Logan Municipal Council
Meeting Minutes for August 18, 2026

Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Municipal Council convened in regular session on Tuesday, August 18, 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 streamed live on the City of Logan YouTube channel at: go.loganutah.gov/CouncilMeetings

Meeting Attendance

Approximately 44 individuals were in attendance at the start of the meeting. Chair Mike Johnson called the meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance.

Council members present:

- Chair Mike Johnson
- Vice Chair Ernesto López
- Councilmember Jeannie F. Simmonds
- Councilmember Melissa Dahle
- Councilmember Katie Lee-Koven - EXCUSED

Administration present:

- Mayor Mark A. Anderson
- City Attorney Craig Carlston
- Finance Director Richard Anderson
- City Recorder Teresa Harris

Opening Ceremony

Tron Arnold, a local volunteer with the Alzheimer's Association, addressed the Council regarding the organization's annual Walk to End Alzheimer's**.** Mr. Arnold explained that the Alzheimer's Association supports research and funding for new treatments and, ultimately, a cure for Alzheimer's disease. The organization also provides support and resources to individuals living with Alzheimer's and their caregivers.

Mr. Arnold announced that the Cache Valley Walk to End Alzheimer's will be held on September 19, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. at Merlin Olsen Park**.** The event will include local vendors and community members who may form teams and participate in the walk. Participants are encouraged to wear purple, the color associated with the Alzheimer's Association, to raise awareness and support funding for Alzheimer's research.

Mr. Arnold explained that individuals and businesses may form teams and make donations. Local businesses may also participate by sponsoring booths at the event. He encouraged community members to participate and help increase awareness of Alzheimer's disease throughout the community.

Councilmembers asked about fundraising opportunities and whether information was available in Spanish. Mr. Arnold confirmed that the Alzheimer's Association has Spanish-language informational materials available. He also provided the organization's website, alz.org**,** where individuals can locate information about the Cache Valley Walk to End Alzheimer's and register or create a team.

Mr. Arnold thanked the Council for the opportunity to provide information about the event.

Mr. Arnold led the audience in the pledge of allegiance.

<u>Meeting Minutes and Agenda</u>

A motion was made and seconded to approve minutes from August 4, 2026, Regular Council Meeting, the August 11, 2026, Truth in Taxation Meeting and the August 18, 2026, agenda as presented.

ACTION: Motion by Councilmember Simmonds, seconded by Vice Chair López, to approve minutes from August 4, 2026, Regular Council Meeting, August 11, 2026, Truth in Taxation Meeting and the August 18, 2026, meeting agenda, as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0)
Dahle: Aye
Johnson: Aye
Lee-Koven: Excused
López: Aye
Simmonds: Aye

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, September 1, 2026.

<u>Questions and Comments for the Mayor and Council</u>

Link to video recording of meeting at time stamp (7:13)

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 Gail Hanson addressed the council and asked whether the City uses Flock cameras or other surveillance cameras and, if so, whether the City is contractually obligated to share information obtained from those cameras with other agencies.

The Council indicated that, due to the number of public comments scheduled for the meeting, staff would follow up with Ms. Hanson regarding her questions. Ms. Hansen thanked the Council.

Logan resident Joshua Molitor addressed the Council regarding an important vote scheduled for tonight's meeting. He stated that he had sent Councilmembers letters expressing his concerns and asking them to carefully consider their decision. He noted that one email appeared not to have been delivered to a staff member.

Mr. Molitor spoke in support of preserving Logan's open spaces, stating that the community should continue to value and protect open space regardless of available tax incentives. He expressed concern about continued development and increasing density, comparing the potential future of Logan to Salt Lake City.

He emphasized the importance of preserving the community's character, wetlands, wildlife, and open spaces. He noted that Logan is located along a significant bird migratory pathway and expressed concern that continued development could destroy wildlife habitat and wetlands to the point that future generations would only be able to learn about the area's wildlife through historical records or online resources.

Mr. Molitor encouraged the Council to carefully consider the long-term impact of its vote and to preserve as much of Logan's remaining open space as possible. He stated that he would not remain for the vote because he was concerned, he might become overly emotional if the decision did not go as he hoped. He thanked the Council and concluded his comments. The Council thanked him for his emails and participation in the discussion.

Logan Resident and property owner Megan Carollo addressed the Council regarding the Canyon Road streetscape portion of the First Dam Tank and Waterline Project. Ms. Carollo stated that her family has lived along Canyon Road for five generations and emphasized the importance of the neighborhood to her family.

Ms. Carollo presented a petition containing 50 signatures requesting documentation establishing the reported 99-foot right-of-way on Canyon Road that is being relied upon for the streetscape portion of the project. She stated that the individuals who signed the petition are among those most directly affected by the project.

Ms. Carollo stated that she had previously met virtually with the project team, requested documentation of the right-of-way through an attorney, and participated in mediation with the State Ombudsman's Office in an effort to resolve the matter. She said that she and other neighbors had obtained property surveys showing a right-of-way on Canyon Road substantially narrower than 99 feet. She stated that recorded plat maps and surveys conducted over approximately the past 70 years support the narrower right-of-way.

Ms. Carollo specifically referenced a 2024 survey of Mayor Anderson's property that she said identifies a 60-foot right-of-way on Canyon Road. She requested that the City provide documentation supporting its claimed 99-foot right-of-way.

Ms. Carollo emphasized that her concern was not with the proposed streetscape design itself, but with the underlying right-of-way claim upon which the design relies. She expressed concern that proceeding without resolving the right-of-way issue could expose the City to liability, additional legal expenses, project delays, and unnecessary costs to taxpayers.

Ms. Carollo acknowledged that several current Councilmembers were not involved in the earlier decisions regarding the project but stated that the issue now rests with the current Council. She said that if the City has documentation establishing a sufficient right-of-way for the proposed design, providing that documentation would resolve the issue and allow the project to proceed with greater certainty. If the claimed right-of-way does not exist, she stated that the issue should be addressed before the project proceeds further.

Ms. Carollo stated that resolving the right-of-way issue would not require abandoning the vision for the Canyon Road streetscape, but could require working within different parameters. She requested that the matter be placed on a future Council agenda so the City can provide a clear determination regarding the right-of-way.

Ms. Carollo also provided the Council with information regarding constitutional protections for private property under the United States and Utah Constitutions, as well as a copy of the survey of Mayor Anderson's property showing the referenced 60-foot right-of-way.

The Council thanked Ms. Carollo for her comments and information.

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

Mayor/Staff Reports

Link to video recording of meeting at time stamp (16:08)

Days of Service & Commemoration Celebration, September 11 & 12, 2026 – Jaren & Julie Taylor, JustServe Cache Valley

Jaren and Julie Taylor, JustServe representatives for Cache Valley, addressed the Council regarding JustServe and opportunities to partner with Logan City to increase community service.

Mr. Taylor explained that JustServe connects individuals who are willing to volunteer with organizations and individuals who need assistance. He thanked the Councilmembers for their service to the community and noted that there are many opportunities for residents to serve without holding elected office.

Mr. Taylor stated that he and his wife were asked in January to serve as JustServe representatives for Cache Valley. Shortly thereafter, they heard Mayor Anderson challenge Logan City employees to personally provide 250 hours of community service each year**.** The Mayor also challenged nonprofit leaders to help identify meaningful service opportunities for City employees, residents, and youth. Mr. Taylor said this challenge aligned closely with the mission of JustServe.

Over the preceding several months, the Taylors had connected with hundreds of nonprofit organizations and approximately 50 faith groups throughout Cache Valley. They explained that numerous local service opportunities are listed on JustServe.org**,** which is continually updated as new projects and events become available.

To increase awareness of these opportunities, the Taylors created Facebook and Instagram pages under the name JustServe Cache Valley**.** They stated that the pages bring service opportunities directly to residents through social media and have received encouraging community support. Local influencers have also helped share the information with a broader audience.

The Taylors reported that there are currently more service opportunities available than volunteers to fill them. They encouraged residents to follow JustServe Cache Valley on Facebook and Instagram to learn about local service projects and volunteer opportunities. They noted that the social media accounts have grown to more than 1,000 followers.

Mr. Taylor described an example of the value of the social media outreach during the fires on Canyon Road. While an evacuation center was being established, volunteers, church leaders, nonprofit organizations, emergency personnel, and City officials worked together to assist residents. A post providing information about the fire and the location of the evacuation center received more than 130,000 views, demonstrating the ability of the JustServe Cache Valley social media pages to quickly distribute important information and connect people with opportunities to help.

Mr. Taylor stated that a subsequent post encouraged residents to sign up for Cache County's Everbridge emergency alert system, further helping residents access important emergency information.

Mr. Taylor noted that Logan City had not yet officially completed the process to become a JustServe city, but the City and JustServe representatives had already begun working together. He highlighted the upcoming America 250 and Cache Valley Days of Service on September 11 and 12 as an example of the partnership. Logan City Parks and Recreation Director Russ Akina and Dana McKinnon were recognized for helping identify meaningful service projects for the event.

Mr. Taylor stated that the City understands many community needs, while nonprofit and faith organizations also understand those needs. JustServe can help connect those needs with individuals who are willing to volunteer. He said that after several months of outreach, the organization had determined that the projects and needs exist and that volunteers are available; the primary need is to connect them.

The Taylors also proposed regularly recognizing youth and other community members who go above and beyond in serving others. They suggested highlighting individuals, particularly young people, who make a positive difference in Logan in order to recognize their contributions and inspire others to participate in community service.

The Taylors encouraged residents to follow JustServe Cash Valley to learn about service opportunities and concluded by humorously cautioning that service can be "highly infectious," expressing hope that community members would become "infected" with the desire to serve.

The Council thanked Jaren and Julie Taylor for their presentation and their efforts to promote community service.

Proclamation: Commitment to Volunteerism – Mayor Anderson

Mayor Anderson stated that volunteerism and JustServe are high priorities for him and for Logan City. He announced that he had signed a proclamation committing Logan City to promoting volunteerism, utilizing JustServe.org to make it easier for residents to find and participate in volunteer opportunities, and regularly recognizing and celebrating the contributions of volunteers.

Mayor Anderson thanked Jaren and Julie Taylor for their presentation and encouraged residents to participate in the upcoming service opportunities on September 11 and 12**,** with the goal of filling all available volunteer positions and expanding participation.

The Council thanked the Taylors for their efforts and welcomed the opportunity to continue the partnership with JustServe.

Logan River Watershed Plan Update – Zan Murray, J-U-B Engineering and Paul Lindhardt, Public Works Director

Public Works Director Paul Lindhardt addressed the Council and introduced an update on the Logan River Watershed Project, noting that the project had recently completed a public comment period as part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process.

Zan Murray with J-U-B Engineering addressed the Council along with Nathan Daug with the Cache Water District, Kyler Olsen Water Resources/Project Engineer with Franson Civil Engineers who collaborates closely with J-U-B and Gordon Coulson, President of the Crockett Avenue Irrigation Company. The project is being pursued through the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS**)** Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Program. Logan City, North Logan City, Hyde Park, and Crockett Avenue Irrigation Company are participating in the project, with Cache Water District serving as the sponsor.

Mr. Murray presented an update on the Logan River Watershed Project, noting that the project had recently completed its public comment period as part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. The purpose of the presentation was to provide the Council with an overview of the project, discuss the preferred alternative, review comments received during the public process, and answer Council questions.

The project is being pursued through the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) watershed program. He explained that NRCS is a federal agency and that the program provides funding for watershed-related projects nationwide. The program was originally implemented in 1953, revised in 1983, and returned to active funding in approximately 2017–2018.

The Logan River Watershed Project is a community project sponsored by Cache Water District, with Logan City, North Logan City, Hyde Park City, and the Crockett Avenue Irrigation Company participating as sponsors or co-sponsors. The project team has been working on the project since approximately 2016.

Project Purpose and Funding

Mr. Murray explained that the preferred alternative has three primary components:

1. Flood control – NRCS funding would cover 100% of eligible flood-control construction costs.
2. Agricultural water management – Eligible improvements would be funded at 75%.
3. Recreation – Eligible recreational improvements would be funded at 50%, with the remaining portion provided by participating sponsors or co-sponsors.

The project originated when Crockett Avenue Irrigation Company engaged JUB Engineers and Franson Civil Engineering in 2016 to study the feasibility of converting portions of its irrigation system to a pressurized system. The service area generally extends east and west through the Logan, North Logan, and Hyde Park areas. The project team subsequently applied for funding through the NRCS watershed program and received funding following its second application.

Mr. Murray explained that the purpose and need for the project includes:

- Protecting limited water rights;
- Improving water efficiency;
- Addressing limited culinary water resources;
- Replacing or improving aging irrigation and other infrastructure;
- Reducing culinary water treatment and delivery costs;
- Reducing wastewater treatment costs;
- Providing flood-control improvements; and
- Providing recreational improvements.

Mr. Murray noted that existing canals and irrigation infrastructure are aging and that stormwater entering the canal system can cause canals to overtop and contribute to flooding of homes and other properties.

Preferred Alternative

The preferred alternative includes approximately 2,100 acre-feet of water storage near the existing sewer lagoon area. The project also includes flood-control improvements, agricultural water-management improvements, and recreation components.

The recreational components discussed include:

- Extension of the trail along Canyon Road between Center Street and approximately 600 East;
- Improvements to the bridge over the Logan River near River Hollow Park; and
- A trail connection from River Hollow Park to Crockett Avenue.

Mr. Murray noted that these improvements are generally consistent with projects already identified in the City's trails and transportation plans.

Flood Control

Mr. Murray and his team identified flood control as the primary component of the NRCS watershed program.

He referenced the significant flooding experienced in 2023, when the Logan River reached approximately 1,800 cubic feet per second (cfs). Proposed improvements would reconstruct or improve the diversion structure so that it could more effectively pass water and debris and continue to provide the ability to divert water into the Little Logan.

The project is expected to reduce the floodplain and remove approximately 28 to 35 homes from the floodplain, which could eliminate the requirement for those property owners to carry flood insurance.

The project also includes a proposed canal overflow facility near approximately 1800 North and North Logan to help redirect excess water moving north from Logan and reduce flooding associated with canal overtopping.

Little Logan River

A substantial portion of the discussion focused on the Little Logan River, including its existing flow, capacity, water rights, future flows, and recreational value.

Mr. Murray explained that the Little Logan is an important community amenity because water diverted into the channel flows through or near several recreational and public areas, including Jens Johansson Park, Merlin Olsen Park, the Cache County Fairgrounds, the Zoo, and Willow Park. Public input received during the development of the EIS emphasized the importance of maintaining water in the Little Logan.

He stated that the Little Logan can carry approximately 90 cfs at the diversion, although its capacity decreases farther downstream as the channel becomes narrower. Approximately 80–85% of the Little Logan's approximately 4.5-mile length has an estimated capacity of approximately 5–10 cfs, while approximately one-half mile has a capacity greater than 15 cfs.

At the time of the presentation, approximately 51 cfs was being diverted at the river diversion. At the Cache County Fairgrounds, the measured flow was approximately 6.3 cfs. The reduction occurs because water is diverted at several locations to serve irrigation users in North Logan and Hyde Park.

Mr. Murray explained that the preferred alternative would provide for approximately 5–10 cfs of water to remain in the Little Logan. The project would also provide approximately 25 cfs of instream flow in the Logan River.

He emphasized that the proposed alternative would not substantially alter the physical characteristics of the Little Logan. The channel would not be enclosed or converted to a pipe under the proposed alternative. There could be limited piping in specific areas where infrastructure, pumping facilities, or other project components require it, but the proposed alternative would generally leave the Little Logan channel intact.

Councilmembers asked whether Logan City or other water-right holders could dedicate additional water to the Little Logan.

The project team stated that entities holding legally recognized water rights could potentially dedicate additional water to the channel. The proposed infrastructure would provide flexibility to accommodate such future decisions.

Kyler Olsen explained that the majority of water currently carried through the Little Logan would instead be conveyed through a pressurized irrigation system serving the Crockett Avenue Irrigation Company service area. The water remaining in the Little Logan would include the dedicated base flow.

Diversion Location and Logan River Flow

The proposed alternative would move the primary diversion point to First Dam. Mr. Olsen explained that this would allow the irrigation system to be pressurized without requiring the same ongoing pumping and associated energy costs.

Councilmember Simmonds questioned why the existing diversion structure would still need to be reconstructed if the diversion would move upstream.

Mr. Murray explained that the existing structure is in poor condition and frequently becomes obstructed by branches, limbs, and trees. Reconstructing the structure would provide an improved ability to maintain flow into the Little Logan and improve the ability to pass water and debris.

Mr. Olsen explained that the portion of the Logan River between First Dam and the existing diversion would experience reduced flow because water would be diverted upstream. However, approximately 25 cfs would be dedicated as instream flow to continue downstream in the Logan River.

Councilmember Simmonds discussed water rights and the relationship between existing water-right holders and flows in the Logan River and Little Logan.

Mr. Murray explained that Crockett Avenue Irrigation Company does not hold the right to the entire flow of the Logan River and that other water-right holders also have rights to water in the river. He explained that under the existing water-right system, flows can be substantially reduced downstream because water-right holders have the ability to divert water for beneficial use.

The Council discussed the distinction between water flowing through the river or canal as a public amenity and the underlying legal ownership of the water.

Mr. Murray acknowledged that water flowing through the Little Logan has historically provided significant recreational and aesthetic benefits to the community, even though the underlying water rights belong to individual water-right holders.

Mr. Olsen explained that the Kimball Decree establishes how water rights are allocated among users of the Logan River. Water allocations are based on the adjudicated water-right system, and the amount available to an individual right holder can decrease during drought conditions.

Drought Conditions

Councilmembers asked whether the proposed 5–10 cfs Little Logan flow would be guaranteed during an extreme drought year.

The project team stated that the specific drought-year operating requirements had not yet been established. The current project is still in the planning phase, and specific agreements concerning water use, water dedication, drought operations, and legally binding obligations would be developed during the design phase.

The team indicated that the amount of water available during a drought could vary depending on the applicable water rights and conditions under the Kimball Decree. The final agreement could establish a schedule or other requirements for operating the system during extreme drought conditions.

Councilmembers noted that this year's water conditions would be considered an extreme year and asked whether the Little Logan would necessarily have no flow under such circumstances. The project team stated that no final determination had been made and that the issue would need to be addressed during the design and agreement process.

Downstream Water and Great Salt Lake

Councilmember Simmonds asked how the project would affect water that currently continues downstream into the Bear River system and ultimately toward the Great Salt Lake.

Mr. Olsen explained that any water pumped into storage would remain subject to the applicable water rights. The project could not pump and store more water than permitted under the existing water rights. He stated that the Crockett group has consumptive water rights for up to approximately 140 cfs, although actual availability varies substantially depending upon the water year.

He further explained that the project would create opportunities for water users who choose not to use their full water allocation to leave water in the system and potentially allow it to move farther downstream. Existing programs may also provide opportunities for water to reach the Great Salt Lake.

Mr. Olsen emphasized that improved efficiency would reduce losses from seepage and evaporation and could therefore reduce overall water demand. The storage system and associated infrastructure would also provide greater flexibility for future water management decisions.

Logan River Instream Flow

The project would dedicate approximately 25 cfs of instream flow to the Logan River. The project team stated that studies indicate this amount of additional flow could improve the condition of the fishery and waterway.

The project would also allow approximately 5–10 cfs of additional water to remain in the Little Logan, based in part on community feedback received during the planning process.

Mr. Olsen stated that the proposed system would provide greater flexibility for future water-right holders or entities to dedicate additional water to either the Logan River or Little Logan. The infrastructure would provide the necessary measurement and accounting capabilities to track those flows.

Water Storage

The project includes approximately 2,100 acre-feet of storage in the area of the existing sewer lagoons. The project team explained that water could flow through approximately 14 miles of the Logan River before being pumped into the storage area.

The Council questioned how the storage component would affect downstream flows. The project team explained that the system is intended to operate within existing water rights and that water would not be pumped beyond the amount legally available to the participating water-right holders.

Water Conservation and Environmental Benefits

Mr. Murray estimated that improved irrigation efficiency could save approximately 5,400 acre-feet of water. The project would also improve water efficiency by reducing seepage and evaporation and using pressurized irrigation infrastructure.

Other environmental benefits discussed included:

- Additional instream flow in the Logan River;
- Continued base flow in the Little Logan;
- Improved fishery and aquatic habitat;
- Sediment removal at First Dam;
- Improved water-use efficiency; and
- Potential opportunities for additional water to reach the Great Salt Lake.

Financial Benefits

Mr. Murray estimated that the participating communities could realize approximately $650,000 annually in water-treatment savings and approximately $1.35 million annually in wastewater-treatment savings. These estimates are based in part on reduced energy, power, and chemical costs associated with treating and pumping water.

He stated that the estimated benefit life of the project is more than 50 years.

Mr. Murray estimated that if the project were not constructed, approximately $85.5 million in additional infrastructure and capital projects could eventually be required. Potential projects could include additional water pipelines, water treatment facilities, storage, and other infrastructure.

He acknowledged that the project could require a larger initial investment but stated that the long-term capital and operating costs associated with secondary irrigation could be lower.

Secondary Water Rates and Connections

Councilmembers reviewed projected secondary-water rates and asked whether the estimates assumed that either 50% or 100% of eligible users would connect to the system.

Mr. Murray explained that the current assumptions do not mandate that every property connects to the secondary water system. If more customers connect, the infrastructure costs would be distributed among more users, resulting in lower monthly costs per user. The project remains feasible even if the adoption rate is lower than 100%.

Councilmembers expressed concern about the amount of construction that would be required throughout the community. The team explained that installation of the system would be phased and that additional outside funding could potentially reduce the costs to users.

The anticipated irrigation season was discussed, with the team indicating that secondary water service would generally correspond to the existing irrigation season, approximately April through September. The storage component could provide additional flexibility and potentially extend service later into the season, although the precise shutoff date would depend on water conditions.

Councilmembers asked about the cost to an individual homeowner to connect to the system. The project team stated that the meter connection to the residence would be included in the project, but the cost of connecting the home's existing sprinkler system would be the responsibility of the property owner. Estimates discussed ranged from approximately $300 to $5,000, depending on the individual property and where the existing sprinkler system is located.

Culinary Water System

Councilmembers asked how converting irrigation demand to secondary water could affect Logan City's culinary water system.

Mr. Murray explained that reducing summer culinary-water demand could potentially reduce the need for future culinary-water infrastructure expansion. The water system is generally sized based on demand, fire flow, and storage requirements. A reduction in summer demand could reduce some infrastructure needs, although fire-flow requirements and other system requirements would continue.

He noted that the City's water master plan had been considered in developing the project estimates. Based on the analysis performed with the City's engineering consultants, the project could reduce the need for some future capital expansion because the City's summer water demand would be lower.

Mr. Murray explained that much of Logan City's culinary-water operating cost is associated with energy and pumping, particularly during the summer when water demand is significantly higher. Reducing the summer peak could therefore reduce pumping and energy costs.

Potential Impact on Water Rates

The Council discussed whether reduced culinary-water consumption could result in a reduction in City water revenues.

Mr. Murray acknowledged that a reduction in water consumption would result in lower variable revenues, while many water-department expenses would remain fixed, including employees, maintenance, meters, and existing infrastructure.

He explained that the initial project estimates had been reduced to account for the fact that not all water-department costs would disappear when water consumption decreased. The estimated savings were therefore adjusted to recognize continuing fixed costs. There could be some difference in water rates initially, but that long-term savings in culinary-water operations and capital costs could offset those differences over time.

Project Cost

The Council asked about the overall estimated cost of the project.

Mr. Murray stated that the current total estimated construction cost is slightly more than $300 million. The estimate includes inflation factors because construction is not expected to begin for several years.

Based on the current funding structure, approximately 89% of the project could be federally funded, leaving an estimated 11% local or sponsor match, or approximately $33 million on a $300-million project. The project team emphasized that the exact amount could change as additional state and other funding sources are identified.

Mr. Murray stated that the local match would not necessarily be divided equally among the participating communities. Instead, costs would generally be allocated based upon the benefits received by each entity.

For example, the recreation portion of the project would require a 50% match. If Logan City proceeded with the proposed Canyon Road trail from Center Street to approximately 600 East, Logan City's estimated share was approximately $1.5 million.

Mr. Murray stated that additional state or other grant funding could potentially be combined with federal funding to reduce the local match.

Overall Project Scale

The Council discussed the size of the project and questioned whether the investment was justified, particularly in light of the project's secondary-water component.

Mr. Murray noted that the project includes approximately 120 miles of infrastructure, in addition to flood-control and recreation improvements. For comparison, the City's current water project includes approximately 22,500 feet of pipe at an estimated cost of approximately $47 million.

Councilmembers questioned whether a project of this size was appropriate given the City's efforts to encourage water conservation.

Mr. Murray acknowledged that alternative conservation approaches could be considered, including rate structures, metering, and other demand-reduction measures. The project team stated that the proposed infrastructure would provide a framework that could accommodate future conservation decisions.

Mr. Murray explained that metering all secondary-water connections could provide customers with information about their water use and potentially encourage conservation. The exact rate structure for secondary water had not yet been determined.

East Side of Logan

Mr. Murray explained that the project's service area does not extend into the upper portion of Logan served by the Logan-High Park/Cache Highland Water Association system. Existing infrastructure in that area would not be substantially changed by the project.

Flood Control as a Significant Project Benefit

Councilmembers discussed the fact that the project is not solely a secondary-water project.

Mr. Murray emphasized that flood control is a significant component of the overall project and that the City needs to address flood-control issues regardless of whether the entire watershed project moves forward. The NRCS program provides an opportunity to obtain federal funding for flood-control improvements that might otherwise require substantial local funding.

Public Comments and EIS Process

Mr. Murray reported receiving approximately 550 comments during the most recent comment period. The comments were organized into approximately 57 categories for purposes of responding to the issues raised.

The most significant areas of concern included:

1. Little Logan flows;
2. Project costs;
3. Classification of the Little Logan;
4. Great Salt Lake considerations; and
5. Other environmental and water-related issues.

He stated that most comments had been addressed and that the team was completing responses and finalizing the EIS.

Mr. Murray also explained that a map showing historical flow rates throughout the Little Logan was being prepared because many public comments reflected confusion regarding the amount of water flowing through different portions of the channel. The map is intended to provide a clearer picture of current conditions and potential future conditions.

He clarified that the classification of the Little Logan is a State responsibility, rather than a responsibility of the project or Logan City.

Next Steps

Mr. Murray reported that the EIS was being completed and that responses to public comments were being finalized. The final EIS would be reviewed by the project team and submitted to NRCS.

The next step would involve the project sponsors and co-sponsors entering into watershed agreements demonstrating support for moving into the design phase. The agreements would establish a framework for proceeding but would not necessarily eliminate all future opportunities to reconsider the project.

The project would proceed through several milestones:

- Completion and approval of the EIS;
- Request for funding for the design phase;
- Design of the project and development of detailed agreements;
- Additional agreements following completion of design; and
- Requests for construction funding.

He emphasized that future phases are dependent upon the availability of federal funding.

Because of the size of the project, the team anticipates that it would be phased. Individual components, such as flood control, trails, or irrigation improvements, could potentially move forward at different times depending upon funding availability and readiness.

Anticipated Timeline

Mr. Olsen estimated approximately three to five years for design and approximately ten years for construction, resulting in an overall estimated project timeline of approximately 13 to 15 years if the project proceeds as anticipated.

Council's Role

A Councilmember asked for clarification regarding the Council's role and whether the Council had formally voted to support the project.

Mr. Murray explained that Logan City is a partner and co-sponsor of the project. The Council's future role would become particularly important when financial agreements, construction phases, or local matching funds require City action.

The Council would have authority over any City funds required as a local match. Council action could therefore affect whether City-funded portions of the project move forward.

The Council also discussed whether the City could prevent project construction within City rights-of-way. Staff indicated that Logan City's involvement could include decisions concerning whether City-owned rights-of-way could be used for construction and whether City users would be required to connect to the secondary-water system.

It was clarified that Logan City previously participated in the project through the initial study with Crockett Avenue Irrigation Company and shared in the cost of that study.

It was further explained that if the City constructs a trail as part of the project, the City would have an ongoing responsibility to maintain that trail. Similarly, maintenance responsibilities for flood-control infrastructure located within a municipality would need to be established through future agreements.

The Crockett Avenue Irrigation Company has identified the diversion structure as a critical component of its operations and is pursuing funding opportunities to advance that portion of the project independently if possible.

Mr. Murray explained that an approved EIS is required before design funding can be requested and that completion of the EIS is therefore an important milestone toward accessing federal funding for future phases.

Federal Funding Concerns

Councilmembers expressed concern about the availability of federal funding given recent reductions in federal grant programs and asked how confident the project team was that sufficient funding would become available to complete a project of this size.

Mr. Murray acknowledged that federal funding availability is uncertain. As a result, the project partners are exploring additional state and other funding sources and considering whether individual portions of the project can be advanced separately.

He explained that some project components may be more important or ready to proceed sooner than others and that pursuing alternative funding sources could allow portions of the project to move forward more quickly, even if the funding match is not as favorable as the NRCS program.

Mr. Murray stated that the City has been working with the City's funding team to identify additional grant opportunities and determine how the project's various benefits could be used to leverage other funding.

Conclusion

The Council thanked J-U-B for the extensive presentation and discussion. Councilmembers indicated that they may submit additional questions to staff and the project team as they continue reviewing the information.

No formal action was taken. The presentation was received as an informational update.

No further Mayor/Staff reports were provided.

<u>Council Business</u>

Link to video recording of meeting at time stamp <u>(1:42:13)</u>

Planning Commission Update – Councilmember Simmonds

Councilmember Simmonds provided an update from the Planning Commission. She noted that a rezoning request considered by the Planning Commission would be addressed later in the meeting and therefore did not provide additional details at this time. She also reported that the former Wendy's property on Main Street between 1000 North and 1400 North will be redeveloped as a Chase Bank. The existing building will be demolished, and a new Chase Bank facility will be constructed.

Council Announcements – Chair Johnson

Vice Chair López reported that the electric vehicle (EV) chargers planned for installation near the Laub Plaza are nearly ready for use. The chargers are expected to include a Level 3 fast charger.

An update was also provided on the mural located near the arch on the building near the Laub Plaza. The mural is progressing well and is expected to be completed within the next week or two.

Additionally, other public art projects are planned for the City's bus stations. These projects were previously approved as part of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding.

No further Council Business items were presented.

<u>Action Items</u>

Link to video recording of meeting at time stamp <u>(1:43:59)</u>

(Continued from the August 4, 2026, Council meeting) **– PUBLIC HEARING - Consideration of a proposed resolution adopting Revised Logan Light and Power Residential, Commercial and Industrial Electrical Rate Schedules and Adopting a Power Cost Adjustment Rate Schedule – <u>Resolution 26-27</u> - Mark Montgomery, Light & Power Director**

Mark Montgomery, Logan Light & Power, presented an overview of Resolution 26-27 and the proposed changes to the Logan Light & Power rate schedule. Mr. McGomery noted that the proposed changes included three primary components:

1. Rate Adjustments: Most electric rates would be adjusted by fractions of a cent.
2. Special Event Rate: A new rate would be established for electrical service provided for special events. Logan Light & Power has historically provided this service without a specific charge. The proposed fee was developed in coordination with the Special Events Committee.
3. Power Cost Adjuster (PCA): The proposed PCA would replace the existing electric surcharge mechanism with additional safeguards and limitations.

Mr. Montgomery explained that, based on average residential electricity usage of approximately 600–700 kilowatt-hours per month, the proposed rate adjustments would increase the average residential electric bill by approximately $2.90 per month.

Special Event Rate - The proposed special event charges were discussed. For a permanent electrical panel, such as the panel located on Center Street, the proposed charge would be $70 for two days. For a temporary hookup requiring Logan Light & Power personnel to physically set up equipment, open a transformer, and make the necessary connections, the proposed charge would be $250 per day, with no separate one-day rate because the cost of mobilizing personnel and equipment would be substantially the same.

It was noted that the proposed rate would not apply immediately to special events that had already been scheduled. Events that had already signed up would be grandfathered through December 31, 2026.

Mr. Montgomery provided comparisons with other municipalities. Provo charges approximately $300 for a temporary hookup, Hyrum charges approximately $75, and Lehi charges approximately $80 for setup plus an hourly labor charge when applicable. It was also noted that several other municipally owned utilities, including Murray, Bountiful, and Brigham City, do not currently charge a comparable special event fee.

Council discussion included the possibility of event organizers passing the electrical cost along to vendors or others using electrical service during an event.

Power Cost Adjuster – Mr. Montgomery explained that Logan Light & Power currently recovers power costs that exceed budgeted amounts by applying the additional cost to the following month's billing based on kilowatt-hour usage.

The proposed Power Cost Adjuster would provide additional safeguards by limiting the adjustment to three cents per kilowatt-hour without additional approval. If an adjustment greater than three cents per kilowatt-hour were necessary, the matter would require discussion with the Mayor, and a greater adjustment would require City Council involvement.

The proposed mechanism would also provide flexibility to defer a portion of an unusually large power-cost adjustment when Logan Light & Power anticipates that costs may be recovered in a subsequent month. Mr. Montgomery noted that other utilities generally have similar power-cost adjustment mechanisms, although the proposed Logan provision would add additional oversight by establishing limits requiring notification or approval by the Mayor and City Council.

Effective Date - Following the presentation, Finance Director Rich Anderson clarified that the resolution, as originally written, would apply to utility bills issued after September 1, 2026. Because Logan Light & Power bills weekly, the first bills issued in September could include nearly four weeks of August electricity usage, including usage occurring before the Council's consideration of the new rates.

Council discussed the timing of the implementation rate and whether the effective date should be delayed to avoid applying the new rates to substantial August usage.

Mr. Anderson indicated that moving the effective date to October 1, 2026, would not create operational concerns.

Chair Johnson opened the public hearing.

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

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Councilmember Dahle to approve Resolution 26-27 with an effective date of September 1, 2026, as presented. Motion failed.

ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair López seconded by Councilmember Dahle to approve Resolution 26-27 with an effective date of October 1, 2026, as amended. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).
Dahle: Aye
Johnson: Aye
Lee-Koven: Excused
López: Aye
Simmonds: Aye

(Continued from the February 3, 2026, Council Meeting) **– Consideration of a proposed resolution to approve Library Fees – Resolution 26-02 – Michael Sauers, Library Director**

Library Director Michael Sauers presented Resolution 26-02 regarding the proposed adjustment to the Logan Library's non-resident library card fee.

Mr. Sauers explained that the current annual non-resident fee of $163 was based on a formula developed more than 20 years ago. He stated that he had reviewed the origin of the fee and determined that the existing formula was not sustainable. In consultation with the Library Board, a revised fee structure was developed.

Under the proposed change, the annual non-resident fee would be reduced from $163 to $125, with a $10 transaction fee. The fee would also be based on the library's fiscal year rather than on the date the card was purchased. This would allow non-residents to purchase library service on a month-to-month basis.

Mr. Sauers noted that the Library Board had already implemented the fiscal year and prorated/month-to-month purchasing provisions because those changes did not involve a change to the dollar amount. Council approval was required for the proposed reduction of the annual fee.

Chair Johnson asked whether individuals who had purchased cards since July 1 would be eligible for a refund of the difference if the new fee were approved.

Mr. Sauers clarified that the new fee would apply when the change was implemented and that the language referring to July 1 could be amended if necessary. It was also clarified that the $10 transaction fee had not been charged during the interim period when prorated purchases were being allowed.

Finance Director Rich Anderson explained the $125 figure represents approximately the average property tax contribution per household toward the library. However, the actual operational cost of providing library services to a household that uses the library was estimated at approximately $280 per user household.

The distinction between the average property tax contribution and the actual cost of providing library services was discussed.

Mr. Anderson noted that the $280 figure represented operational costs and did not include capital costs associated with the library facility.

Mr. Sauers stated that the current $163 non-resident fee is among the highest annual non-resident library fees in the country, with only a few larger jurisdictions charging higher amounts. He explained that the existing formula was based in part on cost per circulation, which could produce unreasonable results as circulation levels changed. He stated that using the average taxpayer contribution as the basis for the fee was viewed by the Library Board as a fairer approach.

Council also discussed the potential impact of setting the non-resident fee at approximately $280, noting that such a fee could make Logan's non-resident library card one of the most expensive in the country and potentially reduce library usage.

Mr. Sauers emphasized that increased library usage supports the library’s mission and services.

Council discussed the additional $10 transaction fee, which is charged each time a non-resident purchases a card or service. The fee was intended, in part, to encourage users to purchase longer-term cards rather than repeatedly purchasing for shorter periods.

It was also clarified that the $125 figure had been established prior to the recent property tax increase and that the recent increase did not affect the library portion of the tax levy. Staff indicated that the difference resulting from the recent tax change would be negligible.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Vice Chair López to approve Resolution 26-02 as presented. Motion was withdrawn/died.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Vice Chair López to approve Resolution 26-02 reducing the annual non-resident fee from $163 to $125, plus the applicable $10 transaction fee as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (3-1).
Dahle: Aye
Johnson: Nay
Lee-Koven: Excused
López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

(Continued from the August 4, 2026, Council meeting) **- CODE AMENDMENT – Consideration of a proposed ordinance amending the Land Development Code Chapter 17.24 "Development Standards for Wetlands" – Ordinance 26-14 – Russ Holley, Community Development Director**

Community Development Director Russ Holly presented Ordinance 26-14, providing an update to Logan City's wetland setback regulations. He explained that Logan City adopted its current wetland code in 2023 and previously had no municipal setbacks from wetlands. Wetlands are subject to federal jurisdiction through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which allows certain wetland impacts through permitting or mitigation.

Mr. Holley reviewed proposed amendments to the wetland setback requirements. The amendments would increase the setback from streets from 25 feet to 35 feet, with sidewalks generally located approximately 25 feet from the wetland after accounting for the park strip and sidewalk. Other proposed setbacks included 15 feet for trails and landscaping, 50 feet for commercial buildings and parking lots, and 25 feet for certain smaller public and recreational structures. Boardwalks through or around wetlands would be exempt.

For single-family residential development, the proposed setback would be 35 feet from a new lot line, resulting in a setback of approximately 43 to 45 feet from the wetland to the home, depending on the side or rear yard setback.

He further explained that the proposed changes were intended to balance wetland protection with development considerations. Increased setbacks could improve wetland health and function by providing a buffer from development, while excessively restrictive setbacks could discourage development or result in additional wetland mitigation and filling.

The amendments would also clarify when wetland delineation is required and replace the existing 50-foot setback with a 20% disturbance allowance with a 10-foot "do not disturb" area immediately surrounding the wetland delineation. The 10-foot area would generally remain undisturbed during construction and would require temporary fencing and signage. Certain federally permitted wetland disturbances would be exempt from this requirement.

Council discussed the distinction between the existing and proposed regulations, including the extent to which landscaping and other improvements could occur within wetland setback areas. Holly explained that setback areas are generally considered open space or landscaping areas and that the proposed 10-foot no-disturbance buffer would provide a protected area immediately adjacent to the wetland.

Council also discussed the differences between residential streets and larger collector and arterial roads. Following discussion, a motion was made to approve Ordinance 26-14 with an amendment to increase the wetland setback for collector and arterial roads from 35 feet to 50 feet.

The final setbacks were clarified as follows:

- Boardwalks — exempt.
- Public trails and sidewalks — 15 feet.
- Single-family residential lot lines — 35 feet.
- Residential streets — 35 feet.
- Collector and arterial roads — 50 feet.
- Commercial, industrial, and multifamily development — 50 feet.
- Single-family residences — approximately 43 to 45 feet from the wetland, depending on the applicable yard setback.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Vice Chair López to adopt Ordinance 26-14 increasing the wetland setback for collector and arterial roads from 35 feet to 50 feet as amended. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).

Dahle: Aye
Johnson: Aye
Lee-Koven: Excused
López: Aye
Simmonds: Aye

PUBLIC HEARING - REZONE/CODE AMENDMENT - Consideration of a proposed ordinance approving the Maple View Subdivision. Steward Land Company/Adams Family Trust, authorized agent/owner is requesting approval of a Planned Development Overlay to allow development of a residential subdivision on approximately 10-acres. The site is located at approximately 350 South 1400 West (TIN 02-066-0013), within the Suburban Neighborhood Residential (NR-4) zone in the Woodruff Neighborhood – <u>Ordinance 26-15</u> - Aaron Smith, Planner

Planner Aaron Smith presented Ordinance 26-15, Maple View Subdivision Planned Development Overlay (PDO), for property located at approximately 350 South and 1400 West, consisting of approximately 10 acres.

Mr. Smith explained that the Planned Development Overlay provides an opportunity to make site-specific modifications to the City's zoning regulations and allows greater variation in development where appropriate. The proposal had previously been discussed by the Council in a workshop, during which Council provided direction regarding the number and distribution of lots and the use of portions of the landfill overlay area for rear yards.

Based on Council's previous direction, the applicant submitted a revised development plan reducing the subdivision to 40 lots and providing a more balanced distribution of lot sizes, with an emphasis on increasing the number of larger lots. The revised plan also incorporates portions of the landfill overlay area into rear-yard areas.

Mr. Smith clarified that the Council was considering approximately 10 acres of the property. A proposed lot shown on adjacent City property was not part of the current request and would require separate City action and public hearings if the City were to dispose of or otherwise make that property available in the future.

Mr. Smith reviewed the proposed lot distribution:

- 14 lots of 10,000 square feet or greater;
- 15 lots of 6,000 square feet or greater; and
- 11 lots smaller than 6,000 square feet.

Mr. Smith explained that the color-coded development plan identified the larger, medium-sized, and smaller lots. The revised plan resulted in fewer of the smallest lots and more medium-sized lots than the previous proposal.

He also reviewed other changes to the development plan, including:

- A proposed connection to 290 South;
- Removal of the previously proposed trail through the development's open space;
- Coordination with the Logan City Parks Department to provide a trail connection through the adjacent park instead;
- Incorporation of portions of the landfill overlay area into rear-yard setbacks; and
- A proposed landscaping buffer and eight-foot trail along 1400 West.

Mr. Smith noted that the text of the PDO ordinance would need to be amended to reflect the revised lot distribution. The previous version identified 14 lots of 10,000 square feet or greater and 13 lots of 6,000 square feet or greater. He recommended changing the latter number to 15, resulting in the final 14/15/11 distribution.

Councilmember Dahle questioned whether the narrower lots in the center of the development would be sufficiently wide to accommodate conventional homes.

Mr. Smith estimated that the lots would generally have approximately 50 feet of frontage, with some lots slightly wider. The applicant indicated that the lots would accommodate conventional homes and would comply with applicable State requirements.

Vice Chair López also asked about changes to the lots along 1400 West.

Proponent Brad Brown explained that the 1350 West street alignment had been shifted east, creating additional acreage and allowing for an additional lot while also increasing the size of the lots in that area. The change was associated with removing the previously proposed private road and the interior "island" lots.

Councilmember Dahle asked how the proposed development compared with the property's existing zoning.

Mr. Smith explained that the property is currently zoned NR-4, which permits four dwelling units per acre. Although the proposed development is being developed at approximately four units per acre, achieving the maximum theoretical density under the base zoning would not be practical because of acreage required for roads and the limitations created by the landfill overlay.

Mr. Smith estimated that a conventional development under the existing NR-4 zoning would likely result in approximately 23 to 25 lots. The PDO provides flexibility to distribute the four units-per-acre density among a greater variety of lot sizes.

At Council's request, Mr. Smith reviewed the purpose of the Planned Development Overlay.

He explained that the PDO is intended to:

- Provide flexibility within the City's zoning regulations;
- Allow unique, innovative, and well-planned developments; and
- Be used where existing zoning is not sufficiently permissive or sufficiently restrictive to accommodate a proposed development.

Mr. Smith stated that the NR-4 zone was not sufficiently permissive to allow the proposed smaller lots, while rezoning the property to MR-9 would not be sufficiently restrictive because it could allow future higher-density development, including townhomes. Staff therefore stated that the PDO appeared to be an appropriate application of the City's regulations in this circumstance.

Chair Johnson opened the public hearing.

Proponent Brad Brown thanked the Council and members of the community for their time, input, and efforts throughout the several-month process. He stated that the applicant had attempted to listen to the Council's direction and make meaningful reductions and changes to the original proposal, including changes made following Planning Commission review.

He expressed hope that the revised proposal represented a reasonable balance and would provide a positive project for the City.

Friederike Hendrickson, a Logan resident living adjacent to the property on 350 South, spoke regarding the concerns expressed by neighborhood residents. He stated that, based on discussions with neighbors, he believed there continued to be concern that the proposed development was too dense for the established character of the neighborhood. She stated that the surrounding community had been developed over many years and that residents believed additional high-density housing was not necessary or warranted in this location.

She also questioned whether a wetland delineation had been completed for the property. He noted that groundwater in the area was high and that there were areas where vegetation appeared to be associated with wetlands. He asked whether a delineation had been required.

Ms. Hendrickson recommended a greater transition between the larger lots and the smaller lots. In particular, he suggested that the smaller lots in the central portion of the development be replaced with larger lots so the area would have a more consistent character with the larger lots surrounding it.

Jacob Hendrickson, who also lives on 350 South, stated that he had previously submitted written comments opposing the PDO. He identified safety as one of his primary concerns, particularly the additional traffic and potential impacts on children. He also expressed concern about maintaining the character of the Equestrian Estates area, noting that residents have horses and other animals and that the neighborhood has historically consisted of larger properties.

Mr. Hendrickson stated that some residents leave the neighborhood because they are looking for larger properties and that there are increasingly fewer such properties available. Additional concerns included Pedestrian safety, bicycle access, safe access to nearby amenities and maintaining larger lots consistent with the original zoning.

Mr. Hendrickson acknowledged that the revised plan was significantly better than the previous proposal but stated that he believed there could still be a greater transition between the larger and smaller lots. He continued to oppose the overlay but emphasized the importance of addressing safety, neighborhood character, and pedestrian and bicycle access.

The public hearing was briefly closed and then reopened to allow additional public comment.

Jason Tubbs, a Logan resident whose property is adjacent to the proposed development, raised concerns regarding traffic, water rights, and the transition from the existing neighborhood to the proposed development.

Mr. Tubbs expressed particular concern about the existing traffic bottleneck on 600 South near the elementary school. He stated that accessing 600 South is already difficult in the morning and questioned whether the proposed subdivision would make the situation worse.

He also asked whether the 10-acre property has associated water rights and, if so, whether development could affect neighboring property owners who also have water rights.

His third concern involved the transition from the existing low-density neighborhood to a higher-density development and the associated safety implications.

Mr. Tubbs explained that his water comes from Southwest Irrigation and asked how the irrigation water currently moves through or around the property.

Council requested that the property owners address the question from Mr. Tubbs.

Tawni Tubbs a lifelong resident of the area and daughter of a neighboring property owner, stated that she could potentially be interested in purchasing a home in the proposed development but believed the proposal was too condensed.

She noted that subdivisions constructed north and south of the area in recent years have attracted younger families moving into the community for employment opportunities. She stated that, as a result, some existing residents are being displaced because larger homes and lots are becoming less available.

Ms. Tubbs stated that, for her own future family needs, she would prefer a larger home and yard rather than a smaller, more condensed property. She encouraged the Council and applicant to consider increasing lot sizes where possible.

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

Councilmember Simmonds asked Dean Adams, one of the property owners, to explain the existing water conveyance system.

Mr. Adams explained that the property's irrigation water historically came from 10th West through an open ditch. He stated that the ditch had subsequently been enclosed and that the property's water previously came from the south side of the Equestrian Estates development.

According to Mr. Adams, when Equestrian Estates was constructed, the existing ditch was blocked. As a result, the water could no longer reach the property through its former route and now must be pumped from a ditch on the north side of Equestrian Estates.

Mr. Adams stated that the property has approximately 10 shares of water.

He explained that there are existing ditches on portions of the property, including along the east and south sides, as well as a well in the southeast corner.

He clarified that there is also a ditch along the entire north side of the 10-acre property, directly behind the neighboring homes. The ditch continues along the property and serves other properties farther west.

Mr. Smith said that any water conveyance crossing the property would need to be preserved and noted that the conveyance is shown on the plat.

Councilmember Simmonds also asked about the existing well.

Mr. Adams confirmed that the well is currently used for the property.

Logan resident Aaron Zilles subsequently explained that an irrigation ditch along the south side of the property continues approximately halfway down the area but that several property owners have filled portions of their ditches. He stated that the water rights serve several properties but expressed uncertainty about where the water would go farther along the system if the ditch were opened. It was suggested that the ditch could potentially be cleaned out to restore the water conveyance.

Chair Johnson asked were wetlands delineated on this property.

Mr., Smith explained that no wetlands had been delineated on the property and a delineation was not required. For the City's initial review, staff relied on the National Wetland Inventory, which showed no wetlands on the property.

Chair Johnson asked about concerns about traffic on 600 South.

Mr. Smith explained that the development would include required improvements and connections designed to provide multiple routes of access rather than concentrating on traffic at one intersection.

The development would:

- Provide a connection to 200 South, which is signalized;
- Include future street stubs;
- Improve 1400 West;
- Address existing dead-end streets; and
- Provide multiple connections to the surrounding street network.

He characterized this as providing redundancy, reducing the subdivision's dependence on a single intersection.

Councilmember Dahle thanked the applicant for continuing to revise the proposal and respond to Council and neighborhood concerns. She acknowledged that the issue was particularly difficult because of the neighborhood's long-standing efforts to maintain larger lots and its established character.

Councilmember Dahle also recognized that the property owners have a legitimate interest in being able to sell and develop their property and credited the applicant for making substantial efforts to accommodate neighborhood concerns.

Chair Johnson asked whether, if the PDO were approved, the applicant could instead develop the property under the underlying NR-4 zoning.

Mr. Smith explained that approval of the PDO would establish the development requirements through ordinance. The applicant would be subject to the approved PDO and could not simply elect to develop under the base zoning.

Community Development Director Russ Holley further clarified that the PDO is a map amendment, and removing the overlay in the future would require another map amendment. Thus, if the Council approved the PDO with modifications, the applicant would be required to proceed under the approved PDO unless the overlay were subsequently amended or removed through the appropriate process.

Vice Chair López stated that the revised plan was significantly better than the original proposal and reflected the applicant's willingness to listen and incorporate community feedback.

He also discussed the City's recent approval of multifamily, townhome, condominium, and apartment projects and referenced the need for "missing middle" housing—housing options between traditional large-lot single-family homes and larger multifamily developments.

He stated that the proposed mixture of lot sizes could address some of the City's housing needs but indicated that adding additional larger lots would make the proposal more acceptable.

Vice Chair López identified several of the smaller green lots in the middle portion of the development as an area that could potentially be changed to provide a better transition from the larger lots.

Mr. Smith explained that the blue lots were generally 6,000 square feet or larger, with many of the southern lots closer to 6,000 square feet and the northern lots closer to 7,000 square feet. The smaller green lots were generally around 4,400 square feet, while lots along the west side were approximately 5,200 to 5,500 square feet.

Council discussed whether the applicant could modify the plan to add additional larger lots.

Chair Johnson suggested that, if the Council was not sufficiently comfortable with the proposal, the matter could be continued for approximately two weeks to allow additional consideration.

Councilmember Simmonds stated that the applicant had already made significant changes but suggested that adding at least two additional larger lots could make the development feel more cohesive, particularly in the area where the larger lots transition directly to the smallest lots.

She stated that the development appeared to contain several different types of subdivisions and housing patterns and expressed concern that the area could become fragmented if too many different development patterns were placed next to each other.

Council also discussed the broader purpose of the PDO and what made the development sufficiently unique to justify the overlay. It was noted that a mixture of lot sizes could provide housing opportunities for people at different stages of life, including residents who may want to purchase a smaller home initially and later move to a larger home while remaining within the same community.

Mr. Brown explained that the concept of "missing middle" housing was an important component of the proposal.

Mr. Brown described the concept of "filtering," in which a community contains a mixture of apartments, townhomes, smaller lots, medium-sized lots, and larger lots. This variety allows residents to move within the community as their housing needs and financial circumstances change.

Mr. Brown stated that the variety of lot sizes was one of the unique characteristics of the proposal that would not necessarily result from conventional zoning. He acknowledged the Council's concern that the mixture could appear disjointed but stated that the variety could also create a more diverse and adaptable community.

Mr. Brown further stated that the ultimate character of the development would depend not only on the subdivision layout but also on the homes ultimately constructed on the lots.

Councilmember Simmonds acknowledged that the architecture and appearance of the completed homes would play an important role in determining whether the development successfully integrated with the surrounding neighborhood.

Chair Johnson asked whether portions of the landfill overlay could be incorporated into individual residential lots as part of the rear-yard area.

Mr. Brown confirmed that portions of the landfill overlay were incorporated into the proposed lot configuration. Homes would not be permitted to be constructed within the restricted landfill area, but the area could be included within the overall lot.

Chair Johnson also discussed the proposed detention facility and whether its size could be reduced.

Mr. Brown explained that the size of the detention facility is based on engineering requirements. He stated that, because of groundwater conditions, additional testing would be required to determine whether the facility could be reduced. Such testing could take approximately a year.

He stated that the development plan intentionally provides a separate parcel for the detention facility rather than placing the facility within individual residential yards.

Councilmembers again asked whether some of the smaller green lots along 375 South could be combined into larger lots.

Mr. Brown stated that the project had already reached the limits of the available contractual time and financial resources and that substantial revisions had already been made in response to Council direction.

Council nevertheless continued discussing whether additional modifications could be made.

Mayor Anderson asked about the anticipated cost of the various lot sizes and discussed current housing prices in the surrounding area.

Mr. Smith provided examples of nearby sales were discussed, including:

- A 1,500-square-foot home on approximately a 4,000-square-foot lot selling for approximately $400,000;
- A 2,000-square-foot home on approximately a 5,000-square-foot lot selling for approximately $480,000; and
- A larger home on a 10,000-square-foot lot selling for substantially more.

Council discussed the tension between providing larger lots and maintaining housing affordability. It was noted that the need for housing is attainable for middle-income residents while also recognizing demand for larger homes and lots.

ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair López seconded by Councilmember Simmonds to amend Ordinance 26-15 converting six of the 6.1 square foot lots into four 0.15 acre lots, resulting in a reduction from 40 lots to 38 lots as amended.

Chair Johnson then suggested that a recess could be taken while a motion remained pending to allow the applicant/development team time to consider the proposed modification.

City Attorney Craig Carlston confirmed that the Council could recess with the motion remaining on

RECESSED at 8:48 p.m. The Council recessed for five minutes to allow the applicant time to consider the proposed modification. The motion remained pending during the recess. Council then planned to continue with the workshop and return to the pending motion later in the meeting.

The Council reconvened at 8:54 p.m.

The Council continued with the workshop items.

Workshop Items

Link to video recording of meeting at time stamp (3:27:01)

Budget Adjustments FY 2026-2027 appropriating: $26,497 Enterprise fund reserves totaling $883,206 toward the implementation and first year of SAAS fees for replacement of Utility Billing Software; $172,366 for the 2027 RAPZ Tax Municipal Population Allocation; $126,624 a grant the Parks & Recreation Afterschool Program received to support After School Programs; $450,000 RAPZ funds Parks & Recreation received from Cache County to be used for the Kunzler Trail Improvement Project - Resolution 26-28 – Richard Anderson, Finance Director

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

Mr. Anderson provided an overview of the City's evaluation of utility billing software. Logan City's current New World software by Tyler Technologies is nearing the end of its lifecycle, and the vendor is no longer adding new clients. Over the past 18 months, staff evaluated more than 40 software options, narrowed the field to two finalists, and recommended SpryPoint as the best option for the City.

The request was to appropriate $883,626 from enterprise fund reserves for implementation and the first year of software-as-a-service costs. Approximately $731,000 would cover implementation, with approximately $151,000 for the first year of software-as-a-service fees. The ongoing annual software costs would be incorporated into the Information Technology budget beginning with the 2028 budget cycle. Staff noted that the contract includes guaranteed pricing for five years.

The software would serve the City's utility-related enterprise funds, including water, sewer treatment, electric, stormwater, garbage, and other related services. Implementation costs would be allocated among the individual enterprise fund reserves, with approximately $27,000 allocated to water, sewer treatment, electric, and garbage, and approximately $30,000 allocated to 911 and stormwater. Staff confirmed that the affected reserves would remain within acceptable levels following the appropriation.

Council discussed the benefits of the new software, including improved customer communication, access to bills and usage information, the ability for customers to compare usage between billing periods, and potential future support for time-of-use electrical rates.

Mr. Anderson explained that implementation of time-of-use rates would require additional meter data management software at a later date.

Council also discussed the cost of moving from City-hosted software to a software-as-a-service model.

Mr. Anderson noted that the new system would provide increased security, a more modern platform, and enhanced customer self-service capabilities. The ongoing software costs would be incorporated into future budgets, while existing Tyler Technologies costs are expected to decrease as systems are replaced.

Mr. Anderson stated that the selection process involved a team effort among utility billing, finance, information technology, the City Treasurer, and the Mayor.

Council expressed appreciation for the thorough evaluation and indicated confidence in staff's recommendation.

The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the September 1, 2026, Council meeting.

Unspent Appropriations FY 2026 – Carry Forwards - <u>Resolution 26-29</u> – Richard Anderson

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT- General Plan: $30,000; Elements Software Implementation: $16,000; Community Art: $15,000

FIRE DEPARTMENT - Fire AV Upgrades and Other Equipment: $52,520; Station Planning Expenses: $20,000

PUBLIC WORKS - Elements Software Implementation: $112,842; 400 North 600 West Intersection: $25,185; Seasonal Inspector: $10,000; Lloyd Estates Financial Assurance: $196,878; Google Fiber Blue Staker: $278,523; Aerial Photography: $22,785; Capital Projects: $576,043

PARKS & RECREATION - Parks & Recreation Capital: $159,480; Flood Plain Design for LRGC Road: $48,292

GOLF COURSE - Clubhouse Walkway Capital: $173,895

WATER AND SEWER - Software Implementation: $69,988; Water Capital Improvements: $2,644,087; Water Tank & Waterline: $46,749,137; Water & Wastewater Masterplans: $30,992; Wastewater Capital Improvements: $5,448,132

SEWER TREATMENT - BioMag Expansion Project: $3,362,462; Pump Repair: $20,921

ELECTRIC - Canyon Road Conduit: $23,472; SOCC Brick Repair: $8,227; UDOT Relocation Project: $225,149; Various Electric Capital Projects: $4,417,419; Natural Gas Generation Project: $210,28; Sediment Removal Project Maintenance: $143,174; Sediment Removal Project Improvements: $872,629; Bucket Truck: $232,470

ENVIRONMENTAL - Environmental Capital Projects: $6,356,266; Landfill Permits: $97,485

STORM WATER - Master Plan Updates (Prof/Tech): $665,439; Rollingstock: $36,571; Master Plan Updates (Supplies): $6,096 Capital Projects: $3,655,312

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES - Zoll Monitors: $17,626; New Ambulance and Remount: $726,058

CAPITAL PROJECTS - General Capital Improvement Projects: $3,238,355; Curb, Gutter, and Street Improvement Projects: $4,907,433; Other Capital Projects: $37,809; Public Works Facility: $52,433,026; Parks and Recreation Capital: $378,285

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT - Fire Vehicles: $1,956,046; Public Works Vehicles: $35,894; Parks & Recreation Vehicles: $12,659; Restricted Revenue and Grants

RESTRICTED REVENUE - Police Alcohol Enforcement: $95,702; Class C Street Projects — Prof/Tech: $114,827; Class C Street Projects Supplies: $290,213; Class C Street Projects — Capital: $6,000,000; Class C Street Projects — Improvements: $4,822,996; Transportation Tax Projects: $3,777,691

FEDERAL GRANTS - CDBG Grant: $842,492 *(Internal: $809,492 | External: $33,000)*; Wastewater Treatment Facility BioMag Expansion Grant: $4,927,152; EECBG – Electric Charging Station Grant: $27,557; Green Waste Facility: $368,908; Logan Riverbank Stabilization: $589,920

STATE GRANTS - First Responders Mental Health Grant: $17,960; House Bill 23 – Police Mental Health Grant: $77,350 House Bill 23 – Fire Mental Health Grant: $57,510; Utah Outdoor Recreation Grant: $202,924 *(Improvements: $178,778 | River Trail Supplies: $24,146);* UCA – Proportionate Share of Remaining Funds: $10,260

MISC GRANTS - Utah League of Cities and Towns: $32,918; CCOGS: $9,050,000 *(Split: $3,200,000 | $5,850,000)*; UDOT 200 N Railroad Crossing Safety Grant: $225,000; UCAIRS – Electric Equipment Rebate: $6,900

RAPZ GRANTS

RAPZ Reimbursement Grants: $183,083

Rec Complex Exterior Trails and 200 South: $154,766

Disc Golf Course & Picnic Tables: $10,555

Logan River Bridge at Trapper Construction: $17,762

RAPZ Population Split Grant (General): $72,212

RAPZ Population Split Grant (Golf): $61,898

Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed carry forwards. He explained that, as a general practice, the City carries forward large capital projects that remain incomplete at the end of the fiscal year. These carry-forwards are brought before the Council for approval. A limited number of operational items are also carried forward when they are unique to a department or unusually large.

Mr. Anderson noted that most of the carry forwards consisted of capital projects, restricted funds, and grants. One item related to the Elements software implementation was listed at $16,000, but the amount would be adjusted to $25,000 to reflect the total remaining balance rather than the current purchase order amount. Other amounts may also be adjusted as final invoices are received.

Council discussed the need for carry-forwards due to the timing of the City's fiscal year occurring in the middle of the major construction season. Councilmembers acknowledged that projects frequently begin before the end of the fiscal year but are not completed by June 30, requiring funds to be carried forward into the following year.

The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the September 1, 2026, Council meeting.

No further workshop items were presented.

At 9:05 p.m. the Council continued a discussion regarding Ordinance 26-15 Maple View Subdivision Rezone/Code Amendment.

The Council continued deliberation regarding the proposed Maple View subdivision and the revised 40-unit plan.

Proponent Brad Brown addressed the Council and stated that, following additional review and analysis, the proposal had been reduced from 51 units to 40 units. He indicated that further reductions would make the project infeasible and respectfully requested approval of the 40-unit proposal. He also stated that he did not believe the revised proposal would substantially change the character of the neighborhood, although he acknowledged that the configuration of several lots created challenges.

Chair Johnson asked City Attorney Craig Carlston whether the pending motion could be withdrawn or denied in order to allow consideration of another motion.

Mr. Carlston explained that the Council can vote or deny the pending motion or the motion could be withdrawn.

ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair López seconded by Councilmember Simmonds to withdraw adoption of Ordinance 26-15 converting six smaller lots into four approximately 0.15-acre lots, resulting in a reduction from 40 lots to 38 lots as amended.

Councilmember Dahle discussed the possibility of having the two homes adjacent to Equestrian Estates orient their driveways toward 350 South in order to provide greater continuity with the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Holley explained that, for a single-family corner lot, the homeowner or builder generally has the ability to determine which street the home is oriented toward, and the City could not dictate the orientation. It was noted that the proposed setbacks appeared to accommodate the possibility.

The Council discussed the procedural consequences if no motion were made.

Mr. Carlston explained that, if the Council did not act affirmatively on the proposed rezoning, the proposal would fail and the property would remain in its base zoning designation of NR-4.

Mr. Brown emphasized that the revised proposal was intended to follow the direction previously provided by the Council to return with a 40-unit plan and that the Council could either approve the proposal, request additional changes, or deny it.

Councilmember Dahle expressed significant reservations about the proposal, noting that the Council had not previously been involved in approving neighborhoods with comparable density. She stated that the concern was not only the proposed density but also the broader issue of allowing developers to request changes to zoning that had already been established. She referenced extensive neighborhood involvement, including meetings, emails, and text messages, and stated that the neighborhood remained opposed to the proposal.

At the same time, Councilmember Dahle acknowledged that the developer had made substantial changes to the original proposal and had demonstrated a willingness to work with the Council. The revised proposal was recognized as being significantly better than the original plan.

Mr. Brown thanked the Council for its consideration and acknowledged the extensive discussions and negotiations that had taken place. He stated that he had spoken individually with nearly all of the Councilmembers and understood that the Council's concerns were thoughtful and not arbitrary. He indicated that the parties had reached a difficult but reasonable middle ground and that the proposal had been reduced as far as he believed was feasible.

Chair Johnson discussed the neighborhood's continued concerns and the difficulty of balancing neighborhood preferences with the City's need to accommodate additional housing. It was noted that the property was attractive as an undeveloped field, but the City could not reasonably expect all property to remain undeveloped indefinitely.

Chair Johnson expressed broader concerns regarding repeated zoning changes and their potential effect on land values and housing affordability. He questioned whether approving an upzone in one location could encourage surrounding property owners to seek similar increases in density, thereby increasing the value of developable land and making housing less affordable. He stated that, while additional housing was needed, continually approving upzones could create a cycle in which increased development potential raised land values and made affordable housing more difficult to provide.

Chair Johnson stated that the revised proposal was not necessarily unreasonable but continued to have concerns regarding its compatibility with the neighborhood and the City's adopted plans. He recognized the developer's willingness to work with the Council and the substantial improvements made to the proposal.

Vice Chair López asked about the number of homes that could potentially be constructed under the existing NR-4 zoning.

Mr. Holley estimated that approximately 25 to 27 units could be accommodated after accounting for roads and the configuration of the property. The proposed 40-unit plan would therefore provide approximately 13 to 15 additional homes.

Chair Johnson noted that the unusual shape of the property required buffer areas, and roads affected the final number of lots.

Chair Johnson asked for guidance regarding how long the Council should wait for a motion.

Mr. Carlston explained that there was no specific time requirement and that, if the Council was not comfortable making a motion to approve, a motion to deny would provide a clear direction.

ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair López seconded by Councilmember Dahle to deny Ordinance 26-15 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote for denial (4-0).
Dahle: Aye
Johnson: Aye
Lee-Koven: Excused
López: Aye
Simmonds: Aye

The Council expressed appreciation to Mr. Brown and the City staff for their work throughout this process.

<u>Other Considerations</u>

No further consideration were presented.

<u>Adjournment:</u>

There being no further business, the Logan Municipal Council adjourned to a meeting of the Logan Redevelopment Agency at 9:15 p.m.

Chairman Johnson called the meeting of the Logan Redevelopment Agency to order at approximately 9:15 p.m.

Workshop Item

Unspent Appropriations FY 2026 – Carry Forwards: REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY - $50,000 for Development Agreement – <u>Resolution 26-30 RDA</u> – Richard Anderson

Finance Director Richard Anderson presented a request to carry forward $50,000 from the prior year's budget into the 2027 budget for development agreements.

The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the September 1, 2026, Council meeting.

Adjournment:

There being no further business, the Logan Redevelopment Agency adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

Teresa Harris, City Recorder