

Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Municipal Council convened in regular session on Tuesday, February 2, 2021, at 5:30 pm via ZOOM Webinar at this link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82829481740> or Webinar ID: 828 2948 1740. Instructions for downloading and using ZOOM can be found at <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362193-Joining-a-Meeting>. Logan Municipal Council Meetings are televised live as a public service on Channel 17 and City of Logan Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/cityoflogan>. To listen to the meeting by phone call: US: +1 669 900 9128.

In compliance with Utah Code Ann. §52-4-207, Chairman, Mark A. Anderson read the following determination in order to hold an electronic meeting without an anchor location:

Based on the rising cases of COVID-19 in the Bear River Health District and State Public Health Order 2020-18 'Adopting COVID-19 Transmission Area Restrictions' categorizing our county designation as a High Transmission Area, it is determined that gathering in-person for the regular City Council meeting is a risk to the health and safety of those present. According to corona.Utah.gov, people at higher risk for severe illness include: Older adults, people of all ages with certain underlying medical conditions, and pregnant people might also be at increased risk of severe illness from COVID-19. Long-standing systemic health and social inequities have put many people from racial and ethnic minority groups at increased risk of getting sick and dying from COVID-19. Given that members of the Council and community who are required to be in attendance or may choose to attend have these risk factors, a virtual meeting (without an anchor location) will be held via Zoom. Logan Municipal Council Meetings are televised live as a public service on Channel 17 and City of Logan Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/cityoflogan>. To listen to the meeting by phone call: US: +1 669 900 9128

Council Members present at the beginning of the meeting via Zoom: Chairman Mark A. Anderson, Vice Chair Jeannie F. Simmonds, Councilmember Amy Z. Anderson, Councilmember Tom Jensen, and Councilmember Ernesto López. Administration present: Mayor Holly Daines, City Attorney Kymber Housley, Finance Department Rueben Nelson, Economic Development Director Kirk Jensen, Community Development Director Mike DeSimone, Planner Russ Holley, Planner Aaron Smith, Library Director Karen Clark, Fire Chief Brad Hannig, Police Chief Gary Jensen, Public Works Director Paul Lindhardt, Assistant Human Resource Director Ambrie Darley, Human Resource Director Greg Cox, City Recorder Teresa Harris and Deputy City Recorder Esli Morales. Excused: Finance Director Richard Anderson.

OPENING CEREMONY:

State of the City - Mayor Holly H. Daines

2021 State of the City Address

February 2, 2021

Good Evening,

I postponed my State of the City address from January, hoping we might be meeting again in person, but that is still not to be. What a year! The past twelve months brought a global pandemic that none of us ever imagined. We also had an earthquake mid-March, just as we were shutting down to try and fight coronavirus. The nation, and even Salt Lake City, experienced violent protests after the death of George Floyd. We did have protests in Logan, but fortunately, they were peaceful, and the Washington Post even picked up a story about our city police chiefs taking pizza to the protestors and having a conversation with them. Add to that list a 100-year windstorm in September that toppled many trees throughout the city, especially in the cemetery where the tree roots pulled up water lines and service roads, taking city crews from the cemetery, forestry, and public works three weeks to get it cleaned up.

With all the challenges of this year, I have wondered how to be better prepared ... the earthquake, in particular, got my attention. Our main Fire Station is nearly 50 years old and has some seismic issues. The roof on the Service Center, where a great deal of our city heavy equipment and vehicles are stored, also provides concern. We will need to invest capital funds in those buildings and are also applying for a FEMA Hazard Mitigation Assistance grant to make sure we have the infrastructure to function well in future emergencies.

During 2020, I realize many of our citizens, businesses and organizations struggled, and there have been some rough times. However, in November, NBC did a national news story on Logan, as we had the lowest unemployment rate in the entire country. Our local economy has continued to grow. Overall, as a city, we have been fortunate.

Last March, at the request of the Governor, some of our employees worked from home if they were able to do that, and for a time we closed City Hall, the Library, and the Recreation Center in order to "flatten the curve."

Many of our employees are considered "essential workers." They simply kept coming to work, doing their job day after day, doing all they could to protect each other. I am extremely proud of our team! They kept picking up the garbage and running the landfill, keeping the lights on, plowing and repairing the streets, keeping our water, wastewater, and sewer systems operating, taking care of our parks and trails, running library books to the curb, approving building permits and providing inspections, facilitating economic development and doing the dozens of other tasks in finance, legal, HR and the Recorder's office required to run a city. And our first responders – the Fire Fighters, EMT's and Police Officers – just kept working. Our EMT's went into homes to transport patients to the hospital, not knowing if a patient had Covid or not. Our police helped citizens and made arrests as necessary, wondering if they were being exposed. Our City Council kept up with their duties, either hosting socially distanced or online meetings. We do have an

89 amazing team. The Council has wisely built-up reserves in all of our funds to prepare for
90 a rainy day. When the pandemic hit in March, just as our budget was taking shape, we
91 took a step back on some projects and expenses, to be cautious and prudent. As the year
92 progressed, our overall revenues did not take the dramatic plunge that other cities have
93 experienced, so we were able to move ahead with most projects.

94
95 Here are a few highlights among the many things we accomplished in 2020:

96
97 My number one priority and goal as Mayor is fiscal responsibility. The Finance
98 Department plays a key role in accomplishing that goal by helping develop the overall
99 budget and tracking expenses, allowing myself and the departmental head's the tools to
100 manage the budget, and providing financial information to the council for their approval.
101 They are critical to the city's excellent financial status. This year, Finance completed a
102 city-wide transition to new software, a multi-year undertaking that will better serve our
103 departments and citizens for years to come. They also administered over \$4M of CARES
104 funds, which required extremely careful expenditure and reporting.

105
106 A second major goal is to revitalize downtown. We are focused on a four-block area and
107 our Economic Development Director has played a key role. The Redevelopment Agency
108 – or RDA -- has been building funds for some time for redevelopment projects. The City
109 Council, acting as the RDA Board, approved funds this past year to incentivize two new
110 housing developments in downtown, one on 100 south replacing the former blighted V1
111 gas station, another on 100 East.

112 The RDA also purchased the blighted buildings near the corner of 300 North and Main
113 which have been a vacant eyesore for years. We are currently doing asbestos mitigation
114 and eventually will demolish those buildings to make way for new development.

115
116 Although we paused for a while on our Center Block Plaza, we are again moving
117 forward. The revised plans will keep Plaza 45 and the building to the South as requested
118 by the Historic Preservation Committee. We will demolish the Emporium and adjacent
119 building to create a plaza – a gathering place to benefit our citizens -- including an ice
120 rink, splash pad, and stage. Plans are nearly complete as we work to finalize the budget
121 for council approval and then submit designs to Planning Commission in the next few
122 months.

123
124 The RDA also assisted with the creation of the new Blue Spring Business Park on 600
125 West and 1000 North with an incentive to help cover part of the cost of new road and
126 utility infrastructure. The project will be a welcome benefit for our tax base. We have
127 also assisted a number of businesses that are expanding or moving to Logan.

128
129 A new library is underway and will also be an exciting part of the downtown renovation.
130 Council approved funding for the design and construction drawings, and we anticipate
131 construction will begin by December 2021. We will demolish the existing library to make
132 way for a new three-story building which will better serve our 700 daily patrons (at least
133 pre-Covid) and the 238 community groups who meet there. By building up, we will gain

134 additional parking and more plaza space for the library. During Covid, our staff was
135 creative and hardworking, finding new ways to serve patrons with curbside pickup – staff
136 walked outside over 12,000 times to safely deliver materials. That protocol will help
137 bridge the gap while the old library is torn down and the new building is constructed.
138 While they were closed, staff provided online storytime and programming, and went
139 through the entire collection to purge old and dated material, and install a new
140 electronic tracking system in each item, all needed steps to move our library forward into
141 the 21st Century.

142
143 The Community Development Department helps our city grow (and we have seen a
144 building boom this year despite Covid) in an orderly and safe manner as they review
145 plans and developments, issue building permits and do inspections, enforce when there
146 are problems with over-occupancy or run-down properties, manage regular CDBG funds
147 to improve our community as well as extra CARES funds. They have also assisted with
148 our downtown efforts and have helped move toward our goals of remaking historic
149 downtown as a destination for living, working, dining, art and entertainment, and
150 activity. They recently completed a Public Art Master Plan which will come to life in our
151 downtown. The Center Block Plaza will help provide a cohesive and walkable
152 downtown, connecting our historic landmarks of the Eccles Theatre, renovated Center
153 Street, Tabernacle and Courthouse. We strive to strengthen our community with good
154 urban planning, enhanced walkability, and a vibrant downtown which will draw new
155 homeowners to fix up, reside in, and stabilize our older core neighborhoods close to
156 downtown. We need to densify downtown housing to prevent sprawl, preserve our rural
157 farmland, help air quality, provide affordable housing and utilize existing infrastructure.

158
159 A third key goal is to upgrade aging infrastructure as well as investing in new. We have
160 continued to do that in a number of departments, some of which I've already mentioned.
161 The Environmental Department has begun partial closure of the Logan Landfill and is
162 managing the construction of the new \$150M wastewater treatment plant which is on
163 budget and on track to be completed in October, followed by startup testing activities.
164 This plant will serve the majority of our valley for many years in the future and is a
165 critical piece of infrastructure for Logan and its neighbors. At the request of other cities
166 for which we provide garbage collection, we will be expanding our green waste program
167 this year to meet those needs. This is a partnership with the forestry department and
168 collections.

169
170 Our Light and Power department has been extremely busy and very productive providing
171 new and upgraded service to keep up with city growth and new construction. They have
172 ordered the equipment to construct two new substations this year, a significant and
173 needed infrastructure addition. The city withdrew from the proposed UAAMPS Small
174 Scale Nuclear project, but the department continues to be proactive in examining options
175 for future clean power needs, including a study phase with UAMPS for 5MW of power
176 from a plant that will combine solar and batteries.

178 The city also joined the Utah Climate and Clean Air Compact, a group of nonpartisan
179 business, city, religious and non-profit leaders who approach those challenges using the
180 Utah Roadmap, developed by the Kem C. Gardner Institute. Public works have replaced
181 8 out of 10 vehicles as part of a \$1.5M Targeted Air Shed Grant, and the remaining two
182 will be done this year, making our fleet cleaner for the environment.

183
184 Our Public Works Department includes Engineering, Water & Sewer, Streets &
185 Stormwater, Facilities, GIS, Fleets, and Shops. They support projects across the city,
186 including downtown, the library construction, parks and trail projects, CDBG projects,
187 as well as repairing and building new sidewalks.

188
189 Water infrastructure improvements include upgraded valves and pumps at the city
190 culinary tank site and building reserves for a new water storage tank in a few years. The
191 new vac truck purchased last year has allowed for enhanced inspection and sealing of
192 sewer lines to prevent infiltration, again enhancing the life of sewer infrastructure.

193
194 A very large and complicated infrastructure project was the intersection of 1400 North
195 and 600 West. In addition to the street and intersection improvements, it added new
196 sewer infrastructure for that part of town and made significant stormwater
197 improvements. Because it crosses the Union Pacific right of way, the department worked
198 with the UP for over four years to plan the intersection, only to have them change the
199 rules for the maintenance agreement at the last minute. That is really frustrating, and the
200 rules are completely unreasonable. We certainly don't like resorting to litigation, but
201 sometimes that's the only option. UP's demands will affect the entire state, and UDOT
202 and the Attorney General's office is supporting our efforts. Once that is resolved, we can
203 open the full width of the intersection across the tracks. In the meantime, Public Works
204 has created temporary solutions to make it usable.

205
206 The engineering department also completed the design for the new bridge at 100 West
207 and 600 South, and they received a Council of Governments grant for \$2.5M to match the
208 city's \$2.3M investment in this important infrastructure. Construction should begin no
209 later than 2023. They are also designing and applying for a UDOT grant for a potential
210 tunnel under Main Street at 600 South that would connect the trail system on both sides
211 of Main Street, a goal we are working towards if we can get funding.

212
213 The Parks & Recreation Department was significantly impacted by Covid, with many
214 disappointing cancellations and closures. The Rec Center has been closed or had
215 reduced programming for much of the year. The Aquatic Center was closed all season –
216 although the silver lining there is it allowed us to complete much-needed capital
217 improvements – which require warm weather to complete -- before the 20th anniversary
218 next year. The Fireworks and 24th of July events were canceled for Covid safety
219 reasons, as were many of the Recreation programs. Our playgrounds were even closed
220 for a while. We are still suffering some of those cancellations but hope next season will
221 be better. The bright spot is our parks and trails provided much needed recreational
222 infrastructure for our citizens! Usage experienced a dramatic uptick, as folks enjoyed

the ability to get outdoors and recreate safely. The other really good news is golfers returned in droves to the Logan River Golf Course. Our staff built on other improvements they made last year and worked hard to make golf safe during the pandemic and were even able to put funds into the reserve account for future improvements.

Parks completed the 1700 South Park and walking trail in the Logan Soccer Complex, improvements funded in part with grants from county RAPZ tax and the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The Legal Department supports all city departments and handles our risk management program. With the continued efforts of all our employees, Logan has gone over two years without a lost-time accident and continues to be 20% lower than other Municipalities in the state in loss exposure, providing substantial savings on our insurance premiums. Last year our worker's comp premium decreased by nearly \$35,000.

The City Recorder's Office helps keep us on track by handling a multitude of documents in an extremely organized and professional way. 2021 is a municipal election year with the term of Mayor and two council seats on the ballot, and the Recorder will run the city election.

Our HR department has had a busy year staying up to date on CARES protocol and assisting our 435 employees.

I mentioned our police earlier, and the way our chiefs handled the protests by listening to the demonstrators. It was a tough year for police officers, as a few bad officers across the nation caused much scrutiny for police. Our police team immediately reviewed city Use of Force policies, and I'm pleased to report we had to adjust very little to be in compliance with best practices. We made some minor revisions, as well as added further training in de-escalation tactics. Our officers also have improved options, tools, and training for non-lethal force, and each have a daily training module they complete, highlighting current topics, as well as the 40 hours each officer is required to train annually to recertify. All on top of their routine duties to keep our community safe. Our police officers respond to difficult and traumatic situations on a regular basis, and they have implemented Critical Incident Stress Management Training to help officers deal with the ongoing effects of those events.

Our Fire and EMS department wrapped up the CCEMS agreement, which given the growth of the county and the significant increase in county EMS calls, no longer worked well for Logan Citizens. They consolidated service with North Logan, providing more depth of fire and EMS service for both communities. We now have fair and equitable contracts with North Logan, Providence, River Heights, and with the County to cover College and Young Ward and Logan Canyon. Fire also applied for and received a clean-air grant toward three new fire engines and received grants for additional personnel. It is a challenge to recruit paramedics, so they sent six employees to Paramedic School,

which will help our ranks significantly. Their crews constantly train and improve their skills in a variety of ways to be prepared to serve our community. It can be a tough job to respond to accidents and fires, and they have also implemented a Critical Incident Stress Management Training for crews and families as we need to keep our first responders both physically fit and mentally healthy in their challenging world.

In summary, we have worked hard to serve our citizens in this difficult year. I know we all hoped when the calendar changed to 2021 there would be a magical improvement. Of course, things are improving as the vaccines are given to the population over the next months, but the challenges have not all gone away as we must still wear masks, social distance, and limit much of what we typically do – especially for fun!

However, I'd like to finish by listing the good things I've noted over the past year, and what I enjoy about this job.

I am grateful for the work ethic and determination that comes from the pioneer heritage in our valley. When life is difficult, we just keep doing our best day by day – both employees and citizens.

I am grateful for our neat and clean city, our beautiful mountains and valley, and our wonderful recreational opportunities close by that have helped keep us sane during the pandemic.

I am so grateful for the peace and the civility that we enjoy in our valley, even if we have differing opinions. I'm grateful for the kindness, the helpfulness of our citizens who watch out for their neighbors, and our non-profit organizations that do so much good. I appreciate people who answer the call when they see a need. So many have stepped up to help others.

I am grateful for a good city council to work with and I am grateful to serve as your Mayor. Thank you for that opportunity.

Chairman M. Anderson thanked Mayor Daines for her speech and said that despite the adversity filled year that the Mayor focused on all the positive aspects that occurred during the past year. He also congratulated the Mayor for all the accomplishments that were able to be completed despite the challenges. The councilmembers concurred with this statement.

Councilmember Jensen requested more information regarding the intersection that has been compromised with Union Pacific, (railroad).

Mayor Daines explained that the intersection has been widened except for the portion directly over the railroad tracks. That is because Union Pacific is the only entity that can work on the right of way. The new intersection has been narrowed over the Union Pacific

tracks until the issue is resolved. The Union Pacific's demands for maintenance was not realistic nor in line with state regulations.

Councilmember Jensen asked for further clarification if the intersection was signalized.

Mayor Daines replied that was indeed correct, but the signal was not able to function to its full potential until the situation is resolved.

Meeting Minutes. Minutes of the Council meeting held on January 19, 2021, were reviewed and approved with no corrections.

Meeting Agenda. Chairman M. Anderson announced there is one public hearing scheduled for tonight's Council meeting.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember A. Anderson seconded by Vice Chair Simmonds to approve the January 19, 2021 minutes and approve tonight's agenda. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting Schedule. Chairman M. Anderson announced that regular Council meetings are held on the first and third Tuesdays of the month at 5:30 pm. The next regular Council meeting is Tuesday, February 16, 2021.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FOR MAYOR AND COUNCIL:

Chairman M. Anderson explained that the Questions and Comments portion of the agenda is suspended until we can once again have in-person meetings. In the meantime, comments can be emailed to City Recorder Teresa Harris teresa.harris@loganutah.org, who will distribute them to the Mayor and Councilmembers.

MAYOR/STAFF REPORTS:

Ratification of Human Resource Director – Mayor Daines

Mayor Daines asked the Council for ratification to appoint Ambrie Darley as the new Human Resource Director for the City of Logan. Ambrie will be replacing Greg Cox who is retiring on March 15, 2021.

ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair Simmonds seconded by Councilmember A. Anderson to approve ratification of Ambrie Darley as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Ambrie Darley thanked the Council for the ratification. She truly enjoys working for the city and the vast opportunities it offers. She has been with Logan City for nine years in the finance department as head of payroll.

Board Appointments (Public Arts Advisory Board) – Mayor Daines

Mayor Daines asked the Council for ratification to appoint Wendi Hassan, Katie Lee-Koven, Marissa Vigneault, Andi Jorgensen, Maria Ellen Huebner, Mark Koven, Caroline Lavoie, and Bruce Crane to serve on the Public Arts Advisory Board.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Jensen seconded by Vice Chair Simmonds to approve ratification of Wendi Hassan, Katie Lee-Koven, Marissa Vigneault, Andi Jorgensen, Maria Ellen Huebner, Mark Koven, Caroline Lavoie, and Bruce Crane as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

SR-30 Project Update – Megan Jacques, Avenue Consultants in conjunction with UDOT

Dave Adamson Project Manager for the SR-30 Project for UDOT spoke on behalf of Megan Jacques, who was not in attendance. Mr. Adamson gave a project update and stated the designs are ready, but at present, they are dealing with regulatory hurdles. They are expecting to advertise the project a year from now and begin construction next spring or summer. (Tiffany Carlson, an Avenue Consultant provided a PowerPoint presentation for the council and public to view.)

UDOT is designing improvements to SR-30 from SR-23 to 10th West. The improvements to SR-30 will address traffic congestion, improve safety, and provide pedestrian and bicycle facilities. In addition, it will provide a trail on the south side of the road and a paved asphalt trail for bicycles.

The portion of the project that is still left open is the SR-23 Intersection. The intersection can be left as is or the other option will involve an RCUT (Restricted Crossing U-Turn). Vehicles on SR-23 would be prohibited from turning left or traveling straight through the SR-30 intersection. Instead, vehicles on the SR-23 will turn onto SR-30 and do a legal U-turn at the nearby crossover. Vehicles continuing straight on SR-30 or making a right turn from SR-30 onto SR-23 will not be impacted.

The suggestion is based on the safety concern with the current SR-23 Intersection as a vehicle driving southbound would have to cross through the entire intersection to cross to the other side. While studies for the RCUT that show a tremendous improvement in safety rather than the current solution of a mere stop sign at the intersection.

The UDOT choose the RCUT as the best option for this intersection to improve vehicle safety, increase efficiency, reduce wait times, improve cost-effectiveness, and reduce surrounding impacts.

They have already met with the County Council and several other smaller city councils to discuss and receive input. UDOT understands that this a new traffic intersection and that it could make some hesitant. Without local support, there is no purpose in moving forward.

402 Councilmember A. Anderson asked if there was an increased cost with the RCUT
403 Intersection.
404
405 Mr. Adamson replied that there would a slight increase, but nothing significant. However,
406 the safety improvements are well worth it.
407
408 Councilmember Jensen asked how a left turn to go south would work.
409
410 Mr. Adamson proceeded to explain via the RCUT Design Concept.
411
412 Vice-Chair Simmonds asked if the RCUT was semi-friendly.
413
414 Mr. Adamson answered that the intersection would be semi-friendly and has been radius
415 sized for all sorts of rural farm equipment to traverse across the road.
416
417 Councilmember Jensen asked if there would be medians to protect vehicles that would
418 perform the U-Turn via the RCUT.
419
420 Mr. Adamson replied that there in fact would be medians to prevent any vehicle from
421 traversing straight across the lanes, a barrier to be precise.
422
423 Mayor Daines had two specific questions regarding RCUT. If the design had been used
424 elsewhere successfully, and if there had been an educational campaign for the public to
425 learn about the proposed intersection.
426
427 Mr. Adamson replied that a similar intersection has been created in Layton. Four of these
428 RCUT intersections were placed near the Layton Mall area. As a result, the traffic flow is
429 steady and is much safer. The problem with a traditional intersection on a busy road is
430 that it creates many conflict points, safety hazards, and slows the flow of traffic. An
431 RCUT intersection spreads vehicle movement and is far more efficient. In Layton, the
432 intersection was created with efficiency in mind, but here it would primarily be for safety
433 concerns.
434
435 Mayor Daines clearly said that if the RCUT intersection improves safety then she would
436 approve the project suggestion contingent upon an educational campaign for the public.
437
438 Mr. Adamson confirmed that indeed would be the case. Part of the UDOT educational
439 campaign is educational videos and links to distribute on the web. Including linking them
440 to the city website to understand how to drive and make u-turns.
441
442 Councilmember A. Anderson asked what the current estimated time frame was or were
443 there still more city councils to visit.
444
445

Mr. Adamson answered that they had already spoken to the Cache County Council, who gave tentative approval of the RCUT intersection to improve the safety of the public. There is still a few smaller City Council's left to speak to, but overall, there was a favorable opinion.

Miss Carlson interrupted to clarify the quote of the Cache County Council member that Mr. Adamson misquoted. "Safety over Convenience."

Vice-Chair Simmonds agreed with the sentiments of the quote as she reiterated the present intersection had the potential to be the scene of a very tragic occurrence. Any intersection that can be created to improve the safety of the public.

Councilmember Jensen stated that he would approve or support the proposed intersection/project.

Chairman M. Anderson clarified that the council gave their approval of the proposed intersection/project especially based on the fact of safety and traffic convivence.

Mr. Adamson added that part of the project is to light up the intersection at night to increase the safety.

Councilmember López asked if the two lanes on SR-30 started on 10th West.

Miss Carlson answered the question via the visual map.

Vice Chair Simmonds pointed out that there are some concerns regarding the construction of the project on wetlands. There cannot be a wider road without a large increase in costs.

Mr. Adamson replied that he was not directly involved with the environmental portion as that is related to another project manager. However, with the current projections and going through the environmental process that section of road through the wetlands did not merit beyond a two-lane highway.

Vice Chair Simmonds asked if the project would commence east going west or west going east.

Mr. Adamson responded that it would be up to the contractor's discretion. UDOT gives the contractors certain parameters to work with, and it is up to the contractors to set their schedule accordingly. He did point out that wetlands have settlement issues having extremely poor soil. It takes some time for the soil to settle and the contractor will likely begin by pouring soil out to form the firm settlement for the road to be constructed on top of first.

Vice-Chair Simmonds asked if the road would be open during the entire construction process.

Mr. Adamson replied that the road would be open during the entire construction process with exceptions. Typically, those are closures during the night or are one-day closures and when those closures do occur, they will be publicized before closing the road.

Councilmember Jensen asked for clarification on the multi-use recreational trail.

Mr. Adamson answered that the trails went from east to west in both directions and are separated from the road. Although through the city portion of the trail, it will be a sidewalk as to not impact businesses.

Councilmember Jensen asked for further explanation on what a buffered bike lane would be.

Mr. Adamson explained that there will be actual bike lanes on the pavement on the shoulder and are for the more aggressive bicyclists, while the multi-use trail is more for jogging, hiking, slower bicyclists, etc.

Councilmember López asked how many miles of trail there would be.

Mr. Adamson answered that roughly it would be about 7 miles of trails. In addition, by the intersection of SR-23, there will be a pedestrian undercrossing. He thanked the Council for their time and allowing him to make his presentation.

No further Mayor/Staff Reports were presented.

COUNCIL BUSINESS:

Planning Commission Update – Vice-Chair Simmonds

Vice Chair Simmonds reported that the Planning Commission met last Thursday, January 28, 2021. They reviewed two projects; one was a proposal for a new short-term trailer park across from the Zollinger property. The proposal was continued until March with no decision made. The other project was a proposal to build 3 restaurant pads in front of the new managed building that has been completed on South Main. The design drawings suggested that it would be an excellent addition to Main Street with project approval.

Councilmember A. Anderson gave an update on the Homeless Coordinating Council. There is not yet a final count of the point in time count that took place on January 28th. In addition to the count, service agencies may contribute numbers and surveys as they interact with social service agencies. Those reports are still pending, but in a surprising turn of events, the numbers are down due to COVID-19 and because homeless shelters or similar types of shelters are closed this year and it has been difficult to find and complete

a count. An example that she gave to the Council was of misted car windows, garage doors open a crack, and storage units that have a removed lock. She encouraged everyone to open their eyes a bit more to see those members of the community that are in desperate need (of shelter).

Chairman M. Anderson thanked the Council for their updates.

Voter District Committee Report – Vice-Chair Simmonds

Vice Chair Simmonds reported on the Voter District Committee which was appointed last January. They had several in-person meetings and virtual meetings and originally the committee was asked to provide the current condition, a historical overview, future impact population growth or population shifts, the legal requirements, and expenses associated with any changes to the election process, including Conesus and minority comments which is listed in the at the beginning of the report and has been provided to the Council.

Chairman M. Anderson asked Councilmember A. Anderson to relay her original intent of the Voter District Committee.

Councilmember A. Anderson explained that the original intent was to actively include two members of the City Council, as well as the Assistant City Attorney Craig Carlston and City Recorder Teresa Harris, who runs the City Elections. The hope was that the committee would gather information and present a report to the Council on their findings of voter districts. However, she expressed concern and wished to underline the term "underrepresented," which is repeatedly used throughout the report the committee presented to the Council. She found that term rather troubling as she believes that all the citizens of the City are equally represented by all five council members no matter their differences.

Chairman M. Anderson interjected that he has taken the liberty to invite Professor Damon Cann, (a Professor at USU in Political Science with a specialty in voting systems) to present at the next council meeting. Professor Cann will go through the pros and cons of voting districts and will answer questions the Council might have.

Councilmember Jensen pointed out that written in the report it is recognized that it would not be prudent for changes to be implemented for the upcoming election, but rather after the release of the Census results. A time frame suggestion was that of 2 ½ years, 2023. Given the severity of the decision, he believes it is prudent to act accordingly.

Chairman M. Anderson agreed with that sentiment and asked that the councilmembers carefully study the report and to ask questions during Professor Cann's presentation.

Councilmember López asked if there could be more research added to the report to the point of comparing voting systems. His primary concern was if the participation in the

voting district would improve or deteriorate once the voting changes were implemented. It is easy to think that there is only one correct way, and though he believes in representation it is far more prudent to make the best-informed decision rather than making a decision for the sake of it.

Vice Chair Simmonds agreed with Councilmember López's sentiments and emphasized the word, participation. Participation was an issue in different areas of the city. Some areas of the city are consistent voters and some areas are not.

Chairman M. Anderson added to that statement and said that may be a topic that needs to be discussed especially how to boost voting participation in various parts of the city and the entire city.

Voter District Committee - Final Report

Background

Beginning in 1987 Logan used a declared seat voting system for electing its 5 council members. In 2008, this system was changed to a different type of at large system: an open contest. Rather than running for a specific seat, all candidates campaigned for a position on council, and those who received the most votes were elected to office.

In October 2019, a presentation was given by one of the council members on how the current system may be improved to facilitate broader representation. Following the presentation, the council passed a motion to form a citizen committee to evaluate the current open-seat voting system as well as explore other potential alternatives, such as a district-based system.

In March 2020, under the direction of the council chair, a committee of 6 citizen volunteers, each representing a geographic area (as defined by elementary school boundaries), was appointed to review the impact of the open seat voting system and examine whether or not a change would be warranted.

Summary of Findings

Since the at-large, open seat system was implemented in 2009:

- The total number of candidates willing to run has decreased, despite an overall increase in population*
- Although the majority of Logan residents live on the west side of Logan, the council has never had more than one elected official at a time residing in this geographic area*
- Just 2 of the 6 neighborhoods (Hillcrest/Wilson) have produced double the*

number of candidates than the other 4 neighborhoods combined. These 2 neighborhoods are the wealthiest, least ethnically diverse, and have the highest percentage of owner-occupied housing.

- Major disparities exist between certain neighborhoods. For example:
 - Hillcrest median income is \$80k; Adams is \$26k
 - Hillcrest has a 1% Latino population; Woodruff has a 28% Latino population
 - Hillcrest is 90% owner-occupied; Bridger is 27% owner-occupied

Consensus Opinion

Of the 6 neighborhood representatives, Wilson, Woodruff, Ellis, Adams, and Bridger recommend the city move away from the current at-large system toward a district-based system, similar to the systems used by the local school boards, county council, Cache water district, state house of representatives, and so forth.

The supermajority (5-1) of the committee is of the opinion that implementing this change would facilitate broader representation. Doing so would come at no additional cost to the city and will increase the likelihood that the composition of the council more accurately reflects the city's population, a population that is expected to grow and become more diverse as time goes on.

Dissenting Opinion

The representative from Hillcrest felt a district-based system has the potential to produce a smaller candidate pool which could translate to a candidate running unopposed in their district. With a typical voter turnout of ~24% in municipal elections, a district candidate could get elected with votes measured in the hundreds rather than the thousands, and all candidates should have to garner support from a substantial number of voters in order to earn a spot on the council. Finally, a district-based system would result in residents being deprived of the opportunity to elect all 5 city council members.

Implementation

The committee did not come to a consensus on whether the council should implement a mixed system or all-district system, but generally agree there should be a minimum of 3 district seats. Whether the system is 3 districts, 2 at-large or 4 districts, and 1 at-large seat, having at least one at-large seat could ensure at least one council member is not parochial to a particular neighborhood and should be taken into consideration.

Timing

The committee recommends no further delay in voting to change the system, with implementation no later than the 2023 municipal election. While there may be

sufficient time to implement voter districts for the 2021 election, as only 2 council members seats will be up for re-election, the committee is empathetic to the potential redundancy of work that may be created from re-drawing boundaries based on updated population data provided by the 2020 census, expected to be released in the fall of 2021.

Management

As gerrymandering is a potential concern when mapping out districts, the committee recommends district boundaries be drawn (or re-drawn) by a governing body similar to this committee, composed of a representative from each neighborhood, independent of sitting council members.

Conclusion

The complete list of pros and cons are outlined in the report. The majority concluded the pros of districting outweigh the cons. All members agreed greater efforts should be made to increase civic participation and voter turnout.

Methodology

The committee had the opportunity to review the following information:

- 20 years of historical voting data
- Costs associated with making a change
- Legal requirements
- Census demographic data including income, ethnicity, housing dynamic (owner-occupied vs renter occupied)
- Informal interviews with neighborhood residents
- A comparison to other cities in Utah with similar population sizes
- A presentation from North Logan mayor and political science professor Damon Cann

No further Council Business items were presented.

ACTION ITEMS: Chairman M. Anderson explained due to meeting restrictions because of COVID-19 precautions, there were two options for those wanting to make a public comment:

1. Email comments to teresa.harris@loganutah.org, who distributed them to the Mayor and Councilmembers. Although you may send email questions and comments during the public hearing portion of the meeting, to guarantee they will be distributed to the Council before the meeting, submit them by Monday, January 18 at 5:00 p.m.

2. Join the meeting via ZOOM Webinar ID: 828 2948 1740. A host will monitor the online meeting. When we get to the agenda item where you wish to comment, use the “Raise your Hand” feature to indicate you want to speak, and the host/or Chair will recognize you in turn. As always, comments are limited to three minutes per person. ***NOTE: Facebook Live comments are not part of the official meeting or public comment.

ACTION ITEM:

PUBLIC HEARING - Budget Adjustment FY 2020-2021 appropriating: \$392 additional funding the Communications Center received from the State of Utah for the FY2021 grant for medical-related training for personnel; \$128,460 funds for fire wildland and standby reimbursements; \$16,500 police rolling stock reserves for the purchase of a replacement vehicle – Resolution 21-07

At the January 19, 2021, Council meeting, Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustments. (Finance Director Richard Anderson was excused from tonight’s Council meeting.)

Assistant Finance Director Rueben Nelson summarized the budget adjustment as funding from a grant and wildland fires and rolling stock reserves for the purchase of a replacement vehicle.

Councilmember Jensen asked for final confirmation on the revenue in the budget as coming from grants.

Mr. Nelson replied that the first one is a grant and the second one is reimbursement from the State of Utah for wildfires. With the last amount of \$16,500 coming from internal reserves.

Chairman M. Anderson opened the meeting to a public hearing.

There were no comments and Chairman M. Anderson closed the public hearing.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Jensen seconded by Councilmember A. Anderson to approve Resolution 21-07 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

WORKSHOP ITEMS:

Consideration of a proposed resolution approving the Program Year 2019 Consolidate Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) for the receipt of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds – Resolution 21-05 – Mike DeSimone, Community Development Director

Community Development Director Mike DeSimone addressed the Council regarding the proposed resolution.

The Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) reviews the progress of the City's 2019 Annual Action Plan (AAP). Logan City received \$471,651 in CDBG funds for Program Year 2019. The 2019 AAP is the first Annual Action Plan for the Five-year Consolidated Plan (2019-2023). The main objectives of the Consolidated Plan and the 2019 AAP are: Invest in infrastructure projects in neighborhoods with eligible low/moderate-income (LMI) areas (40%). Invest in the remediation of access and mobility barriers in all neighborhoods (10%). Sustain community needs that support LMI residents of Logan (30%).

Infrastructure Projects approved & completed during PY2019 were the Three Pointe Avenue & Southwest St. Sidewalk as well as Boulevard-USU Tunnel Trail. The Three-Point & Southwest St. Sidewalk added: a sidewalk, curb, and a gutter; 4 new Ada ramps; 11,335 SF landscaping restoration; 9,834 SF of new asphalt; benefiting 6,205 residents with 3,4440 (55%) are LMI; a total project cost of \$259,443. The Boulevard-USU Tunnel Trail was an 8' wide multi-use trail along 800' of 4th North linking 6th East & the Boulevard with the USU tunnel. Benefitted 6,950 residents of which 5,070 (70%) are LMI with a project cost of \$30,000.

Remediation of Access & Mobility Barriers approved & completed during PY2019 were Lundstrom Park ADA Corners & Sidewalk, and Audible Traffic Signals. Lundstrom Park ADA Corners added 500' of New Sidewalk on either side. An area identified in the Access & Mobility Plan with a project cost of \$15,000. Audible Traffic Signals installation at two prioritized intersections: 200 N 100 E & 1400 N 400 E. Persons with a disability account for nearly 10% of Logan's population and with a project cost of \$12,000.

Community Needs Projects approved & completed during PY2019 were Whitter Center Playground Flooring & Family Place Outdoor Lighting/Security Cameras. The Whittier Center Playground Flooring was replaced with rubber tile in the "tot" play area of the outdoor playground area. The project qualifies as a presumed benefit by remediating access and mobility barriers for a person with disabilities in a specified geographic area with at least 50% LMI residents with a project cost of \$40,000.

Family Place Outdoor Lighting & Security Cameras, there was the installation of three security cameras and outdoor lighting around the outdoor court area. Benefits 1056 LMI residents with a project cost of \$17,000.

Program Administration & Planning completed during 2019 for Program Administration PY2019 is \$83,271 & for Public Arts Master Plan is \$23,000.

Councilmember López inquired further regarding the Lundstrom Park ADA Corners. For clarification purposes, he asked if each of the four corners roughly cost \$4,000.

Mr. DeSimone replied that it depends on what is required in the roadway from a drainage and grading perspective. Generally, for 4 corners, they average about \$5,000 each but it depends on the market and for the city, they are slowly ticking off improvements bit by bit.

Vice Chair Simmonds asked if the corners are \$5,000 how much is a linear foot of sidewalk.

Mr. DeSimone replied that he is not certain but based on the Three-Point & Southwest sidewalk they installed 2,267 ft of the sidewalk, curb, gutter for \$259,443. It depends on the area because a lot of these areas do not have sidewalks, to begin with, are more difficult to create, therefore more expensive. He said that Paul Lindhart, Director of Public Works would be more familiar with the exact costs.

Vice Chair Simmonds commented that she was impressed with the community outreach for the Three-Point project and communicating to those that would be affected.

Councilmember López asked if city employees complete these projects or if it is via contractors.

Mr. DeSimone answered that it was both. For any city project, they attempt using city crews as much as they can, but in some cases, they simply need to contract it out, it just depends on the scope of the work.

Councilmember Jensen asked regarding the Whittier Center, if the project had completed the entire playground area or only a portion.

Mr. DeSimone responded that only half of the Whittier Center playground area was completed, while the other half requires further funding. The neighborhood will likely return at some point for fundraising efforts to complete the other half.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked if the playground by the old Logan High South Campus had been completed during last year's CAPER.

Mr. DeSimone responded that it was not during last year's CAPER but occurred at least two years ago.

The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the February 16, 2021 council meeting.

Consideration of a proposed ordinance amending Chapters 17.14 Public Zone Uses and 17.62 Definitions – Ordinance 21-02 – Russ Holley, Planner

Planner Russ Holley addressed the Council regarding the proposed ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend **denial** to the Municipal Council for the RV Park Occupancy Code Amendment.

REQUEST

The proponent is requesting to amend the land use table for the Public (PUB) and Recreation (REC) zones in the Land Development Code (LDC) to conditionally permit long term RV Park occupancy within the REC zone. The applicant also proposes to amend the definition section of the LDC concerning RV Park occupancy. The current Land Use Table only allows short term RV Parks and defines those as less than 30 days in duration for recreation or vacation purposes. This request proposes to add a definition for long term RV Parks and define them as 90 consecutive day stays with the option to clean up and move to another slot within the park for subsequent 90-day stays.

This amendment request is associated with a proposed new RV Park and rezoning application from COM to REC for approximately 7.87 acres (PC #20-040) located near 2000 South and 800 West.

Land Use	Zones	
	PUB	REC
Outdoor Recreation and Entertainment	C	C
Golf course	C	C
RV Parks short term occupancy (less than 30 calendar days)	N	C
RV Parks long term occupancy (more than 30 but less than 90 days)	N	C
Tent campground	N	C
Miniature golf course and accessory recreation	N	C

Figure 1 shows the proposed code language addition in red ink

a clubhouse, dining and snack bars, pro shop, and practice facilities.

“RV Park, Short-Term” means any lot or parcel of land upon which a site is located, established, or maintained for occupancy by recreational vehicles for a fee as temporary living quarters for recreation or vacation purposes, for a period not to exceed ~~seven~~ thirty (30) days.

“RV Park, Long-Term” means any lot or parcel of land upon which a site is located, established, or maintained for occupancy by recreational vehicles ~~for a fee as temporary living quarters for recreation or vacation purposes, for a period longer than seven days.~~ Patrons on an RV Park, Long Term, may stay up to 90 consecutive days. After 90 consecutive days, patrons may elect to clean up their space and move to a different space within the park for subsequent 90 day stays.

“Non-vehicle Camping (Tents) in RV Park” means a designated area within a Recreational Vehicle Park specifically established for occupancy by people with tents for sleeping and vacation purposes.

“Tent Campground” means any lot or parcel of land upon which a site is located, established, or maintained for occupancy by people with tents for a fee for temporary vacation and recreational purposes.

Figure 2 shows the proposed code amendment struck out in black ink and underlined in red ink

GENERAL PLAN

The adopted Logan City General Plan (2008) Chapter 3.13 outlines REC land use within the city. It mentions RV Parks and specifically states that they should prohibit long-term residential land uses.

Recreation (REC) lands are primarily recreation and park facilities. They are typically publicly owned but may also include privately-owned recreation facilities such as campgrounds, golf courses, and RV parks (long-term residential use is prohibited). This district includes both active and passive recreation (ball fields as well as areas for walking and sitting). The REC designation is a companion district to the Gateway District in that future public open space in gateways may be designated Recreation.

LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE

The LDC 17.13.030 describes the purpose of the REC zone and how these areas benefit the citizens of Logan City.

The purpose of the Recreation zone is to preserve and enhance public and private open, natural, and improved park and recreational areas, and to implement recreation and resource sustainability provisions of the General Plan. The Recreation zone is intended to be applied to publicly owned parks and recreation facilities as well as publicly owned open space. The classification may also be used conditionally for privately-owned recreation facilities, such as a golf course, recreation vehicle park, or campground.

STAFF REVIEW AND SUMMARY

The Logan City General Plan clearly states that long term residential land use for RV Parks in the REC zone is prohibited. Even if moving to another slot every 90 days, this code amendment proposal will create opportunities to accommodate long-term residential uses inside RV Parks. Staff would argue that the negative impacts of RV Parks are typically associated with long-term residential users rather than short term vacation users.

For these reasons, along with better compliance to the General Plan, the LDC was amended three years ago to eliminate long-term occupancy within RV Parks. As currently defined, RV Parks are clearly meant for vacation and recreation purposes and not for residential purposes. RV's are designed and constructed for vacation and recreation purposes and not for long term residential purposes.

Affordable housing is a real issue in the city, but RV Parks are not the best solution to that problem. Long-term RV Parks do not contribute to the local economy in the way a short-term vacation-oriented RV Park does.

RECOMMENDED FINDINGS FOR DENIAL OF THE CODE AMENDMENT

The Planning Commission bases its decision on the following findings supported in the administrative record for this project:

1. The code amendment conflicts with the Logan General Plan that states that the REC land uses are not intended for long term residential uses.
2. The code amendment would result in incompatible land uses within close proximity as REC areas are typically positioned in areas near industry or in areas not ideal for residential land use.
3. This code amendment may likely result in additional citizen complaints related to clean up/appearance associated with RV Parks.
4. Long-term residential uses in RV Parks do not contribute to the tourism and economic development in the City like short-term RV Parks do.

On January 14, 2021, the Planning Commission recommended the Municipal Council **approve** the RV Park Occupancy Code Amendment. The Planning Commission amended the original proposal by the applicant from multiple 90 days stay options to no more than 90 days maximum (7-0).

Planner Russ Holley explained that McKay Winkle submitted the first code amendment application in October, which was denied. The proposal was brought before the Planning Commission on January 14, 2021, and the Planning Commission recommended a single 90-day maximum without the option of a multiple stay at an RV Park.

Planner Holley said also on January 14, 2021, he received an email from Stan Checkett's, and Daniel MacFarland, who is the property owner and applicant for the A-OK RV Park. Stating that they have decided to withdraw the rezone and design review permit as they are looking in a different direction.

Shortly after another email was received from McKay Winkle, who is thinking of withdrawing, but is asking for a 60-day continuance request for a possible alternative project. However, after speaking with City Attorney Kymber Housley since the ordinance is before the Council it is a policy or legislative decision at this point and the project can be continued as requested, approved, or simply denied.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked for clarification on the word terminology usage of Project in this context to be meaning code amendment. To which Planner Holley said that was correct.

Planner Holley further elaborated on the Land Development Code's definition of RV Parks. He pointed out that some of the language is carried over from the 1980's code when there were two different categories for short-term and long-term stays. When the General Plan was adopted in 2008, the General Plan made it clear that RV Parks should not be long-term stay nor for long term residential usage. RV Parks should be used for vacations or temporary oriented.

The Land Development Code similarly defined these terms, but the actual definition section retained the long-term terminology. The Planning Commission's recommendation is simply to remove the long-term definition altogether and remove the short-term as well to simply define an RV Park as a single category with, said definition being 90 days or less.

Planner Holley explained that the other change would occur on the Land Use Table for Recreation Zones (REC) which states that RV Parks are conditionally allowed in REC zones. The regulation states that short term occupancy is for 30 days or less. The proposal is to amend to 90 days or less based on the Planning Commission recommendation. It was a unanimous vote of 7-0.

Planner Holley stated that even though the applicant is not certain of continuing their project that the application for code amendment is independent of the rezone request, and the code amendment would be implemented citywide. The applicant is currently pursuing other possible ventures, but nothing certain currently, therefore the reason as to their request for a continuance.

Vice Chair Simmonds said that when the Planning Commission discussed this the request was a maximum duration of 90 days, nonrenewable, and immediate departure from the RV Park property after the 90 days.

Planner Holley replied that is correct, but there was nothing in the code that said that the lease could be terminated, and then the former resident could return after 24 hours again. However, the same can be said today as nothing is preventing an individual from doing so with the 30-day short term stay. Although the original intent for the application was a 90-day period that was indefinitely renewable. However, this was a sincere concern for staff and the Planning Commission, because when there is an indefinite long-term usage in the RV park there are incrementally complaints and negative impacts associated with those long-term stays.

Chairman M. Anderson asked if there was any data on whether Summer Citizens would elect such an option to stay longer than 30 days and was this a common occurrence.

Vice-Chair Simmonds interjected that most Summer Citizens stay on the USU campus during their time in Logan.

Chairman M. Anderson said that he was aware that was usually the case, but it was a possible avenue that a Summer Citizen might want to take advantage of and stay at an RV Park.

Planner Holley added to that statement that was also one of the original arguments of the applicant. The reason being that some citizens vacationed for longer than 30 days in the summer and the Summer Citizens are one of those groups.

Councilmember Jensen asked if there was a difference between an RV park and a mobile home park.

Planner Holley replied that a mobile home park is a residence designed to be a permanent home and the construction of the mobile home is quite different. The wheels are removed, and the mobile home is fastened to the ground with a series of anchors and a foundation system. While an RV park, while there is still a mobile vehicle that can be moved around, there is also different zoning for a mobile home park vs. that of an RV park.

Councilmember Jensen said that he was concerned that it might affect mobile home parks, but if he understood the explanation correctly the mobile home parks would not be affected.

Planner Holley emphasized that the code amendment would only affect RV Parks and recreation zones. It would not affect any mobile home parks or any mobile home zone.

Councilmember López asked if there was any data on similar-sized cities on the limits for an RV Park.

Planner Holley replied that in their research they looked at Draper, Farmington, and Ogden. These cities were mostly short-term occupancy for RV Parks with a 30-day length of stay.

Councilmember López said that if the code amendment for the RV Park was changed to 90 days that it would be a citywide code change.

Planner Holley said that answer was correct.

Chairman M. Anderson permitted the proponent McKay Winkle to speak regarding the proposal despite it not being a public hearing.

McKay Winkle, the proponent of the application for the amendment said that there is not a current project in the works. They have pulled out from the previous parcel and are looking at other possible parcels, hence the request for a continuance.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked that from a procedural standpoint should they continue with the code amendment change or not.

Vice Chair Simmonds responded that a workshop has never been continued and the notices for the hearing have already been published. She asked whether this code change should be entertained at this current juncture in time.

Chairman M. Anderson replied that they should keep moving forward and decide at the public hearing at the next council meeting as to whether to continue or not or simply how to proceed with the proposal.

The proposed ordinance will be an action item and public hearing at the February 16, 2021 council meeting.

Consideration of a proposed ordinance amending properties in the Ellis Neighborhood (286 South 100 West) from Mixed Residential Low (MR-12) & Commercial (COM) to Mixed-Use (MU) – Ordinance 21-03 – Russ Holley

Planner Russ Holley addressed the Council regarding the proposed ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend **approval** to the Municipal Council for a Rezone of approximately 1.73 acres of property located at approx. 286 South 100 West (TIN# 02-048-0006; 0007; -0008; -0009; -0010; -0011; -0012; -0013.) from Mixed Residential Low (MR-12) and Commercial (COM) to Mixed Use (MU).

Land use adjoining the subject property

North: COM: Commercial Uses East: COM: Commercial Uses
South: MR-12: Residential Uses West: PUB: Logan High School

PROJECT

The proponent is requesting to rezone eight (8) parcels totaling 1.73 acres at approximately 286 South 100 West. The rectangular-shaped parcels sit at the southwest corner of the block adjacent to 300 South and 100 West. The properties currently contain five older residential structures and one commercial structure. This area of town is relatively flat. This is only a rezone request at this time. It is anticipated that if approvals are granted, a Design Review Permit would subsequently be submitted for a new mixed-use project.

GENERAL PLAN

The Future Land Use Plan (FLUP), adopted in 2008, identifies this property as Commercial (COM). The General Plan, a nonregulatory visioning plan, describes COM areas as being intended for retail, service, and hospitality businesses that provide employment centers and serve city-wide and regional populations. New projects should have buildings that meet high architectural standards and are constructed with quality materials. Most COM designations inside Logan City are located near the Main Street corridor north and south of downtown.

Mixed-Use Center (MUC) FLUP designations are described in the General Plan as having concentrations of commercial and office uses with residential uses integrated. MUC developments are required to have both residential and commercial components. MUCs are required to be designed in a compact dense form for people to live, work, and play within a walkable center.

LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE

The Land Development Code (LDC) regulates land uses and entitles properties with specific development allowances. The COM zone allows a wide range of commercial and light industrial uses. The COM zone (current zoning designation) is typically located along with major collector and arterial streets with large capacity utilities. Standard building heights are limited to 40' and 60% lot coverage maximums. Parking requirements are based on each commercial land use and 20% of project sites are required to be improved with open space.

The Mixed Residential Low (MR-12) zoning district (current zoning designation) permits a maximum density of 12 dwelling units per acre and building heights at 35 feet. Lot coverage is capped at 60% and a total of 30% of the site is required to be set aside for open space. New residential buildings are required to provide 2 off-street parking stalls per each dwelling unit.

The Mixed-Use (MU) zoning district (proposed zoning designation) permits a maximum density of 30 units per acre (density bonus's available for an additional 10 units per acre). A minimum amount of commercial space is required based on the overall project size. Building heights are permitted up to 58' with front setbacks at 0'-10' (min.-max.). Street frontage, a building width to property width ratio requirement, is set at a minimum of 60%. 20% of project sites are required to be improved with open space. Studio/one-bedroom residential units require 1.5 parking stalls and two-bedroom or larger units require 2 parking stalls. Commercial parking is based on individual businesses and square footage.

NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY

This area, adjacent to Logan High and a couple of blocks south of Downtown, currently contains a wide variety of nearby land uses. Single-family homes, multi-family apartments, recreation centers, schools, restaurants, gas stations, convenience stores, and hospitality lodging are all within a 600-foot radius of the site. 300 South and 100 West are identified as an existing or future collector and arterial streets on the City's Master Transportation

Plan. 100 West was recently approved for a new bridge and street improvements creating better connections to HWY 89/91 on the south end of the city. These improvements will likely result in higher traffic volumes along this north/south corridor. The existing buildings and structures within a 600-foot radius are single and two stories in height with most of the residential structures being built between 1900-1970. The surrounding commercial structures were built circa 1950-1980's.

Because there is NR zoning and single-family homes kitty-corner to the site, any future development would be subject to the LDC 17.09 height transitional requirements. These include a maximum 35-foot building height nearest to the single-family homes and then transitioning up at a ratio of two horizontal feet to every one vertical foot.

SUMMARY

The COM zoning district, indicated on the FLUP, is similar in nature to the MU zoning district. MU allows taller buildings and a density bonus for residential units but is more limited on the range of permitted commercial uses. As stated in the General Plan, compact infill and re-development near Logan's core will reduce pressure to sprawl outwards into surrounding rural areas. Infill and redevelopment are more efficient on utilities and infrastructure. Infill and re-development are less taxing on Logan City's transportation system and should result in fewer miles driven and lower amounts of pollution emitted by residents. There could be design compatibility issues with a MU development built to maximum allowances with the existing single-family homes to the west/south, but LDC transitional height requirements and Planning Commission site-specific conditions can help to mitigate any potential incompatibilities.

RECOMMENDED FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

The Planning Commission bases its decision on the following findings supported in the administrative record for this project:

1. The Logan City FLUP identifies the area as COM which is similar in nature to MU.
2. This area is positioned along 100 West, a street that is planned for expansion to the south.
3. Infill and redevelopment are more efficient ways to handle population growth and reduce pressure on rural/suburban sprawl.
4. Design incompatibles can be mitigated through Design Review processes.

On January 14, 2021, the Planning Commission recommended the Municipal Council **approve** the Renewal Rezone (7-0).

Vice-Chair Simmonds interjected that the small piece of commercial connected to MR-12 on the visual presentation listed as COM (Commercial) is only a driveway and a parking lot; she asked if the theory behind the MR-12 & COM mixed area is related to any transition between NR-6 and COM.

Mr. DeSimone replied that inference is partially correct, but that the land by the Main Street is in essence zoned as COM. Although portions of the block remain residential, the

long-term plan, (the General Plan) is that the entire block converts completely over to commercial. In the meantime, there are transitional zoning, when there is a residential area next to a high traffic zone.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked if the area is rezoned to mixed usage there is no guarantee that a project will go through.

Mr. DeSimone stated there was no project at this time, but the renewal of the rezone permitted any project that met the requirements of the MR-12 & COM. The argument is that the zoning is a catalyst to revitalize Logan's downtown area. It is supported by Logan City's Master Plan to reduce vehicle use in the downtown area and it also supports and promotes Logan City Bike & Pedestrian Plan and alternative transportation.

Councilmember A. Anderson said that she had a resident call with questions and concerns regarding the zoning. She explained to the resident the current zoning was already that of Mixed Use and was merely a renewal of the zoning area.

Vice-Chair Simmonds added to Councilmember A. Anderson's statement by saying that during Planning Commission the concern of one of the members was that the COM area would continue to spread into the single-family housing area.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked about the future land use for NR-6.

Using the visual map, Mr. DeSimone answered that the area will remain NR-6 except for a corner by the Crumb Brothers, nursery, as a mixed-use area.

Councilmember Jensen countered by saying that with the bridge at 100 West, there is a potential for increased traffic in that area due to the Main Street Study and even possible urbanization but would not affect the single-family areas.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked how much further south the density of the zone in terms of 100 West is.

Mr. DeSimone replied that the MR-12 zoning went all the way down 100 West until it reached the river on 600 South, (the church on the end of the street).

The proposed ordinance will be an action item and public hearing at the February 16, 2021 council meeting.

Consideration of a proposed resolution establishing the Woodruff Neighborhood Plan – Resolution 21-08 – Aaron Smith, Planner

Planner Aaron Smith addressed the Council regarding the proposed resolution to establish the Woodruff Neighborhood Plan and he presented the following:

Summary of Woodruff Neighborhood Plan Process

Over the last several years, Community Development has been engaged in the creation of a specific plan for the Woodruff Neighborhood. Through fits and starts, the plan has developed and is now at a state that it is ready for Municipal Council review and adoption. The plan includes multiple sections that cover a physical inventory and social inventory of the neighborhood, analysis of various areas of the neighborhood, neighborhood outreach through a workshop and survey, and the development of value statements and project recommendations for the neighborhood.

The plan was reviewed by the Planning Commission during the meetings of December 10, 2020, and January 14, 2021. The PC recommended the plan to the City Council with additional language in the plan to include a leadership opportunity for Latinx community members. That language has been added as a new recommendation in the current draft of the plan that has been provided to the Municipal Council.

Summary of the Recommendations Section of the Woodruff Plan

To help drive the analysis and recommendations of the plan, the neighborhood was broken into smaller planning areas based on similar characteristics. These areas are:

The Historic Core - The area from Main Street to 600 W.

The Highway - The corridor along Main Street and US 89/91

West Woodruff - The area from 600 W and westward

Following neighborhood input and analysis of the physical and social inventory, value statements were developed for the neighborhood. These value statements are designed to inform planning recommendations in Woodruff and serve as general statements of the desires of the neighborhood.

General Value Statements

- The high quality and availability of recreational amenities in the neighborhood.
- The open space and agrarian character of the neighborhood.
- The diversity of people that live in the neighborhood.
- Attracting families to stay long term in the neighborhood.

Historic Core Value Statements

- Walkable, pedestrian-oriented, neighborhood streets that are connected to various neighborhood assets.
- Preservation and rejuvenation of historic and aging homes.

The Highway Value Statements

- Convenient connectivity to the neighborhood.
- Improved and new access to commercial centers and nodes.
- Preserve an open, agrarian character as a community gateway.

West Woodruff Value Statements

- 1250 • Development that matches the existing character of the area.
- 1251 • Improved access to 1000 W.

1252

1253 For each value statement, specific recommendations were developed. The following
1254 recommendations are proposed for Woodruff and the associated planning areas:

1255

1256 **Woodruff Wide Recommendations**

- 1257 • Implementation of the Logan City Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan.
- 1258 • Implementation of the Blue Trail along the Logan River.
- 1259 • Develop a Logan City Open Space Plan that identifies areas for protection and
1260 includes implementation strategies.
- 1261 • Actively encourage, recruit, and invite interested Latinx community members to
1262 participate in the neighborhood planning process through participation in planning
1263 projects, such as steering committees, neighborhood councils, advisory boards,
1264 and other City administered committees and commissions, in order to cultivate
1265 community leadership opportunities.
- 1266 • Complete a Latinx outreach survey and report to understand the unique challenges
1267 and community perceptions of Logan’s largest minority group.
- 1268 • Ensure housing policies allow for a variety of housing types in the neighborhood
1269 while addressing housing affordability in the community.
- 1270 • Market housing grant programs towards the Latinx community.
- 1271 • Zone additional area in the neighborhood to NR-4.

1272

1273 **The Historic Core Recommendations**

- 1274 • Provide sidewalks and accessible crossings in areas around the fairgrounds,
1275 Willow Park, and the Aquatic Center.
- 1276 • Provide sidewalks along Park Avenue.
- 1277 • Implement traffic calming and pedestrian improvements along 100 W to mitigate
1278 traffic impacts.
- 1279 • Continue to provide housing rehabilitation assistance to residents of Logan. Use
1280 the program to target older single-family homes that are in disrepair and need
1281 upgrades.

1282

1283 **The Highway Recommendations**

- 1284 • Signalization along the south highway corridor.
- 1285 • Signalization along South Main between 400 South and 700 South.
- 1286 • Improved and new access to commercial centers and nodes.

1287

1288 **West Woodruff Recommendations**

- 1289 • Use an improved 2000 W corridor as a land-use edge that divides suburban and
1290 rural development along the western edge of Woodruff.
- 1291 • The primary land use in the western annexation area should be detached
1292 residential.
- 1293 • Create a network of connected open spaces that create a green belt open space.
- 1294 • Develop active recreation parks in West Woodruff.

1295 • Add signals along 1000 W at 200 S, 1000 S, and 1600 S.
1296
1297
1298 Planner Aaron Smith broke down the plan into five sections: Physical Inventory, (Land
1299 Use, transportation, etc.); Social Inventory, (Demographics, housing); Analysis,
1300 (Planning Areas, Growth Model); Public Participation, (Open House, Survey); &
1301 Recommendations.]
1302
1303 Councilmember A. Anderson pointed out that in the presentation that these areas
1304 connecting West Woodruff had yet to be annexed. The visual presentation was showing
1305 the possibility of what the City could do if that area was annexed.
1306
1307 Planner Smith replied that was indeed correct.
1308
1309 Councilmember Jensen asked if the sewer and lines played into the proposed plan at all
1310 for the properties being proposed in the south.
1311
1312 Planner Smith answered that he and staff looked at likely sewer water extensions
1313 combined with the already existing infrastructure. They felt that the plan was feasible at
1314 this time.
1315
1316 Councilmember A. Anderson asked as that area becomes part of Logan will it have an
1317 impact on the school district as well.
1318
1319 Vice Chair Simmonds replied that that school area belongs to Cache County unless they
1320 find a way to ask the State to change the boundaries.
1321
1322 Planner Smith said that what he did know is that area will have decent connectivity to
1323 highways and roads to ensure that it does not become an island.
1324
1325 Councilmember A. Anderson believes it is important that those communities feel a
1326 connection to the City of Logan especially if their children are attending school
1327 elsewhere. So much of what drives that sense of community is built around schools.
1328 Thereby the request for connectivity and recreation become important topics to ensure
1329 that those families feel inclusive.
1330
1331 Councilmember A. Anderson asked how the City communicated to the members of the
1332 Woodruff community regarding the public hearing that will be held for those who have
1333 an interest and wish to express their concerns. She was aware that a mass email had gone
1334 out to neighborhood groups in that area.
1335
1336 Planner Smith said that emails and notifications were sent as well.
1337
1338 Mayor Daines interjected that she had reached out to the Woodruff Neighborhood Chair.
1339

1340 Councilmember López said that considering that there is a significant amount of the
1341 Latino/Latinx population in that area he wondered if the City was considering providing
1342 Spanish translation interpretation services for the meeting.
1343
1344 Planner Smith replied that in fact had not been requested.
1345
1346 Councilmember López further inquired by asking who would need to request that to
1347 happen.
1348
1349 Planner Smith answered the individual, who would like the usage of such services would
1350 need to contact City Recorder Teresa Harris.
1351
1352 Councilmember López asked if the City could provide translation services during the
1353 next City Council meeting stating that those services would be available.
1354
1355 Mayor Daines asked for a bit more clarification on Councilmember López’s statement.
1356 She asked if what Councilmember López referred to be the actual translation at the
1357 council meeting not a notice of translation.
1358
1359 Councilmember López replied that at the hearing, yes, he would advocate for translation
1360 services. However, in any other future meeting be it requested or to permit members of
1361 the Spanish-speaking community to express their thoughts and opinions. Sometimes
1362 language barriers even limit the desire or even the attempt to express any opinions or
1363 frustrations.
1364
1365 Mayor Daines believed that she had an idea in that regard but would follow through with
1366 Councilmember López if that idea failed to find someone comfortable enough in filling
1367 that role.
1368
1369 Councilmember A. Anderson thanked Councilmember López for his idea. There is a 29%
1370 of Latinx members that live in the Woodruff community. It was a large percentage that
1371 might feel stilted.
1372
1373 Vice Chair Simmonds asked if the statistics had changed from 2019.
1374
1375 Planner Smith said that in 2019 it was 27%. The total population of the Latinx
1376 community in the neighborhood went up slightly with a possible margin of error.
1377
1378 Vice Chair Simmonds reiterated the fact that the City has a rather dynamic population
1379 throughout the city including the Latinx population. She believed that Councilmember
1380 López made an excellent point that further effort is needed to reach out and ensure that
1381 the Latinx population is included in conversations.
1382
1383 Councilmember Jensen asked what the term Latinx meant as he was somewhat unfamiliar
1384 with the word.

1385
1386 Councilmember López replied that it was a new term that was being used by the newer
1387 generations as a more inclusive non-gender specific for individuals within the
1388 community. The term is not officially accepted as of yet though the community has been
1389 historically referred to as Latino & Latinas.
1390
1391 Councilmember A. Anderson agreed as the University had been using Latinx for only the
1392 last 3 to 5 years.
1393
1394 Vice Chair Simmonds said that the term Latinx was non-gender binary.
1395
1396 Councilmember López explained that the reason for the creation of Latinx is that in
1397 Spanish the plural form of a word is always masculine even if there are females present in
1398 the group. The plural form of a word is only feminine if the group being referred to is
1399 entirely female. Therefore, to be more inclusive Latinx was born.
1400
1401 Mayor Daines interjected that Deputy City Recorder Esli Morales is bilingual and has
1402 prior translation experience. She has agreed to provide translation and will proceed
1403 accordingly.
1404
1405 Planner Smith was thanked for his presentation and was excused.
1406
1407 The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the February 16,
1408 2021 council meeting.
1409
1410 There were no further workshop items presented at tonight's council meeting.
1411
1412 **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**
1413
1414 Chairman M. Anderson briefly asked for input from the Council on whether an in-person
1415 meeting or via zoom will be held for the February 16 Council meeting. Numbers for
1416 COVID are dropping, but he still wants everyone to feel safe.
1417
1418 Councilmember A. Anderson said that because she works in health care, she has been
1419 fortunate enough to receive both doses of the vaccine. From a personal standpoint, she
1420 felt comfortable meeting in person. However, the guidelines at present are to continue to
1421 perform social distancing including wearing masks. Whatever the Chairman decides it is
1422 important to limit the number of people within City Hall.
1423
1424 Chairman M. Anderson said that he will reach out further to the councilmembers, but for
1425 the next meeting, he believes it is prudent to remain on Zoom. The hope is that by March
1426 meetings can be conducted in person once again.
1427
1428 Vice Chair Simmonds agreed that the virtual format for council meetings should be
1429 continued at least until March.

ADJOURNED. There being no further business to come before the Council, the Logan Municipal Council adjourned to a meeting of the Logan Redevelopment Agency.

The Logan Redevelopment Agency convened on Tuesday, February 2, 2021, at 7:55 pm via ZOOM Webinar at this link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82829481740> or Webinar ID: 828 2948 1740. Instructions for downloading and using ZOOM can be found at <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362193-Joining-a-Meeting>. Logan Redevelopment Agency Meetings are televised live as a public service on Channel 17 and City of Logan Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/cityoflogan>. To listen to the meeting by phone call: US: +1 669 900 9128.

In compliance with Utah Code Ann. §52-4-207, Chairman, Mark A. Anderson previously read the following determination in order to hold an electronic meeting without an anchor location:

Based on the rising cases of COVID-19 in the Bear River Health District and State Public Health Order 2020-18 'Adopting COVID-19 Transmission Area Restrictions' categorizing our county designation as a High Transmission Area, it is determined that gathering in-person for the regular City Council meeting is a risk to the health and safety of those present. According to corona.Utah.gov, people at higher risk for severe illness include: Older adults, people of all ages with certain underlying medical conditions, and pregnant people might also be at increased risk of severe illness from COVID-19. Long-standing systemic health and social inequities have put many people from racial and ethnic minority groups at increased risk of getting sick and dying from COVID-19. Given that members of the Council and community who are required to be in attendance or may choose to attend have these risk factors, a virtual meeting (without an anchor location) will be held via Zoom. Logan Municipal Council Meetings are televised live as a public service on Channel 17 and City of Logan Facebook page:

<https://www.facebook.com/cityoflogan>. To listen to the meeting by phone call: US: +1 669 900 9128

Council Members present at the beginning of the Logan Redevelopment meeting via Zoom: RDA Chairman Mark A. Anderson, RDA Vice-Chair Jeannie F. Simmonds, Councilmember Amy Z. Anderson, Councilmember Tom Jensen, and Councilmember Ernesto López. Administration present: Mayor Holly Daines, City Attorney Kymber Housley, Finance Department Rueben Nelson, Economic Development Director Kirk Jensen, City Recorder Teresa Harris, and Deputy City Recorder Esli Morales. Excused: Finance Director Richard Anderson.

ACTION ITEM:

PUBLIC HEARING - Consideration of a proposed resolution approving Agency Assistance to 300 North Main, LLC for its investment in the property located at 25/35 West 300 North in the Downtown Redevelopment Project Area – Resolution 21-06 RDA

At the January 19, 2021, Council meeting, Economic Development Director Kirk Jensen addressed the Redevelopment Agency regarding the proposed resolution. The project is located at 300 North Main in the land assembly of acquiring the northwest corner North of the police department. Two parcels were recently acquired which is 25 West 300 North, and 35 West 300 North. To revitalize this corner, the land assembly has been taking place. Eleven years ago, the City acquired a small corner piece, and more recently, within the last year, the remainder front was acquired which is the Army/Navy Building.

Besides these parcels the principles of the entity known as 300 North Main, LLC has ownership of other properties that are on the same block. The building houses the restaurant known as Fox's Pizza Den, and other businesses, (plus surfacing parking). An owner with plenty of vested interest in that block and its future.

The developer put these under contract and had to pay a premium to acquire the recent properties. Recognizing the importance of the properties in achieving redevelopment, it is proposed that the RDA mitigate by assisting and agreeing to subsidize future demolition efforts that serve the interests of the RDA to remove blight. To clarify the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Logan will make available to 300 North Main, LLC the sum of up to \$150,000 as a credit towards demolition of its building located at 25 West 300 North and the building owned by its principals located at 339 North Main Street, conditioned upon 300 North Main, LLC completing the demolition of both buildings as soon as is reasonably allowable, but no later than December 31, 2025. Only the demolition of the building located at 25 West 300 North will be required to receive reimbursement.

This agreement is further conditioned upon 300 North Main, LLC reimbursing the City for any demolition costs received from the City should it sell the property located at 25/35 West 300 North to third-party for development of the property that is not part of a larger development that includes the City property. Said condition is only applicable if the property is sold for more than \$850,000 and is sold within five years after receiving the demolition reimbursement. Furthermore, 300 North Main, LLC will give the City a "First Right of Refusal" to match bona fide offer to purchase the property during the five years after receiving the demolition reimbursement.

Kirk Jensen Economic Development Director summarized the previous presentation presented at the last council meeting. He reminded the Council of the land assembly that took place and the developer/property owner that owns Foxes Pizza Den, and all the other holdings.

Vice-Chair Simmonds asked if they owned the parcels between Main Street and 50 West.

Mr. Jensen replied not all such as KSM Music owns a parcel.

Vice Chair Simmonds stated there are roughly 4 or 5 parcel delineations.

1518
1519 Jared Nielson, owner of the project and one of the principals replied, anything that is
1520 against Main Street they own.
1521
1522 Mr. Jensen reminded the Council that the recently acquired parcels had been very
1523 difficult to contract and had to pay a premium to do so.
1524
1525 City Attorney Kymber Housley asked that Mr. Jensen clarify that the resolution applies to
1526 both the green and orange parcels on the slide presentation.
1527
1528 Mr. Jensen explained that the parcels in green and orange in acquiring various parcels,
1529 the developer had to pay an above project price, the proposal is that the Redevelopment
1530 Agency makes available to the 300 North Main, LLC a credit of \$150,000. A credit that
1531 they can employ towards demolition costs for these two properties after meeting certain
1532 conditions. He also reminded the Council that several of the structures on these parcels
1533 are listed as deficient structures on the blight analysis that was created some 20 years ago
1534 and will bring the City closer to achieving the goal of eliminating blight in the downtown
1535 area.
1536
1537 Chairman M. Anderson asked for the amount of funds that are left in the RDA.
1538
1539 Mr. Jensen replied the Downtown RDA fund has been depleted. These funds would be
1540 sourced from the RDA Reserve roughly 10.2 million dollars of which much is
1541 committed, but there are funds available to cover the proposed expenditure.
1542
1543 Chairman M. Anderson opened the meeting to a public hearing.
1544
1545 Keegan Garrity, a member of the Woodruff Neighborhood addressed the Council. His
1546 question was about the plan for the property after the demolition is complete. There are
1547 some residents like himself that are concerned that this can set a bad precedent of using
1548 the excuse of eliminating blight to allocate funds.
1549
1550 Mr. Jensen thanked Mr. Garrity for his question and replied that the City had been
1551 looking at that corner for the last 15 years since the Army building has sat vacant for 15
1552 years. The difficult part of the endeavor was the land assembly. To answer Mr. Garrity's
1553 question is the vision of a mixed-use project that would come to exist there. The
1554 satisfaction and possibility where multiple facets of ownership are being consolidated
1555 into two owners, one of which is the developer/owner to bring about a project. The area
1556 would be possibly commercial or residential and be a great addition to downtown.
1557
1558 Mayor Daines further added to Mr. Jensen's explanation by saying that eliminating blight
1559 is one of the specific usages for which RDA funds or reserves can be used and demolition
1560 is the first great step to a project. Also, the City receives more complaints about that
1561 corner than anywhere in town.
1562

1563 Vice Chair Simmonds said that the statement Mr. Jensen had used to describe the project
1564 was important. It was the next step to make aggregating to make a viable, well-done
1565 project. It is merely another step in that process.
1566

1567 Mr. Jensen said the City has been in discussions with multiple parties, and part of the
1568 downtown specific plan is procuring development. The 300 North Main LLC owns
1569 property and parcels there and whether a project is forged there with them remains to be
1570 seen.
1571

1572 Councilmember A. Anderson said there are safeguards in place that if the project does
1573 not progress, the City must be paid back or have the right of first refusal. It ticks the
1574 boxes off for blight, consolidation of property, and partnering with an
1575 existing/neighboring owner. From an RDA perspective, more than one checkbox has
1576 been checked off on how RDA funds should be used.
1577

1578 Chairman M. Anderson asked if that answered Mr. Garrity's question to which Mr.
1579 Garrity answered, yes.
1580

1581 Dr. Gail Yost, Logan resident, 261 S 100 E said she is pleased to know about the
1582 demolition that will, at last, take place to remove the blight on this corner of the City. Her
1583 concern is as to why the City does not have a code to not permit owners to allow for
1584 blight to be created like eyesores for 20 years. It just feels that owners are allowed to
1585 make money from allowing their properties to go downhill. She asked, is it possible for
1586 the City to initiate a code change to not permit property owners to allow blight which
1587 costs the city money and in terms of appearance.
1588

1589 Mayor Daines referred the question to City Attorney Kymber to answer.
1590

1591 Mr. Housley replied that his suggestion is that the public hearing continue at this time and
1592 he will respond afterwards.
1593

1594 Dr. Yost said she would just like for the City to work not necessarily to punish owners,
1595 but most certainly not reward them for permitting their properties to go downhill.
1596

1597 There were no further comments and Chairman M. Anderson closed the public hearing.
1598

1599 Mr. Housley readdressed the previous question of Dr. Yost and said that Mayor Daines
1600 had directly addressed that question when she came into office. The Mayor proposed an
1601 ordinance to charge owners for vacant buildings, titled the Vacant Building Ordinance. It
1602 has been in place for the last three years and is still reinforced to this day. It is tough to
1603 take for example the Leo building that was not vacant and is in active use even if it is run
1604 down including single-family homes. It is often easier said than done, but there is an
1605 ordinance on the books.
1606

1607 Mayor Daines added to Mr. Housley's statement that excluding the mentioned activities
1608 the owner can only be requested to board up the windows and they are charged a fee.
1609
1610 Councilmember A. Anderson said that as far as private residences, there were funds set
1611 aside to match for exterior improvements, but sadly a large number of homeowners were
1612 not willing to take advantage of these funds to improve their properties. The owner
1613 needed to be living on the property and it could not be a rental property. We are trying to
1614 make sure that our community reflects our pride and beauty.
1615
1616 Mr. Housley said that there is a Property Maintenance Code that is used to reinforce
1617 against single-family homes. Again, they can require basic maintenance, no broken
1618 windows, that the grass may not be longer than six inches, etc. A lot of times it just
1619 comes down to personal responsibility and taking care of the property. The City can only
1620 go so far in terms of regulations.
1621
1622 Vice Chair Simmonds said that personal property rights can still fight that in some ways.
1623
1624 Mr. Housley said that is correct.
1625
1626 **ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair Simmonds seconded by Councilmember Jensen to**
1627 **approve Resolution 21-06 RDA as presented. Motion carried unanimously.**
1628
1629 **ADJOURNED.** There being no further business to come before the Logan
1630 Redevelopment Agency, the meeting adjourned at 8:21 pm.
1631
1632
1633
1634 Esli Morales, Deputy City Recorder