

1 **Logan Municipal Council**
2 **Meeting Minutes for April 21, 2026**

3 Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Municipal Council convened in regular session on Tuesday,
4 April 21, 2026, in the Logan Municipal Council Chambers located at 290 North 100 West, Logan,
5 Utah 84321 at 5:30 p.m. Logan Municipal Council Meetings are televised live as a public service on
6 Channel 17 and the [City of Logan YouTube channel](#) at: go.loganutah.gov/CouncilMeetings

7 **Meeting Attendance**

8 Approximately 22 individuals were in attendance at the start of the meeting. Chair Mike Johnson
9 called the meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance.

10 Council members present:

- 11 • Chair Mike Johnson
- 12 • Vice Chair Ernesto López
- 13 • Councilmember Jeannie F. Simmonds
- 14 • Councilmember Melissa Dahle - Excused
- 15 • Councilmember Katie Lee-Koven

16 Administration present:

- 17 • Mayor Mark A. Anderson
- 18 • City Attorney Craig Carlston
- 19 • Finance Director Richard Anderson
- 20 • City Recorder Teresa Harris

21 **Opening Ceremony**

22 The opening ceremony was provided by Chair Mike Johnson who led the audience in the Pledge of
23 Allegiance.

24 **Meeting Minutes and Agenda**

25 Chair Johnson announced there are three public hearings scheduled for this Council meeting. A motion
26 was made and seconded to approve minutes from the April 7, 2026 Council meeting and the April 21,
27 2026 agenda as presented.

28 **ACTION: Motion by Councilmember Lee-Koven, seconded by Councilmember Simmonds, to**
29 **approve minutes from the April 7, 2026 Council meeting and the April 21, 2026 meeting agenda,**
30 **as amended. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0)**

31 **Dahle: Excused**

32 **Johnson: Aye**

33 **Lee-Koven: Aye**

34 **López: Aye**

35 **Simmonds: Aye**

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

38 **Questions and Comments for the Mayor and Council**

39 [Link to video recording of meeting at time stamp 3:16](#)

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

48 **Autumn Mathews (Logan)** – Autumn Matthews, a Logan resident and representative of the Cache
49 Water District, presented information on two water conservation programs. She introduced the Spring
50 Grass Reseed Program, which offers residents water-wise grass seed at a 50% discount (\$3.50 per
51 pound), noting that approximately six to seven pounds are needed per 1,000 square feet. She
52 encouraged the City to help promote the program as a low-cost, effective way to reduce water use
53 without requiring ordinance changes.

54 Ms. Matthews also outlined the State-supported Landscape Incentive Program, which would require
55 the City to adopt a water-wise ordinance for new development in order for residents to qualify for turf
56 replacement rebates. Key provisions include restrictions on lawn areas in new construction, such as no
57 park strips, limits on lawn width, and caps on the percentage of landscaped areas that may be turf in
58 residential and non-residential developments. She noted that the program would require City
59 enforcement but could significantly support long-term water conservation efforts.

60 Ms. Matthews briefly explained reseeding methods, including overseeding existing lawns or replacing
61 turf entirely, and described general watering practices to support establishment. She offered to provide
62 informational flyers, including digital copies, and contact information for follow-up.

63 **Susanne Janecke** – Susanne Janecke, geoscientist, and emerita professor from Utah State University,
64 expressed concerns regarding two proposed water-related engineering projects. She stated that both the
65 culinary water project and the irrigation water project could negatively impact quality of life, public
66 health, and safety, and may increase exposure to natural hazards across the valley.

67 Professor Janecke raised concerns about the proposed Logan River watershed project, noting it could
68 divert additional water from the Logan River, potentially impacting flows to the Great Salt Lake. She
69 emphasized the importance of water conservation and the environmental and economic risks
70 associated with reduced lake levels.

71 She also expressed concern about potential geotechnical risks associated with a planned water
72 tank and pipeline project, including the possibility of landslides due to a water-saturated clay layer
73 identified in prior studies. She suggested further analysis may be needed and noted the absence of
74 geotechnical information regarding the pipeline crossing near the East Cache Fault.

75 **Nicole Folland** - Nicole Falland, founder of the Cache Valley Senior Living Guide, a nonprofit
76 organization, addressed the Council regarding resources for the area's aging population. She explained
77 that many seniors and their families face challenges navigating transitions from hospital care to long-
78 term care without centralized, unbiased information. Her organization aims to provide a free,
79 comprehensive resource to help families identify appropriate care options, including assisted living,
80 memory care, and home health services.

81 Ms. Folland stated the goal of reducing hospital re-admissions and ensuring access to care for all
82 seniors and expressed interest in partnering with Logan City. She provided informational materials to
83 the Council.

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

85 **Mayor/Staff Reports**

86 [Link to video recording of meeting at time stamp 13:12](#)

87 **Arbor & Bird Day Proclamation – Mayor Anderson**

88 Mayor Anderson proclaimed April 24 as Arbor and Bird Day in Logan, encouraging residents to
89 protect natural resources, including trees, woodlands, and birds, and to participate in tree planting
90 efforts. Upcoming community tree planting opportunities were noted for the fall.

91 **Introduction of George Woodward, new Public Relations Specialist – Mayor Anderson**

92 Mayor Anderson reported that, in response to Council direction and public input from the General
93 Plan process, the City has prioritized improving communication with residents. A new Public
94 Relations Specialist, George Woodward, was introduced to support these efforts.

95 George Woodward introduced himself as the City's new Public Relations Specialist, noting his recent
96 move to Logan and prior experience in public affairs through military and civilian service with the Air
97 Force. He expressed enthusiasm for improving communication with residents and supporting the
98 City's outreach efforts, as well as providing administrative support to the legal office.

99 No further Mayor/Staff reports were provided

100 **Council Business**

101 [Link to video recording of meeting at time stamp 16:14](#)

102 **Youth Council Program Proposal – Shailynn Spangler, Utah State University Student**

103 Shailynn Spangler, representing the College Community Engagement Council through the Lieutenant
104 Governor’s Office, presented a proposal to reinstate the Logan City Youth Council as part of her
105 capstone project focused on increasing youth civic engagement. She explained that the Youth Council
106 would provide a structured platform for local students to participate in city government, develop
107 leadership skills, and contribute to community decision-making.

108 Ms. Spangler emphasized that youth representation is essential to a healthy civic environment, noting
109 that many young people currently lack opportunities to engage in local government or understand
110 pathways to public service. She referenced research indicating that early civic involvement increases
111 long-term community participation and leadership development and stated that restoring a Youth
112 Council would help strengthen civic engagement across the community.

113 She described her work with the existing Youth Council over the past semester and a half, noting
114 strong student interest and commitment. Based on that experience, she helped develop a proposal
115 outlining a four-year plan to reestablish and sustain the program. The plan includes two initial years
116 focused on establishing structure, identity, and growth, followed by two years centered on long-term
117 impact, sustainability, and legacy.

118 The proposal also identifies staffing and resource needs, including the creation of a part-time Youth
119 Engagement Coordinator position and a modest budget increase to support programming and
120 operations. Additionally, it addresses potential liability considerations and outlines steps to ensure
121 proper oversight and program continuity.

122 Ms. Spangler formally requested Council approval to reinstate the Logan City Youth Council as an
123 official advisory body, authorize the creation of the coordinator position, and approve the associated
124 budget adjustments. She concluded by stating that the investment would strengthen youth engagement
125 and help build future civic leaders within the community.

126 In response to Council questions, Ms. Spangle shared her prior experience in youth city government.
127 She served as mayor of her youth city council during her junior year and described the program as
128 providing meaningful hands-on civic engagement opportunities. She participated in community
129 service projects with veterans, helped plan local events such as parades and Fourth of July activities,
130 and assisted with community events including an Easter egg hunt. She also described initiating a
131 “legacy project” to repaint crosswalk lines in her city due to safety concerns, which continued to be
132 maintained by the city after her involvement. Spangler emphasized that youth council participation
133 fosters leadership development and meaningful community impact.

134 Council discussed the proposal to reinstate the Logan City Youth Council and asked clarifying
135 questions regarding how it would differ from the current high school-based youth program. The
136 applicant explained that the current program is limited to Logan High School students, while the
137 proposed City Youth Council would be a citywide program open to students from multiple schools,
138 including middle school and high school students across Logan, including those attending other area
139 schools.

140 Council members sought clarification on whether a previous city-run youth council existed. It was
141 noted that there was no formal city-established Youth Council in the past, though a similar program
142 may have been loosely supported through the Parks Department.

143 Discussion also addressed the proposal's funding and staffing components, including a requested
144 budget increase (approximately \$500) and the creation of a part-time youth engagement coordinator
145 position. The applicant clarified that the coordinator role would provide adult oversight, support
146 communication and coordination, attend meetings, and assist with program administration. She noted
147 that the position could be either dedicated solely to the Youth Council or combined with other
148 responsibilities, depending on City preference and structure.

149 Council members expressed interest in gathering additional information from other municipalities
150 regarding Youth Council structures, staffing models, and funding approaches. The applicant indicated
151 she had compiled a list of several cities she had consulted through her research and outreach.

152 Overall, Council expressed tentative support for the concept, noting strong interest in the program's
153 potential benefits, while also identifying staffing structure as a key consideration for further review.
154 Council directed follow-up research and coordination with other cities as part of ongoing evaluation of
155 the proposal.

156 **Board Appointment (Renewable, Energy & Sustainability Advisory Board (RESAB) – Chair**
157 **Johnson**

158 Chair Johnson requested ratification of Paul S. De Morgan to serve on the RESAB board, which is a
159 new appointment.

160 Chair Johnson explained that RESAB functions as a Council advisory committee, which is why the
161 appointment is presented for Council ratification rather than mayoral appointment. It was further noted
162 that the Council established the board as a policy advisory body.

163 Paul S. De Morgan introduced himself as a long-time resident of the Cache Valley, noting he has lived
164 in the area for approximately 22 years. He shared that his spouse is a professor at Utah State
165 University and that he has professional experience as a mediator of environmental disputes and a
166 consensus builder for approximately 35 years, including work on energy-related issues. He stated that
167 he has recently reduced his workload and is seeking opportunities to contribute to the community. He
168 was encouraged to consider serving on the Renewable Energy and Sustainability Advisory Board
169 through a board member recommendation.

170 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Vice Chair López to approve**
171 **ratification of Paul S. De Morgan as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).**

172 **Dahle: Excused**

173 **Johnson: Aye**

174 **Lee-Koven: Aye**

175 **López: Aye**

176 **Simmonds: Aye**

177

178 **Planning Commission Update – Councilmember Simmonds**

179 Councilmember Simmonds reported that the Planning Commission considered two items at the most
180 recent meeting and both were approved by a 6–0 vote. The first item was a conditional approval for a
181 Take 5 Oil Change development located near an existing oil change business across from the Walmart
182 entrance area. The second item was approval of the Delta taxi lane H and associated hangar expansion
183 project at the airport, which includes construction of a new taxi lane and adjacent hangar facilities. It
184 was noted that airport-related development projects are reviewed and approved through the Planning
185 Commission process.

186 **Council Announcements – Chair Johnson**

187 Councilmember Simmonds reported attending the Utah State University landscape architecture senior
188 presentations, where students presented projects reimagining the USU campus. Eight teams divided
189 the campus into sections and proposed redesign concepts. She noted the presentations were well done
190 and emphasized the students’ focus on creating a more human-scale campus with walkways, seating
191 areas, trees, and improved pedestrian connectivity. She also highlighted proposed improvements to
192 existing concrete-heavy areas, including efforts to create more accessible and connected outdoor
193 spaces.

194 Councilmember Lee-Koven reported attending the Forestry Advisory Board meeting on April 8, where
195 the primary discussion focused on the City’s initiative to plant 250 trees in recognition of America’s
196 250th anniversary. The trees may be planted in qualifying park strips (six feet or wider), city parks,
197 and other public spaces.

198 She noted that the advisory board includes community representatives and is currently identifying
199 suitable planting locations. Staff emphasized that grouping tree plantings in clusters is preferred for
200 efficiency, and that identifying areas for multiple trees is more effective than isolated single-plant
201 installations due to staffing and labor considerations.

202 Councilmembers discussed neighborhood opportunities for tree planting, including park strips and
203 park areas where additional shade or landscaping improvements would be beneficial. It was noted that
204 City staff can respond quickly once locations are identified, and that tree installation is efficient when
205 sites are properly prepared.

206 It was also noted that volunteer and neighborhood participation opportunities may be available to
207 assist with planting efforts, and that service projects may be coordinated to support the initiative.

208 Chair Johnson reported attending the Fire Ops 101 training event approximately two weeks prior,
209 along with other Councilmembers and Mayor Anderson. He described participating in hands-on fire
210 training exercises conducted by the Fire Department, including hose deployment, confined space
211 smoke conditions, and a vehicle extrication demonstration. He noted the experience was educational
212 and provided insight into emergency response challenges, including visibility limitations, equipment
213 demands, and the importance of fire crew support during operations.

214 Chair Johnson reported on the Golf Advisory Board, noting that the golf course is operating well,
215 remains busy, and is in strong condition due in part to favorable early spring conditions. New golf
216 carts were highlighted as a positive improvement to operations.

217 A discussion followed regarding the value of a Council tour of the golf course to better understand its
218 operations and significance as a city asset.

219 Chair Johnson also reported on a meeting related to the City's outdoor recreation complex and noted
220 the presence of fireflies in the area. Staff are exploring habitat preservation strategies to support and
221 maintain the firefly population in that location.

222 Vice Chair López reported that RESAB is working to develop a strategic vision and guiding document
223 to better define priorities and focus the board's efforts moving forward. The Youth Council
224 participated in community service on Easter Sunday by assisting at the warming center, helping move
225 and reset equipment to support operations.

226 He reported that the Public Arts Board completed a mural at Willow Park, as well as an extension of
227 the children's mural at the library. The Board also received a proposal for an "America 250"
228 commemorative mural to be located on or near Center Street. A request for proposal will be issued in
229 the near future, with outreach to past mural artists and an emphasis on ensuring variety and avoiding
230 duplication of existing mural themes while still reflecting the 250th anniversary.

231 Lastly, he expressed appreciation to Chief Thompson and Fire Department staff for the Fire Ops
232 training opportunity, noting it provided valuable insight into firefighter training, equipment, and the
233 level of effort required to maintain readiness and effectively serve the community.

234 No further Council Business items were presented.

235 **Action Items**

236 [Link to video recording of meeting at time stamp 45:15](#)

237 **PUBLIC HEARING - Consideration of a proposed resolution adopting the Community** 238 **Development Block Grant (CDBG) Annual Action Plan (Program Year 2026) for the City of** 239 **Logan - Resolution 26-10 – Russ Holley, Community Development Director**

240 Community Development Director Russ Holley addressed the Council and gave an overview of what
241 was presented at the April 7, 2026 Council meeting. He stated that plan outlines funding priorities.

242 He presented a detailed breakdown of the proposed Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
243 funding allocations. The largest share of the award, approximately 36% (about \$200,000), is allocated
244 for the construction of 88 accessibility ramps throughout the community. Community needs projects
245 represent roughly 15% of the funding and include items such as bus stop murals and senior nutrition
246 services, totaling just over \$80,000. Housing-related allocations include approximately \$130,000 for
247 land acquisition and just under \$30,000 designated for Sunshine Terrace residential rehabilitation.
248 Administrative costs account for approximately 20% of the total cost, or just over \$100,000.

249 Mr. Holley also responded to questions raised at a previous meeting regarding land acquisition and
250 associated taxation. It was clarified that because the land will be owned by a nonprofit organization, it
251 will be exempt from property taxes; however, individual homeowners will still be taxed based on the
252 value of the structure, as property tax assessments are divided between land value and structure value.

253 Chair Johnson opened the meeting to a public hearing.

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

255 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Councilmember Lee-Koven to**
256 **approve Resolution 26-10 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).**

257 **Dahle: Excused**

258 **Johnson: Aye**

259 **Lee-Koven: Aye**

260 **López: Aye**

261 **Simmonds: Aye**

262 **PUBLIC HEARING - Consideration of a proposed resolution approving the Logan 2045**
263 **General Plan as presented. The General Plan creates a long-term vision for the City of Logan to**
264 **implement over the next 20 years - Resolution 26-09 – Russ Holley, Community Development**
265 **Director and Cody Ferguson, Houseal Lavigne Associates**

266 Russ Holley, Community Development Director, addressed the Council regarding the proposed
267 resolution. He provided an overview of the General Plan process, noting that the plan has been
268 developed over approximately 16 months. During this time, extensive public engagement efforts were
269 conducted, including multiple community workshops, stakeholder meetings, and interviews. The
270 process also included a public survey that received more than 300 responses, along with ongoing
271 outreach to gather community input.

272 The General Plan has gone through several draft iterations and revisions throughout the process. The
273 current draft included in the Council packet was recently reviewed by the Planning Commission
274 approximately three weeks prior, and the Commission provided recommendations and suggested edits.

275 A key area of discussion during the Planning Commission review focused on the 400 North corridor,
276 particularly potential adjustments to the Future Land Use Map. Several alternative concepts were
277 presented for consideration regarding how that corridor could evolve over time.

278 Mr. Holley emphasized that the General Plan serves as a long-range vision and policy framework
279 document. It is intended to guide future land use decisions and development patterns but does not
280 function as binding law or zoning code. Instead, it provides direction that future ordinances and
281 regulations may be based on.

282 Following his presentation, Mr. Holley indicated that the lead consultant, Cody Ferguson, was
283 available by phone to provide additional explanation and respond to Council questions regarding the
284 plan.

285 The lead consultant, Cody Ferguson, addressed the Council and confirmed he was available to answer
286 questions regarding the General Plan update. He noted that Councilmembers had previously
287 participated in workshops and had multiple opportunities to review and provide input on the draft plan
288 throughout the process.

289 He explained that the General Plan update has included extensive public engagement, with numerous
290 workshops and opportunities for community feedback incorporated into multiple revisions of the draft
291 document.

292 Mr. Ferguson stated that the current draft meets all statutory requirements under State of Utah law,
293 including required plan elements such as the moderate income housing component, water use and
294 preservation strategies, and transportation and connectivity considerations.

295 He reiterated that the General Plan is not regulatory in nature and does not function as zoning code.
296 Instead, it serves as a foundational policy and vision document that will guide future regulations, land
297 use decisions, and updates to zoning ordinances.

298 He further explained that the next phase of implementation will involve translating the plan's goals,
299 recommendations, and vision into actionable steps, including potential updates to zoning and
300 development standards in order to align with the community's long-term vision as identified through
301 the public process.

302 Following his presentation, he opened the floor for questions from the Council. No immediate
303 questions were raised at that time.

304 Councilmember Lee-Koven expressed strong appreciation for the extensive work and data presented
305 throughout the General Plan process, noting the significant effort that went into both the analysis and
306 the public engagement components. She emphasized that the plan is fundamentally a community-
307 driven document and reflects broad input from residents.

308 Councilmember Lee-Koven commended Cody Ferguson and his consulting team for their work,
309 noting their responsiveness and effectiveness in facilitating meaningful public involvement.

310 Mayor Anderson indicated that the process included numerous and varied opportunities for
311 community participation, ensuring residents could engage in multiple ways rather than through a
312 single method. He added that the City of Logan and staff made substantial efforts to maximize public
313 engagement, describing the outreach as comprehensive and intentional. Appreciation was extended to
314 city staff, including planning staff, for their commitment to attending and supporting neighborhood
315 meetings late into the evening, demonstrating strong dedication to community involvement and
316 accessibility throughout the planning process.

317 Chair Johnson commented that during Council discussion, a question was raised regarding how to
318 proceed with consideration of the Future Land Use Map included in the General Plan draft.

319 It was noted that the draft includes the current proposed Future Land Use Plan along with several
320 alternative options, and clarification was requested on the appropriate timing for discussion of those
321 alternatives within the agenda process.

322 The question centered on whether Council should address and deliberate on the alternative land use
323 scenarios immediately or defer that discussion until after the public hearing and public comment
324 portion of the item, in order to ensure public input is received prior to Council evaluation of the
325 options.

326 Mr. Holley provided a detailed explanation of the proposed Future Land Use Map options for the 400
327 North corridor. He noted that three alternative approaches were previously presented, with the current
328 draft reflecting a “base option” that emphasizes a mix of higher and medium-density residential
329 development along the corridor.

330 Under the base option, higher-density designations are concentrated near key intersections at 600 East
331 and 200 East, where transit access and traffic volumes are greater. These nodes could also support
332 mixed-use development. Medium-density areas (shown in orange) are proposed for the blocks between
333 these intersections, with a gradual step-down in density toward the surrounding lower-density
334 neighborhoods to the north and south.

335 Mr. Holley explained that sufficient density is necessary along 400 North to make redevelopment
336 financially viable. Because redevelopment often requires acquisition and demolition of existing homes
337 before rebuilding, developers need enough allowable density to offset those costs and make projects
338 feasible.

339 He further clarified that the land use designations in the General Plan are not zoning districts
340 themselves but rather flexible ranges that guide future zoning decisions. Each designation may
341 ultimately include multiple zoning districts. For example, lower-density areas may include several
342 residential neighborhood zones, while medium- and higher-density areas would also be implemented
343 through multiple zoning categories.

344 Mr. Holley noted that achieving approximately 20–30 units per acre in designated medium-density
345 areas would likely be sufficient to encourage redevelopment along the corridor. The framework also
346 allows flexibility to introduce one or more mixed-use zones and potentially apply an overlay zone in
347 the future to further refine development standards.

348 In response to the question, Mr. Holley confirmed that one alternative approach discussed involves
349 implementing portions of the corridor through an overlay zoning tool rather than relying solely on base
350 zoning designations, allowing additional flexibility in how redevelopment is shaped over time.

351 Councilmember Simmonds emphasized that the 400 North corridor represents a long-term, strategic
352 “gateway” area connecting Utah State University and Logan Canyon and noted that redevelopment
353 decisions made in this area will have lasting impacts for approximately 50 years. She stressed the
354 importance of careful, thoughtful planning, particularly given the corridor’s visibility and regional
355 significance.

356 Councilmember Simmonds expressed support for redevelopment and mixed-use concepts but
357 cautioned that “mixed use” must be clearly defined and intentionally structured. They noted that while
358 they are not opposed to mixed-use development, the focus should be on ensuring the concept is
359 implemented in a way that reflects the community’s desired character and outcomes. They suggested
360 that an overlay approach could be used to address design elements such as building form, materials,
361 and overall development standards, while the base zoning would establish allowable density and land
362 use intensity.

363 Mr. Holley confirmed that this approach using base zoning for density and an overlay for design and
364 form would be a viable planning tool to help shape redevelopment outcomes more precisely.

365 Councilmember Simmonds also expressed interest in further refining or exploring how mixed-use
366 designations are defined and implemented in the future, suggesting that staff could bring back
367 additional options or refinements after initial adoption of the plan to continue improving the
368 framework.

369 Discussion then shifted to procedural timing. It was noted that if Council wished to proceed with
370 changes (such as selecting between the presented options), the General Plan could either be approved
371 with contingent modifications or returned for final revision and brought back for formal adoption in
372 approximately two weeks, depending on whether additional changes were needed.

373 Mr. Holley reviewed a series of revisions recommended by the Planning Commission following their
374 review of the draft General Plan. These updates included multiple technical corrections, clarifications,
375 and policy refinements across several sections of the document.

376 Key updates included adjustments to future land use mapping, including corrections on South Main
377 and Highway 89/L Grand Street areas, as well as typographical and mapping corrections (including a
378 correction related to Denzel Stewart Nature Park classification).

379 Additional text revisions were noted throughout the plan, including:

- 380 • Clarification of Logan River system conservation efforts
- 381 • Addition of community design language supporting dark sky-friendly policies
- 382 • Inclusion of community design goals related to summer tourism, specifically recognizing
383 seasonal populations such as senior visitors and their impact on the community
- 384 • Added discussion of programming opportunities and services targeted toward seasonal
385 residents, including potential downtown and plaza-based activities
- 386 • Updates to community facilities sections, including references to recreation center planning
387 and expanded recognition of animal control and animal services within public safety functions
- 388 • Consideration of senior center needs, with discussion of future demand and potential expansion
389 beyond a single facility to serve a growing population

390 Councilmember Simmonds noted that the inclusion of senior center language was intended as an
391 acknowledgment of current and future needs rather than identification of a specific new facility
392 already under development. Council discussion reflected agreement that population growth may

393 support multiple senior service facilities in the future and that the General Plan should reflect
394 anticipated demand.

395 Following presentation of the Planning Commission’s recommended changes, Council discussed
396 process options for moving forward. These included whether to:

- 397 • Incorporate the Planning Commission recommendations and proceed with adoption options
398 (including selection of Fourth North corridor alternative A, B, or C), or
- 399 • Conduct public comment first and return with a final consolidated version of the plan for
400 formal adoption at a later meeting

401 Council indicated preference to proceed to public comment prior to finalizing decisions on the 400
402 North corridor options and other pending adjustments.

403 Vice Chair López acknowledged receipt of an email from Logan resident Hilary Shughart
404 recommending additional language revisions related to the north branch of the Logan River (Little
405 Logan River), specifically referencing proposed edits to page 108 of the General Plan.

406 Mr. Holley explained that this section had already been updated following an earlier neighborhood
407 meeting and subsequent draft revisions. The current draft replaces earlier language referencing
408 “historic canals” with updated language identifying the “north branch of the Logan River,” which was
409 intended to more accurately reflect the waterway system and incorporate prior public input.

410 Ms. Shughart’s additional recommendation included expanding descriptive language to list specific
411 parks and recreation areas associated with the canal/river system. Staff and Council discussed the
412 suggestion and noted that while the intent of recognizing the river system is already reflected in the
413 updated draft, listing every individual park was not considered necessary or preferred for the purposes
414 of the plan.

415 It was also noted that related language had already been added in earlier revisions, including reference
416 to the “Logan River system” on page 27, which was incorporated following Planning Commission
417 discussion. Council generally agreed that the current draft appropriately addresses the intent of the
418 comment.

419 Councilmember Simmonds asked for clarification from Mr. Ferguson how community facility goals
420 should be framed in the General Plan, noting uncertainty about including items such as a recreation
421 center and senior center as formal City goals versus broader countywide or regional efforts. They
422 questioned whether these facilities should be identified as specific objectives or more generally as
423 community resources or future needs.

424 She also raised a concern about consistency in community design language, noting that while certain
425 population groups (such as seasonal senior residents) are referenced, similar recognition is not
426 provided for other key groups such as students. They emphasized the importance of balanced and
427 equitable treatment of all major population groups within the plan.

428 Mr. Ferguson explained that goals within chapters such as Community Facilities and Infrastructure are
429 developed directly from extensive public engagement, including stakeholder meetings, surveys,
430 workshops, and visioning sessions.

431 He noted that it is normal and appropriate for a General Plan to include community facility goals even
432 when those facilities involve partnerships with other entities such as the County, other municipalities,
433 or nonprofit organizations. While implementation may be complex and require coordination, the
434 General Plan is intended to establish vision and direction, while implementation occurs later through
435 partnerships and specific actions.

436 He added that the Community Facilities chapter plays a dual role: it reflects current conditions of
437 infrastructure and services, and it also provides forward-looking guidance aligned with existing and
438 future facility and infrastructure plans. He noted that transportation and community facilities are
439 similar in this regard, as both involve coordination across multiple jurisdictions and agencies.

440 Regarding specific facilities such as a recreation center, he stated that it is appropriate for such needs
441 to surface in the plan when they were consistently identified through public engagement. He
442 emphasized that including these items in the plan does not determine ownership or implementation
443 responsibility but reflects community-identified needs.

444 On the topic of population groups, the consultant explained that it is not unusual for a General Plan to
445 reference specific groups (such as seniors or students) where relevant, based on identified needs and
446 impacts. He noted that Logan’s unique demographics, including a significant university population
447 and a seasonal senior population, influence housing, transportation, and service demands differently,
448 and may appropriately be addressed in the plan where warranted.

449 He further stated that there is no requirement to provide equal or parallel references for every
450 demographic group; instead, inclusion is based on identified needs and planning priorities. He
451 referenced prior additions to the plan related to aging in place, noting that such language was included
452 to address senior housing and mobility considerations.

453 Ultimately, he emphasized that decisions about how prominently to feature specific populations or
454 facility needs rest with the City, as there is no single standardized rule. The plan is intended to reflect
455 community priorities identified through engagement, while leaving flexibility for the City to determine
456 implementation focus.

457 Mr. Holley clarified that the student population is already well represented throughout the General
458 Plan, noting that there is dedicated demographic analysis and that students are integrated into multiple
459 chapters, including housing, transportation, and other key policy areas due to the University’s major
460 influence on the City.

461 They contrasted this with the “summer senior” population, noting that while this group appears to be
462 more unique and was discussed during Planning Commission review, it is not explicitly referenced
463 elsewhere in the plan.

464 Councilmember Simmonds questioned whether it is necessary to elevate this group into specific goals
465 or objectives, given that most related programming is already coordinated through existing partners
466 such as the University and Visitors Bureau.

467 She expressed uncertainty about whether this population warrants additional emphasis within the
468 General Plan and stated they were not strongly attached to including it as a formal goal but wanted to
469 understand the rationale for its inclusion. She does not have a strong position on whether the language
470 should remain but were seeking clarification on the intent behind calling out that specific group.

471 Council discussed whether to include additional language within the Community Design goals related
472 to summer tourism and seasonal residents.

473 Councilmember Lee-Koven noted that the existing Community Design goal focuses on preserving
474 historic structures and ensuring new development complements the built and natural environment.
475 They questioned whether adding a specific goal related to summer tourism or seasonal populations is
476 necessary, given that it was not a consistent theme throughout earlier public engagement.

477 The discussion acknowledged that Logan does experience significant seasonal activity and functions
478 as part of a broader nature-based tourism corridor, with regional attractions such as Bear Lake,
479 Yellowstone, and Hardware Ranch, as well as local arts, festivals, and events contributing to visitation.
480 However, concern was raised that explicitly adding a new goal focused on summer tourism may not
481 reflect a strong enough or consistent community-driven priority from the planning process.

482 It was further noted that tourism-related content is already addressed more generally within the plan
483 under a nature-based tourism framework, and that seasonal populations may be considered within that
484 broader context rather than as a standalone design goal.

485 Councilmember's expressed differing views on whether the addition was necessary, with some
486 questioning its relevance to the established goals. The discussion ultimately shifted toward moving
487 forward to public comment to allow further input from the public before making a final decision on the
488 inclusion of such language.

489 Chair Johnson opened the meeting to a public hearing.

490 Logan resident Kristie Cooley addressed the Council and expressed appreciation to the Council for
491 their work on the General Plan and thanked them for considering a land use change from commercial
492 to open space in her neighborhood area. She emphasized support for preserving green space, citing
493 long-term planning impacts, flooding concerns, and the importance of protecting neighborhood
494 integrity.

495 She also noted the value of maintaining scenic views and open space in the 400 North gateway area
496 and encouraged continued efforts to preserve natural features and mitigate future environmental
497 impacts.

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

499 Council discussed whether to proceed with adoption or delay final action on the General Plan for
500 additional review. A motion was made expressing preference to continue the item for approximately
501 two weeks to allow additional review by Council and staff.

502 The discussion focused on selecting a preferred alternative for the Fourth North corridor (Options A,
503 B, or C). Several Councilmembers expressed support for Option C, noting it provides the greatest
504 flexibility to envision the corridor holistically rather than locking in a rigid block-by-block
505 development pattern. They emphasized the importance of allowing the corridor to evolve over time
506 through redevelopment while still ensuring appropriate City oversight and design intent.

507 Councilmember's also discussed the balance between encouraging redevelopment and avoiding overly
508 restrictive standards. Concerns were raised that while strong planning controls are important,
509 excessive restrictions particularly through an overlay approach could potentially discourage
510 investment or make redevelopment more difficult.

511 Staff noted that Option C, which would rely more heavily on an overlay-based approach, would
512 require additional effort to develop detailed standards, but confirmed there was no immediate urgency
513 to adopt zoning changes for the corridor. Staff also acknowledged that the effectiveness of an overlay
514 depends heavily on how it is ultimately structured and implemented, and that it could either guide or
515 unintentionally constrain redevelopment depending on its design.

516 Overall, Councilmembers expressed a preference for flexibility and phased redevelopment of the
517 corridor over time, recognizing that Fourth North is likely to develop incrementally over several
518 decades and that planning decisions should allow for adaptation as conditions evolve.

519 Mr. Holley emphasized the importance of avoiding long-term planning decisions that could lead to
520 undesirable outcomes over the next 50 years once development is built. He reiterated support for an
521 approach where base zoning establishes achievable density (e.g., up to approximately 30 units per
522 acre), while an overlay could be used to address design elements such as building form, materials, and
523 aesthetic character.

524 The discussion included examples of potential design considerations that could be guided through an
525 overlay or incentive-based approach, such as encouraging rear-loaded buildings, underground parking,
526 and higher-quality exterior materials. These were framed as possible incentives or design preferences
527 rather than strict requirements in the base zoning.

528 It was clarified that the intent was not to impose overly restrictive mandates (such as requiring specific
529 building materials or eliminating surface parking entirely), but rather to explore tools that encourage
530 higher-quality development outcomes while maintaining economic feasibility for developers.

531 Overall, the conversation reflected agreement on using a flexible planning approach that combines
532 base density standards with optional or incentive-based design guidance to help shape long-term
533 corridor development outcomes.

534 Council continued discussion on the proposed 400 North corridor framework and broader General
535 Plan revisions, focusing on balancing development incentives, regulatory flexibility, and long-term
536 community impact.

537 Chair Johnson discussed concerns that overly restrictive design requirements could increase
538 development costs and ultimately affect housing affordability. At the same time, it was emphasized
539 that the General Plan is intended to establish vision and intent rather than strict regulatory controls,
540 with zoning and implementation decisions occurring later through separate processes.

541 Mr. Holley clarified that future zoning changes, including any potential overlay district, would require
542 a separate rezoning process and could be applied comprehensively to the corridor at a later date rather
543 than incrementally during individual development proposals.

544 Councilmembers generally agreed that the General Plan should reflect a conceptual framework for the
545 corridor, acknowledging its long-term importance while preserving flexibility for future Councils to
546 refine implementation details.

547 Following discussion, support was expressed for moving forward with Option C for the 400 North
548 corridor, with the understanding that the specific overlay design would be developed and refined in
549 future work sessions or planning efforts. Council noted trust in the iterative planning process and
550 acknowledged that future governing bodies could adjust implementation tools as needed.

551 Councilmember Simmonds requested clarification on certain inclusions and expressed support for
552 adding “summer tourism” language under Community Design in a general sense, rather than
553 specifically focusing on seasonal residents.

554 Councilmember Lee-Koven briefly revisited several Planning Commission recommendations,
555 including support for adding dark sky-friendly language as an appropriate community design goal.
556 Additional questions regarding recreation and senior center references (page 91) were revisited, with
557 Council expressing general comfort with the explanation provided and no further changes requested at
558 that time.

559 Mr. Holley confirmed they had sufficient direction from Council regarding the proposed revisions to
560 incorporate into an updated draft and to refine and incorporate the discussed changes for a revised
561 version to be brought back for further consideration in approximately two weeks.

562 Vice Chair López requested input from City Attorney Craig Carlston regarding the email submitted by
563 a resident (Hilary) containing proposed language revisions related to the General Plan. He asked
564 whether there were any legal implications associated with the suggested wording and requested that
565 legal counsel review the correspondence and provide feedback before final action on the plan.

566 Mr. Carlston responded that he will read through the email and will respond if any potential legal
567 considerations are tied to the proposed language.

568 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Councilmember Lee-Koven to**
569 **continue Resolution 26-09 to the May 5, 2026 Council meeting as an action item and no public**
570 **hearing as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).**

571 **Dahle: Excused**

572 **Johnson: Aye**

573 **Lee-Koven: Aye**

574 **López: Aye**

575 **Simmonds: Aye**

576 **PUBLIC HEARING - Budget Adjustments FY 2025-2026 appropriating: \$200,000 financial**
577 **assurance funds provided by the developer of the Lloyd Estates Subdivision to construct or**
578 **reconstruct missing or inappropriately constructed improvements - Resolution 26-11 – Richard**
579 **Anderson, Finance Director**

580 At the April 7, 2026 Council meeting, Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council
581 regarding the proposed budget adjustment. He explained that these funds were previously called back
582 by the City and will be used to address construction-related issues in the Lloyd Estates subdivision. He
583 confirmed that the funds have already been received and are now being allocated to complete the
584 necessary improvements.

585 Chair Johnson inquired if \$200,000 in financial assurance funds will cover most of the needed
586 improvements in the Lloyd Estates subdivision and will the work be completed by contracted services
587 rather than City crews.

588 City Engineer Darren Farar addressed the Council and provided additional details regarding the use of
589 the \$200,000 in financial assurance funds for improvements in the Lloyd Estates subdivision. Due to a
590 current staffing shortage, including a vacant engineer position, the City will contract out both the
591 construction work and some engineering support.

592 He noted that while the funds will address most major issues such as correcting problems with a
593 retention basin some minor items (e.g., chipped concrete) may not be fully completed depending on
594 available funding. Normally, these would be addressed by the developer; however, staff indicated that
595 pursuing additional funds may be difficult due to limited resources or willingness from the developer,
596 potentially related to financial constraints.

597 The subdivision location was generally identified, and staff acknowledged that while it is unfortunate
598 the City must step in, the goal is to complete necessary improvements and ensure the area is brought
599 up to standard.

600 Councilmember Simmonds expressed concern that the City's involvement should not result in
601 homeowners receiving less than was originally expected from the developer. The importance of
602 completing improvements to an acceptable standard for residents was emphasized, despite funding and
603 developer limitations

604 Councilmember López noted receiving constituent concerns that delays in completing required
605 improvements—particularly the retention basin are impacting homeowners’ ability to qualify for
606 mortgages. The Councilmember encouraged prioritizing those improvements that directly affect
607 homeownership and financing in the subdivision.

608 Mr. Farar confirmed that priority will be given to critical improvements, emphasizing safety as the top
609 concern. This includes addressing ADA compliance issues and correcting problems with the retention
610 basin to ensure proper stormwater management for residents.

611 He also acknowledged the importance of completing improvements that impact homeownership,
612 noting these items will be prioritized alongside safety needs, with additional work completed as
613 funding allows.

614 Chair Johnson opened the meeting to a public hearing.

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

616 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Vice Chair López to approve**
617 **Resolution 26-11 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).**

618 **Dahle: Excused**

619 **Johnson: Aye**

620 **Lee-Koven: Aye**

621 **López: Aye**

622 **Simmonds: Aye**

623 **Workshop Items**

624 **[Link to video recording of meeting at time stamp 1:41](#)**

625 **Consideration of a proposed resolution to approve fees for the Parks and Recreation**
626 **Department to include Logan River Golf Course, Logan Cemetery, Parks and Recreation Field**
627 **Use – Resolution 26-12– Russ Akina, Parks and Recreation Director**

628 Russ Akina, Parks and Recreation Director addressed the Council regarding the proposed resolution to
629 update Parks and Recreation fees across multiple areas.

630 **Logan River Golf Course:**

- 631 • Proposed increases apply to punch passes and golf cart rental fees.
- 632 • Fees are benchmarked against other courses statewide to remain competitive while improving
633 cost recovery.
- 634 • The increase supports a long-term financial strategy tied to the recent transition from leased to
635 city-owned golf carts. The goal is to generate sufficient revenue to replace carts every three
636 years through resale and reinvestment.
- 637 • If approved at the upcoming public hearing, fees would take effect May 6.
- 638 • Staff has not yet notified golf patrons, pending council feedback, but acknowledges that short
639 notice could be problematic (and may incentivize early purchases before increases).

640 **Field Use Fees:**

- 641 • Updates to baseball, softball, and soccer field rental fees, with side-by-side comparisons of
642 current and proposed rates.
- 643 • Adjustments reflect evolving usage patterns and aim to better align fees with maintenance and
644 operational costs.

645 **Large Group Use Fees:**

- 646 • A separate category was created to address growing demand for large park gatherings (e.g.,
647 events requiring significant lawn space).
- 648 • This is distinguished from formal “special events” to avoid triggering broader
649 interdepartmental review requirements.
- 650 • Fee increases account for real costs incurred by the department, including:
 - 651 ○ Staffing for restroom access, maintenance, and closure
 - 652 ○ Trash collection and disposal, which impacts the parks maintenance budget

653 Mr. Akina noted a significant increase in demand over the past two years, prompting the need for
654 updated pricing. He explained that special event-type fees have existed for years, originally around
655 \$46–\$50 but have evolved alongside increased demand and operational complexity. Current field use
656 and large group use fees (85 and \$150) have been in place for approximately two years. Overall, the
657 proposal is framed as a cost-recovery and sustainability effort, ensuring fees better reflect actual usage,
658 maintenance demands, and long-term capital needs.

659 Councilmember Simmonds asked for clarification on large group use vs. street events, specifically
660 whether groups using public areas such as Center Street are responsible for services like trash
661 management.

662 Mr. Akina confirmed that in those cases, event organizers are responsible for providing garbage
663 services and related cleanup requirements, consistent with the city’s special event expectations.

664 Council asks for clarification on the large group use fee, confirming it is intended for park-based
665 gatherings such as pavilion and green space reservations, not street events like Center Street, which are
666 handled separately under the special events process. Staff agrees the language should be clarified in
667 the resolution to avoid confusion.

668 Council also questions why the large group use fee is higher than comparable categories.

669 Mr. Akina explained it is based on estimated attendance and actual operational impacts such as
670 restroom services, trash collection, and staff time, noting that actual turnout often exceeds what is
671 reported. Only the large group category is being adjusted, while small and medium categories remain
672 unchanged.

673 Mr. Akina also proposed increases to 12 of 13 service fees, with the deed transfer fee remaining at
674 \$60. The changes would take effect July 1. He also corrected comparison data, noting earlier figures

675 reflected non-resident rates that the city no longer uses, and will provide updated resident-based
676 comparisons. Even with increases, Logan’s fees remain lower than nearby communities.

677 The council then asked for follow-up information on golf course capacity and tee time utilization.

678 Logan River Golf Pro Jeff Johns addressed the Council. He explained that the golf course is operating
679 at roughly 80–88% capacity on most days, based on point-of-sale tracking, with weekends (Friday
680 through Sunday) frequently reaching 100+ rounds. He emphasized that true 100% capacity is
681 unrealistic due to no-shows, weather impacts like frost delays, and seasonal adjustments that require
682 shifting tee time blocks earlier or later in the day.

683 He described their tee sheet system as intentionally tight, using 7–8 minute intervals rather than the
684 more common 10-minute spacing. This allows them to better control flow, and he noted that he
685 staggers intervals (7-minute and 8-minute blocks) to keep tee times aligned to consistent clock marks
686 (e.g., 6:15, 6:22, etc.), which improves operational predictability and reduces scheduling confusion.

687 Mr. John added that demand is consistently strong, particularly at weekends, where it is common for
688 golfers to be unable to book tee times on short notice, sometimes needing to wait several days for
689 availability. He described weekdays like Monday and Thursday as lighter, while Tuesday and
690 Wednesday see moderate play that increases as seasonal youth and group play ramps up.

691 Regarding the proposed fee changes, he does not expect any meaningful impact on demand,
692 characterizing the increase as small enough to be largely unnoticed (roughly a dollar difference in
693 some categories, such as cart fees and punch passes). He believes customers will continue to book at
694 similar rates given current demand levels.

695 Finally, he supported the idea of messaging the change as a seasonal “last opportunity” to purchase
696 punch passes at the current rate, noting it could actually increase short-term sales activity without
697 negatively affecting long-term usage.

698 The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the May 5, 2026 Council meeting.

699 **Budget Adjustments FY 2025-2026 appropriating: \$589,920 funds the engineering department**
700 **received from the State of Utah to be used for Phase II improvements to stabilize the bank along**
701 **the Logan River; \$21,000 funds the fire department received from the State of Utah to be used to**
702 **purchase Wildland Shelters that can be used during deployment; \$340 donated funds toward**
703 **youth council expenses; \$100,000 risk management reserves toward Center Street safety**
704 **bollards; \$2,435,000 transfer of reserves to capital project funds to accommodate changes in**
705 **general fund reserve calculation; \$88,222 State alcohol funds toward police enforcement;**
706 **\$20,827 funds received for police overtime shifts; \$47,126 alcohol enforcement reserves toward**
707 **the purchase of lighting systems for patrol vehicles; \$50,240 additional funds for golf course**
708 **operations associated with the longer season; \$13,000 funds the city will received from the State**
709 **of Utah to be used to purchase emergency management supplies and materials – Resolution 26-**
710 **13 – Richard Anderson**

711 Richard Anderson, Finance Director, addressed the Council regarding the proposed resolution. He
712 stated the \$589,920 is a bank stabilization grant for work on Canyon Road near the USU water lab,
713 following earlier funding for design. Another \$21,000 was requested for fire department wildland
714 shelters.

715 The proposed adjustment of \$340 in long-held donated funds for Youth Council expenses, noting the
716 money had been sitting unused for roughly 10–12 years and needed to be formally appropriated to
717 close it out.

718 A further \$100,000 from risk management reserves was proposed for Center Street safety bollards,
719 part of a larger project nearing completion. He estimated the total project cost at approximately
720 \$200,000, with additional funding coming from public works and bike/pedestrian sources.

721 The largest adjustment was a \$2,435,000 transfer from the general fund to capital projects to align
722 with updated state auditor interpretations of how reserves must be calculated. Mr. Anderson explained
723 that the State now excludes transfers from revenue calculations, which could reduce the city's
724 allowable reserve threshold. He noted uncertainty in how future state rules may be applied and
725 indicated the transfer is precautionary to remain compliant.

726 Additional items included \$88,222 in alcohol enforcement funds, \$20,827 for police overtime
727 reimbursements, and \$47,126 from alcohol enforcement reserves for patrol vehicle lighting systems.
728 There was also a \$50,240 appropriation from golf course reserves to cover increased operating costs
729 tied to an extended golf season, and a \$13,000 emergency preparedness grant.

730 Council asked brief clarifying questions, including confirmation that the golf course remains strong
731 financially.

732 Logan River Golf Course Pro Jeff John reported the golf course has generated approximately \$292,000
733 more net revenue year-to-date than the previous year due to an earlier and longer season.

734 The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the May 5, 2026 Council meeting.

735 No further workshop items were presented.

736 **Other Considerations**

737 No further considerations were discussed.

738 **Adjourned**

739 There being no further business, the Logan Municipal Council adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

740

741 Teresa Harris, City Recorder