

State of Maine

Community Development Block Grant Program

2010 Public Infrastructure Grant Program Application Package



Office of Community Development
111 Sewall Street
59 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0059
Phone: (207) 624-7484
TTY: 1-800-437-1220

www.meocd.org

Public Infrastructure

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

See Page 6 for packaging instructions.
Include only those attachments requested by OCD

ONE ORIGINAL – Packaged in this exact order containing the Signed Cover Sheet with Certifications, Activity Designation Sheet, Application and Required Responses, Matching Funds Table with attached Letters of Commitment, Budget Summary, Public Hearing Record and Mandatory Attachments as directed.

SIX COPIES – Packaged in this exact order containing only the Application and Required Responses, Matching Funds Table with Letters of Commitment, Budget Summary, Public Hearing Record and Mandatory Attachments as directed.

MARGIN AND TYPE SIZE for all Applications must contain margins consistent with those in this Application document and be typed using a minimum size 12 Arial font on 8 1/2 x 11 inch paper.

MAXIMUM LENGTH OF REQUIRED RESPONSE SECTION OF APPLICATION

Applicants are limited to the three (3) pages provided in the Required Responses section of each Application and may use attachments only if specifically asked to do so.

NON-CONFORMING APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE SCORED



Public Infrastructure Application Checklist & Packaging Requirements

Use this to make sure your Application contains all required submissions and is packaged in the proper order!

A complete original application consists of the following items packaged in this exact order. The six copies minus the Cover Sheet and Activity Designation Sheet must also be packaged in the same order starting with the Application and Required Responses.

- Cover Sheet with original signature;
- Activity Designation Sheet;
- Application Page;
- Responses to the Impact, Development Strategy, and Citizen Participation sections. (**You may only use the three pages provided.**);
- Matching Funds Table with attached letters of commitment;



Budget Summary;



Public hearing record including the published public hearing notice, attested hearing minutes and attendance list – **The Public Hearing Notice must comply with sample notice contained on page 23 of this application package**



Mandatory professionally prepared engineering and/or health/safety report documenting conditions which warrant the project; and



Mandatory engineering design report and cost estimates.

**STATE OF MAINE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT
COVER SHEET AND CERTIFICATIONS**

Public Infrastructure Grant Program

A. Applicant Identification

Applicant:	Town of Amherst		
Address:	P.O. Box 40		
Town/City/County:	Amherst, ME		
Zip Code:	04605		
Chief Executive Officer:	Denney Honey, 1 st selectman		
Phone Number:	584-2980	E-mail:	honeydustylr@yahoo.com
Contact Person:	Greg Palman		
944-2369		E-mail:	glpalman@rivah.net
Census Tract(s) Where Proposed PI Activities will occur: 965100			

B. The Applicant Certifies That:

1. State Certifications

- a. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the information in this Application is true and correct;
- b. the governing body of the applicant has duly endorsed the document;
- c. a local cash match that directly relates to the proposed activity and is the equivalent of 25 percent of the project grant award will be provided if the applicant is invited to proceed. This match may consist of all non-CDBG loans, grants, endowments, etc. contributed to the project.
- d. the proposed project has been reviewed and it complies with the Community's comprehensive plan and/or applicable state and local land use requirements;
- e. it will work with the Office of Community Development to develop a detailed project if it receives a conditional award; and
- f. it will comply with all applicable State laws and regulations.

2. Federal Certifications

- a. it will take actions to affirmatively further fair housing and implement CDBG activities in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968;
- b. it will not attempt to recover capital costs for the construction of public improvements, assisted in whole or in part with CDBG funds, by charging special assessments or fees against properties owned and occupied by persons of low and moderate income, including any fee, charge or assessment made as a condition of obtaining access to such public improvements, unless:

- (i) CDBG funds are used to pay the proportion of such fee or assessment that relates to the capital costs of such public improvements that are financed from revenue sources other than CDBG funds; or
- (ii) for purposes of assessing any amount against properties owned and occupied by persons of low and moderate income who are not persons of very low income, and the applicant certifies that it lacks sufficient CDBG funds to comply with the requirements of clause (i) above.

c. prior to expenditure of CDBG funds, it will establish a local community development plan that identifies the Community's housing and community development needs, including the needs of low and moderate income, and the activities to be undertaken to meet them;

d. it will provide in a timely manner for citizen participation, public hearings, and access to information with respect to the Maine CDBG Program and the proposed local CDBG project/program. Indicate in public notices and at public hearings that the State program is competitive, the maximum grant amount that can be requested, and the general type of activities contained in the proposed local program. Also announce in public notices the availability of the local program plan/application, describe the Community's previous CDBG performance (if any), and how the Community will collect, consider and maintain all oral and written comments received on the proposal;

e. it will adopt and follow a residential anti-displacement and relocation assistance plan which complies with Section 104 (d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, that at a minimum provides for the replacement of all low/moderate income dwelling units that are demolished or converted to a non-LMI housing use as a direct result of CDBG assistance, and a relocation assistance component;

f. it is not listed on U. S. Dept of Labor's Debarred and Suspended Contractor's List and will not employ contractors or subcontractors on this list;

g. it will comply with the requirements of Section 319 of Public Law 101-121 regarding government-wide restrictions on lobbying; and

h. with the exception of administrative or personnel costs, it will verify that no person who is an employee, agent, consultant, officer, or elected official or appointed official of state or local government or of any designated public agencies, or subrecipients which are receiving CDBG funding may obtain a financial interest or benefit, have an interest in or benefit from the activity, or have an interest in any contract, subcontract or agreement with respect to CDBG activities.

	Amherst	
Signature of Chief Executive Officer	Name of Community	Date: mm/dd/year

PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT PROGRAM ACTIVITY DESIGNATION SHEET

1. Activity Declaration

a. List the activities you will be doing in your proposed project: road reconstruction (Activity Group 3)

b. Are all activities in the same group (see list below)? Yes No

PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE ACTIVITY GROUPS

(Check box next to applicable activity group.)

Activity Group 1 - \$500,000: Water system installation/improvements, Sewer system installation/improvements, Water/sewer system hookups*, Storm Drainage, Utility infrastructure

*(As a housing rehabilitation activity completed in conjunction with and as part of a public infrastructure project)

Activity Group 2 - \$500,000: Infrastructure in support of new LMI housing

Activity Group 3 - \$100,000: Street/roads/sidewalks, Parking, curbs and gutters

2. Multi-Jurisdictional Declaration

a. Is this a multi-jurisdictional project? Yes No

b. If yes, which local government has been designated as the lead applicant? _____

c. If yes, list all participating or benefiting local governments. _____

NOTE: Remember all participating or benefiting local governments must sign the Cover Sheet Certification Form.

3. Is this a multi-jurisdictional project? Yes No

b. If yes, which local government has been designated as the lead applicant? _____

c. If yes, list all participating or benefiting local governments. _____

4. Location of Growth-Related Capital Investments (PL 776)

a. CDBG financed growth-related capital investments may only be made in specific locations as per title 30-A MRSA 4349 as listed below:

- A locally designated growth area as defined in an adopted comprehensive plan consistent with the Growth Management Act.
- In the absence of a consistent comprehensive plan:
- An area served by a public sewer system with the capacity to absorb the growth-related project
- A census-designated place

- A DOT urban compact area

Is the proposed project located in one of the above areas? Yes No

Explain Amherst is a small, rural town with no designated growth area

b. Projects not located in these four specific locations may receive funding under the following conditions.

- To remedy a threat to health and safety
- A project related to a commercial or industrial activity that due to its nature is typically located away from other development or relies on a particular natural resource for its operation. Examples might include sawmills, farms, or aquaculture.
- Industries that must be located near an airport, port, or railroad line
- A tourist or cultural facility that must be at or near a particular historic, cultural or natural site.
- Projects in communities that received grants from SPO within the previous two years to complete comprehensive plans
- Projects in communities that requested funds from SPO prior to January 1, 2000 to complete a comprehensive plan but did not receive a grant to assist in the preparation of a plan.
- Housing projects that serve persons with handicaps, foster children, homeless persons, and others as outlined in the law.
- A pollution control facility.
- A project with no feasible location within the four areas outlined in (a) or fitting any of the exceptions in (b), *if* DECD's commissioner certifies to the Land and Water Resources Council that unique needs of the agency require state funds for the project. A majority of the Land and Water Resources Council's membership must vote to approve the project.

Does the proposed project meet one of the above **exceptions**? Yes No

Explain the road conditions pose a threat to health and safety

**State of Maine
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM
PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE
APPLICATION**

1. Applicant:

Name: Amherst
Street/PO Box: P.O. Box 40
Town/City: Amherst, ME
Zip Code: 04605
Chief Executive Officer: Denney Honey
Phone #/e-mail Address: 584-2980 / honeydustylr@yahoo.com
Contact Person: Greg Palman
Phone #/e-mail Address: 944-2369 gpalman@rivah.net

2. Utility Company (if applicable)

Name: _____
Street/PO Box: _____
Town/City: _____
Zip Code: _____
Chief Executive Officer: _____
Phone #/e-mail Address: _____
Contact Person: _____
Phone #/e-mail Address: _____

Amount of CDBG Program Request: \$100,000

Total project cost: \$187,000

Please refer to Section D. 1-3 contained on Pages 9-10 of this Application Package for additional guidance in completing the following Required Responses section.

REQUIRED RESPONSES

Impact (30 points): why project is necessary. *This project is necessary to address public safety problems arising from poor conditions on the entire 1.5-mile segment of the Tannery Loop Road. The town has been doing piecemeal work on its 4 miles of public ways. Due to very limited revenue the town has been unable to complete this work in a comprehensive manner. The town has been spending an average of \$20,000 a year on road maintenance or about 5 percent of its total municipal budget of \$438,000. The price of asphalt has tripled to \$89 a ton in recent years. This means the town's road budget can accomplish far less than was once the case. The town of Amherst operates on a bare bones budget. About 60 percent of its expenditures are for health, safety, and education. This leaves little discretionary money. The road conditions will deteriorate further as the years go on, making it even more costly to repair. The time to do the work is now.*

How conditions were verified: *An analysis of road conditions was prepared by Roger Picard Associates. A copy of this study is attached.*

How conditions affect users: *The poor condition of the road poses several health, safety and welfare issues. The deteriorated condition of the roadbed makes safe passage difficult. Sinkholes that "could swallow a car" appear in the spring as well as major frost heaves. This is a particular problem for emergency vehicles. Winter travel is especially hazardous since snow, slush, and ice accumulate in ruts and pockets. Due to the poor quality of the road surface, the speed at which emergency vehicles can travel is slowed. Since the road borders one of the few segments of the Union River where public access is possible and it also is the public way closest to the 5,000-acre Amherst Mountains Community Forest, which is managed by the Bureau of Public Lands, traffic is expected to increase.*

Amherst is an inland town with an estimated 2008 year-round population of 227 compared to 235 in 2004 and 232 in 2000. This population decline limits the prospects for relief to the property tax burden. This means that the property tax increases necessary to complete the road improvements in a prompt and cost-effective manner are not acceptable. Residents are already struggling to pay for the current costs of running municipal government. Given that 55 percent of Amherst's households are LMI, they are strongly affected by poor road conditions.

Size/make-up of the target area: *While the project focuses on a 1.5-mile segment of road, the target area is the entire town since the road is used by all residents plus visitors. Amherst is economically depressed. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the town had a poverty rate of 14.9 percent compared to 10.2 percent for the county. Housing values are less than the county median (The Census reported \$65,000 for Amherst in 2000 compared to \$108,600 for the county). The Census also reported that the median household income in Amherst was \$26,042 compared to \$35,811 for the county as a whole. The town has virtually no employment base and residents face longer commutes than the county as a whole. In 2000 the mean commute time for Amherst residents in 2000 was 30.8 minutes compared to 22.4 minutes for the county.*

Why PI funds are necessary/how other funding sources will work: *PI funds are necessary due to the severe fiscal constraints the town faces. Town presently has a 16 percent property tax delinquency rate (or \$40,500 in unpaid taxes). Motor vehicle excise tax payments were for the 2009 tax year about \$5,000 below the budgeted amount of \$40,000. The tax base is further limited by the acreage held in tree growth taxation. According to the 2008 Municipal Valuation Return Statistical Summary, 19,444 acres were held in tree growth in Amherst. This amounted to about 72 percent of the town's 26,856-acre total land area. This is the second highest percentage of land held in tree growth in Hancock County (only Great Pond has a higher percentage).*

These fiscal constraints notwithstanding, the town has authorized the expenditure of \$87,000 in local funds through a town meeting appropriation for this project. This will match the \$100,000 sought in CDBG funds. The total municipal appropriation, which represents an accumulation of several years of reserve funds, was \$100,000. The select board voted, after the public hearing described below, to allocate \$87,000 of the \$100,000 municipal appropriation to this project. This large appropriation is indicative of the importance of this project to the town. The local funds will be blended with the CDBG funds and used for the project jointly. The town has already started bush clearing along the road and done some preliminary digging out of roadside ditches. This in-kind work is in addition to the funds raised as local match.

Development of Strategy (30 points):

Proposed improvements, CDBG and local funds would be used to reconstruct Tannery Loop Road. The details of the improvements are discussed in the attached engineer’s report.

Impacts on health/safety: The primary impacts would be removal of safety hazards and replacement of a deficient roadway with one that meets MaineDOT design standards for local roads. As a result of the investment in CDBG funds, users would benefit from improved vehicular travel and reduced wear and tear on their vehicles.

Financial benefits: This project would have several financial benefits to the predominantly LMI residents of this town. First, the improved road system would reduce wear and tear on residents’ vehicles. Second, it would improve emergency vehicle access by increasing safe travel speeds. Third, the investment of CDBG dollars would allow the road improvements to be made in a comprehensive manner rather than a simple “paint job” of asphalt on top of a deteriorated roadbed. This would reduce long-term road maintenance costs since the entire road would have a solid base.

Project timeline: The proposed timeline is presented below. Activities taking place on or before January 2010 have already been accomplished:

PROPOSED TIMELINE		
Activity	Date	Responsibility
Authorize Expenditure of \$100,000 in funds for local roads	September 26, 2009	Town meeting vote
Obtain cost estimates and engineering specs	January 2010	Town/consulting engineer
Select board authorizes spending of \$87,000 of \$100,000 in local road funds as CDBG match	January 13, 2010	Select board
CDBG Award Announced	March 2010	ME OCD
Initiate Phase II work	April 2010	Town/OCD
Environmental Review	May – June 2010	Town/grant administrator
Complete Phase II work	May-June 2010	Town/grant administrator
Preparation of bid specs	June 2010	Engineer
Solicit bids	June 2010	Town/grant administrator
Award contract	July 2010	Town
Construction phase	July-October 2010	Engineer/administrator
Construction oversight	July-October 2010	Engineer
Close out	November-December 2010	grant administrator

3. Citizen Participation (20 points) How citizen participation relates to identification of solution: *In a town of 227 residents, citizen participation occurs in a largely informal manner. The select board has been receiving complaints about the poor condition of the Tannery Loop Road for several years. Residents have also made clear that their ability to endure the higher rate of taxation necessary to fund the project entirely with local funds is very limited. This made the choice of seeking CDBG PI money the best approach. Voters have supported this project through their pocketbook by authorizing the expenditure of \$100,000 in road funds at the September 26, 2009 town meeting. This amount was the source of the \$87,000 appropriated as local match for this project. As will be discussed under the Relevance of Meetings section, there was strong support for the expenditure of the local match.*

Effective use of media: *Amherst does not have any full-time staff or a town newsletter, Cable TV channel or high speed Internet. It did announce the public hearing on the town web site and in the Bangor Daily News. This helped boost attendance at the public hearing. There was also considerable spreading of news of the proposed project by word of mouth. It was a common topic of discussion at the Amherst general store where residents stop for their morning coffee or to buy gasoline. What ever the causal link, the public hearing attracted 33 people (or 14.5 percent of the estimated year-round population) at 6:00 PM in 14-degree weather. This is far more than the average of ten to sixteen-person attendance at the annual town meeting. There were even some new arrivals in town, who are generally less connected to the informal channels of communication that connect long-term residents.*

Relevance of listed meetings: *Attendees at the public hearing expressed strong support for the project. Comments focused on the importance of improving the Tannery Loop Road and addressing its poor conditions. One person asked why the town didn't pave its gravel roads first. It was explained that there were a greater number of homes on the Tannery Loop Road so that project would have the highest impact per dollar spent. Another individual expressed concern about the federal debt and if the town were not worsening the debt situation by accepting the money. In response it was stressed that deferring expenditures would merely increase future costs. Apart from these two individuals the support was overwhelmingly positive.*

Involvement LMI project beneficiaries: *Since the majority of the town is LMI, these beneficiaries have been involved throughout the process. Their opinions have been expressed most strongly at the annual town meeting where roads typically consume about one-half hour of discussion, more than any other topic. LMI residents also contact the select board members informally during monthly select board meetings or during chance encounters at the general store.*

How other local resources (cash and in-kind) relate to project: *The entire match (\$87,000) consists of municipal tax dollars whose expenditure was authorized at the annual town meeting. Select board members also donated their time in drafting the application. As mentioned above, the town has already done brush clearing for this project (in 2008). This had an estimated value of \$2,000. In 2009, the town spent \$2,800 on brush work on the nearby Smith Road.*

Community Development Block Grant Program

Matching Funds Table (Include Fully Secured Cash Commitments Only)

Funding Source	Grant/Loan	Amount	Terms of borrowing or bond sale
CDBG	Grant	\$100,000	Not applicable
Town meeting appropriation	Cash raised	\$87,000	Not applicable
TOTAL:		\$187,000	

Letters of Commitment for all Cash Matching Funds listed must be attached to this table.

Submit a copy of this Matching Funds Table and all letters of commitment with the original and all six copies of the application.

Budget Summary (Include Cash & In-Kind)

Cost Category	Column 1 CDBG	Column 2 Local	Column 3 State	Column 4 Utility	Column 5 Non-CDBG Federal	Column 6 Other	Column 7 Cost Category Total
Land Acquisition							
Legal Expenses							
Appraisals							
Relocation							
Demolition							
Site Work							
Architectural							
Engineering		\$8,500					\$8,500
Phase III Administration	\$4,000	\$4,735					\$8,735
Construction	\$95,000	\$71,765					\$166,765
Materials							
Equipment							
Inspection							
Other (List)							
1. Phase II Administration	\$1,000	\$2,000					\$3,000
2.							
3.							
TOTAL COSTS							\$187,000

Directions for Completing Budget Summary

1. For each applicable cost (cash and in-kind) in the Cost Category column, list the projected dollar amount for all applicable funding sources in columns 1-6.
2. List the total dollar amount for each cost category in column 7, Cost Category Total
3. Enter the total of all Cost Category amounts in column 7 in the TOTAL COSTS box directly under column 7.
4. **Submit a copy of this Budget Summary with the original and all five copies of the application.**