Ohio Local Government Innovation Fund

Collaborative Measures → Success Measures → Significance Measures → Financial Measures

Round 5: Application Form

Step One: Fill out this Application Form in its entirety.

Step Two: Fill out the online submission form and submit your application materials. All supplemental application materials should be combined into one file for submission.

LGIF: Applicant Profile

Lead Agency	The City of Mansfield
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response
Type of Request	Grant
Request Amount	$100,000.00
JobsOhio Region	Northeast
Number of Collaborative Partners (including lead agency)	6
Project Approach	Efficiency
Project Type	Economic Development

Ohio Development Services Agency

Website: http://development.ohio.gov/cs/cs_localgovfund.htm

E-mail: LGIF@development.ohio.gov

Phone: 614 | 995 2292

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

Instructions

• Make sure to answer each question appropriately in the space provided, not exceeding the space allowed by the answer box.

• Examples of completed applications are available on the LGIF website, found here:

http://development.ohio.gov/cs/cs_localgovfund.htm

Section 1 — Contacts

Lead Agency		
Mailing Address:	Name: The City of Mansfield	
	Street Address: 30 N. Diamond St.	
	City: Mansfield	
	Zip: 44902	
In what county is the lead agency located? Richland		
Ohio House District: 2	Ohio Senate District: 22	

Project Contact		
Please provide information about the individual who should be contacted regarding this application.		
Mailing Address:	Name: Lori Cope	Title: Safety-Service Director
	Street Address: 30 N. Diamond St.	
	City: Mansfield	
	Zip: 44902	
Email Address: lcope@ci.mansfield.oh.us		Phone Number: (419) 755-9736

Fiscal Agency:		
Please provide information for the entity and individual serving as the fiscal agent for the project.		
Mailing Address:	Fiscal Agency: City of Mansfield	
	Fiscal Officer: Lynn Steward	Title: Finance Director
	Street Address: 30 N. Diamond St.	
	City: Mansfield	
	Zip: 44902	

Population		
Does the applicant (or collaborative partner) represent a city, township, or village with a population of less than 20,000 residents?	☐ Yes	☑ No
	List Entity	
Does the applicant (or collaborative partner) represent a county with a population of less than 235,000 residents?	☑ Yes	☐ No
	List Entity	
	Richland County	

Single Applicant		
Is your organization applying as a single entity?	☐ Yes	☑ No

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

Collaborative Partners		
Does the proposal include collaborative partners?	✔ Yes	No

Applicants applying with collaborative partners are required to show proof of the partnership with a signed partnership agreement and a resolution of support from each of the partner's governing entities. If the collaborative partner does not have a governing entity, a letter of support from the partnering organization is sufficient. These documents must be received by the end of the cure period in order for each entity to count as a collaborative partner for the purposes of this application.

Nature of the Partnership

As agreed upon in the signed partnership agreement, please identify the nature of the partnership with an explanation of how the lead agency and collaborative partners will work toegether on the proposed project.

Mansfield and Richland County, Ohio have focused heavily on the presence of blight, including garbage, rodents, tall grass and weeds, and other nuisance complaints. Our city and county has been awarded approximately $1,561,494 to demolish or rehabilitate blighted vacant and/or abandoned housing. In the summer of 2012, a rash of arsons left Mansfield with a significant number of burned out properties. The City has been in fiscal emergency since Aug. 2010 and cannot address this issue alone. The Codes and Community Development departments have been reduced to skeletal staffing levels. As our community struggles to gain traction in this difficult economy, the looming presence of vacant properties and blight remain a primary hindrance to attracting new jobs and people to the area.

The loss of business and industry has taken its toll on this community, and with a declining population, federal sources of support for addressing blight, such as CDBG funds, have been significantly reduced over the last decade as the city population dipped below 50,000.

The City of Mansfield proposes to contract with NECIC to conduct a feasibility study in response to citizens' growing frustration about the deteriorating conditions in their neighborhoods and the perceived lack of effort by government officials to address this blight. The current process may require a single vacant house with multiple code violations to be reported to multiple departments, or agencies, depending on the specific violations.

The current process to address these problems is frustrating and unclear to the citizens, and there is currently no tool to coordinate the responses of multiple agencies involved to effectively combat this issue, or to keep the public aware of the agencies' actions as these blight conditions are addressed.

Committed partners include the City of Mansfield, Mansfield-Ontario-Richland County Health Department (MORCHD), Richland County Building Department, First Call 2-1-1, The North End Community Improvement Collaborative (NECIC), Neighborhood Watch, and Richland County Regional Planning Commission (RCPRC).

The roles of the partners are as follows: NECIC will coordinate the LGIF grant, conduct the feasibility study and convene the partners; First Call 211 will serve as the central intake for residents who lack web access; A software vendor, such as QScend, will be identified to set up a web-based citizen reporting system, host the website and lease the software; RCPRC will provide technical support to develop a model for rolling out the system to other public subdivisions within the county, (villages, townships, etc.) ; Code Enforcement agencies, including City, County and Health Department, will utilize the system for complaint intake, resolution and reporting; Neighborhood Watch Leaders-will assist with the roll out to the community; All partners will help develop the knowledge base, conduct the public awareness campaign and participate in the evaluation and assessment of the system.

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

List of Partners
Please use the following space to list each collaborative partner who is participating in the project and is providing BOTH a resolution of support for the Local Government Innovation Fund application and has signed the partnership agreement.

Collaborative Partner # 1	
Mailing Address:	Name: Richland County Commissioners
	Street Address: 50 Park Avenue East
	City: Mansfield
	Zip: 44902

Collaborative Partner # 2	
Mailing Address:	Name: Mansfield/Ontario/Richland County Public Health Department (MORCHD)
	Street Address: 555 Lexington Avenue
	City: Mansfield
	Zip: 44907

Collaborative Partner # 3	
Mailing Address:	Name: Mansfield/Richland County Public Library - First Call 211
	Street Address: 43 W. Third St.
	City: Mansfield
	Zip: 44902

Collaborative Partner # 4	
Mailing Address:	Name: Richland County Regional Planning Commission (RCRPC)
	Street Address: 35 N. Park St., Suite #230
	City: Mansfield
	Zip: 44902

Collaborative Partner # 5	
Mailing Address:	Name: North End Community Improvement Collaborative, Inc. (NECIC)
	Street Address: 199 N. Main St.
	City: Mansfield
	Zip: 44902

Collaborative Partner # 6	
Mailing Address:	Name:
	Street Address:
	City:
	Zip:

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

Collaborative Partner # 7	
Mailing Address:	Name:
	Street Address:
	City:
	Zip:

Collaborative Partner # 8	
Mailing Address:	Name:
	Street Address:
	City:
	Zip:

Collaborative Partner # 9	
Mailing Address:	Name:
	Street Address:
	City:
	Zip:

Collaborative Partner # 10	
Mailing Address:	Name:
	Street Address:
	City:
	Zip:

Collaborative Partner # 11	
Mailing Address:	Name:
	Street Address:
	City:
	Zip:

Collaborative Partner # 12	
Mailing Address:	Name:
	Street Address:
	City:
	Zip:

Collaborative Partner # 13	
Mailing Address:	Name:
	Street Address:
	City:
	Zip:

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

Project Information

Provide a general description of the project, including a description of the final work product derived from the grant study or loan implementation project. This information may be used for council briefings, program and marketing materials.

The City of Mansfield and the partners of the Central Intake Workgroup propose to conduct a feasibility study utilizing a web-based central intake system to simplify citizen reporting of complaints and problems, and track vacant properties. Local governments can then focus limited personnel on complaint resolution, promote intergovernmental problem solving, improve the use of public funds, and increase citizen participation in working with local government to address blight. It also provides a picture of real-time trends, especially relating to the problems posed by vacant properties.

In continuing its role as the workgroup convener, non-profit partner NECIC will examine the feasibility of developing a joint public/private system between the City, County, Health Department, First Call 2-1-1, and Richland County Regional Planning Commission, neighborhood watch members and other local citizens. The variables to be examined in the study include: the cost savings, the response time and effectiveness of complaint resolution, the ongoing financial sustainability, and citizen's level of involvement and perceptions of the system. The study will also identify gaps and duplication in existing services.

Baseline data will be gathered and assessed related to the number of complaints, public perception of services, the availability of local data, and linkages to areas of high crime. The study will utilize a web-based centralized complaint reporting software and knowledge base for FAQs with 24/7 access via toll-free phone call to First Call 211 or direct online entry. It will also provide an accurate database of vacant properties and a map of blight related violations by area and by type for use in planning and in targeting limited financial resources. The results will be published in a step-by-step Guidebook that other communities could use to support their implementation of a Central Intake system.

By utilizing a web-based citizen reporting system that is also accessible via toll free call to First Call 211 (our local Information and Referral service), our goals are to:

• Create a central intake system to provide easy reporting for our citizens,
• Improve complaint response time and results,
• Assess the feasibility of streamlining the current confusing system,
• Reduce duplication of efforts by providing the initial complaint to all agencies involved in resolving a complaint so response efforts can be coordinated and enhanced,
• Provide transparent tracking progress on complaint resolution,
• Assess patterns and common issues to provide better planning data
• Utilize public/private partnerships to increase the effectiveness of local government to address blight, and improve neighborhood conditions.

The current focus on demolitions, the willingness of the Library's First Call 211 to expand its role to include complaint reporting, the commitments from partners from City and County agencies, Health Department, NECIC and Neighborhood Watch, and the limited funding and manpower available to address blight conditions, make this an optimal time to study the feasibility of this project.

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

Project Information		
Has this project been submitted for consideration in previous LGIF Rounds?	☐ Yes	☑ No
If yes, in which Round(s)?		
What was the project name?		
What entity was the lead applicant?		

Past Success

Provide a summary of past efforts to implement a project to improve efficiency, implement shared services, coproduction, or a merger (5 points).

At the Citizen Action Sector residents, agencies, public officials and policy makers share concerns and receive updates and information about current programs and procedures. Some of the issues tackled are complex and have warranted the formation of work groups, such as the Central Intake Workgroup. Results from these meetings have already helped to identify gaps in services, and help coordination between agencies. Topics addressed include: Code enforcement; rental licensing/vacant property registration; housing and demolition updates, local agency updates; Neighborhood Watch Updates from leaders and police; transportation issues. First Call 211 is Richland County's Information and Referral system operated by the Mansfield/Richland County Public Library in partnership with Richland County Job and Family Services. In the past, First Call 211 has demonstrated success by adapting its services to meet emergent community needs. For example, it served as the Communication Hub during natural disasters and assisted the City on a property tax re-evaluation project. Lastly, most of the partner agencies are members of the Countywide GIS consortium convened by the Richland County Regional Planning Commission. This group has provided access to software, data and personnel that would have been beyond the financial means of individually licensed political subdivisions. This consortium will serve as a model for replicating the central intake system on a countywide scale.

Applicant demonstrates Past Success ☑ Yes ☐ No

Scalable

Provide a summary of how the applicant's proposal can be scaled for the inclusion of other entities (5 points).

The greatest concentration of blight exists in the City of Mansfield, however, this project can be scaled up to address the entire county. The Mansfield Ontario Richland County Health Department, Richland County Codes Department, the Mansfield Richland County Public Library (First Call 211), and the Richland County Regional Planning Commission have all participated in the Central Intake Workgroup from its inception. Their early participation in the Workgroup and in partnering with the City in developing the program design allows the model to be scaled up easily. Also, the Richland County Regional Planning Commission currently convenes cities, villages and townships in the GIS consortium and offers a successful model of providing a countywide public service that is cost-shared and can be adapted to include all of the county's political subdivisions. The ultimate goal, if deemed feasible, is a similarly self-sustaining consortium model.

Applicant demonstrates a Scalable project ☑ Yes ☐ No

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

Replicable

Provide a summary of how the applicant's proposal can be replicated by other entities. A replicable project should include a component that another entity could use as a tool to implement a similar project (5 points).

This project will determine the feasibility of developing a replicable centralized complaint reporting system in other communities in Ohio. Particularly in rural counties with an urban county seat, this project begins where the blight is the most concentrated and builds on the successful adaptation of existing community assets (such as First Call 211) to be reconfigured to meet community needs for both urban and rural areas.

Interestingly, this project was initiated by local citizens who were concerned about the disconnected and confusing reporting system for complaints and blight conditions. Although desiring to see action on the part of local government, citizens felt local government were simply being unresponsive. The local governmental (both City and County) entities were frustrated that they were understaffed, under-resourced, and ill-prepared to meet such overwhelming demand, and also recognized that many times complaints were called into the wrong agencies. By convening in a regular and positive manner, a clear picture of outdated systems emerged with no way to easily share information, and cross agency duplication to address complaints was a common problem. The group explored utilizing shared technology for reporting violations, tracking complaints and reducing duplicative services.

The feasibility study will result in a step-by-step Guidebook for other counties and communities. The Guidebook will outline the process of implementing a web-based system for citizen complaint reporting and tracking, and will promote public/private problem solving and community asset mapping to identify optimal partners in replicating the model and outlining partner roles.

Applicant demonstrates a Replicable project ☑ Yes ☐ No

Probability of Success

Provide a summary of the likelihood of the grant study recommendations being implemented. Applicants requesting an implementation loan should provide a summary of the probability of savings from the loan request (5 points).

It is highly likely that the proposed study will result in the full implementation of the project, especially since the end users of the initiative are heavily involved in its design. The Central Intake Workgroup, including representatives from the City of Mansfield, Richland County, the Health Department, First Call 211, NECIC and residents from Neighborhood Watch, have invested significant time in this project and have come a long way in identifying current problems and systemic solutions. Additionally, support for developing a seamless, user friendly reporting mechanism has received broad-based support from residents as well as public and private agencies at every level.

Applicant demonstrates Probability of Success ☑ Yes ☐ No

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

Performance Audit/Cost Benchmarking
If the project is the result of recommendations from a prior performance audit provided by the Auditor of State under Chapter 117 of the Ohio Revised Code, or is informed by a previous cost benchmarking study, please attach a copy with the supporting documents. In the section below, provide a summary of the performance audit findings or cost bench marking study results (5 points).
N/A
Prior Performance Audit or Cost Benchmarking ☐ Yes ☑ No

Section 3 Project Information

Economic Impact
Provide a summary of how the proposal will promote a business environment through a private sector parter (5 points) and/or provide for community attraction (3 points).
The economic impact of blight is far reaching and results in the decrease of neighboring property values, increased vacant property, loss of jobs, fewer investments through business creation and higher crime. As a community that has already experienced the loss of thousands of manufacturing jobs, the most recent being 2,400 jobs lost in the 2009 closure of the local GM plant, Mansfield and Richland County have been hard hit by the economic downturn and have had difficulty gaining ground to make our communities and county attractive to new business and increased population. The aesthetic impact of abandoned properties is not easily calculated, but certainly has a negative aesthetic and economic impact, making the community less desirable for business growth and job expansion. Vacant and blighted housing also has adverse economic effects on neighboring property values making it harder to justify improvements by property owners, and resulting in higher homeowner's insurance premiums, mortgage rates, and making loans for home improvements more difficult. In some cases, being closely located to vacant properties can even lead to the cancellation or non-renewal of insurance policies. Other direct financial costs include demolition, fire and nuisance abatement, and police calls. Effectively eliminating blight conditions paves the way for improved quality of life, economic development, job creation and crime reduction.
Applicant demonstrates Economic Impact ☑ Yes ☐ No

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

Response to Economic Demand
Provide a summary of how the project responds to substantial changes in economic demand for local or regional government services. The narrative should include a description of the current and future expected servce level needs (5 points).
The City of Mansfield is in fiscal emergency, and Richland County's revenues have declined significantly. We are facing an increased number of blighted and vacant properties, yet we have reduced capacity to resolve the problems. The current system is confusing, inefficient, and frustrating to residents, so some residents have given up trying to report complaints. With a new Central Intake system in place, resident reporting is expected to increase, especially during the first year, as residents gain confidence in the system. Agencies will find it easier to coordinate services, respond to residents, reduce duplication, effectively plan responses to common complaint areas, and reduce costs.
Applicant demonstrates Response to Economic Demand ☑ Yes ☐ No

Section 3 Project Information

Budget Information

General Instructions

• Both the Project Budget and Program Budgets are required to be filled out in this form.

•Consolidate budget information to fit in the form. Additional budget detail may be provided in the budget narrative or in an attachment

Project Budget:

- The Project Budget should detail expenses related to the grant or loan project.
- The Project Budget justification must be explained in the Project Budget Narrative section of the application. This section is also used to explain the reasoning behind any items on the budget that are not self explanatory, and provide additonal detail about project expenses.
- The Project Budget should be for the period that covers the entire project. The look-back period for in-kind contributions is two years. These contributions are considered a part of the total project costs.
- For the Project Budget, indicate which entity and revenue source will be used to fund each expense. This information will be used to help determine eligible project expenses.
- Total Sources must equal Total Uses. Include staff time and other in-kind matches in the Total Uses section of the budget.

Program Budget

- Use the Program Budget to outline the costs associated with the implementation of the program in your community.
- Six (6) years of Program Budgets should be provided. The standard submission should include three years previous budgets (actual), and three years of projections including implementation of the proposed project. A second set of three years of projections (one set including implementation of this program, and one set where no shared services occurred) may be provided in lieu of three years previous if this does not apply to the proposed project.
- Please use the Program Budget Narrative section to explain changes in expenses and revenues, and to defend the budget projections. If the budget requires the combining of costs on the budget template, please explain this in the narrative.

Return on Investment:

- A Return on Investment calculation is required, and should reference cost savings, cost avoidance and/or increased revenues indicated in Program Budget sections of the application. Use the space designated for narrative to justify this calculation, using references when appropriate.

For Loan Applications only:

- Using the space provided, outline a loan repayment structure.
- Attach three years prior financial documents related to the financial health of the lead applicant (balance sheet, income statement and a statement of cash flows).

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Respor	Type of Request	Grant

Project Budget

Use this space to outline all sources of funds and the uses of those funds. Both sections should include all funds related to the project, including in-kind match contributions. Use the project budget narrative on the next page to justify the project budget, and indicate the line items for which the grant will be used.

Sources of Funds

LGIF Request:		$100,000
Cash Match (List Sources Below):		
Source:	CDBG(app pending)	$75,858
Source:		
Source:		
Source:		
In-Kind Match (List Sources Below):		
Source:	Work Group In-Kind - past	$13,975
Source:	Health Dept. In-Kind - future	$6,323
Source:	211 In-Kind - future	$20,000
Total Match:		$116,156
Total Sources:		$216,156

Uses of Funds

	Amount	Revenue Source
Consultant Fees:	$40,500	LGIF
Legal Fees:		
Other: Cloud based systei	$28,900	CDBG (18900)/LGIF (10000)
Other: City of Mansfield	$10,000	LGIF
Other: Health Dept	$11,323	LGIF (5000), in kind (6323)
Other: Marketing	$25,000	LGIF (5000), in kind (20000)
Other: City Admin	$2,000	LGIF
Other: Vacant Prop. Inven	$56,958	CDBG
Other: Work Group in-kinc	$13,975	Past in kind match
Other: Contract Svc. 211	$27,500	LGIF
Total Uses:	$216,156	
Local Match Percentage:	54%	

* Please note that this match percentage will be included in your grant/loan agreement and cannot be changed after awards are made.

Local Match Percentage = (Match Amount/Project Cost) * 100 (10% match required)

☐ 10-39.99% (1 point) ☑ 40-69.99% (3 points) ☐ 70% or greater (5 points)

Section 4 Financial Information

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Respon	Type of Request	Grant

Project Budget Narrative: Use this space to justify any expenses that are not self-explanatory.

Sources of Funds requested in FY 2013/2014
LGIF Request: $100,000
Cash Match Sources:
CDBG (Application Pending): $75,858.00 (2013-2014)

In-Kind Match (List Sources)
Work Group: $13,975
Health Department In-kind (future): $6,323.00
211 In-kind (future): $20,000.00

Uses of Funds requested in FY 2013/2014

Consultant Fees: $40,500 per year
• NECIC: $37,500 (LGIF) each year
- Feasibility Study; Guidebook development; Convener
• Richland County Regional Planning Commission $3,000 (LGIF) per year
- Technical Assistance for replicating countywide model
Web-based cloud services: $28,900 (CDBG - $18,900 and LGIF $10,000)
• Cloud based Citizen Reporting system & related costs
City of Mansfield: Wages and Fringes $10,000.00 (LGIF)
• City staff workgroup participants, planning, building, knowledge base, complaint tree, reporting
Health Department: $11,323 (LGIF $5,000) (In-kind $6,323)
• Health Department workgroup participants, planning, developing knowledge base, developing complaint tree, reporting,
Marketing: $25,000 $5,000 (LGIF) $20,000 (In-Kind)
• First Call 211: Radio Ads, Billboards, in-person presentations
City of Mansfield Administration: $2,000 (LGIF)
Vacant Property Inventory: $56,958 (CDBG)
Work Group In Kind: $13,975 (For preliminary workgroup time)
Contract Services:
• First Call 2-1-1 – Central intake, routing complaints/complaint tree, workgroup participation, knowledge base development
• Vacant Property Inventory (pending CDBG – 2013)

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

Program Budget

Actual ✔ Projected ___	FY_____	FY _____	FY _____
Expenses	**Total Program Expenses**	**Total Program Expenses**	**Total Program Expenses**
Salary and Benefits			
Contract Services			
Occupancy (rent, utilities, maintenance)			
Training & Professional Development			
Insurance			
Travel			
Capital & Equipment Expenses			
Supplies, Printing, Copying & Postage			
Evaluation			
Marketing			
Conferences, meetings, etc.			
Administration			
*Other -_____			
*Other -_____			
*Other -_____			
TOTAL EXPENSES			
	Revenues	**Revenues**	**Revenues**
Contributions, Gifts, Grants, & Earned Revenue			
Local Government: _____			
Local Government: _____			
Local Government: _____			
State Government			
Federal Government			
**Other - _____*			
**Other - _____*			
**Other - _____*			
Membership Income			
Program Service Fees			
Investment Income			
TOTAL REVENUES			

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

Program Budget

Actual ☐ Projected ✔	FY _____	FY _____	FY _____
Expenses	**Total Program Expenses**	**Total Program Expenses**	**Total Program Expenses**
Salary and Benefits			
Contract Services			
Occupancy (rent, utilities, maintenance)			
Training & Professional Development			
Insurance			
Travel			
Capital & Equipment Expenses			
Supplies, Printing, Copying & Postage			
Evaluation			
Marketing			
Conferences, meetings, etc.			
Administration			
*Other -_____			
*Other -_____			
*Other -_____			
TOTAL EXPENSES			
	Revenues	**Revenues**	**Revenues**
Contributions, Gifts, Grants, & Earned Revenue			
Local Government: _____			
Local Government: _____			
Local Government: _____			
State Government			
Federal Government			
**Other -* _____			
**Other -* _____			
**Other -* _____			
Membership Income			
Program Service Fees			
Investment Income			
TOTAL REVENUES			

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

Program Budget

Use this space to justify your program budget and/or explain any assumptions used for the budget projections. These projections should be based on research, case studies, or industry standards and include a thoughtful justification.

Per the Ohio Development Services Agency's instructions, the program budget will be submitted during the cure period.

Section 4: Financial Information Scoring

- [ ] (5 points) Applicant provided complete and accurate budget information and narrative justification for a total of six fiscal years.
- [ ] (3 points) Applicant provided complete and accurate budget information and for at least three fiscal years.
- [x] (1 point) Applicant provided complete and accurate budget information for less than three fiscal years.

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

Return On Investment

Return on Investment is a performance measure used to evaluate the efficiency of an investment. To derive the expected return on investment, divide the net gains of the project by the net costs. For these calculations, please use the implementation gains and costs, NOT the project costs (the cost of the feasibility, planning, or management study)--unless the results of this study will lead to direct savings without additional implementation costs. The gains from this project should be derived from the prior and future program budgets provided, and should be justified in the return on investment narrative.

Return on Investment Formulas:

Consider the following questions when determining the appropriate ROI formula for your project. Check the box of the formula that you are using to determine your ROI. These numbers should refer to savings/revenues illustrated in projected budgets.

Do you expect cost savings from efficiency from your project?

○ Use this formula: $\frac{\text{Total \$ Saved}}{\text{Total Program Costs}}$ * 100 = ROI

Do you expect cost avoidance from the implementation of your project/program?

● Use this formula: $\frac{\text{Total Cost Avoided}}{\text{Total Program Costs}}$ * 100 = ROI

Do you expect increased revenues as a result of your project/program?

○ Use this formula: $\frac{\text{Total New Revenue}}{\text{Total Program Costs}}$ * 100 = ROI

Do you expect some combination of savings, cost avoidance, or increased revenue as a result of your project/program? (Total Gains combines $ Saved, Costs Avoided, and New Revenue)

○ Use this formula: $\frac{\text{Total Gains}}{\text{Total Program Costs}}$ * 100 = ROI

Expected Return on Investment = $\frac{\$39{,}391}{\$38{,}431}$ * 100 = 102%

Expected Return on Investment is:

☐ Less than 25% (10 points) ☐ 25%-75% (20 points) ☑ Greater than 75% (30 points)

Questions about how to calculate ROI? Please contact the Office of Redevelopment at 614-995-2292 or lgif@development.ohio.gov

Section 4

Financial Information

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

Return on Investment Justification Narrative: In the space below, describe the nature of the expected return on investment, providing justification for the numbers presented in the ROI calculation. This calculation should be based on the savings, cost avoidance, or increased revenues shown in the program budgets on the preceeding pages. Use references when appropriate to justify assumptions used for cost projections.

The Total Cost Avoided is $39,391 based on:

• the reduction of time spent answering common questions by Health Department and County and City Code personnel estimated at $29,391

• the elimination of duplicating efforts by different agencies estimated at $5,000, and

• the ability of collaboration of City and County agencies to review reports generated by the software to identify key problems and areas to create an effective response is projected to save at least $5,000.

Our projected Total Program Cost after implementation in 2015 is $38,431. That will consist of the web-based software monthly cost of $1800 per month for a total yearly cost of $21,600. Our Central Intake cost for a year at 211 First Call is projected at $16,831.

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

Loan Repayment Structure

Please outline your preferred loan repayment structure. At a minimum, please include the following: the entities responsible for repayment of the loan, all parties responsible for providing match amounts and an alternative funding source (in lieu of collateral). Applicants will have two years to complete their project upon execution of the loan agreement, and the repayment period will begin upon the final disbursement of the loan funds. A description of expected savings over the term of the loan may be used as a repayment source.

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).

☐ Applicant clearly demonstrates a secondary repayment source (5 points)	☑ Applicant does not have a secondary repayment source (0 points)

Lead Applicant	The City of Mansfield	Round 5	
Project Name	Central Intake/Blight Response	Type of Request	Grant

Scoring Overview

Collaborative Measures	Description	Max Points		Applicant Self Score
Section 1: Collaborative Measures				
Population	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.	5		5
Participating Entities	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.	5		5
Section 2: Success Measures				
Past Success	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.	5		5
Scalable	Applicant's proposal can be scaled for the inclusion of other entities.	5		5
Replicable	Applicant's proposal can be replicated by other local governments.	5		5
Probability of Success	Applicant provides a documented need for the project and clearly outlines the likelihood of the need being met.	5		5
Section 3: Significance Measures				
Performance Audit Implementation/Cost Benchmarking	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.	5		0
Economic Impact	Applicant demonstrates the project will promote a 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).	5		5
Response to Economic Demand	The project responds to current substantial changes in economic demand for local or regional government services.	5		5
Section 4: Financial Measures				
Financial Information	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.	5		1
Local Match	Percentage of local matching funds being contributed to the project. This may include in-kind contributions.	5		3
Expected Return	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.	30		30
Repayment Structure (Loan Only)	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 fund, rainy day fund, contingency fund, etc.).	5		0
			Total Points	74

Resolutions and Letters of Support
In Support of the LGIF Central Intake Workgroup Application for
Mansfield/Richland County, Ohio

The following documents are included in this file:
Resolution from the Mansfield/Ontario/Richland County Health Department
Resolution from the Mansfield/Richland County Public Library
Letter of support from the Richland Community Development Group

The following documents are in process:
Signed partnership agreement with all collaborative partners
Mansfield City Council resolution
Richland County Commissioners resolution
Richland County Regional Planning Commission resolution
NECIC Board of Directors resolution

A-4

A RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT THE CENTRAL INTAKE WORKGROUP LOCAL GOVERNMENT INNOVATION FUND GRANT APPLICATION AND TO CONFIRM PARTICIPATION IN THE CENTRAL INTAKE FEASIBILITY PROJECT

WHEREAS, the Mansfield/Ontario/Richland County Combined Health District is a health district having all powers and duties conferred by law; and,

WHEREAS, Section 3701.01 of the Ohio Revised Code requires boards of health of general health districts to abate and remove all nuisances within its jurisdictions; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of Health of the Mansfield/Ontario/Richland County Combined Health District supports and agrees to participate in the efforts of the Central Intake Workgroup to study the feasibility of a Central Intake system to increase efficiencies and responsiveness of the multiple agencies involved with nuisances and blight in their jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Health of the Mansfield/Ontario/Richland County Combined Health District supports the submittal of the Central Intake Workgroup Local Government Innovation Fund Grant Application.

ADOPTED *this 25th day of February, 2013, by affirmation of the majority of the Mansfield/Ontario/Richland County Combined Health District Board of Health.*

Donald Bartlett
President – MORCHD Board of Health

Stan Saalman, Health Commissioner &
Secretary - MORCHD Board of Health

RESOLUTION NO. 2013-002 FEBRUARY 26, 2013

RESOLUTION FOR LIBRARY PARTICIPATION
IN THE CITY-COUNTY AGENCY INNOVATION
GRANT TO ELIMINATE BLIGHT

BE IT RESOLVED by the Mansfield/Richland County Public Library Board of Trustees that they fully support the grant proposal for the Governor's Innovation Fund for city and county agencies to work together on eliminating blight, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board that the Library, through its First Call 2-1-1 service, will participate in the project as the central intake for calls reporting blight, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board encourages collaboration for the Community's benefit.

Motion to approve the resolution by Mr. Behnke and seconded by Mrs. Coppersmith

Richard Otto
President

Judy Coppersmith
Secretary

March 4, 2012

Hon. Mayor Timothy Theaker
City of Mansfield
30 N. Diamond
Mansfield, OH 44902

Dear Mayor Theaker:

On behalf of the Richland Community Development Group (RCDG), I would like to submit this letter of support for the Central Intake Workgroup's Local Government Innovation Fund proposal.

The Central Intake workgroup is a subcommittee of RCDG's Citizen Action Sector convened by the North End Community Improvement Collaborative (NECIC). The Mansfield Richland County Public Library (First Call 211), several City departments, the Mansfield Ontario Richland County Health Department, Richland County Regional Planning Commission and Neighborhood Watch have been active and committed partners in developing a collaborative and effective response to blight to improve the quality of life for our citizens and encourage business growth and retention.

The timing of this opportunity allows Mansfield/Richland County to assess the feasibility of implementing the web-based centralized citizen complaint reporting system that the workgroup has been researching, determine the number of our vacant residential properties citywide and model our successful GIS consortium to roll the project out to include other cities, townships and villages within Richland County. With the development of a step-by-step Guidebook, we support your development of this initiative that can be replicated in other Ohio communities.

Sincerely,

John Brown
RCDG Board Chair