

AOG: Five County Association of Governments

**PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD (PCIFB) APPLICATION
REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW**

Applicant: Cedar City

Project Title: Cedar City Recreation Center addition

Date Received: May 14, 2020

Date the AOG Steering Committee Reviewed: June 10, 2020

Project Description:

Cedar City is proposing to construct an addition to the current Cedar City Aquatic Center located in the City. The proposed addition to the Aquatic Center would include three gymnasiums, a child care facility, storage areas, seating for the gymnasiums, a track on an upper mezzanine, aerobic equipment and accommodations for various sports such as volleyball, pickleball, basketball and baseball. This will provide needed community space, where a number of public activities can be staged. It can be utilized for boutiques, conventions or banquets and will accommodate those kinds of events very well. This will help the City meet current needs to provide programming for summer activities. Currently the city does not have its own gymnasiums and rents facilities at Cedar Middle School, Canyon View Middle School and the Southern Utah Sports Academy in order to provide sports programs. He said the city cannot rent gyms from churches and is not able to use any high school gym.

PROPOSED FUNDING: CIB funding: \$6,200,000. Cedar City In-kind: \$280,000 (budgeted for architect/engineering). **Total Project Cost:** \$6,480,000.

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?

This will provide needed community space where a number of public activities can be staged.

What are challenges the project faces/creates?

There is some contention in the City that the City is competing with private gyms. Also concerns with the timing of the project with the current economic situation. Some residents were asking for this matter to be provided in a vote.

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.

The action of the Steering Committee on the above date is attested to by:

Type Name: Bryan D. Thiriot **Signature:** _____, Executive Director

AOG: Five County Association of Governments

PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD (PCIFB) APPLICATION
REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

Applicant: East Zion Special Service District

Project Title: Fire Station Acquisition, Retrofit and Access Improvement

Date Received: May 15, 2020

Date the AOG Steering Committee Reviewed: June 10, 2020

Project Description:

The East Zion Special Service District currently does not own a fire station and desperately need a building to house its equipment to keep it secure and out of the elements. They have secured an option to purchase a building within their fire district boundaries at the Zion Ponderosa Ranch. They would like to purchase that building and retrofit and upgrade it with the following items: 1) a front paved pad (Driveway), 2) a training room/office/and rest room, and 3) a paved drive into the building of about 450 feet.

The building they would like to purchase is an existing 48'x48' prefab metal building set on a cement foundation with propane heat and electricity to it. It is located between the Zion Ponderosa Ranch and East Zion Homeowners sub-division. It is currently built and ready for them to occupy. The cost of the building is \$141,000. The District feels that is a very reasonable cost for that area. The Zion Ponderosa Ranch has agreed to donate the lot which it is on with additional land for parking to the East Zion Special Service District (Fire). The East Zion Ridge Homeowners Association has agreed to donate a parcel of land 50'x400' for an entrance and exit to the building. The 2 parcels of land are worth approximately \$100,000 combined; and are currently being recorded in the special service district's name. This land would be included as a donation in like-kind. The funding that the district is seeking from the CIB would only be for the building purchase and improvements. Kane County provided a letter in support of this project.

PROPOSED FUNDING: CIB funding: \$232,000. Other Local In-Kind (land donation): \$100,000. **Total Project Cost:** \$332,000.

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 project will vastly improve year-round fire protection in the portion of Kane County and will be beneficial in regards to the health, safety and welfare of residents in the area.

What are challenges the project faces/creates?

None anticipated.

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.

The action of the Steering Committee on the above date is attested to by:

Type Name: Bryan D. Thiriot **Signature:** _____, Executive Director

AOG: Five County Association of Governments

**PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD (PCIFB) APPLICATION
REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW**

Applicant: Town of Hatch

Project Title: Hatch Town Drainage Study

Date Received: May 15, 2020

Date the AOG Steering Committee Reviewed: June 10, 2020

Project Description:

Hatch Town is in Garfield County in southern Utah along the Highway 89 corridor. The purpose of the drainage study is to mitigate potential flood risks & improve the quality of life in Hatch, Utah. Hatch has an estimated population of 150, and a land area of 0.46 sq. miles. The current government facilities in the town are the Hatch Town office and community center building, The town's fire station, and the Hatch Post Office.

The proposed project is to complete a drainage study by acquiring the professional services of Ensign Engineering. Their plan will help them mitigate and evaluate the potential flood risks associated with new and improved roads, impact of future growth, existing utility improvements, infrastructure, and land use throughout and the town of Hatch.

Hatch Town requires funding from CIB to complete the drainage study. The town is seeking a 50% match from CIB. The town has sought out other funding sources for additional projects but request assistance from the CIB to mitigate potential drainage concerns.

PROPOSED FUNDING: CIB funding: \$25,000. Town of Hatch Cash: \$25,000. **Total Project Cost: \$50,000.**

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 plan will help the town to mitigate and evaluate the potential flood risks associated with new and improved roads, impact of future growth, existing utility improvements, infrastructure, and land use throughout and the town of Hatch.

What are challenges the project faces/creates?

None anticipated

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.

The action of the Steering Committee on the above date is attested to by:

Type Name: Bryan D. Thiriot **Signature:** _____, Executive Director

AOG: Five County Association of Governments

**PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD (PCIFB) APPLICATION
REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW**

Applicant: Town of Hatch

Project Title: Hatch Town Road Improvement

Date Received: May 15, 2020

Date the AOG Steering Committee Reviewed: June 10, 2020

Project Description:

Hatch Town is in southern Utah along the Highway 89 corridor. It was founded in 1872 and currently has a population of 150. Hatch provides easy access to southern Utah's National Parks, and experiences high levels of traffic during tourist season. The project will improve the existing road surfaces in the town to provide a better experience for both residence and visitors.

The project will improve the existing condition of the town's road surfaces by applying a double chip seal to the roads. The double chip seal will also extend the lifespan of the towns existing roads. A total of 365,000 square feet will be covered with double chip seal across nine different streets through the Town of Hatch.

The town of Hatch requires funding from CIB to complete the project. The town can contribute \$50,000 in applicant cash, and Garfield County is able to contribute \$25,000 to this project. They are asking for the assistance of the Utah Permanent Community Impact Fund Board to fill this gap. The town of Hatch plans, with assistance from the CIB, to improve their town roads as much as possible during the summer of 2020.

PROPOSED FUNDING: CIB funding: \$90,000. Town of Hatch Road Fund Cash: \$10,000. Garfield County In-Kind: \$25,000.
Total Project Cost: \$125,000.

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 project will improve the existing road surfaces in the town to provide a better experience for both residence and visitors.

What are challenges the project faces/creates?

The project needs to be completed during the late summer of 2020.

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.

The action of the Steering Committee on the above date is attested to by:

Type Name: Bryan D. Thiriot **Signature:** _____, Executive Director

AOG: Five County Association of Governments

PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD (PCIFB) APPLICATION

REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

Applicant: Ivins City

Project Title: Ivins City New City Hall

Date Received: May 13, 2020

Date the AOG Steering Committee Reviewed: June 10, 2020

Project Description:

The Municipal Building Authority of Ivins City Utah is requesting a \$3.5 million bond carrying 2.5% interest over a 20-year period for the construction of a new City Hall. The City's rapid growth and expanding staff has filled their space to capacity. In addition, the growing Santa Clara Ivins police force needs a new space as well for the same reason. The City has determined that a new City Hall is needed, and the existing City Hall will be remodeled to house the Police Department. This application is for financing the new City Hall construction.

The existing City Hall has served the community well for many years and gone through many changes to accommodate the increasing staff levels. The Council Chambers has been divided to create a conference room, cubicles erected to make workstations, and other spaces have been shared and multi-purposed to accommodate the growing staff. There are 16 full time employees working out of the existing City Hall, with two conference rooms and a council chamber. City Hall currently has 9 offices and does not have space for an additional worker anywhere in the building.

The new City Hall will sit on the corner of Main Street and 100 North and is currently used as a city park and multi-sport activity field. The land is already owned by the City, which sits immediately north of the existing City Hall. A few of the key needs addressed with the new design are:

- The addition of a plan review room for the building department which also serves as an additional meeting space,
- A small room off the Council Chambers which can be used as a workspace for the mayor, administrative law judge, auditors, and others (currently the ALJ displaces an employee when working),
- Design of council chambers and break room to serve as a space for community events in addition to Council and committee meetings,
- Additional storage areas,
- Increased restroom spaces, and
- Better accessibility to departments and a single level (stairs eliminated).

The City began design in November of 2019 and expects to start construction in September of 2020. The construction is expected to take 12 months putting an estimated completion date in September of 2021. The building size is currently designed to be 12,247 square feet with 26 parking stalls (not including street parking) and to operate as efficiently as possible with materials and technologies that are cost-effective. This includes landscaping that minimizes water usage, optimizing solar angles to control internal temperatures, solar panels, and other items. This design will minimize the operating costs of the building and reduced the overall, long-term costs of the building.

The City has explored several options for financing the new city hall including no debt, various levels of debt, and not proceeding with the project altogether considering the COVID-19 environment. Through those discussions, it became clear that financing the whole project from City's funds would place too much strain on City reserves and budget, especially considering the current environment. In addition, the City explored options for bonding the project outside of CIB and found those terms would be much less favorable, increasing the overall costs to the City. The Board determined that the best approach would be to request \$3.5 million at 2.5% interest for a 20-year period, which would position the City best to service the debt and provide the same service levels to the community. The City currently has a property for sale which is under contract, however, the failure of previous offers to close has left uncertainty around the availability of those funds. The City is seeking \$3.5 million in funding currently to give sufficient funds for constructing the project and still meet the budgetary needs for providing services. The Board members have expressed a desire to reduce the requested CIB amount if the sale of the property is completed before funding. We expect this to happen in June of 2020, and if so, we will reduce the amount requested at that time by the amount of proceeds received from that sale.

PROPOSED FUNDING: CIB funding: \$3,500,000. Ivins City Cash: \$1,074,919. **Total Project Cost:** \$4,574,919.

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 current city office is far too small for a rapidly growing city and the city desperately needs a larger office to accommodate current and future needs. The current facility is also not fully accessible.

What are challenges the project faces/creates?

None anticipated

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.

The action of the Steering Committee on the above date is attested to by:

Type Name: Bryan D. Thiriot Signature: _____, Executive Director

AOG: Five County Association of Governments

**PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD (PCIFB) APPLICATION
REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW**

Applicant: Local Building Authority of Beaver Fire District #1

Project Title: Purchase new Brush/Structure Fire Truck

Date Received: May 27, 2020

Date the AOG Steering Committee Reviewed: June 10, 2020

Project Description:

The Local Building Authority of Beaver Fire District #1 is proposing the purchase of a new Brush/Structure Fire Truck.

PROPOSED FUNDING: CIB funding: \$396,998. Beaver Fire District #1 Cash: \$77,998. **Total Project Cost:** \$978,108.

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 new truck will improve fire protection capabilities in the Fire District.

What are challenges the project faces/creates?

None anticipated.

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.

The action of the Steering Committee on the above date is attested to by:

Type Name: Bryan D. Thiriot **Signature:** _____, Executive Director

AOG: Five County Association of Governments

**PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD (PCIFB) APPLICATION
REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW**

Applicant: Local Building Authority of Beaver Fire District #1

Project Title: Purchase new Type 1 Ambulance

Date Received: May 27, 2020

Date the AOG Steering Committee Reviewed: June 10, 2020

Project Description:

The Local Building Authority of Beaver Fire District #1 is proposing the purchase of a new Type 1 four-wheel-drive ambulance. The District's newest current ambulance is a 2011 model. The District has done much research and has decided on a AEV Traumahawk Type 1 4WD ambulance from Professional Sales and Service, Inc. in Salt Lake City, Utah.

PROPOSED FUNDING: CIB funding: \$265,242. Beaver Fire District #1 Cash: \$20,000. **Total Project Cost:** \$265,242.

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 will benefit those requiring transport and ambulance services in the District's service area by providing a new Type-1 ambulance to the District.

What are challenges the project faces/creates?

None anticipated.

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.

The action of the Steering Committee on the above date is attested to by:

Type Name: Bryan D. Thiriot **Signature:** _____, Executive Director