

CACHE COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING
July 09, 2002

The Cache County Council convened in a regular session on 09 June 2002 in the Cache County Council Chamber at 120 North 100 West, Logan, Utah.

ATTENDANCE:

Chairman: *C. Larry Anhder - Excused*
Vice Chairman: Layne M. Beck
Council Members: Darrel L. Gibbons, John Hansen, H. Craig Petersen, Kathy Robison,
Cory Yeates
County Executive: M. Lynn Lemon
County Clerk: Jill N. Zollinger

The following individuals were also in attendance: Lloyd Barfus, Kim Cheshire, Lorene Greenhalgh, Issa Hamud, Pat Hansen, Jarvis Johnson, Kristy Johnson, Mike Kidman, Sheriff Lynn Nelson, Evelyn Palmer, Pat Parker, Kent Parsons, Mrs. Parsons, Curtis Roberts, Sarah Ann Skanchy, Jim Smith, Auditor Tamra Stones, Mark Teuscher, Jennie Christensen (KVNU), Leon D'Souza (Herald Journal) and Matt Flinton (Standard Examiner), Toby Hayes (Deseret News).

CALL TO ORDER:

Vice Chairman Beck called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

INVOCATION:

The invocation was given by John Hansen.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Items added to the agenda:

1. Item 6-c - Jones Simkins LLP External Auditor's Report
2. Executive Session to discuss the purchase of land for the location of the jail.

Council member Gibbons moved to amend the agenda by 1) adding the external auditor's report as item 6-c, 2) having an Executive Session at the end of the meeting and 3) moving item 9-e Jail Update under Other Business and including that discussion along with the Executive Session. Hansen seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 6-0. (Chairman Anhder absent.)

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes of County Council meeting of May 28, 2002, were discussed, corrected and approved. Vice Chairman Beck noted that on the discussion for the BCIA Tax Exemption, the reason the vote was taken as it was came because of the Attorney's memo that had been received; this should be reflected in the minutes.

Council member Yeates moved to accept the minutes as amended. Robison seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous, 6-0. (Anhder absent.)

County Council
July 09, 2002

REPORT OF COUNTY EXECUTIVE: County Executive Lemon reported on the following items:

- Appointment:** There were no appointments.
- Warrants:** The Warrants for the period of 06-21-02 to 06-27-02 and 06-28-2002 to 07-02-02 were given to the Clerk for filing.
- Other Items:**
1. **The 10th East road contract.** The contract was awarded for the road between Providence and Logan. Construction will begin on July 15, 2002 and will go through September 15, 2002.
 2. **New Public Works Director.** Last year during the discussion of consolidation of County Offices, it was proposed that when the Road Superintendent retired there might be a possibility of opening a new position for a Public Works Director. If this were going to happen, it was now time to advertise for that job; and if this position was advertised, should the requirement of an Engineer be included. The alternative to a new Public Works Director would be to incorporate those duties of the public works into the position of the Road Department Superintendent. Executive Lemon would like Council input on this item.
 3. **Eccles Ice Center Advocate Presentation.** Executive Lemon presented the Eccles Ice Center Advocate of the Year 2002 award to Council member Layne Beck. Recognition was given by the Board of Trustees and Employees of the Eccles Ice Center for Mr. Beck's outstanding dedication and service to the Center.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: LLOYD BARFUS

Jim Smith: "Lloyd Barfuss has been selected by his peers as 'Employee of the Month' for the month of July. Lloyd began his career at Cache County over 20 years ago on January 7, 1976. He started working with the Sheriff's Office." He cleaned and at times even cooked. When a particular work-detail job got too difficult or too messy or problems arose, he would even slip into jail coveralls and work right along side the inmates. Lloyd is 82 years young and is the County's' most senior employee by age.

"Today, Lloyd concentrates on keeping the Administration Offices of the Sheriff's Office clean. He still strips, waxes and buffs the floors downstairs and vacuums the carpets upstairs. Each day he tidies up the restrooms; he empties the waste baskets; and he cleans the windows."

One of Lloyd's peers wrote: "Lloyd has worked faithfully for this office for 26 years without a single "atta-boy." He works hard, way too hard, and has nothing on his wall to prove it; besides we all love him to death."

County Council
July 09, 2002

County Executive Lemon presented Mr. Barfuss with the Employee of the Month Award for July, 2002, and Sheriff Lynn Nelson presented the gift certificate.

UPDATE ON DEAD ANIMAL POLICY AT LANDFILL: ISSA HAMUD

Issa Hamud from the Logan City Environmental Division is requesting that the Council approve free dead animal disposal at the Logan City Landfill to help reduce illegal dumping of dead animals along the roads and water ways of Cache County. The Solid Waste Advisory Board is presently in contract with Cache Valley By-Products to handle dead animal disposal for \$1,000.00 per month, with free disposal of dead animals at the landfill.

The Solid Waste Advisory Board had reviewed the dead animal disposal program in its June 17, 2002 meeting and recognized the need to review its contract with Cache Valley By-Products and negotiate for a transparent contract which explains the responsibilities of each party in the agreement.

To give time for negotiations, the Solid Waste Advisory Board decided to extend the contract of Cache Valley By-Products for three (3) months. The Solid Waste Advisory Board also recommended free dead animal disposal at the landfill.

The Council moved into the Cache County Service Area #1 Board of Trustees.

Council member Gibbons moved to accept the recommendation of the Solid Waste Advisory Board to remove the tipping fee for dead animals at the landfill and also authorize the re-negotiation of the contract with Cache Valley By-Products in accordance with the information they have requested. Yeates seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 6-0. (Anhder was absent.)

The Council adjourned from the Cache County Service Area #1 Board of Trustees.

EXTERNAL AUDIT REPORT:

The general purpose financial statements of Cache County were audited by Certified Public Accountants of Jones Simkins LLP.

Mike Kidman address the Council and turned time over to Curtis Roberts who conducted the audit, for the presentation of their report. Curtis Roberts communicated the findings and recommendations of the Audit report. A management letter from Jones Simkins Certified Public Accountants and a Audit Booklet entitled "Cache County Financial Statements - December 31, 2001," were given to the Council for review.

It was the opinion of the auditors that Cache County complied, in all material respect, with the general compliance requirements and the requirements governing types of services allowed or not allowed; eligibility, matching, level of effort, or earmarking; reporting; and special test and provisions that are applicable to each of its major State assistance programs for the year ending

County Council
July 09, 2002

December 31, 2001.

The schedule of expenditures of Federal awards was fairly stated in all material respects. No matters involving internal control over financial reporting and its operation were considered to be material weaknesses. However, matters involving the internal control over financial reporting was noted in a separate management letter dated June 4, 2002. Immaterial instances of noncompliance with requirements were described in that letter.

Audit adjustments were made to taxes receivable and the statement of taxes charged, collected and disbursed. The auditors assisted management in properly recording and reporting the North Park Inter-local Cooperative activity. Follow up on the recommendations stated in the management letter should be completed before the next year's budget was adopted.

A complete copy of the audit report is on file in the County Clerk's office.

Council Member Yeates moved to accept the Jones Simkins LLP audit report. The motion was properly seconded. The vote was unanimous, 6-0. (Anhder absent.)

TV TRANSLATOR DISCUSSION: KENT PARSONS

Executive Lemon introduced Kent Parsons to the Council to discuss the TV translator issue.

Kent Parsons: "I have worked with translators for 45 years and have worked with the University of Utah 36 years; and I am still a full-time employee with Channel 7 and Channel 9. I became involved with Cache County when we got the Pisgah Peak in 1997; so, I am quite aware of most of the things that are happening."

"With the change of television everything has been up in the air. There has been a lot of misinformation and there has been a lot of misdirection. A few years ago the FCC decided to have digital TV come into the nation and there is a lot of concern about that. I can tell you that as an individual who lives about 150 miles from Salt Lake City, I watched the Winter Olympics on high-definition television at home. By the end of 2003 there will be on the Wasatch front no less than 30 TV stations free-of-charge for the general public in Salt Lake. It will be both digital and cable; there is no question where television is going. The question for you folks is, I believe, do you want to continue to supply free over-the-air service to your local people? That is the bottom line."

"I understand that there are some work decisions that have to be made regarding Pisgah Peak by (the year) 2004. I think the decision is at this time (that) we can't wait until 2004 to decide what to do. I came up last Fall and Lynn (Lemon) and I went up to the Clarkston Site to see exactly what it would do. We did a survey. All I can give you is an opinion and that is all."

Questions/Answers:

Lynn Lemon: After we went out there, I came back with somewhat the same idea that we ought to build that site even if we didn't know what our usage would be. One of the questions that the Council has had as we have talked about TV Translators is how many people are really using it. We have cable available to a large percentage of the

County Council
July 09, 2002

County and we have satellite dish network going to a number of people. We have asked BRAG to help us and they are actually doing a poll to determine the usage. I think when Earl (Rouse) came in last week, he said that even if you didn't have anybody using it, you still ought to continue to build the site because those channels are worth something.

Kent Parsons: There are three key places in the State where spectrum is very valuable: 1) The St. George area, 2) the Park City area and 3) Cache Valley. Some (spectrum) has been sold in the Washington County area already. We have pretty much written off that digital would go away and the use would turn back to satellite and cable. I think everyone should have the opportunity to receive PBS Satellite if they want and they should have the chance to receive Cable if they want; but they should (also) have the chance to receive free television. We have PBS signals that I am very concerned about. There is a great movement in who might buy your spectrum from non-commercial entities, which include Christian broadcast. Hopefully in the rural area, that is not what we end up with.

Lemon: You mean they would want to buy a channel?

Parsons: That's true.

Lemon: That might be a non-commercial user but there are also a lot of commercial uses.

Parsons: Yes, with the format of Broadband perspective is before us today. There is a lot of speculation; however, the economy has really cooled things down. The Broadband transmission has not really taken off like people thought it might. If you look at the stock of some of the big players, the stock has deteriorated and has gone way down. So, their's is still in the air but I am here to tell you that there is a gray area in the non-commercial/educational market. Just to give you an idea, some of these licenses, just the license, could have been sold for about \$80,000.00.

The Clarkston site in my opinion is the best telecommunication site in northern Utah. I think you could develop that. In this State 75% of the land mass is owned by the Federal Government. Another portion is controlled by the State and another of course by the native American Indians. We do not control very much land. We have a parcel out there that you can do what you want to with (it). So, when you develop a telecommunication site and you put access to it, it is worse than putting honey jars out for flies; people come in (to use it). From the Clarkston site you can see almost to Logan and you can see almost all of Cache Valley. You must have good input signals if you are going to do television, of which Pisgah has never passed since day one. That has been the biggest problem.

The other thing I would like to quickly note here is that the State has affirmed that \$111,000.00 worth of new equipment is into Pisgah right now and \$60,000.00 more in a microwave that is sitting in my shop just to be installed to upgrade the current system at Pisgah. If you are only going to be there for two years, you are going to need an alternate plan. The alternate plan would be that you develop Clarkston and you would move the microwave to Clarkston for when you can no longer be at Pisgah. You may need a secondary site. You need two. You have a couple of little towns off to the South, Avon or Paradise, that would have to be considered some kind of a very small re-transmitter site to Logan. The Bangeter site that we have located West of Logan appears to me to be second best if you no longer can do it at Pisgah.

Darrel Gibbons: Federal government displaced channels we were using. Are they going to continue to do that?

Parsons: No. It was to have an option on June 19, to auction off all of our channels between 60-69. We have been led to believe that is when they were going to auction those off. When it came about a month before, they changed the auction and said they were going to auction channels 52-59 and now they are not going to auction 60-69. At the moment they are going to take every other channel from 52-59 of which we have moved off for the State to have money to use for those transmitters. So, we are already off those channels and are not in jeopardy there. There is no problem as far as licenses.

Lemon: We would have been displaced in at least four of those channels.

Parsons: That's true. In regards to Mr. Gibbons, I don't think there is any way in the world they can take any more channels because of the heat that the congressional people are taking. In working directly with the FCC in Washington, the Chief Engineers with PBS and the Chief Engineers at the NAP, the Association of Broadcasters, this investment is the best that I think you can do.

Beck: Does Franklin County have a problem with us doing a directional out of Clarkston?

Lemon: Initially were going to just go part way up the mountain and then rebroadcast to Pisgah but we thought if we were going to look at this long-term, we really ought to go on top of the mountain, which is where we would get a better input signal. Preston, Bear Lake County and Caribou County, several of them, contacted us. Franklin County was the one that said it would cause them problems and give them interference. Kent, you have worked with them now; and I think if we broadcast with the Bangeter site, that shouldn't cause any problem then.

Parsons: No. We are not going to change the channels that we are already on. I think this was some mis-

County Council
July 09, 2002

information that had been distributed around. It was never the intent from my perspective to transmit from the UHF signals from Clarkstons. That is a relay point to get it down into the Valley. Certainly there is no way that we would go in to do so if we would cause interference with Franklin County.

Beck: Is Franklin County in compliance? It was Mr. Rouse's opinion that they were out of compliance. He mentioned that eventually they would be out of business because of that.

Parsons: I couldn't answer that. I don't know. I know that the channels they are operating on off of Clarkston are the same channels that the stations in Salt Lake City are broadcasting on and that would be illegal. They would stand a better chance of being displaced because of that. Translators are what we call a secondary service and primary stations like in Salt Lake City can bump at any time; that is why we have to coordinate with every County in the State. Out of 29 Counties there are 24 Counties that have their own each one of them have their own little situation. Up to this point everyone is still standing behind their computers and translators.

Beck: Do you see in the future the possibility of wireless and telecommunications people putting their buildings up there?

Parsons: I think that you would see the possibility of cellular. It is a better site. The only thing (reception) you would really lose would be up in Logan Canyon but outside of that you would have better coverage from off of Clarkston in my opinion. Two things that we have found in going around to the different states and looking at their different situations, the poorest things that I found in the State in looking at the input signals, was that Mt Pisgah had the poorest and worst access. I think that this (Clarkston) would be a tremendous site to providing free television to the patrons.

Beck: In your opinion, would it be the best interest of the County to develop the site up in Clarkston?

Parsons: In my opinion, it would because I think that it is a tremendous location. Keep in mind again who owns the land in the Sate and we can not develop any telecommunication site on public land. So, people who come on board whether it be Broadband, cellular or wireless, where are they going to go? They are going to go for the power lines. in the road? No, it is very easy to see that when you combine everything up, we have among private land owners only 20% of the State, where we can even build.

Craig Petersen: Suppose the County decided it just wanted to sell. Is there certain designations people would want of the spectrum?

Parsons: At the present time the spectrum that you are offering them is for television. There is a movement that is planning to get some Broadbands through the system sandwiched in. I am Vice President of the National Transmittal Service Association and we are totally opposed because this has never been done. We believe that will cause interference in the television itself. Now if you could microwave it in, that would be different and we wouldn't have as much of a problem with it. There are services outside of television that have not been addressed that are still up in the air.

Petersen: At least for right now if we were to sell, the only potential buyers would be the television, isn't it?

Parsons: That's true. That's where the channels that have been taken away from us are going.

Petersen: If that is the only usage of our channels, who are the potential buyers? Would there be any legal problems if the County decides to sell.

Parsons: I do not think so but I'm not an attorney. The bottom line is do you want to have people who will live in your area who can not afford satellite delivery or cable to have television or not?

Petersen: People probably will pay their cable bills for a long, long time but I think you have to look at the numbers. We still have absolutely no information of how many people we are serving.

Parsons: It is very hard to get a handle on but you can easily tell if you just turn the whole works off.

Petersen: In terms of other people who might use the site like cellular companies, what kind of annual revenues are you going to capture for those users.

Parsons: In talking to Max Bangeter with Lynn on a teleconference call, Max said \$300.00 a rack per month. Now, a rack can house several different transmitters or it can handle one. The normal rental on those is about \$300.00 a month per rack. The rack is 19 inches wide and 7 feet high.

Petersen: That doesn't give me a perspective of how many of those might be there. It could be one; it could be ten; it could be fifty. Do you have any idea?

Parsons: That is really subjective. That's like saying: "How long is a piece of string." All I can tell you is the development of the technology has progressed at such a rapid rate and there are about 100 translator sites in the State of Utah. Each one of those sites are increasing getting people to them because we can't develop power lines over public lands; you can't develop telecommunication sites on public land.

Petersen: In terms of other users that might come in, what would it take us to develop it. Is it primarily power?

Lemon: Power, road and a building.

County Council
July 09, 2002

Petersen: So, if we could build a road and have power up there and not do anything else, we would still have a big attractive site for potential users, is that correct?

Roberts: In my opinion, yes. I think you have about a half-a-mile road and you would have less than a half-a-mile of power line. I would suggest that if you are going to maintain the television system that you add one building. You do not mix private service with public service. That is known for problems.

Vice Chairman Beck thanked Mr. Parsons for coming and talking with the Council.

PUBLIC HEARING: OPEN 2002 BUDGET - TAMRA STONES

Vice Chairman Beck opened the public hearing to receive comments from the public concerning opening the 2002 budget. Auditor Tamra Stones reviewed the changes in the budget.

(Attachment #1)

Executive Lemon requested an increase for the Fire Department of \$5600.00 for supplies needed for volunteer firefighters. Ms. Stones suggested appropriating \$2,800.00 and recognize the State matching funds of \$2,800.00

Vice Chairman Beck called for public comments. No comments were made.

Council member Petersen moved to close the Public Hearing. Robison seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 6-0. (Anhder absent.)

Council member Gibbons moved to amend Resolution No. 2002-24 2002 Budget to adjust appropriations \$2,800.00 with respect to the Fire Department recognizing revenue from the State for \$2,800.00 as a match. Petersen seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 6-0. (Anhder absent.)

RESOLUTION NO. 2002-24: ADJUSTMENTS TO THE 2002 BUDGET

A resolution increasing the budget appropriations for certain County departments.

Council member Gibbons moved to waive the rules and adopt Resolution No. 2002-24. Yeates seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 6-0. (Anhder absent.)

(Attachment #2)

ORDINANCE NO. 2002-10: ADMINISTRATIVE DETERMINATION OF A BUILDABLE AGRICULTURAL LOT TO BE PLACED AS SECTION 900 OF THE CURRENT SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE.

Mark Teuscher outlined the amendments that had been made to the Subdivision Ordinance.

The purpose of the amendments were to allow for consideration of lots that were not legally subdivided to be allowed to be identified for a single family home. Any further subdividing would be subject to all of the parcels.

County Council
July 09, 2002

The two basic items changed by Mr. Teuscher: 1) A lot size of 40 acres. 2) The Zoning Administrator would be the one to administer this rather than the Planning Commission.

Discussion:

Craig Petersen: What were the concerns that lead it to be brought up to 40 (acres)?

Mark Teuscher: One concern is initially it would be awarded to 10 acres. By putting it (the lot) to a larger size, it does allow people to make it into an agricultural piece and it would need to go through the subdivision process. If you make it small, it would just be a way to circumvent the subdivision ordinance. I am just really uncomfortable with 10 acres.

Darrel Gibbons: I feel that 40 acres is too large. I feel like it is holding a property owner hostage on a fairly large piece of property in saying that you can't build because it is not 40 acres.

Layne Beck: He could still build.

Teuscher: He could still build but he could still do agriculture. This only allows him for one home on that piece.

Beck: Unless he is willing to go through the subdivision process and convinces his neighbors to come in with him.

Gibbons: I am suggesting if a man owns 30 acres, it is a fairly substantial piece of agricultural property and I think 40 acres is plenty big. My father owned 20 acres and it was a very viable piece of ag. land.

Teuscher: It is up to you guys to debate; I'm just uncomfortable with a 10-acre piece.

Cory Yeates: Darrel, are you comfortable with 30 acres?

Gibbons: I wouldn't want to go any larger than that and that's plenty as far as I am concerned.

Teuscher: The agricultural zone has to be 30 acres. The way it is written in the FR-40 it would have to be 30 acres because that is the minimum lot size.

Gibbons: Generally a person who buys a 30-acre parcel is fairly serious about agricultural intent.

Beck: Unless their intent is in the future to develop it.

Yeates: This is one heck-of-a big subdivision!

Gibbons: If he intends on doing that then he will have to go through the subdivision process.

Lynn Lemon: Mark, now this is only the lots that have already been divided, isn't it?

Teuscher: Legal parcels that were divided as of Jan 1, 2002.

Lemon: You can't take 100 acres and divide it into three 30-acre pieces.

Teuscher: If somebody has split the piece after Jan of 2002, they will not be eligible for this. It would be only for those who existed prior as agricultural splits.

Gibbons: If agricultural property is selling say for \$3,000 an acre and a person comes in and invests \$90,000 to buy a 30-acre portion; and then we tell them it has to be 40 acres to build a home on, I'm not sure that is fair either.

Teuscher: You are always going to have that problem of where you set that boundary.

Gibbons: I think we ought to reduce the lot size from 40 to 30; my real preference would be 20.

Yeates: If we go to 20 we have a lot problem the same as if we go with 10.

Petersen: Mark, what evidence do we have as to how prevalent that really is.

Teuscher: That is extremely prevalent. We have a lot of 10-acre parcels that have been split up.

Lemon: This is not something you can do even now; it has to be a lot that was divided before 2002.

Teuscher: The reason I bring that up is because there are other counties in the inter-mountain west that are looking at 10-acre increments that are not agricultural pieces. There are people that do use them for agriculture, I'm not saying that it can't be done; but in most cases what it becomes is very large "weedettes." In fact in the County we know that if we don't have a secondary water system of irrigation, it becomes very difficult to maintain. If they are agricultural people by trade, they are going to use this land whether they put in pastures or whatever. If somebody is buying 10-acres and they are not from perspective, they are not agriculturally related, what we are finding in the inter-mountain west is that these have just become very large weed lots and it is a problem. As you start to get bigger then they become agriculturally viable in terms of management. It really comes to the property owner and whether he is a good manager of that property as an agricultural person or if he is just intending to have a big piece of property with a house on it.

John Hansen: Mark what I see out in my area, if we have someone that owns a 10-acre parcel, they rent it out to someone else who does farm it and they do a nice job of it. They just retain ownership but I don't see a lot of weed parcels.

Teuscher: I'm just saying that across the Inter-mountain West this is what typically happens when you get to 10-acre pieces. They start to deteriorate. In heavy agricultural areas, they are used but not always. They become difficult to get to, that is not always an advantage to property owners. I am just saying 10-acres is too small.

County Council
July 09, 2002

Hansen: They can rent that fairly reasonable.

Gibbons: It is an advantage to the property owner because if he is about to lease it and keep it in agriculture then he benefits from the green-belt tax status; so, there is some incentive to maintain ag. use with those properties. **Yeates:** That's true.

Beck: Are there any indication of numbers, Lorene, in terms of 40 versus 30?

Lorene Greenhalgh: My preference is 40. If they can have the farm managed by someone else, why can't they cooperate with the subdivision.

Beck: Because one of the reasons is because we have this idea that once we are in our little section of paradise, we don't want anyone else joining us.

Teuscher: The issues that really drove this were not small pieces. They were 128-acre pieces.

Beck: That's true.

Gibbons: Cooperation with respect to land leases though for agricultural uses are monetary driven and there is not a great deal of monetary incentive in creating a subdivision.

Greenhalgh: Sure there is they can sell it at a lot higher price.

Gibbons: Well, if I am the one who wants to subdivide it and am aligned with three other property owners, I am the one who is going to benefit; they're not.

Greenhalgh: They will benefit too because their property will be in an approved subdivision lot as well. They will have all of the benefits that the original owner had.

Gibbons: They may not have any desire to sell their right.

Council member Yeates moved to adopt Ordinance 2002-10 as written at 40 acres. Petersen seconded the motion.

Council member Petersen moved to amend the motion to 20 acres. Gibbons seconded the motion. Vote on the amendment to the motion. 4 "yes" 2 "no". Robison and Yeates voting "no". (Anhder absent.)

Vote on the original motion to adopt Ordinance 2002-10 as amended. 4 "yes" 2 "no". Robison and Yeates voting "no". (Anhder absent.)

ORDINANCE NO. 2002-10 (Vote: 4-2-1)

	ANHDER	BECK	GIBBONS	HANSEN	PETERSEN	ROBISON	YEATES	VOTES CAST
AYE		x	x	x	x			4
NAY						X	x	2
ABSTAINED								0
ABSENT	x							1

(Attachment #3)

ADMINISTRATION BUILDING UPDATE:

Council member Petersen updated the Council on the new Administration building. The Administration building committee had met with an architect who specialized in restoration and two engineers who specialize in seismic restoration. It was felt that substantial progress was being made on the new Administration building.

County Council
July 09, 2002

Third Floor Space. One issue of concern was to finish some unused space on the third floor, which was about 5,000 sq. ft. Cost estimates would be forthcoming.

Court House. Brick options previously presented: 1) Leave the building painted to look as it does right now. 2) Strip the paint and the outer-layer of the brick and refinish it with a historic-looking brick. 3) Strip paint and leave the original surface.

There was concern that a lot of money might be spent; and then although a historic restoration had taken place it would be an eyesore for people to comment about. It was learned that the building may never have been the 3 different colors of brick. What may have happened was they couldn't get brick all the same color so the brick was a different color but the building was always stained. They could stain the middle part of the building; so, the restoration of the building would be a single color. The compromise of re-staining the building now was agreeable to the funding foundations and the funding would not be jeopardized at this point. The committee unanimously recommended that the paint be stripped and stain the brick:

Cost Analysis:	Stripping:	\$ 30,000.00
	Re-bricking:	180,000.00
	Re-staining	20,000.00 to 30,000.00 (1/4 of the cost of re-bricking)

Seismic upgrade: In the past the option was to strip the interior and put granite all over the brick in the interior and bond it together. That approach loses some space. The technique recommended by architects today was to go to the top of the building and cover portions of the roof around the exterior. Drill down through the core of the building through the brick into the foundation about 4-inch cores about 5 to 10 ft. Then drop steel rods down through the building and put an epoxy that bonds it to the brick. Then on the interior of the building you go to each of the floor levels and bind some type of cross structure to those rods. This is a less-expensive technique and requires less work on the interior. By using this option the interior of the building would be preserved to a greater extent.

DISCUSSION: REVIEW OF RESOLUTION NO. 2002-13 - USING 1/64 SALES TAX WHICH WAS USED FOR OLYMPIC VENUES TO RETIRE A PORTION OF THE BOND USED TO CONSTRUCT THE BRIDGERLAND COMMUNITY ICE ARENA.

Vice Chairman Beck reported that he had discussed this issue with one of the members of the Logan City Council. That individual and one of his colleagues believe that this money should go towards the debt retirement with the ice arena. He is working with the Logan City Finance Director to find out where the money actually went. He felt that time ought to be allowed for them to explore that and to see if they (the Logan City Council) are going to do anything with it before any further action was taken.

The largest percentage of the money coming back went to two cities, Logan and North Logan. Executive Lemon commented that if Logan would sign on the other Cities would probably follow along. Council member Robison felt that this should be a joint effort.

This item was carried over to the Council's second meeting in September.

County Council
July 09, 2002

NORTH LOGAN CITY 24TH OF JULY PARADE:

The North Logan City Pioneer Parade will to be held July 24th, 2002. It will begin at 10:00 a.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Council member Yeates moved to go into an Executive Session for discussion of land acquisition. Motion accepted.

The Council moved to an Executive Session at 6:55 p.m.

The Council adjourned from Executive session at 7:40 p.m.

COUNTY JAIL UPDATE:

The County is negotiating to purchase approximately 26.5 acres of land along 1200 West between 200 North and 400 North in Logan. This would be the proposed site for the new public safety facility if negotiations are successful.

COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS:

Council member Gibbons reported that a Scout Troop had inquired of him regarding presenting the Colors during Council meeting. All Council members felt this would be a welcome addition to County Council meetings. Attorney Wyatt will coordinate with the Scout office for Troops to be invited to attend.

Council member Beck asked Council members to consider a date for the Council Summer social. August 13, 2002 was chosen as the date for the Social to be held at Mack Park in Smithfield.

ADJOURNMENT:

Council meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

ATTEST: Jill N. Zollinger
County Clerk

APPROVAL: Layne M. Beck
Council Vice Chairman