed the Council and stated that he has participated in the PIT count and commented that it provides an eye-opening experience, helping participants understand what homeless individuals experience during cold winter months.

He also attended the Council retreat held at Utah State University and thanked the facilitator Dr. Cann for his “political science presentation” noting it was informative though he wished more public members had been in attendance to observe.

Logan resident Patrick Belmont addressed the Council and requested a moment of silence for atrocities occurring in Iran, which the council observed. Mr. Belmont also expressed appreciation for the retreat the Council recently held, particularly the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis portion. He encouraged council members to examine their assumptions about future developments at city, state, national, and global levels, suggesting they should neither assume things will proceed as they have over past decades nor assume everything is unpredictable. He also recommended the Council reach out to a broader group of people for input, specifically mentioning Logan Mitchell as a resource for geothermal information and acknowledging the valuable contributions of Tyson Godfrey from the Logan City Light & Power Department.

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

MAYOR/STAFF REPORTS: (6:32)

Ratification of new Community Development Director – Mayor Anderson

Mayor Anderson announced that Mike DeSimone has decided to retire after 15 years with Logan City. The Mayor recommended Russ Holley as the new Community Development Director, noting there were two strong internal candidates but Mr. Holley was determined to be the right person for the position.

Mayor Anderson requested ratification of Russ Holley to be appointed as the new Logan City Community Development Director replacing Mike DeSimone who will retire on January 22, 2026.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Vice Chair López approve the ratification of Russ Holley as the new Logan City Community Development Director as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).

Dahle: Aye

Johnson: Aye

Lee-Koven: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

Board Appointments (Planning Commission) – Mayor Anderson

Mayor Anderson requested ratification of the following two board appointments to serve on the Planning Commission: Sara Doutre, reappointment and Craig Maughan, new appointment.

Mayor Anderson noted that Craig Maughan was present at the meeting and thanked him for his willingness to serve, acknowledging the considerable time commitment required for the Planning Commission.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Dahle seconded by Vice Chair López approve the ratification of Sara Doutre and Craig Maughan as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).

Dahle: Aye

Johnson: Aye

Lee-Koven: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

Board Appointment – Proposed request for Mayor Mark A. Anderson to serve on the Wastewater Rate Setting Committee – Tyler Richards, Environmental Director

Tyler Richards, Environmental Director, explained that in 2017, prior to construction of the Wastewater Treatment Plant, Logan City entered into an interlocal agreement with six other cities it serves. Each city has a representative on the board and committee that sets rates for wastewater treatment. The request is for Mayor Anderson to serve in this role as former Mayor Holly Daines served as well in the past.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Vice Chair López to approve Mayor Mark A. Anderson to serve on the Wastewater Rate Setting Committee as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).

Dahle: Aye

Johnson: Aye

Lee-Koven: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

COUNCIL BUSINESS: (11:17)

Planning Commission Update – Councilmember Simmonds

Councilmember Simmonds reported that the Planning Commission had recently reviewed two projects: Copperwood Townhomes, an expansion of an interblock development that was approved following changes to infill regulations, and a new Little Lambs Diaper Bank and Community Resource Center located at 1472 North 800 West that will provide a more efficient distribution system for their clientele.

Council Announcements – Chair Johnson

Vice Chair López announced that he and Councilmember Dahle are planning to attend Local Officials Day at the Legislature on Tuesday, January 21. They will attend with 12 members of the Logan High School Youth City Council and will meet with our legislators Chris Wilson and Jason Thompson at the Capitol.

Board Appointments (Planning Commission) – Mayor Daines

Chair Johnson introduced Amber Spackman Jones for appointment to the Renewable Energy and Sustainability Advisory Board (RESAB), noting she had already attended some meetings and been approved by RESAB. He requested ratification of Amber Spackman Jones to serve on the Renewable Energy and Sustainability Advisory Board (RESAB) which is a new appointment.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Lee-Koven seconded by Councilmember Simmonds approve the ratification of Amber Spackman Jones as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).

Dahle: Aye

Johnson: Aye

Lee-Koven: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

General Plan Workshop – February 3, 2026, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in the City Hall Conference Room.

Chair Johnson announced that a General Plan Workshop for the City Council will be held on Tuesday, February 3, 2026 from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the City Hall Conference Room. This workshop is a public meeting but no public comments will be accepted.

ACTION ITEMS:

PUBLIC HEARING - FUTURE BOOKSHOP REZONE – Consideration of a proposed rezone. Annie & Greg Waddoups/Jeffrey L. Peterson Estate, authorized agent/owner, is requesting a zone change of a .52 acre property located at 404 Park Avenue from Traditional Neighborhood Residential (NR-6) to Neighborhood Center (NC) in the Woodruff Neighborhood – Ordinance 26-01 – Aimee Egbert, Planner (16:20)

Aimee Egbert, Planner, presented the Future Bookshop Rezone located at 404 Park Avenue. The applicants, Annie & Greg Waddoups/Jeffrey L. Peterson Estate, requested changing the zoning from Traditional Neighborhood Residential (NR-6) to Neighborhood Center (NC) for a 0.52-acre property.

Ms. Egbert explained the property was originally built as a schoolhouse, later converted to a church, and in the 1950s became a single-family house. The requested Neighborhood Center zone is a "spot floating zone" with four currently on the east side of town and one on the west side. She clarified that NC is the lowest intensity commercial zone, with restrictions including a maximum of 3,000 square feet commercial footprint (5,000 with conditional use permit), no drive-through lanes, and a 35-foot height limit.

The rezone request is strictly for a zoning map amendment; no site plans or operational details are approved at this stage. Any future development must meet the standards of the NC zone and undergo required permitting and review.

Ms. Egbert concluded the request is compatible with the Logan City General Plan and on December 11, 2025, the Planning Commission voted 5–0 to recommend approval.

Chair Johnson inquired regarding the crosswalk located just north of the subject property and whether it included a Rapid Flashing Beacon (RFB).

Public Works Director Paul Lindardt confirmed that the crosswalk does not currently have an RFB.

Vice Chair López asked about the maximum building footprint of 3,000 square feet noted in the proposal and whether a minimum footprint requirement existed.

202
203 Ms. Egbert responded stated there is no minimum requirement. Staff further noted that
204 while the building includes a loft area, planned remodeling will remove the loft and the
205 interior square footage will remain below the 3,000 square foot maximum.

206
207 Councilmember Dahle expressed concern not about increased traffic, but rather the
208 existing safety challenges caused by a blind corner in the area. She suggested that as part
209 of future parking lot improvements, the City consider limiting the parking lot exit to
210 right-turn-only movements for improved safety. She noted that during large events at the
211 fairgrounds—such as the fair, Vintage Market Days, or other high-attendance events—
212 vehicles commonly park on both sides of the street, resulting in a narrow roadway and
213 poor visibility.

214
215 Ms. Egbert suggested the Streets Division consider painting curbs red in the vicinity to
216 discourage parking at those times. She added that event attendees would likely utilize the
217 proposed on-site parking lot if provided.

218 Chair Johnson opened the meeting to a public hearing.

219 There were no comments and Chair Johnson closed the public hearing.

220 Vice Chair López asked whether the garage on the property would be removed.

221 Ms. Egbert confirmed that the applicant intends to remove the garage located in front of
222 the house and convert the area into a patio.

223 Vice Chair López further asked whether additional improvements were planned to
224 increase visibility at the corner adjacent to the proposed parking area, including possible
225 removal or trimming of trees.

226 Ms. Egbert indicated she was not aware of specific plans but noted that improved
227 visibility would likely benefit the applicant. She confirmed that the existing driveway
228 serving the garage would be removed and added that Public Works would not allow two
229 driveways at this location and that only one driveway access would be permitted.

230 Councilmember Dahle asked whether the proposed use or rezone would affect the speed
231 limit on the road, currently posted at 30 mph. She expressed concern that the curve and
232 higher speeds have historically resulted in damage to mailboxes and landscaping in the
233 area.

234 Ms. Egbert stated that the presence of a business would not likely result in a change in the
235 posted speed limit, as existing businesses to the north have not prompted speed changes.

236 Councilmember Dahle expressed support for a bookshop use in the neighborhood but
237 noted concern that the property could convert to other uses in the future.

238 Chair Johnson asked what other uses are permitted within the Neighborhood Center (NC)
239 zone without a Conditional Use Permit.

240 Ms. Egbert responded that the zone permits food service less than 3,000 square feet;
241 general office and sales and service less than 3,000 square feet; and agriculture
242 community or urban uses. She noted that sales and service uses may be broad in scope
243 but remain limited in scale. Automotive sales would not be allowed. Drive-through and
244 walk-up windows are prohibited. Also, certain additional uses may be allowed
245 conditionally, such as food service or offices up to 5,000 square feet.

246 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Councilmember Lee-**
247 **Koven to adopt Ordinance 26-01 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).**
248 **Dahle: Aye**
249 **Johnson: Aye**
250 **Lee-Koven: Aye**
251 **López: Aye**
252 **Simmonds: Aye**
253

254 **PUBLIC HEARING - FAIRGROUNDS NORTH REZONE – Consideration of a**
255 **proposed rezone. Tony Johnson/Alliance Acquisition LLC, authorized agent/owner,**
256 **is requesting the zone change of a .26 acre property located at 390 South 400 West**
257 **from Mixed Residential Low (MR-12) to Neighborhood Center (NC) in the**
258 **Woodruff Neighborhood – Ordinance 26-02 – Russ Holley, Planner ([27:53](#))**
259

260 Russ Holley, Planner, presented the Fairgrounds North Rezone located at 390 South 400
261 West, where applicant Tony Johnson/Alliance Acquisition LLC requested a change from
262 Mixed Residential Low (MR-12) to Neighborhood Center (NC) for a 0.26-acre property.
263

264 Mr. Holley explained this property is across the street from another recently rezoned
265 parcel where the applicant is nearing completion of "Fairway Bagels and Donuts." The
266 current property contains a 1920's brick bungalow.
267

268 Mr. Holley indicated that the current Future Land Use Plan identifies the area as Mixed
269 Residential (MR). The proposed Neighborhood Center (NC) zone is considered a
270 "floating" zone and is not pre-mapped to specific parcels; instead, it is reviewed on a
271 case-by-case basis to determine whether the location and context support the intent of the
272 zone. The current zoning of the parcel is MR-12 and that an existing NC-zoned
273 neighborhood center (bagel and donut shop) is located across the street. The applicant is
274 proposing to rezone the subject parcel, which is slightly over a quarter-acre in size.
275

Mr. Holley reviewed questions raised at the prior meeting regarding scale and intensity of neighborhood centers. The Land Development Code does not limit the number of parcels within a neighborhood center. However, he noted that the intent language describing small-scale and neighborhood-serving intensity suggests that larger clusters of four to six parcels would constitute a higher-intensity zone such as Community Commercial or Commercial General. By comparison, the Tandoori Oven and Credit Union located at the corner at 1000 North and 700 East is comprised of two parcels, while the Island Market neighborhood center at Center Street and 400 East occupies three parcels though only one business operates there. He noted that two additional residential parcels to the south and east are also zoned NC and could allow future expansion of the neighborhood center. He said that NC uses may be up to 3,000 square feet by right, and up to 5,000 square feet with a Conditional Use Permit. The proposal in this case is anticipated to be food service. If the property is successfully rezoned, the applicant would be required to return for design review and, depending on size, a Conditional Use Permit.

Councilmember Simmonds noted that the Tandoori Oven and credit union properties were pre-existing uses and were assigned the NC zone retroactively, and expressed concern about how many parcels could reasonably be considered part of the same neighborhood center, whether they should be contiguous, and how crossing streets should be considered. She questioned how the City defines the scale of a Neighborhood Center and when a group of NC parcels should instead be considered Community Commercial..

Mr. Holley stated that the size and extent of a Neighborhood Center is ultimately a policy decision for the Council. He acknowledged that adjacency or contiguity across a street can be reasonable, especially where walkability and neighborhood-serving intent are maintained. He noted that Community Commercial allows greater intensity and a broader range of uses without a Conditional Use Permit and cited examples of larger commercial centers such as the Dwell Realty, the former Kubex and Elks Lodge, which encompass several acres.

Councilmember Simmonds suggested that a clearer definition of neighborhood center boundaries may be desirable as the City encounters more requests of this type.

Councilmember Lee-Koven noted that each Neighborhood Center is somewhat unique and that case-by-case review remains appropriate given differences in size, context, and limitations in permitted square footage.

Mr. Holley clarified that NC square footage allowances apply per parcel (3,000 square feet permitted, 5,000 square feet conditionally).

Councilmembers discussed hypothetical situations involving consecutive parcels applying for NC zoning and noted that maximum aggregation of NC parcels is not defined in code and would remain subject to Council discretion.

319 Mr. Holley reported that the Planning Commission recommended approval of the rezone
320 and that no written or verbal opposition was received during the public hearing.

321 Chair Johnson opened the meeting to a public hearing.

322 There were no comments and Chair Johnson closed the public hearing.

323

324 Vice Chair López stated that given the existing Commercial activity at the fairgrounds
325 and the high level of visitation generated by events, the proposed rezone did not appear
326 out of place. He noted that the two parcels could reasonably function as Neighborhood
327 Centers within that context.

328

329 **ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair López seconded by Councilmember Dahle to adopt**
330 **Ordinance 26-02 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).**

331 **Dahle: Aye**

332 **Johnson: Aye**

333 **Lee-Koven: Aye**

334 **López: Aye**

335 **Simmonds: Nay**

336

337 **PUBLIC HEARING - RIGHT OF WAY VACATION – Consideration of a**
338 **proposed ordinance vacating certain Right of Way located at 900 North 1000 West**
339 **– Ordinance 26-03 – Paul Lindhardt, Public Works Director ([42:00](#))**

340

341 Paul Lindhardt, Public Works Director presented a request to vacate a public right-of-
342 way located at approximately 900 North and 1000 West, within the Cache Valley Electric
343 (CVE) Subdivision. He explained that when the subdivision was created, 900 North was
344 dedicated as a public street. The applicant and adjacent property owners have petitioned
345 to vacate the right-of-way.

346 He reported that the property owners to the north and south have entered into a private
347 agreement for maintenance and for the recording of a future access easement to ensure
348 continued access for the three affected properties.

349 There was a question about potential changes to the private easement over time and
350 whether the easement could be narrowed below fire code requirements.

351 He consulted with the Fire Marshal and the City Engineer and stated that any party
352 holding interest in the easement could agree to modify it. Such changes would not
353 automatically trigger City review unless associated with a City process, such as a
354 subdivision, building permit, or boundary line adjustment. In such cases, public safety
355 requirements, including fire lane standards, would be reviewed.

356 He noted that as part of a recent building permit submittal on the southern parcel for a
357 proposed warehouse, the Fire Department and Building Division would have authority to

review and require adequate fire access. If future development on any of the three properties required emergency access beyond the extent of the current easement, the applicant could be required to extend or adjust the easement to meet fire access standards.

Mr. Lindhardt reported receiving an email inquiry from a representative of Gossner Foods regarding the schedule and public comment process. The inquiry was acknowledged and addressed.

A petition for the vacation had been publicly posted at City Hall for affected property owners. Three individuals signed the petition in support: representing the southern property, the property east across 1000 West, and a third signer whose property interest was unclear. He noted this was the first time in recent years that signatures had been recorded on a posted petition.

He further reported that the northern property owner submitted a letter of support for the vacation during the preliminary coordination phase, prior to the formal petition process. No verbal or written opposition was received.

Mr. Lindhardt reviewed diagrams in the Council packet illustrating the existing dedicated right-of-way to be vacated and the new private access easement to be recorded. He clarified that the entire public right-of-way would be vacated and replaced with a private access and cross-access easement to the terminus described in the application. He noted that only a portion of the existing right-of-way is currently improved, and that one existing building encroaches into the right-of-way.

Mr. Lindhardt stated that the original subdivision plat included a note requiring removal of the building if the roadway were ever extended; however, he indicated that such a requirement would no longer apply if the right-of-way were vacated.

Mr. Lindhardt identified Cache Valley Electric as the applicant petitioning for the vacation.

Chair Johnson opened the meeting to a public hearing.

There were no comments and Chair Johnson closed the public hearing.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Councilmember Dahle to adopt Ordinance 26-03 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).

Dahle: Aye

Johnson: Aye

Lee-Koven: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

PUBLIC HEARING - ELECTRICAL EASEMENT VACATION – Consideration of a proposed ordinance vacating sections of Electrical Easement and Public Utility Easement at the Cache Valley Marketplace development – Ordinance 26 -04 – Paul Lindhardt (51:44)

Paul Lindhardt, Public works Director presented a petition to vacate certain public utility and electrical easements located within the Cache Valley Marketplace Subdivision, situated between 1400 North and 1250 North and between Main Street and 200 East, commonly known as the Target development area.

He stated that the purpose of the petition is twofold: (1) to vacate easements that conflict with current redevelopment plans, including new building footprints; and (2) to vacate easements that require relocation due to recent boundary and property line adjustments. He noted that when public utility easements are located along property lines and those lines shift, utilities are typically relocated accordingly when feasible.

Mr. Lindhardt reported that affected utilities—primarily Logan City Light & Power—have already relocated or are in the process of relocating their infrastructure. The ordinance would vacate obsolete electrical and public utility easements and allow new easements to be recorded adjacent to the updated property lines. He referenced the legal descriptions that will be recorded as part of the action.

Mr. Lindhardt reviewed the noticing process and reported that the petition was mailed to a large number of property owners within the subdivision. No consents were received, and no objections were filed. One adjacent property owner made an informational inquiry regarding potential impacts to their parcel; the inquiry was addressed and no concerns were raised.

Vice Chair López asked whether electrical infrastructure located within the existing easements had been relocated.

Mr. Lindhardt responded that utilities have either completed relocation or will do so concurrent with ongoing development.

Chair Johnson asked if we don't vacate these easements, can they build their buildings over the easements?

Mr. Lindhardt responded that buildings may not be constructed over active electrical easements and that new easements will be created and recorded as part of the subdivision and platting process. He noted that utility easements do not return to the Council for acceptance and are reviewed administratively through the plat review process.

427 He further explained that easement vacations are commonly processed in conjunction
428 with subdivisions or boundary adjustments. The signed ordinance would not be recorded
429 until new utility easements are also recorded to ensure continuity of access and service
430 for all affected properties.

431 Chair Johnson opened the meeting to a public hearing.

432 There were no comments and Chair Johnson closed the public hearing.

433 Vice Chair López asked whether denial of the easement vacation would create liability
434 for the City, noting that denial would result in the City retaining the existing easements.

435 Craig Carlston, City Attorney responded, potentially. If there were theoretical
436 considerations depending on development agreements and previously issued permits. The
437 City typically conditions development to avoid conflict with existing easements and
438 would not grant permits that allow construction within them.

439 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Vice Chair López to**
440 **adopt Ordinance 26-04 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).**

441 **Dahle: Aye**

442 **Johnson: Aye**

443 **Lee-Koven: Aye**

444 **López: Aye**

445 **Simmonds: Aye**

446

447 **PUBLIC HEARING - Budget Adjustments FY 2025-2026 appropriating: \$2,500**
448 **donated funds for replacement glass for the Police Rescue Vehicle; \$2,500 donated**
449 **funds for a storage container at the Fire Training Facility; \$225,000 funds Public**
450 **Works received from UDOT to improve safety at the railroad crossing at 200 North**
451 **- Resolution 26-01 – Richard Anderson, Finance Director ([57:40](#))**

452 Richard Anderson, Finance Director presented three items for Council consideration: two
453 donations and one grant. He reported that a \$2,500 donation was made to the Logan
454 Police Department for replacement of glass in a police rescue vehicle, and a \$2,500
455 donation was made to the Logan Fire Department for a storage container training facility.
456 The City also received a grant in the amount of \$225,000 from the Utah Department of
457 Transportation for improvements on 200 North. He noted that although 200 North is a
458 state road, the grant allows the City to undertake improvements.

459 Mayor Anderson asked how residents or businesses may make donations to the City, and
460 whether donations can be specified for a particular department or purpose.

Mr. Anderson responded that donations may be made by check to the City of Logan and may be designated for specific uses, including departmental needs. Similar donations occur periodically for both general and specific purposes.

Mr. Anderson asked if Council would like additional clarification in the future regarding donations made for very specific purposes versus general uses.

Councilmember Simmonds stated that donations are generally not discussed at Council meeting until they are being appropriated or allocated.

Mr. Anderson noted that certain exceptions exist, such as donations of conservation easements or capital items such as to the Library when it was being built, which may not involve monetary transactions. In those cases, Council may be asked to determine whether to accept the donation if there are potential liability considerations. Council involvement is more likely when a donation could result in future appropriations, maintenance responsibilities, or ongoing costs.

Chair Johnson opened the meeting to a public hearing.

There were no comments and Chair Johnson closed the public hearing.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Dahle seconded by Councilmember Simmonds to approve Resolution 26-01 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).

Dahle: Aye

Johnson: Aye

Lee-Koven: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

No further action items were presented.

WORKSHOP ITEMS:

Budget Adjustment FY 2025-2026 appropriating: \$7,142 funds received for police overtime shifts - Resolution 26-03 – Richard Anderson, Finance Director ([1:02:51](#))

Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustment.

The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the February 3, 2026 Council meeting.

**Consideration of a proposed resolution to approve Library Fees – Resolution 26-02
– Michael Sauers, Library Director (1:04:10)**

Library Director Michael Sauers addressed the Council regarding the proposed resolution to update Logan Library fees, including revisions to the Eligible Patron Policy and new fee structures for non-resident cards.

Mr. Sauers proposed an effective date of the new fees as July 1, 2026, and incorporates annual review by the Library Board and Director. Proposed changes include updated eligibility criteria for unrestricted and restricted library cards, adoption of a new non-resident family card at an annual rate of \$125 plus a \$10 service fee, prorated by fiscal year, and clarifications regarding restricted cards for organizations, teens, volunteers, and inter-local borrowers.

He presented an overview of the Logan Library’s non-resident library card fee structure and its history. He stated that since his hire, he has frequently heard that the annual non-resident fee of \$163 was based on the average residential property tax paid by Logan residents. After reviewing historical records with staff, he determined that this commonly stated basis is not accurate.

He explained that in June 2000 a formula was adopted to approximate “cost per circulation” as the basis for the non-resident fee. Using that formula, the fee was established at \$157 per year in 2000. It was later updated using 2009 figures, which produced the current \$163 amount. He noted there was a temporary period during discussion of a countywide library system when the fee was reduced to \$75 for non-residents, combined with a \$30 contribution from the county (effectively \$100). After the related ballot measure failed, the fee returned to \$163 in January 2011. In 2013, the Library Board approved a quarterly option equal to one-quarter of the annual fee.

He brought the issue to the Library Board primarily to correct the record so staff and elected officials accurately describe the basis for the fee going forward. He noted that even long-time board members recalled the fee being based on property taxes, though the formal record indicates otherwise.

He reported that if the original 2000 “cost per circulation” formula were updated for inflation to 2025, the resulting fee would be approximately \$278 per year. The Library Board did not support raising the fee to that level out of concern that few non-residents would purchase cards.

Mr. Sauers stated he consulted with Richard Anderson, Finance Director, who confirmed that the average residential property tax contribution for the library is currently about \$125 per household. Mr. Anderson suggested, from a cost-recovery standpoint, doubling that to \$250 for a non-resident fee, and he noted that this recommendation is reflected in

536 the staff memo and packet materials. The Library Board, however, did not support that
537 amount.

538 Mr. Sauers outlined the Library Board's recommendation to the Council as follows:

- 539 • Reduce the non-resident annual family card fee from \$163 to \$125.
- 540 • Allow proration of the fee so that shorter durations (e.g., six months) could be
541 purchased at a proportional cost.
- 542 • Align non-resident cards to the City's fiscal year for statistical tracking, rather
543 than starting on the individual purchase date.
- 544 • Add a \$10 service fee each time a non-resident card is purchased or renewed to
545 account for additional administrative costs and to recognize that the service is
546 being provided to individuals outside city limits.

547 Mr. Sauers stated that an annual fee of \$125 would align with the average property tax
548 contribution that has often been cited informally. He acknowledged that non-resident
549 cardholders typically check out more materials than the average resident cardholder but
550 stated they still represent approximately 10% of total annual circulation. He noted that the
551 \$10 service fee would explicitly recognize that non-residents are receiving a service
552 outside of Logan City and that the fiscal-year alignment would improve internal tracking
553 and reporting.

554 Councilmember Simmonds asked about the impact of non-resident cards on digital
555 services, including Hoopla and Libby, and expressed concern that increased non-resident
556 usage might reduce availability for Logan residents who fund the system through
557 property taxes. Digital services have spending caps, such as the daily dollar limit on
558 Hoopla, which could be reached sooner if more users participate.

559 Mr. Sauers responded that it is difficult to precisely predict changes in digital usage
560 because staff does not know how many non-residents will purchase cards if the fee is
561 lowered. He reported that the current number of non-resident card purchases is modest
562 (approximately 200 annual-equivalent purchases over recent years). He acknowledged
563 that non-resident participation would likely increase with a lower fee but did not
564 anticipate a significant enough change to require additional staff or to overwhelm
565 physical circulation capacity. He confirmed that Hoopla spending is capped by a daily
566 budget and that if more users participate, the cap remains fixed but individual access
567 could be more limited.

568 In response to questions, Mr. Sauers explained:

- 569 • About 53–54% of Logan residents currently have a library card (though not all are
570 active users).

- The library could withstand a moderate increase in non-resident participation without major staffing impacts; digital circulation would increase with minimal staff time, and additional physical circulation would primarily increase shelving and desk activity.
- Increased circulation can help keep shelf space flexible for new materials, since the collection is managed with the expectation that a portion of items will be checked out at any given time.

Vice Chair López noted that the prior ballot initiative to create a countywide library system was narrowly defeated. It was his understanding that the measure passed within Logan City but failed in the unincorporated county and other municipalities and requested clarification on how close the overall countywide vote had been (e.g., approximately 50–50 versus 60–40).

Staff and councilmembers present did not recall the exact margin but believed the vote was relatively close countywide.

Vice Chair López observed that Finance Director Mr. Anderson had advocated for increasing the non-resident library fee and that the Library Director's own analysis using the historical formula also indicated the fee would increase if adjusted for inflation or updated budget figures. He asked how a reduction in the fee could be communicated to Logan residents and taxpayers, and how the City would explain the rationale for lowering the fee with the goal of increasing access for non-residents. He also questioned how the proposed change would be perceived by constituents and how to articulate the anticipated benefits.

Mr. Sauers responded that Logan has invested in a new library facility which some have called a “jewel” that serves as a community asset and that the Board would like residents and non-residents to have access to it, especially those who may need or benefit from library services. He acknowledged that some Logan residents may view the library as a service intended primarily for City taxpayers; however, he noted that libraries also provide multiple avenues for participation by non-residents, including card options for individuals who work within Logan City. He stated that encouraging broader participation strengthens the library's role as a regional community institution.

He clarified that non-residents already have access to the building, programs, and on-site services at no charge, but that borrowing physical materials and accessing digital collections require a library card. He identified those two functions digital access and the ability to check out items as the primary benefits provided by the non-resident fee.

Councilmember Dahle asked, given that the county library system also provides access to Libby, why non-residents would purchase a Logan Library card.

607 Mr. Sauers stated that most non-residents who purchase cards do so for access to Logan's
608 significantly larger physical collection. The Director added that having Libby access
609 through multiple cards can expand digital borrowing options and noted that a statewide
610 discussion is ongoing regarding digital "double dipping" within OverDrive/Libby, as the
611 State subsidizes a portion of that service.

612 Chair Johnson asked about comparisons to other libraries, specifically North Logan and
613 their non-resident fee.

614 Mr. Sauers reported that he thought it was \$110 and noted that North Logan's library is
615 currently closed.

616 Chair Johnson clarified that their fee is currently \$125 by ordinance, making the Logan
617 proposal roughly comparable.

618 Chair Johnson stated that he recently had a discussion with the Cache County Library
619 Board Chair regarding possible future changes in county service, including concerns
620 about digital usage (Libby) and the potential impacts on Logan's system.

621 Mr. Sauers reviewed how Libby/OverDrive is funded. He stated that:

- 622 • Libby is funded through a statewide account to which participating libraries
623 contribute based on population, not on total cardholders (resident or non-resident).
- 624 • Logan also dedicates approximately \$10,000 of its budget specifically to reduce
625 hold times for Logan users by purchasing additional copies of high-demand titles
626 in OverDrive that are reserved exclusively for Logan Library patrons.
- 627 • At present, around 160–200 non-resident cards are active; even if that number
628 increased, Logan's contribution to the statewide Libby account would still be
629 calculated on Logan's population, not on non-resident usage.

630 Mr. Sauers affirmed that the Library spends significantly more on the physical collection
631 than on the digital collection, though digital expenditures have increased recently. He
632 explained that a previous spike in Hoopla costs (approximately \$162,000) stemmed from
633 the lack of a strict daily cap or enforcement of that cap, leading to overspending under the
634 prior administration. He emphasized that the current budget includes a tight control on
635 Hoopla spending and that staff will re-evaluate Hoopla and other digital limits after a full
636 year of usage under the new parameters.

637 Mr. Sauers stated that, based on recent averages of around 200 fee purchases per year,
638 changing the fee by \$40 would change total library revenues by roughly \$10,000 per
639 year, which is relatively small in the context of a library operating budget of
640 approximately \$2.9 million.

641 Mr. Anderson provided a detailed explanation of the differences between tax-supported
642 services and user fee–supported services. He stated that:

- 643 • For a tax, the City determines the total cost of providing a service to a defined
644 constituency, then sets a rate to generate that amount. Not all taxpayers will use
645 the service, but all contribute, based on the principle that everyone benefits to
646 some degree from a public service.
- 647 • For a user fee, the goal is typically to approximate the full cost of providing that
648 service to the individual user, since there is no underlying tax base supporting that
649 user’s participation.

650 Mr. Anderson noted that the Library’s original non-resident fee formula using cost-per-
651 circulation, when updated, yields a full-cost estimate near \$278 per user per year. Using a
652 different approach, he described how he would convert the average tax contribution of
653 \$125 into a per-user cost:

- 654 • Starting with the \$125 average property tax contribution per household.
- 655 • Recognizing that only a portion of those households actively use the library (with
656 estimates ranging between roughly 35% and 55% based on definitions of active
657 cards).
- 658 • Using a mid-range participation assumption of 44%, dividing \$125 by that
659 participation rate yields approximately \$280 as an estimate of the full operational
660 cost of library service per active user, excluding capital costs.

661 He noted that the City spent approximately \$18 million to build the new library facility,
662 including about \$3 million from the City’s general fund (beyond restricted library
663 reserves), and that this capital investment is not reflected in the operational cost estimate.

664 Mr. Anderson expressed strong concern that, as the City prepares for future budget and
665 property tax discussions, it will be difficult to justify increases to Logan taxpayers if the
666 City is unwilling to charge non-residents a fee that approximates the full cost of
667 providing them library service. He characterized this as a question of equity and fairness
668 between Logan taxpayers and non-residents. He stated that, in his view, lowering the
669 non-resident fee substantially below full cost runs contrary to the equity principle that the
670 Council has previously discussed in relation to City services. He feels there should be a
671 benefit to living in Logan and one of those benefits should be access to the library
672 because Logan residents are paying for it.

673 Mr. Sauers noted that the Library Board’s intent is not to undercut taxpayers but to
674 improve access while still acknowledging non-residents’ status. He stated that:

- 675 • The Board's recommended \$125 fee is anchored in the average property tax
676 contribution figure that has long been cited.
- 677 • The additional \$10 service fee per purchase or renewal is intended to recognize
678 that non-residents are being offered a City-funded service.
- 679 • The Board would be open to future adjustments to the non-resident fee if the
680 average tax contribution from Logan residents increases as a result of future
681 property tax changes.

682 Chair Johnson said there are soft benefits and we want everyone to come to our library.

683 Councilmember Dahle agreed that we want everyone to come to our library but is it fair
684 that all have the same cost? As an example at the Brigham City Pool, they charge more
685 for non-residents. She asked why can't we charge just a little bit more for non-residents?

686 Mr. Anderson stated that for him it's not even debatable. The cost is somewhere around
687 \$280, give or take \$15 dollars for the full user cost.

688 Councilmember Dahle said our goal should be to protect our taxpayers and that is why
689 she would have hard time charging the same amount.

690 Chair Johnson said for him it comes down to, are we running on the hard numbers
691 because the hard numbers say don't lower the fee and possibly raise it. Or are we running
692 on the principle of we like libraries or the principle of protecting our residents? The
693 numbers say don't lower the fee it's really a principle of libraries are good give them to
694 everyone which is true or protect our residents and do the best by them which is true. The
695 numbers say one thing and it's really two competing good principles.

696 Vice Chair López inquired whether a higher number of non-resident cardholders would
697 result in increased demand on library staff or services.

698 Mr. Sauers stated that increased non-resident participation would primarily affect digital
699 services, which require minimal staff time. He noted that there could be a slight increase
700 in front-desk activity and materials shelving; however, higher circulation of physical
701 items can be beneficial, as it creates shelf space for new materials. He explained that the
702 library does not have capacity to store all materials on shelves simultaneously and
703 therefore anticipates a portion of items to be checked out at any given time.

704 Mr. Sauers clarified that the current non-resident fee of \$163 is assessed per household.
705 One household fee allows the issuing of multiple cards to family members residing at the
706 same address, averaging approximately 3.7 cards per household. He explained that when
707 163 household fees are sold, the total number of individual library cards issued is closer
708 to four times that amount, though not all cards are regularly used.

He noted that the proposed \$125 rate would operate in the same manner, providing cards for all household members. The Library Board considered, but ultimately did not support, converting to an individual card model, as the resulting fee would need to be significantly lower and raised additional complications. Mr. Sauers also reported receiving one comment from a non-resident who opposed a household model, stating it was inequitable for individuals living alone; however, the Board reaffirmed its support for retaining the household structure.

Mr. Sauers indicated the Library Board's recommendation to reduce the non-resident fee to \$125 plus a \$10 service charge was unanimously supported by the Board.

Chair Johnson invited councilmembers, particularly newer members, to meet with Finance Director Anderson, City Attorney Carlston, or Library Director Sauers for additional data or clarification prior to the public hearing on February 3.

The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the February 3, 2026 Council meeting.

No further workshop items were presented.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

No further considerations were discussed.

ADJOURNED:

There being no further business, the Logan Municipal Council adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Teresa Harris, City Recorder