

Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Municipal Council convened in regular session on Tuesday, February 18, 2020 at 5:30 pm in the Logan City Municipal Council Chamber, 290 North 100 West, Logan, Utah. Vice Chair Tom Jensen conducting.

Councilmember's present at the beginning of the meeting: Vice Chair Tom Jensen, Councilmember Mark A. Anderson, Councilmember Jeannie F. Simmonds and Councilmember Jess W. Bradfield. Administration present: Mayor Holly H. Daines, Finance Director Richard Anderson, City Attorney Kymber Housley and City Recorder Teresa Harris. Electronically: Chair Amy Z. Anderson.

Vice Chair Jensen welcomed those present. There were approximately 34 in attendance at the beginning of the meeting.

### **OPENING CEREMONY:**

Logan City Finance Director Richard Anderson led the audience in the pledge of allegiance.

**Meeting Minutes.** Minutes of the Council meeting held on February 4, 2020 were reviewed and approved with no changes.

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

**ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Bradfield seconded by Councilmember Jensen to approve the February 4, 2020 minutes with no changes and approve tonight's agenda. Motion carried unanimously.**

**Meeting Schedule.** Vice Chair Jensen announced that regular Council meetings are held the first and third Tuesdays of the month at 5:30 pm. The next regular Council meeting is Tuesday, March 3, 2020.

### **QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FOR MAYOR AND COUNCIL:**

There were no comments for the Mayor or Council.

### **MAYOR/STAFF REPORTS:**

No items were presented.

### **COUNCIL BUSINESS:**

#### **Planning Commission Update – Councilmember Bradfield**

Councilmember Bradfield reported the Planning Commission met on February 13, 2020. Some of the items discussed were the L59 Project which, was continued to the February

27 meeting and the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) amendment which, will be a workshop item at the March 3, 2020 Council meeting.

### **Board/Committee Reports – Councilmember Bradfield and Councilmember M. Anderson**

Councilmember Bradfield reported that the Cache Valley Center for the Arts is doing a great job balancing their budget, bringing in new shows and increasing their revenue.

Councilmember M. Anderson reported that he attended a recent Library Board meeting and discussed building maintenance. There was an update from the Friends of the Logan Library and a report on several upcoming events that will be held at the Library. He also attended the Logan Downtown Alliance meeting and they discussed the Logan City Marathon scheduled this summer and announced the Alliance now owns the marathon. They also discussed plans for Center Block. The Forestry Board did not meet this month and the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board will meet this week.

### **Neighborhood Council Assignments – Vice Chair Jensen**

Vice Chair Jensen explained that in the past, each of the councilmember's has been a liaison to one of the City neighborhoods. There are six neighborhoods and five councilmembers. The following assignments were made:

M. Anderson – Woodruff  
Bradfield – Wilson  
Simmonds – Ellis and Bridger  
Jensen – Adams  
A. Anderson – Hillcrest

Vice Chair Jensen indicated the Council will report back as they meet with the various neighborhoods.

No further items were presented.

### **ACTION ITEMS:**

**PUBLIC HEARING - Budget Adjustment FY 2019-2020 appropriating: \$69,605 funds received from the State of Utah for Alcohol Enforcement – Resolution 20-04 – Richard Anderson, Finance Director**

At the February 4, 2020 Council meeting, Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustment.

Vice Chair Jensen opened the meeting to a public hearing.

There were no comments and Vice Chair Jensen closed the public hearing.

**ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Bradfield seconded by Councilmember M. Bradfield to approve Resolution 20-04 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote.**

**A. Anderson: Aye  
M. Anderson: Aye  
Bradfield: Aye  
Jensen: Aye  
Simmonds: Aye**

**PUBLIC HEARING – Consideration of a proposed ordinance adopting the Impact Fee Facilities Plan for Water, Wastewater, Parks, Power and Transportation – Ordinance 20-03**

At the February 4, 2020 Council meeting, City Attorney Kymber Housley addressed the Council regarding the proposed Impact Fee Facilities Plan for Water, Wastewater, Parks, Power and Transportation. He said the impact fees to be considered will be charged to new development and used to offset the cost of facilities to serve new development. These facilities may include water, sewer collection, sewer treatment, parks, power, fire, transportation and other infrastructure. The proposed impact fee facilities will be located within the City’s current boundaries.

Mr. Housley indicated a change to the ordinance and referenced 3.36.040 Subsection A. 5. in the second sentence it reads, “These costs may include all projects included in the Impact Fee Facilities Plan which are under construction or completed but have not been utilized to their capacity, ~~as evidenced by outstanding debt obligations.~~” Mr. Housley said a period will be placed at the end of capacity eliminating the wording of “as evidenced by outstanding debt obligations.”

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED IMPACT FEES**

The impact fees proposed in this analysis will be assessed within the Service Area. The table below illustrates the calculated impact fee for water, wastewater, parks, power, and transportation.

TABLE 1.1: IMPACT FEE PER UNIT

	Single Family Residential (per unit)		Multi-Family Residential (per unit)		Commercial/Retail (per 1,000 SF)		Office (per 1,000 SF)		Industrial (per 1,000 SF)	
	Proposed	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed	Existing
Water*	2,293.00	1,738.00	2,293.00	1,738.00	2,293.00	1,738.00	2,293.00	1,738.00	2,293.00	1,738.00
Wastewater Collection*	203.00	884.00	203.00	884.00	203.00	884.00	203.00	884.00	203.00	884.00
Wastewater Treatment*	2,433.00	-	2,433.00	-	2,433.00	-	2,433.00	-	2,433.00	-
Parks	1,292.00	1,085.00	965.00	931.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Power**	213.00	159.00	213.00	159.00	213.00	159.00	213.00	159.00	213.00	159.00
Fire***	-	55.66	-	55.66	-	43.35	-	43.35	-	43.35
Transportation	1,020.00	677.00	791.00	461.00	2,691.00	2,004.00	1,052.00	779.00	536.00	493.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$7,454.00</b>	<b>\$4,598.66</b>	<b>\$6,898.00</b>	<b>\$4,228.66</b>	<b>\$7,833.00</b>	<b>\$4,828.35</b>	<b>\$6,194.00</b>	<b>\$3,603.35</b>	<b>\$5,678.00</b>	<b>\$3,317.35</b>
<b>% Change</b>	<b>62%</b>		<b>63%</b>		<b>62%</b>		<b>72%</b>		<b>71%</b>	

\* Fee is for 1 ERU based on water meter size. Larger water meters will be assessed a higher fee

\*\* Fee is based on a peak demand of 3kW. Fee will increase as demand on the system increases

\*\*\*While the City has plans to expand the capital facilities for fire service in the future, they are not committed to doing so in the next 6 years or any definitive timeline thereafter. Therefore, this impact fee has been removed from the fee schedule for the time being, with the understanding that it can be added back in at a later date, when specific plans for additional stations are available.

Vice Chair Jensen opened the meeting to a public hearing.

Logan resident Shawn Jordan addressed the Council. He thanked the Council for the work they do and for streaming the Council meetings online.

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

**ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Councilmember Bradfield to adopt Ordinance 20-03 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote.**

**A. Anderson: Aye**  
**M. Anderson: Aye**  
**Bradfield: Aye**  
**Jensen: Aye**  
**Simmonds: Aye**

Mr. Housley announced the ordinance will go into effect 90 days from today.

**PUBLIC HEARING - Consideration of a proposed ordinance amending Sections 9.12.290 and 9.12.300 of the Logan Municipal Code Regulating Public Intoxication and Drinking Alcohol in Public Places – Ordinance 20-01**

At the February 4, 2020 Council meeting, Logan Police Chief Gary Jensen addressed the Council regarding the proposed ordinance. He stated the current terminology refers to “intoxicating liquor” and in court this language can and has been challenged. The proposed ordinance is to change the language from “intoxicating liquor” to “all alcoholic beverages” which would include beer.

Vice Chair Jensen opened the meeting to a public hearing.

Logan resident Gail Yost addressed the Council and asked how prevalent the problem is with alcohol intoxication and how often do the police arrest those who are publicly intoxicated.

Logan Police Chief Gary Jensen responded that unfortunately, the police deal with intoxication and alcohol related issues on a daily basis. He added that Driving Under the Influence (DUI) arrests occur several times per week.

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

**ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Bradfield seconded by Councilmember M. Anderson to adopt Ordinance 20-01 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote.**

**A. Anderson: Aye**  
**M. Anderson: Aye**  
**Bradfield: Aye**  
**Jensen: Aye**  
**Simmonds: Aye**

**PUBLIC HEARING - Consideration of a proposed adoption of the PY2020 Annual Action Plan – Mike DeSimone, Community Development Director**

At the February 4, 2020 Council meeting, Community Development Director Mike DeSimone addressed the Council and presented the PY2020 Annual Action Plan. He said the Annual Action Plan defines funding allocations for 2020 CDBG funds based on

priorities adopted in the 2019-2023 Consolidated Plan. Considerations are the following: Public Infrastructure and Facilities (Funding: 50% over five years), Nonprofit Service Support (Funding: 30% over 5 years) and Planning (Funding: 20% over five years).

Estimated funding allocation for 2020 - \$450,000  
Priority 1 – Infrastructure - \$225,000 (50%)  
Priority 2 – Nonprofit Services - \$315,000 (30%)  
Priority 3 – Administration and Planning - \$90,000 (20%)

\*\*All funding is subject to Congress passing a budget.

#### PY2020 Timeline

February 18 – Public Hearing  
February 19 – March 19 – Application Period  
March 31 – Steering Committee Meeting  
April 6 – May 5 – Public Comment Period  
May 5 – Public Hearing and Adoption of 2020 Annual Action Plan

Vice Chair Jensen opened the meeting to a public hearing.

There were no comments and Vice Chair Jensen closed the public hearing.

CDBG Coordinator Debbie Zilles addressed the Council and further explained that no formal action is needed from the Council at tonight’s meeting other than to hold a public hearing. There will be another public hearing and adoption by the Council on May 5, 2020.

Vice Chair Jensen stated that he is very proud of the projects that have been accomplished and the organizations that have benefitted through CDBG funding.

#### **WORKSHOP ITEM:**

**Budget Adjustment FY 2019-2020 appropriating: \$70,000 Community Development Rolling Stock reserves toward the purchase of two vehicles; \$3,000 a grant the Library received from the State of Utah. The Census Outreach Grant funds will be used to purchase equipment to help with Census report; \$11,200 funds the Library received for the State of Utah. The Community Library Enhancement Funds Grant will be used for collection development, technology for public use, and community outreach programs; \$980 a reimbursement the Police Department received for enforcement of events requested by businesses; \$60,000 a grant awarded for the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). These funds will be used for a study of the Main Street Corridor; \$102,253 a grant from the Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization (CMPO), these funds will be used for the study of the Main Street Corridor; \$40,000 funds the City will receive from Cigna. These funds will be used to promote wellness among the City employees with activities, newsletters, and other wellness programs – Resolution 20-05 – Richard Anderson, Finance Director**

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

The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the March 3, 2020 Council meeting.

**OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

There were no further items considered by the Council.

**ADJOURN TO MEETING OF THE LOGAN REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY.**

Vice Chair Jensen welcomed those present. There were approximately 72 in attendance at the beginning of the Logan Redevelopment Agency meeting

Councilmember's present at the beginning of the Logan Redevelopment Agency meeting. Vice Chair Tom Jensen, Councilmember Jess W. Bradfield, Councilmember Mark A. Anderson and Councilmember Jeannie F. Simmonds. Administration present: Mayor Holly H. Daines, City Attorney Kymber Housley, Finance Director Richard and City Recorder Teresa Harris. Electronically: Chair Amy Z. Anderson

**WORKSHOP ITEM:**

**Presentations: Revitalizing Downtown/Emporium Block – Proposed Center Block Alternatives**

Vice Chair Jensen explained there are no public comments at tonight's RDA meeting. There will be a public hearing scheduled on Tuesday, March 3, 2020. Each presenter will be given 15 minutes each. At the end of the three presentations there will be time for questions from the councilmembers to the presenters.

**Eugene Needham III** – Logan Business Owner Gene Needham III addressed the Council and provided the following accompanied by a Power Point presentation. **\*NOTE: Mr. Needham's complete presentation is available in the February 18, 2020 Permanent Council Packet on file in the Logan City Recorder's Office. It was also posted to the Logan City website at loganutah.org.**

*Logan's downtown has ever represented the challenge of many working in the same area for individual interests and the common good. The problem is to solve matters fairly from many choices. The property owners of the downtown recognize that whatever is done regarding parking and the disposition of businesses affects their well-being. Many have interest in what takes places beyond the Emporium block. The entire city deserves to have the best things done for Logan's historic retail sector.*

*Appreciation is expressed to Mayor Holly Daines, her staff, and the Council for pursuing down-town renewal. However, things have not been thought out satisfactorily at this point. Logan City's Historical Preservation Committee voted against the city demolishing the Emporium. The mayor has seemed elusive regarding whether she will obey this city*

*ruling; she has not been willing to say if she is still intent on tearing down the Emporium building. Surviving documents show the parking behind the Emporium belongs to downtown property owners and cannot be used by the city without permission.*

*There are other things that can be done in the downtown besides tearing down the Emporium and draping an ice-skating pond and apartments over the downtown's limited parking. If the Cowboy Partners developers are allowed to have their way, the city will be handing them twenty million dollars of ownership access to apartment ownership. If this happens, it is not wise nor fair. They have under-performed now three times and do not deserve such benefits!*

*Things are tenuous in the downtown. If not better thought out, they can get worse. It is assumed that the city has around \$7,000,000 to spend on the downtown including RDA money. This money should be spent wisely to help downtown's historic retail sector. Apartments can be built on unused land in the downtown and should not be placed on necessary parking areas.*

*It will cost \$1,400,000 to tear down the Emporium. Rather than tearing down the Emporium building, other things could and should be done to increase traffic. Some of these "other things" will be suggested in ten possible projects below intended to increase traffic in the downtown. With the money already spent, the loss of the Emporium will be a community loss of an additional several million dollars. To lose the Emporium and its potential would set the rest of the downtown back.*

### ***Ten Possible Projects for the Downtown***

*1. Thirteen townhouses are proposed for the former Wonder Bread building at 162 South I 00 West. To be built and sold for around \$225,000 apiece.*

*2. Seventy-Seven apartments to be built on the corner of I 00 South and I 00 West, formerly known as the VI Station. Parking will be underground on the south of the property. This project is already underway. The developers have already demolished the former station and the space is waiting for better weather to begin construction.*

*3. A fifty apartment and eight retail store complex is proposed for 100 South Street, from the VI site to Logan's Heroes. Negotiations have been taking place for this project. It is recommended that the retail spaces on the ground floor be sold to those who will occupy them.*

*4. A parking terrace is proposed for behind Eccles Theater.*

*5. The city to sell the Emporium to a developer. The idea of a restaurant (the Copper Mill) being returned to this site is being considered.*

*6. For a restaurant to fully consider the Emporium site, more parking needs be developed. A parking area east of Logan Fine Art on I 00 North is proposed. This would best come about with the displacing and moving of two retail stores to two locations on the same block.*

7. A smaller retail/apartment complex is recommended to be built on 100 West allowing the roadways to stay the same but would give 3-4 retail spaces below and 8 apartments above.

8. Another retail and office building is proposed to be built by the county on their property on I 00 W I 00 No. Besides offices upstairs, downstairs could be another eight or nine retail spaces. It is recommended that the spaces be sold to give occupants ownership in the downtown.

9. To replace parking spaces lost to the county office building construction and a general need for parking, a parking area could be created by putting a parking lot in place of the six homes on the block north of Center Street after the School Board building on I 00 West.

10. The library has need of repair. Many have thought that Logan needs a new library. Whether the library is remodeled or made new, I would propose that Third North be closed, and the site be made into a city park. I would offer to trade my properties on Third North and Main, the Army-Navy building, Muffler Shop, and Garage, for the Emporium, plus an amount of cash to be determined by negotiation. The buildings would then either be tom down and the site used for a new library or the buildings could be used for a community center. It would principally be used for a museum for art by the finest regional artists to be collected over years. The USU Museum has modern/contemporary art. The U of U Museum has European art, but no museum features the art everyone likes, done by professional, living artists. Living artists produce the most "likeable art." A Logan City Art Museum with fine art by living artists would not only be fairly affordable, it would attract the wealthy, who could locate another home for themselves in Cache Valley and give financial support to our economy as well as prestige. The Daughters of Utah Pioneers relics could be part of the museum along with other community venues.

**Various Center Block Business Owners (George Daines) - James Clawson, Great Harvest Business Owner addressed the Council and provided the following presentation (no PowerPoint was presented) on behalf of various Center Block Business Owners. \*NOTE: The complete presentation is available in the February 18, 2020 Permanent Council Packet on file in the Logan City Recorder's Office. It was also posted to the Logan City website at [loganutah.org](http://loganutah.org).**

*I appreciate this opportunity to present the Logan City Council with an alternative to the present plans of the City respecting the Center Street Block. I am James Clawson the owner of the Great Harvest business located on Center Street. I represent a group of Block Owners who believe this Center Street Alternative offers substantial advantages to Logan City, the general public and Downtown Business Owners. Some of this group would be participants in this Alternative. I am not one of those, but this Center Street Alternative offers very substantial benefits to my business and other owners on Center Street. I am an enthusiastic supporter of this Center Street Alternative. I think it is a better alternative for all the stakeholders.*

*Before discussing the Center Street Alternative, I want to thank Logan City on behalf of all of the Downtown Business Owners for their investment and good planning in*



*upgrading Center Street. We are convinced that this is a great beginning in the revitalization of Logan's Downtown Area and Mayor Holly Daines, the City Council and City Officials should be credited with a great decision and excellent execution. We recognize this great success as we propose an alternative to the current City plans for the Center Block.*

*The root problem with the City plan is that it is based on using property that was principally purchased by block owners and transferred into Logan City name with Logan City's commitment and reaffirmed commitment that this area would be "public parking in perpetuity" for the benefit of the block owners and the general public. See Addendum #1. That covenant by the City can only be modified with the consent of those block owners who paid the money and contributed their property into that process. So, the problem with the City plan is simply that it is not legally feasible without the express consent of each of the block owners who each relied upon that covenant. We present this Center Street Alternative as an alternate that is both feasible and aligned with the end goals that the City has articulated for downtown. Put simply, the Center Street Alternative does not have as its central element the abrogation of covenants made by the City and the inevitable legal barriers of attempting to doing so.*

*We recognize that there is substantial blight, vacancies and lower quality uses on the Center Block particularly in the Main Street frontage. This needs to be addressed as it is Logan's face to the community and visitors. Substantial efforts are needed to revitalize that area and the Downtown Area generally. We are in favor of more revitalization efforts and we recognize that additional Logan City support is required to accomplish that goal. We believe that those efforts need to be matched and multiplied by the efforts of the Block Owners themselves. We believe that this Center Street Alternative and any other revitalization effort, to be successful, requires again the unified efforts of both Logan City and the Downtown Business Owners. Our hope would be that this Alternative would be recognized as a unifying project that all parties could support wholeheartedly. We also recognize that this Alternative is subject to further suggestions, refinements and amendments. We expect that additional input and interaction will improve this Alternative; we would be particularly interested in the City feedback. I suspect that the City Council, Mayor and Logan Officials will need more than the 15 minutes allotted here today to fully consider this Alternative. I am going to try to make this presentation in 10 minutes so as to leave 5 minutes for your questions and I may direct some of those questions to others involved. I am also going to leave you with a copy of my comments this evening along with pictures, drawings and an appendix that will supplement this presentation.*

*This aerial picture of the Center Block and the Theatre Block shows the four (4) major elements of this Center Street Alternative. It is Addendum #2.*

**#1 – Center Street Public Plaza.** *This Center Street Public Plaza would serve the same purposes as the plaza proposed in the City plan for the Emporium area. It could include the same uses as a gathering place, an ice rink, splash pad, stage, music productions, etc. We believe that Center Street is a superior location for those purposes because (1) Center Street is less busy (fast), noisy and dangerous than Main Street; (2) business activities can engage more readily with uses on the plaza; (3) Center Street can be*

closed for activities, including winter and summer events and particularly summer weekend evenings: (4) the plaza is of comparable size, but it can include the street itself and cross street sidewalks as needed for larger events; (5) businesses now located on Center Street would be synergetic with plaza uses (restaurants, theatres, bars, etc.).

**#2 – Theatre Block Parking Terrace.** This facility would directly assist the theatres with their surge parking needs during shows and relieve parking congestion during those times. It would allow confirmed parking for shows. It would also be available as overflow parking for employees and Center Street activities and businesses. The size of this facility would depend on financing. However, the diversion of city funds to this purpose would provide about 70% of the cost needed for a parking facility with approximately 425 stalls.

**#3 – U&I & Al’s Trophies Demolitions & New Parking Area.** Demolition of these buildings would dramatically improve parking and access and easements on the Center Block. The proposal is to remove these buildings and thereby add some 80 public parking stalls just west of the Main Street buildings. This would also allow a complete through road and sightlines from 100 North to Center Street along with pedestrian walkways, etc. This is a key to making full use of the existing Emporium and Plaza 45 buildings. The full development of the existing buildings on this street require substantially more public parking than is currently available. This expansion of public parking along with the proposed parking terrace allows the full development of Center Street businesses that exist and are planned. For example, the brew pub that is slated for West Center can proceed. Even with this additional public parking the probably full use of all of the buildings and which will come may yet requires still more public parking.

**#4 – Emporium & Plaza 45 Plan.**

A. Relocation of U&I to Emporium Ground Floor & Basement - the two mezzanines in the west part of the building are removed.

B. Relocation of Al’s Trophies to the Poco Loco Building including its upstairs & basement.

C. Food Hall in Plaza 45 Ground Floor areas (McKay food operation - using second floor restaurant kitchen).

D. Restaurant on Second Floor of Emporium areas (McKay food operation - using second floor restaurant kitchen).

E. Reestablishment of Banquet Areas, specifically the entire upstairs Emporium area & existing banquet rooms on the 2nd and 3rd floors of Plaza 45 including deck use of the roof area of the Emporium. The upper area of the Emporium is approximately 10,000 square feet of floor area, one of the largest banquet halls available comparable to the USU Ballroom and Riverwoods Conference Center. areas (McKay food operation - using second floor restaurant kitchen).

F. Baugh Jewelry becomes a pedestrian passage from Main Street to the Center Block Parking area. This passage includes access to the Food Hall, several staircases and existing elevator to second and third floors (restaurant and banquet areas). See, Addendum #3.

*G. Main Street Façade of the Emporium would be completely changed - this concept is a period recreation of glass facades used in the early 1900s. It includes a useable porch on Main Street and deck area on roof. The historic fronts of adjoining buildings would be retained and restored. See Addendums #4 and #5.*

***Other Center Block Changes.*** *Our understanding is that Logan City is in the process of developing alternatives that would further improve the west parking areas of the Center Block. Those improvements are consistent with this Center Street Alternative and would be additional improvements to the public parking situation. We understand these alternatives may include purchase of the Larsen/Anderson building on 100 West and a reorganization of access and easements from 100 West. Those improvements are needed and would be an enhancement to this Center Street Alternative.*

***Costs of the Center Street Alternative (Sources of Funds).*** *It is believed that the Center Block Alternative as presented is no more expensive to Logan City than the present project proposed. The estimated costs and a comparison to projected Logan City expenses under its 1 The full regeneration of Main Street businesses requires this additional parking. Current buildings by Logan's code should have 800 plus stalls. The present public parking area has approximately 250 stalls. The problems which were present when the Coppermill was operating a restaurant and banquet facility are well known to the business owners. current plan is attached as Addendum #6. Alternative and Additional Sources of Funds for the Center Street Alternative are described in Addendum #7.*

***Timeline for Center Street Alternative.*** *One of the advantages of the Center Street Alternative is that there are no legal roadblocks to its immediate development. The properties needed for the (1) Center Street Public Plaza, (2) Parking Terrace, and the (3) U&I and Al's Trophies parcels are all owned by a small handful of individuals each of which is supportive of this Center Street Alternative.<sup>2</sup> Hence, the Center Street Alternative can begin immediately and can proceed on the two sites simultaneously. There are no legal or owner roadblocks. Of course, there is a need for more detailed planning, legal agreements, approvals and permits before starting but these could be accomplished rather quickly. An additional advantage is that these two projects will not measurably interfere with ongoing use by block owners during their construction phase. However, some Theatre Block parking will be affected until the Parking Terrace is finished but the future plaza area can remain fully available for public parking during that construction time period. Addendum #8 is the Construction Timeline, it assumes necessary approvals, permits and legal agreements are in place by May 1, 2020 as to the Center Block Portion. The Timeline assumes that necessary approvals, permits, bids and legal agreements for the Theatre Block Portion are in place by July 1, 2020. <sup>2</sup> Of course, the Center Street Project also requires that Logan City be supportive, given its ownership of the Emporium property and its major role in funding the proposed Plaza and Parking Terrace.*

**Mayor Holly H. Daines** – Mayor Daines addressed the Council and provided the following accompanied by a Power Point presentation. **\*NOTE: Mayor Daines complete presentation is available in the February 18, 2020 Permanent Council packet on file in the Logan City Recorder’s Office. It was also posted to the Logan City website at [loganutah.org](http://loganutah.org).**

*Mayor Daines addressed the Council and displayed a photo of the current Emporium building and stated, this is what we have now. She then displayed a photo of what the City is proposing to benefit our citizens and revitalize the Downtown. She continued and stated that, we pledged to come back with a more detailed plan. We need to get this right and have appreciated the input!*

*The architectural design has changed to feature three levels of housing above the retail on Main Street, with a stepped back roof terrace on the fifth level to address concerns about massing. Note the design and material of the building and gateway features.*

*It takes inspiration from the Historic Thatcher building and the Center Street archway. Gateway features frame the plaza and tie it into Center Street with the open metal work. The South entry feature balances the design and reflects the historic façade to be demolished in the new gateway. We will try and save the original cornice from demolition and reuse it or reconstruct it if needed.*

*The building is now all brick on Main Street frontage with some cast stone detailing, has more brick on the plaza side, and emphasizes the cornice feature. One note is that the roof terrace may change, as the final design is still in process. All these changes better reflect the character of historic downtown.*

*The plaza will feature an ice rink in the winter, and in the summer, a water feature, and stage for concerts and activities. The surface parking is near every business. Owners were concerned about losing parking close to their backdoors, so we moved the terrace South to provide easily accessible surface parking near all businesses. We also gain retail frontage on 100 West, and this plan opens up the block with great pathways for pedestrians, and a better flow for autos and delivery vehicles. We listened to the owners and the Historic Preservation Committee!*

*Now, a brief history, I was on the Council when the City bought the nearly vacant Emporium, at a discount of \$1M when no one else wanted the space – to ensure something positive would happen here in the heart of our downtown to benefit our community. Over the next two years, the City tried to find a usage, and issued two RFP’s or publicly announced “Requests for Proposal.” No one was interested in tackling a project there. When I took office two years ago, we immediately began working on the problem. We learned the better approach is to use an RFQ process – or “Request for Qualifications” – to choose a good partner, then work on it together. The RFQ was fair and open, utilizing the City bidding process. Three quality developers were interested, and our team visited a number of their projects, reviewed qualification, and interviewed them in depth. After this diligent process, we selected Cowboy Partners for a number of reasons.*

*First, they have an outstanding track record of successful developments. Dan Lofgren has more than 40 years' experience and cofounded Cowboy twenty years ago. Second, Cowboy keeps their developments as a long-term investment, so they build quality buildings, provide on-site management and maintain their properties well. Third, they have vast experience building and delivering successful projects with a positive impact. About fifteen have been public-private partnerships. Because of their experience, this project is economically and logistically viable. Cowboy's numbers are real, as they routinely must be accountable for the economics of the deal.*

*Yes, Cowboy Partners will make money on this project, but Logan City will benefit as well. It is something we could not do on our own, and no one would take the Emporium on without an incentive from the City. We own the Emporium and need to solve the problem and we did our homework!*

*Dan came to Logan in July 2018 to get public input. From the Cache Valley Daily photo and article, this Chamber held over 100 people. To quote the Herald Journal, "During a 90-minute visioning meeting, an interactive process of identifying and ranking priorities for the vacant, city-owned shopping center...Lofgren,...learned that the people of Logan are interested in a plaza, a parking structure, a public library and mixed-use residential and commercial development. The top ranked priority was some sort of a plaza or park."*

*In August 2018, we invited all property owners around the block to meet with us. Dan listened and worked with us to develop a design. The original plan did include a Library, but because of parking and space limitations for the library's 700 daily patrons, that did not work out.*

*A year later, on September 25, 2019, we had a design to show the public and owners. Based on feedback from owners, Dan modified the plan four different times to better meet their needs.*

*We involved the public and stakeholders in the process!*

*Cowboy's original timeline showed plans ready for Planning Commission by August 2019, and that's why we bid the Emporium demolition. But everything takes longer than expected.*

*This proposal is just one part of the vision to revitalize the Downtown. That vision is based on our Downtown Specific Plan, and The 20 Ingredients of an Outstanding Downtown, courtesy of Roger Brooks.*

*The first step was Center Street. We have invested in new infrastructure and beauty, creating one wonderfully renovated block with a striking downtown gateway and sidewalk café dining and great curb appeal. The next step is the Emporium block, and dealing with both vacant, crumbling buildings and the challenge of bringing new uses and activity downtown.*

*One critical piece is people living and staying downtown to energize the area after 5 pm when office workers go home. Our plan includes housing and a programmed plaza with*

*constant activity. Another key component is walkability. Our project would open up the Block and make it more pedestrian friendly. Logan's Historic layout has 600-foot-long block which make a forbidding wall for pedestrians. Good City planning breaks that up into more walkable segments. Look at the successful downtown blocks on Main Street.*

*The County block is open with a plaza and green space and has great businesses. The Church and Federal block is divided into quarters, with walkable restaurants and shops. The beautiful Tabernacle block has open space with public walkways. The Eccles Theatre block is only 408 feet because the canal shortened the block at 100 South.*

*The Emporium block is the only one that still has the 600-foot wall. This project will improve the block by opening it up for pedestrian activity and providing a beautiful, public space where people can walk and linger, enjoy concerts and activities. People passing by on Main can see the activity of summer concerts and winter skating. It will invite people Downtown to patronize businesses and restaurants and will attract tourists to stop and spend their dollars in our community. It will help the businesses, and our economy. This project makes sense!*

*Center Street is now beautiful, active and pedestrian friendly, creating a gateway for our Theatre District.*

*Now we need to connect our downtown North and South to provide a critical mass – in three blocks – for an outstanding downtown!*

*One other key component of our plan, requested by the citizens, is the plaza and ice rink, with constant activity and programming such as the Rockefeller Center, our rink would be slightly larger. You may have noticed; this is the fourth year in a row we haven't had skating at Merlin Olsen Park because Mother Nature hasn't cooperated. A mechanical rink would solve that problem. In the summer, an interactive water feature and a stage would draw people for concerts, activities and fun.*

*This plaza, centered on the Tabernacle would have lovely views to the East, and create nice symmetry for the block, while opening it up for activity. The development would energize downtown with housing and additional retail or restaurant space. This project meets our goals!*

*Right now, we're spending about \$4,000 a month to heat the old building enough to keep pipes from freezing for required fire suppression. Last winter a pipe broke anyway, resulting in a \$16,000 cleanup cost so we didn't have mold mitigation in addition to asbestos cleanup. There have been at least two sewer leaks in the basement of the Emporium in recent years.*

*For a price, anything can be fixed. Based on the square footage estimates from Cartwright Structural Engineers, it would be \$5-\$7M to retrofit the buildings, and that is without the cost of interior furnishings. And even then, the buildings wouldn't meet the goals of attracting new uses, so that doesn't make sense.*

*Is it a perfect plan? No, nothing is ever perfect. Parking continues to be a concern for some, and structured parking is the only way to make this work. Current utilization of the parking lot is just over 50%, and we are replacing the free public parking, honoring our commitment to provide parking for the surrounding property owners. By demolishing the Emporium and eliminating the large banquets and lunch time usage of the Copper Mill, our studies show the parking demand is manageable given complementary daytime and evening uses of the new plaza and commercial space.*

*Yes, it will change the parking configuration. Some like a terrace - with shaded, cool cars in summer and no scraping snowy cars or trudging through icy lots in winter - but some do not. We looked at adding one more level to the terrace, but that adds \$1.5M to the cost of the project, which we simply can't afford with existing RDA funds-- and really makes for a massive structure. So, the net parking impact is that we gain about 10 stalls. One key feature of the current design is the housing hides the terrace from street sightlines on Main and Center. On 100 West, retail on the street level mitigates the mass.*

*Now for the finances. Can we afford it, and is it worth it? This money comes from cash reserves in our RDA --or Redevelopment Agency -- which is specifically for economic development. This does not use general fund dollars that provides roads, public safety, etc.*

*We've already spent \$2.4M to acquire property. Demolition will be another \$1.2M. The architects estimate on the plaza with rink, water feature, and stage is \$2M, and We've added 10% contingency. This will be a long-term city asset, owned and managed by the city.*

*We will provide the developer with an incentive of \$1.5 - \$1.95 M from general RDA fund reserve, and another \$2.5M from restricted RDA housing funds, which if we don't use reverts to the state. This is a perfect project to use those funds, and a key component to the financing. We've included another \$1.5M for contingency, and for acquisition to accommodate parking.*

*By providing land for the development, the city will be an equity partner for \$2.5M, and will receive a cash flow participation as the property increases in value and profitability. The projections show a cash return starting in year four and growing to \$200,000 by year ten, ongoing for the life of the development, but it is performance based, another reason a developer with a proven track record is so critical.*

*That return on our investment will be dedicated to offsetting operating and capital replacement costs of the plaza and rink.*

*Cowboy Partners will be investing \$19M in the development --with estimated new tax revenue of \$150,000 annually.*

*The project is market rate housing, with 20% affordable housing integrated seamlessly into the development. This helps provide workforce housing, and is the right thing to do - particularly given the valley's housing demand. Cowboy frequently uses this*

*model, and to quote Dan, “I challenge you to walk through one of my buildings and determine which units are the affordable units.” Look at the projects Cowboy has delivered, and you have the assurance this project is economically and logistically doable. This project is financially viable!*

*After Council reviews the proposals, hears public comment in two weeks, and evaluates finances, if they choose to pursue this project, our next steps are as follows:*

- 1. Get a “head nod” from Council on willingness to allocate RDA funds .*
- 2. Prepare plans for submission to Planning Commission.*
- 3. After PC approval, finalize budget.*
- 4. Take finalized project to Property Owners for vote, to provide input to council.*
- 5. Schedule Council RDA workshop/public hearing for final project approval and funding request.*
- 6. Then we would go back to Historic Preservation Committee for both Design Review and a demolition permit, as their primary concern was whether the project would actually happen.*

*In summary, my pledge as Mayor is to revitalize Downtown and make it a vibrant place to benefit our citizens and economy with this investment. Over the last two years, our team has worked hard, focused on our goals, listened to the public, and now this outstanding project is ready to go, and within our reach.*

*I invite citizens to let Council members know your thoughts, as ultimately, Council will decide whether to fund the project and if it goes forward. Thank you.*

### **Questions from the Council to the Presenters:**

Councilmember Simmonds and Chair A. Anderson both stated that because they did not have information prior to the presentations from Mr. Needham and Mr. Daines they won't be asking a lot of questions at tonight's meeting because they would like to read through the material provided and be better prepared to ask questions prior to the public hearing scheduled on March 3.

Councilmember Bradfield asked Mr. Needham and Mr. Daines why there was a delay in them proposing their alternatives for Center Block.

Gene Needham responded that the Emporium building was not accessible, and he did not know what was going on with the building and there was no access to anyone.

George Daines responded that he assumed the City was involved with the Library and its development. The first time the public saw a definitive project was in September and it looked like something was going to proceed. Since September, he and others have been working to come up with a good alternative. He feels the range of what the City is proposing is much broader than the perception of what was first presented. He was completely shocked when it was proposed there would be buildings on the public parking area and why the City feels they can build on property they don't own and that is the reason he got involved. He stated the public parking was purchased by block owners and the first time he saw proposed buildings in the parking area was September. He assumed



the City would be doing a project on the footprint they owned. He said there is a perception that this is a matter of voting and its not. He reminded the Council there are covenants on this land, its public parking and the Council will have to get permission from those who the covenants were made because this is not property the City owns.

City Attorney Kymber Housley responded the City does own the property and there is also no question of how the City acquired the property and that has never been in dispute. The issues aren't whether we can build on it, it's what kind of permission do we need from the property owners to build. It's always been the position of the City that we are not going to force this on the property owners. What we don't know is what percentage of property owners need to state that yes, this is the right project for this property before we move forward and it might be that litigation is the next step. If there is enough support for the project from the property owners, then litigation is something the City is willing to do.

Vice Chair Jensen said it will take time to absorb all of this information. He asked Mr. Daines who will own the various entities of the total plan that he presented.

Mr. Daines responded that U&I Furniture and Al's Trophies will be added to the public parking and will become part of the public parking in perpetuity, the Special Improvement District. The City would trade part of their interest in the Emporium to acquire that which would produce 82 more parking stalls and in his analysis of cost, he figured there would be a credit. He figured the 82 parking stalls would be worth \$15,000 per stall and with the building being traded it would be equal. He feels that some of the property owners around the U&I area would particularly benefit from the public parking. He stated that Cache Valley Bank owns two large buildings on the corner with no parking in that area so he doesn't feel it would be unreasonable to expect a contribution from the bank for the development but he does not feel that the bank should have any more interest when it's finished than anyone else. U&I and Al's Trophies is a trade so they would end up with ownership inside the Emporium building, the ground floor, the basement and the Poco Loco area which, would all be a trade for them. The upper building, Plaza 45 would most likely be a consortium of individuals including Tony Johnson, Tracy McKay and perhaps other members of the McKay Family. He might also take an interest in something in this part of the building. Logan City will have ownership of the parking terrace behind the Theatre and it will be public parking.

Mr. Daines continued and said he envisions swapping rights to parking that are now enjoyed by private individuals to parking rights during business hours in the new parking terrace. If 82 parking stalls are contributed, during business hours they would have 82 stalls as compensation. Logan City would own the plaza, Logan City would own the parking terrace and would become part of the parking district as would the parking facilities.

Logan Finance Director Rich Anderson said regarding credit for parking stalls, he clarified stating that those are assets and can be conceded but, it does need some explanation. It was presented that it would be \$10.1M to do the Cowboy project and \$2.8M for the other project with the credits but is still cash outlay so the real comparison is \$10.1M to \$8.6M.

Mr. Daines responded that he feels Mr. Anderson is \$2M off with the numbers. He stated he would like to meet with Mr. Anderson and go over the financial numbers in more detail. Mr. Daines spoke with Michael Ballam and Mr. Gibbons at the Utah Theatre and representatives at the Eccles Theatre about the potential of a surcharge that could be added to ticketing. This amount is listed as other funding sources on the financial information he provided.

Mayor Daines suggested that until those financial numbers can be vetted, they should not be posted on the website.

Vice Chair Jensen said Mr. Needham presented 10-12 potential projects for Center Block and asked are all of these private projects.

Mr. Needham responded that most are private projects.

Vice Chair Jensen said the Emporium is an old building and has not been upgraded for seismic and the interior posts are not connected. The building would require major upgrades. He asked if Mr. Needham has taken this into consideration.

Mr. Needham responded that he does not know the cost of upgrades but, he owns several buildings in the downtown and some have been in a similar condition as the Emporium. He realizes that the City and the entire Country is becoming more aware of the structural security of buildings.

Vice Chair Jensen said Mr. Needham's project had a net increase of housing and asked how many units he estimated there might be.

Mr. Needham responded there would be 200 apartments and that is if Cache County participates and Logan City participates with RDA funding. He said the thing that's important about his vision is this will be occupying space that currently is empty.

Mr. Daines stated there was is no proposed housing in his presentation.

Mayor Daines stated that \$2.5M of the funds the City intends to use for this project are restricted for housing.

Mr. Housley clarified the concept of buildings being proposed on the parking wasn't something new in September and it originated with the Downtown Business Alliance who brought the concept forward to the City.

Mayor Daines added that the public RFP's that went out and the RFQ also included the parking concept and it was public information.

Mr. Housley also stated we are adding to the parking footprint, so it is not diminishing the parking footprint, there was property being added.

Vice Chair Jensen said it may have been assumed that the City is taking away parking but in reality, we are adding parking.

Mayor Daines said approximately 10 new parking spaces will be added. An extra level added to the parking terrace was considered but it was too costly for the funds we have available. We are fulfilling our obligation to replace the parking, it will be free public parking, and it will be a different configuration. Parking will be close to everyone's back door because that was a concern from the downtown business owners, and she feels the City has really tried to address that concern. The City's proposed plan will have 124 housing units (studio, 1 and 2 bedrooms). The apartments will have to provide their own parking.

Vice Chair Jensen commented this is an exciting potential project for downtown and he thanked Mayor Daines, George Daines and Gene Needham, and others for their presentations. He announced again that a public hearing will be held on March 3, 2020.

**ADJOURNED.** There being no further business to come before the Council, the Logan Redevelopment Agency meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm.

Teresa Harris, City Recorder