

2013-2014

City of Grant

Prepared By: Doug La Fave, City Manager



EVIP Category 2: Consolidation of Services (Previous Filer)

**Local Unit Name: City of Grant
Local Unit Code: 622015**

The City of Grant has a long history of collaborating with its neighboring communities and other organizations. Unfortunately some law makers and citizens choose to believe in old stereotypes that local governments do not collaborate and are inefficient with tax dollars. Nothing could be further from the truth in regards to the City of Grant. In some cases, certain services would not be possible without collaborating with our neighbors and partners. In other cases, the level of service that the City can provide through collaboration is much greater than if we had provided the service for just our residents. Many of the collaborative efforts have become routine business for the City of Grant. Finally, in some collaborative efforts, the benefits are more through coordination that enhances the service for each community than simply cost savings for the community.

It should be noted that some cost savings by collaborative efforts is difficult to calculate. The EVIP Revenue Sharing Statute requires this plan list the cost savings for each collaborative venture. The calculation of the cost savings often depends on perspective of the entity making the estimate and the set of assumptions about the level of service to be provided. For this report, the estimate of cost savings will be from the perspective of the City of Grant. The level of service is assumed to be the current level of service. The amount of cost savings is exact or estimated for FY 2013-2014.

This report identifies current collaborative ventures that the City of Grant is a member of. Each service description will include an estimate of the cost savings, either in dollars or enhanced level of services for citizens and businesses. In making the estimated cost savings calculation, the report will be focused on the cost savings to the City of Grant but may infer cost savings to other public entities. Lastly, this report will highlight several collaborative/consolidated concepts that the City has been working on or is receptive to, which could further enhance collaboration, cooperation and efficiencies with taxpayer dollars.

Previous Filed Collaboration Updates for FY 2013-2014:

- 1. Proposal Name: Newaygo County Economic Development Office (NCEDO):**
NCEDO is the economic development agency for the all the communities in Newaygo County and has been in place since 1999. By having a coordinated effort, the City of Grant receives a better level of service than could be achieved by running its own office. The City of Grant participates as a financial contributor and has representation on a governing board for not only economic development in the City or County, but the region as a whole.
 - a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant, City of Fremont, City of Newaygo, City of White Cloud, County of Newaygo, various Townships within Newaygo County, the Fremont Area Community Foundation and various private sector entities.
 - b. **Budget:** For the City, the expense is \$3,000 annually contributing to the NCEDO budget of around \$189,400 for its FY 13-14 (Oct-Sept.).

- c. **Benefits:** By working together, the level of service is much higher than we could undertake by ourselves even though City staff including the City Manager, Assistant Manager/Clerk and Treasurer/Deputy Clerk assist the countywide organization as needed. A bare bones estimate for a go-it-alone approach for the City of Grant for our own economic development employee may cost around \$35,000 to \$40,000 for a full time employee plus benefits (\$7,000) in our region. If supplies and other miscellaneous expenses were considered, an additional \$6,000 could be possible, placing a total price tag at around \$53,000. The go-it-alone approach would not be able to provide the same services and results as the collaborative approach. Funding such a position would not be financially feasible for the City since economic development would have to come from the general fund which has been constrained by the decline in State Revenue Sharing, Taxable Value loss from the 2008 recession and subsequent Headlee constraints to returning to 2008 funding levels.
 - d. **Cost Savings:** Estimated at ~\$50,000.
 - e. **Status:** Completed and ongoing.
 - f. **Barriers Experienced:** It has been difficult to get financial support from some Township governments. State Government also does not financially support local economic development organizations. A “revenue sharing” style formula to local economic development partnerships would help ensure more sustainability, coordination and implementation regionally and from a state level.
 - g. **Timeline:** Since 1999, the City has made a budget appropriation to NCEDO each May. This upcoming year the timeline will be May 2014.
2. **Proposal Name: Ashland-Grant Fire District:** The Ashland-Grant Fire District is a shared service agreement between the City of Grant, Ashland Township and Grant Township. The current contract is in place through 2016. Without a collaborative effort, it would be very difficult for the City and Townships to provide fire protection and first responder services. By working together, we all have a greater level of service.
- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant, Ashland Township and Grant Township.
 - b. **Budget:** The FY 13-14 (April-March) fire budget is ~\$139,450 of which the City of Grant contributed \$19,847.49.
 - c. **Benefits:** By pooling resources, we have a larger, better equipped department than we could otherwise afford. Without all entities working together the City would likely only be able to afford 1 truck and would likely have to raise more revenues.
 - d. **Cost Savings:** The City would likely have expenses in wages and equipment operating expenses around \$60,000 for a very small volunteer fire department that could be housed out of the DPW facility. With the current arrangement the City is likely saving around ~\$40,000 with the Joint Fire District.
 - e. **Status:** Completed and ongoing.

- f. **Barriers Experienced:** Contract amendment negotiations have at times been difficult. Dealing with private ambulatory service and dispatch has been a cost control problem with respect to dispatching most calls, notably medical calls as high priority calls because each entity has fear of litigation. Potential legal reforms at the State level could provide further cost savings.
- g. **Timeline:** Since 2006 the current contract has been in place with several amendments being approved since then. The current contract is in place until January 1, 2016.

3. Proposal Name: Newaygo County Central Dispatch Authority: Newaygo County Central Dispatch has been a successful collaboration between all the cities, townships and the county. Dispatch has become a very high technology field. It is difficult for any one unit of government to fund and operate a dispatch center by itself. To run a dispatch center, the city would need to hire at least 3 dispatchers and purchase modern dispatch center equipment. Currently Newaygo County is working on further expansion with other neighboring counties.

- a. **Key Partners:** Newaygo County, City of Grant, City of Fremont, City of White Cloud, City of Newaygo, Village of Hesperia and State of Michigan.
- b. **Budget:** The total budget for central dispatch is ~\$965,000. The center is funded through a surcharge on telephone lines and cell phone plans.
- c. **Benefits:** If the City were to create a dispatch center, we would not be able to afford the same level of service or use the sophisticated technology that is available in a collaborative effort. A more scaled back go-it-alone approach would cost the City of Grant around \$120,000 in wages and benefits to cover 24 hour coverage, estimated \$20,000 in operating supplies, upwards of \$200,000 for basic technological equipment, totaling an estimated \$340,000. The funding would have to come from a share of phone line surcharges and cell phone surcharges in the City and General Fund money that is not available.
- d. **Cost Savings:** ~\$300,000 depending on how much revenue is collected by the central dispatch authority from phone lines and cell phones that contribute to the authority.
- e. **Status:** Completed.
- f. **Barriers:** The MIC fees and other revenue that would have gone to other local government units for individual dispatch authorities is/was able to flow to the County for providing and running the service.
- g. **Timeline:** Completed and ongoing.

4. Proposal Name: City of Grant-Grant Public Schools Joint Diesel Fuel Purchasing: This is a joint venture between The City of Grant and Grant Public Schools to aid one another with purchasing power.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant, Grant Public Schools and local churches.

- b. **Budget:** The City DPW Fuel budget is \$8,000 for FY 13-14.
 - c. **Benefits:** With the City of Grant and Grant Public Schools purchasing diesel fuel in bulk together for plow trucks, buses and other heavy equipment we mutually benefit from economy of scale savings.
 - d. **Cost Savings:** Because fuel prices fluctuate regularly and at times drastically, it is hard to place an exact number on the savings. As of December 2013, the average consumers report for diesel rate in western Michigan was ~\$3.90 per gallon for diesel and the City's most recent invoice for diesel fuel from Grant Public Schools had the rate at \$3.15 per gallon. In calculating the difference in pricing from the annual DPW budget, with about \$4,000 in the DPW fuel budget used for diesel fuel, it saves the City ~\$769.23 per year in diesel fuel costs.
 - e. **Status:** Completed and ongoing.
 - f. **Barriers:** N/A.
 - g. **Timeline:** The contract is open ended and in place in perpetuity unless either party notifies the other with a 30 days' notice.
5. **Proposal Name: City of Grant-Grant Public Schools Winter Salt Agreement:** This is a joint venture between the City of Grant and Grant Public Schools to save money through cooperation and purchasing power.
- a. **Key Partners:** The City of Grant and Grant Public Schools.
 - b. **Budget:** The winter salt budget for the City for major and local streets for FY 13-14 is \$2,517.30.
 - c. **Benefits:** The City of Grant and Grant Public Schools get a price break by purchasing a larger bulk amount of salt instead of purchasing it separately. Grant Public Schools does not have a salt storage facility as the City does. Similar to the City/School fuel purchasing arrangement, the City purchases the salt in bulk and stores it and sells it at cost to Grant Public Schools as they need it.
 - d. **Cost Savings:** It's difficult to pinpoint the exact savings because salt is only purchased once a year and the prices can fluctuate dramatically from year to year, but we do know that by purchasing more to include the schools usage the rate is lower than if the City only purchased the lesser amount it needs.
 - e. **Status:** Completed and ongoing.
 - f. **Barriers:** Sometimes GPS staff ends up purchasing higher priced salt because it is more convenient for maintenance staff have it ordered/delivered to GPS vs. picking it up from the secured DPW facility.
 - g. **Timeline:** The contract is open ended and ongoing with no sunset date. Notification of either party would be required to end the collaboration.

- 6. Proposal Name: Newaygo County Geographical Information System:** Newaygo County GIS is funded by taxpayers within Newaygo County. The GIS Authority provides maps, aerial photographs and other address related information. The GIS Authority also provides a web interface for our residents to easily access the information. For the City of Grant and City of Newaygo a higher resolution aerial is available. The aerial photographs are used by the engineering staff, the assessor, zoning administration and economic development. The City contributed \$1,197. By cooperating in the agreements, we are able to receive aerial photographs every 10 years of the entire county with. Without the collaboration, Grant would not receive the aerial photographs as frequently nor at such a high resolution. The web interface makes the information available to our residents.
- a. **Key Partners:** Newaygo County, City of Grant, City of Newaygo and remaining Cities and all Townships that contribute data.
 - b. **Budget:** \$1,197 for the City, \$88,490 for countywide approach.
 - c. **Benefits:** Our joint effort has made it easier for developers to access key information about potential sites. It also makes it affordable for all the municipalities to have their GIS data available on the Internet. We have a consistent format that makes it easier for citizens and developers to use.
 - d. **Cost Savings:** If the City had to hire a consultant or staff to develop our own GIS system, it would be cost prohibitive. For the software and technology, it could be tens of thousands of dollars and annual maintenance would likely cost around \$8,000-\$10,000 at a minimum. Thankfully the partnership with Newaygo County has been great at benefitting all of their departments as well as other local sub units.
 - e. **Status:** Completed.
 - f. **Barriers:** None, other than financial.
 - g. **Timeline:** The next GIS flyover will be 2020. The City is current with Newaygo County until then with the GIS high resolution contribution.
- 7. Proposal Name: CMET drug enforcement team:** This is a multicounty drug enforcement effort. The City of Grant does not provide funding or a designated officer, but does work with CMET when they are working in our area and provide whatever assistance is necessary. CMET is a multijurisdictional drug task force. The team is administered by the Michigan State Police and has two local and three county agencies currently contributing manpower to the unit. CMET has eight sworn officers divided into two separate operational groups which are responsible for investigations in the unit's area. The jurisdictions serviced by CMET are: Ionia, Montcalm, Mecosta, and Newaygo Counties. Participating agencies include Big Rapids Department of Public Safety, Ionia County Sheriff's Department, Montcalm County Sheriff's Department, Newaygo County Sheriff's Department and Michigan State Police. Local units help when able or asked for assistance.

Without the collaboration, drug enforcement would not be undertaken. Our communities are too small for our officers to work in them for drug enforcement. Too many of our residents know all our officers.

- a. **Key Partners:** Newaygo County Sheriff's Department all local police agencies and Michigan State Police.
 - b. **Budget:** The City does not contribute monetarily, but equipment, time and labor should be considered when collaboration does occur.
 - c. **Benefits:** Without a collaborative effort, it would be very difficult for municipalities in Newaygo.
 - d. **Cost Savings:** Without the collaboration there would be a very expensive cost to all or some agencies that would undertake a specialty program alone. Specific cost savings are unknown due to in kind support built into regular public safety budgets.
 - e. **Status:** Completed, ongoing.
 - f. **Barriers:** Financial. Declining tax revenue and State Revenue Sharing (now EVIP) has made funding training, hours, etc... very difficult contribute at a reasonable level.
 - g. **Timeline:** As resources are available and there is a need for intergovernmental collaboration. Current and ongoing month by month each FY.
- 8. Proposal Name: City of Grant-Newaygo County Building Safety and Permits:** This is a partnership between the City of Grant, City of Fremont and numerous Townships within the county that partner with Newaygo County for handling building permits and safety inspections. This is funded by permit fees from each entity. This partnership enables each community to only handle zoning compliance permits and maintains a professional, unified entity that handles permits and inspections.
- a. **Key Partners:** Newaygo County, City of Grant, City of Fremont various Townships.
 - b. **Budget:** The budget for Newaygo County for this department in FY 2013-2014 is \$224,155.
 - c. **Benefits:** Our joint effort has made it easier for residents and developers to get zoning compliance permits from the local entity and utilizing one organization for all remaining permits and inspections. It makes sense for the local units because there is no budget appropriation needed. The County department is funded by the collective fees charged and collected from partner local units of government.
 - d. **Cost Savings:** If the City had to hire an inspector, even on an as needed basis it would be hard to see that it would be able to be completed without a general fund appropriation, which at this time of declining revenue would be impossible.

Beyond cost, this affords those who need permits access to professional staff and consistency that would not otherwise exist.

- e. **Status:** Complete and ongoing.
- f. **Barriers:** None.
- g. **Timeline:** This has been an ongoing collaboration for many years and continues.

9. Proposal Name: City of Grant-Grant Township Water/Sewer District: This partnership provides water to a Franchise district in Grant Township. The city maintains the water mains and handles all administration related to the section of the system. The Grant Township customer contributions to the City water system are minimal, in that there are only a handful of customers connected.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant and Grant Township.
- b. **Budget:** The City of Grant water operating budget is \$142,024 for FY 13-14 and of that township customers contribute around \$1,000.
- c. **Benefits:** It benefits the township customers who have access to City water that would otherwise have to spend thousands of dollars to replace wells/pumps and the City for contributing to the economy of scale of users.
- d. **Cost Savings:** The City benefits more from the economy of scale vs. actual financial participation.
- e. **Status:** Complete and ongoing. The City has a franchise agreement with Grant Township.
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** In 1994 the City signed a 30 year agreement with Grant Township which expires in 2024.

10. Proposal Name: City of Grant-Grant Public Schools shared crossing guard: This is a joint venture between the City of Grant and Grant Public Schools to provide cost effective safety to school children while walking to and from school.

- a. **Key Partners:** The City of Grant and Grant Public Schools.
- b. **Budget:** The annual budget for the crossing guard is ~\$1,800.
- c. **Benefits:** The City of Grant and Grant Public Schools are able to split the cost in half by each contributing to the pay of crossing guards, which adds to safety of children walking to school and financially to the two organizations.
- d. **Cost Savings:** Cost savings for the City is about \$900.
- e. **Status:** Complete and ongoing.
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** Has been in place since the early 1980's.

11. Proposal Name: Newaygo County Brownfield Authority: This is a joint venture between the local units of government a local foundation and the economic development office to help better utilize resources and work together.

- a. **Key Partners:** All cities, villages and townships in Newaygo County along with NCEDO and the Fremont Area Community Foundation.
- b. **Budget:** \$46,750 held by Newaygo County.
- c. **Benefits:** By working together NCEDO helps coordinate projects for each subunit in the county. If the City of Grant had a go it alone approach with its own Brownfield authority, the City would have to incur legal, audit, environmental and project expenses on its own.
- d. **Cost Savings:** It's hard to place a number specifically for the City, but it would at least be in the neighborhood of several thousands of dollars each year.
- e. **Status:** Complete and ongoing.
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** Completed in 2007.

12. Proposal Name: City of Grant-Newaygo County Sheriffs Dept Substation: The City of Grant offers access to its police station, use of computers, restrooms and interview facilities in southern Newaygo County.

- a. **Key Partners:** The City of Grant and Newaygo County Sheriff Department.
- b. **Budget:** The City does not charge for access, utilities, etc... In return the Sheriff's Department helps cover LEIN fees for the City because their officers use City technology. This saves the City about around \$1,100 per year.
- c. **Benefits:** This is a mutually beneficial relationship between City and County law enforcement. The City does not have a 24/7 police department and by having access to the City Police Department, County deputies have access to cover when City police officers may not be on duty. This also benefits surrounding populations outside of the City because a majority of the population in Newaygo County is in the southern portion of the County. Since the County seat is centrally located, this can provide a logistical issue from time to time with the Sheriff Department and areas that they cover to have a base of operations. By having access to a professional office environment at the City Police office, the surrounding areas are served better as well as a result.
- d. **Cost Savings:** The City saves some expense as related to LEIN fees, but both departments are served better with either personnel/coverage and office operating expenses.
- e. **Status:** Complete and ongoing.
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.

- g. **Timeline:** Completed in 2006.

13. Proposal Name: Worker’s Compensation Insurance: The City of Grant is a member of the Michigan Municipal League Workers Compensation Fund.

- a. **Key Partners:** Over 800 cities, villages, townships, counties and special districts.
- b. **Budget:** The City of Grant contributes around \$2,000-\$3,000 annually.
- c. **Benefits:** The Michigan Municipal League Workers' Compensation Fund is the state's leading provider of municipal workers' compensation and risk management services. The Fund has the lowest rates, the best claims service and the highest historical return of dividends of any insurer in Michigan. The Fund has more than 880 members, \$135 million in assets and more than \$65 million in net member equity. Efficient administration, effective loss control programs and proactive claims services have resulted in rates that are on average 50 percent lower than those of our nearest competitor.
- d. **Cost Savings:** Very difficult to estimate. As a member the City received dividends checks back when the fund is healthy and claims are down. It is unlikely that a private sector insurance company would return profits when funds are healthy. This in turn also helps keep rates low for the City.
- e. **Status:** Complete and ongoing.
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** The City is a current member.

14. Proposal Name: Newaygo County Hazard Management Plan/ NIMS: The City of Grant worked together with representatives from Newaygo County and the other municipalities to develop a hazard management plan for the County.

- a. **Key Partners:** Newaygo County (Emergency Services Dept.), cities, villages and townships within Newaygo County.
- b. **Budget:** Each partner contributed one or more staff people for a series of meetings and trainings.
- c. **Benefits:** The County took the lead in preparing the Plan. Without their lead, each community would have had to devote its resources to write their own plan. We estimate that it would have cost the City of Grant nearly \$3,000-\$5,000 to prepare its own plan.
- d. **Cost Savings:** This is hard to calculate, but in a collaborative effort it is likely by having the plan developed for the entire county it was less expensive than each entity creating their own.
- e. **Status:** Completed and ongoing when additional training is required.

- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** Completed.

15. Proposal Name: DPW Countywide Mutual Aid Agreement for Equipment Sharing:

Four Cities in Newaygo County have currently agreed and signed a DPW mutual aid agreement for sharing/utilizing equipment in need from one another. Items such as sewer vacator trucks/trailers, street sweepers are expensive and many private companies charge minimum hourly rates if needed which can drive up costs. By sharing equipment and employees at cost via hourly wages and Act 51 reimbursement rates, cities within Newaygo County will only have to pay actual costs of equipment instead of four hour minimums etc... the private sector charges for emergencies that sometimes last only a half hour.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant, City of Fremont, City of Newaygo and City of White Cloud. This group is working with other authorities and governmental units to add more in the future.
- b. **Budget:** There is no pre-set budget for equipment sharing.
- c. **Benefits:** Communities to not need to buy every type of equipment and can avoid expensive minimum rates by the private sector.
- d. **Cost Savings:** This varies widely depending on emergencies experienced and type of equipment and personnel needed.
- e. **Status:** Completed and ongoing.
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** Completed in 2012-Ongoing.

16. Proposal Name: IT Services: The City of Grant has partnered with the IT Director from Grant Public Schools which gives the City IT help on an as needed basis without having a full or part time employee on payroll. This arrangement also helps save the City money versus the private sector because there are no emergency call out fees, or trip fees for service, strictly time as needed.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant, Grant Public Schools IT Director
- b. **Budget:** City is spending approximately \$7,000 across department budgets for IT equipment and services in the current FY 13-14.
- c. **Benefits:** Great service without high call out fees or having to pay for a full or part time employee.
- d. **Cost Savings:** If the City had to hire a part time or full time IT only employee it would likely be anywhere in the range of \$20,000-\$45,000 split across departments. By partnering with the GPS IT Director, the City is able to have adequate IT services but also save money.

- e. **Status:** Complete and ongoing.
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** 2007 and ongoing.

17. Proposal Name: Grant Area District Library: Partnership of surrounding local government units for one public library authority.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant, Ashland Township, Grant Township, and Grant Public Schools (represents several portions of other townships)
- b. **Budget:** ~\$152,000 in expenses for FY 2013.
- c. **Benefits:** Greater collaboration amongst other local government units keeps the millage rate low with the economy of scale while also providing for a high quality facility and operations for the community, through educational opportunities, access to books, computers/internet and other services.
- d. **Cost Savings:** If the City ran its own library, a general fund appropriation would have to be made and the City would have to build or purchase its own building and operate it. It is difficult to estimate what the cost would be (estimate \$90,000). Currently there is a small millage and the services and revenues benefit from the economy of scale the service is available and without direct expense to the City General Fund.
- e. **Status:** Complete.
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** Completed in 2000.

18. Proposal Name: Police Services-Mutual Aid: The City of Grant and all surrounding departments have a mutual aid agreement that City Officers will respond to emergency only calls if City Officers are closer than State Police or County Sheriff Deputy to surrounding Townships.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant, Michigan State Police, Newaygo County Sheriff Department-Surrounding Townships.
- b. **Budget:** There is no financial tracking for this agreement by any partner department
- c. **Benefits:** The benefit is that if there is an emergency, the closest department-officer responds so that safety of citizens is not put at jeopardy because of jurisdictional boundaries.
- d. **Cost savings:** Without the mutual aid agreement in place, with the serious decline in revenue sources for public safety, the City would be forced to deficit spend in general fund operating or risk the possibility of no public safety service.

- e. **Status:** Complete and ongoing.
- f. **Barriers:** Sometimes politics or lack of understanding of budgets and community size from one community to another.
- g. **Timeline:** 1995 completed.

19. Proposal Name: Drug Testing: The City of Grant participates in the Michigan Municipal League drug and alcohol testing program for our employees who possess a Commercial Driver’s License (CDL). Under federal regulations, all employers who have positions that require CDL certification must have a random testing program for drugs and alcohol. Also, after most accidents, drivers are required to be tested for drugs and alcohol.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant, Michigan Municipal League, and many other Michigan cities.
- b. **Budget:** ~\$250.
- c. **Benefits:** By working together, not every community has to be an expert in all aspect of the rules. The pool provides administrative oversight and organizes the testing program. Having an outside pool select the candidates for testing helps ensure the randomness of those selected for testing. The benefit to the City is ensuring that we remain in compliance with State and Federal rules. If the City had to send employees to labs and pay lab fees it would likely cost ~\$600 per year.
- d. **Cost Savings:** \$350.
- e. **Status:** Complete and ongoing.
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** Completed and ongoing.

20. Proposal Name: City of Grant-District 10 Health Department: The City of Grant has partnered with the District 10 Health Department WIC program to lease community center office space so that the health department has an affordable location to serve residents of the greater Grant area

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant and the District 10 Health Department
- b. **Budget:** \$8,600-lease for WIC for FY 2013-2014.
- c. **Benefits:** The benefit to the health department is that they have access to office space and additional facilities for their operations and their rent and all utilities and maintenance/cleaning is bundled for them at \$8,000 per year. It costs the City \$12,877 per year to keep the building “open” with operating expenses like utilities, maintenance, etc... This arrangement helps the City with an anchor tenant and gives the health department a great facility at a low fixed cost. This agreement makes

financial sense for both parties while also providing community health services right in the center of the community.

- d. **Cost Savings:** There is really not a cost savings, more of a good utilization of the facility and the City's goal is not to make revenue off of the partnership but rather to cover utilities, supplies, etc...
- e. **Status:** Complete and ongoing.
- f. **Barriers:** Budget and expenses perception.
- g. **Timeline:** 2013 the lease was renewed.

21. Proposal Name: City of Grant-Newaygo County Equalization-Assessing Services: is a partnership between the City of Grant and Newaygo County Equalization Department. Previously the City had contracted with the private sector.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant and Newaygo County Equalization.
- b. **Budget:** The budget for the City is \$8,840 for assessing services.
- c. **Benefits:** Our joint effort has made it easier for residents and developers to get assessing services handled. Previously the contracted private sector assessor would be available several days a month and via telephone/e-mail. Now the City has access to an entire department of highly qualified and licensed staff that is open 5 days a week all day within the county. This has enhanced the level and access to citizens and businesses for the same cost.
- d. **Cost Savings:** The City has not saved money, but enhanced the level and access of the assessing services for the same cost for residents and businesses, thus providing more value for tax dollars.
- e. **Status:** Complete and ongoing.
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** Current agreement expires March 31, 2014. Renegotiations are in progress. Partnership has been in place since 2007.

22. Proposal Name: City of Grant-MiDeal/Federal Purchasing Program: This is a membership/partnership where the City of Grant can purchase vehicles or certain equipment and supplies at the volume bid discount of the State and Federal Government.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant, State of Michigan, Federal Government
- b. **Budget:** Depends on equipment and supplies needed.

- c. **Benefits:** The benefit is purchasing power. For example, if the City is purchasing a police car, we can get one from the State of Michigan bid, which saves the City money on the vehicle and the bid process.
- d. **Cost Savings:** Because of the economy of scale for purchasing, the City has always realized better savings vs. the “go it alone approach.”
- e. **Status:** Complete and ongoing
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** The City has been a member since 2008.

23. Proposal Name: City of Grant –Newaygo County Prosecutor Prescription Drug

drop-off : Newaygo County Prosecutor’s Office has partnered with local law enforcement agencies within Newaygo County to build and house prescription drug drop off containers. These containers are located at law enforcement sites around the County and are collected periodically in a collaborative effort to get unused prescription drugs out of households. Unused prescription drugs have been increasingly abused by teenagers and this segment of drug usage has been rising across the country.

- a. **Key Partners:** Newaygo County Prosecutor, City of Grant, City of Fremont, City of White Cloud, City of Newaygo, Village of Hesperia and Newaygo County Sheriff Department.
- b. **Budget:** N/A. Expenses covered through court fees collected by the Newaygo County Prosecutors Office.
- c. **Benefits:** A coordinated effort in a countywide approach offers a unified approach and multiple sites to try and get unused prescription drugs out of households.
- d. **Cost Savings:** If the City went alone on this venture, it would have to pay the full cost of the container and then all cost associated with transporting and disposing of the prescription drugs collected. At this time there is no dollar amount known, but currently the City has very little cost into the collaboration.
- e. **Status:** Complete and ongoing.
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** In place since 2012.

24. Proposal Name: Wellhead protection plan: The State of Michigan is encouraging all communities with water systems to develop wellhead protection plans and the City of Grant has one along with Grant Township which is to be considered by the District 10 Health Department. The purpose of the wellhead protection plan is to protect the water

source we use at the water treatment facility. Since our source water originates outside the city limits, it was important to include the entire aquifer that our water source draws on.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant, Grant Township, DEQ, District 10 Health Department.
- b. **Budget:** N/A
- c. **Benefits:** Protects water for many residents in several communities.
- d. **Cost Savings:** Cost savings is the wrong metric for wellhead protection. Collaboration is required for a good plan. Better and safer drinking water for the region is the goal. No cost savings will be generated.
- e. **Status:** Plan was completed with an update in process.
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** The plan update will be completed by fall 2014.

27. Proposal Name: Banners and decorations for downtown streetscape: The City of Grant has worked well with the Grant Area Chamber of Commerce to keep improving the image of the City and Greater Grant Area by focusing on fundraising and adding decorations and aesthetic elements to the core corridor of Grant along M-37 and Main Street.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant and Grant Area Chamber of Commerce.
- b. **Budget:** ~\$400.
- c. **Benefits:** American flags, Welcome to Grant banners, Welcome to Grant signs, holiday decorations and more to come have all benefitted the greater Grant Community and its image.
- d. **Cost Savings:** The goal is to promote the entire Grant Area and businesses with little cost to the city directly. The City has participated as a member and supplies staff to put up and take down aesthetic elements. It is certain that without the cooperative and collaborative efforts of the Grant Area Chamber of Commerce that none of these additions to the area would be possible.
- e. **Status:** This collaboration has changed as the Chamber of Commerce merged with other neighboring communities in 2013. The City has been given ownership of the decorations.
- f. **Barriers:** Financial.

g. **Timeline:** Ongoing. The City will continue the operations and maintenance.

28. Proposal Name: NCRESA-NCATS/City of Grant: The City of Grant has signed a 5 year collaborative lease agreement with NCRESA (Newaygo County Regional Education Agency) and their internet technology service they provide, NCATS. The Lease is for space as well as electricity from the City water tower.

a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant, NCRESA-NCATS

b. **Budget:** ~\$3,120 per year

c. **Benefits:** Provides low cost internet service to area residents and the City receives some much needed general fund revenue.

d. **Cost Savings:** Cost savings for NCRESA is about \$200,000. That is what a recent cell tower cost that was built in the City. For the City it provides some revenue and also provides better service and service options for internet in the community.

e. **Status:** Complete and ongoing.

f. **Barriers:** N/A.

g. **Timeline:** Agreement/lease signed 2012-2017.

29. Proposal Name: City of Grant and Newaygo County Road Commission Mechanic Services: The City has partnered with the Road Commission to have larger plow/dump trucks worked on.

a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant and the Newaygo County Road Commission

b. **Budget:** N/A.

c. **Benefits:** Provides lower cost per hour than they City has received from large mechanic shops in the region. Because the Road Commission is closer than the mechanic shops for large trucks in Grand Rapids and Muskegon and thus time and fuel is also saved. In turn the Road Commission makes some revenue and has more work for their mechanic staff.

d. **Cost Savings:** Cost savings are variable because costs depend on repairs that are typically not predictable. The City does realize a lower per hour labor charge and shorter travel distance.

e. **Status:** Current and ongoing.

- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** Current and ongoing.

30. Proposal Name: City of Grant and Newaygo County Road Commission Road Paving: The City has partnered with the Road Commission to receive more competitive pricing in regards to the economy of scale (volume) for City street repaving projects that align with the City’s PASER ratings and CIP planning.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant and the Newaygo County Road Commission
- b. **Budget:** FY 2013/2014, \$32,500
- c. **Benefits:** Because the City has partnered collaboratively with the County bids for tonnage of asphalt the economy of scale is larger and thus the price lower. The Road Commission bid was the low bid over private firms.
- d. **Cost Savings:** per ton of asphalt was lower compared to previous resurfacing projects because of the economy of scale. The original estimate was \$32,500 as the low bid when compared to submitted private firm bids and actual cost came in at \$28,619.25 or a \$3,880.75 savings on top of being the low bid.
- e. **Statuses:** Complete.
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** Complete for current FY.

31. Proposal Name: City of Grant Safe Routes to School Project: This program was collaboration between the Grant Public School System, City of Grant and other organizations. Its goal is to Increase the number of children hiking and biking to school. This is made possible by the installation of sidewalks along with an educational campaign to teachers, students, parents, and residents. Approximately \$179,000 (revised per MDOT accounting statement) of the construction was funded by a grant from MDOT and \$31,250 for engineering services was provided for from a grant from the Fremont Area Community Foundation.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant, Grant Public Schools, MDOT and the FACF.
- b. **Budget:** Total, approximately \$210,250.
- c. **Benefits:** The increased exercise will help to address childhood obesity and improve the overall health of children making them more ready to learn. It will also reduce traffic congestion and reduce greenhouse gases adding to the health of the community.

- d. **Cost Savings:** Approximately \$210,250 for costs related to engineering and construction of new sidewalk with no impact on any City budgets as it was completely grant funded.
- e. **Status:** Completed.
- f. **Barriers:** Educational.
- g. **Timeline:** Completed.

32. Proposal Name: Water System Extension: As contamination from leaking fuel stations and other contamination sources continue to move southeast out of the City limits, it will be imperative for the health and safety of businesses and residents southeast of the City in Ashland Township to connect to the City water system. The City will approach the Township, when needed, in accordance with the City Master Plan to extend utilities through an Act 425 Agreement so as to protect City utilities and infrastructure, while at the same time making sure that the Township does not lose any tax revenues.

- a. **Key Partners:** The City of Grant, Ashland Township, Michigan DEQ and U.S. EPA.
- b. **Budget:** N/A.
- c. **Benefits:** Increased economy of scale relative to costs for operating municipal utilities as well as health and environmental benefits for those who have and someday will experience well contamination.
- d. **Cost Savings:** There are no estimates at this time. When such notifications are made regarding contamination plumes, the City will work with the Michigan DEQ, U.S. EPA and Ashland Township to plan for expenses and construction of water mains and connections.
- e. **Status:** One property was annexed to provide water service and was completed in 1994. There are approximately 6-7 remaining properties in the direction of the contamination plume. This is an ongoing process/collaboration.
- f. **Barriers:** Jurisdictional/Taxes.
- g. **Timeline:** Ongoing. A month/date/quarter/year cannot be given with this type of collaboration because the actual timeline is dictated by the contamination plume, which has its own timeline the State DEQ has advised me they cannot accurately estimate for this report (Source Grand Rapids DEQ Office).

33. Proposal Name: Sharing of computer data bases and programming such as assessment programs and tax collection records through BS&A.Net assessing software: All the municipalities and the county use the same program for property assessments and tax collections. Each spring, both the assessments systems and the tax collections must be reconciled to the county's database. If the all the units were to use the system database and same system, each unit would save time in not having to reconcile between the local and county system. In addition, maintaining the names and mailing address for every parcel of land is difficult and time consuming. Having one database to maintain would save both the local units and the county time and effort.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant and Newaygo County (other local units also participating as well).
- b. **Budget:** ~\$600.
- c. **Benefits:** Online database sharing creates better efficiencies for staff and the general public.
- d. **Cost Savings:** The savings are difficult to accurately calculate for this report. Certainly staff time reduction to reconcile between the City and County databases is a savings. As well, and updates do not require physical trips between the County Office in White Cloud to the City of Grant, so equipment rental and mileage are no longer required.
- e. **Status:** Completed and ongoing.
- f. **Barriers:** Initial upfront costs.
- g. **Timeline:** Completed in July of FY 2012-2013 and is ongoing.

34. Proposal Name: Public utility layers to the GIS system: The City of Grant and Newaygo County GIS department sharing information for updating GIS boundaries, utilities, and parks for mapping.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant and Newaygo County (other local units also participating as well).
- b. **Budget:** In kind staff time.
- c. **Benefits:** Online database sharing creates better efficiencies for staff and the general public for a "one stop" location for mapping information.
- d. **Cost Savings:** The savings are difficult to accurately calculate. The Newaygo County GIS department has been a wonderful partner in working with local units for collecting local sub-unit data (like recreation parks mapping) and placing it on the public County GIS page for the benefit of everyone.

- e. **Status:** Completed and ongoing. Mapping link:
<http://gisweb.countyofnewaygo.com/recreationviewer/viewer.aspx>
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** Completed and ongoing.

35. Proposal Name: City of Grant Plowing M-37 through the City Limits: Currently the State of Michigan pays the Newaygo County Road Commission to plow the stretch of M-37 north and south through the City. If MDOT would agree to open up a cost comparison between having the City DPW plow M-37 versus the Road Commission, it would be possible that the State of Michigan could save some public Act 51 funds, while at the same time enhancing Act 51 funds to the City of Grant.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant and MDOT.
- b. **Budget:** N/A.
- c. **Benefits:** The City of Grant DPW plows City streets complete around M-37 running through the City and it could be a benefit to both MDOT and the City for the City to conduct this plowing and MDOT to reimburse/compensate this City.
- d. **Cost Savings:** Until there is a review from MDOT there is now way to know.
- e. **Status:** The City had contacted MDOT and the City was advised that MDOT is currently under contract with the Newaygo County Road Commission at this time.
- f. **Barriers:** Having both entities on the same page.
- g. **Timeline:** As of winter 2013 the City advised MDOT that we are interested in collaboration at anytime and for them to advise in the future.

36. Proposal Name: City of Grant and Michigan State Police substation: The City of Grant has expressed interest to the Newaygo State Police Post Detachment and Hart Post Commander that the City is willing to provide free access to use the City Police Station. Like many State agencies, unless they are directed to do something, they have taken this under advisement.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant and MSP.
- b. **Budget:** N/A.

- c. **Benefits:** The City would benefit from increased police presence as well as benefit from the experiences and knowledge that MSP Troopers could share with City Police staff. The State of Michigan would save the entire expenses related to office space as well as fuel. A professional environment for interviews, report writing, etc... would be available at no cost for MSP.
- d. **Cost Savings:** There would not be a direct cost savings to the City of Grant but better coverage would benefit the citizens of the area. MSP would save money because they would not have to pay for a lease, utilities, or office supplies.
- e. **Status:** The offer is still open.
- f. **Barriers:** MSP does not want to entertain the partnership.
- g. **Timeline:** The City was advised by the Hart, MI MSP Post that such an arrangement is still not of interest at this time. The City will reach out again this next summer (2014) as we start our new fiscal year and inquire with MSP to see if there is any interest.

****Update of proposals submitted in previous year 2013 EVIP Submission****

37. Proposal Name: M-37 Blight Elimination: True North Community Services-Center for Non-Profit Housing in conjunction with the City of Grant, City of Newaygo, City of White Cloud, and the City of Fremont partner on a joint effort to deal with for a Target Market Analysis (TMA) for inventory and community needs as well as demolition funds for blighted properties along the M-37 corridor.

- a. **Key Partners:** The City of Grant, City of Newaygo, City of White Cloud, The City of Fremont and the Fremont Area Community Foundation, True North Community Services-Center for Non-Profit Housing and MSHDA.
- b. **Budget:** N/A. The Target Market Analysis part of the collaboration grant was awarded and the total budget running through True North Community Services-Center for Non-Profit Housing is ~\$50,000. The remaining funding for the blight elimination-demolition was turned down by the private sector.
- c. **Benefits:** The first part, the Target Market Analysis would help each entity provide the community and developers of a cohesive inventory and needs study. The blight grant dollars would provide a targeted and cohesive approach to help eliminate some of the blight through the main transportation corridor through Newaygo County along M-37.

- d. **Cost Savings:** The Target Market Analysis study would save each City ~\$12,500. The blight demolition grant would have saved approximately \$15,000.
- e. **Status:** The Target Market Analysis funding was approved and is ongoing but the blight demolition funds were refused by the private property owner that would have benefitted.
- f. **Barriers:** For the blight demolition, the private sector participation was turned down.
- g. **Timeline:** The Target Market Analysis is ongoing and should be completed in the spring of 2014. The demolition was not accepted by the private sector participant and the funds instead went to another community.

38. Proposal Name: City of Grant-MDOT Parking Collaboration: The City of Grant proposes to offer the local MDOT TSC access to the City's secure-locked DPW facility to park and equipment they may have in the area so they are not left out unsecured during summer projects and subject to vandalism or long and expensive trips back to the TSC.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant and MDOT.
- b. **Budget:** N/A.
- c. **Benefits:** This consolidation would be another example of the City reaching out and working with other entities to help us all serve our mission to serve the taxpayers by being more efficient and saving money, even if it's not the City that realizes the actual financial savings, every citizen and business funds State agencies, thus in a roundabout way we are still saving money for local taxpayers. For MDOT, it would save fuel and other operating expenses related to State owned vehicles by allowing State employees working in the Grant area to leave the vehicles in a secured area.
- d. **Cost Savings:** There would not be a direct cost savings to the City of Grant but a cost savings in transportation expenses and employee travel time could be realized by MDOT.
- e. **Status:** The offer is still open.
- f. **Barriers:** An MDOT employee expressed interest to the Grant DPW Supervisor, but (his) MDOT Supervisor advised that although the offer was appreciated it was not needed.
- g. **Timeline:** The City reached out this past summer of 2013 and will reach out again this next summer of 2014 as we start our new fiscal year.

2014 required 1 new proposal to increase existing level of cooperation, collaboration, consolidation, innovation, or privatization either within the jurisdiction or with other jurisdictions

39. Proposal Name: City of Grant-Grant Public Schools Way finding Signage

Collaboration: Grant Public Schools has experienced problems with attendees of events at the Fine Arts Center finding the location off of the State Highway (M-37). The City had included Grant Public Schools and other public locations and partners previously. Because Grant Public Schools is not a local road authority, they could not make a request to MDOT for the needed signage. The City has met with Grant Public Schools and MDOT Officials and is planning on applying for the permit, purchasing, and installing the signage.

- a. **Key Partners:** City of Grant, Grant Public Schools, and MDOT.
- b. **Budget:** ~\$1,600.
- c. **Benefits:** This collaboration brings the three parties together to help provide a long term solution to a problem.
- d. **Cost Savings:** The City solicited a private sector proposal for the sign and installation, which totaled \$5,652. The City put together a proposal for the signage and having the City DPW install the signage (at cost, i.e. equipment rental and labor plus materials) which is estimated at ~\$1,600. Grant Public Schools has agreed to reimburse the City for the signage expenses and the City is “donating” the administrative time to coordinate the project. This collaboration will save Grant Public Schools approximately \$4,052.
- e. **Status:** Ongoing.
- f. **Barriers:** N/A.
- g. **Timeline:** The City of Grant will formally apply for the MDOT permit in January 2014. The collaboration project is anticipated to be complete during the month of April 2014.