

TENNESSEE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY JUNE 27, 2023 AGENDA

- 1. Call meeting to order
- 2. Approval of minutes from the TLDA meeting of May 31, 2023
- 3. Consideration and adoption of written guidelines to comply with Public Chapter 300 that reserves a period for public comment
- 4. Annual review of Tennessee Local Development Authority's Debt Management Policy
- 5. Report on SRF borrowers that have not submitted request for project expense reimbursement
- 6. Update on the SRF program's Clean Water and Drinking Water priority ranking lists
- 7. Adjourn

TENNESSEE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY May 31, 2023

The Tennessee Local Development Authority (the "TLDA") met on Wednesday, May 31, 2023, at 2:38 p.m. in the Volunteer Conference Center, 2nd Floor, Cordell Hull Building, Nashville, Tennessee. The Honorable Tre Hargett, Secretary of State, was present and presided over the meeting.

The following members were also present:

The Honorable David H. Lillard, Jr., State Treasurer Commissioner Jim Bryson, Department of Finance and Administration Mayor Paige Brown, House Appointee Mayor Rollen "Buddy" Bradshaw, Senate Appointee

The following members were absent:

The Honorable Bill Lee, Governor The Honorable Jason E. Mumpower, Comptroller of the Treasury

Recognizing a physical quorum present, Mr. Hargett called the meeting to order.

Mr. Hargett stated that the first item on the agenda was approval of the minutes from the April 26, 2023, TLDA meeting. Ms. Brown motioned to approve the minutes, and Mr. Bradshaw seconded the motion. Mr. Hargett asked all in favor to say aye and all opposed to say no. By a vote of 5 - 0, the motion was carried, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Mr. Hargett stated that the next item on the agenda was consideration of a request from the Cumberland Utility District (the "District") to issue United States Department of Agriculture ("USDA") Rural Development Waterworks Revenue Bonds in an amount not to exceed \$600,000 on parity with two of its outstanding SRF loan agreements. He recognized Ms. Sandra Thompson, TLDA Assistant Secretary and the Director of the Division of State Government Finance ("SGF") to present the item. Ms. Thompson stated that the District proposed to issue USDA bonds to provide funding for improvements and extensions to its waterwork's system. Ms. Thompson stated the District's letter noted that the project would replace a water line that was vitally important to the health and welfare of the citizens within its service area. Ms. Thompson explained that the bonds would be payable solely from and secured by a lien on the net revenues of the system and would remain subject to prior liens in favor of the District's SRF loan DWF 2001-043 and the Series 2012 waterworks revenue and refunding bonds. Furthermore, she stated that all the District's obligations would be secured by a shared lien position after the maturity of the series 2012 bonds in 2025. She said that the District believed the TLDA's consent to this request would be in the public's interest as it would preserve the District's ability to incur future debt on a shared lien basis, thereby minimizing interest costs to ratepayers. Ms. Thompson noted that the District's 2012 bonds have a AA- rating by Standard and Poor's. She reported that the District had a history of timely repayments, had timely filed its audit report for FY2022, and would have sufficient revenues to cover its debt service based on financial projections. Ms. Thompson stated that the District's current and projected debt service coverage ratios met or exceeded the required 1.2 times coverage. She reported that it had a security deposit on file in the amount of \$227,036. However, she noted that the District was currently under the administrative review of the Utility Management Review Board. Ms. Thompson stated that based on analysis conducted, the District appeared to meet the TLDA's criteria to issue the bonds on parity with its 2013 SRF loans. Mr. Hargett inquired if there was any discussion. Hearing none, Mr. Bryson motioned to approve the request, and Mr. Lillard seconded the motion. Mr. Hargett asked all in favor to say aye and all opposed to say no. By a vote of 5 - 0, the motion was carried, and the request was unanimously approved.

Mr. Hargett stated that the next item on the agenda was the consideration of a request from the Paris Utility Authority (the "Authority") to issue Water and Wastewater Revenue Bonds in an amount not to exceed \$520,000 subordinate to its outstanding SRF loans. He called upon Ms. Thompson to present the item. Ms. Thompson stated that the Authority proposed to issue bonds to finance the cost and design of construction of extensions and

improvements to its water and wastewater system. Furthermore, she noted that costs associated with the bonds included legal fees and issuance costs. Ms. Thompson said that the bonds would be sold by private placement to Foundation Bank at an interest rate of 4.99%. She noted that there was no debt rating on the bonds. She reported that the Authority had a history of timely repayments of its outstanding debt, had timely filed its FY2022 audit report, and would have sufficient revenues to cover its debt service based on financial projections. Ms. Thompson reported that the Authority had a security deposit on file in the amount of \$430,966. She stated that its debt service coverage ratios met or exceeded the 1.2 times coverage requirement. Additionally, she noted that the Authority was not under the jurisdiction of any of the utility boards. Ms. Thompson stated that based on analysis, the Authority appeared to meet the TLDA's criteria to issue the bonds subordinate to its SRF loans. Mr. Hargett inquired if there were any questions or discussion. Hearing none, Mr. Lillard motioned to approve the request, and Mr. Bryson seconded the motion. Mr. Hargett asked all in favor to say aye and all opposed to say no. By a vote of 5 - 0, the motion was carried, and the request was unanimously approved.

Mr. Hargett stated that the next item on the agenda was the consideration and approval of a Drinking Water State Revolving Fund ("DWSRF") loan. He recognized Ms. Vena Jones, Program Manager, Division of Water Resources, for the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation ("TDEC"), to present the loan request. Ms. Jones first presented the Report on Funds Available for Loan Obligation for the DWSRF Loan Program. She stated the unobligated fund balance was \$99,448,313 as of March 27, 2023. Upon approval of the loan request to be presented totaling \$1,100,000, the remaining funds available for loan obligations would be \$98,348,313. She then presented the DWSRF loan request.

• Smyrna (DWF 2022-246-01) Requesting \$1,100,000 for waterline replacements: replacing approximately 7,800 linear feet of 8-inch diameter lines with 24-inch diameter waterlines by methods of open cut and pipe bursting; recommended interest rate of 3.10% based on the Ability to Pay Index (ATPI); Priority ranking 27 of 72 (FY2021); Term: 20 years

Mr. Hargett inquired if there were any questions. Hearing none, Ms. Brown motioned to approve the loan, and Mr. Bryson seconded the motion. Mr. Hargett asked all in favor to say aye and all opposed to say no. By a vote of 5 - 0, the motion was carried, and the loan was unanimously approved.

Hearing no other business, Mr. Hargett asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Lillard motioned to adjourn, and Mr. Bryson seconded the motion. Mr. Hargett asked all in favor to say aye and all opposed to say no. By a vote of 5 - 0, the motion was carried, and the meeting was adjourned.

Approved on this _____ day of _____, 2023.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra Thompson Assistant Secretary

Proposed Guidelines for Public Comment at Meetings

- Written notification to request to speak at a meeting must be sent to and received by email to Asst. Secretary, Sandi Thompson, at <u>SGF@cot.tn.gov</u> two business days in advance of the meeting. The email should include the proposed speaker's name, the agenda item(s) upon which the speaker wishes to comment, and whether the speaker's comments will be in favor of or opposed to the agenda item(s). Speakers will be selected on a first-come first-served basis.
- 2. The public comment period will be held at the beginning of the meeting once the meeting is called to order and a quorum has been established.
- 3. Speakers will be limited to two minutes per person per agenda item, with a maximum of two speakers in favor of and two speakers opposed to each agenda item.
- 4. Speakers must identify themselves at the beginning of their allotted time and stay on topic of the agenda item(s) that they have indicated their desire to speak on when addressing the board.
- 5. Speakers should conduct themselves in a respectful manner and will be asked to remove themselves if they engage in threatening or disruptive behavior.
- 6. The Board, in its discretion, may ask relevant questions of any speakers providing public comment. Such question period will not include the speaker's allotted time frame.
- 7. The Chairman may extend the allotted time frame or the number of speakers for a particular agenda item if the Chairman determines that the circumstances reasonably require it. If the Chairman extends the allotted time frame or the number of speakers, the Chairman shall ensure that an equal extension is granted to both those in favor of and opposed to any agenda item subject to an extension.

Tennessee Local Development Authority



DEBT MANAGEMENT POLICY

Prepared by: Division of State Government Finance

Table of Contents

Tenne	essee Local Development Authority	1
Debt N	Management Policy	1
Introd	luction	1
Goals	and Objectives	2
А.	The Goals of this Policy	2
B.	The Objectives of this Policy	2
Debt N	Management/General	2
А.	Purpose and Use of Debt Issuance	2
B.	Debt Capacity Assessment	3
C.	Federal Tax Status	3
D.	Legal Limitations on the Use of Debt	3
Types	of Debt	3
А.	Bonds	3
B.	Short-Term Debt	4
Debt N	Management Structure	4
А.	Term	4
B.	Debt Service Structure	4
C.	Call Provisions	5
D.	Original Issuance Discount/Premium	5
Refun	ding Outstanding Debt	5
А.	Refunding Opportunities	5
B.	Term of Refunding Issues	6
C.	Escrow Structuring	6
D.	Arbitrage	6
E.	Cost of Issuance	6
Metho	ods of Sale	6
А.	Competitive	6
B.	Negotiated	6
C.	Private Placement	7
Select	ion of Underwriting Team (Negotiated Transaction)	7
А.	Senior Manager	7
B.	Co-Manager	7
C.	Selling Groups	7
D.	Underwriter's Counsel	8
Credit	Quality	8

Secur	ity for the TLDA Bond Program	
Credi	t Enhancements	
А.	Bond Insurance	
B.	Letters of Credit	9
C.	Liquidity	9
D.	Use of Structured Products	9
Risk A	Assessment	9
А.	Change in Public/Private Use	9
B.	Default Risk	9
С.	Liquidity Risk	10
D.	Interest Rate Risk	10
E.	Rollover Risk	10
F.	Market Risk	10
Trans	sparency	10
Profe	ssional Services	10
А.	Issuer's Counsel	10
B.	Bond Counsel	11
C.	Financial Advisor	11
D.	Refunding Trustee	11
E.	Dealer	11
F.	Issuing and Paying Agent	11
G.	Credit/Liquidity Provider	11
H.	Verification Agent	11
I.	Escrow Bidding Agent	11
Poter	ntial Conflicts of Interest	12
Debt	Administration	12
А.	Planning for Sale	12
B.	Preparing for Bond Closing	12
Feder	ral Regulatory Compliance and Continuing Disclosure	13
А.	Arbitrage	13
B.	Investment of Proceeds	13
C.	Disclosure	14
D.	Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)	15
Revie	ew of the Policy	15
Adop	tion of the Policy	16
Annu	al Review	17

Debt Management Policy

Introduction

Debt management policies provide written guidance about the amount and type of debt issued by governments, the issuance process for such debt, and the management of the debt portfolio. A debt management policy tailored to the needs of the Tennessee Local Development Authority (the "Authority"): (1) identifies policy goals and demonstrates a commitment to long-term financial planning; (2) improves the quality of decisions concerning debt issuance; and (3) provides justification for the structure of debt issuance. Adherence to its debt management policy signals to rating agencies and the capital markets that the Authority is well-managed and able to meet its obligations in a timely manner.

Debt levels and their related annual costs are important financial considerations that impact the use of current resources. An effective debt management policy provides guidelines for the Authority to manage its debt program in line with those resources.

In 1978, the General Assembly created the Authority [Sections 4-31-101 et seq., Tennessee Code Annotated]. The Authority is a corporate governmental agency and instrumentality of the State of Tennessee (the "State"). The Authority is comprised of the Governor, the Secretary of the State, the State Comptroller of the Treasury, the State Treasurer, the Commissioner of Finance and Administration, a Senate appointee and a House appointee.

The Authority is authorized to issue debt to (i) loan funds to local governments for sewage treatment and waterworks (the "State Loan Programs"), capital projects, firefighting equipment, and airport facilities; (ii) loan funds to certain small business concerns for pollution control equipment; (iii) make funds available for loans for agricultural enterprises; (iv) make loans to not-for-profit organizations providing certain mental health, mental retardation, and alcohol and drug services (the Community Provider Pooled Loan Program or the "CP Program"); (v) make loans to local government units to finance construction of capital outlay projects for K-12 educational facilities; (vi) make payment on covered claims against insurers operating in this state which have been deemed insolvent as the result of a natural disaster; and (vii) make the proceeds available to petroleum underground storage tank board for purposes of providing for the reimbursement of reasonable and safe cleanup of petroleum sites. The aggregate amounts outstanding for certain programs are limited as follows: \$10,000,000 for firefighting equipment; \$200,000,000 for airport facilities; \$50,000,000 for pollution control equipment; \$50,000,000 for mental health, mental retardation, and alcohol and drug services; \$30,000,000 for agricultural enterprises; \$15,000,000 for petroleum underground storage tank cleanup costs; and \$75,000,000 for capital outlay projects for K-12 educational facilities.

The Authority issues debt only pursuant to the provisions of the TLDA State Loan Programs General Bond Resolution adopted by the Authority on August 3, 1982 as amended and supplemented and restated and readopted on March 14, 1985 and as amended on May 17, 1989. This Policy applies only to that program. The TLDA has oversight for the State Revolving Fund and State Infrastructure Loan Programs; however, since debt is not issued for these programs, they are not included in this policy.

The Division of State Government Finance (SGF) serves as staff to the Authority. The Director of SGF serves as the Assistant Secretary to the Authority.

Goals and Objectives

The Authority is establishing this debt policy as a tool to ensure that financial resources are adequate to meet the Authority's long-term debt program and financial planning. In addition, this Debt Management Policy (the "Policy") helps to ensure that financings undertaken by the Authority satisfy certain clear objective standards designed to protect the Authority's financial resources and to meet its long-term capital needs.

A. The Goals of this Policy

- To document responsibility for the oversight and management of debt related transactions;
- To define the criteria for the issuance of debt;
- To define the types of debt approved for use within the constraints established by the General Assembly;
- To define the appropriate uses of debt;
- To define the criteria for evaluating refunding candidates or alternative debt structures; and
- To minimize the cost of issuing and servicing debt.

B. The Objectives of this Policy

- To establish clear criteria and promote prudent financial management for the issuance of all debt obligations;
- To identify legal and administrative limitations on the issuance of debt;
- To ensure the legal use of the Authority's debt issuance authority;
- To maintain appropriate resources and funding capacity for present and future capital needs;
- To protect and enhance the Authority's credit rating;
- To evaluate debt issuance options;
- To promote cooperation and coordination with other stakeholders in the financing and delivery of services;
- To manage interest rate exposure and other risks; and
- To comply with federal Regulations and generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP").

Debt Management/General

A. Purpose and Use of Debt Issuance

Debt is to be issued pursuant to the authority of and in full compliance with provisions, restrictions and limitations of the Constitution and laws of the State (including Title 4, Chapter 31, and Title 68, Chapter 221, Parts 2 and 5, Tennessee Code Annotated), pursuant to resolutions adopted by the Authority.

- Prior to the issuance of bonds, bond anticipation notes may be issued for the payment of costs of projects as authorized by the bond authorization and a resolution of the Authority.
- Bonds may be issued to refund outstanding debt.

B. Debt Capacity Assessment

The dollar amount of debt that the Authority may issue and that may be outstanding for the State Loan Programs is not limited by statute; however, debt issued for this program shall be "limited special obligations" of the Authority payable solely from and secured by payments made by local government units, or state-shared taxes withheld, pursuant to loan program agreements.

C. Federal Tax Status

- **Tax-Exempt Debt** The Authority will use its best efforts to maximize the amount of debt sold under this Policy using tax-exempt financing based on the assumptions that tax-exempt interest rates are lower than taxable rates and that the interest savings outweigh the administrative costs, restrictions on use of financed projects, and investment constraints.
- **Taxable Debt** The Authority will sell taxable debt when necessary to finance projects not eligible to be financed with tax-exempt debt.

D. Legal Limitations on the Use of Debt

- No debt obligation shall be sold to fund the current operation of any state service or program.
- The proceeds of any debt obligation shall be expended only for the purpose for which it was authorized and applied to fund loan program agreements only when the ratio of unobligated state-shared taxes complies with state statutes, including any pledge of the statutory reserve fund.
- Notes may be issued only when the Comptroller has filed a certificate as required by TCA Section 4-31-108(f), including the certification that loan program agreements are in place that will utilize at least 75% of the note proceeds.

Types of Debt

A. Bonds

The Authority may issue limited special revenue bonds, backed by payment pursuant to loan program agreements. These bonds may be structured as:

- **Fixed Interest Rate Bonds** Bonds that have an interest rate that remains constant throughout the life of the bond.
 - Serial Bonds
 - Term Bonds
- **Variable Interest Rate Bonds** Bonds which bear a variable interest rate but do not include any bond which, during the remainder of the term thereof to maturity, bears interest at a fixed rate. Provision as to the calculation or change of variable interest rates shall be included in the authorizing resolution.

B. Short-Term Debt

Pending the issuance of the definite bonds authorized by the bond authorizations, the Authority may issue short-term debt. Such debt shall be authorized by resolution of the Authority. Typically, short-term debt is issued during the construction period to take advantage of the lower short-term interest rates. Short-term debt will be subsequently repaid with proceeds from the sale of long-term debt or fees and charges from the borrowers. Short-term debt may include:

- **Bond Anticipation Notes ("BANs")** BANs are short-term interest-bearing securities generally issued to finance a capital project during construction.
- **Fixed Rate Notes** Notes issued for a period of time less than eight years at a fixed interest rate.
- **Variable Rate Notes** Notes which bear variable interest rates until redeemed. Provisions as to the calculation or change of variable interest rates shall be included in the authorizing resolution.
- **Commercial Paper ("CP")** CP is a form of bond anticipation note that has a maturity up to 270 days, may be rolled to a subsequent maturity date and is commonly used to finance a capital project during construction. It can be issued incrementally as funds are needed.
- **Revolving Credit Facility** A form of bond anticipation note involving the extension of a line of credit from a bank. The bank agrees that the revolving credit facility can be drawn upon incrementally as funds are needed. The draws upon the line of credit may bear variable interest rates until redeemed. Provision as to the calculation or change of variable interest rates shall be included in the authorizing credit agreement.

Debt Management Structure

The Authority shall establish by resolution all terms and conditions relating to the issuance of debt and will invest all proceeds pursuant to the terms of the Authority's authorizing resolution and the State's investment policy.

A. Term

The term of any debt (including refunding debt) used to purchase or otherwise obtain or construct any equipment, goods, or structures shall have a reasonably anticipated lifetime of use equal to or less than the average useful life of the project. The final maturity of the bond debt should be limited to thirty (30) years after the date of issuance or the date the project is deemed complete or placed in service, whichever is earlier.

The final maturity of notes and any renewals is limited to eight years from the date of issue of the original notes unless the Authority has begun repayment of principal and the ultimate maturity of the notes will not exceed thirty (30) years from the date of first issuance or the date the project is deemed complete or placed in service, whichever is earlier.

B. Debt Service Structure

Debt issuance shall be planned to achieve level debt service unless otherwise determined by the Authority. The Authority shall avoid use of bullet or balloon maturities; this does not include term bonds with mandatory sinking fund requirements.

No debt shall be structured with other than at least level debt service unless such structure is specifically approved by a majority vote of the members of the Authority.

C. Call Provisions

When issuing new debt, the structure may include a call provision that occurs no later than ten years from the date of delivery of the bonds. Call provisions should be structured to provide the maximum flexibility relative to cost. The Authority will avoid the sale of long-term non-callable bonds absent careful evaluation by the SGF and consultation with the Financial Advisor with respect to the value of the call option.

D. Original Issuance Discount/Premium

Bonds sold with original issuance discount/premium are permitted with the approval of the Authority.

Refunding Outstanding Debt

The Authority may refund outstanding bonds by issuing new bonds. Authority staff with assistance from the Authority's financial advisor ("Financial Advisor") shall have the responsibility to analyze outstanding bond issues for refunding opportunities, whether for economic, tax-status, or project reasons.

A. Refunding Opportunities

The bonds may be considered for refunding when:

- Advance Refunding:
 - The refunding results in present value savings of at least 4.0% per series of refunded bonds. Consideration will be given to escrow efficiency when reviewing refunding candidates.
- Current Refunding:
 - The refunding results in present value savings of at least 2% per series of refunded bonds; or the present value savings per series must be equal to or greater than twice the cost of issuance allocable to the refunding series.
- Refunding for Other Purposes:
 - The refunding of the bonds is necessary due to a change in the use of a project that would require a change to the tax status of the bonds; or
 - The project is sold or no longer in service while still in its amortization period; or
 - Restrictive covenants prevent the issuance of other debt or create other restrictions on the financial management of the project and revenue producing activities.

After consultation with the Financial Advisor, the Comptroller may waive the foregoing refunding considerations given that the sale of refunding bonds will still accomplish cost savings to the public. Such waiver shall be reported in writing to the Authority at its next meeting.

B. Term of Refunding Issues

The Authority will refund bonds within the same fiscal year of the term of the originally issued debt. No backloading of debt will be permitted.

C. Escrow Structuring

The Authority shall structure refunding escrows using legally permitted securities deemed to be prudent under the circumstances and will endeavor to utilize the least costly securities unless considerations of risk, reliability and convenience dictate otherwise. The Authority will take competitive bids on any selected portfolio of securities and will award to the lowest cost provider giving due regard to considerations of risk and reliability or unless State and Local Government Series securities ("SLGS") are purchased directly from the federal Government. The provider must guarantee the delivery of securities except for SLGs. Under no circumstances shall an underwriter, agent or financial advisor sell escrow securities to the Authority from its own account.

D. Arbitrage

The Authority shall take all reasonable steps to optimize escrows and to avoid negative arbitrage in its refunding subject to the State's investment policy subject to Section 4-31-104(6) of the TCA. Any positive arbitrage will be rebated as necessary according to federal guidelines (see also "Federal Regulatory Compliance and Continuing Disclosure – A. Arbitrage").

E. Cost of Issuance

Costs of issuance includes fees paid for professional services provided to the Board in the debt issuance process, including underwriting fees.

Methods of Sale

A. Competitive

In a competitive sale, the Authority's bonds shall be awarded to the bidder providing the lowest true interest cost as long as the bid adheres to the requirements set forth in the official notice of sale. The competitive sale is the Authority's preferred method of sale.

B. Negotiated

While the Authority prefers the use of a competitive process, the Authority recognizes that some securities are best sold through negotiation. The underwriting team will be chosen and the underwriter's fees negotiated prior to the sale. See section below titled "Selection of Underwriting Team (Negotiated Transaction)." In its consideration of a negotiated sale, the Authority will assess the following factors:

- A structure which may require a strong pre-marketing effort such as a complex transaction;
- Volatility of market conditions and whether the Authority would be better served by flexibility in timing a sale;
- Size of the bond sale may limit the number of potential bidders;
- Credit strength of the Authority and that of its borrowers;
- Whether or not the bonds are issued as variable rate demand obligations;
- Tax status of the bonds; and

• If legal or disclosure issues make it advisable in marking bonds

C. Private Placement

From time to time, the Authority may need to consider privately placing its debt. Such placement shall only be considered for debt transactions where the size is too small or the structure is too complicated for public debt issuance, the market of purchasers is limited, and/or will result in a cost savings to the Authority relative to other methods of debt issuance.

Selection of Underwriting Team (Negotiated Transaction)

If there is an underwriter, the Authority shall require the underwriter to clearly identify itself in writing, whether in a response to a request for proposals ("RFP") or in promotional materials provided to the Authority or otherwise, as an underwriter and not as a financial advisor from the earliest stages of its relationship with the Authority with respect to that issue. The underwriter must clarify its primary role as a purchaser of securities in an arm's-length commercial transaction and that it has financial and other interests that differ from those of the Authority. The underwriter in a publicly offered, negotiated sale shall be required to provide pricing information both as to interest rates and to takedown per maturity to the Authority or its designated official in advance of the pricing of the debt.

A. Senior Manager

The Authority with assistance from its staff and financial advisor shall select the senior manager(s) for a proposed negotiated sale. The selection criteria shall include but not be limited to the following:

- Experience in selling Tennessee debt;
- Ability and experience in managing complex transactions;
- Prior knowledge and experience with the Authority;
- Willingness to risk capital and demonstration of such risk;
- Quality and experience of personnel assigned to the Authority's engagement;
- Financing ideas presented; and
- Underwriting fees.

B. Co-Manager

Co-managers will be selected on the same basis as the senior manager(s). The number of comanagers appointed to specific transactions will be a function of transaction size and the necessity to ensure maximum distribution of the Authority's bonds. The Secretary or Assistant Secretary to the Authority will, at his or her discretion, affirmatively determine the designation policy for each bond issue.

C. Selling Groups

The Authority may use selling groups in certain transactions to maximize the distribution of bonds to retail investors. Firms eligible to be a member of the selling group, should either have a public finance department or pricing desk located within the boundaries of the State. To the extent that selling groups are used, the Secretary or Assistant Secretary of the Authority at his or her discretion may make appointments to selling groups as the transaction dictates.

D. Underwriter's Counsel

In any negotiated sale of the Authority's debt in which legal counsel is required to represent the underwriter, the appointment will be made by the Senior Manager

Credit Quality

The Authority's debt management activities will be conducted to receive the highest credit ratings possible, consistent with Authority's financing objectives.

The Office of the Comptroller of the Treasury through the Division of State Government Finance will be responsible for the communication of information to the rating agencies and keeping them informed of significant developments throughout the year. The Office of the Comptroller of the Treasury through the SGF will schedule rating agency calls and/or visits prior to the issuance of bonds.

The Office of the Comptroller of the Treasury through the SGF, together with the Financial Advisor, shall prepare presentations to the rating agencies to assist credit analysts in making an informed decision.

The Authority, with the assistance of the Financial Advisor, shall be responsible for determining whether or not a rating shall be requested on a particular financing, and which of the major rating agencies will be asked to provide such rating.

Security for the TLDA Bond Program

The Security for bonds and notes of the TLDA is the pledge of revenue received by the Authority from the borrowers and the statutory reserve fund. The moneys and securities on deposit in the Statutory Fund may only be withdrawn at the request of the Authority. If there has been a withdrawal from the Statutory Fund in any bond year, the Authority shall deposit in the Statutory Fund an amount equal to the withdrawal and interest thereon from moneys on deposit in the State Loan Program Fund or the General Fund.

For the State Loan Program, the security is the pledge of the system revenues, a general obligation pledge of the borrowing local government, the debt service reserve fund, and the intercept of state-shared taxes. The debt service reserve fund contains a deposit from the borrower equal to one year of the maximum annual debt service. State-shared taxes may be taken if the borrower is delinquent in payments. The intercept of state-shared taxes will be tested periodically.

Credit Enhancements

The Authority will consider the use of credit enhancements on a case-by-case basis, evaluating the economic benefit versus the cost. Only when clearly demonstrable savings can be shown shall an enhancement be utilized. The Authority may consider each of the following enhancements as alternatives by evaluating the cost and benefit of such enhancements:

A. Bond Insurance

The Authority may purchase bond insurance when such purchase by the Authority is deemed prudent and advantageous. The primary consideration shall be based on whether such insurance is less costly. For competitive sales, the purchaser of the bonds may be allowed to determine whether bond insurance will be used and will be included in the bid for the bonds and will be paid for by the purchaser of the bonds. If the Authority decides to purchase insurance, it shall do so on a competitive bid basis whenever practicable. In a negotiated sale, the Authority will select a provider whose bid is most cost effective and will consider the

credit quality of the insurer and that the terms and conditions governing the guarantee are satisfactory to the Authority.

B. Letters of Credit

The Authority may enter into a letter-of-credit ("LOC") agreement when such an agreement is deemed prudent and advantageous. The Authority will prepare and distribute an RFP to qualified banks or other qualified financial institutions, which includes terms and conditions that are acceptable to the Authority. The LOC will be awarded to the bank or financial institution providing the lowest cost bid with the highest credit quality that meets the criteria established by the Authority.

C. Liquidity

For variable rate debt requiring liquidity facilities to protect against remarketing risk, the Authority will evaluate:

- Alternative forms of liquidity, including direct pay letters of credit, standby letters of credit, and line of credit, in order to balance the protection offered against the economic costs associated with each alternative;
- Diversification among liquidity providers, thereby limiting exposure to any individual liquidity provider;
- All cost components attendant to the liquidity facility, including commitment fees, standby fees, draw fees, and interest rates charged against liquidity draws; and
- A comparative analysis and evaluation of the cost of external liquidity providers compared to the requirements for self-liquidity.

The winning bid will be awarded to the bank or financial institution providing the lowest cost with the highest credit quality that meets the criteria established by the Authority.

D. Use of Structured Products

No interest rate agreements or forward purchase agreements will be considered unless the Authority has established a policy defining the use of such products before the transaction is considered.

Risk Assessment

The SGF will evaluate each transaction to assess the types and amounts of risk associated with that transaction, considering all available means to mitigate those risks. The SGF will evaluate all proposed transactions for consistency with the objectives and constraints defined in this Policy. The following risks should be assessed before issuing debt:

A. Change in Public/Private Use

The change in the public/private use of a project that is funded by tax-exempt funds could potentially cause a bond issue to become taxable.

B. Default Risk

The risk that debt service payments cannot be made by the due date.

C. Liquidity Risk

The risk of having to pay a higher rate to the liquidity provider in the event of a failed remarketing of short-term debt.

D. Interest Rate Risk

The risk that interest rates will rise, on a sustained basis, above levels that would have been set if the issue had been fixed.

E. Rollover Risk

The risk of the inability to obtain a suitable liquidity facility at an acceptable price to replace a facility upon termination or expiration of a contract period

F. Market Risk

The risk that in the event of failed remarketing of short-term debt, the liquidity provider fails.

Transparency

The Authority shall comply with the Tennessee Open Meetings Act, providing adequate public notice of meetings and specifying on the agenda when matters related to debt issuance will be considered. All costs (including interest, issuance, continuing, and one-time) shall be disclosed to the citizens in a timely manner. Additionally, the Authority will provide certain financial information and operating data by specified dates, and to provide notice of certain enumerated events with respect to the bonds, pursuant to continuing disclosure undertakings requirements of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("SOC") Rule 15c2-12. The Authority intends to maintain transparency by:

- Posting the Official Statement of a bond sale to the Authority's website within two weeks of the closing of such sale;
- Preparing and filing with the Division of Local Government Finance (LGF) a copy of the costs related to the issuance of a bond and other information as required by Section 9-21-151, of the TCA, within 45 days of the closing of such sale, and presenting the original of such document to the Authority at its next meeting (see also "Debt Administration – B. Post Sale"); and
- Electronically submitting through the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board's Electronic Municipal Market Access ("EMMA") website the information necessary to satisfy the Authority's continuing disclosure requirements for the bonds in a timely matter (see also "Federal Regulatory Compliance and Continuing Disclosure").

Professional Services

The Authority requires all professionals engaged to assist in the process of issuing debt to clearly disclose all compensation and consideration received related to services provided in the debt issuance process by the Authority. This includes "soft" costs or compensations in lieu of direct payments.

A. Issuer's Counsel

The Authority will enter into an engagement letter agreement with each lawyer or law firm representing the Authority in a debt transaction. No engagement letter is required for any lawyer who is an employee of the Office of Attorney General and Reporter for the State of

Tennessee who serves as counsel to the Authority or of the Office of General Counsel, Office of the Comptroller of the Treasury, which serves as counsel to the SGF regarding Authority matters.

B. Bond Counsel

Bond counsel shall be engaged through the SGF and serves to assist the Authority in all its general obligation debt issues under a written agreement.

C. Financial Advisor

The Financial Advisor shall be engaged through the SGF and serves and assists the Authority on financial matters under a written agreement. However, the financial advisor shall not be permitted to bid on, privately place or underwrite an issue for which it is or has been providing advisory services. The Financial Advisor has a fiduciary duty including a duty of loyalty and a duty of care.

D. Refunding Trustee

The Refunding Trustee shall be appointed by resolution of the Authority adopted prior to the issuance of any of refunding bonds. The Refunding Trustee will be a bank, trust company or national banking association that provides Paying Agent and Registrar services.

E. Dealer

The Authority will enter into a Dealer Agreement with the appointed CP dealer. The Dealer agrees to offer and sell the CP, on behalf of the Authority, to investors and other entities and individuals who would normally purchase commercial paper.

F. Issuing and Paying Agent

The Authority covenants to maintain and provide an Issuing and Paying Agent at all times while the CP is outstanding. The Authority will enter into an Issuing and Paying Agency Agreement with an appointed firm. The Issuing and Paying Agent will be a bank, trust company or national banking association that has trust powers.

G. Credit/Liquidity Provider

The Authority shall enter into a Credit Agreement with the appointed credit provider. A credit provider shall be a bank or lending institution that extends credit to the Authority in the form of a revolving credit facility, a line of credit, a loan or a similar credit product or as a liquidity facility for CP.

H. Verification Agent

The Verification Agent will be selected through a request for proposal process prior to the issuance of refunding bonds. The Verification Agent primarily verifies the cash flow sufficiency to the call date of the escrowed securities to pay the principal and interest due on refunded bonds.

I. Escrow Bidding Agent

The Escrow Bidding Agent will be selected through a request for proposal process prior to the issuance of refunding bonds. With regards to structuring the refunding escrow with investment securities, the Escrow Bidding Agent will prepare bidding specifications, solicit bids for investment securities, review and evaluate responses to the bids, accept and award bids, and provide final certification as to completion of requirements.

Potential Conflicts of Interest

Professionals involved in a debt transaction hired or compensated by the Authority shall be required to disclose to the Authority existing client and business relationships between and among the professionals to a transaction (including but not limited to financial advisor, swap advisor, bond counsel, swap counsel, trustee, paying agent, underwriter, counterparty, and remarketing agent), as well as conduit issuers, sponsoring organizations and program administrators and other issuers whom they may serve. This disclosure shall include such information that is reasonably sufficient to allow the Authority to appreciate the significance of the relationships.

Professionals who become involved in a debt transaction as a result of a bid submitted in a widely and publicly advertised competitive sale conducted using an industry standard, electronic bidding platform are not subject to this disclosure provision. No disclosure is required if such disclosure would violate any rule or regulation of professional conduct.

Debt Administration

A. Planning for Sale

Before the issuance of bonds, the procedures outlined below will be followed:

- Prior to submitting a bond resolution for approval, the Director of the SGF (the "Director"), with the assistance of the Financial Advisor, will present to staff of the members of the Authority information concerning the purpose of the financing, the estimated amount of financing, the proposed structure of the financing, the proposed method of sale for the financing, members of the proposed financing team, and an estimate of all the costs associated with the financing, and;
- In addition, in the case of a proposed refunding, proposed use of credit enhancement, or proposed use of variable rate debt, the Director will present the rationale for using the proposed debt structure, an estimate of the expected savings associated with the transaction and a discussion of the potential risks associated with the proposed structure.
- The Director (with the assistance of staff in the SGF) with the advice of Bond Counsel, the Financial Advisor, and other members of the financing team, will prepare a Preliminary Official Statement describing the transaction and the security for the debt that is fully compliant with all legal requirements.

B. Preparing for Bond Closing

In preparation for the bond closing, the procedures outlined below will be followed:

- The Director (with the assistance of staff in the SGF), Bond Counsel, and the Financial Advisor, along with other members of the financing team will prepare an Official Statement describing the transaction and the security for the debt that is fully compliant with all legal requirements.
- The Financial Advisor will provide a closing memorandum with written instructions on transfer and flow of funds.
- The Authority's staff, with assistance from the Financial Advisor, will evaluate each bond sale after completion to assess the following: costs of issuance including the underwriter's compensation, pricing of the bonds in terms of the

overall interest cost and on a maturity-by-maturity basis, and the distribution of bonds and sales credit, if applicable.

- The Director will present a post-sale report to the members of the Authority describing the transaction and setting forth all the costs associated with the transaction.
- Within 45 days from closing, the Director will prepare a Form CT-0253 "Report on Debt Obligation" outlining costs related to the issuance and other information set forth in Section 9-21-151 of the TCA, and also present the original at the next meeting of the Authority and file a copy with the LGF.
- The Director will establish guidelines and procedures for tracking the flow of all bond proceeds, as defined by the Internal Revenue Code, over the life of bonds reporting to the Internal Revenue Service all arbitrage earnings associated with the financing and any tax liability that may be owed.
- The Post-Issuance Compliance ("PIC") team will meet annually to review matters related to compliance and complete the PIC checklist.
- As a part of the PIC procedures, the Director (with the assistance of staff in the SGF) will, no less than annually, request confirmation from the responsible department that there has been no change in use of tax-exempt financed facilities.

Federal Regulatory Compliance and Continuing Disclosure

A. Arbitrage

The SGF will comply with arbitrage requirements on invested tax-exempt bond funds. Proceeds that are to be used to finance construction expenditures are exempted from the filing requirements, provided that the proceeds are spent in accordance with requirements established by the IRS. The Authority will comply with all of its tax certificates for tax-exempt financings by monitoring the arbitrage earnings on bond proceeds on an interim basis and by rebating all positive arbitrage when due, pursuant to Internal Revenue Code, Section 148. The Authority currently contracts with an arbitrage consultant to prepare these calculations, when needed. The Authority will also retain all records relating to debt transactions for as long as the debt is outstanding, plus three years after the final redemption date of the transaction.

B. Investment of Proceeds

Any proceeds or other funds available for investment by the Authority must be invested per Section 4-31-104(6) of the TCA, subject to any restrictions required pursuant to the next sentence or pursuant to any applicable bond issuance authorization. Compliance with federal tax code arbitrage requirements relating to invested tax-exempt bond funds will be maintained. Compliance with arbitrage requirements on invested tax-exempt bond funds will be maintained.

Proceeds used to refund outstanding long-term debt shall be placed in an irrevocable refunding trust fund with the Refunding Trustee. The investments (i) shall not include mutual funds or unit investment trusts holding such obligations, (ii) are rated not lower than the second highest rating category of both Moody's Investors Service, Inc. and Standard & Poor's Global rating services and (iii) shall mature and bear interest at such

times and such amounts as will be sufficient, together with other moneys to pay the remaining defeasance requirements of the bonds to be redeemed.

C. Disclosure

The Authority will disclose on EMMA the State's and the Authority's audited Annual Comprehensive Financial Report as well as certain financial information and operating data required by the continuing disclosure undertakings for the outstanding bonds no later than January 31st of each year. The Authority will also, in accordance with the continuing disclosure undertakings, disclose on EMMA within ten business days after the occurrence of the following events relating to the bonds to which the continuing disclosure undertakings apply:

- Principal and interest payment delinquencies.
- Nonpayment-related defaults, if material.
- Unscheduled draws on debt service reserves reflecting financial difficulties.
- Unscheduled draws on credit enhancements reflecting financial difficulties.
- Substitution of credit or liquidity providers or their failure to perform.
- Adverse tax opinions, the issuance by the Internal Revenue Service of proposed or final determinations of taxability, Notices of Proposed Issue (IRS Form 5701-TEB) or other material notices or determinations with respect to the tax status of such bonds or other material events affecting the tax status of such bonds.
- Modifications to rights of bondholders, if material.
- Bond calls, if material, and tender offers.
- Defeasances.
- Release, substitution or sale of property securing the repayment of the bonds, if material.
- Rating changes
- Bankruptcy, insolvency, receivership, or similar event of the State.
- Consummation of a merger, consolidation, or acquisition involving the Authority or sale of all or substantially all of the assets of the Authority, other than in the course of ordinary business, the entry into a definitive agreement to undertake such an action or the termination of a definitive agreement relating to any such actions, other than pursuant to its terms, if material.
- Appointment of successor trustee or the change of name of a trustee, if material.

The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) adopted amendments to Rule 15c2-12 of the Securities Exchange Act that require reporting on material financial obligations that could impact an issuer's financial condition or security holder's rights. The amendments add two events to the list of events that must be included in any continuing disclosure agreement that is entered into on or after February 27, 2019:

• Incurrence of a financial obligation of the issuer or obligated person, if material, or agreement to covenants, events of default, remedies, priority rights, or other

similar terms of a financial obligation of the issuer or obligated person, any of which affect security holders, if material; and

• Default, event of acceleration, termination event, modification of terms, or other similar events under the terms of the financial obligation of the issuer or obligated person, any of which reflect financial difficulties.

D. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)

The Authority will comply and prepare its financial reports in accordance with the standard accounting practices adopted by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board and with the accounting policies established by the Department of Finance and Administration when applicable.

Review of the Policy

The debt policy guidelines outlined herein are only intended to provide general direction regarding the future use and execution of debt. The Authority maintains the right to modify these guidelines and may make exceptions to any of them at any time to the extent that the execution of such debt achieves the Authority's goals.

This policy will be reviewed by the Authority no less frequently than annually. At that time, the Director will present any recommendations for any amendments, deletions, additions, improvement, or clarification.

Adoption of the Policy

After a public hearing on December 7, 2011, the Authority adopted this Policy, effective December 7, 2011.

After a public hearing on May 11, 2017, the Board adopted the amended Policy on May 11, 2017, effective May 11, 2017.

After a public hearing on July 22, 2021 the Board adopted the amended Policy on July 22, 2021, effective July 22, 2021.

Vice-Chair Tennessee Local Development Authority

APPENDIX A

Annual Review

The Authority has reviewed and accepted the Debt Management Policy on:

October 8, 2014 November 19, 2015 July 20, 2020 July 26, 2022 June 27, 2023

PROJECT NAME & NUMBER	STATE GOVERNMENT FINANCE LOAN ACTIVITY at 05/16/2023	Project Type	DATE LOAN AWARDED		LOAN MOUNT	TDEC DETAILS/COMMENTS/STATUS	PROJECT SCHEDULE STATUS Compliance Non-compliance (Need explanation or justification)
City of Athens CW8 2021-459	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Wastewater	10/25/2021	\$ 2	2,000,000	The city will submit the first payment request by June or July of 2023. (Per Doug Unger, P.E., Director of Engineering.)	In compliance with a completion date of December 31, 2023.
City of Camden DW7 2021-237	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Drinking Water	12/20/2021	\$	255,000	The first payment request will be submitted by June or July of 2023. The city has paid the previous invoices from the municipal funds and will submit a reimbursement to SRF. (Per Mattie Cushman, Project Manager, Community Development Partners, LLC.)	Not in compliance with a completion date of September 30, 2022
City of Chattanooga SRF 2020-440-01	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Wastewater	2/23/2022	\$ 19	9,000,000	This is a companion loan to to other loans; one exhausted, one not exhaused. The city plans to request reimbursements from the initial loan first, completely exhausting it before requesting reimbursement from this loan. (Per Christie Hesse, P.E., Jacobs Engineering)	In compliance with a completion date of December 31, 2024.
City of Cleveland DWF 2022-247	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Drinking Water	7/26/2022	\$	825,000	The Dempsey Circle Pump Station has a long lead item. The pump station itself is pre-fabricated. Shop drawings have been reviewed, and the pump station has been ordered and is being fabricated. The contractor has submitted two payment applications associated with the pump station fabrication. The first payment request will be submitted in June or July of 2023. (Per Jon Sparkman, Manager, Cleveland Utilities)	In compliance with a completion date of August 31, 2023. Have requested to submit a project schedule amendment.
City of Cleveland SRF 2022-473	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Wastewater	7/26/2022	\$ 2	4,650,000	The HRWWTP Ultraviolet Disinfection is well underway. Two pay applications from Morgan Construction will be submitted in June or July 2023. (Per Jon Sparkman, Manager, Cleveland Utilities). No NTP to contractor yet. Will be submitting once they have more information.	In compliance with a completion date of April 1, 2024.
City of Dyersburg CG20 2023-479	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Wastewater	11/28/2022	\$ 7	7,982,000	The first construction and engineering payment request will be submitted in June or July of 2023. (Per Tiffany Heard, P.E., Smith Seckman Reid, Inc.)	In compliance with a completion date of September 30, 2025.
City of Elizabethton DG20 2022-252	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Drinking Water	10/19/2022	\$ 1	1,350,000	The bid process opened on May 23, 2023. The amount is above the requested amount, so that the project will be re-bid on July 1, 2023. (Per Jamie Carden, P.E., McGill Associates)	Not in compliance with a completion date of August 1, 2023.
Hamilton County WWTA SRF 2022-468	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Wastewater	6/15/2022	\$	276,670	The recipient terminated this loan on September 9, 2022. The letter is dated September 7, 2022	
Town of Hartsville-Trousdale City DW8 2021-239	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Drinking Water	11/28/2022	\$ 2	2,250,000	Construction is scheduled to begin in the month of July, with the first payment request submitted in August. (Per Evan White, P.E., Mid-Tenn Engeneering Co.)	In compliance with a completion date of February 29, 2024.
Hiwassee Utilities - Bradley County DW7 2021-232A	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Drinking Water	2/23/2022	\$ 1		The first payment request for engineering and construction will be submitted in June or July. (Per David Kozan, P.E., Vice President, Owen and White, Inc., Consulting Engineers)	In compliance with a completion date of December 30, 2025.
Hiwassee Utilities - McMinn County DW7 2021-232B	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Drinking Water	2/23/2022	\$ 1	1,459,450	The first payment request for engineering and construction will be submitted in June or July of 2023. (Per David Kozan, P.E., Vice President, Owen and White, Inc., Consulting Engineers)	In compliance with a completion date of December 30, 2025.

	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Wastewater	10/19/2022	\$ 15,000,	The first payment request for engineering costs will be submitted by the end of July. (Per Evan Sanders, President, Community Development Partners, LLC.)
	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Wastewater	7/26/2022	\$ 5,000,	The Bid Package was complete and submitted to SRF for review on May 30, 2023. The first payment request is scheduled for August 1, 2023. (Per Matthew Johnson, P.E., Barge Design)In compliance with a completion date of September 30, 2024.
	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Wastewater	7/26/2022	\$ 10,400,	Companion Loan for CG9 2022-469. Will exhaust first loan before requesting funds for second loan. The Bid Package was complete and submitted to SRF for review on May 30, 2023. The first payment request is scheduled for August 1, 2023. (Per Matthew Johnson, P.E., Barge Design)
,	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Drinking Water	10/19/2022	\$ 650,	The first payment request for engineering costs will be submitted by the end of July. (Per Evan Sanders, President, Community Development Partners, LLC.). Construction hasn't started yet. No PCC yet.
	No funds have been disbursed to borrower	Wastewater	11/28/2022	\$ 1,096,	This is a companion loan to CW8 2021-457 and SRF 2018-403. The city plans to request reimbursements from the initial loans first, completely exhausting it before requesting reimbursement from this loan. (Per Randy Harper, P.E., Goodwin, Mills, and Cawood, Inc.)

2022 Clean Water PRL Summary	Counts	Totals	
35 of the 104 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding.	35	\$263,146,863	
8 of the 104 Communities are currently working with SRF in the funding process.	8	\$52,155,500	
2 of the 104 Projects are anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of the funded planning and design loan.	2	\$8,500,000	
4 of the 104 Projects have been funded.	4	\$24,482,000	
5 of the 104 Communities were contacted but a response from the community has not been received.	5	\$48,243,148	
27 of 104 Communities decided not to proceed with SRF funding.	27	\$33,185,000	
19 of 104 Communities still interested in AMP funding.	19	\$4,207,710	
4 of 104 Communities still considering SRF with ARPA Funding.	4	\$58,970,000	
	104	\$492,890,221	
Clean Water Balance as of April 26,2023		\$205,696,268	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary	Counts	Totals	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary	Counts 34	Totals \$105,812,209	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary 34 of the 143 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding.			
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary 34 of the 143 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding. 17 of the 143 Communities are currently working with SRF in the funding process.	34	\$105,812,209	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary 34 of the 143 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding. 17 of the 143 Communities are currently working with SRF in the funding process. 6 of the 143 Projects are anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of the funded planning and design loan.	34 17	\$105,812,209 \$80,403,700	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary 34 of the 143 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding. 17 of the 143 Communities are currently working with SRF in the funding process. 6 of the 143 Projects are anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of the funded planning and design loan. 1 of the 143 Projects have been funded.	34 17	\$105,812,209 \$80,403,700 \$53,849,000	
	34 17 6 1	\$105,812,209 \$80,403,700 \$53,849,000 \$200,000	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary 34 of the 143 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding. 17 of the 143 Communities are currently working with SRF in the funding process. 6 of the 143 Projects are anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of the funded planning and design loan. 1 of the 143 Projects have been funded. 1 of the 143 Communities were contacted but a response from the community has not been received.	34 17 6 1 16	\$105,812,209 \$80,403,700 \$53,849,000 \$200,000 \$32,857,016	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary 34 of the 143 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding. 17 of the 143 Communities are currently working with SRF in the funding process. 6 of the 143 Projects are anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of the funded planning and design loan. 1 of the 143 Projects have been funded. 16 of the 143 Communities were contacted but a response from the community has not been received. 15 of the 143 Communities decided not to proceed with SRF funding.	34 17 6 1 16 15	\$105,812,209 \$80,403,700 \$53,849,000 \$200,000 \$32,857,016 \$42,321,000	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary 34 of the 143 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding. 17 of the 143 Communities are currently working with SRF in the funding process. 6 of the 143 Projects are anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of the funded planning and design loan. 1 of the 143 Projects have been funded. 16 of the 143 Communities were contacted but a response from the community has not been received. 15 of the 143 Communities decided not to proceed with SRF funding. 40 of the 143 Communities still interested in AMP funding.	34 17 6 1 16 15 40	\$105,812,209 \$80,403,700 \$53,849,000 \$200,000 \$32,857,016 \$42,321,000 \$5,810,900	

Total CWSRF Requested \$492,995,221 **Total Green Requested**

\$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

Rank Order	Priority Points*	ATPI	Pop.	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
1	129.5	80	8,135	Oakland	Fayette	WWTP Expansion/Advanced Treatment (Expanding the existing WWTP from 1.0 to 3.0 MGD to include new headworks, construction of two SBRs; renovation of the existing SBRs; and the installation of new blowers, effluent pumps, associated piping, and electrical components.)	\$ 17,000,000		Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
2	124.2	80	1,659	Norris	Anderson	WWTP Expansion/Advanced Treatment (Expansion of the existing WWTP from 0.2 to 0.5MGD to include) Construction	\$ 12,000,000	\$ -	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
3	124.2	80	1,659	Norris	Anderson	WWTP Expansion/Advanced Treatment (Expansion of the existing WWTP from 0.2 to 0.5MGD to include) Planning and Design	\$ 1,200,000	\$ -	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
4	121.0	10	1,120	Mason*	Tipton	WWTP Improvements/Secondary Treatment (Construction of a pump station and the installation of new force main to discharge the existing WWTP's effluent to the Loosahatchie River.) Planning and Design		\$ -	Considering SRF with ARPA Funding
5	119.3	50	17,147	Springfield*	Robertson	New WWTP/Advanced Treatment (Construction of a new 7.0 MGD WWTP to include a new biological treatment system, influent pump stations, headworks, activated sludge treatment, and sludge digestion/management.)	\$ 47,000,000	\$ -	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
6	117.0	80	647	Bell Buckle	Bedford	New WWTP (Construction of a new WWTP to replace the existing 0.15 MGD WWTP.)	\$ 5,000,000	\$-	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding

Total CWSRF Requested \$492,995,221 **Total Green Requested**

\$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

Rank Order	Priority Points*	ATPI	Pop.	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
7	116.5	60		Oak Ridge	Anderson/Roan e	GREEN - WWTP Improvements/Advanced Treatment (Renovation of the existing chemical facilities; installation of a fine bubble diffuser system and new blowers with VFDs; modifications to the piping gallery; and improvements to the HVAC, instrumentation/controls, and electricals.) Construction	\$ 6,500,000	\$ 6,500,000	Anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of the planning and design loan
8	116.5	60	29,124	Oak Ridge	e	WWTP Improvements/Advanced Treatment (Renovation of the existing chemical facilities; installation of a fine bubble diffuser system and new blowers with VFDs; modifications to the piping gallery; and improvements to the HVAC, instrumentation/controls, and electricals.) Planning and Design	\$ 910,000	\$-	Currently working with the community
9	115.4	0	1,994	Rocky Top*		WWTP Improvements/Advanced Treatment (Improvements to the dewatering facility, blower building, headworks; installation of a back-up generator; and conversion of the chlorine gas disinfection system to Hypochlorite.) Construction	\$ 800,000	\$ -	Currently working with the community
10	115.4	0	1,994	Rocky Top*	Anderson/Cam pbell	WWTP Improvements/Advanced Treatment (Improvements to the dewatering facility, blower building, headworks; installation of a back-up generator; and conversion of the chlorine gas disinfection system to Hypochlorite.) Planning and Design		\$ -	Currently working with the community

CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2022 Priority Ranking List July 15, 2022 Total CWSRF Requested

\$492,995,221 **Total Green Requested** \$139,650,048

\$141,279,221

Total Disadvantage Community Requested

Rank	Priority		_	Local			Total Project Amount	GREEN Component Amount	
Order 11	Points* 115.0	0	Pop. 4,194	Government Tiptonville*	<u>County</u> Lake	Project Description WWTP Expansion from 0.67 MGD to 2.5 MGD - Secondary Treatment (Expanding the WWTP from 0.67 MGD to 2.5 MGD to include headworks and chlorine contact chamber modifications, replacement of the existing aeration system, installation of additional baffle curtains in the existing 5- acre pond, and completing the improvements necessary to place the adjacent 16-acre lagoon cell back into service.) Planning and Design		(\$)	Status Does not wish to pursue funding
12	113.0	20	2,567	Maynardville*	Union	WWTP Improvements/Advanced Treatment (Improvements to include replacing the influent pumping station, grit removal system, aeration blowers and diffusers, and the chlorine disinfection system with UV Disinfection; and the addition of a centrifuge sludge dewatering facility.)	\$ 3,275,000		Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
13	112.0	70	6,859	Greenbrier	Robertson	WWTP Improvements/Advanced Treatment (Improvements to the solids handling at the existing WWTP.) Construction		\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
14	112.0	70	6,859	Greenbrier	Robertson	WWTP Improvements/Advanced Treatment (Improvements to the solids handling at the existing WWTP.) Planning and Design		\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
15	111.8	30		Jackson Energy Authority	Madison	WWTP Improvements/Advanced Treatment (Improvements to the Biosolids Drying at the Miller Ave WWTP.)	\$ 8,000,000	\$ -	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
16	111.4	30		Luttrell*	Union	WWTP Upgrade/Advanced Treatment (Construction of a 0.25 MGD SBR, installation of yard piping, and electrical improvements.) Construction	\$ 3,200,000	\$ -	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
17	111.4	30	1,041	Luttrell*	Union	WWTP Upgrade/Advanced Treatment (Construction of a 0.25 MGD SBR, installation of yard piping, and electrical improvements.) Planning and Design	\$ 175,000	\$-	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding

July 15, 2022

Total CWSRF Requested \$492,995,221

Total Green Requested \$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

Rank Order	Priority Points*	ATPI	Pop.	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
18	111.1	10			Haywood	WWTP Improvements/Advanced Treatment (Replacement of the aeration system at the existing Lagoon treatment facility.) Construction	\$ 1,780,000		Currently working with the community
19	111.1	20	2,120	South Fulton*		WWTP Improvements/Secondary Treatment (Installation of a new mechanically cleaned bar screen; and modifications to the influent inlet channel and screening area at the existing WWTP.)	\$ 665,000	\$ -	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
20	111.0	50	9,191	Lenoir City*		WWTP Improvements/Secondary Treatment (A feasibility study for upgrading the existing WWTP or constructing an EQ basin to handle peak wet-weather flows.) Planning and Design	\$ 400,000	\$ -	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
21	111.0	50	9,191	Lenoir City*		WWTP Improvements/Secondary Treatment (Construction for a 1MG EQ Basin at the existing WWTP.) Construction	\$ 2,000,000	\$ -	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
22	109.1	40	53,699	Kingsport		WWTP Improvements/Secondary Treatment (Construction of a 5 MG EQ Basin and pumping facility; and the installation of standby electrical power and odor control at the WWTP to prevent sewer overflows.)	\$ 11,000,000	\$ -	Considering SRF with ARPA Funding
23	108.1	50	181,370	Chattanooga	Hamilton	WWTP Improvements/Advanced Treatment (Replacing the existing solids treatment system with a Thermal Hydrolysis Process to produce Class A biosolids.)		\$ -	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
24	45.0	10	39,818	Caryville- Jacksboro Utilities Commission		Force main/Interceptor Replacement (Replacing approximately 6,000 LF of 8-inch diameter force main with a 16-inch diameter force main from the main pumping station to the WWTP.)	\$ 950,000	\$ -	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding

July 15, 2022

Total CWSRF Requested \$492,995,221

Total Green Requested \$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

Rank Order	Priority Points*	ATPI	Pop.	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
25	45.0	20	1,250	Tellico Plains*	Monroe	Collection System Expansion (Expansion of the existing collection system to provide sewer service to the Bank Street and Cherokee Subdivisions.) Planning and Design	\$ 250,000	\$ -	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
26	45.0	20	2,585	Parsons*	Decatur	Collection System Relocation (Installation of approximately 1,500 LF of 12-inch diameter interceptor sewer, two manholes, and a lift station from W 4th St to Gum Ave and connecting to an existing force main at Coley Ave.)	\$ 1,606,863	\$ -	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
27	45.0	30	4,058	Livingston*	Overton	Stormwater/Green Infrastructure (Demolition of the existing structures/developments on 4 acres of land within the City Pond Watershed to restore it to a protected natural green space to improve the water quality and stormwater flow in the drainage system.)	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 1,800,000	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
28	45.0	30	11,704	Crossville*	Cumberland	New Pump Station/Force main (Construction of a new pump station and the installation of approximately 13,000 LF of 4-inch diameter force main from the Meadow Park WTP to the Crossville WWTP; and to provide sewer service to customers currently utilizing septic systems.)	\$ 2,045,000	\$-	Currently working with the community
29	45.0	40	53,699	Kingsport	Sullivan	New Sewer Interceptor (Installation of approximately 20,700 LF of 36-inch diameter interceptor sewer within the Reedy Creek Drainage Basin.)	\$ 47,000,000	\$ -	Considering SRF with ARPA Funding
30	45.0	60	1,059	Huntland	Franklin	Decentralized Wastewater Treatment (A feasibility study for upgrading the existing WWTP and drip dispersal facility and expansion of the existing STEP system to provide service to customers currently being served by septic systems.) Planning and Design	\$ 475,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding

July 15, 2022

Total CWSRF Requested \$492,995,221

Total Green Requested \$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

Rank	Priority	4701	D	Local	6t	Paris de Description	Total Project Amount	GREEN Component Amount	Status
Order 31	Points* 45.0	ATPI 60	Pop. 5,829	Government Loudon	County Loudon	Project Description New Force main Interceptor (Installation of approximately 4,500 LF of force main from the Care Inn Lift Station to the WWTP to replace the existing 12-inch diameter force main.)	(\$) \$ 6,000,000	(\$) \$ -	Status Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
32	45.0	60	19,982	Tullahoma	Coffee/Franklin	Collection System Expansion (Installation of approximately 6,700 LF of 12-inch and 15-inch diameter sewer line to eliminate an existing pump station and provide sewer service to an unserved area.)	\$ 1,500,000	\$ -	Funded
33	45.0	70	12,644	Lakeland		New Sewer Interceptor (Installation of approximately 3 miles of 42-inch diameter sewer line from the Scott's Creek WWTP to Chambers Chapel Road to replace the existing Clear Creek Interceptor currently at capacity; and the abandonment of two pump stations.)	\$ 15,000,000	\$ -	Funded
34	45.0	90	2,375	Piperton	Fayette	New WWTP (Construction of a 3 MGD SBR to discharge to the Wolf River.)	\$ 4,500,000	\$-	Does not wish to pursue funding
35	30.0	0	1,994	Rocky Top*		GREEN - I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of approximately 33,000 LF of sewer lines by methods of CIPP, pipe bursting, and/or open cut; and manhole rehabilitation.) Construction Only	\$ 4,126,500	\$ 4,126,500	Currently working with the community
36	30.0	10	2,084	Jellico*	Campbell	GREEN- Pump Station Replacement (Replacing Lift Station #1 and associated appurtenances at the I-75 Interchange.) Construction	\$ 941,000	\$ 400,000	Does not wish to pursue funding
37	30.0	10	2,084	Jellico*	Campbell	Pump Station Replacement (Replacing Lift Station #1 and associated appurtenances at the I-75 Interchange.) Planning and Design	\$ 159,000	\$-	Does not wish to pursue funding

CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

2022 Priority Ranking List

July 15, 2022

Total CWSRF Requested \$492,995,221

Total Green Requested \$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

Rank Order	Priority Points*	ATPI	Pop.	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
38	30.0	10	9,497	Brownsville [*]	Haywood	GREEN - I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of approximately 5,720 LF of sewer line and 21 manholes within the sewer collection system.) Construction	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
39	30.0	20	2,120	South Fulton*	Obion	Pump Station Replacement (Replacement of the existing Old Pierce Road Pump Station and the installation of approximately 25 LF of new 6-inch force main to connect to the existing 8-inch gravity sewer line.)	\$ 570,000	\$ -	Considering SRF with ARPA Funding
40	30.0	20	2,585	Parsons*	Decatur	GREEN - I/I Correction (Replacement of approximately 9,200 LF of 8-inch and 12-inch diameter sewer lines by method of pipe bursting; rehabilitation of 30 manholes from 4th Street to 9th Street.)	\$ 2,250,000	\$ 2,250,000	Does not wish to pursue funding
41	30.0	20	10,021	Paris*	Henry	GREEN - I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of approximately 17,500 LF of 6-inch to 30-inch diameter sewer line by methods of CIPP, pipe bursting, point repairs, and replacement to eliminate inflow and infiltration in the Lagoon Sewer Basin.)	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000	Does not wish to pursue funding
42	30.0	20	10,021	Paris*	Henry	GREEN - I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of approximately 17,500 LF of 6-inch to 30-inch diameter sewer line by methods of CIPP, pipe bursting, point repairs, and replacement to eliminate inflow and infiltration in the Old WWTP Lagoon Sewer Basin.)	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
43	30.0	30	5,910	Erwin*	Unicoi	GREEN - I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of approximately 51,000 LF of sewer line by CIPP and pipe bursting; and the rehabilitation of 715 sewer laterals and 200 manholes within the sewer collection system.)	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 1,250,000	Does not wish to pursue funding

CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

2022 Priority Ranking List

July 15, 2022

Total CWSRF Requested \$492,995,221

Total Green Requested \$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

Rank Order	Priority Points*	АТРІ	Pop.	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
44	30.0	30	16,371	Dyersburg*	Dyer	GREEN —I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of approximately 40,100 LF of 6-inch through 36-inch diameter sewer line by methods of CIPP and/or bursting; and the lining of approximately 3,000 vertical feet of manholes.)	\$ 6,800,000	\$ 6,800,000	Funded
45	30.0	30	16,371	Dyersburg*	Dyer	Pump Station Improvements (Replacement of two pumps and the installation of a generator at the Public Works PS.)	\$ 1,182,000	\$ -	Funded
46	30.0	40	782	Trimble*	Dyer	GREEN - I/I Correction (Evaluation of the sewer collection system to include CCTV, smoke testing, and cleaning; rehabilitation of approximately 3,000 LF of 8-inch diameter sewer lines by method of pipe bursting; replacement of 24 service lines with cleanouts; and manhole rehabilitation along Obion, E Mitchell, and Pierce Street.)	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	Does not wish to pursue funding
47	30.0	40	992	Alexandria*	Dekalb	Pump Station Replacement (Replacement of the existing East High Street Pump Station with a vertical fine screen sewer lift station.)	\$ 300,000	\$ -	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
48	30.0	40	3,505	Etowah*	McMinn	GREEN - I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of approximately 30,000 LF of sewer line and approximately 200 manholes to reduce inflow and infiltration within the sewer collection system.) Construction	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,500,000	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
49	30.0	40	3,505	Etowah*	McMinn	I/I Correction (Conduct a Sanitary Sewer Evaluation Survey of the sewer collection system to include CCTV, flow monitoring, and manhole inspections and cleaning to reduce and eliminate sources of inflow and infiltration.) Planning and Design	\$ 350,000	\$-	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding

July 15, 2022

Total CWSRF Requested \$492,995,221

Total Green Requested \$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

Rank Order	Priority Points*	ATPI	Pop.	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
50	30.0	40		Harriman*	Roane/Morgan	I/I Correction (Sewer system evaluation to prioritize sewer lift stations for rehabilitation and/or upgrades, flow monitoring, and SCADA to determine and eliminate sources of infiltration and inflow.) Planning Only		\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
51	30.0	50	2,533	Carthage*		GREEN - I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of approximately 84,480 LF of sewer line and 21 manholes within the sewer collection system.) Construction	\$ 12,352,548	\$ 12,352,548	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
52	30.0	50	4,950	Madisonville*		GREEN —I/I Correction (Evaluation of the sewer collection system to include mapping and modeling; and the rehabilitation of sewer lines, manholes, and service laterals to reduce inflow and infiltration.) Construction	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	Does not wish to pursue funding
53	30.0	50	4,950	Madisonville*		I/I Correction (Evaluation of the sewer collection system to include mapping and modeling; and the rehabilitation of sewer lines, manholes, and service laterals to reduce inflow and infiltration.) Planning and Design	\$ 150,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
54	30.0	50	4,950	Madisonville*	Monroe	Pump Station Replacement (Replacing PS #8 and #11) Construction	\$ 520,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
55	30.0	50	4,950	Madisonville*	Monroe	Pump Station Replacement (Replacing PS #8 and #11) Planning and Design	\$ 130,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
56	30.0	50	9,191	Lenoir City*		I/I Correction (Evaluation of the sewer collection system in the Martel Area to eliminate sources of infiltration and inflow.) Planning and Design	\$ 1,000,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
2022 Priority Ranking List

July 15, 2022

Total CWSRF Requested \$492,995,221

Total Green Requested \$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

Rank Order	Priority Points*	ATPI	Pop.	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
57	30.0	50		Lenoir City*		I/I Correction (Evaluation of the sewer collection system in the Rock Springs Sewer Basin to eliminate sources of infiltration and inflow.) Planning and Design	\$ 1,500,000		Does not wish to pursue funding
58	30.0	50	9,191	Lenoir City*	Loudon/Roane	I/I Correction (SSES of the sewer collection system to include CCTV, smoke testing, manhole inspection, flow monitoring, and hydraulic modeling.) Planning and Design	\$ 600,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
59	30.0	50	9,191	Lenoir City*	Loudon/Roane	Pump Station Rehabilitation (Rehabilitate or replace the existing Loves PS.)	\$ 800,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
60	30.0	50	9,191	Lenoir City*	Loudon/Roane	Pump Station Rehabilitation (Rehabilitate or replace the existing Manis Lane Pump Station.)	\$ 800,000	\$-	Does not wish to pursue funding
61	30.0	60	1,059	Huntland	Franklin	Stormwater Management (Improvements to stormwater infrastructure to include installing drainage tiles and swales.) Planning and Design	\$ 25,000	\$-	Does not wish to pursue funding
62	30.0	60	19,982	Tullahoma	Coffee/Franklin	GREEN - I/l Correction (Rehabilitation of approximately 30,000 LF of sewer lines by method of CIPP or replacement.)	\$ 5,000,000		Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
63	30.0	70	6,859	Greenbrier	Robertson	I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of the sewer collection system and pump stations to eliminate sources of infiltration and inflow.) Construction	\$ 4,230,000	\$ 4,230,000	Does not wish to pursue funding
64	30.0	70	6,859	Greenbrier	Robertson	I/I Correction (Evaluation of the sewer collection system to include SSES and pump station rehabilitation to eliminate sources of infiltration and inflow.) Planning and Design	\$ 480,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding

CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2022 Priority Ranking List

July 15, 2022

Total CWSRF Requested \$492,995,221

Total Green Requested \$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

Rank Order	Priority Points*	ATPI	Pop.	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
65	30.0	70		Lebanon	Wilson	GREEN - I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of three pump stations, approximately 20,000 LF of sewer line by methods of CIPP/replacement and the rehabilitation of manholes by spray lining as well as repairs to three pumping stations in order to address excess amounts of inflow and infiltration.)	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
66	30.0	80	647	Bell Buckle	Bedford	GREEN - I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of approximately 15,800 LF of 8-inch diameter sewer lines by method of CIPP and/or replacement; and manhole rehabilitation.)	\$ 2,750,000	\$ 2,750,000	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
67	30.0	80	1,659	Norris	Anderson	GREEN - I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of approximately 48,000 LF of sewer lines and 247 manholes.) Design and Construction	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 8,000,000	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
68	30.0	80	1,659	Norris	Anderson	I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of approximately 48,000 LF of sewer lines and 247 manholes.) Planning	\$ 700,000	\$ -	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
69	30.0	80	·	Hamilton County Water & Wastewater Treatment Authority	Hamilton	GREEN - I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of approximately 28,000 LF of sewer line by method of trenchless and open- cut; repairing 870 service lateral and 230 manholes; and lining 1,400 vertical feet of manholes in Sewer Basins 1A, 1B, 3A, 5, and 8A in East Ridge to improve hydraulic capacity and eliminate SSOs.)	\$ 8,630,000	\$ 8,630,000	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
70	30.0	80	·	Hamilton County Water & Wastewater Treatment Authority	Hamilton	GREEN —I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of the sewer lines in Sewer Basins 5, 6, and 7 to reduce I/I, improve hydraulic capacity, and eliminate SSOs in the Red Bank Area.)	\$ 6,755,000	\$ 6,755,000	Does not wish to pursue funding

2022 Priority Ranking List

July 15, 2022

Total CWSRF Requested \$492,995,221

Total Green Requested \$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

Rank	Priority			Local			Total P Amo	unt	Am	Component Iount	
Order		ATPI	Рор.	Government	County	Project Description	(\$)			(\$)	Status
71	30.0	80		Hamilton County Water & Wastewater Treatment Authority		GREEN —I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of the sewer lines in Sewer Basins 2 and 6 to improve hydraulic capacity and eliminate SSOs in the Signal Mountain Area.)	\$ 6	5,150,000	\$	6,150,000	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
72	30.0	80		Hamilton County Water & Wastewater Treatment Authority		GREEN —I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of the sewer lines in Sewer Basin 1,2, 3, and 4 to reduce I/I, improve hydraulic capacity, and eliminate SSOs in the Soddy Daisy Area.)	\$ 5	5,000,000	\$	5,000,000	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
73	30.0	80		Hamilton County Water & Wastewater Treatment Authority		Collection System Rehabilitation (Construction of a new EQ basin and pump station; and the installation of a new gravity sewer/force main to reduce impacts of SSOs in the Soddy Daisy Area.)	\$ 4	1,825,000	\$	-	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
74	15.0	80	1,659	Norris	Anderson	I/l Correction (Construction of a 1MG EQ basin.) Construction	\$ 2	2,775,000	\$	-	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
75	15.0	80	1,659	Norris	Anderson	I/I Correction (Construction of a 1MG EQ basin.) Planning	\$	225,000	\$	-	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
76	10.0	10	1,120	Mason*		Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the wastewater collection system to include GIS mapping and identification of major assets.)	\$	140,000	\$	-	Interested in AMP funding
77	10.0	20	2,585	Parsons*		Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the wastewater collection system to include an assessment of the major assets to develop a Capital Improvement Plan.)	\$	25,000	\$	-	Interested in AMP funding

2022 Priority Ranking List

July 15, 2022

Total CWSRF Requested \$492,995,221

Total Green Requested \$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

Rank Order	Priority Points*	ΑΤΡΙ	Pop.	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
78	10.0	30		Rockwood*	Roane	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the sewer collection system to evaluate system capacity, condition of the assets, and eliminate I/I.)	\$ 800,000		Interested in AMP funding
79	10.0	40	782	Trimble*	-	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the wastewater collection system to include an assessment of the major assets to develop a Capital Improvement Plan.)	\$ 35,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
80	10.0	40	3,505	Etowah*	McMinn	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the wastewater collection system.)	\$ 25,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
81	10.0	40	6,144	Harriman*	Roane/Morgan	Asset Management Plan (Evaluation of the wastewater collection and treatment system to develop a capital improvement plan.)	\$ 150,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
82	10.0	40	6,144	Harriman*	Roane/Morgan	Capacity Development (A feasibility study for expanding the wastewater collection system to reach unsewered areas inside the service area.) Planning Only	\$ 150,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
83	10.0	40	7,046	Fayetteville*		Asset Management Plan (Evaluation of the pump stations within the sewer collection system and the WWTP's equipment to develop a Capital Improvement Plan.)	\$ 350,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
84	10.0	60	5,829	Loudon		Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the sewer collection system to evaluate system capacity, develop a plan to mitigate SSOs, and incorporate a system model to improve hydraulic capacity.)	\$ 400,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding

2022 Priority Ranking List

July 15, 2022

Total CWSRF Requested \$492,995,221

Total Green Requested \$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

Rank	Priority			Local			Total Project Amount	GREEN Component Amount	
Order	Points*	ATPI	Рор.	Government	County	Project Description	(\$)	(\$)	Status
85	10.0	70	6,859	Greenbrier		Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the wastewater collection system.)	\$ 300,000	\$-	Interested in AMP funding
86	10.0	70	16,829			Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the wastewater collection system.)	\$ 400,000	\$-	Interested in AMP funding
87	10.0	90	41,797	Spring Hill	Maury/Williams	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the wastewater collection and stormwater system.)	\$ 500,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
88	6.0	10	9,497	Brownsville*	-	New WWTP (Construction of a new 2.0 MGD SBR to replace the existing Trickling Filter Plant.) Construction	\$ 17,000,000	\$-	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
89	6.0	10	9,497	Brownsville [*]	-	WWTP Improvements/Secondary Treatment (Replacement of the sludge dewatering system at the Trickling Filter Plant.) Construction Only	\$ 1,620,000	\$-	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding

CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2022 Priority Ranking List

July 15, 2022

Total CWSRF Requested \$492,995,221

Total Green Requested \$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

Rank Order	Priority Points*	ATPI	Pop.	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
90	6.0	10	9,497	Brownsville*	Haywood	WWTP Improvements/Secondary Treatment (Replacement of the sludge dewatering system at the Trickling Filter Plant.) Planning and Design		\$ -	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding
91	6.0	50	2,533	Carthage*	Smith	WWTP Improvements/Secondary Treatment (Construction of new headwords and sludge handling facilities; installation of new blowers; and the rehabilitation of the primary clarifier and existing basins.)	\$ 3,690,600	\$ -	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
92	30.0	10	650,910	Memphis	Shelby	GREEN - I/I Correction (City-Wide Sewer Assessment & Rehabilitation Program /Group 3 CIPP, Group 3Relay, Group 3 Point Repair, Group 4 Relay, Group 5 CIPP, Group 6 CIPP to include pre-cleaning, rehabilitation of approximately 184,000 linear feet of 6-inch through 36- inch diameter sewer lines by methods of CIPP, replacing, and point repairs; reinstating laterals, and manhole rehabilitation.)	\$ 42,136,000	\$ 42,136,000	Currently working with the community
93	30.0	10	1,612	Decatur	Meigs	I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of 8-inch diameter sewer lines by methods of CIPP, trenchless, or pipe bursting; and rehabilitation of manholes and pump stations.) Planning and Design	\$ 300,000	\$-	Currently working with the community
94	30.0	10	1,612	Decatur	Meigs	GREEN - I/I Correction (Rehabilitation of 8-inch diameter sewer lines by methods of CIPP, trenchless, or pipe bursting; and rehabilitation of manholes and pump stations.) Construction	\$ 2,000,000		Anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of the planning and design loan
95	111.1	20	2,110	Halls*	Lauderdale	WWTP Improvements/Secondary Treatment (Replacement of the aeration system at the Halls Wastewater Treatment Lagoon.)	\$ 900,000	\$-	Community still interested in pursuing SRF funding

CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2022 Priority Ranking List

July 15, 2022

Total CWSRF Requested \$492,995,221

Total Green Requested \$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

Rank Order		ATPI	Pop.	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
96	10.0	10	7,852	Ripley*	Lauderdale	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the sewer collection system to include GIS mapping, a preventive work plan, and an inventory and assessment the condition of the existing facilities to help develop a capital improvement plan.)	\$ 45,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
97	10.0	10		Caryville- Jacksboro Utility Commission	Campbell	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the sewer collection system to include purchase of a computerized system and software to assist with AMP needs, prioritize O&M activities, and GIS mapping to assess the condition of existing facilities.)		\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
98	10.0	20	2,110	Halls*	Lauderdale	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the wastewater collection system.)	\$ 200,000	\$-	Interested in AMP funding
99	10.0	20	10,021	Paris*	Henry	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the wastewater collection system to include software purchase, GIS mapping, flow monitoring and hydraulic modeling, and an inventory and assessment of the condition of existing facilities to develop a Capital Improvement Plan.)	\$ 500,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
100	10.0	30	3,293	Newbern*	Dyer	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the wastewater collection system to include GIS mapping and inventory/assessment of the major assets to develop a Capital Improvement Plan.)	\$ 60,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
101	10.0	30	4,412	Rogersville*	Hawkins	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the sewer collection system to include GIS mapping, a preventive work plan, and an inventory and assessment of the condition of the existing facilities to help develop a capital improvement plan.)	\$ 50,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding

2022 Priority Ranking List

July 15, 2022

Total CWSRF Requested

Total Green Requested \$139,650,048

Total Disadvantage Community Requested \$141,279,221

\$492,995,221

Rank	Priority		_	Local	. .		Total Project Amount	GREEN Component Amount	
Order 102	Points* 10.0	ATPI 40	Pop. 1,513	Government Englewood*		Project Description Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the wastewater collection system to include GIS	(\$) \$ 150,000	(\$) \$-	Status Interested in AMP funding
103	10.0	50	2,093	Bluff City*	Sullivan	Mapping.) Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the wastewater collection system to include a	\$ 32,71) \$ -	Interested in AMP funding
104	10.0	60	53,331	Roane County	Roane	comprehensive inventory of major assets.) Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management	\$ 500,000	- \$	Interested in AMP funding
						Plan for the wastewater collection system to include flow monitoring and an inventory and assessment of the condition of existing facilities.)			

2022 Clean Water PRL Summary	Counts	Totals	
35 of the 104 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding.	35	\$263,146,863	
8 of the 104 Communities are currently working with SRF in the funding process.	8	\$52,155,500	
2 of the 104 Projects are anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of the funded planning and design loan.	2	\$8,500,000	
4 of the 104 Projects have been funded.	4	\$24,482,000	
5 of the 104 Communities were contacted but a response from the community has not been received.	5	\$48,243,148	
27 of 104 Communities decided not to proceed with SRF funding.	27	\$33,185,000	
19 of 104 Communities still interested in AMP funding.	19	\$4,207,710	
4 of 104 Communities still considering SRF with ARPA Funding.	4	\$58,970,000	
	104	\$492,890,221	
Clean Water Balance as of April 26,2023		\$205,696,268	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary	Counts	Totals	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary	Counts 34	Totals \$105,812,209	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary 34 of the 143 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding.			
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary 34 of the 143 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding. 17 of the 143 Communities are currently working with SRF in the funding process.	34	\$105,812,209	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary 34 of the 143 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding. 17 of the 143 Communities are currently working with SRF in the funding process. 6 of the 143 Projects are anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of the funded planning and design loan.	34 17	\$105,812,209 \$80,403,700	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary 34 of the 143 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding. 17 of the 143 Communities are currently working with SRF in the funding process. 6 of the 143 Projects are anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of the funded planning and design loan. 1 of the 143 Projects have been funded.	34 17	\$105,812,209 \$80,403,700 \$53,849,000	
	34 17 6 1	\$105,812,209 \$80,403,700 \$53,849,000 \$200,000	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary 34 of the 143 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding. 17 of the 143 Communities are currently working with SRF in the funding process. 6 of the 143 Projects are anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of the funded planning and design loan. 1 of the 143 Projects have been funded. 1 of the 143 Communities were contacted but a response from the community has not been received.	34 17 6 1 16	\$105,812,209 \$80,403,700 \$53,849,000 \$200,000 \$32,857,016	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary 34 of the 143 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding. 17 of the 143 Communities are currently working with SRF in the funding process. 6 of the 143 Projects are anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of the funded planning and design loan. 1 of the 143 Projects have been funded. 16 of the 143 Communities were contacted but a response from the community has not been received. 15 of the 143 Communities decided not to proceed with SRF funding.	34 17 6 1 16 15	\$105,812,209 \$80,403,700 \$53,849,000 \$200,000 \$32,857,016 \$42,321,000	
2022 Drinking Water PRL Summary 34 of the 143 Communities are still interested in receiving SRF funding. 17 of the 143 Communities are currently working with SRF in the funding process. 6 of the 143 Projects are anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of the funded planning and design loan. 1 of the 143 Projects have been funded. 16 of the 143 Communities were contacted but a response from the community has not been received. 15 of the 143 Communities decided not to proceed with SRF funding. 40 of the 143 Communities still interested in AMP funding.	34 17 6 1 16 15 40	\$105,812,209 \$80,403,700 \$53,849,000 \$200,000 \$32,857,016 \$42,321,000 \$5,810,900	

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order	Priority Points+	АТРІ	Pop. Served	Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
1	105	40	776	FY22 Base	Trimble*	Dyer	Waterline Replacement (Installation of approximately 6,100 LF of 6-inch diameter PVC waterlines to replace asbestos cement and cast iron waterlines in the distribution system.)	\$ 537,000	\$-	Considering SRF with ARPA funding
2	105	40	1,389	FY22 BIL General	Cedar Grove Utility District*	Carroll	Waterline Replacement (Replacing approximately 83,000 LF of 6-inch diameter asbestos cement waterlines with PVC and associated appurtenances along Hwy 220, Hwy 70, Hwy 70E, and Dunn Road.)	\$ 4,407,200	\$ -	Currently working with the community
3	85	0	5,414	FY22 Base	Spencer*	Van Buren	WTP Improvements (Replace existing raw water intake and booster pump station.)	\$ 6,000,000	\$ -	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
4	85	20	6,230	FY22 BIL General	Huntingdon*	Carroll	Waterline Replacement (Replacement of approximately 9,500 LF of 8-inch and 10-inch diameter PVC waterlines along Main Street and Browning Hwy.)	\$ 1,250,000	\$ -	Currently working with the community
5	85	30	14,848	FY22 Base	Livingston*	Overton	WTP Improvements (Installation of a new raw water pump, screen, and ball valves at the existing WTP.)	\$ 800,000	\$ -	Currently working with the community
6	85	40	13,390	FY22 BIL General	Chuckey Utility District*	Greene/Washington	New Water Storage Tank (Construction of a 250,000 gallon WST off Rheatown Road.)	\$ 670,000	\$-	Currently working with the community
7	85	40	15,219	FY22 Base	Harriman*	Roane/Morgan	Distribution System Improvements (Replacement of leaking waterlines and service connections; and install zone meters within the service area to reduce water loss.) Construction	\$ 2,250,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
8	85	40	15,219	FY22 Base	Harriman*	Roane/Morgan	Water Loss Reduction (Survey of the distribution system for leaks and establish district metering zones to reduce system- wide water loss.) Planning and Design	\$ 250,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order	Priority Points+	АТРІ	Pop. Served	Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
9	85	50	2,947	FY22 Base	Copper Basin Utility District*	Polk	GREEN - Distribution System Improvements (Installation of zone meters, leak detection equipment, and point repairs to leaking waterlines in the service area.) Water Efficiency	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	Does not wish to pursue funding
10	85	70		FY22 BIL General	Greenbrier	Robertson	Waterline Replacement (Replacement of approximately 10,000 LF of galvanized waterline within the distribution system.) Construction	\$ 1,000,000	\$ -	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
11	85	70	8,521	FY22 Base	Greenbrier	Robertson	Waterline Replacement (Replacement of approximately 10,000 LF of galvanized waterline within the distribution system.) Planning and Design	\$ 100,000	\$ -	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
12	65	10		FY22 BIL General	Decaturville*	Decatur	Waterline Extension (Installation of approximately 20,200 LF of 4-inch thru 8- inch diameter waterlines along Brooksie Thompson Road, Olen Britt Road, Hwy 100, Crawford School Road, and at the Decatur County High School.)	\$ 1,529,000	\$-	Considering SRF with ARPA funding
13	65	10	5,366	FY22 Base	Jellico*	Campbell	GREEN - WTP Improvements (Upgrade the raw water intake, install new blowers, and piping modifications at the existing WTP; and rehabilitate the abandoned WTPWater and Energy Efficiency) Construction	\$ 1,678,500	\$ 1,678,500	Considering SRF with ARPA funding
14	65	10	5,366	FY22 Base	Jellico*	Campbell	WTP Improvements (Upgrade the raw water intake, install new blowers, and piping modifications at the existing WTP; and rehabilitate the abandoned WTP.) Planning and Design	\$ 244,500	\$ -	Considering SRF with ARPA funding

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order	Priority Points+	АТРІ	Pop. Served	Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
15	65	10	27,300	FY22 Base	LaFollette	Campbell/ Claiborne	Waterline Replacement (Replacing approximately 11,750 LF of 6-inch diameter waterlines with 12-inch diameter waterlines to provide better pressure in the downtown area.) Construction	\$ 2,750,000		Anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of the funded planning and design loan
16	65	10		FY22 BIL General	LaFollette	Campbell/ Claiborne	Waterline Replacement (Replacing approximately 11,750 LF of 6-inch diameter waterlines with 12-inch diameter waterlines to provide better pressure in the downtown area.) Planning and Design	\$ 200,000	\$ -	Funded
17	65	10		FY22 BIL General	LaFollette	Campbell/ Claiborne	Waterline Replacement (Replacing approximately 16,000 LF of 6-inch and 8-inch diameter waterlines with 12-inch diameter waterlines along SR-63 and from E Elm Street to Glade Springs Road.) Construction		\$ -	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
18	65	10	27,300	FY22 Base	LaFollette	Campbell/ Claiborne	Waterline Replacement (Replacing approximately 16,000 LF of 6-inch and 8-inch diameter waterlines with 12-inch diameter waterlines along SR-63 and from E Elm Street to Glade Springs Road.) Planning and Design		\$ -	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
19	65	20	1,596	FY22 Base	Obion*	Obion	Waterline Replacement (Replacement of approximately 6,500 LF of 4-inch diameter cast iron waterline with 6-inch diameter PVC waterline on Palestine Avenue and Main Street.)	\$ 1,001,000	\$-	Considering SRF with ARPA funding
20	65	20		FY22 BIL General	Perryville Utility District*	Decatur	GREEN - Water Meter Replacement (Installation of approximately 1,450 AMR throughout the distribution system.) Water Efficiency	\$ 882,000	\$ 882,000	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order	Priority Points+	АТРІ		Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
21	65	20	3,289	FY22 Base	Perryville Utility District*	Decatur	Water Storage Tank Improvements (Installation of a telemetry system and welding repairs.)	\$ 726,000	\$-	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
22	65	20	3,960	FY22 BIL General	South Fulton*	Obion	GREEN - Water Meter Replacement (Installation of approximately 1,650 AMI meters throughout the distribution system.) Water Efficiency	\$ 700,000	\$ 700,000	Considering SRF with ARPA funding
23	65	20	3,960	FY22 Base	South Fulton*	Obion	WTP Improvements (Installation of an emergency generator at the WTP.)	\$ 500,000	\$ -	Considering SRF with ARPA funding
24	65	20		FY22 BIL General	Huntingdon*	Carroll	GREEN - Water Meter Replacement (Replacement of approximately 2,400 meters within the distribution system.) Water Efficiency	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 1,250,000	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
25	65	30	14,046	FY22 Base	Watts Bar Utility District*	Roane/Meigs/Rhea /Loudon/McMinn	GREEN - Water Meter Replacement (Installation of approximately 3,600 AMR meters throughout the distribution system.) Water Efficiency	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	Currently working with the community
26	65	30	14,046	FY22 BIL General	Watts Bar Utility District*	Roane/Meigs/Rhea /Loudon/McMinn	WTP Improvements (Installation of 500 gpm gravity filters at the existing WTP.)	\$ 2,100,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
27	65	40	776	FY22 Base	Trimble*	Dyer	WTP Improvements (Rehabilitation of the clearwell and pressure filter at the existing WTP.)	\$ 261,000	\$-	Considering SRF with ARPA funding
28	65	40	1,389	FY22 BIL General	Cedar Grove Utility District*	Carroll	New Water Storage Tank (Construction of 250,000 gallon WST and the installation of a 300 gpm booster pump station at Carroll County 1000 Acre Lake.)	\$ 2,227,500	\$-	Considering SRF with ARPA funding
29	65	40	2,691	FY22 Base	Alexandria*	Smith/Dekalb	GREEN - Distribution System Improvements (Replacement of the water booster pump station.) Energy Efficiency	\$ 351,500	\$ 150,000	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order	Priority Points+	ATPI	Pop. Served	Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
30	65	40	3,492	FY22 BIL General	Monteagle*		Water Storage Tank - New (Construction of a 350,000 gallon WST located along West Main Street.)	\$ 1,750,000	\$-	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
31	65	40	4,158	FY22 Base	Northwest Dyersburg Utility District*		Distribution System Improvements (Installation of approximately 7,200 LF of 2- inch and 6-inch diameter waterlines and associated appurtenances to eliminate dead- end lines along Beaver Creek/Quail Hollow Road, Simpson Hill/Revel Road, and Village Street; the abandonment of 16 miles of old waterlines; and the re-connection of existing customers to an 8-inch diameter waterline to reduce water loss.)		\$ -	Considering SRF with ARPA funding
32	65	40	4,158	FY22 BIL General	Northwest Dyersburg Utility District*	Dyer	WTP Improvements (Rebuilding two high service pumps, rehabilitating of two pressure filters, and replacing a 4-inch valve.)	\$ 332,173	\$-	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
33	65	40	7,961	FY22 Base	Cross Anchor Utility District*	Greene	Waterline Replacement (Installation of approximately 27,400 LF of 8-inch diameter PVC or DIP waterline along Jearoldstown and West Pine Road.)	\$ 2,500,000	\$-	Considering SRF with ARPA funding
34	65	50		FY22 BIL General	Copper Basin Utility District*		New Water Storage Tank (Construction of a 300,000 gallon WST and 250 gpm booster pump station; and the installation of approximately 4,100 LF of 6-inch diameter PVC waterline in the Isabella Area.)	\$ 2,500,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
35	65	50	2,968	FY22 Base	Carthage*		Waterline Replacement (Replacing approximately 143,000 LF of aging waterlines and associated appurtenances throughout the distribution system.)	\$ 10,653,536	\$-	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order		АТРІ		Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
36	65	50	-	FY22 BIL General	Carthage*	Smith	WTP Improvements (Replacing two high service pumps; installing agitators for the filters and a new control panel at the existing WTP.)	\$ 426,000	\$-	Does not wish to pursue funding
37	65	50	14,829	FY22 Base	Madisonville*	Monroe	Distribution System Improvements (Replace existing booster pump station and install approximately 5,100 LF of 6-inch diameter waterline and associated appurtenances.) Construction	\$ 1,200,000	\$ -	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
38	65	50	14,829	FY22 Base	Madisonville*	Monroe	Distribution System Improvements (Replace existing booster pump station and install approximately 5,100 LF of 6-inch diameter waterline and associated appurtenances.) Planning and Design	\$ 250,000	\$-	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
39	65	50	30,885	FY22 Base	Lenoir City	Loudon/Roane	New Water Storage Tank (Construction of a new 1 MG WST and the installation of approximately 4,000 LF of 16-inch diameter waterline in the Hickory Creek Road Area.)	\$ 1,500,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
40	65	50		FY22 BIL General	Springfield	Robertson	WTP Improvements (Installation of a new high service pumping system and SCADA controls; and expansion of the existing clearwell by 1 MG.)	\$ 4,500,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
41	65	60	32,369	FY22 Base	Jonesborough	Washington	WTP Expansion (Expansion of the existing WTP from 4 MGD to 8 MGD to include replacement of the intake pumps; construction of a new sedimentation basin, flocculation basin, filter building and basin, flash mixer, and clearwell; and the rehabilitation of existing filters.)	\$ 22,200,000	\$-	Currently working with the community

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order	Priority Points+	АТРІ	Pop. Served	Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
42	65	80		FY22 BIL General		Hamilton/Bradley	New Water Transmission Main (Installation of approximately 4,800 LF of 30-inch diameter transmission main beginning at Enterprise South Nature Park/Still Hollow Loop, crossing I-75 and connecting to the existing 24-inch diameter transmission main at Old Cleveland Pike/Old Lee Hwy.)	\$ 4,900,000		Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
43	65	80	60,100	FY22 Base	Eastside Utility District	Hamilton/Bradley	Water Transmission Relocation (Installation of approximately 11,000 LF of 6-inch, 8-inch, and 24-inch diameter transmission main from Bel-Air Road to Ooltewah-Ringgold Road.)	\$ 5,800,000	\$ -	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
44	65	80	60,100	FY22 BIL General	Eastside Utility District	Hamilton/Bradley	WTP Improvements (Construction of new 2.5 MG clearwell and a 20 MGD water pump station at the existing WTP.)	\$ 15,000,000	\$ -	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
45	45	10	6,132	FY22 Base	Decatur*	Meigs	New WTP (Construction of a new WTP and the development of a new water source.) Construction	\$ 10,464,000		Anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of a planning and design loan
46	45	10	6,132	FY22 Base	Decatur*	Meigs	New WTP (Construction of a new WTP and the development of a new water source.) Planning and Design	\$ 1,306,000	\$-	Currently working with the community
47	45	10	13,601	FY22 Base	Brownsville Energy Authority*	Haywood	Waterline Extension (Installation of approximately 20,250 LF of 12-inch diameter waterlines from Windrow Road to Anderson Avenue to create a loop and make the system more resilient.) Construction	\$ 1,720,000	\$ -	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order	Priority Points+	АТРІ	Pop. Served	Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
48	45	10	13,601	FY22 BIL General	Brownsville Energy Authority*		Waterline Extension (Installation of approximately 20,250 LF of 12-inch diameter waterlines from Windrow Road to Anderson Avenue to create a loop and make the system more resilient.) Planning and Design	\$ 213,000	\$ -	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
49	45	10	27,300	FY22 Base	LaFollette		Waterline Extension (Construction of a booster station and the installation of approximately 67,000 LF of 2-inch through 8- inch and 12-inch diameter waterlines on Cedar Creek, Alder Springs, Norman, Flat Hollow, and Flatwood Road to provide water to the unserved areas in Campbell County.) Construction	\$ 6,225,000	\$ -	Anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of a planning and design loan
50	45	20	672	FY22 BIL General	Stanton*		Waterline Extension (Installation of approximately 31,600 LF of 12-inch diameter waterline along Hwy 179.)	\$ 1,800,000	\$-	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
51	45	20	12,495	FY22 Base	Paris*	Henry	Waterline Replacement (Installation of approximately 12,000 LF of 12-inch diameter DIP waterline to improve pressure in the western portion of the distribution system.)	\$ 2,500,000	\$ -	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
52	45	30	12,980	FY22 BIL General	Erwin*		Waterline Extension (Installation of approximately 15,000 LF of 2-inch through 6- inch diameter PVC and DIP waterlines along Lower Higgins Creek, Sandy Bottom, McInturff Springs, and Canah Hollow Road.)	\$ 1,354,000	\$-	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
53	45	30	14,046	FY22 Base	Watts Bar Utility District*	-	New Water Storage Tank (Construction of a 450,000 gallon WST, a 385,000 gallon WST, and a 150 gpm booster pump station in the Wolf Creek Area and on Lankford Ridge.)	\$ 3,200,000	\$-	Currently working with the community

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order	Priority Points+	АТРІ	Pop. Served	Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
54	45	30	14,046	FY22 BIL General	Watts Bar Utility District*	-	New Transmission Main (Construction of a 300 gpm booster pump station and the installation of approximately 1,000 LF of 12- inch diameter DIP water transmission main.)	\$ 2,100,000	\$ -	Currently working with the community
55	45	30	31,261	FY22 Base	Crossville		Waterline Extension (Installation of approximately 6,000 LF of 16-inch diameter waterlines along City Lake and Taylor's Chapel Road to Spruce Loop.)	\$ 900,000	\$ -	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
56	45	40	12,761	FY22 BIL General	Fayetteville*	Lincoln	Waterline Replacement (Replacement of approximately 83,000 LF of aging waterlines to improve pressure and reduce water loss.) Construction	\$ 15,200,000	\$ -	Currently working with the community
57	45	50	2,947	FY22 Base	Copper Basin Utility District*		Waterline Extension (Installation of approximately 17,900 LF of 6-inch diameter PVC waterline along Stansbury Mountain, Bethlehem, and Burgertown Road.)	\$ 1,500,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding
58	45	50	2,968	FY22 BIL General	Carthage*	Smith	Water Storage Tank Improvements (Installation of a mixer to improve water quality.)	\$ 25,000	\$-	Does not wish to pursue funding
59	45	50	30,885	FY22 Base	Lenoir City		Waterline Extension (Installation of approximately 4,000 LF of 12-inch diameter DIP waterline along Hwy 70 and Riley Drive.)	\$ 1,500,000	\$-	Does not wish to pursue funding
60	45	50	30,885	FY22 BIL General	Lenoir City		WTP Expansion (Upgrading the existing WTP from 3 MGD to 6 MGD.) Planning and Design	\$ 2,000,000	\$-	Does not wish to pursue funding
61	45	50	90,384	FY22 Base	Cleveland		WTP Improvements (Construction of a 200,000 gallon filter backwash basin and associated appurtenances at the Cleveland Filter Plant.)	\$ 1,300,000	\$ -	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order	Priority Points+	АТРІ	Pop. Served	Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
62	45	50	90,384	FY22 BIL General	Cleveland	Bradley	WTP Improvements (Construction of a new high service pump station adjacent to the Cleveland Filter Plant; replacement of the existing power grid; and installation of a new motor control center and emergency power capabilities.)	\$ 4,970,000	\$-	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
63	45	50	90,384	FY22 Base	Cleveland	Bradley	WTP Improvements (Construction of a Sodium Hypochlorite Feed System to replace the existing Chlorine Feed System at the Cleveland Filter Plant.)	\$ 3,325,000	\$-	Currently working with the community
64	45	60	1,590	FY22 BIL General	Huntland	Lincoln	WST Improvements (Installation of telemetry.)	\$ 105,000	\$ -	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
65	45	60	1,590	FY22 Base	Huntland	Lincoln	WTP and Distribution System Improvements (Installation of a standby electrical generator, SCADA, and telemetry at the WTP; and the installation of approximately 700 AMR meters.) Planning and Design	\$ 125,000	\$ -	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
66	45	60	5,327	FY22 BIL General	Witt Utility District	Hamblen/ Jefferson/ Sevier/Cocke	New Water Storage Tank (Construction of 2 MG water storage tank.) Planning and Design	\$ 100,000	\$-	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
67	45	60	5,327	FY22 Base	Witt Utility District	Hamblen/ Jefferson/ Sevier/Cocke	Waterline Extension (Installation of approximately 134,000 LF of 16-inch, 24- inch, and 36-inch diameter transmission main; and the installation of approximately 100,000 LF of 2-inch through 8-inch diameter waterlines to serve industrial and residential customers.) Planning and Design	\$ 1,050,000	\$ -	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
68	45	60	5,327	FY22 BIL General	Witt Utility District	Hamblen/ Jefferson/ Sevier/Cocke	WTP Improvements (Installation of two high service pumps at the existing WTP.) Planning and Design	\$ 100,000	\$ -	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

* Disadvantage Community (ATPI of 50 or less and population less than 20,000) **Total Project GREEN Component** Pop. Rank Priority Local Amount Amount Order Points+ ATPI Served Funding Government County **Project Description** (\$) (\$) Status 69 45 60 32.369 New Water Transmission Main (Installation FY22 Base Washington 12,625,000 \$ Jonesborough \$ Community still interested in receiving SRF funding of approximately 33,000 LF of 24-inch diameter DIP transmission main from the Water Treatment Plant to Old Embreeville Road.) 70 32.369 FY22 BIL Jonesborough Washington Waterline Extension (Installation of 45 60 \$ 6,145,000 \$ Community still interested in receiving SRF funding General approximately 18,500 LF of 16-inch diameter DIP waterline on the north side of the town.) Community was contacted but SRF has not 71 45 70 40,502 FY22 Base Lebanon Wilson New Water Storage Tank (Construction of a \$ 2,750,000 \$ 2.0 MG WST.) received a returned response 72 25 3.668 FY22 Base Mason* WTP Improvements (Improvements to the \$ 40.000 \$ Community still interested in receiving SRF funding 10 Tipton iron oxidation processes, replacement of the filter media, and the evaluation of the treatment process for potential failure points.) Planning Brownsville Energy Haywood 73 10 13,601 FY22 Base **GREEN - Water Meter Replacement** \$ 1,720,000 \$ 25 1,720,000 Does not wish to pursue funding Authority* (Replacement of approximately 5,700 meters with AMI meters.) Water Efficiency 4,063 FY22 BIL Parsons* 74 25 20 Decatur Water Transmission Line (Replacement of \$ 641,000 \$ Considering SRF with ARPA funding General approximately 1,100 LF of 10-inch diameter waterline and associated appurtenances along Beech Road.) 75 25 20 7,094 FY22 Base Maynardville* Union **GREEN - Water Meter Replacement** \$ 1,375,000 \$ 1,375,000 Anticipated to be funded once the community has (Installation of approximately 27,500 AMI completed the requirements of the funded meters throughout the distribution system. planning and design loan Water Efficiency) Construction 76 7,094 FY22 Base Maynardville* **GREEN - Water Meter Replacement** 75,000 \$ Currently working with the community 25 20 Union \$ (Installation of approximately 2,700 AMI

meters throughout the distribution system.)

Planning and Design

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order	Priority Points+	АТРІ	Pop. Served	Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
77	25	20	12,495	FY22 Base	Paris*	Henry	Waterline Replacement (Replacement of approximately 19,000 LF of cast iron waterlines with 8-inch diameter DIP waterlines in the downtown area.)	\$ 2,500,000	\$ -	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
78	25	20	17,866	FY22 BIL General	McMinnville*	Warren	WTP Improvements (Rehabilitation of the raw water pumps, sedimentation basins, filters, pipe gallery, control building, electrical components, and controls; and upgrades to campus security.)	\$ 5,700,000	\$-	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
79	25	30	10,721	FY22 Base	Rockwood*	Roane	WTP Improvements (Renovation of the settling basins, flocculation basins, and laboratory; and the replacement of valves, pipes, and actuators at the existing WTP.)	\$ 5,900,000	\$-	Currently working with the community
80	25	30	14,848	FY22 BIL General	Livingston*	Overton	GREEN - Water Meter Replacement (Installation of approximately 5,100 AMI and zone meters in the rural areas.) Water Efficiency	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,500,000	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
81	25	40	12,761	FY22 Base	Fayetteville*	Lincoln	WTP Expansion (Expansion of the existing WTP from 4.5 MGD to 8 MGD.) Construction	\$ 20,100,000	\$-	Anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements of a planning and design loan
82	25	40	12,761	FY22 Base	Fayetteville*	Lincoln	WTP Expansion (Expansion of the existing WTP from 4.5 MGD to 8 MGD.) Planning and Design	\$ 800,000	\$-	Currently working with the community
83	25	40	12,761	FY22 Base	Fayetteville*	Lincoln	WTP Improvements (Improvements to the solids management facilities and disinfection byproduct control; and the demolition of the existing WTP.) Construction	\$ 1,800,000	\$ -	Currently working with the community

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan
* Disadvantage Community (ATPI of 50 or less and population less than 20,000)

Rank Order	Priority Points+	АТРІ	Pop. Served	Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
84	25	40	13,390	FY22 BIL General	Chuckey Utility District*	Greene/Washington	Waterline Extension (Installation of approximately 13,400 LF of 12-inch diameter waterlines along Rheatown, Quaker Knob, and Stone Dam Road.)	\$ 1,830,000	\$ -	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
85	25	50	30,885	FY22 Base	Lenoir City	Loudon/Roane	GREEN – Water Meter Replacement (Replacement of approximately 1,800 water meters with AMI meters within the Martel Water System Area.) Water Efficiency	\$ 800,000	\$ 800,000	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
86	25	60		FY22 BIL General	Huntland	Lincoln	GREEN - Distribution System Improvements (Installation of insertion valves and approximately 700 AMR metersWater Efficiency) Construction	\$ 950,000	\$ 810,000	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
87	25	60	1,590	FY22 Base	Huntland	Lincoln	WTP Improvements (Installation of a standby electrical generator, SCADA, and telemetry at the existing WTP.)		\$-	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
88	25	60		FY22 BIL General	Jonesborough	Washington	GREEN - Water Meter Replacement (Replacement of approximately 14,500 water meters with AMI/AMR throughout the distribution system.) Water Efficiency	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 4,500,000	Considering SRF with ARPA funding
89	25	100	8,735	FY22 Base	Hartsville- Trousdale Water & Sewer Utility District	Trousdale	New WTP (Construction of new membrane WTP to include rehabilitation of the existing raw water intake; upgrades to the raw water pumps; and the installation of transmission main to the new WTP site.)	\$ 20,000,000	\$-	Considering SRF with ARPA funding

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order	Priority Points+	АТРІ	Pop. Served	Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
90	15	20		Revolving Fund	Perryville Utility Dist		Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include GIS mapping and a preventative work plan, to assess the condition of existing facilities and to help maintain a capital improvement plan and budget.)	\$ 60,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
91	10	0		Revolving Fund	Big Creek Utility District*		Asset Management Plan (Develop an inventory and assess the condition of existing facilities within the distribution system to increase efficiency and help maintain a capital improvement plan.)	\$ 250,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
92	10	10		Revolving Fund	Decaturville*		Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system.)	\$ 35,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
93	10	10		Revolving Fund	Mason*		Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system.)	\$ 225,000	\$-	Interested in AMP funding
94	10	10	3,668	FY22 Base	Mason*	Tipton	Energy/Water Audit (Development of a strategic financial plan to fund capital improvements cost.)	\$ 50,000		Does not wish to pursue funding
95	10	20		Revolving Fund	Obion*		Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include GIS mapping and a preventative work plan, to assess the condition of existing facilities and to help maintain a capital improvement plan and budget.)	\$ 40,000	\$-	Interested in AMP funding

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order	Priority Points+	ΑΤΡΙ	Pop. Served	Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
96	10	20		Revolving Fund	South Fulton*	Obion	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include GIS mapping.)	\$ 175,000		Interested in AMP funding
97	10	20		Revolving Fund	Parsons*		Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include GIS mapping and a preventative work plan, to assess the condition of existing facilities and to help maintain a capital improvement plan and budget.)	\$ 25,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
98	10	40		Revolving Fund	Trimble*	Dyer	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system.)	\$ 35,000	\$-	Interested in AMP funding
99	10	40		Revolving Fund	Cedar Grove Utility District*	Carroll	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution to include GIS mapping, identification of major assets, and assessment of the condition of existing facilities to help maintain a capital improvement plan.)	\$ 60,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
100	10	40		Revolving Fund	Monteagle*	Grundy/Madison/ Franklin	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include GIS mapping, hydraulic modeling, assessment of the condition of existing facilities, and a preventative work plan.)	\$ 150,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order 101	Priority Points+ 10	ATPI 40	Funding Revolving Fund	Local Government Northwest Dyersburg Utility District*	County Dyer	Project Description Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include GIS mapping and a preventative work plan, to assess the condition of existing facilities and to help maintain a capital improvement plan and budget.)	Total Project Amount (\$) \$ 60,000	GREEN Component Amount (\$) \$ -	Status Interested in AMP funding
102	10	40	Revolving Fund	Byrdstown*	Pickett	Asset Management Plan (Develop an inventory and assess the condition of existing facilities within the distribution system to increase efficiency and help maintain a capital improvement plan.)	\$ 250,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
103	10	40	Revolving Fund	Kingsport	Sullivan/ Hawkins/ Washington/ Greene	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan to include an inventory of assets, an assessment of the condition of existing facilities, and a preventative work plan development for the distribution system to increase efficiency and reliability.)	\$ 500,000	\$-	Interested in AMP funding
104	10	50	Revolving Fund	Madisonville*	Monroe	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include GIS mapping and hydraulic modeling.)	\$ 50,000	\$-	Interested in AMP funding
105	10	80	Revolving Fund	Eastside Utility District	Hamilton/Bradley	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan to include an inventory of assets, an assessment of the condition of existing facilities, and a preventative work plan for the distribution system to increase efficiency ₇ and reliability, and to provide a proactive maintenance strategy for the UD.)	\$ 200,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order 106	Priority Points+ 10	ATPI 80		Funding Revolving Fund	Local Government Eastside Utility District		Project Description Asset Management Plan (Purchase of a computerized maintenance management system to support asset management planning.)	Total Proje Amount (\$) \$ 500	ct	GREEN Component Amount (\$) \$ -	Status Interested in AMP funding
107	10	90	51,725	Revolving Fund	Spring Hill		Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include GIS mapping and a preventative work plan, to assess the condition of existing facilities and to help maintain a capital improvement plan and budget.)	\$ 500.	000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
108	65	10	4,291	DWSRF/BIL General	Scotts Hill*		Waterline Extension (Phase 2 - Installation of approximately 16,440 LF of 6-inch and 10- inch diameter waterlines along Hwy 641 and 3 Way Road, and associated appurtenances.) Construction	\$ 2,120,	000	\$-	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
109	65	10	9,360	Revolving Fund	Ripley*	Lauderdale	Water Line Replacement (Phase 2- Replacement of approximately 6,000 LF of 10 inch diameter asbestos cement waterlines with 12-inch diameter PVC waterlines along Highway 209 from Webb Avenue East to Marvin Drive; and the replacement of approximately 40 service lines, and associated appurtenances.) Construction	\$ 1,420,	000	\$-	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
110	65	30	3,953	DWSRF/BIL General	Clifton*	Wayne	GREEN - New Water Treatment Plant (Construction of a 1.5 MGD WTP to include a new raw water intake and 2,500 LF of waterline from the intake to the WTP site.) Construction - Energy Conservation	\$ 12,200	000	\$ 610,000	Currently working with the community

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order	Priority Points+	АТРІ	Pop. Served	Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
111	65	50	12,458	DWSRF/BIL General	Etowah Utilities*	McMinn/ Polk	WTP Expansion and Distribution System Improvements (Expansion of the existing WTP from 4.2 MGD to 8 MGD to include new raw and finish water pumping, sedimentation basin, disinfection, flocculation and mixing chamber valves, and SCADA; upgrade existing filters; and the construction of a new 3.2 MGD booster pump station to replace the existing West 5th Street Pump Station.) Construction	\$ 12,935,000	\$ -	Anticipated to be funded once the community has completed the requirements a planning and design loan
112	65	50	12,458	DWSRF/BIL General	Etowah Utilities*	McMinn/ Polk	WTP Expansion and Distribution System Improvements (Expansion of the existing WTP from 4.2 MGD to 8 MGD and the construction of a new 3.2 MGD booster pump station to replace the existing West 5th Street Pump Station.) Planning and Design	\$ 525,000	\$-	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
113	65	50	246,423	DWSRF/BIL General	Knoxville Utility Board	Knox	Distribution System Improvements (Installation of approximately 56,700 LF of waterlines along West Glenwood Ave, Bruhin Road, Riverside Dri06/01/202ve/Wilder Place, Island Home Blvd, Lincoln Park Area, and River Crossing at the MBW WTP; and the construction of a 1,500 gpm booster pumping station on Bruhin Road.)	\$ 21,000,000	\$ -	Does not wish to pursue funding

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank	Priority		Pop.		Local			Total Project Amount	GREEN Component Amount	
Order	Points+	ΑΤΡΙ	-	Funding	Government	County	Project Description	(\$)	(\$)	Status
114	65	70		DWSRF/BIL General	Duck River Utility Commission	Moore	WTP Improvements (Improvements to the existing WTP to include rehabilitation of clarifiers 1 & 2, repair flocculator #1, replace raw water and high service pumps, add VFDs to pumps, changing filtration method, adding membranes, new flash mix basin, two new sedimentation basins, sludge pumps, and misc. items.) Planning and Design	\$ 750,000		Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
115	45	0	11,492	DWSRF/BIL General	Oneida*	Scott	WTP Improvements (Construction of a 4 MGD sedimentation and flocculation basins, contact tank, feedwater chamber/pumps, and associated piping and appurtenances.) Construction	\$ 3,000,000	\$ -	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
116	45	10	4,291	DWSRF/BIL General	Scotts Hill*	Decatur/Henderson	New Water Storage Tank (Construction of a 200,000 gallon WST and booster pump station off Eagle Nest Landing.) Design and Construction	\$ 2,340,000	\$ -	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
117	45	70		DWSRF/BIL General	Witt Utility District	Hamblen/Jefferson/ Sevier/Cocke	Waterline Extension (Installation of approximately 163,500 LF of 2-inch, 6-inch, 8- inch, 10-inch, 12-inch diameter waterlines by method of open cut and/or horizontally directional bore in Jefferson County.) Construction	\$ 18,636,516	\$ -	Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
118	25	10	13,601	DWSRF/BIL General	Brownsville Energy Authority*	Haywood	WTP Improvements (Construction of a new raw water well and high service pump.)	\$ 1,050,000	\$-	Community still interested in receiving SRF funding
119	25	50	22,592	DWSRF/BIL General	Winchester	Franklin	Water Meter Replacement (Intallation of approximately 12,950 AMR meters.)	\$ 4,170,500	\$-	Currently working with the community

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

*	Disadva	ntage Communi	ty (ATPI	of 50 or less a	nd population less	s than 20,000)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			-
	lank rder	Priority Points+	ATPI	Pop. Served	Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
	120	25	70	5,327	DWSRF/BIL General	Witt Utility District	Hamblen/Jefferson/ Sevier/Cocke	New Water Storage Tank (Construction of a 300,000 Gallon and a 500,000 Gallon WST off Hwy 92.) Construction	\$ 710,50		Community was contacted but SRF has not received a returned response
	121	15	0		-	Huntsville Utility District*	Scott/ Morgan	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include purchase of a computerized system and software to assist with AMP needs, prioritize O&M activities, and GIS mapping to assess the condition of existing facilities.)	\$ 115,00	D \$	Interested in AMP funding
	122	15	10		Revolving Fund	Scotts Hill*	Decatur/Henderson	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan to include GIS mapping, an inventory of existing assets, an assessment of the condition of existing facilities, a preventative work plan, and a capital improvement plan.)	\$ 185,00	0 \$	- Interested in AMP funding
	123	15	10	9,360	Revolving Fund	Ripley*	Lauderdale	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include GIS mapping, n inventory and assessment of the condition of existing facilities, a preventative work plan, and a capital improvement plan.)	\$ 148,00	D \$	Interested in AMP funding
	124	15	10	11,125	•	Caryville-Jacksboro Utility Commission*	Campbell	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include purchase of a computerized system and software to assist with AMP needs, prioritize O&M activities,	\$ 115,00	0 \$	Interested in AMP funding

and GIS mapping to assess the condition of

existing facilities.)

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order		АТРІ		Funding		County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
125	15	10		Revolving Fund	Brownsville Energy Authority*	Haywood	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system.)	\$ 210,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
126	15	10		Revolving Fund	LaFollette	Campbell/ Claiborne	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system.)	\$ 77,890	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
127	15	20		Revolving Fund	Friendship*	Crockett	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system.)	\$ 80,000	\$-	Interested in AMP funding
128	15	20		Revolving Fund	Dyer*	Gibson	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include GIS mapping and a preventative work plan for prioritizing assets, and to maintain a capital improvement plan and budget.)	\$ 107,500	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
129	15	20	6,230	Revolving Fund	Huntingdon*	Carroll	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system.)	\$ 160,000	\$-	Interested in AMP funding
130	15	20		Revolving Fund	Covington*	Tipton	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include GIS mapping and a preventative work plan for prioritizing assets, and to maintain a capital improvement plan and budget.)	\$ 107,500	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
131	15	30		Revolving Fund	Hampton Utility District*	Carter	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include GIS mapping, development of an engineering report of the findings, and a capital improvement plan.)	\$ 100,000	\$-	Interested in AMP funding

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order 132	Priority Points+	ATPI 30		Funding Revolving	Local Government Newbern*	County Dyer	Project Description Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset	Total Project Amount (\$) \$ 60,000	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status Interested in AMP funding
132		30	6,743	Fund	NewDern*		Management Plan to include GIS mapping, an inventory of existing assets, an assessment of the condition of existing facilities, a preventative work plan, and a capital improvement plan.)	÷ 00,000	φ -	interested in AMP funding
133	15	30	9510	Revolving Fund	Jefferson City*	Jefferson	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include GIS mapping, development of an engineering report of the findings, and a capital improvement plan.)	\$ 125,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
134	15	30	11,431	Revolving Fund	Rogersville*	Hawkins	Asset Management Plan (Develop a preventative work plan for the treatment and distribution system to increase efficiency and reliability.)	\$ 46,870	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
135	15	30	32,237	Revolving Fund	Elizabethton	_	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan to include GIS mapping, an inventory of assets, an assessment of the condition of existing facilities, and a preventative work plan development for the treatment and distribution system to increase efficiency and reliability.)	\$ 124,330	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
136	15	40	4,709	Revolving Fund	Lakeview Utility District*		Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan to include an inventory of assets, an assessment of the condition of existing facilities, hydraulic model, and a preventative work plan development for the distribution system to increase efficiency and reliability.)	\$ 79,990	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan

Rank Order 137	Priority Points+ 15	ATPI 50	2,810	Funding Revolving Fund	Local Government Bluff City*	County Sullivan	Project Description Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the treatment and water distribution system to assess the condition of existing facilities, prioritize aging infrastructure, increase the efficiency and reliability of the system, and to help maintain a capital improvement plan.)	Total Project Amount (\$) \$ 43,820	GREEN Component Amount (\$) \$ -	Status Interested in AMP funding
138	15	50		Revolving Fund	Copper Basin Utility District*	Polk	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan to include GIS mapping, hydraulic modeling, development of an engineering report of the findings, and a capital improvement plan.)	\$ 100,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
139	15	60		Revolving Fund	Kingston	Roane	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include GIS mapping and a preventative work plan for aging infrastructure.)	\$ 45,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
140	15	60		Revolving Fund	Ocoee Utility District	Bradley/Polk	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan to include GIS mapping, an inventory and assessment of the condition of existing facilities.)	\$ 375,000	\$-	Interested in AMP funding
141	15	70		Revolving Fund	Waverly	Humphreys	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan to include inventory and condition assessment, hydraulic model, GIS mapping, purchase asset management software, and a capital improvement plan.)	\$ 100,000	\$ -	Interested in AMP funding
142	15	70	50,162	Revolving Fund	Gallatin	Sumner	Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset Management Plan for the water distribution system to include GIS mapping.)	\$ 90,000	\$-	Interested in AMP funding

Total DWSRF Requested\$358,749,805Total Green Requested\$19,975,500Total Disadvantage Community Requested\$176,377,569

+ Includes 5 points for having an approved Growth Plan
* Disadvantage Community (ATPI of 50 or less and population less than 20,000)

Rank Order	-	АТРІ	Pop. Served	Funding	Local Government	County	Project Description	Total Project Amount (\$)	GREEN Component Amount (\$)	Status
143	15	80		0	East Sevier County		Asset Management Plan (Develop an Asset	\$ 100,000	\$-	Interested in AMP funding
				Fund	Utility District		Management Plan to include GIS mapping,			
							hydraulic modeling, development of an			
							engineering report of the findings, and a			
							capital improvement plan.)			