

Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Municipal Council convened in regular session on Tuesday, March 1, 2022, 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 YouTube channel at: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCFLPAOK5eawKS_RDBU0stRQ

Council Members present at the beginning of the meeting: Chair Jeannie F. Simmonds, Vice Chair Ernesto López, Councilmember Amy Z. Anderson, Councilmember Tom Jensen, and Councilmember Mark A. Anderson. Administration present: Mayor Holly H. Daines, Assistant City Attorney Craig Carlston, Finance Director Richard Anderson, City Recorder Teresa Harris, and Deputy City Recorder Esli Morales.

Excused: City Attorney Kymber Housley.

Chair Jeannie F. Simmonds welcomed those present. There were approximately 23 in attendance at the beginning of the meeting.

OPENING CEREMONY:

Community Development Director Mike DeSimone led the audience in the pledge of allegiance.

Meeting Minutes. Minutes of the Council meeting held on February 15, 2022, were reviewed, and approved with minor corrections.

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

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember A. Anderson seconded by Councilmember M. Anderson to approve the February 15, 2022, minutes and approve tonight's agenda. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting Schedule. Chair Simmonds 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, March 15, 2022.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FOR MAYOR AND COUNCIL:

Chair Simmonds explained that any person wishing to comment on any item not otherwise on the agenda may address the City Council at this point by stepping to the microphone and giving his or her name and address for the record. Comments should be limited to not

more than three (3) minutes unless additional time is authorized by the Council Chair. Citizen groups will be asked to appoint a spokesperson. This is the time and place for any person who wishes to comment on non-agenda items. Some items brought forward to the attention of the City Council will be turned over to staff to respond outside of the City Council meeting.

Gail B. Yost, a resident of Logan said that a friend had remarked that flags on President's Day or on Martin Luther King Day had not been placed along Main Street. She asked as to the reason for not doing so.

Mayor Daines responded that the flags on Main Street are put up by the city's Forester and his staff. Typically, this time of year it is difficult to do so because of the snow. As such specific holidays are selected to put up flags, Memorial Day, Independence Day, and Veterans Day.

Teresa Harris, City Recorder reiterated that the reason for the Forester being unable to put up flags in the winter is because of the snow, the curb, and not being able to use equipment to do so.

Chair Simmonds imposed the question if July 24 (Pioneer Day) is more important than President's Day.

Mayor Daines restated that the impediment is winter weather (specifically snow) and the difficulties for staff attempting to do so with such weather.

Elise Carter spoke on behalf of the Logan Environmental Action Force of Logan High School. Over the years, the Council has done great things in terms of investing in renewable energy such as creating RESAB (Renewable Energy and Sustainability Advisory Board) and voting for the clean air quality act of 2016. A difficult decision is faced on whether to use more coal-generated power with the ENCHANT program. On behalf of the youth of the community, it is being requested that the Council not invest in more coal-powered energy. The RESAB Advisory Board strongly advised against entering into a power agreement with ENCHANT. The Council's efforts are greatly appreciated in increasing renewable energy, but greenhouse emissions continue to increase at a global and local level. As a resident of Logan and someone who will reap the consequences of the decisions made today it is requested that the Council consider the future impact and take a legitimate stand against further emissions.

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

Councilmember M. Anderson asked if another solar project was being considered.

Mayor Daines answered that the city has bought into or is planning to enter into purchase agreements.

Councilmember M. Anderson inquired what the city's goal is regarding renewable energy.

Mayor Daines replied that the RESAB Board determined 50% by 2030. The city has essentially met that goal and the Bboard will meet on March 3, 2022, to discuss if there is a need to update that goal.

MAYOR/STAFF REPORTS:

No Mayor/Staff Reports were presented.

COUNCIL BUSINESS:

Planning Commission Update – Chair Simmonds

Chair Simmonds reported on the Planning Commission meeting that was held on February 24, 2022. Lloyd Estates, a 7.23-acre subdivision is proposed to be 44 single-family building lots at 200 W 600 N in a traditional neighborhood zone. There are substantial conditions that need to be met including wetland mitigation, entry, and exits of the property. The Cytiva Logan Expansion design plan was approved. A new duplex at 261 E 300 N where an older home will be torn down for a three-story apartment building. The proposed duplex is located within the zone that the use was proposed. And a land-code development amendment was proposed regarding alternatives park strips.

No further Council Business items were presented.

ACTION ITEMS:

PUBLIC HEARING - Budget Adjustment FY 2021-2022 appropriating: \$1,468,356 restricted Class C Reserves toward the 800 North, 800 West-1000 West and 100 West, 500 South-Hwy 89/91 Projects; \$236,191 a UDOT reimbursement toward Public Works Capital – Resolution 22-07 – Richard Anderson, Finance Director

At the February 15, 2022, Council meeting, Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustments.

Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.

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

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Jensen seconded by Vice Chair López to approve Resolution 22-07 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING - CODE AMENDMENTS – Consideration of a proposed amendments to Chapter 17.08 “Neighborhood Residential Uses”; Chapter 17.11 “District and Corridor Zones Uses”; Chapter 17.37 “Additional Development Standards” and Chapter 17.62 “Definitions” to include standards for short term rentals in Residential and Commercial Zones – Ordinance 22-04 – Mike DeSimone, Community Development Director

At the February 15, 2022, Council meeting, Community Development Director Mike DeSimone addressed the Council regarding the proposed code amendments.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the Municipal Council of the proposed amendments to Chapters 17.08, 17.11, 17.37, and 17.62 of the Land Development Code.

BACKGROUND

The proposed code amendments define minimum operational standards for Short Term Rentals and what zones they are appropriate to be located in.

What is a short-term rental?

A short-term rental, also referred to as a vacation rental, is a transient rental accommodation, typically within a single-family residential dwelling (but not always), that is rented out for a period of time not exceeding 30 days. This short-term occupancy is viewed and regulated differently than a traditional rental (long-term occupancy) where the term of rental is longer than 30 days.

The use of short-term rentals has grown in popularity in many locations primarily because of their location and draw, although many communities are experiencing a significant pressure on maintaining affordable housing for residents. Logan is an entirely different rental and attraction market than a Moab or a Park City or even Bear Lake, all of which function more as "designations" due to their proximity to National Parks, significant ski areas, or other outdoor recreational opportunities. The demand in Logan City for short-term rentals is not that great and has, over the past few years, remained relatively constant. The typical number of short-term rentals being advertised in Logan on the larger short-term rental platforms (VRBO & Airbnb) averages around 25 at any given time which is in contrast to other jurisdictions having thousands of short-term rentals. The Utah State Legislature stepped in a few years ago but failed to provide any real guidance on how a community could, or could not, regulate short-term rentals short of legislating that a city could not use the listing platforms as a basis for enforcement.

What are the issues associated with short-term rentals (STR)?

Pros: A short-term rental:

- May contribute supplementary financial assistance to homeowners, especially elderly homeowners on fixed incomes, enabling them to stay in their homes longer;
- Makes efficient use of space in a home that is otherwise empty or may go unused;
- Enable travelers to find less expensive alternatives to a traditional lodging such as a hotel room;
- Provide a unique “experience” for both host’s and guests that may not be available in more traditional forms of lodging (e.g., hosting international guests or guests experiencing a unique residential neighborhood);
- Helps property owners maximize the economic potential of their property by renting out unused bedroom space;
- Provide additional lodging during peak demand events;
- Provide an incentive to keeping properties from being blighted; and
- Contribute more money into the local economy as it is believed individuals staying in STR's end up staying longer and spend more money in the communities in which they stay.

Cons: A short-term rental:

- Can have an adverse impact on neighborhood character as the residential nature of a neighborhood changes from long-term neighbors with a vested interest in their neighborhood to short-term or transient "guests" who don't share the same long-term interest;
- Can create a number of nuisance problems involving loud music, parties, trash, inconsiderate guests, excessive traffic, inadequate parking, and the commercialization of residential properties for private events;
- May not pay their fair share of local taxes (lodging taxes) nor do they have the same licensing, inspection, and accountability as do more traditional forms of transient lodging;
- May be problematic in a "college town" in that they could be viewed as a tool to circumvent student occupancy limitations; and
- Can negatively impact the availability and affordability of the housing stock by removing available residential units from the long-term housing market and driving up the cost of existing units as residential values become more commercialized due to the potential revenue.

What do other communities do?

The approach to short-term rentals is varied. A large number of jurisdictions have not adopted any specific regulations for short-term rentals, and as a general rule, prohibit them in the residential zones as they are treated as transient lodging. However, because most jurisdictions operate on a complaint-driven code enforcement system, there are probably more short-term rentals operating throughout residential neighborhoods than most jurisdictions realize.

Some jurisdictions permit a short-term rental where the owner/occupant just rents out a spare bedroom of their house while others permit the rental of an entire dwelling without the owner present. Other cities limit the concentration or total number of short-term rentals citywide. For example, the City of Hurricane (UT) permits short-term rentals with a limitation that one short term rental cannot be located within 300' of another short-term rentals. In their residential zones, they will only license three (3) short-term rentals per 1,000 of population limiting the total number citywide. Park City permits short-term rentals in most of their zones as a permitted or conditional use. Other areas such as Moab have banned them from residential zones altogether as they drive up the price of housing making it unaffordable for many residents to live in certain neighborhoods or communities.

Proposed Approach

The proposed approach is to permit short term rentals in the denser multi-family residential zones (MR-20, MR-30 & CR) and in the commercial zones (TC-1, TC-2, COM, MU, CC & GW), but to prohibit short term rentals in the single-family residential zones and industrial zones. See the following proposed Use Tables:

The proposed language in Section 17.37.130 is as follows:

§17.37.130. Short Term Rentals (Vacation Rental)

- A. The purpose of this Section is to establish regulations for short-term rentals to ensure they won't unreasonably reduce neighborhood housing opportunities and to ensure compatibility with surrounding residential uses by minimizing the commercial nature of a short-term rental. These regulations do not apply to hotels, motels, or bed and breakfasts.
- B. **General Requirements.**
 - 1. No person, firm, or corporation shall operate or otherwise make available a short-term rental without first obtaining a Logan City business license pursuant to Chapter 5.02 of the Logan Municipal Code.
 - 2. A short-term rental is temporary lodging typically located in a residential dwelling for a fee and for a rental period of less than 30 continuous days. A short-term rental excludes hotels, motels, or bed & breakfast establishments.

C. **Standards.**

1. The maximum occupancy of a short-term rental in the residential zones shall comply with Logan's residential occupancy limitations: residential occupancy of a dwelling unit by a family or no more than three (3) persons at any one time.
2. The maximum occupancy of a short-term rental in the commercial zones is two (2) occupants per bedroom plus two (2) additional occupants.
3. As part of the short-term rental licensing required under LMC Title 5, the owner shall designate a local contact available to respond to the short-term rental within one (1) hour. The contact's name & phone number shall be posted in a prominent place inside of the dwelling together with a copy of the short-term rental license.
4. Each short-term rental in the residential zones shall provide at least 2 off- street parking stalls per residential dwelling unit. Each short-term rental in the commercial zones shall provide at least one (1) off-street parking stall per (2) bedrooms.
5. Recreational vehicles, trailers, boats, ATV's, or similar vehicles shall not be parked on the site or in the public right of way adjacent to the short-term rental.
6. The short-term rental is subject to the City's nuisance ordinances regarding noise, garbage, parking, occupancy, etc., and more than three (3) violations within a calendar year may result in revocation of the short-term rental license.
7. The number of household pets is limited to the number allowed for a single-family home.
8. A short-term rental may not be the subject of multiple rental contracts for the same night or nights.
9. A short-term rental shall comply with all applicable local and State Building, Health, Fire, Safety, and Maintenance Codes.
 - a. Any basement bedroom shall comply with the current Building Codes for egress window size and location in all basement bedrooms regardless of when the structure was built; and
 - b. A short-term rental shall be inspected upon initial license application under LMC Title 5 by both the Logan City Building Official and the Logan City Fire Marshal.
10. Signs are limited to a single sign, no larger than two (2) square feet, and shall be mounted on the building. No sign shall be illuminated. No banners, window signs, posters, flags, exterior lighting, or other attention getting devices shall be permitted. Signs shall not be painted in or on windows and shall not be mounted in a window.

Staff's position on prohibiting short-term rentals in single-family residential areas is consistent with City policy on trying to maintain and protect the integrity of single-family neighborhoods and with the adopted neighborhood plans. We believe that permitting short-term rentals in single-family residential areas is not beneficial for the existing

residents or for the neighborhood as a whole. As discussed during the Accessory Dwelling Units code amendment process, many of the core neighborhoods have seen a dramatic decline in owner occupancy while the remaining residents deal with the problems and issues associated with long-term rentals near a major university (noise, parking, occupancy). Short-term rentals could potentially lead to additional degradation and increased problems with parking, occupancy, noise, etc., and could negatively impact Logan's housing market as new home buyers are competing with investors for limited housing stock.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND SUMMARY

Staff is concerned about additional impacts to single-family residential areas caused by the encroachment of transient housing into core neighborhoods. This draft approach pushes short-term rentals into more intensive zones where the impact is less. Regardless of which applicability option the PC recommended to the Municipal Council, staff recommended that the operational standards discussed above carry forward. They are also proposing an amendment to licensing requirements.

GENERAL PLAN

The Land Development Code was prepared and adopted to implement the vision expressed in the General Plan. The allowance for short-term rentals in single-family residential areas could lead to further decline in these core neighborhoods and would be contrary to the overall intent of the General Plan. The proposal to limit short-term rentals in denser zones helps balance the needs/desires of residents living in Logan versus those investors who want to establish a short-term rental for economic gain.

On January 27, 2022, the Planning Commission recommended to the Municipal Council approval of the following Land Development Code Amendments:

Land Development Code (LDC) Chapters 17.08 "Neighborhood Residential Land Uses", 17.11 "District and Corridor Land Uses", 17.37 "Additional Development Standards", and 17.62 "Definitions."

The approach staff presented to the Planning Commission was relatively conservative in where short-term rentals were to be permitted. That approach did not permit short-term rentals in the single-family zones nor in the MR-9 or MR-12 zones, permitted them in the MR-20, MR-30 & MR-40 zones provided current occupancy standards were being met, and permitted them in all of the Commercial zones subject to the minimum operational standards. The Planning Commission found that, because the demand for short-term rentals is not excessive, the limited demand would have minimal negative effects on the neighborhoods. Their recommendation to the Municipal Council is to permit short-term

rentals in all zones subject to the operational standards outlined under Ordinance #22-04 (Exhibit C). Planning Commissioners voted (5-0).

Councilmember M. Anderson asked what options there are to limit the concerns raised by staff regarding short-term rentals.

Mike DeSimone, Community Development Director replied that there is a variety of options: Owner Occupancy in SFR (Single-Family residential) zones, limit the number of licenses or that of per population, in SFR zone, an STR (Short-term rental) cannot be within 300 ft of another STR, eligibility must require 1 off-street stall per bedroom with a minimum of 2 off-street parking stalls, the number of occupancies is limited by the number of total parking stalls, there cannot be multiple rental contracts with the same person or group for more than 45/60 total days in a calendar year, and require that rental contracts list all occupants.

Councilmember A. Anderson inquired how staff would anticipate enforcement.

Mr. DeSimone responded that if the rental contract lists all occupants, it would be a means of ensuring that is the case.

Mayor Daines stated that during the legislative session there has been discussion of short-term rentals and the impact on the housing shortage. There will not be any action this legislative session, but there is to be discussion in the future. The city may be preempted and will adjust as needed to meet State code.

Mr. DeSimone said based on population, geography, or distance will determine if there will be a demand for STR.

Chair Simmonds asserted that knowing the number of existing STR will permit a better understanding of ongoing potential violations.

Mr. DeSimone answered that State law does not permit the use of online platforms for reinforcement, but they can be used to gain an estimate which at present is roughly 50. The Planning Commission in their review determined that there is not a high demand for STR. The Community Department reacts in accordance with complaints and if any issues arise there remains the ability to adjust the code accordingly.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked what the current code is for enforcement of a business that does not hold a business license and the penalty if caught.

Mr. DeSimone responded that firstly, the location of the business would have to be confirmed and determined if it is consistent with the zoning. The scale of the business would need to be reviewed. The reason for a business license is to ensure that the business is safe for the business owner and the clientele. The premise of the business must meet building and fire code requirements. Lastly to ensure that the operating business is paying taxes. And as for a penalty, there is the option of a fine or a civil suit and closing the business down.

Craig Carlston, Assistant City Attorney explained that a penalty can go through the administrative court process and impose fines in that manner or prosecute as a Class B Misdemeanor.

Councilmember A. Anderson requested a verbal confirmation that the penalties of a violated business license would apply to an Airbnb.

Mr. DeSimone confirmed that was correct.

Councilmember Jensen expressed reservations that rentals could have a negative impact on neighborhoods, especially with an absentee landlord. Councilmember Jensen has received comments from concerned citizens and the possibility of circumventing the administrative process of an STR to be used as an unlawful boarding house. Delicate care needs to be applied to ensure that neighborhoods are not further negatively impacted. Also, there is a genuine concern with enforcement as there are already problems with enforcement. And suggested that further feedback be received from neighborhood councils.

Vice Chair López requested verbal clarification that staff did not recommend an entire city code application of STR, whereas the Planning Commission did recommend such an action. And if the STR are concentrated in a specific area of the city.

Mr. DeSimone confirmed that was correct. The original recommendation of staff is that STR be allowed in the non-single-family zone rather in the denser, multi-family zones. The Planning Commission, on the other hand, felt there is not sufficient demand. And that STR is spread out across the city.

Councilmember M. Anderson concurred that STR should be available throughout the city but be limited as explained by Mr. DeSimone in order to enforce.

Councilmember A. Anderson said that the purpose of an Airbnb is for families to travel and stay together. If there is an occupancy limit of unrelated individuals that may impact how the Airbnb is marketed. She believed that STR should be allowed throughout the

city, but there is a concern of enforcement to ensure that STR is not used to circumvent existing occupancy codes.

Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.

Keegan Garrity, a resident of the Woodruff neighborhood is in favor of STR if they are owner-occupied for the same reasons that Councilmember Jensen stated. He asked that the Council consider the reason why STR be permitted citywide and not ADU (Accessory Dwelling Units), a matter of inconsistency.

Dr. Gail Yost, a resident of Logan spoke against STR citing similar concerns that Councilmember Jensen stated. STR impact cohesive neighborhoods. The concern even with an owner-occupied STR is that an owner may elect to disregard the code. And requested that neighborhood councils be permitted to discuss the topic and that a decision on the ordinance is postponed.

Kersey Hatten, a resident of Logan spoke in favor of owner-owned STR. She believed that permitting STR would permit first-time homeowners a better opportunity in the market. The average household income is \$66,000, and the average house price is \$420,000. Many young families are currently renting and having an option for first-time homebuyers to supplement income and permit homeowner's further lifestyle options such as staying home with children. That limiting the number of STR rentals via licenses would be an excellent means of enforcement. And asked for further information on the boundaries for an Airbnb.

Mr. DeSimone explained that Airbnb is currently only allowed in certain areas.

Fred Rigby spoke against short-term rentals having experienced several unpleasant experiences. There is a strong concern about enforcement and how that will affect residential areas. He requested that a decision be postponed until more neighborhood committees bring further comment and input.

Mayor Daines said that if there is an immediate concern, please contact the Police. Otherwise, please use the city website or call to express a complaint or concern. Mr. DeSimone concurred.

Ted Chalfant resides by the university and spoke in favor of STR. His family has had great experiences with STR. He asked that STR be permitted in the entire city as it permits those visiting to involve themselves with the local community and promotes local businesses. He agreed that a limit on STR via permits would be a good method of

enforcement including the option per density or limiting per neighborhood, but he was against owner-occupied STR.

Gary Hoffman spoke against STR using the reasoning of economics. The City of Logan is not Jackson Hole, WY, or Park City, UT, if there are too many STR it will saturate the market. There are far too many what-ifs.

Connor Simmons spoke in favor of STR being a partner of several Airbnb's. There are three STR owned in Logan, but considering economics, there is no further room for growth nor match STR owned in Salt Lake. Their partnership has since shifted focus to Ogden and other areas of the state. Investors are unlikely to enter or sweep up multiple properties in Logan. The growth of STR will likely remain with locals. Room rentals are rare in Logan, usually, it is families or travelers seeking a living area to stay in while traveling. The average stay in STR is 60% longer than in a hotel. Guests are short-term, a bad neighbor is for a long time, but a bad guest can be removed by the host. The Airbnb system rates both guests and renters, and their objective is to keep guests and neighbors happy. He is in favor of more ADU's and believes it will aid with the housing crisis.

Diana Roundy spoke in favor and said that Airbnb changed their policy, two-night rules, it is highly regulated and certain criteria must be met. The guests and hosts rate each other. The only way to maintain earnings is with a five-star rating. 62% of the visits in the area come from less than 300 miles away, (locals). The upkeep on an Airbnb must include landscape, decoration, accessibility, etc. She is in favor of a property manager to be within an hour's reach, but that an STR not be owner-occupied.

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

Councilmember A. Anderson requested verbal clarification that owner-occupied means that the owner does not need to be in the primary residence (in the home) at the time of the rental.

Mr. DeSimone confirmed that was correct.

Councilmember A. Anderson said based on public feedback, there is a consensus on a limited number of STR licenses. Although what that exact number is at present is unknown. Based on the number of questions at present, Councilmember A. Anderson expressed concerns about voting on the ordinance at this time.

Chair Simmons observed that 50 STR were found on the Airbnb website and asked if they were duplicated on other websites.

Mr. DeSimone could not confirm as there was some carryover.

Chair Simmonds inquired if there were 50 STR, what the density would be based on the population.

Mr. DeSimone answered that 1 per thousand and at present there is a population of 51,000 based on the census, (51 in total).

Chair Simmonds asked about the Planning Commissions' concern regarding RVs parking at an STR.

Mr. DeSimone responded that the recommendation is for an RV to park off-street not in the street. There must be sufficient availability for an RV to park in a driveway.

The Council discussed whether to have the input from neighborhood councils. The council determined that further neighborhood input was necessary. Mayor Daines would send out information to the neighborhood chairs that include the presentation, Planning Commission feedback, and the draft minutes to be sent out via email. Furthermore, there were remaining questions from the Council regarding enforcement, license limitations, RV parking, etc. As such the Council proposed to continue the Ordinance until the April 19, 2022, council meeting.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Jensen seconded by Councilmember A. Anderson to continue Ordinance 22-04 until the April 19, 2022 Council meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING - CODE AMENDMENTS – Consideration of a proposed amendment to Chapter 7.11 “District and Corridor Zone Use Table’ Chapter 17.15 “Development Standards: Public Zone”; and Chapter 17.37 “Additional Development Standards”, to remove RV Parks and Self-Storage Warehousing from the Commercial Services and Industrial Zones and include minimum development standards for RV Parks – Ordinance 22-05 – Mike DeSimone

At the February 15, 2022, Council meeting, Community Development Director Mike DeSimone addressed the Council regarding the proposed code amendments.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the Municipal Council of the proposed amendments to Chapters 17.11, 17.15, and 17.37 of the Land Development Code.

BACKGROUND

The proposed code amendments define minimum operational standards for Recreational Vehicle Parks and the appropriate zones for placement. The proposed code amendments also remove RV Parks and commercial self-storage from the Commercial Services (CS) and the Industrial (IP) zones (Use Table), and changes Impound Tow Lots in the CS zone from a permitted use to a conditional use.

Currently, RV Parks are permitted in the CS, IP and Recreation (REC) zones while commercial self-storage facilities are conditionally permitted in the CS, IP and Airport zones. In considering vacant land zoned for future industrial development, approximately 38% of the total land area zoned for industrial uses is currently vacant and potentially available for future industrial growth. See table below. Accounting for roadways and wetlands, the 396 acres of vacant lands zoned IP are further reduced by 25% down to approximately 300 acres. Recent projects approved in the IP zone after these numbers were generated further reducing the total vacant acreage by an additional 100 acres (Fed Ex, Costco, Blue Springs).

New uses typically located in the Industrial zones, e.g., manufacturing, fabrication, sales & services, wholesale sales, big box retail, etc., are important for the tax base of Logan and other taxing entities (schools) while also providing important employment opportunities for residents.

Both commercial self-storage facilities and RV Parks are very land consumptive, provide minimal employment opportunities, and provide very little, if any, sales tax benefit. From a community benefits perspective (tax base, jobs), removing these types of uses from the industrial zones is beneficial. The aerial below shows the 1.5 blocks north of 10th North between 6th and 10th West where Costco and Blue Springs were recently approved and the range of uses located there (planned or existing). There are two commercial self-storage facilities in this 1.5 block area that collectively sit on 32 acres which is approximately 15% of the total land area. These blocks also contain BATC and the Cache County School District's bus yard, both of which generate minimal property taxes but generate significant numbers of jobs. The attraction to these types of uses is the proximity to transportation routes and large tracts of land.

However, the growth and development of the private sector industrial base is what contributes to the tax base of Logan, Cache County, schools, etc. And if we aren't smart about the types of uses going into the IP zone and the amount of land being consumed with minimal tax return or employment benefits, additional industrial growth will require further annexations with an associated expansion of city services.

The changes for the tow impound yards is an aesthetic issue, especially as the CS zone continues to develop with a variety of office uses. It is important to be able to apply additional conditions on a tow impound yard to ensure compatibility with adjacent uses.

Proposed RV Park Standards

We currently have few specific standards for RV park developments. The proposed RV park standards address minimum park size, maximum density, space improvements, setbacks and buffers, parking areas, streets, open space, landscaping, length of stay, signage, and designation of management spaces for long term occupancy. The proposed standards are as follows:

§17.37.140. Recreational Vehicle (RV) Parks

- A. The purpose of this section is to establish regulations for Recreational Vehicle (RV) Parks to ensure to ensure high quality development while minimizing impacts to adjacent properties.
- B. General Requirements.
 - 1. Minimum Area. The minimum size of an RV park shall be at least three (3) acres.
 - 2. Maximum Density. The maximum number of RV spaces shall not exceed 20 per acre. Only one (1) RV is permitted per space.
 - 3. Rental Space Improvements. All RV spaces shall be improved with a hardened surface (concrete or asphalt) measuring no less than 10' wide by 40' in length, shall contain, at a minimum, hookups for water, sewer & electricity, and shall contain at least one vehicle parking space per RV site.
 - 4. RV Park Setbacks and Perimeter Buffer Area. All improvements within the RV Park shall be setback at least 25' from all property lines and external roadways. With the exception of the ingress or egress access roads into the park, the 25' setback area shall be maintained as permanent open space.
 - 5. Streets & Parking Areas. All internal streets, roadways, and parking areas within the RV park shall be designed to provide safe and convenient access to all spaces and common use facilities, shall be constructed and maintained to allow free movement of emergency and service vehicles at all times, and shall be hard surfaced with either asphalt or concrete. All interior roadways designated for one-way travel shall be at least 15 feet in width while roadways designated for two-way travel shall be at least 24 feet in width. All interior roadways shall be designated for no parking.
 - 6. Open Space. At least 20% of the site shall be designated as open space. Open space excludes any roadways, parking areas, RV spaces, etc.
 - 7. Landscape Requirements. The RV Park shall be landscaped according to the commercial landscaping standards contained in Chapter 17.32.

8. RV Park Management Space. The RV Park may designate one RV space per 20 RV spaces for use by resident park employees who provide on-site maintenance, security, and operations functions, and whose length of occupancy is year-round. If this space is not used by a park employee, it may be rented in accordance with the length of stay limitations in this Section.
9. Length of Stay. The length of occupancy for each RV space shall not exceed 30 consecutive days. However, as part of the Design Review permitting process, an RV park may have up to 20% of their total RV stalls designated and approved for longer term occupancy by the same person(s) for a period not exceeding 180 consecutive days.
10. Recreational vehicles, trailers, boats, ATV's, or similar vehicles shall not be parked on the internal park roadways or in the public right of way adjacent to the RV park.
11. All signage shall comply with Chapter 17.33.

There is also a minor change being proposed to Section 17.15.050 to reflect the minimum 20% of open space required for RV Parks.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND SUMMARY

The proposed RV Park standards should help to eliminate any ambiguity when reviewing new parks. The proposed to permit RV Parks in only the Recreation zone links that type of land use within a zone where other, similar uses are located. In addition, removing commercial self-storage facilities from the CS and IP zones will retain land area that could go towards other, more intensive land uses with a greater tax and employment base. Changing how we permit an impound tow yard (move from permitted to conditional use) in the CS zone gives decision makers more latitude in the conditions that should be applied to a future tow yard to help ensure compatibility with neighboring uses. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward these proposals on to the City Council for their consideration.

RECOMMENDED FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

The Planning Commission bases its decisions on the following findings:

1. Utah State Law authorizes local Planning Commission to recommend ordinance changes to the legislative body (Municipal Council).
2. The Code Amendments are done in conformance with the requirements of Title 17.51 of the Logan Municipal Code.
3. The proposed Code Amendments are consistent with the Logan City General Plan.
4. The proposed amendments provide reasonable standards for new RV Parks and clarify appropriate uses in the CS and IP zones.
5. No public comment as been received regarding the proposed amendments.

On January 27, 2022, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the following Land Development Code Amendments:

Land Development Code (LDC) Chapters 17.11 "District and Corridor Land Uses", 17.15 "Development Standards: Public Zones", and Chapter 17.32 "Additional Development Standards."

The proposed change to the above referenced Chapters removes certain uses from the CS & IP Zones in the District and Corridor Use Table, clarifies open space requirements for RV Parks in the Public & Recreation Zones, and creates standards for new RV Parks. Planning Commissioners voted (5-0):

Councilmember A. Anderson inquired if the maximum stay of 30 consecutive days is restricted to the park or the stall itself.

Mr. DeSimone answered that restriction applied to the stall itself. The 30-day consecutive days is designated by FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency).

Chair Simmonds requested for clarification on density.

Mr. DeSimone explained that if there are 3 acres, there are 20 units per acre, a total of 60 units. However, three of those units can be for management use.

Councilmember Jensen said there is a mobile home on the west side of town with each pad being for a long-term residential lot. He asked are there still any provisions that address this issue?

Mr. DeSimone responded that there is mobile home zoning, but it is not frequently applied. There are already those in existence, however, there will be no more permitted. The current code is specifically to address recreation zoning.

Chair Simmonds requested confirmation if the proposed code is not applicable to existing RV Parks.

Mr. DeSimone confirmed that the proposed code will not apply to existing RV Parks.

Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.

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

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember A. Anderson seconded by Councilmember M. Anderson to adopt Ordinance 22-05 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING – CDBG PY2022 Annual Action Plan – Amanda Pearce, CDBG Coordinator

CDBG Coordinator Amanda Pearce addressed the Council. She explained it is a requirement by HUD that we initiate the 2022 Annual Action Plan 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 be in need of services, and what specific planning projects the city may consider.

Ms. Pearce stated that the PY2022 AAP will define the funding priorities for 2022. She said we are in year 4 of the 2019-2023 Consolidated Plan and anticipated approximately \$500,000 in CDBG funding this year. Based on the Consolidated Plan's priorities, the funding outcome should approximate 50% to provide a suitable living environment (40% for infrastructure and 10% for access and mobility), 30% to improve for service improvements), and 20% to invest in CDBG planning and administration (5% for planning and 15% for administration).

Chair Simmonds asked if the percentages (of 17% admin. & .7% planning) are in anticipation for this year or next year.

Ms. Pearce answered that these are the percentage of funding used through year three up to this point. Years 4 & 5 have yet to be used up and will be addressed in the upcoming years.

Councilmember A. Anderson clarified for the public that this is the Annual Action Plan specifically for the residents of the City of Logan, but the County also has their own Annual Action Plan. Non-profits and organizations that work with residents of Cache County should apply to the County for grant applications and funding.

Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.

Dr. Gail B. Yost inquired how city projects vs. non-profit projects are prioritized. Do non-profits receive a higher rating for services provided or is it equal. And if there is any room for other types of non-profits that have been listed.

Ms. Pearce responded that the objective is to stay within the funding goals. The goal is that 30% of all funds received go towards non-profits and their services provided. There is also the possibility of other types of non-profits to apply as long as they meet the criteria.

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

WORKSHOP ITEMS:

Budget Adjustment FY 2021-2022 appropriating: \$11,610 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; \$10,609 funds received for police overtime shift reimbursements; \$5,363 funding the police Department received for the Bulletproof Best Partnership to be used to purchases vests for police officers; \$14,667 funds the Fire Department received from the State of Utah to be used for mental wellness screenings, mental health classes, and training for firefighters – Resolution 22-09 – Richard Anderson, Finance Director

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

Councilmember M. Anderson asked how many bulletproof vests can be purchased with this amount.

Police Chief Gary Jensen replied that roughly between 8 to 10 bulletproof vests can be purchased with the grant amount.

The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the March 15, 2022, Council meeting.

REZONE – Consideration of a proposed rezone of approximately 1.36 acres of property located at 310 West 1400 North from Mixed Residential Low (MR-12) to Mixed Residential Medium (MR-20) West Pointe Subdivision (Bridger Neighborhood) – Ordinance 22-06 – Tanya Rice, Planner

Planner Tanya Rice 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 1.36 acres of property located at approximately

310 W 1400 N (TIN# 05-089-0001, 05-089-0002, 05-089-0003, 05-089-0004, 05-089-0005, 05-089-COMM,) from MR-12 to MR-20.

Land use adjoining the subject property

North: CS: Commercial Services East: MR-12: Mixed Residential Uses

South: NR-6: Residential Uses West: MR-12: Mixed Residential Uses

SITE HISTORY

West Pointe Condominiums (West Pointe) is a 1.36-acre condominium complex consisting of five (5) buildings at 310 West 1400 North. The five (5) buildings are each individually owned with co-ownership of the land maintained and governed by the five-building owners via the West Pointe Homeowners Association (HOA). Each of the five buildings is fourplexes, totaling 20 dwelling units in the complex. The remaining areas of the complex are designated as common areas.

This complex is originally known as Lot 2 of 6 of the 1992 Royal Pointe Subdivision. At the time of the initial Royal Pointe subdivision when Lot 2 was legally created, the property was zoned R4 which permitted 19.5 units per acre. The 1.36-acre site would have been allowed up to 26 units. Twenty (20) units were constructed on Lot 2, and in 1994, the West Pointe Condominiums were created through a condominium plat rather than a legal subdivision. The result has been a subdivision of ownership & improvements that the City has not recognized as a legal subdivision of land. Since 1994, the zoning has changed twice and is currently zoned MR-12 (12 units per acre). The current zoning would permit 16 units on the 1.36-acre site.

PROJECT PROPOSAL

The proponent is requesting a rezone from Mixed Residential Low (MR-12) to Mixed Residential Medium (MR-20) in order to subdivide the 1.36-acre complex of buildings. The intent is to change the nature of the land & improvements from a “condominium” where only the buildings are individually owned, to a condition where an owner owns both the building and the land underneath. The underlying purpose of the rezone and subdivision is to legitimize the current division of improvements & ownership, tie those improvements & ownership to the real property located underneath, and make the properties easier to market and sale. An HOA, or similar entity, would still be required to own and maintain the common areas, e.g., driveways, open space, etc. A rezone is required to legally subdivide the overall site because the current unit count exceeds the allowable density under the current MR-12 zone. The proposed rezone would permit up to 27 units on the 1.36-acre site.

GENERAL PLAN

The property is currently designated as MR in the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP). The General Plan, a nonregulatory visioning plan, describes Mixed Residential (MR) areas as being intended for all stages of life and levels of income. MR areas are located near employment centers and service areas allowing walkability and transportation choices. MR zones range from 9-30 dwelling units per acre.

LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE - ZONING

The Land Development Code (LDC) regulates land uses and entitles properties with specific development allowances. The Mixed Residential Low (MR-12) zoning district (current zoning designation) is a low-density multi-family zone permitting a maximum density of 12 dwelling units per acre. Building heights are limited to 35 feet and lot coverage is capped at 40%. A total of 30% of the site is required to be set aside for open space and outdoor amenity space. This density functions as an appropriate transition between residential areas and commercial centers or higher density complexes.

The Mixed Residential Medium (MR-20) zoning district (requested zoning designation) is a multi-family zone permitting a maximum density of 20 dwelling units per acre. Building heights are limited to 45 feet and lot coverage is capped at 60%. A total of 30% of the site is required to be set aside for open space and outdoor amenity space. Structures in this zone include a mixture of housing types including town houses, apartments, and stacked housing developed at 20 dwelling units per acre.

NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY

The proposed up-zone to MR-20 is located adjacent to a single-family residential area zoned NR-6, other multi-family complexes zoned MR-12, and a mixture of commercial and light industrial uses located in the CS zone across 1400 North. There are not any other MR-20 zoned properties in the immediate vicinity.

The MR-12 and MR-20 zones are generally similar in design and development standards except the MR-20 allows for more intensive development patterns with taller buildings, greater lot coverages, and higher densities. There are no other MR-20 zoned properties within the immediate area, so increased densities on this site would be incompatible with neighboring single-family residential areas to the south as well as other development patterns in the vicinity. Both the multi-family and single-family residential areas were developed during the same period of time (1994). Adding additional units immediately adjacent changes the overall character. Rezoning this site could lead to similar requests of the adjacent properties in Royal Pointe. The Bridger Neighborhood contains a high percentage of density, multi-family residential development which has negatively impacted the elementary school with high rates of transiency and has contributed to the high rate of transient occupancy. Because the Bridger Neighborhood contains a very high

percentage of multi-family residential, the City has authorized a number of zoning actions to “downzone” Bridger to prevent additional, high-density projects. Rezoning properties to increase the potential density and unit counts is detrimental to the overall neighborhood, the school district, and is contrary to the goals of the Bridger Neighborhood. Staff recommends that this property remain MR-12 zoning.

SUBDIVISION

The owners of the West Pointe Condominiums have enjoyed the benefits of having a subdivision without meeting any of the requirements to be legally created and subdivided. Now, because of the difficulties in marketing and selling these improvements & ownership, the applicant is requesting the City grant an “after the fact” subdivision making it more convenient for them. Staff’s recommendation is that the City deny the proposed subdivision and the proposed rezone.

However, if the Planning Commission and City Council view this request differently, the subdivision of the condominiums is contingent upon the approval of the rezone. The proposed subdivision would be inconsistent with the current zoning. If the rezone is denied, the subdivision is also denied. If the rezone is approved, compliance with the subdivision and zoning standards in MR-20 shall also be met. As a developed site, the expectation is that the subdivision and resulting lots will need to meet minimum zoning setbacks, parking requirements for each building, and minimum open space requirement. As the subdivision is currently proposed, minimum setbacks and open space requirements are not met but can be conditioned. As conditioned, a subdivision permit could be granted.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Notices were mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property. As of the time of this report, one comment had been received.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

Legal notices were posted on the City’s website and the Utah Public Meeting website on 1/3/2022, published in Herald Journal in a quarter page ad on 12/30/2021, Legal Notice published in the Herald Journal on 1/2/2022, and a Public Notice mailed to property owners within 300’ were sent on 12/27/2021.

RECOMMENDED FINDINGS FOR DENIAL of REZONE

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

1. The existing zoning (MR-12) is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed zoning (MR-20) is incompatible with the Bridger Neighborhood.
2. This land was originally developed as a multi-family condominium complex and has functioned as such for 28 years.

3. The change in zoning for a single parcel, in this neighborhood, is contrary to the neighborhood stabilization goals and policies of the Logan General Plan, especially when there are no other parcels zoned MR-20 in the immediate vicinity.
4. Changing the zone from MR-12 to MR-20 is inconsistent with previous zoning actions in this area.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL of SUBDIVISION if rezone is approved; This project is subject to the proponent or property owner agreeing to comply with the following conditions as written, or as may be amended by the Planning Commission.

1. All standard conditions of approval will be recorded with the Subdivision Permit and are available in the Community Development Department.
2. Five (5) lots are approved with this subdivision permit.
3. All building setbacks shall comply with the MR-20 zone and shall be reviewed and approved prior to final plat approval.
4. Two parking stalls per unit will be included within each lot.
5. The overall open space shall comply with the MR-20 zone requirements.
6. The final plat shall be recorded within one (1) year of this action.
7. An HOA, or similar management entity, shall be established to maintain all common areas.
8. Cross access easements shall be granted for access, parking, open space, and utilities.

On February 10, 2022, the Planning Commission recommended that the Municipal Council **deny** the West Pointe Subdivision Rezone. Planning Commissioners vote (7-0):

Councilmember M. Anderson inquired about the MR-12 buildings to the east of the project.

Ms. Rice answered that the subdivision previously had been called, Royal Subdivision. It was subdivided into 6 parcels. The rest of the properties were fourplexes, while the parcel currently being addressed elected to build condominiums.

Councilmember A. Anderson requested an explanation on the difference between subdividing and condominiums.

Ms. Rice explained that in a condominium, the building is owned and not the land.

Vice Chair Simmonds asked for a brief summary on the reasoning behind the proponent's request.

Ms. Rice responded that the reasons were subserving. The main reasoning for the proponent is lending, selling, marketing, and for insurance purposes. The consensus among staff is that the proponent had ample opportunity to build more to meet standards or change during the zoning opportunities such as in 1994. The staff does not recommend the zone change be made, but there are personal factors for the proponents.

Councilmember Jensen inquired as to why the condominium simply can't be changed to a subdivision, why is there a need for a change in the zoning.

Mr. Carlston replied that a condominium does not meet the requirements of a subdivision such as maximum density nor setbacks.

Ms. Rice further restated that a condominium building is owned but not the land underneath.

Vice Chair López asked who owned the land.

Ms. Rice answered that four different owners own the various buildings, but the land is actually owned by the (HOA) association.

Councilmember Jensen inquired if there is intent to tear down the existing structures and build a new project.

Ms. Rice replied that the proponent claimed that is not the intent of the proposal.

Vice Chair Simmonds commented that the Planning Commission shared concerns regarding the proposal and especially that it appeared to be spot zoning.

Vice Chair López asked what the proponents' options would be if nothing was done.

Ms. Rice answered that nothing would change. The condominium would continue to exist as an illegal non-confirming use. Unless the rezone was approved and in which case a plan would need to be worked out to meet the zoning standards.

Councilmember Jensen inquired that in the case of the rezone would the site need to be redesigned to meet the zoning criteria.

Ms. Rice responded that the proponent would be required to adjust setbacks, the property line changed to show a shared drive, etc.

Councilmember Jensen inquired what setbacks would be permanent.

Ms. Rice answered that the only permanent or rather grandfathered setback would be the perimeter of the property.

Councilmember A. Anderson remarked that the Planning Commission discussed a possible deed restriction but would not be a logical option considering the request for a rezone.

Ms. Rice expanded that the Planning Commission determined that two of the original owners since the original creation have had ample opportunity to opt into another zoning (such as in 1994).

The proposed ordinance will be an action item and public hearing at the March 15, 2022, Council meeting.

Consideration of a proposed resolution authorizing the Steel Solar 1B Project Transaction Schedule under the Master Firm Power Supply Agreement with Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems (UAMPS) – Resolution 22-10 – Yuqi Zhao, Light & Power Resource Manager

Light & Power Resource Manager Yuqi Zhao addressed the Council regarding the proposed resolution. She stated the Steel Solar 1B Project began in Plymouth, Box Elder County with 8 members signing up with the program. However, since then one of the members has dropped the project. There are 5 megawatts to spare and hence will be prorated. The original share has increased from 5 MW to 5.77 MW with the schedule showing that change.

Chair Simmonds requested clarification as her understanding was that Mark Montgomery, Director of Light & Power had said that the project had been stalled. She asked if the project was now moving forward.

Mayor Daines answered that the Mesa project was to provide 5 MW this summer, however, there have been supply issues causing the project to not be ready for this summer's usage. The Steel Solar 1B project is the second project that is being considered as well as a tentative third with a battery option. Mayor Daines inquired if there was a firm timeline for the discussed project.

Ms. Zhao responded that the Steel Solar 1B project is slated to commence between May 31, 2023, to December 31, 2023. The city has signed up for three solar projects. The first is the Red Mesa solar project to be provided with 49 MW (with 15 others). Due to shortages caused by the pandemic, the Mesa Project was postponed from June of 2022 until next year. However, the Mesa Project has declared to aim for December 31, 2022.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked for clarification on the soonest date when the Steel Solar 1B project can be drawn upon.

Ms. Zhao repeated that the project is slated to commence between May 31, 2023, to December 31, 2023. The hope is that the shortages will be resolved and that the project will be able to function by the summer of 2023.

The proposed resolution will be an action item at the March 15, 2022, Council meeting.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

There were no further considerations addressed by the Council.

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

The Logan Redevelopment Agency convened on Tuesday, March 1, 2022, at 7:23 pm, in the Logan Municipal Council Chambers located at 290 North 100 West, Logan, Utah 84321. Logan Municipal Council Meetings are televised live as a public service on Channel 17 and the City of Logan YouTube channel at:
https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCFLPAOK5eawKS_RDBU0stRQ

Council Members present at the beginning of the meeting: Chair Jeannie F. Simmonds, Vice Chair Ernesto López, Councilmember Amy Z. Anderson, Councilmember Amy Z. Anderson, Councilmember Tom Jensen, and Councilmember Mark A. Anderson.
Administration present: Mayor Holly H. Daines, Assistant City Attorney Craig Carlston, Finance Director Richard Anderson, Economic Development Director Kirk Jensen, City
Excused: City Attorney Kymber Housley.

Chair Jeannie F. Simmonds welcomed those present. There were approximately 7 in attendance at the beginning of the meeting.

WORKSHOP ITEM:

Budget Adjustment FY 2021-2022 appropriating: \$65,000 funds for the construction of a new Ellen Eccles Theatre cooling system canal diversion at 50 West 100 South; \$2,150,000 donations received for the Center Block Plaza Project – Resolution 22-08 RDA – Kirk Jensen, Economic Development Director

Economic Development Director Kirk Jensen addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustments. The reason and need for the canal diversion are that the Mill Creek project Phase 1 has ended and will enter Phase 2. Part of the construction will impact the existing diversion per a 1992 Easement Agreement that the city entered. It is the City's obligation to fund the expense in the instance there is an impact on the existing diversion which is occurring at present.

Vice Chair Simmonds was uncertain as to the rationale or reason for the city to enter into such an agreement.

Mr. Jensen replied that the rationale behind the decision is that the ground was undeveloped at that time and that the canal directly benefitted the city.

Chair Simmonds clarified for the public that all donations received for the Center Block Plaza Project will be used for the project. However, any remaining funds from Center Block will go back into the RDA funds to be used for other projects.

Councilmember M. Anderson asked how much of a percentage is the donation for the plaza project.

Finance Director Rich Anderson responded that roughly 50% of the donations make up the plaza's budget.

The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the March 15, 2022, Council meeting.

ADJOURNED. There being no further business, the Logan Redevelopment Agency adjourned at 7:28 pm.

Esli Morales, Deputy City Recorder