



ISS ESG



# ISS ESG MUNI QUALITYSCORE



TITLE

METHODOLOGY



ISS-ESG.COM

© 2019 | Institutional Shareholder Services and/or its affiliates



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

METHODOLOGY FOR CALCULATION OF RANKINGS AND ESG SCORES.....	3
FREQUENCY OF UPDATES FOR RANKING DATA.....	3
DATA UTILIZED IN CALCULATION OF SCORES FOR RANKINGS AND ESG SCORES.....	3
RANKING AND ESG SCORES .....	7
SCORING DETAILS FOR RANKING AND PEER ESG SCORES .....	7
SCORING DETAILS FOR DYNAMIC ESG SCORES.....	8
ESG SCORES BY ISS ESG .....	10
SOURCES OF DATA UTILIZED BY ISS ESG .....	12

## METHODOLOGY FOR CALCULATION OF RANKINGS AND ESG SCORES

Individual scores are calculated for each of the following seventy-two (72) data inputs below. Individual scores determine the ranking for each City/Town, County, State, and School District, both statewide, and nationally, for each data input. Each individual score is then combined to create one final value (total score) per City/Town, County, State, and School District - the total or final score is then utilized to determine the final Ranking, and ESG score for each these respective entities.

Scores are calculated by summing the total from all Cities/Towns, Counties, States, and School Districts for the variable in question and then determining the individual City/Town, County, State, or School Districts weight, or contribution to the total. By determining the relative value for each variable (i.e. score), the ISS ESG Muni QualityScore can determine the correct final Ranking, and ESG score for each City/Town, County, State, and School District, while not simply depending on the underlying ranking

### FREQUENCY OF UPDATES FOR RANKING DATA

ISS ESG Muni QualityScore rankings are updated no later than thirty days following standard fiscal quarter dates to reflect the new releases of any Census data and data utilized from quasi government sources.

***Current rankings are provided utilizing data up to and including December 31, 2020***

## DATA UTILIZED IN CALCULATION OF SCORES FOR RANKINGS AND ESG SCORES

### ESG Factor - Social

#### Demographics (11)

- Population - (change from 2018 to 2019)
- Population - (average annual change 2009 - 2019)
- Median Income - (change from 2018 to 2019)
- Median Income - (average annual change 2010 - 2019)
- Unemployment rate (2019)
- Unemployment rate - (change from 2018 to 2019)
- Unemployment rate - (average annual change 2010 - 2019)
- Racial Employment Parity score - (2019)
- Gender Employment Parity score - (2019)
- Poverty rate (2019)
- Poverty rate - (change from 2018 to 2019)

- Poverty rate - (average annual change 2010 - 2019)
- Gini Index (Income Distribution) (2019)

## ESG Factor - Governance

### Financial (2)

- County Debt per Resident - (2017)
- County School District Debt per Student - (2018)

### Industry (2)

- Industry Concentration Risk - (2017)
- Firm Concentration Risk - (2017)

## ESG Factor - Environmental

### Environment (18)

- Air - Climate Change exposure in regard to Ragweed, and Ozone (Q3 2018)
- Water - Climate Change exposure as projected by 2050
- Coastal - Climate Change exposure in regard to rising Sea levels
- Heat Index - Climate Change exposure in regard to rising Heat levels
- Incinerators – Solid Waste tonnage burned per day (Q4 2019)
- Declarations of Disaster – (review from 2009 to Q3 2020)
- Drought Conditions (Q4 2020)
- Superfund sites (September 2020)
- Fracking Wells (Q4 2017)
- Flood Risk (2017)
- Water Usage 2015 – released 06/2018
- Coal Ash Ponds / Landfills
- Emissions from Power Plants (CO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>) – three measures
- Dams at risk of failure (2019)
- Bridges deemed Structurally Deficient (2019)
- Lyme Disease (Q4 2018)

## **ESG Factor - Social**

### Health (7)

- Counties identified by Center for Disease Control (CDC) at risk (Q4 2017)
- Safe Drinking Water Violations (review 2009 to Q3 2020)
- Percentage of Population diagnosed with Diabetes (CDC) 2018
- Drug Overdose Mortality Rates (December 2017)
- Opioid Prescription Rates (December 2016)
- Cancer Incidence Rates (2012 – 2017)
- Obesity levels (2018)

### Home Ownership (6)

- Home Ownership as a percentage (2019)
- Home Ownership as a percentage - (change from 2018 to 2019)
- Home Ownership as a percentage - (average annual change 2010 – 2019)
- Vacant Housing as a percentage (2019)
- Vacant Housing as a percentage - (change from 2018 to 2019)
- Vacant Housing as a percentage - (average annual change 2010 - 2019)

### Housing Values (3)

- Median Housing Values – (change from 2018 to 2019)
- Median Housing Values – (average annual change 2009 – 2019)
- Median Income as a percentage of Median Housing Values (2019)

## **ESG Factor - Governance**

### Real Estate Taxes (6)

- Real Estate Taxes as a percentage of Median Housing Values (2019)
- Real Estate Taxes as a percentage of Median Housing Values - (change from 2018 to 2019)
- Real Estate Taxes as a percentage of Median Housing Values - (average annual change 2010 – 2019)
- Real Estate Taxes as a percentage Median Income (2019)
- Real Estate Taxes as a percentage Median Income - (change from 2018 to 2019)

- Real Estate Taxes as a percentage Median Income - (average annual change 2010 – 2019)

#### Personal Infrastructure (5)

- Police per capita (2018)
- Firefighters per capita (2020)
- Teachers per student capita (2019)
- Dentists per capita (2019)
- Doctors per capita (2018)

#### **ESG Factor - Social**

##### Social Indicators (10)

- Bachelor's Degree or higher - percentage of population (change from 2018 to 2019)
- Bachelor's Degree or higher - percentage of population (Average change 2010 - 2019)
- Incidents of Crime per 100,000 residents (2018)
- Incidents of Crime per 100,000 residents – (change from 2018 to 2018)
- Incidents of Crime per 100,000 residents - (average annual change 2009 - 2018)
- Cost of Crime per 100,000 residents (2018)
- Cost of Crime per 100,000 residents – (change from 2018 to 2018)
- Cost of Crime per 100,000 residents - (average annual change 2009 - 2018)
- Homelessness (2009 – 2019)
- Ransomware / Cyberattack incidents (2013 – Q3 2020)

## RANKING AND ESG SCORES

The ISS ESG Muni QualityScore data is calculated utilizing seventy-two (72) unique socioeconomic datasets and provides a material view of risk for the respective entity when measured against its respective peers.

*The ranking and ESG scores provided by ISS ESG should not be interpreted as investment advice and do not provide or are intended to provide a buy sell or hold recommendation for any security or real estate property.*

ISS ESG does not survey any of the respective entities, and relies on non-interpretive data from government, quasi-government, and special interest groups such as NRDC (National Resources Defense Council).

Data is provided via license and is provided on an as-is basis.

## SCORING DETAILS FOR RANKING AND PEER ESG SCORES

Counties used as an example.

The following notation is used in the following calculations:

**dv** value of the data element being scored for a single entity (county, city, school district, state)

**dv1** first value of the data element being scored of the entities in question (i.e. first county of 3,141 counties)

**dv3141** last value of the data element being scored (i.e. last county of 3,141 counties)

**Es** The score for one data element (among 69 data elements) for one entity (i.e. county)

**SE** The final score for all 69 data elements for one entity (i.e. county)

The score for one data element being valued is given by

$$Es \text{ (Score for Dataset)} = \frac{dv}{\sum(dv1..dv3141) / 100}$$

The sum of all sixty-nine (69) Element scores (Es) for all data elements is given by

$$SE \text{ (Score for the single entity (i. e. County))} = \sum(Es1..Es69)$$

The entity (County in this example) with the highest score **SE** – ranks as #1 out of 3,141 counties

The entity (County in this example) with the lowest score **SE** – ranks as #3,141 out of 3,141 counties

The conversion from a percentile score of peer ranking to a letter grade is based on the table below:

PEER ESG SCORE	RANKING OF ENTITY VS RANKING OF PEERS	DESCRIPTION
AAA	=> 90%	Top decile of peer group
AA	=> 80% & < 90%	Second decile of peer group
A	=> 70% & < 80%	Third decile of peer group
BBB	=> 60% & < 70%	Fourth decile of peer group
BB	=> 50% & < 60%	Fifth decile of peer group
B	=> 40% & < 50%	Sixth decile of peer group
CCC	=> 30% & < 40%	Seventh decile of peer group
CC	=> 20% & < 30%	Eight decile of peer group
C	=> 10% & < 20%	Nineth decile of peer group
D	< 10%	Bottom decile of peer group

## SCORING DETAILS FOR DYNAMIC ESG SCORES

Counties used as an example.

### Overview:

In calculating the Dynamic ESG scores, the Mean is first calculated from the previously calculated Final Scores. Then the Standard Deviation is calculated for the Final Scores (of all the relative entities measured i.e. counties). The Standard Deviation creates the bounds by which the ESG scores are assigned with one full Standard Deviation being added to the Mean for the upper boundary and one full Standard Deviation being subtracted from the Mean for the lower boundary.

### Formulae:

The sum of all sixty-nine (71) Element scores (Es) for all data elements is given by

$$\text{Score for the single entity (i. e. County)} = \sum (Es1..Es71)$$

The mean for the Final Scores for all entities ( $\bar{x}$ ) is given by



$$\text{(Final Scores Mean)} \bar{x} = \frac{\sum x}{n}$$

The Standard Deviation (S) for the Final Scores is given by

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (x - \bar{x})^2}{n - 1}}$$

Once the Mean and the Standard Deviation of all Final Scores have been calculated the Final Scores for all entities (i.e. Counties) – the Final Scores are then allotted to respective basket (see below).

<u>DYNAMIC ESG SCORE</u>	<u>SCORE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
<u>AAA</u>	<u>Mean + 1 S</u>	<u>Mean plus one full Standard Deviation</u>
<u>AA</u>	<u>Mean + 2/3 of S</u>	<u>Mean plus two thirds of the Standard Deviation</u>
<u>A</u>	<u>Mean + 1/3 of S</u>	<u>Mean plus one third of the Standard Deviation</u>
<u>BBB</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean of all Scores for the respective Entities</u>
<u>BB</u>	<u>Mean - 1/3 S</u>	<u>Mean less one third of the Standard Deviation</u>
<u>B</u>	<u>Mean - 2/3 S</u>	<u>Mean less two thirds of the Standard Deviation</u>
<u>C</u>	<u>Mean - 1 S</u>	<u>Mean less one full Standard Deviation</u>

## ESG SCORES BY ISS ESG

### ISS ESG MuniQualityScore Data - State Level ESG Scores as of Q4 2019

			ESG SCORE	ESG SCORE
<u>GEO.id</u>	<u>GEO.id</u> <u>2</u>	<u>GEO.display-label</u>	<u>Peer</u> <u>Rankings</u> <u>Model</u>	<u>Dynamic Standard</u> <u>Deviation Model</u>
<u>Id</u>	<u>Id2</u>	<u>Geography</u>	<u>(Q4 2019)</u>	<u>(Q4 2019)</u>
<u>0400000US01</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Alabama</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>BB</u>
<u>0400000US02</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Alaska</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>CCC</u>
<u>0400000US04</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>Arizona</u>	<u>CC</u>	<u>B</u>
<u>0400000US05</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>Arkansas</u>	<u>BB</u>	<u>BBB</u>
<u>0400000US06</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>California</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>CC</u>
<u>0400000US08</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>Colorado</u>	<u>AAA</u>	<u>AAA</u>
<u>0400000US09</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>Connecticut</u>	<u>CC</u>	<u>CCC</u>
<u>0400000US10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>Delaware</u>	<u>CCC</u>	<u>BB</u>
<u>0400000US11</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>District of Columbia</u>	<u>AA</u>	<u>AA</u>
<u>0400000US12</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>Florida</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>BB</u>
<u>0400000US13</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>Georgia</u>	<u>BBB</u>	<u>BBB</u>
<u>0400000US15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>Hawaii</u>	<u>BB</u>	<u>BBB</u>
<u>0400000US16</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>Idaho</u>	<u>AAA</u>	<u>AAA</u>
<u>0400000US17</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>Illinois</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>CC</u>
<u>0400000US18</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>Indiana</u>	<u>BBB</u>	<u>BBB</u>
<u>0400000US19</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>Iowa</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>0400000US20</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>Kansas</u>	<u>CCC</u>	<u>BB</u>
<u>0400000US21</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>Kentucky</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>CC</u>
<u>0400000US22</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>Louisiana</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>CC</u>
<u>0400000US23</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>Maine</u>	<u>BBB</u>	<u>BBB</u>
<u>0400000US24</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>Maryland</u>	<u>CCC</u>	<u>BB</u>
<u>0400000US25</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>Massachusetts</u>	<u>BB</u>	<u>BBB</u>
<u>0400000US26</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>Michigan</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>0400000US27</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>Minnesota</u>	<u>AA</u>	<u>AA</u>

<u>0400000US28</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>Mississippi</u>	<u>CCC</u>	<u>BB</u>
<u>0400000US29</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>Missouri</u>	<u>CCC</u>	<u>BB</u>
<u>0400000US30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>Montana</u>	<u>AAA</u>	<u>AAA</u>
<u>0400000US31</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>Nebraska</u>	<u>AA</u>	<u>AAA</u>
<u>0400000US32</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>Nevada</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>BB</u>
<u>0400000US33</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>New Hampshire</u>	<u>BB</u>	<u>BBB</u>
<u>0400000US34</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>New Jersey</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>CC</u>
<u>0400000US35</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>New Mexico</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>CC</u>
<u>0400000US36</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>New York</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>CC</u>
<u>0400000US37</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>North Carolina</u>	<u>BBB</u>	<u>BBB</u>
<u>0400000US38</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>North Dakota</u>	<u>AAA</u>	<u>AAA</u>
<u>0400000US39</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>Ohio</u>	<u>CC</u>	<u>B</u>
<u>0400000US40</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>Oklahoma</u>	<u>CC</u>	<u>B</u>
<u>0400000US41</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>Oregon</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>AA</u>
<u>0400000US42</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>Pennsylvania</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>CC</u>
<u>0400000US44</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>Rhode Island</u>	<u>CC</u>	<u>B</u>
<u>0400000US45</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>South Carolina</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>AA</u>
<u>0400000US46</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>South Dakota</u>	<u>AA</u>	<u>AAA</u>
<u>0400000US47</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>Tennessee</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>BBB</u>
<u>0400000US48</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>Texas</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>CCC</u>
<u>0400000US49</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>Utah</u>	<u>AAA</u>	<u>AAA</u>
<u>0400000US50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>Vermont</u>	<u>BB</u>	<u>BBB</u>
<u>0400000US51</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>Virginia</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>BBB</u>
<u>0400000US53</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>AA</u>	<u>AAA</u>
<u>0400000US54</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>West Virginia</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>CC</u>
<u>0400000US55</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u>	<u>BBB</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>0400000US56</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>Wyoming</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>

## SOURCES OF DATA UTILIZED BY ISS ESG<sup>1</sup>

U.S. Census Bureau (American Community Survey 5 Year)

<http://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/about.html>

U.S. Census Bureau (Census of Governments – County Area Employment and Payroll Data)

<http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>

U.S. Census Bureau (County Business Patterns)

<http://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/cbp.html>

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) [http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/advpress.nsf/names/hq\\_2011-5-16\\_sdwaecho](http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/advpress.nsf/names/hq_2011-5-16_sdwaecho)

FBI, Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) <https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/ucr>

Kentucky State Police <http://www.kentuckystatepolice.org/data.htm>

New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services <http://www.criminaljustice.ny.gov/>

West Virginia State Police <http://www.wvsp.gov/about/Pages/Publications.aspx>

HRSA Health Resources and Services Administration – Area Health Resource File <http://ahrf.hrsa.gov/>

FEMA – Federal Emergency Management Agency – as (12/31/2016) <http://www.fema.gov/states/new-york>

GlobalChange.gov <http://nca2014.globalchange.gov/>

Climate Central <http://www.climatecentral.org/>

National Resources Defense Council <http://www.nrdc.org/globalWarming/sneezing/contents.asp>

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers [http://climatechange.alaska.gov/docs/iaw\\_USACE\\_erosion\\_rpt.pdf](http://climatechange.alaska.gov/docs/iaw_USACE_erosion_rpt.pdf)

The Center for Remote Sensing of Ice Sheets (CREGIS) <https://www.cresis.ku.edu/data/sea-level-rise-maps>

CDC via Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes <http://journals.lww.com/jaids/pages/issuelist.aspx>

### Data corrections and / or assumptions - where data could not be verified:

#### Number of Counties in the United States

As of December 31, 2019 there are 3,142 counties in the United States of which the ACRE Data Inc. has analyzed and ranked 3,141

Kalawao County, Hawaii (FIPS Code 15005) was excluded from analysis, as this county has an estimated population of 90. It is a judicial district of Maui County. The county has no elected government.

Also please note that the Independent city of Bedford, Virginia (51515) changed to town status and was added to Bedford County (51019) effective July 1, 2013.

<sup>1</sup> We would like to note that there are hundreds of additional sources that have been utilized to: source data, and or validate data. School boards, sheriff's offices, state crime reports, tax assessors at various locations throughout the United States have been utilized in the creation of the ISS ESG MuniQuality Score. We would like to recognize those who have graciously assisted in the construction of these rankings especially those who have been kind enough to share their own research and results. Thank you again to those at Climate Central, GlobalChange, and the National Resource Defense Council.

Effective 2015: 02270 Wade Hampton Census Area changed its name and FIPS Code to: 02158 Kusilvak Census Area, Alaska

Effective 2015: 46113 Shannon County, South Dakota changed its name and FIPS Code to: 46102 Oglala Lakota County, South Dakota

**Demographics**

**Median Housing Value - U.S. Census Bureau (American Community Survey 5 Year)**

The census data for Median Housing Values for the following counties could not be validated for the period of 2009 – 2013. As a result these counties utilized modified figures that were derived by reviewing the census provided allocation of housing units with ranges of values. This data was reviewed for the previous year and subsequent year providing a growth or contraction factor that was then utilized in determining a better representation of the Median Housing Value for the county in question.

The ACRé Data Inc. will continue to directly contact the respective agencies in an effort to collect missing or incorrect data.

Blaine County	Nebraska
Dimmit County	Texas
Foard County	Texas
Glasscock County	Texas
Irion County	Texas
Jim Hogg County	Texas
Kenedy County	Texas
King County	Texas
La Salle County	Texas
Martin County	Texas
Real County	Texas
Runnels County	Texas
Sabine County	Texas
Throckmorton County	Texas
Upton County	Texas
Ward County	Texas

**Environment**

**Climate Change Data**

- Climate Change data for Alaska was determined by utilizing data from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as well as the Center for Remote Sensing of Ice Sheets (CRéSIS). Based upon the multiple physical factors facing Alaska in climate change scenarios: flooding, coastal erosion, tundra / permafrost thawing – a value of 1 (one) was assigned to the scores of those identified counties in Alaska under the data input Coastal - Climate Change exposure in regards to rising Sea levels. Scores for counties identified as exposed to Climate Change range from 0.018 to 6.34

**Declarations of Disaster**

- Declarations can include declarations for Major Disasters, Emergencies, and Fires. Each type of declaration has its own requirements and types of assistance.
- All declarations from 2009 onward have been checked by hand to prevent duplication in the counting of disasters. This occurs in FEMA reports where the disaster was originally designated an Emergency, or a Fire, and later designated again as a Major Disaster. Therefore, the data utilized by the ACRé Data Inc. may not match other sources that utilize the FEMA data feed.

**Superfund sites**

- Superfund sites are included from the list of NPL sites provided by the EPA, as well as the list of Proposed sites from the EPA.
- Additional sites that are essentially government owned and are not on the NPL list (or Proposed list) are added to the ACRé Superfund list utilizing scores from comparable sites within that respective County.

- Any sites not provided with a score from the EPA are all scored at the minimum scoring level of 28.5 which is set by the EPA for any site to be included on the NPL list or the proposed list.

**Coal Ash Ponds / Landfills**

- All Coal Ash data (CCR) was checked by hand using original power company documents. Ponds and Landfills where previously closed have numbers taken into account where documents could be sourced from the respective power producer.

**Social Indicators**

**Crime Data** - FBI, Uniform Crime Reports (UCR)

Please Note: Violent Crime, and Property Crime, are combined to provide one Crime Index level for each county

Please Also Note: The FBI UCR data reported for Counties (Table 10 on the FBI UCR site), will not match what the ACRE Data Inc. has utilized. This is due to the fact that the ACRE Data Inc. has rebuilt all the FBI UCR data from the raw data files provided by the FBI. This has provided a more accurate representation of Crime levels at the County level as well as increased coverage of all Counties by a factor of 18%

The following counties either did not report data to the FBI UCR or their data could not be validated for the period of 2009 – 2018. As a result these counties utilized the state population weighted crime ratio (per 100,000) for the period in question. The ACRE Data Inc. will continue to directly contact the respective agencies in an effort to collect missing or incorrect data.

Aleutians East Borough	Alaska
Denali Borough	Alaska
Hoonah-Angoon Census Area	Alaska
Lake and Peninsula Borough	Alaska
Matanuska-Susitna Borough	Alaska
Northwest Arctic Borough	Alaska
Prince of Wales-Hyder Census Area	Alaska
Southeast Fairbanks Census Area	Alaska
Yakutat City and Borough	Alaska
Yukon-Koyukuk Census Area	Alaska
Conejos County	Colorado
Costilla County	Colorado
Crowley County	Colorado
Kiowa County	Colorado
Mineral County	Colorado
Liberty County	Florida
Chattahoochee County	Georgia
Glascock County	Georgia
Webster County	Georgia
Allamakee County	Iowa
Decatur County	Iowa
Monona County	Iowa
Ringgold County	Iowa
Hamilton County	Kansas
Haskell County	Kansas
Jewell County	Kansas
Wallace County	Kansas
Alcorn County	Mississippi
Benton County	Mississippi
Holmes County	Mississippi

Issaquena County	Mississippi
Jefferson Davis County	Mississippi
Lawrence County	Mississippi
Perry County	Mississippi
Quitman County	Mississippi
Sharkey County	Mississippi
Smith County	Mississippi
Walthall County	Mississippi
Winston County	Mississippi
Yalobusha County	Mississippi
Liberty County	Montana
Petroleum County	Montana
Powder River County	Montana
Treasure County	Montana
Wheatland County	Montana
Arthur County	Nebraska
Banner County	Nebraska
Blaine County	Nebraska
Boone County	Nebraska
Cedar County	Nebraska
Clay County	Nebraska
Dundy County	Nebraska
Fillmore County	Nebraska
Frontier County	Nebraska
Garden County	Nebraska
Garfield County	Nebraska
Grant County	Nebraska
Greeley County	Nebraska
Hayes County	Nebraska
Hooker County	Nebraska
Keya Paha County	Nebraska
Logan County	Nebraska
Loup County	Nebraska
McPherson County	Nebraska
Thomas County	Nebraska
Thurston County	Nebraska
Valley County	Nebraska
Wheeler County	Nebraska
Catron County	New Mexico
De Baca County	New Mexico
Harding County	New Mexico
Caswell County	North Carolina
Gates County	North Carolina
Graham County	North Carolina
Hyde County	North Carolina
Benson County	North Dakota
Billings County	North Dakota



Bowman County	North Dakota
Divide County	North Dakota
Dunn County	North Dakota
Golden Valley County	North Dakota
Griggs County	North Dakota
Sioux County	North Dakota
Steele County	North Dakota
Wheeler County	Oregon
Bon Homme County	South Dakota
Buffalo County	South Dakota
Clark County	South Dakota
Day County	South Dakota
Edmunds County	South Dakota
Grant County	South Dakota
Gregory County	South Dakota
Haakon County	South Dakota
Harding County	South Dakota
Hyde County	South Dakota
Jackson County	South Dakota
Jones County	South Dakota
Kingsbury County	South Dakota
Lyman County	South Dakota
Mellette County	South Dakota
Sully County	South Dakota
Todd County	South Dakota
Collingsworth County	Texas
McMullen County	Texas
Garfield County	Utah
Piute County	Utah
Rappahannock County	Virginia
Pulaski County	Indiana
Union County	Indiana



**We empower investors and companies to build  
for long-term and sustainable growth by providing  
high-quality data, analytics, and insight.**

---

**SUCCEED WITH ISS ESG SOLUTIONS**

Email [sales@iss-esg.com](mailto:sales@iss-esg.com) or visit [iss-esg.com](https://iss-esg.com) for more information.

---

ISS ESG is the responsible investment arm of Institutional Shareholder Services Inc., the world's leading provider of environmental, social, and governance solutions for asset owners, asset managers, hedge funds, and asset servicing providers. With more than 30 years of corporate governance expertise and 25 years of providing in-depth responsible investment research and analytics, ISS ESG has the unique understanding of the requirements of institutional investors. With its comprehensive offering of solutions, ISS ESG enables investors to develop and integrate responsible investing policies and practices, engage on responsible investment issues, and monitor portfolio company practices through screening solutions. It also provides climate data, analytics, and advisory services to help financial market participants understand, measure, and act on climate-related risks across all asset classes. In addition, ISS ESG delivers corporate and country ESG research and ratings enabling its clients to identify material social and environmental risks and opportunities.

This document and all of the information contained in it is the property of Institutional Shareholder Services Inc. ("ISS") or its subsidiaries. The Information may not be reproduced or disseminated in whole or in part without prior written permission of ISS. ISS MAKES NO EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES OR REPRESENTATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE INFORMATION.

© 2021 | Institutional Shareholder Services and/or its affiliates