

Application Section 1: Contact Information

Applicant: City of Grandview Heights
1016 Grandview Avenue
Grandview Heights, Ohio 43212
Franklin County
Population: 6,536 residents
Employees: 65
www.grandviewheights.org

Contact: David R. Wood
Chief of Police
1016 Grandview Avenue
Grandview Heights, Ohio 43212
Franklin County
dwood@grandviewheights.org
(614) 488-7901 phone
(614) 481-6200 fax

Application Section 2: Collaborative Partners

1.) Sharon Township Police Department

Chief Donald Schwind
95 East Wilson Bridge Road
Worthington, Ohio 43085
614-540-3047
deschwind@sharontwp.us
2010 Population Estimate: **15,969**
Approximate number of Officers: **10**

2.) Franklin Township

Chief Jim Timko
2193 Frank Road
Columbus, Ohio 43223
(614) 279-9411
Timothy_guyton@yahoo.com
2010 Population Estimate: **10,271**
Approximate number of officers: **13**

3.) Village of Valleyview Police Department

Chief Ti Meyers
432 North Richardson Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43204
614-279-5630
Tmeyers320@yahoo.com
2010 Population
Estimate: **620**
Approximate number of officers: **4**

4.) Village of Minerva Park Police Department

Chief Kim Nuesse
2829 Minerva Lake Road
Columbus, Ohio 43231
614-882-1408
chief@minervapark.org
2010 Population Estimate: **1,272**
Approximate number of officers: **7**

Tab 3 Project Information: Subsection/Project Description of Grant Proposal

The City of Grandview Heights and its collaborative partners will use the \$50,000 grant from the Local Government Innovation Fund to complete a detailed feasibility study that could tell us if there is extra time on the radio to dispatch other police department call for service. Based on number of calls for service and the time that the radio traffic is minimal, there could be room and time on the Grandview Heights radio to dispatch calls for service for other public entities. The concept of this partnership will also be available for cities, villages, townships, and smaller counties that have an interest to save money through the process of shared services.

In the summer of 2011 Grandview Heights Administration Building that also houses the Fire and Police Department and communication center was struck by lightning. The entire radio system had to be replaced with the now available newer model. This new system came with the available ability to use two radio channels simultaneously. This system is important to us because we are one of the few Police Departments in central Ohio that owns two radio channels. We are utilizing one channel to dispatch only Grandview Heights officers.

For the study we will be contracting a professional in the field of police administration and communication. The answers we are looking for include:

- Can the current excess capacity of the Grandview Heights radio room support other police departments?
- Can our system and radio room utilize both of our channels?
- Would there be added cost to our system to reach the other departments?
- How many radio dispatchers would be needed to run both channels?
- Is there physically enough room to add more personnel?

Tab 3 Project Information: Subsection/Problem

The problem faced by most small divisions of police is that of finance and the pressure to provide the type of policing and services desired by the smaller community. Larger community's expectations and demands are much different than smaller communities. After talking with several smaller police departments about the cost and quality of dispatching and the community it is apparent that there are several common problems that this grant can help us identify and address. Smaller communities demand closer communication and contact with their police departments. They like the idea of knowing their officers and more important the officers knowing them and their children. The smaller communities expect and have enjoyed the very quick cruiser response when they call the communications center. This special attention is not always the case in larger cities.

Because of the size, type of policing and expectations of the communities and limited number of channels in central Ohio we have an opportunity to share services and to continue quality services at a cost savings to all partners and possibility more.

Tab 3 Project Information: Subsection/Targeted Approach - Efficiency

This grant proposal fulfills the criteria of adopting an Efficiency philosophy by joining like size departments that understand the dynamics of policing a smaller community and the communications that are unique to our size.

Tab 3 Project Information: Subsection/Number of Entities Participating

We are pleased to report that all 4 chiefs of police contacted were eager to participate and enthusiastically expressed an interest in this grant proposal. These partners are no different than other small communities; because of budget cuts we are all looking for ways to cut cost and to share resources and services.

Tab 3 Project Information: Subsection/Ability to Replicate/Scale Proposal for others

The foundation for the application for this grant by the City of Grandview Heights will be a template that can be used by other small communities to guide them into cooperation and insight to the needs and obstacles that can best be overcome by cooperation and communication.

We believe that the template approach used in this study is logical and would be beneficial to other departments because there is many other small police department throughout the state, like Grandview Heights, that have communication centers that are not being fully utilized.

Tab3 Project Information: Subsection/Explanation of Anticipated Probability of Success

Based upon our initial discussions and enthusiasm of our partners, and based upon the finalization of the feasibility study, we believe the probability of the proposal implementation will exceed 80%. Additionally, we anticipate the collaborative partners having the wisdom to seek expert advice from professionals and consultants who are experts in this field to obtain the desired outcomes.

Tab 3 Project Information: Subsection/Anticipated Return on Investment

With the grant award for this proposal of \$50,000, the savings would be based upon the results or the study and the cost associated with it.

While, it is impossible to guarantee precise results, current rates for dispatching are continuing to rise every year as demonstrated by the attached financial information, giving us a great opportunity to work together on this common goal.

The feasibility study will help determine what incremental costs might be necessary to invest in for this approach to work statewide by both service providers and the recipient communities, such as:

- For the entity providing the service (such as Grandview Heights), there may be a slight increase in costs due to staffing needs and equipment modification;

- For the recipient community, there may be costs such as investing in a Repeater signal or other such electronic enhancements to insure the quality of the transmission

Similarly, the feasibility study will demonstrate the benefits of such collaboration and the scalability Statewide, such as:

- For the entity providing the service (such as Grandview Heights), as the attached worksheets demonstrate, the unit cost of service can drop dramatically, and the incremental revenue provided by the recipient communities will be consistent with partially offsetting costs. Clearly, this will at least help in slowing budget increases.
- For the recipient community, the feasibility study can help determine a mutually beneficial rate structure of sharing services with both a short-term reduction in their current costs, as well as a solid business model with a long-term view towards cost containment or more modest increases in future years.

It would be fair to say that 1.) effective planning; 2.) like-minded partners working collaboratively to reduce costs and time; 3.) obtaining expert advice, and 4.) a fundamentally sound and fair business model; are indeed a recipe for success and worthy of the trust and investment in a feasibility study by the Local Government Innovation Fund.

In summary, if we didn't believe that a double-digit savings of greater than 25% for each collaborative partner was fiscally achievable, politically attractive, and scalable to our colleagues, we wouldn't pursue this opportunity. It is also important to remember that this is not a one-time savings but will benefit all year after year.

Tab 3 Project Information: Subsection/Past Success

The lead applicant, the City of Grandview Heights, Police department utilizes shared services using the Upper Arlington practice shooting range and also we belong to several task forces in the county. Our Service Department is joining a consortium for fleet maintenance. We provide a full array of city services to the Village of Marble Cliff. We believe our partners also have a lot of experiences to share with the group and think that having five public entities in our submission is one of the strengths of this proposal.

Tab 3 Project Information: Subsection/Cost Benchmarking/Performance Audit

Reviewing the results of the Auditor of State's Performance Audit reports makes it apparent that there are many agencies that should share dispatching duties. During our search of performance audits on the Auditor of State's "SkinnyOhio" website (<http://skinnyohio.org/>), we identified 3 audits released since 2009 that recommend consolidating dispatching services. Issues addressed in the audits included better service and lower cost.

Tab 3 Project Information: Subsection/Economic Impact

Grandview Heights is a small community that has 17 officers. We patrol our community and a small adjoining community, Marble Cliff. We have responsibility for 2.2 square miles. Our communication center accounts for about 13% of the police department total annual budget.

The opportunity to hold down costs, have balanced budgets, living within available resources, and a strong, experienced workforce are not only an attraction to new businesses to our communities, but also highly desirable to our residents.

Tab 3 Project Information: Subsection/Response to Economic Demand

Economic pressure on our budgets is a reality for all public agencies, as well as public pressure to provide the best value per benefit dollar spent. This is the focus of this partnership. Our target market is for like-minded small police departments that quite possibly have been paying more than they should for dispatching and spending more than they can afford.

Respectfully Submitted on behalf of the Partners,

1. **City of Grandview Heights**
2. **Sharon Township**
3. **Franklin Township**
4. **Village of Minerva Park**
5. **Village of Valley View**

Tab 4 Financial Documentation: Subsection/3years Financials

As required, the most recent three year data, and forecasted 3 year trends, are provided in the attachment for the City of Grandview Heights. This level of investment as a stand-alone entity is not sustainable fiscally, and not politically sellable, which is likely the same with all of our other partners. The financial information demonstrates that a new business model such as the one proposed in this grant request, is needed so that small entities can utilize common resources to save time and money.

Tab 4 Financial Documentation: Subsection/Local Match

The Lead Applicant will commit to an in-kind contribution of 20% of the grant fund secured to maximize the success potential of this initiative.

Financial Section - LGIF Grant Proposal

City of Grandview Heights

Communications Department Costs Allocated by Number of Residents Served

	Actual			Expected		
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Operating Costs						
Salaries & Wages	\$ 221,227	\$ 232,764	\$ 241,813	\$ 250,896	\$ 246,055	\$ 250,315
Medicare	3,148	3,288	3,375	3,391	3,321	3,383
Pension	45,892	49,413	52,411	32,746	32,068	32,664
Health Insurance	38,838	41,477	44,226	59,711	64,925	72,939
Conferences & Training	1,224	129	338	500	500	500
Uniforms	359	673	1,274	1,500	1,500	1,500
Total Personnel Costs	\$ 310,688	\$ 327,744	\$ 343,437	\$ 348,744	\$ 348,369	\$ 361,301
Maintenance Contracts	8,455	8,891	7,921	10,000	10,000	10,000
LEADS	9,302	7,708	7,668	10,500	10,500	10,500
E911 Maintenance	5,473	5,473	5,828	5,000	5,000	5,000
Operating Supplies	584	728	789	750	750	750
Printing & Reproduction	482	305	746	750	750	750
Fees & Dues	540	490	421	700	700	700
Equipment Maintenance	350	-	-	1,000	1,000	1,000
Telephone Utility	2,464	2,633	2,123	2,000	2,000	2,000
Total Operating Costs	\$ 338,338	\$ 353,972	\$ 368,933	\$ 379,444	\$ 379,069	\$ 392,001
Current Number of Residents Served	7,109	7,109	7,109	7,109	7,109	7,109
Cost per Resident	\$ 47.59	\$ 49.79	\$ 51.90	\$ 53.38	\$ 53.32	\$ 55.14
IMPACT If: Doubled Number of Residents Served	14,218	14,218	14,218	14,218	14,218	14,218
Cost per Resident	\$ 23.80	\$ 24.90	\$ 25.95	\$ 26.69	\$ 26.66	\$ 27.57
IMPACT If: Tripled Number of Residents Served	21,327	21,327	21,327	21,327	21,327	21,327
Cost per Resident	\$ 15.86	\$ 16.60	\$ 17.30	\$ 17.79	\$ 17.77	\$ 18.38

Local Government Innovation Fund Program

Application Score £ £

Lead Applicant	
Project Name	

	Grant Application
--	--------------------------

or

	Loan Application
--	-------------------------

The Local Government Innovation Fund Council
77 South High Street
P.O. Box 1001
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1001
(614) 995-2292

Local Government Innovation Fund Project Scoring Sheet

Section 1: Financing Measures

Financing Measures	Description	Criteria	Max Points	Applicant Self Score	Validated Score
Financial Information	<i>Applicant includes financial information (i.e., service related operating budgets) for the most recent three years and the three year period following the project. The financial information must be directly related to the scope of the project and will be used as the cost basis for determining any savings resulting from the project.</i>	Applicant provides a thorough, detailed and complete financial information	5		
		Applicant provided more than minimum requirements but did not provide additional justification or support	3		
		Applicant provided minimal financial information	1		
		Points			
Repayment Structure (Loan Only)	<i>Applicant demonstrates a viable repayment source to support loan award. Secondary source can be in the form of a debt reserve, bank participation, a guarantee from a local entity, or other collateral (i.e., emergency rainy day , or contingency fund, etc.).</i>	Applicant clearly demonstrates a secondary repayment source.	5		
		Applicant does not have a secondary repayment source.	0		
		Points			
Local Match	<i>Percentage of local matching funds being contributed to the project. This may include in-kind contributions.</i>	70% or greater	5		
		40-69.99%	3		
		10-39.99%	1		
		Points			
Total Section Points					

Section 2: Collaborative Measures

Collaborative Measures	Description	Criteria	Max Points	Applicant Self Score	Validated Score
Population	<i>Applicant's population (or the population of the area(s) served) falls within one of the listed categories as determined by the U.S. Census Bureau. Population scoring will be determined by the smallest population listed in the application. Applications from (or collaborating with) small communities are preferred.</i>	Applicant (or collaborative partner) is not a county and has a population of less than 20,000 residents	5		
		Applicant (or collaborative partner) is a county but has less than 235,000	5		
		Applicant (or collaborative partner) is not a county but has a population 20,001 or greater.	3		
		Applicant (or collaborative partner) is a county with a population of 235,001 residents or more	3		
		Points			
Participating Entities	<i>Applicant has executed partnership agreements outlining all collaborative partners and participation agreements and has resolutions of support. (Note: Sole applicants only need to provide a resolution of support from its governing entity.)</i>	More than one applicant	5		
		Single applicant	1		
		Points			
Total Section Points					

Local Government Innovation Fund Project Scoring Sheet

Section 3: Success Measures

Success Measures	Description	Criteria	Points	Applicant Self Score	Validated Score
Expected Return	<i>Applicant demonstrates as a percentage of savings (i.e., actual savings, increased revenue, or cost avoidance) an expected return. The return must be derived from the applicant's cost basis. The expected return is ranked in one of the following percentage categories:</i>	75% or greater	30		
		25.01% to 74.99%	20		
		Less than 25%	10		
			Points		
Past Success	<i>Applicant has successfully implemented, or is following project guidance from a shared services model, for an efficiency, shared service, coproduction or merger project in the past.</i>	Yes	5		
		No	0		
			Points		
Scalable/Replicable Proposal	<i>Applicant's proposal can be replicated by other local governments or scaled for the inclusion of other local governments.</i>	The project is both scalable and replicable	10		
		The project is either scalable or replicable	5		
		Does not apply	0		
			Points		
Probability of Success	<i>Applicant provides a documented need for the project and clearly outlines the likelihood of the need being met.</i>	Provided	5		
		Not Provided	0		
			Points		
Total Section Points					

Section 4: Significance Measures

Significance Measures	Description	Criteria	Points Assigned	Applicant Self Score	Validated Score
Performance Audit Implementation /Cost Benchmarking	<i>The project implements a single recommendation from a performance audit provided by the Auditor of State under Chapter 117 of the Ohio Revised Code or is informed by cost benchmarking.</i>	Project implements a recommendation from an audit or is informed by benchmarking	5		
		Project does not implement a recommendation from an audit and is not informed by benchmarking	0		
			Points		
Economic Impact	<i>Applicant demonstrates the project will a promote business environment (i.e., demonstrates a business relationship resulting from the project) and will provide for community attraction (i.e., cost avoidance with respect to taxes)</i>	Applicant clearly demonstrates economic impact	5		
		Applicant mentions but does not prove economic impact	3		
		Applicant does not demonstrate an economic impact	0		
			Points		
Response to Economic Demand	<i>The project responds to current substantial changes in economic demand for local or regional government services.</i>	Yes	5		
		No	0		
			Points		
Total Section Points					

Section 5: Council Measures			
Council Measures	Description	Criteria	Points Assigned
Council Preference	Council Ranking for Competitive Rounds	The Applicant Does Not Fill Out This Section; This is for the Local Government Innovation Fund Council only. The points for this section is based on the applicant demonstrating innovation or inventiveness with the project	
Total Section Points (10max)			

Scoring Summary		
	Applicant Self Score	Validated Score
Section 1: Financing Measures		
Section 2: Collaborative Measures		
Section 3: Success Measures		
Section 4: Significance Measures		
Total Base Points:		

Reviewer Comments

Franklin County
2010 Census Population For Cities, Villages, and Townships



Department of
Development

Name	Census Population			Percent Change 2000 to 2010	Percent Change 1990 to 2000
	2010	2000	1990		
Franklin County	1,163,414	1,068,978	961,437	8.8%	11.2%
Incorporated Places and Balance of County					
Bexley city	13,057	13,203	13,088	-1.1%	0.9%
Brice village	114	70	106	62.9%	-34.0%
Canal Winchester village (part)	6,286	4,194	2,708	49.9%	54.9%
Columbus city (part)	770,122	702,132	632,270	9.7%	11.0%
Dublin city (part)	35,367	27,087	12,551	30.6%	115.8%
Gahanna city	33,248	32,636	27,791	1.9%	17.4%
Grandview Heights city	6,536	6,695	7,010	-2.4%	-4.5%
Grove City city	35,575	27,075	19,653	31.4%	37.8%
Groveport village	5,363	3,865	2,857	38.8%	35.3%
Harrisburg village (part)	320	326	338	-1.8%	-3.6%
Hilliard city	28,435	24,230	11,796	17.4%	105.4%
Lithopolis village (part)	32	---	---	n.a.	n.a.
Lockbourne village (part)	237	280	155	-15.4%	80.6%
Marble Cliff village	573	646	629	-11.3%	2.7%
Minerva Park village	1,272	1,288	1,463	-1.2%	-12.0%
New Albany village (part)	7,701	3,711	1,621	107.5%	128.9%
Obetz village	4,532	3,977	3,167	14.0%	25.6%
Pickerington city (part)	86	55	39	56.4%	41.0%
Reynoldsburg city (part)	26,157	26,388	24,486	-0.9%	7.8%
Riverlea village	545	499	490	9.2%	1.8%
Upper Arlington city	33,771	33,686	34,128	0.3%	-1.3%
Urbancrest village	960	868	870	10.6%	-0.2%
Valleyview village	620	601	582	3.2%	3.3%
Westerville city (part)	28,328	29,418	29,092	-3.7%	1.1%
Whitehall city	18,062	19,201	20,572	-5.9%	-6.7%
Worthington city	13,575	14,125	14,882	-3.9%	-5.1%
Balance of Franklin County	92,540	92,662	98,983	-0.1%	-6.4%
Townships and Independent Cities					
Bexley city	13,057	13,203	13,088	-1.1%	0.9%
Blendon township	9,069	9,193	11,203	-1.3%	-17.9%
Brown township	2,293	2,031	1,910	12.9%	6.3%
Clinton township	4,109	4,294	4,579	-4.3%	-6.2%
Columbus city	770,122	702,132	632,270	9.7%	11.0%
Dublin city	35,367	27,087	---	30.6%	n.a.
Franklin township	10,271	11,798	14,757	-12.9%	-20.1%
Grandview Heights city	6,536	6,695	7,010	-2.4%	-4.5%
Hamilton township	8,260	7,950	9,650	3.9%	-17.6%
Jackson township	40,608	32,625	25,265	24.5%	29.1%
Jefferson township	10,972	5,322	3,842	106.2%	38.5%
Madison township	23,509	21,243	18,850	10.7%	12.7%
Marble Cliff village	573	646	---	-11.3%	n.a.
Mifflin township	35,710	35,787	28,449	-0.2%	25.8%
Norwich township	31,807	27,488	15,946	15.7%	72.4%
Perry township	3,637	4,087	5,924	-11.0%	-31.0%

Franklin County
2010 Census Population For Cities, Villages, and Townships



Department of
Development

Name	Census Population			Percent Change 2000 to 2010	Percent Change 1990 to 2000
	2010	2000	1990		
Plain township	9,829	5,926	4,366	65.9%	35.7%
Pleasant township	6,671	7,030	6,678	-5.1%	5.3%
Prairie township	16,498	17,118	16,860	-3.6%	1.5%
Sharon township	15,969	16,455	17,484	-3.0%	-5.9%
Truro township	26,837	27,151	26,401	-1.2%	2.8%
Upper Arlington city	33,771	33,686	34,128	0.3%	-1.3%
Washington township	1,549	1,412	13,113	9.7%	-89.2%
Westerville city	28,328	29,418	29,092	-3.7%	1.1%
Whitehall city	18,062	19,201	20,572	-5.9%	-6.7%

n.a. - Could not calculate. Division by zero.


--- Denotes that entity did not exist as currently organized.

Note: For the 2000 and 1990 columns, the population may not sum to the county total because of changed jurisdictional structures.

Source: Census 2010, U.S. Census Bureau.

Prepared by: Office of Policy, Research, and Strategic Planning, Ohio Department of Development.

Fairfield County
2010 Census Population For Cities, Villages, and Townships



Name	Census Population			Percent Change 2000 to 2010	Percent Change 1990 to 2000
	2010	2000	1990		
Fairfield County	146,156	122,759	103,461	19.1%	18.7%
<u>Incorporated Places and Balance of County</u>					
Amanda village	737	707	727	4.2%	-2.8%
Baltimore village	2,966	2,881	2,971	3.0%	-3.0%
Bremen village	1,425	1,265	1,400	12.6%	-9.6%
Buckeye Lake village (part)	15	3	---	400.0%	n.a.
Canal Winchester village (part)	815	284	0	187.0%	n.a.
Carroll village	524	488	545	7.4%	-10.5%
Columbus city (part)	9,666	7,447	688	29.8%	982.4%
Lancaster city	38,780	35,335	34,507	9.7%	2.4%
Lithopolis village (part)	1,074	600	529	79.0%	13.4%
Millersport village	1,044	963	1,012	8.4%	-4.8%
Pickerington city (part)	18,205	9,737	5,645	87.0%	72.5%
Pleasantville village	960	877	926	9.5%	-5.3%
Reynoldsburg city (part)	910	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Rushville village	302	268	230	12.7%	16.5%
Stoutsville village	560	581	529	-3.6%	9.8%
Sugar Grove village	426	448	472	-4.9%	-5.1%
Tarleton village (part)	0	---	---	n.a.	n.a.
Thurston village	604	555	539	8.8%	3.0%
West Rushville village	134	132	121	1.5%	9.1%
Balance of Fairfield County	67,009	60,188	52,620	11.3%	14.4%
<u>Townships and Independent Cities</u>					
Amanda township	2,706	2,429	2,216	11.4%	9.6%
Berne township	5,088	4,969	4,690	2.4%	5.9%
Bloom township	8,466	6,374	5,788	32.8%	10.1%
Clearcreek township	4,057	3,411	3,084	18.9%	10.6%
Columbus city	9,666	7,447	---	29.8%	n.a.
Greenfield township	5,565	4,944	4,581	12.6%	7.9%
Hocking township	4,672	4,812	4,136	-2.9%	16.3%
Lancaster City township	38,754	35,335	34,507	9.7%	2.4%
Liberty township	7,916	7,265	6,758	9.0%	7.5%
Madison township	1,682	1,385	1,413	21.4%	-2.0%
Pleasant township	6,083	5,549	5,626	9.6%	-1.4%
Richland township	2,195	1,940	1,734	13.1%	11.9%
Rush Creek township	3,893	3,549	3,496	9.7%	1.5%
Violet township	38,572	26,914	19,253	43.3%	39.8%
Walnut township	6,841	6,436	6,179	6.3%	4.2%

n.a. - Could not calculate. Division by zero.

--- Denotes that entity did not exist as currently organized.

Note: For the 2000 and 1990 columns, the population may not sum to the county total because of changed jurisdictional structures.

Source: Census 2010, U.S. Census Bureau.

Prepared by: Office of Policy, Research, and Strategic Planning, Ohio Department of Development.

Licking County
2010 Census Population For Cities, Villages, and Townships



Department of
Development

Name	Census Population			Percent Change 2000 to 2010	Percent Change 1990 to 2000
	2010	2000	1990		
Licking County	166,492	145,491	128,300	14.4%	13.4%
<u>Incorporated Places and Balance of County</u>					
Alexandria village	517	85	478	508.2%	-82.2%
Buckeye Lake village (part)	2,731	3,046	2,986	-10.3%	2.0%
Granville village	5,646	3,167	4,315	78.3%	-26.6%
Gratiot village (part)	133	96	106	38.5%	-9.4%
Hanover village	921	885	778	4.1%	13.8%
Hartford village	397	412	410	-3.6%	0.5%
Heath city	10,310	8,527	7,231	20.9%	17.9%
Hebron village	2,336	2,034	2,076	14.8%	-2.0%
Johnstown village	4,632	3,440	3,198	34.7%	7.6%
Kirkersville village	525	520	563	1.0%	-7.6%
New Albany village (part)	23	---	---	n.a.	n.a.
Newark city	47,573	46,279	44,389	2.8%	4.3%
Pataskala city	14,962	10,249	3,046	46.0%	236.5%
Reynoldsburg city (part)	8,826	5,681	1,281	55.4%	343.5%
St. Louisville village	373	346	366	7.8%	-5.5%
Utica village (part)	2,116	2,128	2,019	-0.6%	5.4%
Balance of Licking County	64,471	58,596	55,058	10.0%	6.4%
<u>Townships and Independent Cities</u>					
Bennington township	1,687	1,265	902	33.4%	40.2%
Bowling Green township	1,747	1,668	1,258	4.7%	32.6%
Burlington township	1,223	1,073	983	14.0%	9.2%
Eden township	1,248	1,243	1,137	0.4%	9.3%
Etna township	16,373	5,410	6,412	202.6%	-15.6%
Fallsbury township	981	865	692	13.4%	25.0%
Franklin township	2,118	1,782	1,401	18.9%	27.2%
Granville township	9,773	8,994	7,856	8.7%	14.5%
Hanover township	2,705	2,731	2,556	-1.0%	6.8%
Harrison township	7,561	6,494	5,041	16.4%	28.8%
Hartford township	1,431	1,290	1,206	10.9%	7.0%
Heath city	10,310	8,527	7,231	20.9%	17.9%
Hopewell township	1,381	1,200	1,091	15.1%	10.0%
Jersey township	2,740	2,841	2,404	-3.6%	18.2%
Liberty township	2,360	1,797	1,505	31.3%	19.4%
Licking township	4,632	3,870	3,927	19.7%	-1.5%
McKean township	1,523	1,516	1,374	0.5%	10.3%
Madison township	3,211	3,061	2,709	4.9%	13.0%
Mary Ann township	2,116	2,118	1,900	-0.1%	11.5%
Monroe township	6,946	5,523	5,135	25.8%	7.6%

Delaware County
2010 Census Population For Cities, Villages, and Townships



Department of
Development

Name	Census Population			Percent Change 2000 to 2010	Percent Change 1990 to 2000
	2010	2000	1990		
Delaware County	174,214	109,989	66,929	58.4%	64.3%
Incorporated Places and Balance of County					
Ashley village	1,330	1,216	1,077	9.4%	12.9%
Columbus city (part)	7,245	1,891	---	283.1%	n.a.
Delaware city	34,753	25,243	20,030	37.7%	26.0%
Dublin city (part)	4,018	4,283	3,811	-6.2%	12.4%
Galena village	653	305	330	114.1%	-7.6%
Ostrander village	643	405	413	58.8%	-1.9%
Powell city	11,500	6,247	2,154	84.1%	190.0%
Shawnee Hills village	681	419	416	62.5%	0.7%
Sunbury village	4,389	2,630	2,046	66.9%	28.5%
Westerville city (part)	7,792	5,900	1,101	32.1%	435.9%
Balance of Delaware County	101,210	61,450	35,551	64.7%	72.9%
Townships and Independent Cities					
Ashley village	1,330	1,216	1,077	9.4%	12.9%
Berkshire township	3,085	2,251	2,189	37.1%	2.8%
Berlin township	6,498	3,315	1,976	96.0%	67.8%
Brown township	1,416	1,297	1,152	9.2%	12.6%
Columbus City township	4,738	1,891	---	150.6%	n.a.
Concord township	9,294	4,507	7,597	106.2%	-40.7%
Delaware township	2,152	26,149	21,067	-91.8%	24.1%
Delaware City township	34,472	---	---	n.a.	n.a.
Genoa township	23,093	11,293	4,053	104.5%	178.6%
Harlem township	3,953	3,762	3,391	5.1%	10.9%
Kingston township	2,156	1,603	1,093	34.5%	46.7%
Liberty township	26,172	15,429	5,944	69.6%	159.6%
Marlboro township	281	227	142	23.8%	59.9%
Orange township	26,269	12,464	3,791	110.8%	228.8%
Oxford township	987	854	880	15.6%	-3.0%
Porter township	1,923	1,696	1,325	13.4%	28.0%
Radnor township	1,540	1,335	1,188	15.4%	12.4%
Scioto township	2,993	2,527	2,220	18.4%	13.8%
Shawnee Hills village	681	---	---	n.a.	n.a.
Sunbury Village township	4,385	2,630	2,046	66.7%	28.5%
Thompson township	684	558	507	22.6%	10.1%
Trenton township	2,190	2,137	1,867	2.5%	14.5%
Troy township	2,115	2,665	2,323	-20.6%	14.7%
Washington township	4,018	---	---	n.a.	n.a.
Westerville City township	7,789	5,900	1,101	32.0%	435.9%

n.a. - Could not calculate. Division by zero.

--- Denotes that entity did not exist as currently organized.

Note: For the 2000 and 1990 columns, the population may not sum to the county total because of changed jurisdictional structures.

Source: Census 2010, U.S. Census Bureau.

Prepared by: Office of Policy, Research, and Strategic Planning, Ohio Department of Development.

Tab 5 – Supporting Documentation: Number of Entities Participating

We are pleased to report that all 4 chiefs of police contacted were eager to participate and enthusiastically expressed an interest in this grant proposal. These partners are no different than other small communities; because of budget cuts we are all looking for ways to cut cost and to share resources and services.

Tab 5 – Supporting Documentation: Participating Entities/Resolution of Support/Agreements

To underscore the commitment, initiative, and energy of all partners, this proposal has five participating entities. Additionally, a letter of interest signed by the Chief of Police of each entity is attached to underscore the commitment of all partners. The partners will comply within the 60 day timeframe allowed for Round 1 participants to secure a Resolution of Support from their governing bodies.

Division of Police

City of Grandview Heights

1016 Grandview Avenue
Grandview Heights, Ohio 43212


March 1, 2012

Sir/ Madam,


The below listed Chiefs of Police formed this partnership to explore the possibility of Grandview Heights dispatching police calls for service for the listed communities and possibly others. Grandview Heights is one of only a few central Ohio cities that own several radio channels that are used to dispatch law enforcement.

This study will answer the feasibility of several small Police Department joining together to utilize a shared resource in the hopes of saving time and money.


This partnership is not an endorsement of the outcome of the study it is merely a group of Chiefs that have similar but unique perspectives that can add to the overall goal of saving money.



Don Schwind, Chief of Police Sharon Township



Ti Myers, Chief of Police Village of Valleyview Police Department



Kim Nuesse, Chief of Police Village of Minerva Park Police Department



Jim Timko, Chief of Police Franklin Township Police Department



David Wood, Chief of Police Grandview Heights

Resolution No. 12-059

WHEREAS, Section 715.02.07 of the Ohio Revised Code provides for two or more OH public agencies having the authority to enter into an Agreement for the joint management of a Consortium benefiting all participating OH public agencies by the Constitution or laws of the State of Ohio; and

WHEREAS, it has been proposed that a cost savings could be realized by joining with surrounding municipalities and townships in the sharing of Dispatching/Communications services; and

WHEREAS, Franklin Township has been invited to partner in an application for funding through a State of Ohio Department of Development Local Government Innovation Fund grant to conduct a detailed feasibility study and evaluation of the issues to be addressed along with cost savings opportunities.

Now therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Trustees that the following Resolution be hereby adopted:

Section 1. The Township is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with various surrounding municipalities and townships for the purpose of submitting a Local Government Fund Innovation Fund Grant Application to seek funding for the purpose of studying feasibility and desirability of the sharing of Dispatching/Communication services.

Section 2. The Township Chairman is authorized to execute any documents necessary to enter into, and carry out this agreement.

Section 3. This resolution shall be in force and effect immediately upon its adoption.

Passed: April 12th, 2012

Timothy L. Dwyer Approved
Signature

Chairman
Title

Attest Albert J. Z...

CHIEF OF POLICE
Title

RECORD OF RESOLUTIONS
City of Grandview Heights

Resolution No. 12-2012

Passed April 9, 2012

A Resolution Supporting and Authorizing the City of Grandview Heights to enter into an agreement with surrounding public entities to apply for Local Government Innovation Fund Grants to study the feasibility of shared dispatching services.

WHEREAS, the City of Grandview Heights is the Lead Grant Applicant on behalf of a group of public entity collaborative partners who wish to submit an Ohio Department of Development Local Government Innovation Fund Grant Application to conduct a feasibility study, with an interest in establishing a process and business model for participating entities to provide shared dispatching/communications services; and

WHEREAS, substantial cost savings could be realized by partnering with other neighboring participating municipalities and townships in applying for funds to study the feasibility of providing shared dispatching services. Additional public entities will be permitted to participate in the Consortium based upon requirements of By Laws and Operating Procedures of the Consortium to be developed in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations; and

WHEREAS, Section 715.02.07 of the Ohio Revised Code authorizes two or more Ohio public agencies to enter into an Agreement for the joint management of a Consortium benefiting all participating Ohio public agencies; and

WHEREAS, the match requirements to the grant award consist of a 20% in-kind contribution of documented eligible City services and City staff time provided toward this effort in the past two years and going forward.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS, OHIO THAT:

SECTION 1. The Mayor and Director of Finance are authorized to enter into an agreement with various surrounding municipalities and townships for the purpose of submitting the Local Government Innovation Fund Grant Application to conduct a feasibility study to implement a joint collaboratively constructed and approved sharing of Dispatching services.

SECTION 2 This Resolution shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

RECORD OF RESOLUTIONS
City of Grandview Heights


Resolution No. 12-2012

Passed April 9, 2012

Passed: April 9, 2012


Steven R. Reynolds, President
Grandview Heights City Council

Attest:


Deborah K. Nicodemus,
Clerk of Council

Approved as to form:

Approved Not Approved

Marie-Joelle Khouzam,
City Attorney


Ray E. DeGraw, Mayor

Date: Joelle

Date: 4-9

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT PUBLICATION OF THE FOREGOING
ORDINANCE OF RESOLUTION WAS MADE BY POSTING TRUE
COPIES THEREOF AT FIVE OF THE MOST PUBLIC PLACES IN
GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS AS DETERMINED BY COUNCIL PURSU-
ANT TO ORD. 50-80. TO WIT: GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL
BUILDING, STEVENSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, EDISON
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL,
GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS PUBLIC LIBRARY. EACH FOR A PERIOD
OF FIFTEEN DAYS COMMENCING ON THE 11 DAY OF
April 2012


CLERK OF COUNCIL
CITY OF GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS, OH

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE VILLAGE OF MINERVA PARK TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING A FUND GRANT APPLICATION, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

WHEREAS, Section 715.02.07 of the Ohio Revised Code provides for two or more Ohio public agencies having the authority to enter into an agreement for the joint management of a consortium benefiting all participating Ohio public agencies by the constitution or laws of the State of Ohio; and

WHEREAS, it has been proposed that a cost savings could be realized by joining with surrounding municipalities in sharing of dispatching and/or communications services; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Minerva Park has been invited to partner in an application for funding through a State of Ohio Department of Development Local Government Innovation Fund grant to conduct a detailed feasibility study and evaluation of the issues to be addressed, along with cost-savings opportunities.


NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Council of the Village of Minerva Park, Franklin County, State of Ohio, that:

Section 1. The Village of Minerva Park is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with various surrounding municipalities and townships for the purpose of submitting a Local Government Fund Innovation Fund Grant Application to seek funding for the purpose of studying feasibility and desirability of sharing Dispatching and/or Communication services.

Section 2. The Mayor, Police Chief, and Fiscal Officer are hereby authorized and directed to execute the documents necessary to enter into and carry out this agreement.

Section 3. All prior resolutions or any parts thereof that is/are inconsistent with this resolution is/are hereby repealed as to the inconsistent parts thereof.

Section 4. Council declares this to be an emergency measure necessary for the health, safety and welfare of the residents of Minerva Park, such emergency arising out of the need to meet the deadline for submitting a fund grant application to pursue cost-savings opportunities for dispatching and/or communications services. Wherefore, this resolution shall take effect and shall be in force upon its passage.


Lynn Eisentrout, Mayor, Village of Minerva Park

First Reading: Waived April 29, 2012
Second Reading: Waived April 29, 2012
Third Reading: Waived April 29, 2012
Passed: April 29, 2012


Attest Nancy White, Fiscal Officer,
Village of Minerva Park

Reviewed by Counsel

RECORD OF RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 2012-12 Passed April 29, 2012

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE VILLAGE OF MINERVA PARK TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING A FUND GRANT APPLICATION, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY


WHEREAS, Section 715.02.07 of the Ohio Revised Code provides for two or more Ohio public agencies having the authority to enter into an agreement for the joint management of a consortium benefiting all participating Ohio public agencies by the constitution or laws of the State of Ohio; and

WHEREAS, it has been proposed that a cost savings could be realized by joining with surrounding municipalities in sharing of dispatching and/or communications services; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Minerva Park has been invited to partner in an application for funding through a State of Ohio Department of Development Local Government Innovation Fund grant to conduct a detailed feasibility study and evaluation of the issues to be addressed, along with cost-savings opportunities.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Council of the Village of Minerva Park, Franklin County, State of Ohio, that:

- Section 1. The Village of Minerva Park is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with various surrounding municipalities and townships for the purpose of submitting a Local Government Fund Innovation Fund Grant Application to seek funding for the purpose of studying feasibility and desirability of sharing Dispatching and/or Communication services.
- Section 2. The Mayor, Police Chief, and Fiscal Officer are hereby authorized and directed to execute the documents necessary to enter into and carry out this agreement.
- Section 3. All prior resolutions or any parts thereof that is/are inconsistent with this resolution is/are hereby repealed as to the inconsistent parts thereof.
- Section 4. Council declares this to be an emergency measure necessary for the health, safety and welfare of the residents of Minerva Park, such emergency arising out of the need to meet the deadline for submitting a fund grant application to pursue cost-savings opportunities for dispatching and/or communications services. Wherefore, this resolution shall take effect and shall be in force upon its passage.



Lynn Eisentrout, Mayor, Village of Minerva Park

First Reading: Waived April 29, 2012
Second Reading: Waived April 29, 2012
Third Reading: Waived April 29, 2012
Passed: April 29, 2012



Attest Nancy White, Fiscal Officer,
Village of Minerva Park

Reviewed by Counsel

