EXHIBIT

RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION OF Hopkins County, TEXAS, AUTHORIZING THE AWARD OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICE PROVIDER CONTRACT FOR THE TEXAS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (TxCDBG) 2018 DISASTER RELIEF PROJECT.

WHEREAS, the 2018 Disaster Relief contract requires implementation by professionals experienced in the administration of federally-funded disaster relief projects;

WHEREAS, in order to identify qualified and responsive providers for these services a Request for Proposals (RFP) for administration services has been completed in accordance with TxCDBG requirements;

WHEREAS, the proposals received by the due date have been reviewed to determine the most qualified and responsive providers for each professional service;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1

- Section 1. That GRANTSWORK be selected to provide Texas CDBG application and project-related administration services for the 2018 Disaster Relief project.
- Section 2. That any and all contracts or commitments made with the above-named services providers are dependent on the successful negotiation of a contract with the service provider;

PASSED AND APPROVED ON 2019. **APPROVED:** COURT OF A County Judge ATTEST: A COMMISSION STATE County Clerk

Texas Community Development Block Grant

Phase Two Solicitation for Administrative Services

Evaluation of Proposals

Applicant Community:	Hop	kins C	ounty						
Evaluation Team:	Name of Evaluator						Title		
(at least three persons required,	Judge Robert Newsom Mickey Barker						County Judge Commissioner Precinct 1		
including one local official)									
	Greg Anglin						Commissioner Precinct 2		
	Wade Bartley						Commissioner Precinct 3		
	Joe Price						Commissioner Precinct 4		
	Shannah Walker						Hopkins County Auditor		
	Beth Wisenbaker						Grants		
Description of Anticipated Project:	2018 TDA DR								
Date Solicitation Sent:	March 22, 2019								
Responses received: ONLY PROPOSAL RECEIVED WAS FROM GRANTSWORK	Name of Firm						Date Response Received		
	GrantsWork						April 2, 2019		
		 Points awarded (if scoring was used on Form P506), or Evaluation such as Highly Advantageous (H), Advantageous (A), Not Advantageous (N), or Unacceptable (U). 							
x	•	Eval	uation	such	as H	lighl	y Advantageous (H), Advantag		
Name of Firm		Eval	uation	such	as H	lighl	y Advantageous (H), Advantag		
Name of Firm		Eval (A), I	uation Not Ad	such lvant	as Fageo	Highlous (1	y Advantageous (H), Advantag N), or Unacceptable (U).		
Name of Firm	Experience	Prior Work Performance	Capacity to Perform	such lvant	as Fageo	Highlous (1	y Advantageous (H), Advantag N), or Unacceptable (U).		
	Experience	Eval (A), 1 Lion Work Performance	Lapacity to Perform	such lvant	as Fageo	Highlous (1	y Advantageous (H), Advantag N), or Unacceptable (U).		
Firm Recommended:	Experience	Eval (A), 1 Lion Work Performance	Labacity to	Loposed Cost	Other Other	Highl ous (1 Other Other	y Advantageous (H), Advantag N), or Unacceptable (U). Notes	eous	
Firm Recommended:	Experience Experience Gran Gran * If Fin Coun	Eval (A), 1 Lion Mork Performance Performance	Labacity to	Loposed Cost	as H ageo Lageo Unper	Highl bus (1 Other Other O	y Advantageous (H), Advantag N), or Unacceptable (U). Notes mmended by Evaluators, provide explan No conflict	ation	
Firm Recommended: Firm Selected:	estimation of the second secon	Eval (A), 1 Lion Mork Performance Performance	Labacity to Perform Perform Perform Perform Perform Perform Perform	Loposed Cost	as H ageo Lageo Unper	Highl bus (1 Other Other O	y Advantageous (H), Advantag N), or Unacceptable (U). Notes	ation	