

AGENDA ITEM # VIII-C.

AOG: Five County Association of Governments

PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD (PCIFB) APPLICATION

REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

Applicant: Henrieville Town

Project Title: Road maintenance equipment and Firehouse security system

Date Received: October 1, 2015

Date AOG Steering Committee Reviewed: October 14, 2015

Project Description:

Henrieville Town is in need of a new tractor, with tiller, mower, and backhoe implements.
The town also desires to install a security system for their firehouse and other public facilities.
PROPOSED FUNDING: Applicant In-kind (trade-in value) \$10,000 CIB Grant: \$85,000 **Total project cost:** \$95,000.

Is the project on the County Capital improvements List? Yes No

Is the project consistent with local and regional plans? Local: Yes No

Regional: Yes No

Is the project a planning project? Yes No

How will the project benefit the applicant community?

Henrieville uses their tractor to mow the sides of the roads, till gardens, backhoe work, snow removal, etc. Their current tractor and equipment is old and inadequate and needs to be replaced. Having security on their facilities is crucial to keeping what they have safe and sound, keeping track of who (and when) enters their buildings.

What are challenges the project faces/creates?

Henrieville states they have no money to purchase or replace these items for our community. Henrieville has a very low income from taxes. They do not have any other options to ensure safety and security for their townspeople or to provide them the services they greatly appreciate and need.

AOG Recommendation:

The Five County Association of Governments Steering Committee reviewed this project on the date indicated above and voted to:
____support this project. ____remain neutral on this project. ____not support this project.

Type Name: Bryan Thiriot

Signature: _____, Executive Director

AGENDA ITEM # VIII-C. (Continued)

AOG: Five County Association of Governments

PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD (PCIFB) APPLICATION

REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

Applicant: Enoch City

Project Title: Enoch City Storm Drainage Plan

Date Received: October 1, 2015

Date AOG Steering Committee Reviewed: October 14, 2015

Project Description:

This planning project will complete a Storm Drainage Master Plan for the whole of Enoch City and including the land within Enoch City Annexation Declaration Boundary.

PROPOSED FUNDING: Applicant Cash: \$10,000; CIB Grant: \$10,000 **Total project cost:** \$20,000.

Is the project on the County Capital improvements List? Yes No

Is the project consistent with local and regional plans? Local: Yes No

Regional: Yes No

Is the project a planning project? Yes No

How will the project benefit the applicant community?

The Planning Commission and City Council are working to address policy changes that will be conducive to good storm drain management for all future development. In conjunction, a detailed Storm Drainage Master Plan is needed to give direction to current and future development within the build-out area of approximately 5,945 acres.

What are challenges the project faces/creates?

Enoch City has recently established a Storm Drainage Enterprise Fund to collect revenues to create plans and implement these plans. The needs are many and the financial costs are high. The Enoch City Council has chosen to build facilities with an immediate minimal financial impact on current residents and without long-term debt. The costs of the proposed plan can be carried by the Enterprise Fund, leaving less for the needed projects this plan would describe. The help from the CIB Board by providing Enoch City with a 50% matching grant will safeguard some funding for physical solutions.

AOG Recommendation:

The Five County Association of Governments Steering Committee reviewed this project on the date indicated above and voted to:

___ support this project. ___ remain neutral on this project. ___ not support this project.

Type Name: Bryan Thiriot

Signature: _____, Executive Director

AGENDA ITEM # VIII-C. (Continued)

AOG: Five County Association of Governments

PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD (PCIFB) APPLICATION

REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

Applicant: Kane County (Municipal Building Authority)

Project Title: Civic Center

Date Received: October 1, 2015

Date AOG Steering Committee Reviewed: October 14, 2015

Project Description:

Kane County is seeking grant and loan funding from the CIB for the remodel and new construction of buildings located in downtown Kanab for use as a Civic Center. The Civic Center would be located at about 13 North and 100 East. The site was previously used as a public school and a public library.

PROPOSED FUNDING: Applicant Cash: \$1,250,000; Applicant In-Kind: \$2,500,000 (School District land value); CIB Loan: \$1,500,000 for 30yrs@2.0%; CIB Grant: \$5,250,000 **Total project cost: \$10,500,000.**

Is the project on the County Capital improvements List? Yes No

Is the project consistent with local and regional plans? Local: Yes No

Regional: Yes No

Is the project a planning project? Yes No

How will the project benefit the applicant community?

The new Civic Center will include the following on the "campus": a Conference Center; an Events Center; a Gymnasium; a future museum; Kanab City offices; Kanab Senior Citizens Center; Art/Tech Center; Outdoor Amphitheater; Festival Field and Terrace. All of these important functions will be in walking distance of one another and provide needed services and functions for Kane County in Kanab.

What are challenges the project faces/creates?

Without this assistance the vision of Kane County, Kanab City and the others involved in this project will not be realized. They have indicated in their application that it is not feasible without significant grant money and subsidized loans.

AOG Recommendation:

The Five County Association of Governments Steering Committee reviewed this project on the date indicated above and voted to:

___ support this project. ___ remain neutral on this project. ___ not support this project.

Type Name: Bryan Thiriot

Signature: _____, Executive Director

AGENDA ITEM # VIII-C. (Continued)

AOG: Five County Association of Governments

PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD (PCIFB) APPLICATION

REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

Applicant: Hurricane Valley Fire Special Services District

Project Title: Quint Pumper/Ladder Fire Truck

Date Received: October 1, 2015

Date AOG Steering Committee Reviewed: October 14, 2015

Project Description:

The District is seeking a loan to purchase a new quint fire apparatus. A quint is a ladder truck with standard fire engine pump capacity. The quint would replace an existing 1988 engine serving the LaVerkin area, which has been determined to be insufficient to serve that area.

PROPOSED FUNDING: CIB Loan: \$995,000 for 20yrs@2.5%; **Total project cost:** \$995,000.

Is the project on the County Capital improvements List? Yes No

Is the project consistent with local and regional plans? Local: Yes No

Regional: Yes No

Is the project a planning project? Yes No

How will the project benefit the applicant community?

The existing 1988 engine serving LaVerkin is inadequate and does not comply with NFPA as it is an open cab and the manufacture of that truck no longer makes fire trucks, thus parts are hard to obtain. The LaVerkin fire station is being enlarged through a CDBG grant to accommodate this new ladder truck.

What are challenges the project faces/creates?

The District will be going through a "Truth in Taxation" process and will be raising its levy to the maximum it is allowed to do. Without this CIB assistance they will not be able to meet the needs in their District; which are ever increasing.

AOG Recommendation:

The Five County Association of Governments Steering Committee reviewed this project on the date indicated above and voted to:

____ support this project. ____ remain neutral on this project. ____ not support this project.

Type Name: Bryan Thiriot

Signature: _____, Executive Director

AGENDA ITEM # VIII-C. (Continued)

AOG: Five County Association of Governments

PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD (PCIFB) APPLICATION

REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

Applicant: Santa Clara City

Project Title: Old Hwy 91 Swiss Village, Santa Clara to 200 E. Widening and Improvements

Date Received: October 1, 2015

Date AOG Steering Committee Reviewed: October 14, 2015

Project Description:

Santa Clara proposes to reconstruct and widen Old Hwy 91 to improve drivability, extend pavement life and increase safety for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists. The reconstruction will begin near the intersection of 200 East and Old Hwy 91 and end to the east near the Swiss Village townhomes. This will complete improvements at the west end of Santa Clara Drive similar to that which Santa Clara completed several years ago from the east end of the historic district to the west.

PROPOSED FUNDING: Applicant Cash: \$215,000; Federal Grant (TAP): \$175,000 ; Federal Highways Grant \$3,251,531; CIB Loan: \$243,000 for 10yrs@2.5%; CIB Grant: \$242,000 **Total project cost: \$4,126,531.**

Is the project on the County Capital improvements List? Yes No

Is the project consistent with local and regional plans? Local: Yes No

Regional: Yes No

Is the project a planning project? Yes No

How will the project benefit the applicant community?

This route is popular for walkers and bicyclists. The road is over 50 years old and has many coats of chip seal. The large cracks are very dangerous for bicyclists. There is no shoulder provided for the cyclists nor are there sidewalks for pedestrians putting them in danger. This will bring this remaining section of roadway in Santa Clara up to current highway standards and make for a safer route for all modes of transportation.

What are challenges the project faces/creates?

Santa Clara is for the most part a bedroom community. Without this assistance the City will not be able to fund this project. The City believes that this is the best time to accomplish this project in order to keep the costs down that are ever increasing with time.

AOG Recommendation:

The Five County Association of Governments Steering Committee reviewed this project on the date indicated above and voted to:

___ support this project. ___ remain neutral on this project. ___ not support this project.

Type Name: Bryan Thiriot

Signature: _____, Executive Director