

**CACHE COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING**  
**October 22, 2002**

The Cache County Council convened in a regular session on 22 October 2002 in the Cache County Council Chamber at 120 North 100 West, Logan, Utah.

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**The following individuals were also in attendance:** Colleen Anhder, Jay Aguilar, Newel Daines, Lorene Greenhalgh, David Nielsen, Evelyn Palmer, Pat Parker, Auditor Tamra Stones, Jim Smith, Mark Teuscher, Mayor Doug Thompson, Pastor Mike Trail, Attorney Scott Waytt, Jennie Christensen (KVNU) and Joe Rowley (Herald Journal)

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairman Anhder called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. Executive Lynn Lemon was excused and Pat Parker was welcomed to be his representative at the meeting.

**INVOCATION:**

The invocation was given by Pastor Mike Trail, Assembly of God Church

**REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

There were no additions or changes to the agenda.

**REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The minutes of County Council meeting for October 8, 2002 were reviewed, corrected and approved. Council member Robison gave her corrections to the Clerk.

**Council member Petersen moved to approve the minutes of October 8, 2002 as corrected. Yeates seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 7-0.**

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

**Appointments:** There were no appointments recommended.

**Warrants:** The Warrants for the period of 09-20-2002 to 09-26-2002 and 09-27-2002 to 10-03-2002 were given to the Clerk for filing.

**Other Items:** No other items were discussed.

County Council  
October 22, 2002

**INTRA-DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET TRANSFER REQUESTS:**

The following budgetary transfers were presented to the Council: **1) Election** - \$3500.00 to transfer funds to pay for temporary help for the election. **2) Data Processing** - \$7,500.00 to update monitors for several departments.

**(See Attachment No. 1)**

**Council member Yeates moved to approve the budget transfers. Vice Chairman Beck seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 7-0,**

**THE COUNCIL MOVED INTO THE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION**

**TAX ABATEMENT REQUEST:**

In the last Council meeting, Mr. Jim Malouf addressed the Council and requested a tax abatement on his property that had not been able to be developed because of issues with North Logan City. In that meeting, Council member Gibbons requested to see the actual tax amounts. Executive Lemon had prepared a list of parcels and their taxable values along with the amount of taxes paid.

**(See Attachment No. 2)**

**Discussion:**

**Darrel Gibbons** questioned under who's name the lots were being consider during the time of the assessment. In talking with Kathleen Howell, it was determined that in 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000 it was Matt Nielson who had received the tax notice.

**Cory Yeates** interjected that also on the tax notice was the name of the Canyon Ridge Estates. It was determined that response to the tax notice could have been given at the time. He further explained that this was a three-phase subdivision where phases 1 and 2 were completely built and sold. From the beginning it was known that phase-3 needed to have a water tank. The code was read as follows:

**Code 3.60.040-D: "Applications for deferral or settlement shall be accepted and considered only as to non-commercial residential real property and shall be limited to the actual residential improvements occupied by the applicant as a dwelling unit together with not more than one acre of the real property upon which the residential dwelling unit is located.**

The interpretation of that code by Council member Yeates was that Mr. Malouf had taken a business venture on phases 1, 2, and 3. The 3<sup>rd</sup> phase had not "panned out" and he does not reside on any one of those properties. Some of those parcels which can not be built upon right now were sold, according to Kathleen Howell, for barely under \$100,000.00 each. Council member Yeates also explained that the way to abate taxes is on valuation. Therefore, there is still value there; all he has to do is build a tank.

**Darrel Gibbons** commented that North Logan wants Mr. Malouf to get the tank in and has approved the tank. Mr. Malouf wanted to build a tank twice the size North Logan City had given permission to be put in.

**Yeates** referred to the list of parcels in question and pointed out that Kathleen Howell had shown him that an awful lot of properties there showed taxable value of \$51,000.00. These people are not coming in and asking that the value be lowered because they know what they paid for the lots and they are getting a bargain on it. They don't want a lot to

County Council  
October 22, 2002

be assessed at \$50,000.00 fee because there is no water on it. Councilman Yeates said: "If we abate his taxes, we are going to have other developers come in and say: 'We can't do this.' 'We can't do that.' It (the Tax Assessment) complies with the ordinance.

**Craig Petersen:** I think we are probably satisfied with these lots being fairly valued right now. The question is whether or not the fact that there was a delay in terms of doing the right valuation in the past, such as a justification for a tax abatement. We have responded when we have been requested to do a case evaluations. I don't know that we have any future obligation to go back and rectify past mistakes.

**Yeates:** Along with that, three or four years ago when the development was going in and those lots were being sold, there was no problem. It wasn't until we got into the third phase and everything dried up.

**Gibbons:** It has only been the past two years.

**Council member Yeates moved to deny the tax abatement requests for Mr. Malouf. Petersen second the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0.**

## **THE COUNCIL MOVED OUT OF THE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION**

### **CACHE COUNTY JAIL UPDATE:**

Chairman Anhder noted that the new Jail facility groundbreaking were well attended.

### **HISTORIC COURTHOUSE BUILDING UPDATE: NEWEL DAINES**

Newel Daines, addressed the Council. He presented copies of the development drawings and stated that the schematic drawings of the restoration of the Courthouse were finished. Now was the time for contacting foundations and individuals for financial donations to the project. He presented the Council with an application format for these donation requests.

#### **(See Attachment No. 3)**

The projected timetable plan included: Complete for bid by February 28, 2003; bid closing as of March 31, 2003; the contract to be awarded by April 30,2003; construction to begin May 31, 2003 and completion date July 1, 2004.

Volunteers, paid staff, key staff positions and salaries were to be noted on the application. Also presented on the request format would be a list of each committed donor and amount pledged and a list of each potential donor both public and private.

Thus far Cache County has allocated \$1,000,000.00 on deposit for this project and \$5,000.00 has been received from the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Mr. Daines suggested that the Council in some way recognize the names of prominent citizens of Cache County inside the restored courthouse possibly naming corridors, etc. The names of David Eccles and Charles W. Nibley and their accomplishments and outstanding business ventures in Cache County were brought up. It was noted that there were no legal problems with attaching a person's name to a public building.

County Council  
October 22, 2002

**Council member Gibbons moved to accept the application form presented by Newel Daines. Robison seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 7-0.**

Vice Chairman Beck suggested that a letter be sent to Ellen Eccles Foundation stating such issues as had been presented. The County Executive and the County Council Chairman would sign this letter. Council member Gibbons felt that part of that letter should reflect the willingness and desire of the Council to recognize David Eccles as a prominent individual in the County for his economic and cultural development endeavors.

**ORDINANCE NO. 2002-09: NATURAL BARRIER DETERMINATION DEFINITION**

Mark Teuscher explained that basically in the subdivision land-use ordinance, there are parcels divided by natural barriers such as roads and large bodies of water. What this section does is actually add to the ordinance, where it refers to a natural barrier, a basic definition of what a "natural barrier" really is. This definition has only encouraged such things as: State, Federal and County roads; waterways under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation and/or railroad right-of-ways that are active and in use. Private roads do not constitute a natural barrier.

The Benson Planning Commission wanted to add a proposal to include large canals. They also suggested twenty feet was for the canal easement, which meant that the canal could be a 4ft.-wide ditch because an easement usually associated with a canal is 16ft. Because canals can be piped and moved at the whim of the canal company, Mr. Teuscher encouraged the Council not to include canals as a natural barrier. He did feel that possibly the Council might want to identify those specific canals of longstanding as natural barriers.

Council member Gibbons felt there were several canal companies that had major canals used to deliver irrigation water for 70, 80 or 100 years which should be considered as natural barriers. Canal companies generally have a delivery system, which is a major canal and an easement.

Mr. Teuscher suggested approving this ordinance and direct the Zoning staff to come back with an addition to the sub-division ordinance and this definition to include major canals with different ways of identifying them.

**Council member Petersen moved to continue Ordinance No. 2002-09 pending the inclusion of language which considers major canals as natural barriers. Yeates seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0.**

Chairman Anhder suggested the language to include *width* (not only the canal bed but also the easements) and the *roadway or access path* to the side of the canal making total width somewhere in the excess of 30ft.

**PROPOSED ROAD ALIGNMENT - 1<sup>ST</sup> EAST IN LOGAN**

County Council  
October 22, 2002

**Discussion:**

**Cory Yeates:** Jay (Aguilar), it seems to me that the CMPO are grasping at straws.... Second East got shot down by Logan City; 4<sup>th</sup> East has never been even considered by River Heights. It just seems that we are trying to grasp at straws here and 1<sup>st</sup> East is not the answer. It will do nothing to alleviate the congestion on Main Street. Right now the traffic does come through the "Y." It's pretty heavy. A lot of people turn up 3<sup>rd</sup> South and come up past 1<sup>st</sup> East. Those people are not going to get off that highway and come up through Providence and weave around a bunch of houses to try to get on 1<sup>st</sup> East. They are going to stay going the exact direction that they are going.

**Layne Beck:** What about people, Cory, who live in Providence and River Heights who want to get up to the University?

**Yeates:** River Heights has some accesses involved and you can go through a bunch of residential areas where they have condominiums and things.

**Larry Anhder:** As soon as I get across the Logan River Bridge, I get off of Main Street. Most of the time I turn to 1st West but if this came through, the Providence people would use 1<sup>st</sup> East.

**Yeates:** My recommendation is to have a road that goes all the way through town.

**Beck:** It goes all the way to 800 North.

**Council member Gibbons moved to approve the proposed alignment on 1st East in Logan. Petersen seconded the motion. The vote was 6-1. (Yeates voted "no.")**

**FINAL PLAT APPROVAL: WILSON-ALLEN MINOR SUBDIVISION**

Lorene Greenhalgh, Zoning Administrator, presented a memorandum of the Wilson-Allen Minor Subdivision Approval Request.

**(See Attachment No. 4)**

This request was for approval of a 4-lot minor subdivision on 67.67 acres of property in the Agricultural Zone to be called the Wilson-Allen Minor Subdivision with one agricultural lot restricted for residential development on 26.31 acres located at 1680 East High Creek Road, one lot with a commercial gravel pit on 10.36 acres located at 1640 East high Creek Road, (each with access on a private road at 1562 East High Creek Road), one existing single family dwelling on 15.99 acres located at 1930 East High Creek Road and with one residential lot for the future construction of a single family dwelling on 15.01 acres located at 1820 East High Creek Road, Cove.

The Planning Commission reviewed this request on 7 October 2002 and has recommended approval with the requirement that the applicants understanding that if the lot with the gravel pit and/or the agricultural lot are to be changed to include a residential use, that a 50-foot wide right-of way for access will be required and that these two lots will be required to have an approved culinary water right prior to the release of a zoning clearance for a building permit.

**Council member Gibbons moved to waive the rules and approve the final plat for the Wilson-Allen Minor Subdivision. Petersen seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 7-0.**

**HARDSHIP REQUESTS: AUDITOR TAMRA STONES**

County Council  
October 22, 2002

There were four hardship requests for tax abatement: **1) Leslie A & Michael L. Kunz** (Previous - land only) for \$88.00 because of unemployment due to medical reasons. **2) Ruth H. Wilson** (Resubmitted - A medical statement was now included.) for \$400.01 because of a medical condition for which a costly surgical proceed was needed. **3) Philip D. & Janice E. Covington** (Previous) for \$102.87 because of extensive medical problems and unemployment since February of this year. (Taxes unpaid and owed for 2001 were in the amount of \$106.43 plus penalties and interest were planned to be paid by December.) **4) Mike Hallmark & Linda E. Sindt** ( New - land only) for \$175.00 and interest excused that had accrued since April 1, 2002. because of severe medical problems and unemployment.

**(See Attachments No. 5)**

**Council member Yeates moved to approve all above applicants for hardship requests. Hansen seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 6-0. (Beck absent.)**

**PUBLIC HEARING: NATURAL BARRIER DETERMINATION DEFINITION**

Chairman Anhder opened the public hearing and asked for public comment. There were no public comments rendered.

**Council member Yeates moved to close the public hearing. Robison seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 7-0.**

**RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN COMPREHENSIVE PLAN - RE: RR ZONE DISCUSSION:**

Mark Teuscher explained that the Comprehensive Plan needed a section added that would allow the Comprehensive Plan to consider other zones than just the FR-40 Zone. These changes simply added to the current implementation policy and did not take anything away from the plan. These changes had been discussed in Council previously.

**RESOLUTION 2002-31: RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN COMPREHENSIVE PLAN - RE: RR-ZONE**

**(See Attachment No. 6)**

**Council member Petersen moved to suspend the rules and to adopt Resolution 2002-31. Gibbons seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 7-0.**

**POLICY ON CHANGING PRIVATE ROADS TO PUBLIC ROADS DISCUSSION:**

Executive Lemon submitted a letter to the Council concerning the County's policy on changing

County Council  
October 22, 2002

Private Roads to Public Roads.

**(See Attachment No. 7)**

**Council member Gibbons moved that it is the County's policy that we will not accept these private roads as county roads. That where we have allowed development on a private road and the understanding was given and agreed upon that the private road was to be maintained by the property owner, we will expect them to honor that agreement. Hansen seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 7-0.**

**PUBLIC HEARING: OPEN 2002 BUDGET - TAMRA STONES**

Auditor Stones outlined the proposed adjustments to the budget.

Adjustments to be considered:

GENERAL FUND	\$ 91,432.00
MUNICIPAL SERVES FUND	117,030.00
TRAVEL COUNCIL	6,528.00
SENIOR CITIZEN'S FUND	300.00
CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND	281,530.00

Chairman Anhder opened the meeting to public comment. No public comments were rendered.

**Vice Chairman Beck moved to close the public hearing. Yeates seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 7-0.**

**RESOLUTION 2002-30: A RESOLUTION INCREASING THE BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN COUNTY DEPARTMENTS**

**(See Attachment No. 8)**

**Council member Petersen moved to waive the rules and approve increasing the budget appropriations. Gibbons seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 7-0.**

**SET FEE FOR MASTER PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT DISCUSSION:**

**Discussion:**

**Council member Petersen** did not feel there should be an additional charge if the item for an additional meeting was carried over to the next Planning and Zoning meeting.

**Lorene Greenhalgh** stated: "There is a mailing for each meeting in which the item is discussed." **Corey Yeates** also felt it was unfair to charge again if the Planning Commission is already there.

**Larry Anhder** thought there was a way to have a projected cost before the final plat; and if there were additional costs, the County could re-bill. The great leverage is that before anything is signed he (the petitioner) will pay the fee.

**Petersen** felt it was proper to charge for clearly identified costs associated with the project.

County Council  
October 22, 2002

**Anhder** felt overhead costs should also be included in the fee.

**Layne Beck** cautioned that policy set forth for any one development of this nature doesn't go for just that one project. It would apply to other developments of the same nature. He felt the fee ought to be more generic.

**Mark Teuscher** suggested that master planning meetings and amended master development agreements probably ought to have a separate fee.

**Attorney Scott Wyatt** explained that in order for the fee not to be struck as a unconstitutional path, they (the petitioners) have got to only pay for their costs.

**Anhder** wanted to tell anticipated costs, actual costs, and costs for addition things for final approval that needed to be met before the final agreement is signed.

**Wyatt** also said that the fee for overhead could be included.

**Chairman Anhder complimented the Planning and Zoning Department for the direction they were going in. He requested a resolution for this item to be brought before the Council.**

### **REVENUES FOR 2003 BUDGET DISCUSSION:**

The Council received a letter from Executive Lemon concerning recommendations for the 2003 Budget discussion. Executive Lemon wanted input from the Council on salary recommendations. He recognized the fact that the County will be facing extraordinary costs. He did feel, however, that a very good decision had been made by the Council in the last meeting, that of hiring more personnel for the Jail.

Chairman Anhder related through **Executive Lemon's letter:** **1)** Interest Earnings were going down; **2)** Indigent Defense Fund assessment was up; **3)** UACI premiums were up; **4)** Willow park Budget was up; **5)** The major item was that the bond payment needed to be made on the County Administration Building and the Public Safety Complex including the Jail

### **Discussion:**

**Vice Chairman Beck** noted that Lynn's figures were less than Auditor Stones figures that had been presented earlier. **Auditor Stones:** I haven't spent a lot of time with Lynn discussing this but I finally pulled some numbers together and they are really rough. Revenue comes in somewhere close to about \$13,000,000.00. This does not reflect Lynn's projections because I have not had a chance to discuss with Lynn his projections on a lot of these. A lot of these are only my estimates.

I got what I could from some of the departments but they were really rough. We haven't been able to get agency projection claims and Department of Correction numbers and House Bill 162 and Condition of Probation Numbers. I know my rental number is way high. I used somewhere close to his interest earnings figure. I used \$225,000.00 As you notice in the current budget amendment that we did, I cut it from \$450,000.00 to \$225,000.00.

I anticipated a \$3,000,000.00 tax increase and I'm still short based on the current requests submitted. That's without anybody going through and suggesting these were wrong or these were too high. We had a short discussion about the Fire Board expenditures. This includes a request to the lease/purchase of new police fleet vehicles.

We included about \$142,000.00 for additional equipment necessary to do the phone transfer for the administration building. This also includes what we will need for the new historic courthouse and for the jail exclusive of the installation when we move stuff. We have estimated this might run about \$30,000.00 but that is only a wild estimate.

I did prepare a brief list of the new employee request and I did include the five new deputies. We were supposed to



County Council  
October 22, 2002

get five deputies if we got the third floor of the new jail. The request was to start them at midyear next year.

**Chairman Anhder:** How much do we currently get for property taxes?

**Stones:** This year the budget was for \$3.6 million dollars just for the general fund levy.

**Anhder:** Do you remember on what rate? Preliminarily we are looking at a property tax increase of maybe 1/3?

**Stones:** Yes, at least. Here it is, .001254 was what we got for this year. The assessed value this year was \$100,000,000.00 increase over 2001.

**Anhder:** One-hundred million in a year!

**Stones:** We had all that construction out there and these may only be partial value increases for like Lowe's and all those big stores we got. We have to add on the Sam's Club. Our value was something over 2.8 Billion dollars.

**Petersen:** I think it is important that as we are talking about preliminary situations, we realize that they are preliminary. When we talk about need to generate more property taxes, a good share of those could be generated by that huge increase in evaluation.

**Stones:** Yes. New growth will typically bring you a lot of that funding that we need. Our big problem here is we really aren't going to know where we are going to be until next August of 2003. We have to estimate on the high-side now because we are an Entity who must have two tax increase hearings. One this year based on no kind of numbers at all and then again in July or August next year. When we know closer what the numbers will be, we can fine tune it and probably realistically bring it back down where it needs to be.

**Petersen:** Right. I want to get back to my major point. When Larry was talking about maybe one-third increase in property tax, that doesn't mean the people's property tax will go up by one-third. That means we need to generate one-third more. A significant portion was to come from additional evaluation.

**Stones:** Correct. I have my calculations which I brought. This was the original notice that Lynn gave me in March; we based our number of this year's tax increase on meeting an annual debt service payment of \$1,078,000.00. It certainly got fine-tuned after this but the increase was about the same. Based on those numbers, we were talking about an increase of \$31.85 but the value went up \$100,000,000.00. We are talking about the County value overall. We were at 2.7 Billion dollars in total taxable value in 2001. In 2002 we are at 2.8 Billion. That is about \$100,000,000.00 increase. When you compute the need based on that value and the current value, the increased amount was something close to .000385. Currently it is .000377 or something like that. It is equalizing and dropping. When it gets to 2003 in August, we will have a better feel for where it is going to be.

**Vice Chairman Beck:** There is one issue that I think we need to consider in our budget discussions this year and that is what we are going to do with our public TV translator. In 2004 our lease expires regardless of what happens with the lawsuit up there in Mt. Pisgah. If we do nothing and let those channels go dark, the Federal Communications Commission will sell that spectrum to some other entity.

**Kathy Robison:** That Dan Jones public survey said that most people were not interested in having that television translator service.

**Anhder:** We've always known that most don't but some do.

**Petersen:** We still don't have any idea how many people we are serving.

**Beck:** I agree with the guy that owned the Valley channel. In a sense the way we framed the debate in the past, we have said: "Is technology going to change?" "Are so many people using it?" That is not the issues as much as "Free Speech" is. If everyone is subject to a subscription service for getting information, then you are subject to their whims - the way they are going to raise the price. I'm convinced that it is in the County's best interest to invest whatever it takes to develop that site.

**Anhder:** Plus we may have a monetary asset that is worth protecting.

**John Hansen:** I agree.

**Petersen:** The question is what we do with the asset. You know, you can operate the system out there but if nobody watches them, we could sell off the channels or lease them. It really is an asset but that doesn't equate the fact that we ought to continue to provide public transmission to a very small amount of interested people who are using it. We need to know something about what is the highest and best use of that asset. It may or may not be to provide public transmission to a small amount of people.

**Anhder:** You're right but I do tend to agree with Layne. Even if there are very few, we ought to maintain that as an alternative.

**Beck:** Our translators have all been upgraded to be able to accept digital signals. This happened through a situation that the Governor got into with the Olympics. State-wide they were upgraded so that we can in fact receive digital signals and rebroadcast digital signals with these translators. That's where television is going. Now you can analog spectrum and that will narrow the spectrum sending additional signals such that we could sell off the rest of it to cellular

County Council  
October 22, 2002

phone companies or whatever. To loose that by letting the channels go dark, doesn't make any sense to me.

**Petersen:** That shouldn't be an option. We shouldn't lose it. We should decide how we can best capitalize on our asset.

**Beck:** We need to keep broadcasting on that spectrum.

**Petersen:** Let someone else broadcast on them and keep the revenue. That's what I was saying. We need to think about what's the best use of that asset. Nobody wants us to lose them.

**Beck:** Here is the other thing we have got to consider though. In 2004 our lease expires up there. If we don't have an alternative site before then, we're dark unless we want to pay Mr. Beus thousands of dollars every month to continue broadcasting from the site that we are currently broadcasting from.

**John Hanson:** So you are saying to make sure we don't lose the asset, we better make sure we have some property to move to.

**Beck:** And have FCC approval at the new site.

**Petersen:** I don't disagree with that but lets make sure we are using it the best way we can.

**Anhder:** What do you suggest?

**Petersen:** I would still like to know what the current usages is.

**Beck:** We need to consider in this budget what we are going to do with the public transmitter. We can't just keep doing nothing. If we do nothing, those channels will go dark unless we are willing to spend thousands of dollars every month to Mr. Beus in 2004.

**Anhder:** Has he indicated how much he is going to charge us for a lease on that?

**Yeates:** He wants \$1,500.00 per month per channel. He says that's the going rate. Another thing, we also have the additional Cellular One antenna up there for which he wants \$1,500.00 a month for as well.

**Gibbons:** It would not be inappropriate to give the direction to the Executive that he consider in this budget dollars that will secure a site.

**Beck:** We already have the site; the question is developing a road and getting electricity to the site and building a small building.

**Gibbons:** I think there are a few things that we can do. I agree with Craig.

**Petersen:** If we put forth the effort; we have an asset out there that people will want to buy, we might get potential leasers to cooperate with us on improving the site.

**Anhder:** Then we don't have the channels to keep it for us.

**Petersen:** No, I am not suggesting that we have to sell all we have. If as Layne says, the band that we have is becoming more and more valuable and we need less of it, we could sell off or lease a portion to capture value.

**Anhder:** So it is the sense of the Council that we convey to the Executive that we need some money for this.

**Stones:** How much?

**Beck:** Tell Lynn that we need to work towards developing the site out at Clarkston and whatever is necessary to get that done.

**Gibbons:** We have pretty well go on record as a Council that we would approve a tax increase large enough to make a bond payment with respect to the capital projects that we have going. We have pretty much made that commitment. In talking with Lynn, I felt it would be easier for him to make a budget proposal for this Council if he had some idea whether they would limit any increase to just the bond payment or whether we would consider a larger increase to cover some other costs.

**Beck:** The increases that we have talked about all along, Darrel, that I think we need to have the Executive consider is the additional operation costs that we are going to have out of the Jail because we are going to have additional staff out there.

**Anhder:** Some won't be until next year's budget.

**Beck:** Next year we are not going have prisoners in our jail we are still going to be housing them outside of the County.

**Anhder:** We are hiring some of the extra people.

**Gibbons:** We know we are going to have the five additional (staff) approved in the last meeting for sure. I'm hesitant to approve salary increases for the County employees.

**Beck:** The State of Utah had zero percent increase.

**Gibbons:** I think it is going to be a tough economic situation for families all the way across the County. I think we need to be conservative and stingy with the tax increase.

**Anhder:** Our best asset we want to maintain is our employees because these building are nothing without employees that feel like they are appreciated. I don't know what that means as far as a salary increase but I think I would at least encourage the Council to keep somewhat of an open mind on that. Let's not close the door completely....

County Council  
October 22, 2002

**The Council will anxiously await the Executive's budget proposal for 2003.**

**UTAH ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES ANNUAL CONVENTION:**

The Utah Association of Counties Annual Convention will be held on November 13-15, 2002 in St. George, Utah

**COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS:**

**Kathy Robison:** I met with the BRAG Human Services Board last Wednesday and we discussed the Food Banks budget. They decided to increase Logan's portion to be more in line with the population; so, we did vote to do that. Also, beginning in the Spring of 2003, each organization currently being helped financially through Social Services block grants will have to prepare a statement telling us what they did with the money. Also how they spent the prior year's money since they have to make some kind of a statement first so that we know where they are spending the money they are getting. Then they will be re-evaluated for the following year. Those were the main two changes in their procedures.

**Layne Beck** brought the Council's attention to the memo that Executive Lemon submitted with regard to Jim Smith's employee recommendation regarding employee compensation for medical services.

Chairman Anhder gave his best wishes for those who were up for election this November.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Council meeting was adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

---

ATTEST: Jill N. Zollinger  
County Clerk

---

APPROVAL: C. Larry Anhder  
Council