

APPROVED

Council Meeting

Minutes

13 June 2000

Council Meeting Minutes Index

Ambulance Service Discussion	12
Appointments	2
Bridgerland Travel Semi-annual Report	3-4
College/Young Incorporation Comments	13
Disparate Jurisdiction Letter	13
Hyrum Reservoir	2-3
Pre-marital Counseling Discussion	13
Public Hearings	
Agriculture Protection Area, Bailey Group of Wellsville	6
Open 2000 Budget	5
Proposed Subdivision Ordinance	6-9
Resolutions	
Approved	
2000-15, Budget Adjustments	5
2000-16, Inter-departmental Budget Transfer	5
Tabled	
2000-17, Authorizing the Executive to Execute Interlocal Agreements for the Bear River Heritage Area	10
Road Discussion, Tabled	5
Satellite Registrars Appointed	4
Speed Limits/Related Issues	9-10
Tax Sale for May 2000	
Parcel 16-087-0026	10
Television Translator Discussion	6
Water Policy Advisory Board	
Appointments	10-11
Willow Park Budget Discussion and Approval	11

Council Meeting
13 June 2000

Cache County Council Meeting Minutes 13 June 2000

The Cache County Council met in a regular session on 13 June 2000 in the Cache County Council Chamber, 120 North 100 West, Logan, Utah 84321

Attendance

Council Chairman: Darrel L. Gibbons
Council Vice-chairman: H. Craig Petersen
Council Members: C. Larry Anhder, Guy Ray Pulsipher, Sarah Ann Skanchy, Cory Yeates
Cache County Executive: M. Lynn Lemon
Cache County Clerk: Daryl R. Downs
Excused: H. Craig Petersen, Layne M. Beck

The following individuals were also in attendance: Pat Parker, Jim Smith, Lamar Clements, Maridene Hancock, Don Bailey, Nan Schmidt, Taylor Palmer, Thomas Schmidt, Joe Kirby, Thad Erickson, C. R. Batten, Doug Thompson, Scott Wyatt, Lynn Nelson, Kelly Pitcher, Scott Huskinson, Bobbie Coray, Jason Watterson, Linda Burris, Allen Burris, Halley Allen, Larry Merrill, Al Applegarth, Max Delgado, Lynn Davis, Russ Akina, Mike Glead, Bruce Ward, Wayne Cardon, Ken Cardon, Cheryl Eames, Paul Dextras, Mike Weibel (Herald Journal), Jenny Christensen (KVNU).

Call to Order

Chairman Gibbons called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m.

Invocation

Guy Ray Pulsipher

Review and Approval of Agenda

Item 6b was omitted from the agenda. Mr. Ferebee was not able to be in attendance. Item 6c was added to the agenda. This is the approval of Satellite Registrars for the upcoming Primary Election. Final Plat approval for the Maple Leaf Ranch and Maple Leaf estates subdivisions, items 10a and 10b, was tabled until the next agenda.

Review and Approval of Minutes

Council Meeting
13 June 2000

Report of the County Executive

Appointments

Reserve Deputy Sheriff

Michael Bohm
John F. Bedingfield
Tisha K. Cooper
Matt Meccariello
Matt Pearce

Kara Nielson, Deputy Sheriff

Evelyn Mae Palmer, Deputy County Clerk
Dixie L. Page, Deputy County Recorder

Pulsipher questioned why they were appointing all of the reserve deputy sheriffs. **The council approved the appointments 5-0.**

Lemon proposed that the county continue with the current dental plan. Those members who choose the United Health plan can use the difference in cost between UHC and Public Employees Health Plan (PEHP) toward a portion of the dental premium.

Other Items

Lemon reminded the council of the meeting to be held with Governor Leavitt on July 15th with the mayors and all of the various city councils in the county.

The County has been in discussion with the USU Extension Service about the secretary becoming an employee of USU and not the County. This would save the County about \$1,000 per year. The County would still pay the salary and benefits of the secretary by contract.

June 19th is the open enrollment for County Employees. Employees with insurance concerns should attend this enrollment meeting.

Gibbons and Lemon met with Hyrum City about the enlargement of the Hyrum Reservoir. He provided the proposal to the council members. The federal government would pay the bill for this because they have an interest in the late season water. The report is just an initial proposal. Lemon said that the Federal Government is pushing this to help with the Bear River Bird Refuge. Lemon mentioned that this could bring a number of benefits to the county. He specifically mentioned improving the road across the reservoir. Hyrum City, according to Lemon, gets requests for annexations in the area, but they deny them because access across that road is not

Council Meeting
13 June 2000

suitable. Generally the County is not in a position financially to do such a project. Anhder said that the State of Utah had once considered this alternative and decided against it. Lemon said that the federal project is much larger than the state project.

Mr. Lemon gave the warrants to the clerk.

Items of Special Interest

Bridgerland Travel Semi-Annual Report

Maridene Hancock presented the Bridgerland Travel report to the council. They have recently mailed out 65,000 calendar of event flyers as an insert in the newspaper. They have also shared costs on 22 bus boards that advertise local events. Bridgerland covered half the cost of these signs with any entity that was willing to share the cost. Five groups participated in Ms. Hancock's bus board offer. They were Utah Festival Opera Company, American West Heritage Center, Cache Valley Cruise-In, Eccles Theatre, and Bridgerland Travel Council. The Travel Council has also advertised in USA Weekend, Sunset Magazine, and has a card with Internet addresses that are linked to each other. There is an interactive calendar that local events organizers can fill in to use as advertising for their events. The web sites are linked together and the webmaster is able to review the calendar input before it is listed on the web. They are getting an average of 120 requests per day via the net. Bridgerland advertises with banners or ads on the Utah.com site. They are also promoting information through the Cache Valley Guide. The guide contains articles written by people from around the world who have immigrated to Utah, maps, and listing of restaurants in addition to many other items.

Bridgerland has also created copies of *Planning and Organizing Events* written by Art Jones from Utah State University. They have been handing these out to all of the events organizers.

Maridene has been going on site to visit with hotels and doing training. She teaches them about the events that are going on in the community. She also provides them with sample information to make them aware of all of the information that is available to tourists. They have also created a CD Rom for members of the press. This goes out to 253 in-state groups and over 600 out-of-state groups.

Maridene said the Harley Davidson HOG motorcycle group met this past week. They apparently liked our fairground facility and the city in general. She is trying to get them to book again for next year.

They also are promoting a small plane conference for owners of small planes. This would encourage them to fly into our valley and use our airport. They are also working on a fishing conference and are promoting a golf tournament where they would travel to four different courses in the area. The Mormon History Association and State Courts are also booked for future events.

Council Meeting
13 June 2000

The Top of Utah Marathon was singled out in Runners World. They are currently accepting 1,750 participants. The decorative toll painting conference is in its last year. She noted that they have some concerns about losing conferences and events, but they are working to find new ones.

Maridene provided the council with some numbers on travel trends. The numbers were estimated by the Utah Division of Travel Development.

Maridene noted that there was a positive impact of 1.5 million dollars through tourism in 1998. Average tourism spending growth in Cache County has averaged 7.6% from 1993-1998. There are also 1,379 people employed by the travel/recreation industry. Gross taxable room rates were \$7,461,665. Gross transient room tax collections equaled \$223,850.

The legislature has asked for an audit to review how transient room taxes are utilized. Maridene asked for a grant from the State Travel Council for a branding Cache Valley grant. The Chamber of Commerce building is remodeling their building beginning in September of this year.

There will be a ribbon cutting on June 29th in Logan Canyon. It will be at the forest service building in Logan canyon. Bridgerland Travel Council is planning on getting some significant television coverage for this event.

Ms. Hancock also provided the council members with a copy of the financial statement for the organization. Mailing costs have been high this year due to the response to all of the advertising that has been done. They have been mailing information out to individuals at a much higher rate.

Attachment 1

Satellite Registrars Appointed

Stephanie Fricke
Fran Baer
Dean O. Clegg
Sherry Bryson
Douglas Jenkins
Connie Gittins
Cheri Kidd
Marlo Adkins
Sarah Parker

Skanchy moved that the Satellite Registrars be appointed as recommended. Yeates seconded the motion and it passed 5-0.

Road Discussion

This discussion was moved to a later date because Mr. Ferebee could not attend. Lemon mentioned that they needed to have the discussion as soon as possible and consider the RS2477 roads and the actions being taken by the state with regard to those roads.

Public Hearing

Open 2000 Budget

Lemon addressed the council. The first item proposed was an expenditure. A sum of \$1000 was appropriated from the Fund 20 appropriated surplus to the zoning office for temporary help.

An appropriated surplus from Fund 24, Council on Aging, for \$7356 was recommended. The appropriated surplus will be used for purchase of a van for the Senior Center.

Skanchy moved that the public hearing be closed. Pulsipher seconded the motion, and it passed 5-0.

Skanchy moved to adopt Resolution 2000-15, Budget Adjustments. Yeates seconded the motion and it passed 5-0.

R2000-15	ANHDER	BECK	GIBBONS	PETERSEN	PULSIPHER	SKANCHY	YEATES	votes cast
AYE	X		X		X	X	X	5
NAY								
ABSTAINED								
ABSENT		X		X				

Attachment 2

Skanchy moved that the council adopt Resolution 2000-16, Inter-departmental Budget Transfer. Yeates seconded the motion and it passed 5-0.

R2000-16	ANHDER	BECK	GIBBONS	PETERSEN	PULSIPHER	SKANCHY	YEATES	votes cast
AYE	X		X		X	X	X	5
NAY								
ABSTAINED								
ABSENT		X		X				

Attachment 3

Agricultural Protection Area, Bailey Group of Wellsville

This proposal was amended due to some property being in Wellsville City. Gibbons asked if any one had any questions concerning the Bailey group request. Two parcels were removed from the request because they were within Wellsville City limits.

Skanchy moved to close the public hearing. Pulsipher seconded the motion, and it passed 5-0.

Anhder asked Mr. Bailey if someone had encouraged him to pursue this request. Don said that he had simply researched the issue and decided to do so. Don said that he thinks that whatever will help the agricultural situation is worth pursuing. Anhder said that this will not prevent a law suit as some have suggested. Lemon said that it is a complete defense of agricultural practices as defined under the law if you are practicing sound agricultural practices. Bailey felt that the agriculture areas are being encroached upon. He described a situation that he is in with his own land that borders the Jensen Historical Farm. During the mountain man shoot-out and the Festival of the American West, Mr. Bailey has had cattle drowned during the fireworks event. He has had some difficulty trying to work with the people who run the Farm and the Festival. He was finally compensated to some degree for the loss of his cattle.

Television Translator Discussion

Lemon reminded the council that there is a window from July 31 to August 4 during which the County may apply to the FCC for channels to broadcast from the translator. He said that there are several things that need to be considered. The plan is to develop the Clarkston site and get FCC approval. They will then broadcast from the Clarkston site for every household that can get the channels. The remainder of the households could use the Mount Pisgah translator until those channels are lost or the lease is up. After the channels or lease is lost, a new site would be developed with smaller translators for the southern end of the valley. The Mount Pisgah lease expires in June 2004. The county is also currently in litigation with the owner of the Pisgah site. This project would be done in cooperation with Franklin County. Mr. Jaussi, who has been working on the project, has been working with Kent Parsons from the state. Mr. Parsons represents the entire state in this process. Cache County has also become a member of the UAC Interlocal Cooperative which deals with rural television translators.

Attachment 4

Public Hearing

Proposed Subdivision Ordinance

Gibbons invited Teuscher to articulate any views before comments were given. Teuscher turned the time over to Bruce Parker. Parker said that after more than 1 ½ years the planning and development services of the County Planning Commission, the Benson Planning Commission, and the College Young Planning Commission have prepared this proposal for final consideration.

Council Meeting
13 June 2000

Mr. Parker wanted to discuss the major provisions that will have an effect on the Cache County Council. Under current processes, the council does not have a great deal of input into the process. The council does not see a subdivision plat until the very end of the process. Under the new process, the council will see the plats much earlier in the process. They will also be the reviewing and approval authority in the plat approval process. This is a requirement of the state law. All divisions of property in the county are considered as subdivisions. Parker said that the document is consistent in every way except for 300-6 and 500-2. In these two areas, Benson and College\Young have decided to differ with the recommendation of the County. Benson and College\Young are recommending a prohibition on the hauling of water, except in the recreation zone. Benson and College\Young are also recommending that an approved Culinary Water Application be presented with the other subdivision documents as part of the approval process. Mr. Teuscher gave a document to the council members earlier, which explained the county's recommendation on these issues.

The County would not put a prohibition on the hauling of water, and it would only require that a culinary water application have been submitted, not approved, when preliminary subdivision applications are presented.

Skanchy asked what the term "ministerial" meant. Parker said that it referred to the idea that if a request complies with the code, the council is bound by the code to approve the request.

The county may delegate authority to someone to sign final plats in the council's stead. Gibbons opened the public hearing to comments from the public.

Wayne Cardon from Benson objected to 300-5. He disagrees with the need for a licensed surveyor to do a simple lot split. He thinks that it is ridiculous to have a surveyor there to do a single split. He noted that surveyors have surveyed areas out in Benson on three different occasions in their area. Each time the stakes have been in a different location even though each surveyor used the same benchmarks. He also objects to 300-6 paragraph 1 on water requirements. He does not think that any culinary well can provide adequate fire protection. He said that the state code does not require it and he thinks that it should be stricken. Cardon is unaware of any law that prevents hauling of water for fire protection or for culinary purposes and suggested that perhaps a tanker could be located in the area.

He also thinks that if an application has been approved, the council should not have the approval at its discretion. The owner should be able to move ahead if they have submitted a valid application.

Yeates moved to close the public hearing. Pulsipher seconded the motion and it passed 5-0. Teuscher said that they have worked on the issue after the other public hearings.

Ms. Skanchy asked about annexation to local municipalities. This is found in 300-8 on page 12. Parker said that there are a couple of location conditions that would trigger a requirement for the zoning commission to notify the municipality and try to have the property annexed into the municipality. If the site is contiguous to a municipality, if it is an island, or if it is a peninsula as

defined by state law, or if it is receiving or proposing to receive services from the municipality, the proposed subdivision would trigger the provisions for attempting an annexation with the municipality. The provision would require the zoning administrator of the county to contact the appropriate municipality and make them aware of the subdivision application. This would allow the municipality to work with the person seeking the subdivision to see if an annexation into the municipality would be possible. The presumption is that this is the appropriate approach for those subdivisions meeting the location criteria. A 90 day period follows to allow for the annexation process to occur. If the parties cannot complete the process, after 6 months, the person seeking the subdivision can ask the county again for a subdivision in the unincorporated area. The city cannot request any annexation. It must be requested by the property owner.

Anhder asked if there should be some sort of requirement to give incentive for the developer to annex property into a city. Currently, Anhder said that the incentive is to develop outside of the city because it is less demanding and less expensive. This makes it an incentive to develop in the county rather than the city. Anhder thinks that the County is supporting two opposing views on this issue. He suggested that the county needs to be supporting only one view. Mr. Parker said that the incentive is to have some of the services that the cities can provide and the county cannot.

Teuscher recognizes that it is a difficult issue, but he thinks that the proposed ordinance provides a good start for encouraging annexation into cities when it is appropriate to do so. Parker said that one of the advantages on development in the city is the possibility for higher density development.

Teuscher said that the Logan Urbanized Area is the exact same boundary as the MPO. It is defined by the U.S. Census Bureau. The western boundary is 1800 west. The southern boundary is 3200 South. The eastern boundary is the U.S. Forest Service boundary and the northern boundary falls north of Smithfield City. These boundaries will be adjusted during the 2000 Census.

Contiguous is defined in the ordinance as a boundary of at least 50 feet of property bordering a municipality. The Logan Urbanized Area refers to the whole area which may be further away from a Logan City's boundary. For purposes of being contiguous, a road does not constitute separation. Contiguous does not apply within the urbanized area.

Anhder said that the time for notification of municipalities by the County should be 45-60 days, not 30 days.

Parker suggested that a work session would be held on the 27th of June and that this would be a good time to discuss the issue of water. Skanchy asked how an individual would obtain a storm drainage easement. She said that she is aware that the canal companies are concerned about run-off. Teuscher said that after 2003 there will be new regulations. He said that it may be necessary to revisit the ordinance at that time to make it compliant with any new state regulations. Teuscher

Council Meeting
13 June 2000

said that the storm drainage issues are not as large a concern in the county as they are for cities because of lower density. Skanchy also wondered how the solid waste issue would be handled in areas that are in the unincorporated areas that are up in the canyon. Someone suggested that in those cases the individuals might be required to haul it out if they haul it in.

Anhder asked about the Legacy Subdivision. Under the ordinance those in the outlying areas would not be required to have water. They could haul it in. Anhder asked if this is a place that a person should be allowed to have a home. Teuscher said that most of the homes Anhder is referring to do not have year-round residents.

Skanchy asked about the cluster and farm provisions. Parker said that this allows for a higher density when there are other concerns. This allows for the same number of units on a piece, but the homes are clustered together so that more open property remains. The same would be allowed for farms. This would allow for higher density development in one area of a development parcel and then more open space in the remaining area of that parcel. Steep hillsides or high water table areas, or farm areas would be left undeveloped. The total number of home sites would remain the same. Developers could achieve full development potential as allowed by the zoning requirements, recognizing that other environmental factors have greater significance.

This could potentially benefit the County as well. The county may avoid having to provide services in difficult or highly expensive access areas. Anhder countered that this allows individuals who normally would not be able to develop undesirable property to develop the usable area of it at a higher density level. Parker suggested that this would not be a subdivision discussion. He thinks that this should be dealt with as a zoning issue. Anhder suggested that only property suitable for development should be counted as part of the total acreage available for high density development. Parker said that they could have the base density listed as A1. Then for land that is not suitable, another provision would be triggered that would prevent the unacceptable from being counted.

Attachment 5

Initial Proposal for Consideration of Action

Approval May Tax Sale

Skanchy moved for approval of the May tax sale of parcel 16-087-0026. Anhder seconded the motion, and it passed 5-0.

MAY TAX SALE	ANHDER	BECK	GIBBONS	PETERSEN	PULSIPHER	SKANCHY	YEATES	votes cast
AYE	X		X		X	X	X	5
NAY								
ABSTAINED								
ABSENT		X		X				

Attachment 6

Resolution 2000-17, Authorizing the Executive to Execute Interlocal Agreements for the Bear River Heritage Area

Skanchy asked that this be tabled until the next agenda so that it could be considered further. Lemon said that someone from BRAG could address the issue at the next council meeting.

Speed Limits/Related Issues

Lemon introduces the issue to the council. Two years ago the council was presented with a roads ordinance that would have an established speed limits of 40 miles per hour on any road that was not posted. The law says that any road that has a speed-limit needs to have a sign indicating what the speed is. This would also affect municipalities. Mr. Kirby said that it is difficult to keep the signs up. Legal issues are a concern if the county does not have signs posted. The County could be subject to a lawsuit. The county attorney's office felt that the speed limit would not be effective unless the signs were erected. The county attorney suggested having the legislature create a law that would set the speed limit on all gravel roads at 40 miles per hour if not posted. Lemon will be in a meeting on Monday, 19 June 2000, to discuss the issue and hopefully come to some consensus. Joe Kirby said that each time an individual comes to an intersection it is possible that the speed limit is different if one travels in a different direction. This necessitates placing signs at all of the intersection locations and can be very expensive.

Water Policy Advisory Board

Lemon said that they tried to represent different geographical areas of the county. Lemon is waiting on confirmation from a couple of people who have been asked to serve on the board. Three individuals will represent agricultural interests: Noble Erickson, Jim Watterson, and Ray Bankhead.

Three individuals will represent cities and municipalities: Kevin Hansen (Logan), Lloyd Jenson (Amalga), and a third who has not been confirmed.

One member from the county council: C. Larry Anhder.

Council Meeting
13 June 2000

Two individuals who possess technical expertise in water issues: Paul Riley (State Water Board) and Ann Peralta (previously a member of the board).

Two members at large: Bill Bullen and one member who has not been confirmed.

Yeates asked Lemon if he had heard from Wise Water Planning members. Lemon said that he had listened to their suggestions and was considering a member of the board from one of their suggestions.

Skanchy moved for approval of that board members as recommended. Yeates seconded the motion, and it passed 5-0.

WATER POLICY ADVISORY BOARD	ANHDER	BECK	GIBBONS	PETERSEN	PULSIPHER	SKANCHY	YEATES	votes cast
AYE	X		X		X	X	X	5
NAY								
ABSTAINED								
ABSENT		X		X				

Discussion on the Willow Park Budget

They agreed upon a 2000 budget of \$258,403 as the County's share of the total budget. The landscaping, parking, and improvements at the skate park and swimming pool will be the priority project for Willow Park next year. The County also agreed to place the \$100,000 request as a high priority on next year's restaurant tax list. The County also provided an increase in restaurant tax of \$20,000 to finish the fairground electrical upgrade. A total of 318 parking stalls will be developed at the swimming pool site.

Yeates moved to approve Lemon's recommendation. Anhder seconded the motion, and it passed 5-0.

WILLOW PARK BUDGET	ANHDER	BECK	GIBBONS	PETERSEN	PULSIPHER	SKANCHY	YEATES	votes cast
AYE	X		X		X	X	X	5
NAY								
ABSTAINED								
ABSENT		X		X				

Ambulance Service Discussion

Lemon said that some things were agreed upon at the last meeting. There is agreement that the ambulance service should be kept together. This is the consensus of the county board members who represent the council. Logan City agreed with this. The second thing agreed upon was that Logan would be that provider and no RFP would be done for private service. They also agreed that \$75,000 dollars would be the final payment from the County for 1999 services provided. They have not agreed on what to do about the upcoming year's projected deficit. According to Mayor Thompson, the board also agreed that the County should have some degree of input on the running of the ambulance. The degree of support would be related to the amount of input the County would be given. The board discussed methods for handling the deficit in the future. One solution was to raise the tax rate. Another solution was to charge one dollar per household for service. This would generate about \$315,000 per year in revenue. Mayor Thompson said that any surplus could be used to build a reserve fund or to help the volunteer departments.

Skanchy asked about the points of difference with the Fire Board on this issue. Lemon said that North Logan was considering developing its own ambulance service. This would reduce the current service area. Skanchy asked who has authority to institute a county wide fee. Lemon said this would need to be done by inter-local agreement. Anhder said that he was opposed to a household fee. The EMS council is concerned that all of the ambulances are within Logan City. The deficit from last year was apparently due to bad debts from other years. Lemon is not in favor of the County paying the entire deficit. Anhder asked if the property tax assessed for health services could help fund the program. Lemon said that this tax is specifically for the County Health Dept. It would not apply to something like ambulance service.

Lemon said that Chief Dextras has put all of the high end supervisors in the fire budget. Lemon says he thinks that county should have more input into the process. He was also surprised that the same level of deficit is anticipated for this year as for last. Lemon said that there was a good deal of discussion in 1993 about the agreement. Lemon said that the agreement would continue until one party ends the agreement with at least six months notice.

Gibbons thinks that it is in the best interest of the total community to keep the services together. Lemon admits that the agreement says that the council will fund the deficit. Another proposal suggested that the County could sign a yearly negotiated contract that would say what the County was willing to fund for the year.

Sheriff asked what the other cities' roles are in this issue. Lemon said that the other mayors have said that they don't know enough about the situation. By code, the county does not have obligation to provide this service. It is a state function by statute. Lemon suggested that the County should have the state get involved to help solve the dilemma. Skanchy recalled in past years that the County had purchased an ambulance in lieu of paying a deficit amount. The 1998, 1999, and 2000 deficits are the only deficits at issue. Prior deficits are not considered.

Other Business

Premarital Counseling Discussion

Gibbons received a letter from a Bryan Ramboz from the Department of Human And Family Development at USU. Mr. Ramboz suggested a program requiring pre-marital counseling for individuals for adolescent marriages in the county. Downs responded that Title 30 of the Utah Code provides for such a service if the council chooses to require it. Skanchy said that she doesn't think that it falls within the council's purview. Lemon said that divorce classes are required for individual with children who are getting a divorce. The pre-marital counseling would be for those under 19 years of age.

Gibbons said that this falls in the same category as the letter from Melanie Smith. Gibbons said that if the council is in agreement they would not place it on the agenda again. Ms. Smith wanted the council to pass a resolution or an ordinance some other measure to put it on the ballot for a vote of the people. The council decided to not pursue Ms. Smith's request.

Skanchy asked Lemon about the Disparate Jurisdiction letter that she received. Lemon said that he had not heard anything more about the letter. Apparently, if defined as a disparate jurisdiction by the Attorney General, the County would split the available funds with Logan City.

Lemon did confirm with the consultant that they wanted to do a presentation on the 179 North Main Courthouse.

Gibbons asked about the College\Young Public hearing concerning incorporation. Lemons said that some seemed to be in favor and others opposed the proposal. The promoters of the process said that many of the numbers suggested were too high. The proponents have challenged the numbers that were provided. One of the big discrepancies in on the cost of doing the roads. The proponents feel that they can do the same work for about \$50,000 less than the numbers given by the consultant. Lemon feels that the consultant chosen did an objective report and he feels bad that her work is being challenged. At this point, there will be one more public hearing and then the proponents can seek additional signatures. If successful, the proponents can then have the issue placed on the ballot.


Yeates asked why they are not going to do an RFP on the ambulance service. He is of the opinion that the costs that Logan City charges are too high. He suggested that Logan city is hiring new employees and balancing their budget at the expense of the County. Anhder said that the deficit began when they began hiring new employees.

Lemon said that the assumption has been that they will remain with a single provider.


Council Meeting
13 June 2000

Adjourn

Gibbons adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:20 p.m.



Daryl R. Downs
Cache County Clerk

Darrel L. Gibbons
Chairman, Cache County Council

Estimated Spending by Travelers

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998(p)	Avg. Annual % Change 1993-98	% Change 1997-98
Beaver	\$20,694,350	\$21,119,561	\$21,821,495	\$22,624,427	\$23,273,789	\$24,338,309	3.3%	4.6%
Box Elder	\$28,212,410	\$30,093,813	\$31,817,239	\$32,917,196	\$35,166,881	\$37,155,369	5.7%	5.7%
Cache	\$51,562,918	\$52,685,267	\$61,763,417	\$65,446,036	\$70,889,182	\$74,531,208	7.6%	5.1%
Carbon	\$35,151,566	\$35,116,975	\$35,460,916	\$38,386,227	\$38,897,441	\$40,593,749	2.9%	4.4%
Daggett	\$9,831,631	\$10,978,364	\$10,690,030	\$10,307,830	\$9,998,893	\$10,493,464	1.3%	4.9%
Davis	\$202,023,140	\$212,402,039	\$222,352,021	\$236,869,530	\$259,164,438	\$265,962,493	5.7%	2.6%
Duchesne	\$23,335,682	\$23,057,390	\$24,112,882	\$24,045,588	\$25,162,787	\$25,879,447	2.1%	2.8%
Emery	\$12,464,491	\$11,816,158	\$14,138,536	\$15,252,358	\$15,463,227	\$15,121,742	3.9%	-2.2%
Garfield	\$42,549,710	\$43,980,766	\$45,763,580	\$48,678,846	\$53,678,766	\$52,640,780	4.3%	-1.9%
Grand	\$80,586,173	\$86,462,480	\$93,353,173	\$95,361,227	\$109,881,986	\$98,746,313	4.1%	-2.1%
Iron	\$72,513,453	\$78,257,357	\$81,584,309	\$78,832,413	\$82,973,507	\$86,624,711	3.6%	4.4%
Juab	\$15,862,303	\$16,599,686	\$18,328,976	\$18,313,808	\$18,189,143	\$18,621,724	3.3%	2.4%
Kane	\$45,953,621	\$48,866,969	\$51,277,751	\$51,688,577	\$54,460,838	\$55,725,758	3.9%	2.3%
Millard	\$22,265,539	\$22,894,616	\$22,978,300	\$22,947,980	\$23,035,471	\$24,258,875	1.7%	5.3%
Morgan	\$4,893,510	\$5,322,838	\$5,519,883	\$5,735,552	\$6,636,322	\$6,546,594	6.0%	-1.4%
Piute	\$611,667	\$629,982	\$851,794	\$1,048,558	\$1,064,351	\$1,242,313	15.2%	16.7%
Rich	\$5,483,587	\$6,405,767	\$7,620,237	\$9,035,000	\$8,826,578	\$9,306,809	11.2%	5.4%
Salt Lake	\$1,594,095,069	\$1,612,659,076	\$1,707,752,750	\$1,854,892,191	\$1,934,543,311	\$1,981,128,097	4.4%	2.4%
San Juan	\$41,431,863	\$40,738,068	\$41,099,070	\$43,380,690	\$43,940,891	\$44,775,140	1.6%	1.9%
Sanpete	\$18,202,956	\$18,658,782	\$21,157,517	\$22,714,537	\$24,823,566	\$24,201,055	5.9%	-2.5%
Sevier	\$32,250,477	\$33,167,204	\$34,151,732	\$38,297,878	\$37,261,580	\$36,759,277	2.7%	-1.3%
Summit	\$233,472,978	\$250,557,079	\$261,574,298	\$280,194,295	\$297,103,350	\$307,739,114	5.7%	3.6%
Tooele	\$30,785,221	\$30,251,883	\$31,693,055	\$32,114,826	\$32,780,789	\$33,289,014	1.6%	1.6%
Uintah	\$37,902,278	\$39,086,257	\$40,338,983	\$39,228,176	\$41,916,366	\$43,824,087	2.9%	4.6%
Utah	\$216,643,174	\$225,224,501	\$241,862,172	\$264,141,420	\$286,007,177	\$291,785,742	6.1%	2.0%
Wasatch	\$33,138,790	\$34,785,964	\$37,104,807	\$38,859,613	\$40,682,378	\$44,479,557	6.1%	9.3%
Washington	\$160,418,013	\$170,920,495	\$184,024,007	\$202,562,352	\$218,315,148	\$223,228,334	6.8%	2.3%
Wayne	\$10,061,206	\$10,000,995	\$12,027,749	\$12,874,733	\$11,562,358	\$13,447,672	6.0%	16.3%
Weber	\$172,850,286	\$177,259,668	\$187,779,323	\$193,248,138	\$203,299,488	\$207,553,253	3.7%	2.1%
Utah Total	\$3,250,000,000	\$3,350,000,000	\$3,550,000,000	\$3,800,000,000	\$4,000,000,000	\$4,100,000,000	4.8%	2.5%

(p)=preliminary estimate

Source: Estimated by Utah Division of Travel Development (see introductory note for details)

Estimated local tax impact from traveler spending

	1993 (r)	1994 (r)	1995 (r)	1996 (r)	1997 (r)	1998 (p)	Avg. Annual % Change 1993-98	% Change 1997-98
Beaver	\$426,174	\$439,287	\$453,887	\$470,588	\$484,095	\$506,237	3.5%	4.6%
Box Elder	\$607,266	\$625,951	\$661,799	\$684,678	\$731,471	\$772,832	4.9%	5.7%
Cache	\$1,063,142	\$1,095,854	\$1,284,679	\$1,361,278	\$1,474,495	\$1,550,249	7.8%	5.1%
Carbon	\$708,629	\$730,433	\$737,587	\$798,434	\$809,067	\$844,350	3.6%	4.4%
Daggett	\$221,534	\$228,350	\$222,353	\$214,403	\$207,977	\$218,264	-0.3%	4.9%
Davis	\$4,286,083	\$4,417,962	\$4,624,922	\$4,926,886	\$5,390,620	\$5,532,020	5.2%	2.6%
Duchesne	\$465,277	\$479,594	\$501,548	\$500,148	\$523,386	\$538,293	3.0%	2.8%
Emery	\$238,439	\$245,776	\$294,082	\$317,249	\$321,635	\$314,532	5.7%	-2.2%
Garfield	\$887,492	\$914,800	\$951,882	\$1,012,520	\$1,116,518	\$1,094,928	4.3%	-1.9%
Grand	\$1,744,735	\$1,798,420	\$1,941,746	\$1,983,514	\$2,098,345	\$2,053,923	3.3%	-2.1%
Iron	\$1,579,163	\$1,627,753	\$1,696,954	\$1,639,714	\$1,725,849	\$1,801,794	2.7%	4.4%
Juab	\$334,967	\$345,273	\$381,243	\$380,927	\$378,334	\$387,332	2.9%	2.4%
Kane	\$986,092	\$1,016,433	\$1,066,577	\$1,075,122	\$1,132,785	\$1,159,096	3.3%	2.3%
Millard	\$461,993	\$476,208	\$477,949	\$477,318	\$479,138	\$504,585	1.8%	5.3%
Morgan	\$107,410	\$110,715	\$114,814	\$119,299	\$138,035	\$136,169	4.9%	-1.4%
Piute	\$12,712	\$13,104	\$17,717	\$21,810	\$22,139	\$25,840	15.2%	16.7%
Rich	\$129,263	\$133,240	\$158,501	\$187,928	\$183,593	\$193,582	8.4%	5.4%
Salt Lake	\$32,542,016	\$33,543,309	\$35,521,257	\$38,581,758	\$40,238,501	\$41,207,464	4.8%	2.4%
San Juan	\$822,058	\$847,352	\$854,861	\$902,318	\$913,971	\$931,323	2.5%	1.9%
Sanpete	\$376,518	\$388,103	\$440,076	\$472,462	\$516,330	\$503,382	6.0%	-2.5%
Sevier	\$669,284	\$689,878	\$710,356	\$796,596	\$775,041	\$764,593	2.7%	-1.3%
Summit	\$5,056,017	\$5,211,587	\$5,440,745	\$5,828,041	\$6,179,750	\$6,400,974	4.8%	3.6%
Tooele	\$610,456	\$629,239	\$659,216	\$667,988	\$681,840	\$692,411	2.6%	1.6%
Uintah	\$788,726	\$812,994	\$839,051	\$815,946	\$871,860	\$911,541	2.9%	4.6%
Utah	\$4,544,829	\$4,684,670	\$5,030,733	\$5,494,142	\$5,948,949	\$6,069,143	6.0%	2.0%
Wasatch	\$701,950	\$723,548	\$771,780	\$808,280	\$846,193	\$925,175	5.7%	9.3%
Washington	\$3,449,023	\$3,555,146	\$3,827,699	\$4,213,297	\$4,540,955	\$4,643,149	6.1%	2.3%
Wayne	\$201,811	\$208,021	\$250,177	\$267,794	\$240,497	\$279,712	6.7%	16.3%
Weber	\$3,576,941	\$3,687,001	\$3,905,810	\$4,019,561	\$4,228,629	\$4,317,108	3.8%	2.1%
Aggregate	\$67,600,000	\$69,680,000	\$73,840,000	\$79,040,000	\$83,200,000	\$85,280,000	4.8%	2.5%

(p) preliminary estimate
(r) revised

Source: Estimated by Utah Division of Travel Development (see introductory note for details).

Estimated County Travel & Recreation-Related Employment

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998(p)	Avg. Annual % Change 1993-98	% Change 1997-98
Beaver	371	384	396	417	427	450	4.0%	5.4%
Box Elder	506	547	578	607	646	688	6.3%	6.5%
Cache	924	958	1,121	1,206	1,302	1,379	8.3%	5.9%
Carbon	630	639	644	708	714	751	3.6%	5.2%
Daggett	176	200	194	190	184	194	2.0%	5.8%
Davis	3,622	3,863	4,037	4,366	4,753	4,922	6.3%	3.6%
Duchesne	419	419	438	443	462	479	2.7%	3.6%
Emery	223	215	257	281	284	280	4.6%	-1.5%
Garfield	763	800	831	897	986	974	5.0%	-1.2%
Grand	1,445	1,573	1,695	1,758	1,853	1,827	4.8%	-1.4%
Iron	1,300	1,423	1,481	1,453	1,524	1,603	4.3%	5.2%
Juab	284	302	333	338	334	345	3.9%	3.2%
Kane	824	889	931	953	1,000	1,031	4.6%	3.1%
Millard	399	416	417	423	423	449	2.4%	6.1%
Morgan	88	97	100	106	122	121	6.7%	-0.6%
Plute	11	11	15	19	20	23	16.0%	17.6%
Rich	98	117	138	167	162	172	11.9%	6.3%
Salt Lake	28,576	29,330	31,004	34,188	35,527	36,662	5.1%	3.2%
San Juan	743	741	746	800	807	829	2.2%	2.7%
Sanpete	326	339	384	419	456	448	6.5%	-1.8%
Sevier	578	603	620	706	684	680	3.3%	-0.6%
Summit	4,185	4,557	4,749	5,164	5,456	5,695	6.4%	4.4%
Tooele	552	550	575	592	602	616	2.2%	2.3%
Uintah	679	711	732	723	770	811	3.6%	5.4%
Utah	3,884	4,096	4,391	4,868	5,252	5,400	6.8%	2.8%
Wasatch	594	633	674	716	747	823	6.7%	10.2%
Washington	2,876	3,109	3,341	3,733	4,009	4,131	7.5%	3.0%
Wayne	180	182	218	237	212	249	6.7%	17.2%
Weber	3,099	3,224	3,409	3,562	3,733	3,841	4.4%	2.9%

(p) preliminary estimate

See "Statewide Total for Utah" table for total state employment. County employment figures do not add up to the Statewide total.

Source: Estimated by Utah Division of Travel Development (see introductory note for details)

Gross Taxable Room Rents

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998(p)	Avg. Annual % Change 1993-98	% Change 1997-98
Beaver	\$2,544,815	\$2,421,967	\$2,740,436	\$2,499,089	\$2,706,961	\$2,995,476	3.3%	10.7%
Box Elder	\$1,612,391	\$1,688,863	\$2,237,144	\$2,382,792	\$2,452,799	\$2,743,436	11.2%	11.8%
Cache	\$3,531,490	\$4,449,428	\$5,154,183	\$6,002,665	\$6,145,150	\$7,461,665	16.1%	21.4%
Carbon	\$2,702,520	\$2,746,242	\$2,605,233	\$2,780,721	\$3,490,261	\$4,289,202	9.7%	22.9%
Daggett	\$897,991	\$1,022,561	\$1,241,024	\$1,373,982	\$1,324,813	\$1,817,340	15.1%	37.2%
Davis	\$5,640,443	\$7,342,701	\$8,448,973	\$10,679,692	\$12,260,194	\$13,428,722	18.9%	9.5%
Duchesne	\$525,847	\$450,509	\$578,489	\$562,428	\$738,600	\$963,268	12.9%	30.4%
Emery	\$1,245,441	\$1,546,360	\$2,369,843	\$687,393	(\$493,023)	\$1,451,453	3.1%	--
Garfield	\$9,798,411	\$13,048,603	\$14,238,300	\$15,601,048	\$15,971,028	\$16,155,172	10.5%	1.2%
Grand	\$16,317,422	\$17,491,753	\$19,929,316	\$22,557,127	\$25,158,976	\$24,171,088	8.2%	-3.9%
Iron	\$11,161,092	\$11,978,934	\$11,797,615	\$11,765,173	\$12,219,753	\$12,214,175	1.8%	0.0%
Juab	\$1,371,756	\$1,476,859	\$1,490,368	\$1,645,718	\$1,692,894	\$1,770,058	5.2%	4.6%
Kane	\$7,099,491	\$7,058,558	\$9,083,028	\$8,899,542	\$8,940,005	\$8,255,033	3.1%	-7.7%
Millard	\$2,007,378	\$1,798,341	\$1,958,747	\$1,733,381	\$2,142,495	\$1,996,992	-0.1%	-6.8%
Morgan	\$31,544	\$36,431	\$36,615	\$36,817	\$35,630	\$29,054	-1.6%	-18.5%
Piute	\$89,793	\$98,116	\$106,428	\$175,043	\$153,199	\$186,610	15.8%	21.8%
Rich	\$522,086	\$800,137	\$967,778	\$1,123,620	\$1,221,604	\$1,349,081	20.9%	10.4%
Salt Lake	\$162,464,435	\$191,224,625	\$217,424,435	\$249,695,693	\$273,307,501	\$278,347,388	11.4%	1.8%
San Juan	\$6,497,397	\$6,937,032	\$7,936,391	\$8,064,566	\$8,147,581	\$8,580,677	5.7%	5.3%
Sanpete	\$634,180	\$682,056	\$856,673	\$945,171	\$1,198,546	\$1,323,559	15.9%	10.4%
Sevier	\$4,750,392	\$4,776,406	\$4,937,538	\$5,015,299	\$5,203,651	\$5,085,250	1.4%	-2.3%
Summit	\$54,152,755	\$56,179,282	\$63,688,124	\$72,159,515	\$79,855,432	\$88,875,994	10.4%	11.3%
Tooele	\$3,758,400	\$4,259,218	\$4,635,204	\$4,873,994	\$4,239,960	\$4,122,923	1.9%	-2.8%
Uintah	\$3,665,529	\$3,731,009	\$4,237,011	\$3,940,391	\$4,491,601	\$5,305,277	7.7%	18.1%
Utah	\$17,722,818	\$18,665,825	\$21,648,250	\$24,079,584	\$27,379,992	\$27,914,001	9.5%	2.0%
Wasatch	\$2,722,427	\$3,268,750	\$3,712,409	\$4,407,672	\$6,290,345	\$6,539,151	19.2%	4.0%
Washington	\$27,262,092	\$25,086,218	\$28,881,918	\$30,564,311	\$32,201,732	\$34,111,888	4.6%	5.9%
Wayne	\$1,619,584	\$1,727,366	\$2,374,459	\$2,576,634	\$2,734,676	\$2,950,418	12.7%	7.9%
Weber	\$12,282,596	\$13,348,192	\$14,933,747	\$16,251,329	\$16,991,754	\$16,348,310	5.9%	-3.8%
State of Utah	\$364,632,516	\$405,342,342	\$460,249,679	\$513,080,389	\$558,204,110	\$580,782,661	9.8%	4.0%

(p) preliminary estimate

Source: Estimated by Division of Travel Development (see introductory note for details).

Gross Transient Room Tax Collections

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998(p)	Avg. Annual % Change 1993-98	% Change 1997-98
Beaver	\$75,682	\$72,659	\$82,213	\$74,973	\$81,209	\$89,864	3.5%	10.7%
Box Elder	\$48,372	\$50,666	\$67,114	\$71,484	\$73,584	\$82,303	11.2%	11.8%
Cache	\$105,945	\$133,483	\$154,625	\$180,080	\$184,354	\$223,850	16.1%	21.4%
Carbon	\$81,076	\$82,387	\$78,157	\$83,422	\$104,708	\$128,676	9.7%	22.9%
Daggett	\$26,940	\$30,677	\$37,231	\$41,219	\$39,744	\$54,520	15.1%	37.2%
Davis	\$168,689	\$220,281	\$253,469	\$320,391	\$367,806	\$402,862	19.0%	9.5%
Duchesne	\$15,775	\$13,515	\$17,355	\$16,873	\$22,158	\$28,898	12.9%	30.4%
Emery	\$38,297	\$46,391	\$71,095	\$20,622	(\$14,791)	\$43,544	2.6%	--
Garfield	\$293,859	\$391,458	\$427,149	\$468,031	\$479,131	\$484,655	10.5%	1.2%
Grand	\$471,430	\$524,753	\$597,879	\$676,714	\$754,769	\$725,133	9.0%	-3.9%
Iron	\$334,330	\$359,368	\$353,928	\$352,955	\$366,593	\$366,425	1.9%	0.0%
Juab	\$41,153	\$44,306	\$44,711	\$49,372	\$50,787	\$53,102	5.2%	4.6%
Kane	\$212,939	\$211,757	\$272,491	\$266,986	\$268,200	\$247,651	3.1%	-7.7%
Millard	\$60,221	\$53,950	\$58,762	\$52,001	\$64,275	\$59,910	-0.1%	-6.8%
Morgan	\$946	\$1,093	\$1,098	\$1,104	\$1,069	\$872	-1.6%	-18.4%
Piute	\$2,694	\$2,943	\$3,193	\$5,251	\$4,596	\$5,598	15.8%	21.8%
Rich	\$15,663	\$24,004	\$29,033	\$33,709	\$36,648	\$40,472	20.9%	10.4%
Salt Lake	\$4,802,795	\$5,736,739	\$6,522,733	\$7,490,871	\$8,199,225	\$8,350,422	11.7%	1.8%
San Juan	\$159,781	\$207,837	\$228,878	\$242,988	\$250,430	\$264,407	10.6%	5.6%
Sanpete	\$18,390	\$20,462	\$25,700	\$28,355	\$35,956	\$39,707	16.6%	10.4%
Sevier	\$142,457	\$143,292	\$148,126	\$150,459	\$156,110	\$152,557	1.4%	-2.3%
Summit	\$1,624,054	\$1,685,378	\$1,910,644	\$2,164,785	\$2,395,663	\$2,666,280	10.4%	11.3%
Tooele	\$56,376	\$98,030	\$138,452	\$146,121	\$124,401	\$117,729	15.9%	-5.4%
Uintah	\$105,554	\$111,930	\$127,110	\$118,212	\$134,748	\$159,158	8.6%	18.1%
Utah	\$530,930	\$559,975	\$649,447	\$722,388	\$821,400	\$837,420	9.5%	2.0%
Wasatch	\$81,673	\$98,062	\$111,372	\$132,230	\$188,710	\$196,175	19.2%	4.0%
Washington	\$815,383	\$752,587	\$866,458	\$916,929	\$966,052	\$1,023,357	4.6%	5.9%
Wayne	\$48,588	\$51,821	\$71,234	\$77,299	\$82,040	\$88,513	12.7%	7.9%
Weber	\$369,420	\$400,446	\$448,012	\$487,540	\$509,753	\$490,449	5.8%	-3.8%
State of Utah	\$10,749,409	\$12,130,249	\$13,797,672	\$15,393,364	\$16,749,328	\$17,424,509	10.1%	4.0%

(p) preliminary estimate

Source: Estimated by Utah Division of Travel Development (see introductory note for details).

RESOLUTION NO. 2000- 15

A RESOLUTION INCREASING THE BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN COUNTY DEPARTMENTS.

The Cache County Council, in a duly convened meeting, pursuant to Sections 17-36-22 through 17-36-26, Utah Code Annotated, 1953 as amended, finds that certain adjustments to the Cache County budget for 2000 are reasonable and necessary; that the said budget has been reviewed by the County Auditor with all affected department heads; that a duly called hearing has been held and all interested parties have been given an opportunity to be heard; that all County Council has given due consideration to matters discussed at the public hearing and to any revised estimates of revenues; and that it is in the best interest of the County that these adjustments be made.

NOW THEREFORE, it is hereby resolved that:

Section 1.

The following adjustments are hereby made to the 2000 budget for Cache County:

see attached

Section 2.

Other than as specifically set forth above, all other matters set forth in the said budget shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 3.

This resolution shall take effect immediately upon adoption and the County Auditor and other county officials are authorized and directed to act accordingly.


This resolution was duly adopted by the Cache County Council on the 13th day of June, 2000.

ATTESTED TO:

CACHE COUNTY COUNCIL

Daryl R. Downs, Cache County Clerk

Darrel L. Gibbons, Chairman



FUND 20 MUNICIPAL SERVICES FUND REVENUES

ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	Current Budget	Recommended		Amended Budget	Reason for Change
		decrease DEBIT	increase CREDIT		
20-38-90000 Appropriated Surplus	\$ -		\$ (1,000)	\$ (1,000)	temporary help in Zoning Office
Totals		\$ -	\$ (1,000)	\$ (1,000)	
Net adjustment				\$ (1,000)	

FUND 20 MUNICIPAL SERVICES FUND EXPENDITURES

ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	Current Budget	Recommended		Amended Budget	Reason for Change
		Increase DEBIT	Decrease CREDIT		
20-4180-620 Zoning - Misc Services	\$ 3,500	\$ 1,000		\$ 4,500	Temporary help from SOS
Totals		\$ 1,000	\$ -	\$ 1,000	
Net adjustment				\$ 1,000	

FUND 24 COUNCIL ON AGING FUND REVENUES

ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	Current Budget	Recommended		Amended Budget	Reason for Change
		Decrease DEBIT	Increase CREDIT		
24-3890000 Approp Surplus	\$ -		\$ (7,356)	\$ (7,356)	for UDOT van match
Totals		\$ -	\$ (7,356)	\$ (7,356)	
Net adjustment				\$ (7,356)	

FUND 24 COUNCIL ON AGING FUND EXPENDITURES

ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	Current Budget	Recommended		Amended Budget	Reason for Change
		Increase DEBIT	Decrease CREDIT		
24-4971-130 Center - employee benefits	\$ -	\$ 7,356		\$ 7,356	UDOT van match (from 1999) transfer adj
Totals		\$ 7,356	\$ -	\$ 7,356	
Net adjustment				\$ 7,356	

INTER DEPARTMENT BUDGET TRANSFER

RESOLUTION NO. 2000- 16.

A RESOLUTION TRANSFERRING OF UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATION BALANCE BY GOVERNING BODY.

The Cache county Council, in a duly convened meeting, pursuant to Section 17-36-23, Utah Code Annotated, 1953 as amended, finds that certain adjustments to the Cache County budget for 2000 are reasonable and necessary; that the said budget as been reviewed by the county Auditor with all affected department heads; that the County Council has given due consideration to matters discussed at the public meeting and to any revised estimates of revenues; and that it is in the best interest of the County that these adjustments be made.

NOW THEREFORE, it is hereby resolved that:

Section 1.

The following adjustments are hereby made to the 2000 budget for Cache County:

see attached schedule

Section 2.


Other than as specifically set forth above, all other matters set forth in the said budget shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 3.


This resolution shall take effect immediately upon adoption and the County Auditor and other county officials are authorized and directed to act accordingly.


This resolution was duly adopted by the Cache County Council on the 13th day of June, 2000.

ATTESTED TO:


Daryl R. Downs,
Cache County Clerk

CACHE COUNTY COUNCIL


Darrel L. Gibbons, Chairman



FUND 10 GENERAL FUND REVENUES


COUNT	DESCRIPTION	Current Budget	Recommended		Amended Budget	Reason for Change
			Increase DEBIT	Increase CREDIT		
TOTAL REVENUES			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	

FUND 10 GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES

ACCOUNT	DESCRIPTION	Current Budget	Recommended		Amended Budget	Reason for Change
			Increase DEBIT	Increase CREDIT		
10-4142-740	Clerk - Equip	\$ 7,100		\$ (6,900)	\$ 200	Transfer to fix INGeo Software
10-4146-620	Assessor - Misc Services	\$ 34,978	\$ 11,025		\$ 46,003	To fix INGeo Software
10-4220-250	Fire - Equip supply & maint	\$ 22,625		\$ (4,125)	\$ 18,500	Transfer to fix INGeo Software
TOTAL expenditures			\$ 11,025	\$ (11,025)	\$ -	

PLA NO. 2

(300 YDS. NORTH)
OF THE PRESENT
CLARKSTON SITE.



**CACHE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
CACHE COUNTY SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE**

Section 300-6/500-2. Evidence and Availability of Required Services.

In addition to the information required in Section 300-5/500-1, the following information is required to be presented as part of the minor/preliminary subdivision application, necessary to establish the availability of basic services to the proposed subdivision.

(1) Water Requirements.

The Bear River Health Department and the Utah Department of Environmental Quality shall be considered the County's experts in evaluating the proposed culinary water supply system. It shall be the responsibility of the applicant to provide information and materials as required by the Bear River Health Department or the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, as applicable.

In addition to the requirements of the Bear River Health Department and the Utah Department of Environmental Quality for the provision of culinary water, the following information shall be provided.

Culinary Water Application.

All applications for minor/preliminary subdivision approval shall include a valid well application, filed with the Office of the State Engineer, for the provision of culinary water for the number of equivalent residential units proposed.

