

Logan Municipal Council

Logan, Utah

November 2, 2021

Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Municipal Council convened in regular session on Tuesday, November 2, 2021, in the Logan Municipal Council Chambers located at 290 North 100 West, Logan, Utah 84321 at 5:30 pm. Logan Municipal Council Meetings are televised live as a public service on Channel 17 and the City of Logan YouTube channel at: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCFLPAOK5eawKS_RDBU0stRQ

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

Excused: City Recorder Teresa Harris

Chair Mark A. Anderson welcomed those present. There were approximately 12 in attendance at the beginning of the meeting.

OPENING CEREMONY:

Councilmember Ernesto López provided the opening ceremony and led the audience in the pledge of allegiance.

It's November two thousand twenty-one. The holiday season in our country is well underway. As I reflect on the past twelve months, I realize that I have many reasons to be thankful. Thankful as in, overflowing with gratitude for the blessings we enjoy in our daily lives. From opportunities to liberties, you would probably agree with all or most of them. They are plentiful and reach every corner of our existence.

One that recently struck me was seeing children playing outside in our streets and sidewalks. At first glance, they were just children having fun enjoying their bikes and scooters. But as the days went by and I kept seeing them enjoy their childhood, I realized that many children around the world do not have the same privilege. In too many parts of the world, safety is a luxury they can't afford. To us, the citizens of Logan, feeling safe comes very naturally. Maybe even as natural as breathing. Many others elsewhere do not know such a feeling. Parents would never allow their children to play by themselves for fears of their children dying or disappearing altogether. Not long ago, Logan was ranked one of the safest areas in our nation, and I feel fortunate to enjoy living here with my family, walking our streets without worrying about an impending wrong happening to us.

After our early winter storm a few weeks ago, I was reminded once more about our many blessings. I witnessed crews work diligently to clean up fallen tree branches and reconnect lost power. I kept thinking, how many weeks would such an effort take in my beloved Mexico after such an event? 1, 2, 3 weeks? 1 month, 2 months? I understand there were overwhelming numbers of downed power lines across our valley, yet I saw how our city crews worked long hours making sure people had power in their homes. They also quickly mobilized to set up debris drop-off locations for people to bring their downed tree branches. I saw our city landfill open its doors to an entire valley to come and dispose of their tree branches with no questions asked. Many of us saw firsthand the mountain of green waste this became after a week or so of the incident. What a blessing to see our city do even more than expected for its citizens and beyond.

Taking part in our community traditions and culture and expanding them to new horizons has also been a blessing. How fortunate are we that we get to enjoy parades and festivals on our streets? That our families can enjoy the diversity of our people. That we can come together to help those in need. That we can set our differences aside and offer a helping hand to your neighbor. That we can dedicate days or even months to a variety of worthy causes and celebrations. May we continue to learn more about each other and discover that we have much more in common than we think.

When I joined the Logan City Council a year ago, I didn't know what to expect. This wonderful opportunity has given me a new outlook on my daily life and the things that occupy my mind. I have learned much I didn't know about our city, its people, and government, and I have a new appreciation for everything that makes Logan the place it is. We know it's not perfect. We know that we can find ways to do better. I can do better. You as well. I am thankful for this experience and the opportunity to serve our community. Thankful for the welcoming support you have provided to a newcomer like me, with strengths and weaknesses and a genuine desire to serve. May God continue to bless each one of us with love and wisdom. May He bless our city and valley. Our state and nation. May we be thankful every day of our lives.

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

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

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

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

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FOR MAYOR AND COUNCIL:

Chair M. Anderson 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.

John Shivik, a resident of Logan expressed his gratitude for the city staff in cleaning up after the storm.

Chairman M. Anderson thanked the city staff and residents in helping the community after the storm.

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

MAYOR/STAFF REPORTS:

Recreation Program Update – Mayor Daines

Mayor Daines gave an update on the new Parks & Recreation program that will commence on November 30 at 6 p.m. (and continue on Tuesdays and Thursdays). The program is designed for 5th to 8th graders. There will be various games and activities, an enjoyable alternative to participating in a team sport.

Councilmember Jensen added to the report from the Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT). He remarked that the urgent need for housing needs creative approaches to housing in order to be proactive rather than reactive.

Mayor Daines reported that the League of Cities and Towns has appointed her to serve on the board representing Northern Utah, but the board appointment hinges upon reelection.

No further Mayor/Staff Reports were presented.

COUNCIL BUSINESS:

Planning Commission Update – Vice-Chair Simmonds

Vice Chair Simmonds reported there was a single item on the agenda that the Cache County Food Pantry will be constructing a 92 by 42 square foot building to the west of the existing building. A single house will be removed to permit a wider driveway behind the church. There were concerns regarding church parking and adequate landscaping. The item was continued to the next meeting in 2 weeks.

No further Council Business items were presented.

ACTION ITEMS:

(Continued from October 19, 2021) Code Amendments– Consideration of proposed amendments to the Land Development Code Chapters 17.08 “Neighborhood Residential Uses”, 17.11 “District and Corridor Uses”, 17.37 “Additional Development Standards”, and 17.62 “Definitions” to include standards for “Community Agriculture, Urban Agriculture, and the keeping of domestic fowl, bees, and livestock in urban areas – Ordinance 21-22 – Mike DeSimone, Community Development Director

Community Development Director Mike DeSimone addressed the Council and provided a memo with the following information:

This is a follow-up to the October 19, 2021 Council discussion regarding the proposed Ordinance #21- 22 (Urban Agriculture).

Background

Ordinance 21-22 is a proposed amendment to the Land Development Code (LDC) redefining the City’s definition of “Agriculture”, defining minimum standards for keeping chickens, domestic fowl, bees, and livestock on residential properties, and establishing in the Land Use Tables where the different categories of agriculture are permitted. As we have discussed, there is a disconnect between the Logan Municipal Code (6A.06.030) and the Land Development Code regarding how and where agricultural uses (Animals for Family Food Production) are permitted. Urban Agriculture is the proposed mechanism to address minimum standards for raising Animals for Family Food Production in residential areas.

Public Notice & Public Review Process

These proposed code amendments were discussed by the Planning Commission on September 9th and September 23rd. In terms of public notification, we sent out the PC agenda and packets to the neighborhood council chairs on 9/3/21 for the 9/9/21 PC hearing and again on 9/16/21 for the 9/23/21 PC hearing. Legal notices were published in the Herald Journal on 8/28/21, posted on the City's website and the Utah Public Meeting website on 8/30/21, and noticed in a quarter-page ad (Herald Journal) on 8/21/21. This topic was also reported on by KSL in September.

Following the first Planning Commission hearing, I reached out to a number of local beekeepers and other communities for assistance with the beekeeping standards. Input received was included in a revised draft. I also included suggestions made during the original PC hearing and public comment period into the revised draft that was eventually passed by the PC on 9/23/21.

Council Direction

The direction from Council was to look for the “science” on backyard animals. In reviewing the various Agricultural Extension services for Utah State University, Idaho State U, Colorado State U, University of California at Davis, University of Nevada Reno, Montana State U, Washington State U, and Oregon State U, it is clear there is not really any “science” behind the keeping or raising of backyard animals. Rather, it comes down to the basic premise that if a jurisdiction, as a matter of policy, wants to permit animals in a residential setting, residents should follow Best Management Practices for keeping animals. Best Management Practices center around the appropriate numbers of animals as determined by the jurisdiction, enclosures & square footage per bird, sanitation, nuisance control, feed, water, location, setbacks from adjoining residential dwellings and/or properties, and disease and vector control, all of which are addressed in the proposed code amendments. Many of these extension services address backyard chickens, but none address keeping other types of livestock in a residential setting. All extension services are oriented more to large-scale agricultural operations.

I have attached a guide to raising chickens from Oregon State University Extension Services that provides general information and is used as a reference by other Universities. This pamphlet provides information for people wanting to raise chickens in their backyard while also making sure they are aware that (1) not all cities allow chickens in residential areas, and (2) while someone may consider their chickens their pets, not everyone loves living next door to non-traditional animals.

Consideration of Multiple Species on a Single Residential Lot

I have put together a tentative approach patterned after North Logan, Hyde Park, Smithfield, and Hyrum that uses a system of Animal Equivalent Units (AEU) in

determining the total number of animals that could go on a residential lot. This approach is used in range management or herd management to quantify how many animals can be assigned to a piece of property without overgrazing or damaging the underlying land. Under the AEU methodology, a carrying capacity is assigned to a specific piece of property based on property size and the species of animals. The larger the animal, the greater the potential impact, the greater the need for more physical space to accommodate their needs, and the fewer number of animals per acre. Vice versa for smaller animals. It is generally a simple mathematical exercise to determine how many fowl, or small, medium or large animals are appropriate for a certain size lot. While it is not 100% accurate because most backyard owners aren't grazing animals, it at least sets a baseline to work from. This methodology is included under Section 17.37.120 in the attached updated draft code language.

There are other approaches to limiting the total number of animals. Some jurisdictions only permit chickens and bees on residential lots, some jurisdictions only permit chickens, bees, and miniature animals on residential lots less than 20,000 square feet, while others only permit large livestock on lots larger than one acre. For example, the City of Denver permits up to 8 chickens or ducks and 2 dwarf goats on any residential lot in the City. The City of Eugene, Oregon limits properties under 20,000 square feet to any two of four categories: 6 fowl, 6 rabbits, 3 miniature goats, 1 miniature pig, while the city of Flagstaff, AZ has a system based on acreage, namely only chickens, ducks, rabbits & miniature goats on lots less than an acre in size with larger livestock permitted on lots greater than an acre.

Council Changes

At the 10/19/21 hearing, the Council made the following changes to the number of chickens based on lot size (17.37.080.B.2):

Lot	Maximum Permitted
Less than 6,000 square feet	Went from 5 - Six (6)
6,000 – 10,000 square feet	Went from 6 - Twelve (12)
10,001 – 12,000 square feet	Went from 8 - Fifteen (15)
12,001 – 20,000 square feet	Went from 10 - Twenty (20)
20,001 square feet or greater	Went from 15 - Twenty-Five (25)

The Council also agreed to prohibit animal slaughtering.

Recent Comments

The Council has received a number of recent comments, namely from residents in Hillcrest, who do not want livestock in their neighborhood. These comments are contrary to the written and verbal comments received during the Planning Commission

process from residents expressing an interest in maintaining livestock on their properties with minimal government oversight.

We did receive a suggestion that we consider regulating animals using a context-based approach, with the recommendation that we consider only permitting livestock in the historic areas of the city originally platted under the "Plat of Zion" and generally tied to an early date, e.g., 1900, 1910, or 1920. The premise is that because the historic areas of Logan originally platted under the Plat of Zion concept were developed in a manner with the house being placed on the front on the lot and the rear of the lot was to be used for gardens, fruit trees, and animals, residents should be more accepting and comfortable with having livestock around them. We evaluated this approach and concluded that too many of the historic blocks & lots have been subsequently subdivided to such an extent that the integrity of the original Plat of Zion is not wholly intact. It would be almost impossible to manage a regulatory system based on the original block plat date, just as it would be to manage a system based on neighborhood boundaries.

In response to recent concerns about livestock in more densely populated areas, one suggestion could be to increase the setbacks for livestock shelter & pens from 50' to 75' or even 100' from adjoining homes. This would limit the locations where livestock could go in the City based on the underlying amount of acreage someone had as well as the overall lot layout. In a residential neighborhood like Hillcrest, this standard would be difficult to meet whereas, in the older neighborhoods with the long, deep lots, the standard would not be that difficult to meet.

Grandfathering (Non-conformities)

Grandfathering is a term we use to authorize or permit the continuation of a legally existing, non-conforming use or structure. Chapter 17.52 in the Land Development Code governs how we make decisions to authorize a non-conformity while the policies stated under 17.52.030 governs the City's approach to non-conformities:

- A. Legally existing nonconforming uses shall be permitted to continue operating in the same way the use operated at the time the zoning regulations were enacted, revised, or amended which rendered the use nonconforming.
- E. A use or structure which becomes legally existing nonconforming upon the adoption, revision, or amendment of applicable regulations may continue. However, if the structure or use is vacated for 12 or more months following the modifications to the ordinance that rendered it nonconforming, it shall lose its legally existing status and shall be brought into conformance with appropriate codes prior to subsequent use.

If someone has legally established an agriculture use on their property at a time when it was permitted, and even if the rules have subsequently changed, that person is legally able to continue with their established use. As was previously discussed, the City adopted Ordinances 00-34 & 00-62 in 2000 eliminating references to keeping animals for personal use from the Zoning Code. The definition of Agriculture that was adopted in 2000 is the same definition found in the current LDC. In 2013, the City adopted Ordinance 13-70 where agriculture was re-established as a permitted use in the NR-2 and NR-4 zones. If someone has an ongoing agricultural practice established after 2013 and is currently located in an area zoned NR-2 or NR-4, then they would fall under the grandfathering provisions. Similarly, if a property owner has an ongoing agricultural practice established prior to 2000 and currently located in areas that were zoned for agriculture, then they would also fall under the grandfathering provisions.

Animal Equivalent Units (AEU)

§17.37.120. Number of Animals Permitted (Animal Equivalent Units/AEU) A. The use of the Animal Equivalent Unit methodology for determining the total permitted numbers of animals is applicable when a homeowner is keeping a variety of species on a residential lot. If a homeowner chooses to keep or raise a single category of animals, e.g., domestic fowl or miniature livestock, or large livestock, then the requirements listed in the sections above apply. B. Number Allowed. The number of allowable animals kept shall be determined based on the animal equivalent unit (AEU) for each animal and the size of the lot. C. Classification. Each animal species shall be assigned one of the following classifications based on their approximate weight as follows: 1. Large animals (larger than 500 lb.) - cattle, horse, donkey, mule, etc. 2. Medium animals (250 - 500 lb.) - emu, llama, pigs, etc. 3. Small animals (30 - 250 lb.) - sheep, goats, miniature horses, etc. 4. Fowl and smaller animals (less than 30 lb.) - fowl (turkeys, chickens, ducks, geese, pigeons), rabbits, etc. D. Animal Equivalent Units. Each classification of an animal shall be represented by an animal equivalent unit as follows:

Animal 1.00 Medium Animal 0.50, Small Animal 0.20 Fowl, and Smaller Animal 0.05
E. Animal Equivalent Units (AEU) allowed per Acre: 2.0 F. Formula: Lot Acreage x 2.0
(AEU per Acre) = # of animals allowed on site

Mike Desimone, the Community Development Director summarized the changes to the proposed amendment. Mr. DeSimone stated that after reaching out to the USU Extension program, there is no science in setting nor determining the numbers of animals allowed per residential lot. It is a policy decision with a clear objective for enforcement standards.

Councilmember Jensen commented that the public is evenly split between in favor and against the proposal as some desire more animals and others none at all.

Chairman M. Anderson requested further clarification on setbacks.

Mr. DeSimone explained that urban agriculture requires a fenced location such as a chicken coop in the side or back yard. The location of said ‘coop’ must be 25 feet starting from an adjoining (residential) structure not from the property line. The setbacks change with miniature livestock to 50 feet and so forth.

Vice Chair Simmonds asked what would occur if the setback standards were not met.

Mr. DeSimone responded that the chicken coop could not be put into place in that case.

Vice Chair Simmonds inquired if livestock such as goats are raised due to individuals being allergic to say chickens if the same rules apply or in the case where they are already owned.

Mr. DeSimone answered that it is not up to the City to validate if a medical condition requires them to have said livestock on site. The same standards would apply to the individual as much as any other citizen of the city. In the instance that they are already owned any response will be dependent on the standards that are set by the city. The standards must exist for the citizens desiring to have livestock and for the citizens that do not desire to have livestock living next to them.

Councilmember López asked if surrounding cities have a permit process to receive approval from their neighbors to have livestock.

Mr. DeSimone replied that only a few cities have a permit process. In the interest of the city and public, there is no desire to add another bureaucratic process rather than simply having a standard of owning livestock in place that is an applicable uniform system to the entire city.

Councilmember A. Anderson requested an explanation on the animal equivalent units (AEU).

Mr. DeSimone explained how the AEU functions giving an example of how to calculate livestock according to the property size.

Councilmember Jensen spoke in favor of quiet fowl and small animals that do not crow or are loud in volume. He reiterated the fact that the City is not in the habit of policing chickens and concerns over setbacks.

Mr. DeSimone said that there are variations depending on the location determined by enacted ordinances.

Vice Chair Simmonds reminded of the potential negative impact of the removal of a horse or the establishment of a large animal like a horse via the AEU and especially as the City becomes denser.

Chairman M. Anderson stated that the setback for larger animals is made larger such as 25 feet or more. Councilmember Jensen agreed with the assessment.

Mayor Daines and the Council expressed concern regarding larger animals such as cows and horses being part of the AEU. They requested that larger animals not be permitted in the AEU. The Council discussed that the AEU should be more restrictive in the manner that only a certain set of animals can be owned rather than multiple varieties.

Mayor Daines expressed similar sentiments regarding the exclusion of large animals in the AEU considering the growing density of the City.

Vice Chair Simmonds asked what the status of large animals such as horses in regards to grandfathering would be if large animals are excluded from the AEU.

Mr. DeSimone explained that there are areas that can be grandfathered, but the proof would need to be shown. There is the non-conformity and legal aspect to consider.

Chairman M. Anderson stated a preference to continue the ordinance as there are various points of discussion still left on the table. The Council agreed.

Vice Chair Simmonds requested an illustration in the ordinance and chart that discusses grandfathering status for public education. And any determination on a date for grandfathering be made prior to the effective date of the ordinance as not to have any individual purchase more livestock to circumvent the ordinance.

Kymber Housley, City Attorney stated that the grandfathering date would be applicable to the entire city, not just one zoning area. He explained that illegal nonconforming is regulated by state statute. “A legally existing nonconforming use (grandfathered use) is

- i. one that was legal when established
- ii. has been maintained continuously
- iii. because a change in the ordinance, it does not conform with the current law.”

Because of illegal subdivisions, a date and time were set to be recognized as grandfathered. After that that the subdivision would be considered illegal. That is an option to select a date or time. To show a legal establishment will likely rely on

neighbors as it is difficult to show proof. And elucidated that the change in the code should prohibit large animals by weight rather than specific animals.

Councilmember A. Anderson requested further clarification on the Produce Stand addition to the ordinance. The concern is that members of the public are not aware. There is a need to raise awareness.

The Council requested further changes and information to the proposed ordinance regarding the proposed AEU. The complete removal of any large animal of a certain weight category including any animal that can grow to meet that weight category. A request to set a date to determine when an animal will be considered grandfathered. And further information on the produce portion of the ordinance.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember López seconded by Vice Chair Simmonds to continue Ordinance 21-22 to the November 16, 2021 Council meeting as an action item with no public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING - Budget Adjustment FY 2021-2022 appropriating: \$7,299 funds received for police overtime shirt reimbursements, \$106,465 funds received for wildland reimbursements for the fire department – Resolution 21-53 – Richard Anderson, Finance Director

At the October 19, 2021 Council meeting. Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustments.

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

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

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Jensen seconded by Vice Chair Simmonds to approve Resolution 21-53 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

WORKSHOP ITEMS:

Consideration of a proposed resolution of the City of Logan approving the Program Year 2020 (PY2020) Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) in accordance with the entitlement community requirements of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the receipt of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds – Resolution 21-54 – Amanda Hovey, CDBG Coordinator

CDBG Coordinator Amanda Hovey addressed the Council regarding the proposed resolution.

The Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) reviews the progress of the City's 2020 Annual Action Plan (AAP).

Logan City received \$509,744 in CDBG funds for Program Year 2020. The 2020 AAP is the second Annual Action Plan for the Five-Year Consolidated Plan (2019-2023). The main objectives of the Consolidated Plan and the 2020 AAP are: Invest in infrastructure projects in neighborhoods with eligible low/moderate-income (LMI) areas (40%). Invest in remediation of access and mobility barriers in all neighborhoods (10%). Sustain community needs that support LMI residents of Logan (30%). (20% - public facility, 10% - public services).

Infrastructure Projects approved and completed during PY 2020:

1200 N 200 W Intersection Alignment completed Fall 2020. 450' of new sidewalk, curb & gutter, 4 new ADA ramps, benefits 5,395 residents of which 3,480 (66%) are LMI. Project cost - \$52,505.20

Community Needs Projects Approved & Completed PY 2020, Public Facilities:

Senior Center Parking Lot Repair completed Fall 2021. Removing and replacing the asphalt parking lot benefits 656 LMI residents. Project Cost - \$26,202.85

Family Place Shed completed summer 2021. A new shed was constructed to provide storage and replace rental storage units that benefit 387 LMI residents. Project Cost - \$32,000.

Community Needs Projects Approved & Completed PY 2020, Public Services:

Cache Humane Society Vouchers benefit 36 LMI residents. Project cost - \$3,216.

CAPSA Technology Enhancements benefits 1215 LMI Residents. Project cost - \$16,000.

English Language Center Smartboards benefit 404 LMI Residents. Project cost - \$29,500.

Program Administration & Planning completed during 2020:

Program Administration PY2020 - \$82,560.92

Covid-19 Responses Activities:

14 CV Activities benefited over 169,000 people. The total cost of \$297,597.46 [Cache Food Pantry Coolers, Cache Food Pantry Emergency Food, CAPSA Emergency Shelter, CAPSA Rental Assistance, CAPSA Organizational Needs, BRHD PPE Supplies, LMI Resident Assistant Grant, Sunshine Terrace Segregated Patient Space, Sunshine Terrace Telehealth, CNS Charity Care, Little Lambs Emergency Diaper & Hygiene Distribution, ELC Technology, Cache Employment Training Center PPE, Common Ground Outdoor Adventure Utilities & PPE]

\$210,163.54 funds remaining to be reallocated.

Vice Chair Simmonds inquired why more vouchers weren't used at the Cache Humane Society Vouchers.

Misses Hovey replied that the Cache Humane Society was closed for a time and that affected the use of the vouchers.

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

Budget Adjustment FY 2021-2022 appropriating: \$10,000 a grant the Police Department was awarded from the State Asset Forfeiture Grant (SAFG) to be used to replace outdated police equipment; \$210,000 EMS reserves for the purchase of an ambulance; \$1,200 a grant the Library received from the State of Utah to be used to pay for the renewal of Wi-Fi hotspots at the Library; \$850,000 Environmental reserves for the purchase of a new tree branch grinder – Resolution 21-56 – Richard Anderson, Finance Director

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

Mayor Daines stated that the current tree branch grinder is 14 years old. Due to the storm and the age of the tree branch grinder, a new grinder needs to be purchased. The next challenge will be to get rid of all the wood chips. State law only permits the wooden chips to remain on-site for a year.

Councilmember Jensen requested an explanation regarding the Wi-Fi hotspots.

Karen Clark, Library Director responded that the Wi-Fi hotspots are small electronic portable devices that provide wi-fi. The portable device that can be checked out for a week. If the wi-fi hotspot fails to be returned the wi-fi can then be turned off from the library. The library already owns 12, but the devices are so popular that 10 more have been purchased.

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

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

Councilmember A. Anderson reminded the community that there will be thanksgiving meals available. The deadline for ordering a meal is November 12th. The contact number is 702-354-8412. The Fishes and Loaves annual community meal will be hosted on Saturday, November 20th, an in-person meal with the option to take away. The meal will be from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. at the presbyterian church on Center and 200 West.

Councilmember A. Anderson has been requested to co-chair the Local Homeless Council, but the board appointment hinges upon reelection.

Councilmember López said that United Way is requesting volunteers to aid in preparations for the Thanksgiving meal.

There were no further considerations addressed by the Council.

ADJOURNED. There being no further business, the Logan Municipal Council adjourned at 6:41 pm.

Esli Morales, Deputy City Recorder