

Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Municipal Council convened in regular session on Tuesday, March 2, 2021, in the Logan Municipal Council Chambers located at 290 North 100 West, Logan, Utah 84321 at 5:30 pm. Logan Municipal Council Meetings are televised live as a public service on Channel 17 and the City of Logan Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/cityoflogan> and the City of Logan YouTube channel at: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCFLPAOK5eawKS_RDBU0stRQ COVID-19 Safety and Social Distancing Protocols were followed.

Council Members present at the beginning of the meeting: Chairman Mark A. Anderson, Vice Chair Jeannie F. Simmonds, Councilmember Amy Z. Anderson, Councilmember Tom Jensen, and Councilmember Ernesto López. Administration present: Mayor Holly H. Daines, Assistant City Attorney Craig Carlston, Finance Director Richard Anderson, Economic Development Director Kirk Jensen, Community Development Director Mike DeSimone, Planner Russ Holley, Police Chief Gary Jensen, Public Works Director Paul Lindhardt, Fire Chief Brad Hannig, Parks & Recreation Director Russ Akina, City Recorder Teresa Harris and Deputy City Recorder Esli Morales. Excused: City Attorney Kymber Housley.

Chairman M. Anderson welcomed those present. There were approximately 16 in attendance at the beginning of the meeting.

OPENING CEREMONY:

Matilyn Mortensen, News Director at Utah Public Radio gave the opening ceremony on Journalism and the importance of local news. With many unprecedented events including making decisions about safety and moving forward. The previous station manager at UPR once said, "There is no Walter Cronkite to guide us anymore." Part of that is a lamentation that the world no longer has a centralized media experience. It is concerning to an extent with the rise of misinformation and how those sources can impact the perception of reality. A key fact to remember is who was telling the story.

In the past, the news was predominantly told by Caucasian members of the community, men. News in that time might have been more centralized, but the stories being told weren't as representative of the human experience. It is important to fight against misinformation, but it is exciting to live in a time where we can research and gain more understanding than we ever could have before. There is no Walter Cronkite to guide us, but that just means that we can be our own guides. It is a large responsibility, but a welcoming one with even a specialization in media literacy.

In this day and age, Miss Mortensen offered a few principles in understanding the mass of information that passes before us on a continual basis. The first principle is to PAUSE. If the news leads to a strong emotional reaction be it positive or negative. It is important to fact-check that piece of news. Misinformation relies on our emotions.

44
45 It is important to read as many sources as we can, and there are still two major
46 newspapers in the State, the Desert News, and the Salt Lake Tribune. Just locally there is
47 the Heald Journal, Cache Valley Daily, the Utah Public Radio offering a rich source of
48 news. If we take advantage of these sources, we can become that much more informed
49 and protect ourselves against misinformation.

50
51 The third is to go LOCAL. News that is closer to the source is ALWAYS better news.
52 This means read local events from YOUR community. When we see important events
53 occur in different parts of the state or country, don't rely exclusively on the national
54 media. It may take a few more clicks but go and see what the local community sees and
55 knows.

56
57 Lastly, support the Media E-Value, there are concerning media sources in our country,
58 but we still have good ones and we want to keep them here. This is work and it is not that
59 simple, but as Walter Cronkite would say, "That's the way it is." If we want to be part of
60 preserving our democracy and want to be part of a more perfect union, it is work that we
61 need to be engaged in.

62
63 **Meeting Minutes.** Minutes of the Council meeting held on February 16, 2021, were
64 reviewed and approved with no corrections.

65
66 **Meeting Agenda.** Chairman M. Anderson announced there are seven public hearings
67 scheduled for tonight's Council meeting.

68
69 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember A. Anderson seconded by Councilmember**
70 **López to approve the February 16, 2021 minutes and approve tonight's agenda.**
71 **Motion carried unanimously.**

72
73 **Meeting Schedule.** Chairman M. Anderson announced that regular Council meetings are
74 held on the first and third Tuesdays of the month at 5:30 pm. The next regular Council
75 meeting is Tuesday, March 16, 2021.

76
77 **QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FOR MAYOR AND COUNCIL:**

78
79 Chairman M. Anderson explained that the Questions and Comments portion of the
80 agenda is suspended. In the meantime, comments can be emailed to City Recorder Teresa
81 Harris teresa.harris@loganutah.org, who will distribute them to the Mayor and
82 Councilmembers.

89 **MAYOR/STAFF REPORTS:**

90
91 **Recognition of Human Resource Director Greg Cox – Mayor Daines**

92
93 Mayor Daines thanked Human Resources Director Greg Cox who will be retiring as of
94 March 19, 2021. She thanked Mr. Cox for his 15 years of excellent service to the City,
95 and his hard work and dedication to the over 400 employees of the City.

96
97 Mr. Cox expressed his appreciation to Mayor Daines and the City staff and said it had
98 been a great 15 years working at the City.
99

100 **Transportation Capital Projects Update – Paul Lindhardt, Public Works Director**

101
102 Public Works Director Paul Lindhardt addressed the Council regarding the multiple
103 ongoing capital transportation projects that are current and more prevalent. Currently,
104 they are working on updating the Master Transportation Plan. A large effort was put in
105 during the past year in virtual open houses which were more successful than initially
106 expected in both, attendance and the public feedback received. At present, they are
107 currently working on gathering and processing the data required for the update to the
108 Transportation Master Plan to present a draft version in the nearby future. Rather than
109 doing another virtual open house, they will use Facebook and other City media sites to
110 receive feedback from the public.

111
112 Councilmember A. Anderson asked for the expected date of completion for the draft.
113

114 Mr. Lindhardt replied that the draft will be up for review by late summer and completed
115 before fall. The current project that has received plenty of attention is the intersection at
116 1400 N 600 W. Last year, it took about a year and a half to reconstruct that entire
117 intersection including a traffic light and underground work, (storm drains and sewer line).
118 The project is nearly completed except for the railroad crossing, the topic of
119 disagreement. UDOT, (Utah Department of Transportation) is currently in conversation
120 with Union Pacific to address the issue and the contract regarding the annual assessment
121 of maintenance fees. UDOT hopes that Union Pacific permits the ongoing projects to be
122 permitted to continue while the discussion on fees remains in effect. Regardless of the
123 decision, the intersection is functioning and safe.

124
125 As a direct consequence of the railroad issue, large projects are being reshuffled in order:
126 1800 N 600 W is in a similar situation and will be postponed until there is a resolution,
127 100 N from Main to 200 West is the project moving forward to take the place of 1800 N
128 600 W on the project schedule. The design is nearly complete and are presently working
129 on property acquisition with a projected time frame to start this upcoming winter to
130 spring next year.

131
132 100 West from 600 South to the Highway over the Logan River, the design is nearly
133 complete. They are currently working on property acquisition as well. The City applied in

2020 for \$2.6 million dollars from COG, (Cache County Council of Governments), and was awarded the funds as part of Phase 1 of the application. They are currently with COG to determine when to apply for Phase 2 portion to fully fund that project.

UDOT is anticipating the complete rebuild of Main Street from the South “Y” to at least 1000 N. They anticipate that 2025 will be the year the project will commence. However, funding cycles have changed which may bump the project to a year or two later. They are commencing on data gathering, surveying, and design work of that project. Along with that project, most of the utilities on Main Street will be replaced. The summer downtown will be especially busy with construction.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked if by then the 100 West Project will be completed for there to be a bypass to Main Street.

Mr. Lindhardt answered that is the intent and hope for all parties. Depending on the timing of the Phase 2 application, they are anticipating a 2023 construction. Another possible project is a pedestrian underpass under Main Street at 600 South adjacent to the Logan River. A feasible study has been completed; the results are expensive but doable. They are currently working to submit a grant application to UDOT as they are in favor and support of that project. They will be applying for TIF funds and are optimistic about other funding opportunities as well. UDOT encourages the completion of this project, before the Main Street project.

Councilmember Jensen asked if the road needed to be raised or would that area be tunneled through.

Mr. Lindhardt replied that they would plan to go under since the road is driven by the bridge deck. There is not much asphalt across the bridge deck, and they do not want to add to that. UDOT is attempting to deploy funds towards the 3200 South Project. UDOT confirmed and is moving forward to complete the environmental documentation by September, and construction by next spring on that intersection.

Vice Chair Simmonds asked if the entire property was purchased from Ted’s.

Mr. Lindhardt replied that was not the case. They would be entering through the East side and avoiding Ted’s property. And as part of that environmental phase, there will be public comment on the alternative’s proposed which would be this summer.

Lastly, the Logan River Watershed Project is not a transportation project, but it would be prudent to provide an update considering the ongoing discussions. The Crockett Canal Company has done a study on the possibility of pressurizing the canal system. Through that study, it was found to be feasible with positive benefits. An application was made by the Cache Water District with co-applicants of Logan City, Hyde Park City, North Logan City, and the canal company for an NRCS Grant for the project. They were awarded Phase 1 of the grant and have begun the environmental phase of studying the possibility,

the design, and a portion for the construction if feasible. Currently open in the process is the public scoping meetings and comments, the comment period is open until March 16th. He encouraged the public to do so as there has been erroneous information distributed stating that a project has already been suggested and the parties are moving forward. He wishes to reassure the community that at present they are merely scoping the project and that there are no proposed projects or alternatives nor any forthcoming.

Vice Chair Simmonds interjected that there will be a public scoping meeting on March 4, 2021 via Zoom at 6 p.m. Mr. Lindhardt added that the link is on the Logan City Facebook page with all the information on other meetings as well.

Vice Chair Simmonds commented that for those who have attended a previous meeting, this meeting will be exactly the same with the same presented content. They are not allowed to change the presentation and must present the exact same information as in the prior meetings. She also asked, Mr. Lindhardt if there was a date as to when the SR-30 project would commence.

Mr. Lindhardt replied that UDOT at present is working on design and property acquisition which is scheduled for the Spring of 2023.

Chairman M. Anderson remarked that the Canal Company is not acquiring more shares nor more water.

Mr. Lindhardt clarified that the project was not a water rights acquisition project, but an alternative means.

Vice Chair Simmonds commented that the project was more about looking at efficiency.

Chairman M. Anderson noted his own experience with the piped canal behind his home. The result was more water with much smaller piping and a lesser loss of water.

Councilmember Jensen asked that if less water will be used because of efficient piping where will the extra water go.

Vice Chair Simmonds explained that the Crockett Canal Company serves a geographic region with boundaries. That geographic boundary has become less and less agricultural and more of housing. The exciting prospect of the project is that the Company would expand secondary water availability to their entire geographic district which means culinary water could be available to the community for use. It is one potential, but it is largely in place for managing floodwaters.

No further Mayor/Staff Reports were presented.

224 **COUNCIL BUSINESS:**

225
226 **Planning Commission Update – Vice-Chair Simmonds**

227
228 Vice Chair Simmonds reported that the Planning Commission met last Thursday,
229 February 25, 2021 . One of the items is a workshop item for a rezone request. The
230 Commission approved the addition to the 8th and Main building which will cover up what
231 is currently the outdoor storage on the west side. The design looks rather appealing and
232 will add a great deal to that space. Lastly, the Kunzler Property on 10th West has a rather
233 large housing project that is proposed to go there. The Planning Commission delayed the
234 decision for two weeks to digest the entire proposal (including wetland issues, etc.).
235

236 Councilmember A. Anderson said that when the annexation of the Kunzler property was
237 approved, the understanding is that there would be a conservation easement on the
238 property with the requirement for water mitigation studies. She wondered if all of this
239 had been done considering that the area is a flood plain.
240

241 Vice Chair Simmonds replied that she was not aware that the Planning Commission had
242 access to those reports nor if those reports had been completed. It was not clear in the
243 presentation of the proponent if that had been done or not. She referred the question to
244 the Community Development Department.
245

246 Mayor Daines interjected that the conservation easement process began shortly after
247 January 2019.
248

249 **Voting Systems – Chairman Mark Anderson**

250
251 Chairman M. Anderson explained the Council had discussed at the last meeting to
252 continue the voting discussion and to find comparable cities to perform research with.
253 Several cities have been identified, but there is a possibility for more. Questions have
254 been submitted from each of the Council members to build a questionnaire that would be
255 consistent across the board.
256

257 Councilmember Jensen said that he made a list and one of the best and most unique
258 things about Logan is that it is a college town. He made a list of cities with universities of
259 a similar population and student population.
260

261 Chairman M. Anderson said there is a timeline in mind to present their findings. The
262 suggestion is for each council member to take two cities and in total present 10 cities.
263

264 Councilmember A. Anderson inquired who would be the ideal person to contact is it the
265 Chair of the Council or another to present consistent results.
266

267 Chairman M. Anderson replied that the Chair, Council, Mayor, City Recorder or
268 Elections Officer.

Councilmember A. Anderson agreed that all of those are excellent options as some of the questions might be difficult for a City Recorder or Election Officer to answer as they are more oriented towards elected council members.

Chair M. Anderson remarked that he would very much want to find cities that have transitioned to another system in the last ten years and how that transition has worked for them.

Councilmember A. Anderson agreed that they should attempt to speak to the City Recorder and an elected official on the council.

Councilmember Jensen said he will need to be excused from the March 16, 2021 Council meeting and suggested that any findings be presented at a later council meeting.

Vice Chair Simmonds said that about a month's time frame would be best to research properly. It was suggested the first Council meeting, April 6, 2021 and the Council agreed.

Chairman M. Anderson listed the available cities for the council members to select Riverton, Murray, Orem, Provo Ogden, Sandy, Draper, and Lehi. Councilmember A. Anderson was assigned Provo and Riverton. Councilmember López Ogden, and yet undecided town. Councilmember Jensen Bozeman, MT, and possibly Ithaca, NY depending on the voting system. Vice Chair Jensen Orem and another yet undecided college town. Lastly, Chairman M. Anderson with Sandy and Murray.

No further Council Business items were presented.

ACTION ITEMS:

(Continued from February 16, 2021) - 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

At the February 2, 2021 and February 16, 2021, Council meeting, 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 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 collectors 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).

Planner Russ Holley summarized the renewal rezone request. The project site is at 100 W 300 S (approx. 286 South 100 West), 1.7 acres in total, and 8 existing parcels. On the property, there is one commercial structure and 5 residential homes. The current zoning for this area is Mixed. Five of the properties are zoned MR-12, (Multi-Family residential zone), and the remaining 3 are zoned COM (Commercial). The application is for Mixed-Use, but the future development plan calls for the entire block to be Commercial. Mixed-Use is similar to COM as commercial land use is allowed, (restaurants, offices, etc.). The differences are the population densities with Mixed-Use is slightly higher with a bonus that allows for up to 40 units per acre. It is mandatory that in a Mixed-Use area there is both commercial and residential.

Chairman M. Anderson asked how the density bonus works.

Planner Holley explained that there is a minimum commercial requirement for the base. If they provide additional commercial for the entire first level, there is an eligibility for density bonus for up to 10 units per acre. Commercial zoning does not have to be residential, it can be purely commercial, but there is an option for residential, but it is purely secondary in nature. Mixed-Use is a little bit taller allow up to 58 feet vs. 40 feet and tighter for setbacks. A handful of comments have been received some in favor and some against.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked what the Planning Commissions' response was.

Planner Holley answered that the Planning Commission was in unanimous favor of the project rezone, (7-0).

Councilmember Jensen said that part of the reason and request for the continuation was for the owner of the Beehive Grill, Jeff Mathews. He met with Jeff for two hours and went over the project with him. Mr. Mathews seems satisfied for the most part with still some concern leftover regarding the parking. However, Councilmember Jensen explained the proposed plan and that finally settled Mr. Mathews's objections.

Councilmember A. Anderson said that similar concerns had been received regarding the parking from other citizens. On the other hand, considering the current zoning, there does not appear to be much of a difference with the current zoning.

Chairman M. Anderson said that similar concerns had been sent to him regarding traffic.

Councilmember López asked if the project is not rezoned to Mixed-Use will the project remain as MR-12 & Commercial or does it automatically become Commercial based on the Future Land Use Master Plan.

Vice Chair Simmonds answered that the zoning remains the current zoning. She added that her concerns are more along the lines of traffic. However, she understands that traffic simply happens despite their desires. She would just prefer that the City be a little more proactive and a little less reactive.

The other Council members agreed with the sentiment.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Jensen seconded by Councilmember A. Anderson to adopt Ordinance 21-03 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING - Budget Adjustments FY 2020-2021 appropriating: \$11,400 funds the Library received from the State of Utah, the Community Library Enhancement Fund (CLEF) Grant to be used for collection, development, technology for public use and community outreach programs; \$207,600 purchase of a new ambulance from the EMS Funds – Resolution 21-10 – Richard Anderson, Finance Director

At the February 16, 2021, Council meeting, Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustments.

Councilmember Jensen asked the reason as to the purchase for a new ambulance.

Mr. Anderson replied that an ambulance will be replaced every single year on an annual basis.

Vice Chair Simmonds explained that the ambulances get nearly as many miles as the police vehicles do since the EMS provides transports out of the valley on almost daily basis.

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

Dr. Gail Yost, lives on 100 E in Logan. She is very grateful for the funds for the Library and with the new Library to be built book weeding is presently be done and there must be books to replace the void left behind.

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

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember A. Anderson seconded by Vice Chair Simmonds to approve Resolution 21-10 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING - Consideration of a proposed sale of real property owned by the City of Logan located at approximately 1500 North Aspen Drive in Logan, Utah (commonly known as the Deer Pen Subdivision) consisting of 22 subdivided lots totaling approximately 8.63 acres.

At the February 16, 2021 Council meeting, Mayor Daines addressed the Council regarding the proposed sale of the property. In 2016, the Deer Pen Subdivision was approved by the Planning Commission but was never brought before the council. They returned to the Planning Commission in order to be completely transparent including to the Wilson Neighborhood. The reason for selling the property that it's a good time and the neighborhood is more comfortable with the idea. The money from the sale will go back into the cemetery perpetual care fund. The cemetery desperately needs a new irrigation system, which is a rather expensive project. Mayor Daines said there must be a public notice and hearing to sell the property and a public process for a bid.

Mayor Daines summarized the proposal that had been presented at the last council meeting. The property had been purchased for a new cemetery, but presently there is no further need for another cemetery. As such the sale of that property will go towards funding a new irrigation system for the City's cemetery with a portion of the land that will not be sold and will remain as a natural public park.

Vice Chair Simmonds asked if there would be a process for the sale of the property.

Mayor Daines answered that presently, the land is being appraised. Once appraised, there will be a public process to ensure that the public is aware, the City will solicit bids, with a minimum bid based on the appraisal. Property of this designation is sold at a premium rate in the City as there is a demand for single-family housing.

Vice Chair Simmonds further inquired what would be the percentage of the property that would be housing and infrastructure, and parkland.

Parks & Recreation Director Russ Akina replied there would be roughly 23 acres of natural park area on the south and the north side of the project.

Vice Chair Simmonds commented that would be roughly 22 lots with Planner Holley remarking that each lot would be a quarter of an acre. Vice Chair Simmonds estimated that would be 2/3's and 1/3, 9 acres.

Mayor Daines remarked that on the north and east side of the development there will be connections up to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, and improvements on the crossing on 1500 East as part of the trail connection connecting both trails. There is a concept plan and further discussions will occur with the Wilson neighborhood.

Vice Chair Simmonds was pleased to learn that there was that much natural park space available to the neighborhood and community.

Mayor Daines clarified that the park was not an open, green grass turf area, but rather a natural park. There would be plantings and walking paths reflecting the foothills of the landscape.

Chairman M. Anderson asked about the remaining capacity within the cemetery.

Mayor Daines answered that the current cemetery has at least 30 to 40 more years if not more. A crucial reason for moving ahead with the proposal is that the cemetery needs an upgrade to their irrigation system. The irrigation system is not automated and once a week the staff must physically walk around to water the grass. It is very time-consuming and labor-intensive. The funds will go entirely into the perpetual maintenance funds, the first project will go toward automating the irrigation system, a very large project considering the acreage of the cemetery.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked if the plans are for the park to remain as an off-dog-leash park or not.

Mayor Daines replied that the park may not remain an off-dog leash park as there have been discussions whether creating a fenced area or not will occur. As the project continues input will be gathered from the neighborhood. Furthermore, it had been suggested that a new substation would need to be built in the park, but USU has agreed to lease the City a parcel site, (West of 1200 East), transmission lines will be put underground to make the implementation the least intrusive as possible. The Light & Power department made several compromises and for that, they are truly grateful.

Councilmember López asked when the park would be available to the public.

Mayor Daines responded that the schedule is the first to spray against invasive weeds this summer. Mr. Akina is in the process of creating a specific site plan for an irrigation system installed even for native plants. The expectation is to begin work in the Fall, and the rest will continue by next Spring.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked if the funding for that will come from the sale of the property.

Mayor Daines answered that the proceeds from the sale will go back into the cemetery's perpetual funds. Mr. Akina is ensuring that there will be funds in the budget for the maintenance of the park. There will be future discussions with the neighborhood to rename the park rather than its current name of the "Deer Pen."

Councilmember Jensen asked about the concerns regarding the height of the homes blocking the view of the natural landscape, fencing, etc., and if there would be any restrictions on the homes to be constructed.

Mayor Daines replied that back in 2016, they did codify certain height restrictions on the foothills of the mountain. There have been discussions regarding fencing along the park, the conclusion that has been reached is that when the property is sold to a developer that there will be a deed restriction. The deed restrictions will be no vinyl nor chain link fencing adjacent to the park. We will not mandate that there must be fencing or not, but there will not be chain link or vinyl fencing.

Vice Chair Simmonds interjected that there are color restrictions along with the previously mentioned ordinance. The homes must blend with the natural landscape.

Councilmember Jensen asked if that color restriction was in the code.

Mayor Daines explained that it was, and that ordinance applied to all homes built in that area whether in a subdivision or not.

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

The Council received an email from Maria Rodriguez at 2002 Mountain View Lane which read:

Dear Mrs. Daines,

I am extremely concerned about the sale of the property at Deer Crest and the development plans that the City of Logan has been seriously reviewing in the past few months - including an electrical substation (as of February 2021 no longer in action) and now new Community Development. Specially since we consider the City of Logan's plans for the area to be quite disparate, and established with an extremely sense of urgency.

In January 2020 I personally contacted Mr. Russ Holley, City of Logan Senior City Planner, and requested specific information (including maps with plans) about the City of Logan plans for the Deer Pen Subdivision. His reply read: "I am not sure what the City Plans are right now" on January 21, 2020. Given that the current plats considered by the City of Logan are signed by Steven Earl on 1/28/2019 I wonder how it was possible that Mr. Holley was not aware about the City's plans? Was the City of Logan Senior City Planner not aware of this plat in January 2020? Why did I not receive this information from the City of Logan when I requested them directly by email? There was no disclosure either by the City of Logan at that time of any plans for a substation at Deer Crest in January 2020. My home value will be directly affected

(decrease) by the misinformation from the City of Logan. The house we build was designed in February 2020 (and build in April 2020) was based on the information we received from Mr. Russ Holley, City of Logan Senior City Planner. The new Development by the City of Logan will certainly obstruct the views from our home diminishing its value.

I therefore wonder, are the plans considered by the City of Logan well established or are they simply an urgent development that will affect generations to come? For example, are water pressure concerns and drainages well addressed for the neighborhood? Parking availability to access to Hiking trails given the private roads in the area well thought?

In the same line of the City of Logan miscommunication for plans at Deer Crest, let me point out that our home is located at 2002 Mountain View Lane, within 300 feet from the area being considered by the City of Logan. We have not received the "Public notification" referred to in PC 21-005. Since this is of outmost importance to meet the minimum public noticing requirements of the Land Developments Code and Municipal Code we would like to request a proof from the City of Logan that the notice was sent on 1/25/2021 to us (as property owners within 300 foot from the propose Deer Pen Subdivision property sale by the City of Logan).

Sincerely,

Maria Rodriguez

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

PUBLIC HEARING - Certification of Campbell Annexation Petition – Consideration of an annexation petition filed by Mark Daines on behalf of Paul Campbell for the purposes of annexing 37.45 acres, more or less, into the City of Logan located North of 2200 South and East of 800 West – Ordinance 21-04 – Mike Simone, Community Development Director.

At the January 19, 2021 Council meeting, Community Development Mike DeSimone addressed the Council regarding the proposed annexation. The area according to FLUP (Proposed Future Land Use Plan) would be multi-residential (MR). The adjoining property across the road is also Multi-Family. The area proposal is MR-20, 20 units per acre. A petition of protest has been filed by the City of Nibley and is scheduled for review on March 18, 2021 at 4 p.m. before the Cache County Boundary Commission. The recommendation is for the public hearing to be conducted tonight and the Council then continue voting on the annexation until after the Boundary Commission meets.

Chairman M. Anderson stated that he had a personal and business association with Mr. Campbell. He asked Assistant City Attorney Craig Carlston regarding conflict of interest and further steps he should take.

Mr. Carlston replied that the conflict of interest has been disclosed by Chairman Anderson and that abstaining would be a proper course to take.

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

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

Vice Chair Simmonds is confronted by the fact that not only are annexation petitions accepted, but the annexation area is automatically zoned. The Planning Commission has no role in that, and she finds that to be disconcerting. It was evident at the last Planning Commission meeting that they were not aware of the proposed annexation. She does not know the reason as to why or if it is simply part of the process.

Councilmember A. Anderson commented that MR (multi-family) is a rather general term. The designation does not necessarily need to be MR-20 considering the concerns of Nibley single-family residents, who will be located across the street if there will be a higher density of residents or traffic. They are valid concerns to consider.

Mr. DeSimone explicated that zoning is required to be placed on any annexation area requesting to be annexed into the City. The zoning was based on the FLUP and the area across the street which is MR-20 and around that area is COM (Commercial) which is 30 units per acre. The other factor that was also considered is the setting of the site. There are a number of employment areas just beyond the scope of the site, major employers including a nearby highway. If the Council disagrees, the area can certainly be zoned differently and be sent to the Planning Commission.

Vice Chair Simmonds requested further clarification on the zoning.

Mr. DeSimone expounded that the reason for MR-20 rather than MR-9 or MR-30, etc. They do not know what kind of project will be developed there, but it is based on location and context. For example, to the North of this area is commercial, wide-industrial, and rail lines. Taking into account the amount of land in the City of Logan, the City needs to maximize the land that it has. If the City concerns itself about what Nibley wants to do, then that area would be NR-6. Nibley is self-interested in its views as the City of Logan is the one taking on the responsibility of affordable housing and multi-family in the valley, and they are not. Nibley is arguing that the residents of Logan will use their parks and their roads, but their residents use our parks and our roads which is not a valid argument. The annexation area should be zoned based on the context of the area and in the best interests of the City.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked that if during an annexation process there is no concrete role for the Planning Commission as far as recommendations or review of the incoming zoning.

Mr. DeSimone replied that in the City's annexation process, it does not go through the Planning Commission, but rather directly presented before the Council. The role of the Planning Commission is indirect via the FLUP.

Chairman M. Anderson clarified that the annexed area must be given a specific zone.

Vice Chair Simmonds said that theoretically, that area could be a holding zone.

Mr. DeSimone explained that an AGR (Agriculture) zoning could be applied to force the area to go back into a public process to be presented before the Planning Commission, and then be brought back before the Council again. He reminded the Council that the public hearing being conducted is at the same level of scrutiny that would be before the Planning Commission. The same questions would be asked if there was a proposed project in place and the reason for the zoning. The answers would be the same that there is no proposed development project and that the zoning is based on the FLUP.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember A. Anderson seconded by Vice Chair Simmonds to continue Ordinance 21-04 until the April 6, 2021 Council meeting as an action item and public hearing . Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING - Certification of Carles Jessop (Kunzler II) Addition Annexation Petition – Consideration of an annexation petition filed by M. Brett Jensen on behalf of Charles and Sally Carles Living Trust and S. Willard and Elaine D. Jessop for the purposes of annexing 19.7 acres, more or less, into the City of Logan located on the West side of 1000 West and South of 1100 South – Ordinance 12-05 – Mike DeSimone, Community Development Director

At the January 19, 2021 Council meeting, Community Development Mike DeSimone addressed the Council regarding the proposed annexation. The FLUP dictates that there is a constraint with the area wetland or flood plains, the proposed area is NR-6. The conservation areas along the river are still being worked on as of last year. There is a project pending on the property and is in front of the Planning Commission. The plat area is within the annexation policy plan.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked a clarifying question in regard to whether the current areas were in front of the Planning Commission which Mr. DeSimone answered was the case.

Vice Chair Simmonds commented that she would have preferred an NR-6 zoning with constraints for wetlands.

Mr. DeSimone replied that the zoning does not need to apply the constraints as the constraints are there regardless as dictated by Federal, State, and Local requirements.

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 López. to adopt Ordinance 21-05 as presented. Motion carried 3-2. (Vice Chair Simmonds and Councilmember A. Anderson voted nay).

PUBLIC HEARING – PY 2021 Annual Action Plan – Mike DeSimone, Community Development Director

Community Development Director Mike DeSimone addressed the Council and explained that it is a requirement by HUD that we initiate the 2021 Annual Action Plan (AAP) cycle with a public hearing. This hearing does not require formal action by the Council.

The purpose of the public hearing is to help inform the CDBG Steering Committee when they start meeting on determining what areas of the City should be emphasized, the types of projects that should be accomplished this year, what services or programs may be lacking, what particular groups of people may require services, and what specific planning projects that the City may consider.

The PY2021 AAP will define the funding priorities for 2021. We are in year 2 of the 2019 - 2023 Consolidated plan and anticipate approximately \$500,000 in CDBG funding this year. Based on the Consolidated Plan's priorities, the funding outcome should approximate 50% of the annual funding for infrastructure and/or facility improvements, 30% of annual funding to support human infrastructure/social services, and 20% of annual funding for Administration & Planning. The Application Period is from March 3, 2021 to April 2, ²⁰²¹. The Steering Committee Meeting is on April 13. The Public Comment Period is May 1, 2021 st to June 1, 2021. With final Public Hearing June 1, ²⁰²¹ and adoption of the 2021 Annual Action Plan (AAP).

Councilmember Jensen said that regarding the homeless population, he asked if some of the effort or funds can be put forward to alleviate this portion of the community.

Mr. DeSimone explained that funding could be used under the secondary priority act. The proposal must come from individuals in the community who work in that field and present a proposal for CDBG funding. It is up to the Council to determine exactly how much of an amount that will be since it is a competing interest.

Councilmember Jensen asked if it is BRAG (Bear River Association of Governments) that works with the Homeless populace.

Mr. DeSimone answered that it is the Homelessness Coordinating Council and other groups that work alongside.

Vice Chair Simmonds clarified that these funds cannot be given to BRAG, because they receive their own funds.

Councilmember A. Anderson expounded that CAPSA is the only homeless shelter in the City for adults and children, while the Family Place is considered an emergency shelter. These are the two non-profit organizations in existence that could apply for those funds. She said that the hotel on 300 South is being converted to long-term low-income housing. It is via a company from Salt Lake City that has been working with BRAG, and the City to comply with our zoning. This might be an organization that might be interested in applying for CBDG funding.

Mr. DeSimone replied that would be possible, but that they would have to apply through a recognized non-profit organization.

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

Dr. Gail Yost lives on 100 East in Logan. She commented that at the last Homelessness Coordination I Meeting a community member was wanting to start an emergency, homeless shelter that was nonprofit, and would encourage to seek out CBDG funds. She said we have homeless and we have homeless who are unsheltered. An emergency shelter is needed as a reliable source especially during bad weather.

Clark Bruniot from the Family Place addressed the Council and expressed his appreciation to the City, who fosters these grants, and for nonprofits. It is helpful to their organization and will hopefully help in this round of CBDG funding.

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

Chairman M. Anderson asked when the date for registration begins.

Mr. DeSimone responded that the application process begins on March 3, 2021.

Vice Chair Simmonds reminded the public that to apply for those funds it must be via a registered nonprofit. The registration for the nonprofit must have already been completed which roughly takes 6 to 8 months.

Mr. DeSimone clarified the funds are used to purchase items or to facilitate a project, but not to fund the salaries of personnel. The funds must go towards the continuity of the project as there is no guarantee that there will be funds the next year.

WORKSHOP ITEMS:

Budget Adjustment FY 2020-2021 appropriating: \$207,849 funds received from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). These funds will be used to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19) – Resolution 21-14 – Richard Anderson

Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustment. This is for the CARES act funding received for the Fire Department vaccine program. He addressed the issue of citizens paying for the right issues, not just homelessness and many other issues. He reminded the Council that homelessness is a regional issue and requires regional resources. Logan in the past has attempted to solve regional problems with local resources and unfortunately, everybody lets us.

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

REZONE – Consideration of a proposed rezone. Craig Winder/Conley & Diana Krebs, authorized agent/owner, request a rezone of approximately 10 acres from Industrial Park (IP) to Mixed Residential Medium, (MR-20) located at approximately 1400 North 1200 West – Ordinance 12-06 – Russ Holley

Planner Russ Holley addressed the Council regarding the proposed rezone.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend **denial** to the Municipal Council for a Rezone of approximately 10 acres of property located at 1200 West 1400 North (TIN# 04-078-0005) from Industrial Park (IP) to Mixed Residential Medium (MR-20)

Land use adjoining the subject property

North: IP: Vacant East: IP: Commercial Uses

South: Outside of City Boundary West: Outside of City Boundary

PROJECT

The proponent is requesting to rezone one (1) parcel that totals approximately 10 acres at the northeast corner of the intersection of 1200 West and 1400 North. The square-shaped vacant parcel has historically been used for agricultural purposes. This flat lower-elevation area of town appears to have some sensitive lands that may include wetlands, low water tables and unique soil compositions. Although 1000 West is a highly developed, high traffic corridor in the City, the area immediately surrounding this parcel is rural and undeveloped in nature.

893 **GENERAL PLAN**

894 The Future Land Use Plan (FLUP), adopted in 2008, identifies this property as Industrial
895 Park (IP). The General Plan, a nonregulatory visioning plan, describes IP areas as being
896 intended for large employment, industrial, storage, shipping, and production uses.
897 Typical development will be larger in scale and may include heavy equipment usage and
898 noisy operations. IP areas are not intended for residential use.

899
900 **LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE**

901 The Land Development Code (LDC) regulates land uses and entitles properties with
902 specific development allowances. The IP zone (current zoning designation) allows a wide
903 range of commercial and industrial uses. The IP zone is well-suited for large
904 manufacturing, shipping & receiving, office, research & development, and construction
905 businesses. Standard building heights are limited to 48' and with a Conditional Use
906 Permit height can reach 80'. Large setbacks and landscaping requirements shape projects
907 into campus-style development patterns. Parking requirements are based on each
908 commercial and industrial land use.

909
910 The Mixed Residential Medium (MR-20) zoning district (requested zoning designation)
911 is a multi-family zone permitting a maximum density of 20 dwelling units per acre.
912 Building heights are limited to 45 feet and lot coverage is capped at 60%. A total of 30%
913 of the site is required to be set aside for open space and outdoor amenity space. New
914 residential buildings are required to provide 2 off-street parking stalls per each dwelling
915 unit.

916
917 **NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY**

918 This Bridger Neighborhood area in the northwest quadrant of the city is predominately
919 industrial in nature and character. Current land uses range from a concrete batch plant to
920 professional office buildings. North of 600 North and west of 600 West, no residential
921 land uses exist. The nearest existing residential land use is approximately 3,600 feet
922 away. Historically used as agricultural lands surrounding the City, over the past 50 years
923 the northwest quadrant has become the industrial hub for the entire valley.

924
925 **SUMMARY**

926 The IP zoning district should be considered incompatible with residential uses because of
927 the heavy, noisy, dusty, and impactful land uses permitted. Placing residential uses
928 adjacent to industrial uses can result in poor living conditions. It's unfair to residents to
929 allow substandard and undesirable living situations, especially when planning efforts
930 have been made to accommodate multi-family growth in areas in and around downtown.
931 These areas are better suited and more compatible for multi-family residential uses. Staff
932 recommends that this property remain IP zoning.

933
934 **AGENCY AND CITY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

935 No comments have been received.
936
937

938 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

939 Notices were mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property. As of the
940 time of this report, five (5) written comments have been received. All five (5) comments
941 express opposition to the rezone proposal and are attached for review.

942
943 **PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**

944 Legal notices were posted on the City's website and the Utah Public Meeting website on
945 2/18/21 and noticed in a quarter-page ad on 2/6/21, and a Public Notice mailed to
946 property owners within 300' were sent on 2/2/21.

947
948 **RECOMMENDED FINDINGS FOR DENIAL**

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

- 951 1. The Logan City FLUP identifies the area as IP and not intended for residential
952 uses.
953 2. The nearest existing residential land use is over 3,600 feet away.
954 3. The IP Zoning district allows land uses and businesses that would be considered a
955 nuisance and incompatible to residential land uses.
956 4. This land is better suited for industrial uses as it is located in close proximity to
957 1000 West and other industrial businesses.

958
959 On February 25, 2021, the Planning Commission recommended the Municipal Council
960 **deny** the 1200 West 1400 North rezone request.

961
962 Planner Holley addressed the Council to explain that the area is 10 acres in size and is a
963 vacant undeveloped property. There is not much of any development towards the South,
964 but more towards the Westside. The request is to rezone the current area from IP
965 (Industrial Park) to MR-20. This was one area on the FLUP that was amended from MR
966 back to Industrial Park. The biggest issue with housing adjacent to an industrial area is
967 compatibility. It is difficult to allow industrial development which would allow anything
968 from a batch plant to a major facility that has work shifts around the clock. Those types
969 of uses are incompatible as there are noise and other negative impacts that come with
970 industrial zoning. Another concern is that Staff is hesitant to lose industrial space in the
971 name of family housing. In addition, the Bridger Neighborhood has expressed numerous
972 times that they feel that there is enough multi-family housing. The school district
973 expressed their concerns about more multi-family housing. Thereby, Staff recommended
974 denial to the request.

975
976 Planner Holley further explained that the applicant expressed that the proposed project is
977 a growth opportunity for the City. It could be the start of multiple residential projects on
978 this side of the City as the City grows to the west. Housing affordability which we are in
979 low supply of, and though a valid point, the location is not in an appropriate area.

Vice Chair Simmonds interjected that there was expressed concerns that the children that might reside in the said area would attend Bridger Elementary School and would be forced to cross 10th West every day.

Chairman M. Anderson asked where the closest residential area from the proposed project location was.

Planner Holley answered that the closest residential area was 5 blocks away at 600 West.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked about the FLUP regarding the expansion plan for the unincorporated county area to the west and what that area be designated.

Planner Holley replied that area would be designated as IP (Industrial Park).

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

Consideration of a proposed resolution amending Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Billing Rates – Resolution 21-13 – Chief Brad Hannig

Chief Brad Hannig addressed the Council regarding the proposed resolution.

<i>New Procedure</i>	<i>Proposed Billing Rate</i>
Med-Ketamine	\$45.00
Med-Tordol	\$20.00
Med-Tranexamic Acid (TXA)	\$100.00
Med-Phenergan	\$15.00
Convenient Payment Fee (for online bill pay with a credit card)	\$3.00

Chief Hannig stated that most of the items on the list were previously adopted, but a few items are new medications and supplies that were inadvertently left off. As well as a new convenient payment system that allows for those using Emergency services to pay those fees with a credit card and set up recurring payments which is a processing fee to offset the fees.

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

There were no further workshop items presented at tonight's council meeting.

1019 **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

1020
1021 Councilmember A. Anderson commented that the present Covid case count in the valley
1022 is under 5%. It is great to see those numbers continue to fall and urges the community to
1023 maintain the masking status quo.

1024
1025 **ADJOURNED.** There being no further business to come before the Council, the Logan
1026 Municipal Council adjourned to a meeting of the Logan Redevelopment Agency.

1027
1028 The Logan Redevelopment Agency convened on Tuesday, March 2, 2021, at 7:24 pm, in
1029 the Logan Municipal Council Chambers located at 290 North 100 West, Logan, Utah
1030 8432. Logan Municipal Council Meetings are televised live as a public service on
1031 Channel 17 and the City of Logan Facebook page:

1032 <https://www.facebook.com/cityoflogan> and the City of Logan YouTube channel at:

1033 https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCFLPAOK5eawKS_RDBU0stRQ

1034 COVID-19 Safety and Social Distancing Protocols were followed.

1035
1036 Council Members present at the beginning of the Logan Redevelopment meeting:
1037 Chairman Mark A. Anderson, Vice Chair Jeannie F. Simmonds, Councilmember Amy Z.
1038 Anderson, Councilmember Tom Jensen, and Councilmember Ernesto López.

1039 Administration present: Mayor Holly H. Daines, City Attorney Kymber Housley,
1040 Assistant City Attorney Craig Carlston, Finance Director Richard Anderson, Economic
1041 Development Director Kirk Jensen, Community Development Director Mike DeSimone,
1042 Planner Russ Holley, Planner Aaron Smith, Library Director Karen Clark, Police Chief
1043 Gary Jensen, Public Works Director Paul Lindhardt, Fire Chief Brad Hannig, Parks &
1044 Recreation Director Russ Akina, City Recorder Teresa Harris and Deputy City Recorder
1045 Esli Morales. Excused: City Attorney Kymber Housley.

1046 **ACTION ITEMS:**

1047
1048 **PUBLIC HEARING - Budget Adjustments FY 2020-2021 appropriating: \$4,347,905**
1049 **to fund building demolition and construction of the Center Block Plaza and**
1050 **associated improvements, including stage, administration building, portable ice**
1051 **rink, splash pad, site furnishings, and equipment; \$1,575,157 funds for building**
1052 **improvements at 41 & 45 North Main Street – Resolution 21-11 RDA**

1053
1054 At the February 16, 2021 Council meeting, Economic Development Director Kirk Jensen
1055 addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustments. Together all these
1056 projects will positively impact the entire City. The past several months the staff and
1057 Mayor Daines have worked with the architect to bring the Center Block Plaza together
1058 within a sound budget. The first step will be demolition before the construction and the
1059 associated improvements begin. The final project will create a destination for the
1060 community both in the winter and the summer. The second part of the resolution is for
1061 funding improvements associated with 41 & 45 North Main Street, (Plaza 45), with the
1062 final intent to sell the property.

Economic Development Director Kirk Jensen explained that the resolution is regarding the sourcing of the funds for the proposed project. The funds will come from other project areas that fall underneath this umbrella of projects. For that to happen, Utah RDA provides for this, the Redevelopment Agency Board needs to determine if the proposed Plaza project will benefit all of the other project areas, which they believe is the case.

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 Vice Chair Jensen seconded by Councilmember A. Anderson to approve Resolution 21-12 RDA as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING - Consideration of a proposed resolution approving the use of Agency funds for publicly owned infrastructure and improvements in the Downtown Redevelopment Project Area – Resolution 21-12 RDA

At the February 16, 2021 Council meeting, Economic Development Director Kirk Jensen addressed the Council regarding the proposed resolution. He explained that it is about sourcing the funds to carry out the Center Block Plaza project. The improvements in the first discussion and eliminate the deficit in the Downtown RDA that resulted in acquiring the property from where the Plaza will be built. Those funds will come via transfer from other agency project fund balances. Utah RDA law allows for that when the cost of the installation of publicly owned infrastructure and improvements benefits the project area or areas from where the funds are sourced. The RDA Board is required to determine the transfer of funds from other funds to benefit all project areas.

Mayor Daines gave a brief recap on the Plaza project. The project is ready to go with the revised Center Block design plans. The City has worked hard to create something beautiful for the citizens to enjoy within the Redevelopment area budget. It will fulfill the request of the Historic Preservation Committee and the request of property owners that we stay within the imprint of our building and not affect the parking of the area. The project will feature a skating rink, splash pad, and stage to be used in all seasons. The exterior of Plaza 45 and 41 will be refurbished, before being put up for sale through a public process and will permit the City to recuperate the funds. There are reserves in the RDA funds to pay for the project and to assist a variety of other projects planned for downtown. It is a significant investment for generations to come and does meet the City's goals for Downtown. There has been concern about the traffic on Main Street and the access points. There are lovely red brick planters down the facade to prevent children from running out into the street. The architect for the design gave a low number and a high number, they are using the high number which is a total of \$4,347,905.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked about project maintenance in the future.

Mayor Daines replied that additional part-time employees will be hired in the Parks Department. The last time Merlin Olsen Park was open for skating was 5 years ago. The income was \$24,000, there will be some income from the skating rink that will help with maintenance. There will be flowers and other additions planted much like Center Street. It will be a beautiful, walkable, and pedestrian-friendly area. All age groups will be drawn to the plaza, the Park Staff has come up with over 100 potential uses to get people to come downtown and congregate.

Councilmember Jensen asked if there would be any modifications for the parking area or if using the building on 100 West for parking.

Mayor Daines replied that none at this time as there is an old parking agreement. As for the building on 100 West the City is making money on it, the tenant is paying a monthly rent. It is undecided for the moment; it may become parking later on or even be sold to reimburse some of the costs of the RDA. Overall, it is an investment that is not going down in value.

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

Logan resident Keegan Garrity stated that the topic of the Center Block Plaza has come up more than once. He quoted a previous quote from Mayor Daines, “The Downtown specific plan calls for a plaza, but there is also a budget.” He has been in favor of most of the projects the addition of sidewalks, the expansion of the trail system, but his favorite is the Bridger Bike Park. He asked for the Council to imagine if even half a percent of that went to public outreach. He conducted an online poll which suggested that a splash pad would be an excellent idea by the Transit Center and old Sears building could be sold to fund it. An ice-skating Rink is great, Merlin Olson Park is great place for that, and we can skate underneath the temple lights as our parents did. We want a stage for concerts, but we are concerned about parking. He feels the City does not need to spend millions of dollars on things that people already have. To truly inspire a mom and dad in Preston would be a library, a children's museum funded at a county level.

Logan businessman Marty Moore and his partner own two buildings on the northeast corner of Main Street. He has been working in the downtown for twenty years and moved into their present law office 13 years ago. He has been eagerly waiting for downtown to be redeveloped but instead has watched the Downtown deteriorate. He is very much in favor of the project to create a vibrant, active downtown area.

Wendi Hassan with the Cache Valley Center for the Arts addressed the Council. She is very grateful for the changes and can't wait to have the community back. She can see the local theatre community using the stages, and an artistic pathway from that open space to the Lyric Theatre. There will be more performance opportunities and more audience members. Interblock walkways to create patron flow, a very real opportunity to great things.

Developer Tony Johnson is grateful for the downtown momentum. He has submitted a project on Center Street that will contain 48 apartment units as well as commercial space. It could be programmed very similar to what has been discussed. He and his partners are interested in keeping the old buildings, an asset to the city to adaptively reuse those to turn them into an asset. They completed a project on 300 South that was structurally more deficient than the Emporium.

Chris Sands owns about 1% of the Center Block, in a nice old building. Thanks to the City facade grant, he was able to improve his structure. He was a proponent of the residential aspect of the plaza. He wanted to see more people downtown and has watched the projects emerge downtown. It is still a small town with historic fabric. He asked that the auto parts building on 100 West not be sold for more parking. They do not need more parking and is used or full during Summerfest.

Cole Mathews resident from Hyrum said he grew up in the valley. He had many family gatherings in the old Copper Mill restaurant. The Emporium is a historic building and needs to be persevered and needs to stay in the City. He is concerned about how much is being spent on this project. The City is willing to spend an amount on this rather than on the Cache Valley Cruise-in for the citizens to have a 3-day weekend. It concerns him about going over their limits with no building revenue in the past few years.

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

Councilmember A. Anderson said that various emails have been received from the community with no strong opinions against the project with far more positive commentary in favor of the project.

Chairman M. Anderson announced that he has a conflict of interest due to owning an adjacent property in the downtown area.

Councilmember A. Anderson said that she went back and reviewed the comments from a year ago. Removing any parking comments most of the comments are positive. She credits the Mayor for revamping the idea to the public and explaining the importance of improving the downtown area. She appreciates the sentiment of the Emporium and what it means to the citizen of the community. She attended the Historic Preservation Committee where they discussed the “missing tooth concept”. The new plans have addressed those concerns. The plan achieves our downtown goals and with the RDA's use of funds to drive redevelopment and address blight.

Councilmember Jensen commented that the Emporium went to bid twice with zero offers the first time, and the second offer had plenty of public outcries. The downtown sidewalks are wide and empty, and they need to be active. The City on the ranking of downtown area comes in the lower 30's, but there was a comment that said that regionally, the City had one of the best Farmer Markets. There can be a linkage between

the Plaza and interconnecting to the rest of the downtown area. This is what the RDA funds are for, redevelopment not for anything else.

Councilmember López said that Wendy Hassan mentioned an additional space for the performing arts in a central location. He can imagine multicultural performances and other performances in such a great location.

Councilmember A. Anderson said that various members of the community say that tearing down the Emporium is a terrible thing, but ever since she moved to the valley in 1974, the building has never been a functioning property. One of the challenges that students say is that our blocks are so big that it is like walking on a highway and so impenetrable. This offers a break in that and offers an amazing opportunity to show people that it is possible to have that exciting energy in a middle of such a large block. It offers a public space between multiple interconnected spaces.

Chairman M. Anderson explained that as he went through the planning process for Center Street, he began to become excited. He could not have been happier to see the Christmas Parade and the street so full of people. It did not improve their sales one penny and in fact, affected their sales negatively and they loved it because people were there. It is gratifying to see that they contributed to those changes. It is hard to make changes. When they tore down half of their business, it was heartbreaking for his dad, but when he saw the vision and plans, he could not stay away. He was there everyday to ensure that the contractors were doing it correctly. He saw what could be built and create in that same space that he had worked hard in for so many years. If we can catch the vision, then we can see all that downtown can be.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember A. Anderson seconded by Councilmember Jensen to approve Resolution 21-11 RDA as presented. Motion carried. (Chairman M. Anderson abstained).

Councilmember A. Anderson thanked those who attended and expressed their opinions.

ADJOURNED. There being no further business to come before the Logan Redevelopment Agency, the meeting adjourned at 8:17 pm.

Esli Morales, Deputy City Recorder