



Non-Competitive Grant Manual (Updated)

State Water Infrastructure Grant Program

Tennessee Department of Environment & Conservation | April 2022



Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Grant Overview	4
<i>Background</i>	4
<i>State Goals and Priorities</i>	4
<i>Critical Need Priority Areas</i>	5
<i>Additional Priority Areas</i>	5
Deadline to Submit and Timelines	5
<i>Collaborative Proposals</i>	5
<i>Non-Collaborative Proposals</i>	6
<i>Review Process</i>	6
<i>Grant Timeline</i>	6
Eligibility	7
<i>Grant Applicants</i>	7
<i>Project Owners</i>	7
<i>Activities</i>	7
Project Award Type	8
Example Scenarios	9
Funding	10
<i>Co-Funding</i>	10
Incentives to Reduce Co-Funding.....	11
<i>Administrative Use of Funds</i>	11
<i>Procurement</i>	11
<i>Additional Funding Considerations</i>	12
Submission Guidelines	13
<i>Collaborative Proposals</i>	13
Incentives.....	13
<i>Tennessee Infrastructure Scorecard</i>	14
Scorecard Completion	14
Identifying Critical Needs	15
<i>Project and Proposal Development</i>	17
<i>Critical Need Matrices</i>	19
Drinking Water Critical Needs Matrix	19
Wastewater Critical Needs Matrix.....	20
Stormwater Critical Needs Matrix.....	21
Format and Checklist	22
<i>Grant Proposal Requirements</i>	22
General Information	22
Technical Information.....	23
Application Evaluation	24
Funding Conditions	25

<i>Grant Schedules</i>	25
<i>Reimbursement</i>	26
<i>Federal Reporting Requirements</i>	27
<i>Monitoring and Oversight Responsibilities</i>	27
Additional Considerations	28
<i>Construction Projects</i>	28
<i>Public Record</i>	29
<i>Certification</i>	29
Definitions	31
Appendices	34
<i>Appendix A: Examples of Collaborative Proposals</i>	34
<i>Appendix B: Technical Information for Standard Projects Application</i>	36
Investigation and Planning.....	36
Investigation, Planning and Design.....	37
Planning, Design, and Construction.....	38
Construction Only	39
<i>Appendix C: Non-Competitive Grant Allocations and Co-Funding Requirements by City and County</i>	40

Grant Overview

Background

Tennessee's *Water Infrastructure Investment Plan* (WIIP) describes how the State of Tennessee plans to invest the state's American Rescue Plan (ARP) fiscal recovery funds in water infrastructure projects. These funds were authorized and appropriated by the federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA). The state's Financial Stimulus Accountability Group (FSAG) designated \$1.35 billion for the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) to administer for this purpose. This grant manual details how TDEC is administering \$1 billion through non-competitive, formula-based grants. Funds are made available through the State Water Infrastructure Grants (SWIG) program to be used for eligible drinking water, wastewater, or stormwater projects. SWIG refers to Tennessee's grant funding available for water, wastewater, or stormwater projects, including funding as described in the WIIP. This grant manual describes the non-competitive SWIG grant funding outlined in the WIIP. Entities eligible to apply for these non-competitive grants will need to meet minimum technical and administrative requirements and demonstrate commitment of co-funding before a grant can be awarded. The state will obligate all ARP funds by December 31, 2024 to ensure all ARP funds are fully spent by December 31, 2026.

State Goals and Priorities

An estimated \$5 to \$15 billion of investment in Tennessee's water infrastructure is necessary between now and 2040.¹ These non-competitive SWIG investments are one opportunity to modernize, improve, and strengthen water infrastructure across the state. However, these investments alone will not address all outstanding needs. TDEC is focusing this non-competitive SWIG grant effort on the following goals:

- Protect and promote human health and safety and improve the quality of Tennessee's water by supporting drinking water and wastewater systems in significant non-compliance to work towards and achieve compliance;
- Improve the technical, managerial, and financial capabilities of small, disadvantaged, or underserved water infrastructure systems; and
- Address critical water infrastructure needs across the state.

Based on reports produced by the Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the TN H₂O Plan.

TDEC identified 11 priority areas of emphasis for the non-competitive grant program. Focusing on these areas will prepare Tennessee's water infrastructure systems for long-term technical, financial, managerial, and environmental sustainability. To ensure the most critical aspects of a drinking water or wastewater treatment system are addressed, TDEC has established a subset of these priority areas of emphasis for designation as critical need areas. Critical need priority areas must be addressed in proposals either through the proposed project itself or by demonstrating that critical needs are being addressed with other resources. The additional priority areas of emphasis are optional but encouraged activities. For a complete description of priority areas of emphasis, see Section V of the [*Water Infrastructure Investment Plan*](#).

Critical Need Priority Areas

- Achieving Compliance with Local, State, and Federal Drinking Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater Water Quality Requirements
- Asset Management Planning for Sustainable Drinking Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater Systems
- Water Loss Reductions for Drinking Water Systems
- Infiltration and Inflow Reductions for Wastewater Systems
- Modernization of Facilities and Equipment for Drinking Water and Wastewater Systems

Additional Priority Areas

- Water Reuse
- Green Infrastructure Best Management Practices / Managing Stormwater
- Consolidation / Regionalization for Drinking Water and Wastewater Systems
- Managing Risk / Building Resilience to Extreme Weather Events, Cybersecurity, or Other Hazards for Drinking Water and Wastewater Systems
- Planning for Replacement of Lead Service Lines for Drinking Water Systems
- Enhancing Service to Small, Underserved, or Disadvantaged Communities² for Drinking Water and Wastewater Systems

Deadline to Submit and Timelines

Collaborative Proposals

Grant applicants may submit collaborative grant proposals with one or more projects during the collaborative grant proposal period. Deadlines for submission are discussed in the Grant

² See Section V of the [*Water Infrastructure Investment Plan*](#) for definitions of disadvantaged, small, and underserved communities.

Timeline section. All proposals must be submitted by November 1, 2022 to be eligible to receive non-competitive grant dollars. See Collaborative Proposals under Submission Guidelines of this grant manual for additional information about qualifying as a collaborative proposal.

Non-Collaborative Proposals

Eligible grant applicants may only submit one non-collaborative grant proposal, but that proposal may contain one or more projects. Non-collaborative proposals must be submitted during the non-collaborative grant proposal period. Deadlines for submission are discussed in the Grant Timeline section. All proposals must be submitted by November 1, 2022 to be eligible to receive non-competitive grant dollars.

Review Process

TDEC will review, evaluate, and recommend grant awards within 30 days of receiving a **complete** grant proposal and application. TDEC will announce grant awards and execute contracts within 60 days of grant award recommendations. Grant applicants should anticipate project management discussions with TDEC during this process, including but not limited to discussing an overview of the award, scope of services, project timelines, terms and conditions, subcontracting, the budget, and the process to reimburse for costs incurred.

Grant Timeline

The anticipated timeline for this grant offering is as follows:

April 2022	Application period for collaborative grant proposals opened
May 30, 2022	First round of collaborative grant awards announced; grant awards announcement monthly thereafter as needed
June 1, 2022	Application period for non-collaborative grant proposals opened
August 31, 2022	First round of non-collaborative grant awards announced; grant awards announcement monthly thereafter as needed
November 1, 2022	Non-competitive grant phase closes
December 31, 2022	All remaining grant awards announced and contracts executed
January 31, 2023	Competitive grant timeline and fund total announced
TBD	Application period for competitive grant proposals opened
December 31, 2024	All remaining WIIP funds awarded or otherwise obligated
September 30, 2026	All non-competitive and competitive grant agreements end

Eligibility

Grant Applicants

Eligible grant applicants include subrecipients as identified in the *Water Infrastructure Investment Plan*. These include all counties and eligible cities (those that are incorporated and own water or wastewater systems or a permitted stormwater program) and have a designated funding allocation. Grant applicants must consider funding allocations and co-funding requirements when developing and submitting proposals. TDEC recognizes cities and counties may be served by systems (eligible project owners) that are not grant applicants. All grant proposals must identify all eligible project owners serving the grant applicant's jurisdiction. TDEC strongly encourages grant applicants to consider these systems when developing a proposal.

Grant applicants are responsible for grant oversight and monitoring of activities. Grant applicants are also responsible for submitting progress updates as requested by TDEC and as required by the U.S. Department of Treasury (the "Treasury"). Activities associated with these requirements are administrative expenses and may be funded using ARP funds not to exceed 6% of the total grant contract. For additional information about oversight, monitoring, and progress update submittal, see the Funding Conditions section of this grant manual.

Project Owners

All projects must be implemented by eligible project owners or by grant applicants on behalf of an eligible project owner. Project owners operate drinking water or wastewater systems or a permitted stormwater system. All project owners must complete the Tennessee Infrastructure Scorecard (the "Scorecard") and submit Scorecard summaries with proposals to be eligible to receive state ARP funds. Project owners may be an eligible grant applicant or a partner on a proposal.

Activities

According to the Treasury's Final Rule, ARP eligible activities to be funded by non-competitive SWIG program are necessary investments in water, wastewater, or stormwater infrastructure. During the non-competitive grant phase, TDEC intends to address necessary and critical needs that align with eligibility under the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) programs. Additional information about CWSRF stormwater eligibility is included in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) January 2015 memorandum, "Interpretive Guidance for Certain Amendments in the Water Resources Reform and Development Act to Titles I, II, V, and VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act."

For this non-competitive grant guidance, TDEC has expanded the eligibility for some projects deemed necessary under the Treasury's Final Rule. Some stormwater projects that propose the repair, replacement, or removal of culverts or other road-stream crossing infrastructure may be eligible under this grant offering. These projects should be for the purpose of managing stormwater. These expanded stormwater activities must be authorizable through a general Aquatic Resource Alteration Permit (ARAP). Expanded stormwater activities that require an individual ARAP are not eligible. Any projects for the purpose of repair, replacement or removal of culverts must be designed to improve or maintain aquatic organism passage. Projects that will result in an appreciable permanent loss of water resource value, therefore requiring stream or wetland compensatory mitigation as a result of proposed grant activities are not eligible under this grant program.

Projects intended to address contamination issues in private, residential wells are also eligible. Activities that include rehabilitation of private wells, testing initiatives to identify contaminants in wells, and treatment activities and remediation strategies that address contamination are now eligible. Additionally, projects that address lead service line issues, specifically corrosion control studies, are now eligible under this grant opportunity.

Project Award Type

The extent of activities and deliverables are dictated by the project award type. There are four project award types: investigation and planning; investigation, planning, and design; planning, design, and construction; and construction only. Proposals must identify the eligible activities, as well as how the grant applicant (and any partners) intends to address the activities. For example, applicants that have identified a need to address water loss may choose to investigate and plan for the remediation of the water loss by developing a water loss control plan and a preliminary engineering report. Alternatively, applicants may go one step further and propose to investigate, plan, and develop designs to mitigate the water loss, thus creating a water loss control plan, preliminary engineering report, and plans and specifications. A step further would be to plan, design and propose a construction project to rehabilitate distribution lines to eliminate water loss based on the water loss control plan.

Grant applicants will submit a grant proposal with one or more water infrastructure systems (individual utility). Each water infrastructure system can select a project award type by water infrastructure type (drinking water, wastewater or stormwater), based on the maximum extent of activities intended for each water infrastructure system. Therefore, a proposal can have a mix of project award types based on individual water infrastructure systems and their corresponding water infrastructure type. Applicants can propose as many projects per award type as they see fit so long as the projects are of the same type of infrastructure system. The maximum activity

allowed for each system, and deliverables expected will be determined by the award type granted.

Example Scenarios

A proposal requesting funds for drinking water projects executed by a water infrastructure system under the investigation and planning project award type would be limited to activities of investigation and planning only. However, the proposal may include additional projects executed by a different drinking water system that include construction activities, falling under the planning, design and construction project award type. Each water infrastructure system is restricted to conducting only those activities described by the project award type for each system. Therefore, the first system described would be prohibited from conducting any construction related to drinking water using non-competitive SWIG funds. Grant applicants could execute multiple planning projects, including comprehensive asset management planning, water loss control planning, and treatment plant capacity expansion planning for drinking water.

If the grant applicant also included stormwater projects in the proposal, they may select a different project award type for stormwater infrastructure. In this scenario, the applicant could identify planning, design, and construction project award type, and include stormwater projects with a range of activities for each individual stormwater project, up to, and including planning, design, and construction. Eligible activities could include comprehensive stormwater management planning, creating plans and specifications for a neighborhood-wide green infrastructure stormwater management system, and a bank stabilization construction project that went from development of plans and specifications to project execution. Therefore, not every individual project under the planning, design, and construction award type is required to go to construction. However, any critical needs that must be addressed will require a construction component. Construction-only project award types should have plans and specifications complete, necessary permits identified, and be ready to proceed with the bid process at the time of application. No planning and design will be authorized for construction-only project award types.

A grant proposal can have a mix and match of project award types if addressing multiple water infrastructure types and/or including multiple water infrastructure systems. For example, a single proposal may include investigation and planning for drinking water (with one or many individual projects) and planning, design, and construction for stormwater. A single proposal may also include investigation and planning for drinking water (executed by one water infrastructure system) and construction only for drinking water (executed by a different water infrastructure system). Proposal projects are only limited by available funding, project eligibility, and the feasibility of project completion by the end of the grant award. TDEC compiled and published a

list of Frequently Asked Questions, including regarding activity eligibility, which may be found on the TDEC ARP website (tn.gov/environment/arp).

Funding

TDEC has allocated the \$1 billion dollars for this SWIG non-competitive formula-based grant offering as published in Appendix B of this grant manual. Cities and counties with designated funding allocations may request up to this dollar amount for reimbursement of eligible drinking water, wastewater, or stormwater projects following proposal development, submittal, state approval, and receiving a fully executed grant contract.

A proposal's overall grant budget is the sum of the funding allocation and co-funding, considering any applicable co-funding reductions. Grant applicants may divide their funding allocation across collaborative and non-collaborative proposals as long as the totals do not exceed the funding allocation.

Co-Funding

Co-funding requirements are applied to every non-competitive SWIG proposal. Co-funding requirements range from 15%–35%. Co-funding amounts are determined by a city's or county's Ability to Pay Index (ATPI). Cities or counties with an ATPI of 50 or below have a co-funding requirement of 15%. Cities or counties with an ATPI of 60–70 have a co-funding requirement of 25%, and cities or counties with an ATPI of 80–100 have a co-funding requirement of 35%. Each proposal may consist of one or more projects executed by one or more water infrastructure systems. Grant applicants may receive co-funding from an array of partners or financial supporters, including neighboring subrecipients and project owners.

Both cash and third-party in-kind contributions are eligible to meet co-funding requirements. Cash may consist of local ARP funds, State Revolving Fund loans, financial assistance grants and loans, cash reserves, revenue bonds, and public-private partnerships or sponsors. Other cash-value contributions include engineering plans and specifications developed on or after March 3, 2021.

Third-party in-kind contributions means the value of non-cash contributions that may consist of goods or services, benefit a federally assisted project, and are contributed by a third-party without charge. These may consist of project owner labor, equipment services, or material contributions. TDEC will consider the use of in-kind co-funding contributions provided an individual accountability report is completed and submitted with the grant application.

Treasury's Final Rule allows for the use of ARP funds as a match for other federal and non-federal grant programs where the costs are eligible under both programs. The entire project, including

ARP dollars, is then subject to the requirements of those grant programs. ARP funds, local or state, cannot be used as match for grant programs that restrict the use of federal funds to meet match requirements.

Incentives to Reduce Co-Funding

1. *Collaborative Proposal*: If multiple entities (water infrastructure systems, cities, and/or counties) collaborate on a proposal, the required co-funding percentage will be based on the lowest ATPI among the partners. Collaborative proposals are further incentivized with an additional 5% reduction in required co-funding. For more information about eligible collaborative proposals, see Collaborative Proposals under Submission Guidelines.
2. *Priority Areas of Emphasis*: If a proposal dedicates at least 50% of the overall grant budget to activities that address priority areas of emphasis, co-funding requirements will be reduced by 5%. Priority areas of interest include both required critical needs and additional priority areas.

Administrative Use of Funds

Grant applicants are responsible for ensuring proper grant administration. Applicants may contract with consultants to administer the grant; however, legal liability of the terms and conditions of the grant remains with the grant applicant.

Up to 6% of a grant applicant's total grant contract may be used for reasonable and allocable administrative expenses, including pre-grant collaborative planning activities.

- Pre-grant collaborative planning activities may involve collaborative efforts between a city or county, its systems, or engineering and consulting experts to identify eligible and investment-worthy activities and support grant application, project, and proposal development. These activities must have occurred on or after March 3, 2021.
- Administrative expenses may include grant application, project, and proposal development and submittal, reporting, compliance assurance and monitoring, or direct or indirect costs associated with administering the grant award. Grantees may also be reimbursed for a reasonably proportionate share of the costs of audits required by and performed in accordance with the "Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996" as provided in 2 C.F.R. § 200.425.

Procurement

Grant applicants are responsible for ensuring that any procurement using non-competitive SWIG funds, or payments under procurement contracts using such funds, are consistent with state procurement standards and those set forth in the [Uniform Guidance](#) at 2 CFR Part 200, as

applicable. When the terms of a grant award allow disbursements for the cost of goods, materials, supplies, equipment, or contracted services, such procurement must be made on a competitive basis, including the use of competitive bidding procedures, where practical. Grant applicants must maintain documentation for the basis of each procurement for which a disbursement is made pursuant to the grant award. In each instance where it is determined that use of a competitive procurement method is not practical, supporting documentation must include a written justification for the decision and for use of a non-competitive procurement. Further, grant applicants are considered subrecipients, and therefore must comply with 2 C.F.R. §§ 200.317—200.327 when procuring property and services under a federal award.

For additional information, see [U.S. Treasury's Compliance and Reporting Guidance for State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds](#) and the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards contained in 2 CFR Part 200.

Additional Funding Considerations

Some proposals may use grant or loan dollars in conjunction with ARP funds to complete an existing project or leverage multiple funding programs for a new project during the grant period. In some instances, the requirements of the companion grant or loan program (e.g., Davis-Bacon and Buy American provisions) would apply to the ARP project. For example, using funding from SRF in conjunction with ARP to complete a wastewater treatment plant expansion or construction of a new storage tank would necessitate the entire project adhering to the requirements of SRF. However, if the ARP-funded portion of the project is completed using only ARP funds and an SRF loan is sought for a new, distinct phase of the related infrastructure project, the SRF requirements would not apply to the ARP-funded stage of the project.

TDEC will base grant award totals on the estimates included in the grant application budget section. It is important that applicants research the goods or services they are seeking to purchase and obtain accurate price information prior to submitting the application. Only goods and services identified in the application and authorized in the grant award will be funded. Significant adjustments to a grant award budget will not be possible given the federal deadlines. If a grantee needs to adjust line-item expenses, funds may be redirected from one line item to another budgeted line item. This action must be a no-cost modification. If projects exceed the grant budget, grantees should pursue an SRF loan or other financial assistance to complete the scope of work by the contract end date September 30, 2026.

Submission Guidelines

Collaborative Proposals

The first phase of proposal submission is open to collaborative proposals which consist of one or more collaborative projects. A collaborative project involves multiple entities (cities, counties, utility districts or authorities) working together on activities with a shared purpose or goal. Partner entities may be eligible subrecipients, project owners, or cities that are not eligible subrecipients but are served by an eligible subrecipient or project owner's system.

All collaborative proposal teams must identify a *lead entity* to serve as the grant applicant. The grant applicant must be a county or eligible city with a funding allocation. TDEC will only enter a grant contract with the lead entity serving as the grant applicant; the grant applicant is responsible for oversight and monitoring and submitting invoices and progress reports to TDEC.

Eligible grant applicants may only submit one collaborative proposal when they are serving as a lead entity for a collaborative project. The collaborative proposal should consist of only collaborative projects. ***All entities involved in the collaborative proposal, including the grant applicant and any partners in the collaborative proposal, can submit a separate non-collaborative proposal in the second phase of solicitation with any remaining funds (i.e., funds available through the funding allocation not dedicated to the collaborative proposal).***

Grant applicants of collaborative proposals must identify one or more collaborative partners. All partners that own systems included in the collaborative proposal must submit a Scorecard summary for those systems. Critical water infrastructure needs for water systems included in collaborative proposals should be addressed by project owners in the proposal or provide justification otherwise. TDEC recommends partner contributions of 15% toward a project budget. Contributions may be cash, third-party in-kind, or a mixture of cash and third-party in-kind.

Incentives

- Collaborative proposals may be submitted in the first round of application solicitation.
- Co-funding requirements for collaborative proposals will be based on the lowest ATPI of all eligible partners. Co-funding requirements apply to the entire proposal.
- All collaborative proposals will receive a co-funding reduction of 5% from the lowest identified co-funding level among partners. This reduces the co-funding range from 15–35% to 10–30%.

Examples of collaborative proposal scenarios are described in Appendix A.

Tennessee Infrastructure Scorecard

Addressing critical water infrastructure needs across the state through SWIG grant dollars is a priority for TDEC. To assist in identifying needs, TDEC is requiring applicants to submit the Tennessee Infrastructure Scorecard summary with their application. The Scorecard is a benchmarking tool for drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater systems. It was developed as a pilot tool in 2020 through a partnership with the Tennessee Association of Utility Districts (TAUD) to assist small systems with prioritizing their most critical needs. In 2021, the Scorecard was adapted for use as a needs assessment tool for systems of any size. Systems must complete a Scorecard to secure their allotment of state ARP funds.

The Scorecard covers key areas of a system's technical, managerial, financial, operational, and environmental health. Financial data, asset management, risk and resiliency, compliance, and operations are assessed at a basic level. Several aspects of the Scorecard cover priority areas of emphasis for the state. These areas are seen as key to responsibly operate water infrastructure and, if flagged during Scorecard completion, shall be addressed in a non-competitive SWIG project proposal during the non-competitive phase. Other elements in the Scorecard, such as optimization and risk and resiliency, are guiding elements that promote improved compliance and sustainability but are not considered Critical Needs for the purpose of this grant opportunity.

Scorecard Completion

Cities and counties that operate multiple systems, including a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), must complete a Scorecard for every system they own or operate before submitting an application. However, this does not mean that applicants must propose funding projects for every system managed. Instructions on how to complete a Scorecard can be accessed on the TDEC ARP website, the Division of Water Resources' State Revolving Fund loan program website, or the TAUD website.

During TDEC's SWIG non-competitive open grant period, applicants will submit Scorecard summary reports as part of the application process. The Scorecard summary will highlight critical system needs based on the information entered. These critical system needs should be a focus of the grant proposal; critical areas flagged during Scorecard completion must be reflected in project proposals.

The Scorecard highlights key areas systems should address to ensure their operations are functioning and providing an adequate level of service for the citizens of Tennessee. Decision makers, managers, and operators should take note when systems are not meeting the State's minimum expectations for technical, managerial, and financial stability, as indicated by "flagged"

areas in the Scorecard. The State interprets these red flags as the threshold for meeting minimum expectations. Non-competitive SWIG grant applicants should utilize funds to correct or improve their system function to meet state minimum grant standards or justify not doing so in grant proposals.

Identifying Critical Needs

Any systems with **significant non-compliance** issues are considered to have a critical need. These systems will be required to use non-competitive SWIG grant dollars to address those issues or demonstrate they are meeting the compliance requirements. Systems must develop and execute or demonstrate they are meeting the items in their corrective action plans (CAP)/ engineering report (ER) and are implementing items on schedule. If a system is not on schedule, actions must be taken to get on schedule, including any construction activities.

Asset management plans (AMP) are a critical component to properly managing a water infrastructure system. Technical, managerial, and financial (TMF) capacity is necessary for a water system to continuously provide safe, reliable drinking water and wastewater services. EPA data reported by the states show that operational issues account for an increasing number of health-based violations. This is especially true for very small water systems, which can be more challenged to quickly resolve the underlying issues. TMF capacity building includes asset management planning. Systems need asset management to address aging water infrastructure, make sound investment decisions to maximize limited financial resources, and make costs transparent to support financial decisions. With a proper plan for asset management, a system can improve service and reliability, reduce risk and unexpected costs, and enhance communication with customers and stakeholders while realizing many additional benefits. Systems that lack key components of a comprehensive asset management plan, including having computers with the technology to create, manage, and update the information, digital maps of the system, an operation and maintenance process, an inventory and condition assessment of all assets, and a capital improvement plan will need to include AMP development in the grant proposal or demonstrate the AMP will be completed with other means.

Treated **drinking water loss** is a pervasive issue for drinking water systems across the country. Lost water revenue, high energy costs, increased raw water usage, and inability to meet demand can all be addressed, in part, by reducing water loss throughout a distribution system. If a system has more than 40% unaccounted for treated drinking water loss, this is a critical need and should be addressed in non-competitive SWIG proposals.

Excessive **inflow and infiltration (I/I)** of wastewater systems, like water loss, is also a pervasive issue placing a strain on systems and leading to sanitary sewer overflows, high plant operating costs, and environmental hazards. Reducing I/I has beneficial impacts through reduced energy

demands, improved environmental compliance, and regained plant capacity. Therefore, systems with I/I in excess of 50% have critical I/I elimination needs and should be addressed in non-competitive SWIG proposals.

Aging and failing infrastructure, both from a plant perspective and from a distribution and collection line perspective, hampers system operations and causes costly emergencies, losses, and water quality concerns. Systems meeting or exceeding the 80% design capacity of a plant or that have more than 50% of the distribution or collection lines at the end of their useful life (51 years or older) face critical infrastructure needs. When these issues are identified in the Scorecard summary, systems should address them in the non-competitive SWIG proposals.

Stormwater asset management is a new and emerging challenge across the state. MS4s are regulated entities responsible for managing their stormwater system. Developing a stormwater centric asset management plan can improve TMF along with understanding and addressing stormwater and recurring nuisance flooding issues. MS4s that lack a comprehensive stormwater management plan or a digital inventory and map of the entire storm sewer system have asset management critical needs. When these issues are identified in the Scorecard summary, systems should address them in the non-competitive SWIG proposals.

Some systems may face more than one critical need issue. Grant applicants that own multiple water infrastructure systems may have critical needs across drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater. TDEC recognizes that not all critical needs can be resolved with non-competitive SWIG dollars alone. In addition, grant applicants may not have the capacity to work across all infrastructure systems they own. Therefore, grant applicants only have to address the critical needs for systems in which they intend to perform work as part of the non-competitive SWIG proposal. However, if a grant applicant has significant non-compliance issues for any water infrastructure system they own, these must be addressed or demonstrate these issues are being addressed and on schedule through other means. Finally, if the grant applicant has more than one area of critical need for any given system, proposals will be required to address, at a minimum, two areas.

Project and Proposal Development

Each grant applicant may submit one grant proposal, with a mix of project award types – one for each individual drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater water infrastructure (utility) system. Grant applicants should select the project award type that describes the maximum extent of activities proposed for each individual water infrastructure system (drinking water, wastewater, stormwater).

The project award types are:

- Investigation and planning
- Investigation, planning, and design
- Planning, design, and construction
- Construction only

Project owners (partners and grantees) should select the project award type for each category of water infrastructure system that intends to do work. The project award type covers the maximum extent of activities proposed for each individual system. There may be multiple systems within a single water infrastructure type (e.g., two utility districts that provide drinking water services both included in a grant application). Each drinking water project owner is eligible to select the project award type that captures the maximum extent of activities they propose.

For example, a proposal is submitted by a county as the grant applicant with two partners, utility districts 1 and 2 (UD1 and UD2). both provide drinking water services. The utility districts both want to address water loss. UD1 is ready for construction and UD2 prefers to do investigation, planning and design. UD1 will select the construction only project award type while UD2 will select investigation, planning and design. UD1 (ready for construction) will adhere to the critical need thresholds for construction only as described in the next section. UD2 (not ready for construction) will adhere to the critical need thresholds for investigation, planning and design as described in the next section. No construction is authorized for the UD2.

Every water infrastructure system included in the proposal will need to address those critical needs that exceed thresholds according to the Scorecard. Critical needs should be addressed in the following manner:

1. If the water infrastructure system has one critical need identified, that critical need must be addressed according to the Critical Need Matrix.
2. If the water infrastructure system has two critical needs identified, both of those critical needs must be addressed according to the Critical Need Matrix.
3. If the water infrastructure system has three or more critical needs identified, two of those critical needs must be addressed according to the Critical Need Matrix.

- a. If significant non-compliance is identified, that must be one of the two critical needs addressed.
- b. If asset management is identified, that must be one of the two critical needs addressed.
- c. If neither significant non-compliance nor asset management are identified, the project owner and grant applicant may choose which critical need(s) to address to meet the two critical need threshold.

Grant applicants are not limited to using funds only to address critical needs. If the grant applicant can demonstrate in the proposal critical need thresholds will be met, applicants can propose additional activities as long as they do not exceed the grant applicant's funding allocation. TDEC recognizes that systems may already be addressing critical needs through capital improvement plans, projects, and corrective action plans. If efforts are already underway to address critical needs, grant applicants must demonstrate they will meet critical need requirements (as outlined in the Critical Need Matrix) with alternative funding within the timeframe established. If grant applicants sufficiently demonstrate this and commit toward meeting the thresholds in the grant agreement, non-competitive grant funds may be used for other activities.

Critical Need Matrices

Drinking Water Critical Needs Matrix

		Project Award Type and Critical Need Requirement			
Critical Needs		Investigation and Planning	Investigation, Planning, and Design	Planning, Design, and Construction	Construction Only
Drinking Water	Significant Non-Compliance	Must establish a CAP/ER within 6 months of the grant award and/or meet the compliance schedule.	Must complete any documents (reports, manuals, and construction documents) as required in the Order or CAP/ER and/or must meet compliance schedule.	Must get approval of all required documents, including plans and specifications and a construction budget/schedule, that demonstrates all actions outlined in the Order or CAP/ER will be complete to the maximum extent possible within the grant timeline and compliance schedule.	Must get approval of all required documents, including plans and specifications and a construction budget/schedule, that demonstrates all actions outlined in the Order or CAP/ER will be complete to the maximum extent possible within the grant timeline and compliance schedule.
	Asset Management	Must establish an Asset Management Plan by the end of the grant award.			
	Water Loss	Must develop a Water Loss Control Plan.	Must develop a Water Loss Control Plan and plans and specifications.	Must develop a Water Loss Control Plan, plans and specifications, and dedicate at least 25% of the construction budget to water loss OR reduce water loss to below 40% by the end of the grant award.	Must dedicate at least 25% of the construction budget to water loss OR reduce water loss to below 40% by the end of the grant award.
	Modernization	Must develop an Aging Infrastructure Replacement or Demand Reduction Plan.	Must develop an Aging Infrastructure Replacement or Demand Reduction Plan and plans and specifications.	Must develop an Aging Infrastructure Replacement or Demand Plan, plans and specifications, and dedicate at least 25% of the construction budget to asset replacement OR reduce plant demand to such a capacity that it doesn't meet or exceed 80% for 5 years.	Must dedicate at least 25% of the construction budget to asset replacement OR reduce plant demand to such a capacity that it doesn't meet or exceed 80% for 5 years.

Wastewater Critical Needs Matrix

		Project Award Type and Critical Need Requirement			
Critical Needs		Investigation and Planning	Investigation, Planning, and Design	Planning, Design, and Construction	Construction Only
Wastewater	Significant Non-Compliance	Must establish a CAP/ER within 6 months of the grant award and/or meet the compliance schedule.	Must complete any documents (reports, manuals, and construction documents) as required in the Order or CAP/ER and/or must meet compliance schedule.	Must get approval of all required documents, including plans and specifications and a construction budget/schedule, that demonstrate all actions outlined in the Order or CAP/ER will be complete to the maximum extent possible within the grant timeline and compliance schedule.	Must get approval of all required documents, including plans and specifications and a construction budget/schedule, that demonstrates all actions outlined in the Order or CAP/ER will be complete to the maximum extent possible within the grant timeline and compliance schedule.
	Asset Management	Must establish an Asset Management Plan by the end of the grant award.			
	I & I	Must develop a I&I Reduction and Elimination Plan.	Must develop a I&I Reduction and Elimination Plan and plans and specifications.	Must develop a I&I Reduction and Elimination Plan, plans and specifications, and dedicate at least 25% of the construction budget to I&I OR reduce I&I to below 50% by the end of the grant award.	Must dedicate at least 25% of the construction budget to I&I OR reduce I&I to below 50% by the end of the grant award.
	Modernization	Must develop an Aging Infrastructure Replacement or Demand Reduction Plan.	Must develop an Aging Infrastructure Replacement or Demand Reduction Plan and plans and specifications.	Must develop an Aging Infrastructure Replacement or Demand Plan, plans and specifications, and dedicate at least 25% of the construction budget to asset replacement OR reduce plant demand to such a capacity that it doesn't meet or exceed 80% for 5 years.	Must dedicate at least 25% of the construction budget to asset replacement OR reduce plant demand to such a capacity that it doesn't meet or exceed 80% for 5 years.

Stormwater Critical Needs Matrix

		Project Award Type and Critical Need Requirement			
Critical Needs		Investigation and Planning	Investigation, Planning, and Design	Planning, Design, and Construction	Construction Only
Stormwater	Stormwater Control Measures	Must consider and evaluate using stormwater control measures (SCMs) that use infiltration, evaporation, and transpiration or biologically active filtration and comply with Rule 400-40-10 as an option in PER	Must consider and evaluate using SCMs that use infiltration, evaporation, and transpiration or biologically active filtration and comply with Rule 400-40-10 as an option in PER	Must use SCMs that use infiltration, evaporation, and transpiration or biologically active filtration and comply with Rule 400-40-10 or justify the absence of these SCMs	Must use SCMs that use infiltration, evaporation, and transpiration or biologically active filtration and comply with Rule 400-40-10 or justify the absence of these SCMs
	Asset Management	Must have a stormwater management plan and a digital storm sewer wide inventory and map by the end of the grant award.			

Format and Checklist

Applicants will complete a grant application using TDEC’s online Grant Management System (GMS). The GMS allows grants administration partners to affiliate with the grant applicant to prepare the application for the legally authorized representative’s review and electronic signature. Signees other than the executive officer or mayor must include a resolution from the applicant’s governing body giving authority to sign for the applicant.

The GMS will include the grant manual, grant application including the project proposal narrative and project budget worksheets, and document upload capability. It will be designed to ensure only complete applications may be submitted for TDEC review and approval. The GMS will also be used as the portal for submitting the required Title VI Pre-Audit Survey, Supplier Direct Deposit Authorization (SDDA), and for future invoice for reimbursement requests and state approvals.

The solicitation will announce the opening of the GMS for collaborative project proposals and remain open for application through the end of the application period as detailed in the Timeline section of this grant manual. Long-term access to the GMS is possible with user log in and affiliations. More information about this system will be available to grant applicants during the grant workshops and on the website.

Grant Proposal Requirements

General Information

The following general information is required as part of a complete grant proposal. Grant proposals may contain one project award type per water infrastructure type for each water infrastructure (utility) system. All eligible grant applicants, at a maximum, can only submit one collaborative proposal and one non-collaborative proposal.

- A. Designated grant applicant
 - 1. Identification of all water infrastructure systems within the grant applicant’s jurisdiction or that serve citizens within the grant applicant’s jurisdiction
 - 2. Identification of all partners party to the grant proposal, and
 - 3. Letters of support and commitment of funds from all entities identified in (2)
- B. Brief narrative of the overall proposal, including:
 - 1. How the proposal addresses state goals and priorities
 - a. Critical Needs
 - b. Additional Priority Areas
 - 2. Project award type(s)
 - 3. Project name(s), and

4. If the proposal is collaborative, a distribution of responsibilities for each subrecipient and project owner
- C. Proposal timeline including the start and completion dates of all individual projects
- D. Overall grant budget, including:
 1. Distribution of funds for each subrecipient and project owner, if collaborative
 2. Total administrative expenses, and
 3. Budget for each individual project
- E. Co-funding requirements

Technical Information

Standard Projects

Standard Projects are those that are complex in nature and require a detailed technical review. Projects like regionalization, new or expanded treatment plants, decentralized stormwater management, or large-scale stream restoration projects are examples of standard projects needing additional technical review.

The following information should be submitted as part of a complete application for standard projects.

- A. How the project award type addresses state goals and priorities
 1. Scorecard summaries identifying Critical Needs
 2. Additional Priority Areas
- B. Project information
 1. Description of each individual project
 2. Detailed individual project budget(s)
 3. Scorecard summary for each system
 4. Maps of project areas
 5. Detailed schedule for individual projects which must include “on or before” dates for all required deliverables
 6. List of required permits (as needed)
 7. Site certification or letter in lieu of for each individual project (as needed)

For a complete checklist of technical information required for standard projects by project award type, see Appendix B.

Streamlined Construction Projects

Streamlined Construction Projects are those projects that only address critical needs identified in the Scorecard summary. Proposals can fund ongoing, approved elements of a CAP, construction focused on rehabilitation of distribution or collection lines, or replacement of aging equipment

at the facility. These actions are limited to activities that can be permitted through a general ARAP and Construction General Permit (CGP) or need no ARAP or CGP. The proposed activity must not require a modification to an existing national pollutant discharge and elimination system (NPDES), state operating permit, or water withdrawal ARAP.

The following information should be submitted as part of a complete application for *Streamlined Construction Projects*.

- A. How the project award type addresses state goals and priorities
 - 1. Scorecard summaries identifying Critical Needs
- B. Project information
 - 1. Description of each individual project
 - 2. Detailed individual project budget(s)
 - 3. Scorecard summary for each system
 - 4. Maps of project areas
 - 5. Detailed schedule for each individual project
 - a. Verification of a comprehensive asset management plan
 - i. Capital Improvement Plan submittal
 - b. Final Scorecard Summary
 - c. Projected start of construction
 - d. Initiate operation on or before date
 - e. Operation and maintenance manual on or before date (if applicable)
 - f. Complete construction on or before date
- C. Enforcement and Compliance CAP/ER and approved CAP/ER documents, including plans and specifications and a construction budget and schedule if applicable.

Application Evaluation

TDEC will conduct a comprehensive review of all complete and eligible grant applications, including all required supporting documentation (see the list of required supporting documentation in the Grant Proposal Requirements section above). Applications will be evaluated based solely on the data provided; therefore, project eligibility, co-funding documentation, completeness, and accuracy are important. Each grant applicant is responsible for submitting all relevant and factual information with the application. Funding will be awarded based on the merits of the applications. Please note that TDEC may select parts of a proposal for funding and may offer to fund less than the eligible grant amounts or a smaller amount than requested in the application.

TDEC will review all applications for project eligibility and how the proposal addresses Critical Needs as identified through the Scorecard or other Priority Areas of Emphasis. In addition, applicants must demonstrate how they will meet co-funding requirements, identify any applicable incentives, and validate feasibility of project completion within the performance period. TDEC will preliminarily conduct an administrative review of each application for completeness, accuracy, and eligibility prior to initiating the technical evaluation. TDEC will further review each application with an emphasis on significant non-compliance, asset management planning, drinking water systems and water loss, wastewater systems and inflow and infiltration, and system modernization/optimization.

During the review process, TDEC staff may contact applicants concerning insufficient applications, to request additional information, to discuss alternatives, or the potential of leveraging of other funding opportunities (e.g., SRF, BIL, CDBG). Information submitted to the GMS will be the basis for grant contracts. Complete applications that include accurate budgets, project timelines and descriptions, and co-funding information are critical for timely grant execution and award. It is imperative that cost estimates and timelines are realistic and align with the ARP timeframe. Budget adjustments and grant contract amendments may not be possible.

Funding Conditions

Grant Schedules

There are two levels of schedules in a non-competitive SWIG grant: the proposal schedule and the individual project schedule. Proposals may have multiple project award types depending on the number of water infrastructure (utility) systems and partners or project owners party to the proposal. Each water infrastructure system owned and operated by a project owner or grantee is eligible to select one project award type per water infrastructure system type (drinking water, wastewater, or stormwater). Project award types may consist of many individual projects. Individual projects will have independent schedules within the timeframe of an overall proposal schedule.

Proposal schedules establish the grant contract term with start dates of March 3, 2021 and end dates of September 30, 2026. All proposals must have an end date of September 30, 2026 to ensure proper close-out of all activities prior to December 31, 2026. All grant contracts will end by September 30, 2026.

Individual project schedules are dependent on the project award type and the project itself. Grant applicants and project owners need to consider the feasibility of completing an individual project within the limits of the project award type. Individual project schedules should identify start date,

dates of major milestones toward project completion, and end dates based on the deliverables required. Grant applicants must provide the timeline and dates for submission of all deliverables as part of each individual project schedule. ***For a complete checklist of technical information required for standard projects by project award type, see Appendix B.***

TDEC may amend the individual project schedule upon written request and for good cause shown. **Project schedules must include a start date and an end date. These items must be identified in the grant proposal.**

Projects focused on stream and wetland restoration, rehabilitation, or bank stabilization projects will have application and reporting requirements that may differ from traditional infrastructure projects. Depending on the scope and complexity of the activity, pre and post project requirements may align with (or similar to) reporting requirements in the TDEC Stream Mitigation Guidelines utilizing the TN Stream Quantification Tool or TN Rapid Assessment Methods for wetlands. If the proposal contains water resource restoration or rehabilitation, applicants should contact the SWIG program for additional guidance. Projects that will result in an appreciable permanent loss of water resource value, therefore requiring stream or wetland compensatory mitigation as a result of proposed grant activities are not eligible under this grant program.

Reimbursement

A request to be reimbursed for cost incurred for non-competitive SWIG grants shall include only requests for actual, reasonable, and necessary expenditures required in the delivery of service described in the grant contract and identified in the individual project budget. Reimbursement may not include any request for future expenditures. The grant contract term for a reimbursement request means the time during which the grant applicant may incur new obligations to carry out the work authorized in the grant contract. Grant contracts will start on March 3, 2021 and end on September 30, 2026. Grant applicants may elect to complete their final report early if all contract deliverables are complete and reports are submitted and approved.

- A. Investigation and Planning
 - The **maximum** allowable reimbursement is 80% of the individual project budget until the **PER(s) and asset management plan(s) is received and approved** by TDEC.
- B. Investigation, Planning and Design
 - The **maximum** allowable reimbursement is 80% of the planning fees in an individual project budget until the **PER(s) is received and approved** by TDEC.

- The **maximum** allowable reimbursement is 80% of the design fees of an individual project budget until **plans and specifications and asset management plan(s) are received and approved** by TDEC.
- C. Planning, Design, and Construction or Construction only
- The **maximum** allowable reimbursement is 80% of the design fees of an individual project until **plans and specifications are received and approved** by TDEC.
 - The **maximum** allowable reimbursement is 90% of the total individual project costs until an **asset management plan(s) is received and approved and construction is complete, the site has been inspected by TDEC (or designated agent), the facilities are in proper operation, and the project has been approved** by TDEC.

Federal Reporting Requirements

Funds described in the WIIP are state fiscal recovery dollars and all grant recipients are subject to federal reporting requirements found in 2 CRF Part 200 as well as the Compliance and Reporting Guidance issued by U.S. Treasury. All SWIG grant recipients will be required to provide timely reports to TDEC during the grant award period. Grant contracts will provide detailed information on program progress and expenditure reporting requirements, reporting frequency, and report deadlines. Grant applicants are urged to review the U.S. Treasury Compliance and Reporting Guidance prior to applying for non-competitive SWIG funds to become familiar with these requirements, including any requirements that would apply to partners and subcontractors executing elements of a grant proposal. It is recommended grant recipients and partners appropriately maintain accounting records for compiling and reporting accurate, compliant financial data in accordance with appropriate accounting standards and principles. Grant applicants may be subject to state and local audits.

Monitoring and Oversight Responsibilities

Grant applicants, all subrecipients, and project owners are responsible for ensuring all fiscal recovery funds are used in compliance with U.S. Treasury's Final Rule. In addition, recipients should be mindful of any compliance obligations that may apply to other funding sources used in conjunction with these fiscal recovery funds or statutes and regulations that may independently apply to water infrastructure projects.

Additional Considerations

Construction Projects

All construction projects must comply with and secure all relevant state and federal permits prior to project execution. Construction-only projects should be ready to proceed upon submitting a grant application, including ready to apply for, or having secured, all applicable permits. Awarding of a grant does not indicate a permit will be authorized and is not a substitute for required permits. Any construction project should evaluate the need for 401 water quality certification permits, coverage under the DWR Construction General Permit, NPDES permits, and any other applicable state and federal permits.

TDEC will require the submission of an authority-to-award (ATA) bid package from grant recipients prior to commencing construction. Once TDEC completes review and approval of the ATA bid package, the grant recipient and partners are authorized to award construction contracts. Grant applicants should schedule pre-construction conferences (PCC) prior to issuing a notice to proceed (NTP) with construction. TDEC will require a two-week notification prior to the PCC. Once the PCC is held, an NTP can be issued. Construction start dates in the NTP must be within 120 days of the approval of the ATA bid package. If construction projects are not initiated prior to this date, TDEC may limit remaining grant activity and/or revoke grant dollars. TDEC will not authorize construction until all permits have been secured. Bid packages will be reviewed for compliance with the competitive procurement process, federal requirements concerning minority business enterprises, equal employment opportunity documentation, bid tabulations, and other common, relevant information.

Construction project grantees must receive TDEC approval for initiation of operations, performance certifications, operation and maintenance manuals, and other common, relevant material prior to project close out. All construction projects will be inspected at the start of construction, during construction, and at the completion of construction to ensure the project is executed according to plans and specifications, complies with permit requirements, and is progressing in a timely manner. Construction projects experiencing up to three-month delays in individual project schedules and at risk of missing deliverable dates should notify SWIG staff immediately. Grantees must provide sufficient justification for the delay and request a project schedule modification. Schedule modifications will be granted on a case-by-case basis given reasonable assurances the project will be complete by September 30, 2026. No projects may extend construction activity or incur any expenses for reimbursement past September 30, 2026. Any projects that are not completed on time may forfeit remaining grant award dollars or risk

contract termination and be required to remit funds back to the state. Additional information on requirements for construction projects will be provided in grant contracts.

Public Record

Any information submitted in response to the solicitation for the State of Tennessee's non-competitive SWIG funds may be considered public record and will be subject to disclosure to the public as required by Tennessee law. By submitting an application for a grant, applicants agree to allow the use of applicant and project information as provided in application and grant documents to be published or distributed in various print or electronic media publications.

The application is also subject to the State of Tennessee's applicable laws governing the public disclosure of personally identifiable information, which are set forth in Tennessee Code Annotated section 10-7-504(a)(29). Pursuant to Tennessee Code Annotated section 10-7-503(a)(5), "information made confidential by State law shall be redacted whenever possible, and the redacted record shall be made available for inspection and copying."

Certification

TDEC reserves the right to not award funds to applicants that:

- Fail to submit a complete application;
- Do not address a minimum of Critical Needs identified in the Scorecard Summaries;
- Exhibit poor performance in complying with the expectations and requirements of previous grant or loan contracts with the State of Tennessee;
- Have regulatory and/or programmatic compliance issues with the State of Tennessee (e.g., is in significant non-compliance with current regulations enforced by TDEC) and do not address any significant non-compliance issues in the grant application.

The applicant shall certify that:

- The applicant understands that the elements of Title VI compliance correspond to requirements for Title VI as provided for in 42 U.S.C. § 2000(d) and in Tennessee Code Annotated section 4-21-904, and applicant has either adopted and implemented these elements of compliance or has agreed to adopt and implement TDEC's compliance resources as its own;
- The applicant understands that the applicant's eligibility for funding is contingent upon its satisfaction of and adherence to the requirements of Title VI, as well as any contractor or subcontractor associated with the project as required by law;
- The applicant has successfully submitted and received notification of completion for its annual Title VI Compliance application;

- The applicant understands that if the applicant is awarded a grant by TDEC, the applicant will need to show evidence of completion of Title VI training when requested by TDEC;
- The applicant has read and understands the reporting requirements and that the applicant will comply with these requirements;
- All vendors will be selected in accordance with state public contracting laws under Tennessee Code Annotated Title 4, Chapter 56; Title 12, Chapter 3; and Title 12, Chapter 4; and
- The applicant, along with the officers, directors, owners, partners, employees, or agents of the applicant organization, is (are) not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, or declared ineligible for an award by any State or Federal agency.

Definitions

- *Ability to Pay Index (ATPI):* The Ability to Pay Index is an indicator that describes the economic health of a city or county relative to Tennessee state averages. The ATPI is based on the simple average of nine socio-economic and financial variables: median household income, unemployment, food stamp dependence, families in poverty, community assets, revenues, debt, and expenditures, and change in population.
- *Co-Funding:* The required local cash or in-kind proportion of funds to be used in conjunction with non-competitive SWIG funds.
- *Collaborative Project:* A collaborative project is one that involves multiple entities (counties, cities, and/or utilities) working together on an activity or set of activities for a shared purpose.
- *Competitive Grant:* The competitive grant is a grant program that TDEC will develop to program funds remaining after the non-competitive grant solicitation closes. TDEC will release additional details about the competitive grant program in early 2023.
- *Critical Needs:* Action areas identified by TDEC as necessary to maintaining a sustainable and reliable water infrastructure system. Critical needs include addressing significant non-compliance, reducing water loss and inflow and infiltration, developing asset management plans, and modernizing aging infrastructure.
- *Eligible City:* An eligible city is incorporated and operates a public drinking water or wastewater system or has a permitted stormwater system.
- *Funding Allocation:* Unique amount of total available grant funds each subrecipient may be awarded for eligible water infrastructure projects.
- *Grant Applicant:* Eligible subrecipients, including all counties and eligible cities submitting a grant proposal as a project owner or on behalf of an eligible project owner.
- *Grant Budget:* Total proposal costs including requested state funding from designated allocation, co-funding requirements, and detailed breakdown of project and administrative costs.
- *Non-Collaborative Project:* A non-collaborative project is one undertaken by a single entity (county, city, or utility) or by multiple entities (counties, cities, and/or utilities) that do not meet the threshold for partner eligibility as described in this grant guidance.
- *Non-Competitive Grant:* The non-competitive grant program is addressed in this grant guidance. Funds are available to counties and eligible cities in the amount described by the funding allocation table. These funds are not competitive and will be awarded to counties and eligible cities that submit an application that meets minimum criteria as described in this grant guidance.

- *Priority Areas of Emphasis:* Priority areas of emphasis are identified action areas for water infrastructure projects that align with federal, state, and local agency priorities. Priority areas of emphasis are divided into critical need priority areas and additional priority areas. A complete list and descriptions of all priority areas of emphasis are included in Section V of the *Water Infrastructure Investment Plan*.
- *Project Award Type:* The project award type describes the type of activities contained in a proposal. There are four project award types: investigation and planning; investigation, planning, and design; planning, design, and construction; and construction. The project award type is based on the set of activities proposed for each individual water infrastructure (utility) system and must cover the maximum extent of activities that utility system proposed. Individual utility systems are allowed one project award type per water infrastructure type (drinking water, wastewater, or stormwater) included in a proposal.
- *Project Owner:* Project owners are those entities that may execute projects. Project owners must operate a drinking water or wastewater system or a permitted stormwater system or execute a project on behalf of a drinking water or wastewater system or a permitted stormwater system. All project owners must complete the Scorecard or execute a project on behalf of a system that has completed the Scorecard.
- *Streamlined Construction Projects:* Projects that address critical needs only, are rehab projects or are proceeding under a previously approved CAP/ER, are authorized through a general ARAP, and require no modification to an existing NPDES, SOP, or water withdrawal ARAP.
- *Subrecipient:* A subrecipient is an entity with a designated funding allocation as outlined in Appendix B of the *Water Infrastructure Investment Plan*. All 95 counties and 267 eligible cities are subrecipients. Subrecipients may establish sub-subrecipient relationships with project owners to execute projects.
- *State Water Infrastructure Grants (SWIG):* Tennessee's grant programs for water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure, including the programs described in the WIIP.
- *Tennessee Infrastructure Scorecard (Scorecard):* Online infrastructure needs assessment tool. The Scorecard benchmarks a system's operational, financial, and environmental performance and identifies critical needs to improve system performance.
- *Water Infrastructure System:* Water infrastructure systems are those systems that operate and provide drinking water (with a public water system identification number) or wastewater (with a NPDES or SOP) services or are a designated municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) by the State of Tennessee. When developing projects and proposals, the water infrastructure system refers to the utility executing drinking water, wastewater,

or stormwater activities based on the proposed activities. A water infrastructure system may operate multiple water infrastructure types.

- *Water Infrastructure Type*: The water infrastructure type refers to drinking water, wastewater, or stormwater and describes the category of activity and investment using non-competitive SWIG funds. Each water infrastructure system included in a grant application should select a project award type for each water infrastructure type described in the application.

Appendices

Appendix A: Examples of Collaborative Proposals

Scenario	Collaborative Project Application Example
<p>City of Alice, City of Merlin, and Dorian County want to work together on a collaborative stormwater management plan. City of Alice and City of Merlin plan to work together on a regional water supply construction project.</p>	<p>City of Alice, City of Merlin, and Dorian County could pool any amount of their individual funds together and apply to fund the stormwater management plan under the collaborative proposal solicitation. These entities would need to designate a grant applicant. TDEC would contract with the grant applicant.</p> <p>Because the cities plan to work together on an additional project, one of the cities should be the grant applicant and include the additional regional water supply construction project in the collaborative proposal.</p> <p>The city serving as the grant applicant in the collaborative phase can't include non-collaborative projects for funding in the proposal. The grant applicant and any city and county not designated as the grant applicant may apply in the non-collaborative proposal phase to utilize any additional funds in their funding allocation. In this example, if the Alice is the grant applicant, Alice would submit an application that includes both the stormwater management plan project and the regional water supply construction project, as well as any non-collaborative projects Alice proposes. Merlin and Dorian County would only submit an application if they intend to apply for a non-collaborative project on their own.</p>
<p>Sawyer County and Lyra County want to work together on a watershed-scale wastewater assessment and collaborate to address inflow and infiltration concerns across multiple systems in their counties.</p>	<p>Sawyer County and Lyra County could pool any amount of their individual funds together and apply to fund the watershed-scale wastewater assessment and inflow-and-infiltration construction project together as one proposal with two projects. These entities would need to designate a grant applicant. TDEC would contract with the grant applicant. The grant applicant should include all projects for funding in the proposal, including the grant applicant's non-collaborative projects. The county not designated as the grant applicant in the collaborative phase may apply in the non-collaborative proposal phase to utilize any additional funds in their funding allocation.</p>
<p>Holden County and City of Starbuck want to work</p>	<p>Holden County and City of Starbuck could pool any amount of their individual funds together and apply to fund the green infrastructure project</p>

<p>together on a green infrastructure project. City of Starbuck wants to secure funding for a water reuse project and Holden County wants to expand water lines to county residents not currently connected to services.</p>	<p>together as a collaborative proposal. These entities would need to designate a grant applicant. TDEC would contract with the grant applicant for the collaborative proposal. The grant applicant for the collaborative proposal would include additional projects to fund, including non-collaborative projects, in the collaborative proposal.</p> <p>The partner not serving as the grant applicant in the collaborative phase may apply in the non-collaborative phase to utilize any additional funds in their funding allocation.</p>
--	---

Appendix B: Technical Information for Standard Projects Application

Investigation and Planning

- A. How the project award type addresses state goals and priorities
 - 1. Scorecard summaries identifying Critical Needs
 - 2. Additional Priority Areas
- B. Project information
 - 1. Description of each individual project
 - 2. Detailed individual project budget(s)
 - 3. Scorecard summary for each system
 - 4. Maps of area of interest and location of activities
 - 5. Detailed schedule for individual projects which include “on or before” dates:
 - a. Engineering Agreement within 60 days of grant award
 - b. Preliminary engineering report (or facilities plan)
 - c. Verification of a comprehensive asset management plan
 - i. Capital Improvement Plan
 - d. Final Scorecard Summary
 - e. Critical Needs Matrix deliverables, as needed, based on Scorecard Summaries and Scorecard section requirements:
 - i. CAP/ER
 - ii. Water Loss Control Plan
 - iii. Inflow and Infiltration Reduction and Elimination Plan
 - iv. Infrastructure Replacement or Demand Reduction Plan
 - v. Stormwater management plan and a digital storm sewer wide inventory and map (if applicable to MS4)

Investigation, Planning and Design

- A. How the project award type addresses state goals and priorities
 - 1. Scorecard summaries identifying Critical Needs
 - 2. Additional Priority Areas
- B. Project information
 - 1. Description of each individual project
 - 2. Detailed individual project budget(s)
 - 3. Scorecard summary for each system
 - 4. Maps of area of interest and location of activities
 - 5. Detailed schedule for individual projects which include “on or before” dates:
 - a. Engineering Agreement within 60 days of grant award
 - b. Preliminary engineering report (or facilities plan)
 - c. Verification of a comprehensive asset management plan
 - i. Capital Improvement Plan submittal
 - d. Final Scorecard Summary
 - e. Critical Needs Matrix deliverables based on TN Infrastructure Scorecard section requirements:
 - i. CAP/ER
 - ii. Water Loss Control Plan
 - iii. Inflow and Infiltration Reduction and Elimination Plan
 - iv. Infrastructure Replacement or Demand Reduction Plan
 - v. Stormwater management plan and a digital storm sewer wide inventory and map (if applicable to MS4)
 - f. Plan of Operation(s) for every individual project where a new facility is planned, or expansion or upgrade of existing facility
 - g. Engineering plans and specifications

Planning, Design, and Construction

- A. How the project award type addresses state goals and priorities
 - 1. Scorecard summaries identifying Critical Needs
 - 2. Additional Priority Areas
- B. Project information
 - 1. Description of each individual project
 - 2. Detailed individual project budget(s)
 - 3. Scorecard summary for each system
 - 4. Maps of area of interest and location of activities
 - 5. Detailed schedule for individual projects which includes “on or before” dates:
 - a. Verification of a comprehensive asset management plan
 - i. Capital Improvement Plan submittal
 - b. Final Scorecard Summary
 - c. Critical Needs Matrix deliverables based on TN Infrastructure Scorecard section requirements:
 - i. CAP/ER
 - ii. Water Loss Control Plan
 - iii. Inflow and Infiltration Reduction and Elimination Plan
 - iv. Infrastructure Replacement or Demand Reduction Plan
 - v. Stormwater management plan and a digital storm sewer wide inventory and map (if applicable to MS4)
 - d. Preliminary engineering report (or facilities plan)
Plan of Operation(s) for every individual project where a new facility is planned, or expansion or upgrade of existing facility
 - i. Engineering plans and specifications
- C. For individual projects going to construction
 - 1. Detailed schedule that includes “on or before” dates as applicable:
 - a. Projected start of construction
 - b. Projected Initiation of Operations
 - c. Operation and maintenance manual on or before date
 - d. Complete construction
 - e. List of required permits
 - f. Site certification or letter in lieu of for each individual project

Construction Only

- A. How the project award type addresses state goals and priorities
 - 1. Scorecard summaries identifying Critical Needs
 - 2. Additional Priority Areas
- B. Project information
 - 1. Description of each individual project
 - 2. Detailed individual project budget(s)
 - 3. Scorecard summary for each system
 - 4. Maps of project areas
 - 5. Preliminary engineering report(s) (or facilities plan)
 - 6. Engineering plans and specifications (Standard Projects only)
 - 7. Detailed schedule for each individual projects which includes “on or before” dates:
 - a. Verification of a comprehensive asset management plan
 - i. Capital Improvement Plan submittal
 - b. Final Scorecard Summary
 - c. Plan of Operation(s) for every individual project where a new facility is planned, or expansion or upgrade of existing facility (Standard Projects only)
 - d. Projected start of construction
 - e. Initiate operation on or before date
 - f. Operation and maintenance manual on or before date (if applicable)
 - g. Complete construction on or before date
 - h. List of required permits (as needed) (Standard Projects only)
 - i. Site certification or letter in lieu of for each individual project (as needed) (Standard Projects only)
- C. Enforcement and Compliance CAP/ER and approved CAP/ER documents, including plans and specifications and a construction budget and schedule (if applicable)

Appendix C: Non-Competitive Grant Allocations and Co-Funding Requirements by City and County

County	City	ATPI	Representative Population		Base Allocation	Population Allocation	ATPI-Population Allocation	Total Allocation	Co-Funding Level
Anderson		50	29,141	0.42%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,053,217.99	\$1,922,888.23	\$5,081,369.22	15%
Bedford		70	25,617	0.37%	\$2,105,263.00	\$925,853.11	\$1,014,212.85	\$4,045,328.96	25%
Benton		40	11,704	0.17%	\$2,105,263.00	\$423,007.56	\$926,755.45	\$3,455,026.01	15%
Bledsoe		10	13,089	0.19%	\$2,105,263.00	\$473,064.42	\$1,554,635.44	\$4,132,962.86	15%
Blount		90	91,499	1.32%	\$2,105,263.00	\$3,306,969.33	\$1,207,524.45	\$6,619,756.78	35%
Bradley		60	61,264	0.89%	\$2,105,263.00	\$2,214,211.84	\$3,234,036.57	\$7,553,511.41	25%
Campbell		10	29,688	0.43%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,072,987.74	\$3,526,168.30	\$6,704,419.04	15%
Cannon		70	11,803	0.17%	\$2,105,263.00	\$426,585.64	\$467,297.27	\$2,999,145.91	25%
Carroll		40	13,876	0.20%	\$2,105,263.00	\$501,508.28	\$1,098,740.49	\$3,705,511.77	15%
Carter		30	41,810	0.60%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,511,102.72	\$3,862,404.85	\$7,478,770.57	15%
Cheatham		90	30,983	0.45%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,119,791.81	\$408,886.76	\$3,633,941.57	35%
Chester		80	11,033	0.16%	\$2,105,263.00	\$398,756.19	\$291,207.93	\$2,795,227.12	35%
Claiborne		20	27,330	0.40%	\$2,105,263.00	\$987,764.59	\$2,885,421.11	\$5,978,448.69	15%
Clay		0	6,159	0.09%	\$2,105,263.00	\$222,599.42	\$812,811.41	\$3,140,673.82	15%
Cocke		10	28,914	0.42%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,045,013.73	\$3,434,237.07	\$6,584,513.80	15%
Coffee		70	25,338	0.37%	\$2,105,263.00	\$915,769.45	\$1,003,166.85	\$4,024,199.30	25%
Crockett		50	7,916	0.11%	\$2,105,263.00	\$286,101.15	\$522,342.51	\$2,913,706.67	15%
Cumberland		50	49,074	0.71%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,773,639.20	\$3,238,180.47	\$7,117,082.66	15%
Metro Government of Nashville and Davidson County		60	689,447	9.97%	\$2,105,263.00	\$24,971,087.46	\$36,394,894.37	\$63,418,244.83	25%
Decatur		20	8,528	0.12%	\$2,105,263.00	\$308,220.14	\$900,361.19	\$3,313,844.32	15%
DeKalb		40	14,095	0.20%	\$2,105,263.00	\$509,423.41	\$1,116,081.52	\$3,730,767.93	15%
Dickson		80	36,227	0.52%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,309,321.17	\$956,185.06	\$4,370,769.23	35%
Dyer		40	16,741	0.24%	\$2,105,263.00	\$605,055.50	\$1,325,599.20	\$4,035,917.70	15%
Fayette		80	25,112	0.36%	\$2,105,263.00	\$907,601.33	\$662,812.80	\$3,675,677.12	35%

County	City	ATPI	Representative Population		Base Allocation	Population Allocation	ATPI-Population Allocation	Total Allocation	Co-Funding Level
Fentress		20	15,999	0.23%	\$2,105,263.00	\$578,238.04	\$1,689,127.42	\$4,372,628.46	15%
Franklin		80	26,108	0.38%	\$2,105,263.00	\$943,598.90	\$689,101.48	\$3,737,963.38	35%
Gibson		50	25,306	0.37%	\$2,105,263.00	\$914,612.90	\$1,669,833.21	\$4,689,709.11	15%
Giles		70	21,112	0.31%	\$2,105,263.00	\$763,032.78	\$835,853.60	\$3,704,149.38	25%
Grainger		40	20,122	0.29%	\$2,105,263.00	\$727,252.07	\$1,593,316.23	\$4,425,831.30	15%
Greene		40	48,460	0.70%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,751,447.93	\$3,837,198.32	\$7,693,909.25	15%
Grundy		0	10,730	0.16%	\$2,105,263.00	\$387,805.12	\$1,416,052.35	\$3,909,120.47	15%
Hamblen		60	34,068	0.49%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,231,290.30	\$1,798,399.68	\$5,134,952.98	25%
Hamilton		80	111,670	1.61%	\$2,105,263.00	\$4,035,992.36	\$2,947,447.63	\$9,088,702.99	35%
Hancock		0	5,380	0.08%	\$2,105,263.00	\$194,444.69	\$710,005.74	\$3,009,713.44	15%
Hardeman		20	16,121	0.23%	\$2,105,263.00	\$582,647.38	\$1,702,007.82	\$4,389,918.20	15%
Hardin		30	19,618	0.28%	\$2,105,263.00	\$709,036.43	\$1,812,309.45	\$4,626,608.88	15%
Hawkins		40	36,941	0.53%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,335,126.66	\$2,925,091.69	\$6,365,481.35	15%
Haywood		0	7,659	0.11%	\$2,105,263.00	\$276,812.62	\$1,010,768.40	\$3,392,844.02	15%
Henderson		40	18,595	0.27%	\$2,105,263.00	\$672,063.02	\$1,472,404.10	\$4,249,730.13	15%
Henry		30	20,731	0.30%	\$2,105,263.00	\$749,262.63	\$1,915,128.32	\$4,769,653.94	15%
Hickman		60	21,393	0.31%	\$2,105,263.00	\$773,188.72	\$1,129,305.04	\$4,007,756.77	25%
Houston		50	5,727	0.08%	\$2,105,263.00	\$206,986.01	\$377,899.90	\$2,690,148.91	15%
Humphreys		70	11,246	0.16%	\$2,105,263.00	\$406,454.47	\$445,244.87	\$2,956,962.33	25%
Jackson		30	10,697	0.15%	\$2,105,263.00	\$386,612.43	\$988,188.10	\$3,480,063.54	15%
Jefferson		70	40,449	0.58%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,461,913.27	\$1,601,432.47	\$5,168,608.74	25%
Johnson		10	15,533	0.22%	\$2,105,263.00	\$561,395.80	\$1,844,919.57	\$4,511,578.37	15%
Knox		90	264,725	3.83%	\$2,105,263.00	\$9,567,727.04	\$3,493,610.97	\$15,166,601.01	35%
Lake		0	1,339	0.02%	\$2,105,263.00	\$48,394.32	\$176,709.61	\$2,330,366.93	15%
Lauderdale		0	13,717	0.20%	\$2,105,263.00	\$495,761.68	\$1,810,250.70	\$4,411,275.39	15%
Lawrence		50	29,997	0.43%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,084,155.66	\$1,979,371.96	\$5,168,790.62	15%
Lewis		30	8,914	0.13%	\$2,105,263.00	\$322,171.00	\$823,474.69	\$3,250,908.69	15%
Lincoln		60	27,723	0.40%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,001,968.45	\$1,463,456.45	\$4,570,687.89	25%

County	City	ATPI	Representative Population		Base Allocation	Population Allocation	ATPI-Population Allocation	Total Allocation	Co-Funding Level
Loudon		90	38,778	0.56%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,401,519.76	\$511,758.41	\$4,018,541.18	35%
Macon		50	18,427	0.27%	\$2,105,263.00	\$665,991.15	\$1,215,917.83	\$3,987,171.97	15%
Madison		50	30,618	0.44%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,106,599.93	\$2,020,349.05	\$5,232,211.98	15%
Marion		60	20,574	0.30%	\$2,105,263.00	\$743,588.31	\$1,086,071.24	\$3,934,922.55	25%
Marshall		80	20,313	0.29%	\$2,105,263.00	\$734,155.22	\$536,146.72	\$3,375,564.93	35%
Mauzy		90	4,495	0.06%	\$2,105,263.00	\$162,458.90	\$59,321.11	\$2,327,043.01	35%
McMinn		50	33,334	0.48%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,204,761.97	\$2,199,566.12	\$5,509,591.09	15%
McNairy		10	16,646	0.24%	\$2,105,263.00	\$601,622.00	\$1,977,115.25	\$4,684,000.25	15%
Meigs		40	11,195	0.16%	\$2,105,263.00	\$404,611.22	\$886,451.41	\$3,396,325.62	15%
Monroe		50	32,470	0.47%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,173,535.17	\$2,142,554.50	\$5,421,352.67	15%
Montgomery		80	53,347	0.77%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,928,074.55	\$1,408,054.88	\$5,441,392.43	35%
Metro Government of Lynchburg and Moore County		80	6,461	0.09%	\$2,105,263.00	\$233,514.34	\$170,533.35	\$2,509,310.69	35%
Morgan		10	19,477	0.28%	\$2,105,263.00	\$703,940.39	\$2,313,364.99	\$5,122,568.38	15%
Obion		20	12,650	0.18%	\$2,105,263.00	\$457,198.02	\$1,335,549.84	\$3,898,010.86	15%
Overton		60	18,606	0.27%	\$2,105,263.00	\$672,460.59	\$982,183.41	\$3,759,907.00	25%
Perry		10	6,450	0.09%	\$2,105,263.00	\$233,116.78	\$766,093.56	\$3,104,473.34	15%
Pickett		20	4,203	0.06%	\$2,105,263.00	\$151,905.40	\$443,740.39	\$2,700,908.79	15%
Polk		50	15,578	0.23%	\$2,105,263.00	\$563,022.20	\$1,027,924.67	\$3,696,209.87	15%
Putnam		70	36,725	0.53%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,327,319.96	\$1,453,994.10	\$4,886,577.06	25%
Rhea		30	22,385	0.32%	\$2,105,263.00	\$809,041.72	\$2,067,924.72	\$4,982,229.44	15%
Roane		60	36,115	0.52%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,305,273.25	\$1,906,457.80	\$5,316,994.05	25%
Robertson		90	31,986	0.46%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,156,042.37	\$422,123.49	\$3,683,428.86	35%
Rutherford		100	96,115	1.39%	\$2,105,263.00	\$3,473,801.43	\$0.00	\$5,579,064.43	35%
Scott		0	16,793	0.24%	\$2,105,263.00	\$606,934.90	\$2,216,194.51	\$4,928,392.40	15%
Sequatchie		40	10,469	0.15%	\$2,105,263.00	\$378,372.03	\$828,964.70	\$3,312,599.72	15%
Sevier		80	70,117	1.01%	\$2,105,263.00	\$2,534,178.17	\$1,850,686.72	\$6,490,127.89	35%
Shelby		30	107,162	1.55%	\$2,105,263.00	\$3,873,063.61	\$9,899,617.99	\$15,877,944.60	15%

County	City	ATPI	Representative Population		Base Allocation	Population Allocation	ATPI-Population Allocation	Total Allocation	Co-Funding Level
Smith		70	14,760	0.21%	\$2,105,263.00	\$533,457.93	\$584,369.04	\$3,223,089.97	25%
Stewart		60	11,526	0.17%	\$2,105,263.00	\$416,574.26	\$608,440.61	\$3,130,277.87	25%
Sullivan		50	73,752	1.07%	\$2,105,263.00	\$2,665,554.84	\$4,866,574.68	\$9,637,392.52	15%
Sumner		100	67,761	0.98%	\$2,105,263.00	\$2,449,027.30	\$0.00	\$4,554,290.30	35%
Tipton		60	31,772	0.46%	\$2,105,263.00	\$1,148,307.96	\$1,677,197.21	\$4,930,768.16	25%
Metro Government of Trousdale and Hartsville		70	11,615	0.17%	\$2,105,263.00	\$419,790.91	\$459,854.09	\$2,984,908.00	25%
Unicoi		20	11,845	0.17%	\$2,105,263.00	\$428,103.60	\$1,250,560.30	\$3,783,926.91	15%
Union		20	16,329	0.24%	\$2,105,263.00	\$590,164.94	\$1,723,967.85	\$4,419,395.79	15%
Van Buren		50	4,706	0.07%	\$2,105,263.00	\$170,084.89	\$310,528.53	\$2,585,876.43	15%
Warren		30	27,165	0.39%	\$2,105,263.00	\$981,801.13	\$2,509,500.78	\$5,596,564.91	15%
Washington		70	56,095	0.81%	\$2,105,263.00	\$2,027,393.14	\$2,220,879.49	\$6,353,535.62	25%
Wayne		30	10,366	0.15%	\$2,105,263.00	\$374,649.39	\$957,610.35	\$3,437,522.73	15%
Weakley		40	14,723	0.21%	\$2,105,263.00	\$532,120.67	\$1,165,808.31	\$3,803,191.99	15%
White		60	22,353	0.32%	\$2,105,263.00	\$807,885.17	\$1,179,982.03	\$4,093,130.21	25%
Williamson		100	97,585	1.41%	\$2,105,263.00	\$3,526,930.37	\$0.00	\$5,632,193.37	35%
Wilson		100	68,464	0.99%	\$2,105,263.00	\$2,474,435.22	\$0.00	\$4,579,698.22	35%
McNairy	Adamsville	20	2,265	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$81,861.94	\$239,132.05	\$882,791.98	15%
Crockett	Alamo	40	2,336	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$84,428.03	\$184,971.01	\$831,197.04	15%
Blount	Alcoa	60	10,978	0.16%	\$561,798.00	\$396,768.37	\$579,512.49	\$1,538,078.87	25%
DeKalb	Alexandria	40	981	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$35,455.44	\$77,678.32	\$674,931.76	15%
Putnam	Algood	50	3,963	0.06%	\$561,798.00	\$143,231.29	\$261,501.19	\$966,530.47	15%
Fentress	Allardt	60	555	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$20,058.89	\$29,297.63	\$611,154.52	25%
Shelby	Arlington	80	14,549	0.21%	\$561,798.00	\$525,831.94	\$384,010.17	\$1,471,640.11	35%
Cheatham	Ashland City	70	5,193	0.08%	\$561,798.00	\$187,686.11	\$205,598.13	\$955,082.25	25%
McMinn	Athens	30	14,084	0.20%	\$561,798.00	\$509,025.85	\$1,301,078.92	\$2,371,902.77	15%
Tipton	Atoka	80	10,008	0.14%	\$561,798.00	\$361,710.50	\$264,153.81	\$1,187,662.31	35%
Carroll	Atwood	40	940	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$33,973.61	\$74,431.83	\$670,203.44	15%

County	City	ATPI	Representative Population		Base Allocation	Population Allocation	ATPI-Population Allocation	Total Allocation	Co-Funding Level
Greene	Baileyton	30	436	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$15,757.97	\$40,277.65	\$617,833.62	15%
Shelby	Bartlett	90	57,786	0.84%	\$561,798.00	\$2,088,509.49	\$762,609.51	\$3,412,917.00	35%
Putnam	Baxter	50	1,578	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$57,032.29	\$104,125.38	\$722,955.67	15%
Bedford	Bell Buckle	80	410	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$14,818.28	\$10,821.65	\$587,437.92	35%
Davidson	Belle Meade	100	2,901	0.04%	\$561,798.00	\$104,848.34	\$0.00	\$666,646.34	35%
Crockett	Bells	60	2,463	0.04%	\$561,798.00	\$89,018.08	\$130,018.15	\$780,834.23	25%
Polk	Benton	40	1,523	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$55,044.47	\$120,595.40	\$737,437.87	15%
Davidson	Berry Hill	90	2,112	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$76,332.19	\$27,872.34	\$666,002.54	35%
McNairy	Bethel Springs	10	742	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$26,817.47	\$88,130.45	\$676,745.92	15%
Benton	Big Sandy	10	486	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$17,565.08	\$57,724.26	\$637,087.34	15%
Grainger	Blaine	50	2,084	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$75,320.21	\$137,514.12	\$774,632.34	15%
Sullivan	Bluff City	50	1,822	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$65,850.97	\$120,225.88	\$747,874.85	15%
Hardeman	Bolivar	20	5,205	0.08%	\$561,798.00	\$188,119.82	\$549,528.61	\$1,299,446.43	15%
Gibson	Bradford	30	1,001	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$36,178.28	\$92,472.31	\$690,448.59	15%
Williamson	Brentwood	100	45,373	0.66%	\$561,798.00	\$1,639,877.15	\$0.00	\$2,201,675.15	35%
Tipton	Brighton	60	2,888	0.04%	\$561,798.00	\$104,378.49	\$152,453.28	\$818,629.77	25%
Sullivan	Bristol	40	27,147	0.39%	\$561,798.00	\$981,150.57	\$2,149,575.38	\$3,692,523.95	15%
Haywood	Brownsville	10	9,788	0.14%	\$561,798.00	\$353,759.23	\$1,162,561.82	\$2,078,119.05	15%
Carroll	Bruceston	30	1,507	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$54,466.20	\$139,216.55	\$755,480.75	15%
Hawkins	Bulls Gap	50	756	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$27,323.46	\$49,885.16	\$639,006.62	15%
Pickett	Byrdstown	30	798	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$28,841.42	\$73,719.18	\$664,358.61	15%
Benton	Camden	30	3,674	0.05%	\$561,798.00	\$132,786.21	\$339,403.86	\$1,033,988.07	15%
Smith	Carthage	60	2,291	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$82,801.63	\$120,938.52	\$765,538.16	25%
Campbell	Caryville	30	2,212	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$81,139.00	\$205,598.00	\$848,535.00	15%
Clay	Celina	10	1,422	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$51,394.12	\$168,896.91	\$782,089.02	15%
Hickman	Centerville	60	3,532	0.05%	\$561,798.00	\$127,654.03	\$186,449.09	\$875,901.12	25%
Marshall	Chapel Hill	80	1,717	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$62,056.05	\$45,318.95	\$669,173.00	35%
Dickson	Charlotte	70	1,656	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$59,851.38	\$65,563.36	\$687,212.73	25%

County	City	ATPI	Representative Population		Base Allocation	Population Allocation	ATPI-Population Allocation	Total Allocation	Co-Funding Level
Hamilton	Chattanooga	60	181,099	2.62%	\$561,798.00	\$6,545,304.75	\$9,559,950.19	\$16,667,052.93	25%
Hawkins	Church Hill	50	6,998	0.10%	\$561,798.00	\$252,922.67	\$461,767.68	\$1,276,488.35	15%
Carroll	Clarksburg	70	379	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$13,697.87	\$15,005.14	\$590,501.01	25%
Montgomery	Clarksville	60	166,722	2.41%	\$561,798.00	\$6,025,689.25	\$8,801,009.48	\$15,388,496.73	25%
Bradley	Cleveland	50	47,356	0.68%	\$561,798.00	\$1,711,547.01	\$3,124,817.10	\$5,398,162.10	15%
Wayne	Clifton	20	2,651	0.04%	\$561,798.00	\$95,812.80	\$279,884.79	\$937,495.60	15%
Anderson	Clinton	50	10,056	0.15%	\$561,798.00	\$363,445.32	\$663,551.84	\$1,588,795.16	15%
Hamilton	Collegedale	70	11,109	0.16%	\$561,798.00	\$401,502.99	\$439,820.84	\$1,403,121.84	25%
Shelby	Collierville	100	51,324	0.74%	\$561,798.00	\$1,854,959.00	\$0.00	\$2,416,757.00	35%
Wayne	Collinwood	30	898	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$32,455.64	\$82,957.18	\$677,210.81	15%
Maury	Columbia	50	41,690	0.60%	\$561,798.00	\$1,506,765.66	\$2,750,942.32	\$4,819,505.99	15%
Putnam	Cookeville	50	34,842	0.50%	\$561,798.00	\$1,259,264.31	\$2,299,072.50	\$4,120,134.81	15%
Polk	Copperhill	20	443	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$16,010.97	\$46,770.64	\$624,579.60	15%
Tipton	Covington	20	8,663	0.13%	\$561,798.00	\$313,099.33	\$914,614.09	\$1,789,511.42	15%
Franklin	Cowan	40	1,759	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$63,574.02	\$139,282.54	\$764,654.56	15%
Cumberland	Crossville	30	12,071	0.17%	\$561,798.00	\$436,271.73	\$1,115,118.13	\$2,113,187.85	15%
Stewart	Cumberland City	10	305	0.00%	\$561,798.00	\$11,023.35	\$36,226.13	\$609,047.48	15%
Claiborne	Cumberland Gap	50	313	0.00%	\$561,798.00	\$11,312.49	\$20,653.51	\$593,764.00	15%
Jefferson	Dandridge	60	3,344	0.05%	\$561,798.00	\$120,859.30	\$176,524.85	\$859,182.15	25%
Rhea	Dayton	20	7,065	0.10%	\$561,798.00	\$255,344.19	\$745,901.94	\$1,563,044.14	15%
Meigs	Decatur	30	1,563	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$56,490.16	\$144,389.83	\$762,677.99	15%
Decatur	Decaturville	20	807	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$29,166.70	\$85,200.69	\$676,165.39	15%
Franklin	Decherd	50	2,379	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$85,982.14	\$156,979.89	\$804,760.04	15%
Dickson	Dickson	60	16,058	0.23%	\$561,798.00	\$580,370.43	\$847,678.23	\$1,989,846.66	25%
Stewart	Dover	50	1,826	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$65,995.54	\$120,489.82	\$748,283.36	15%
DeKalb	Dowelltown	50	342	0.00%	\$561,798.00	\$12,505.00	\$24,678.00	\$598,981.00	15%
Weakley	Dresden	50	3,019	0.04%	\$561,798.00	\$109,113.11	\$199,210.72	\$870,121.83	15%

County	City	ATPI	Representative Population		Base Allocation	Population Allocation	ATPI-Population Allocation	Total Allocation	Co-Funding Level
Sequatchie	Dunlap	40	5,357	0.08%	\$561,798.00	\$193,613.42	\$424,182.24	\$1,179,593.67	15%
Gibson	Dyer	40	2,308	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$83,416.05	\$182,753.89	\$827,967.95	15%
Dyer	Dyersburg	30	16,164	0.23%	\$561,798.00	\$584,201.49	\$1,493,229.18	\$2,639,228.67	15%
Rutherford	Eagleville	90	813	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$29,383.56	\$10,729.27	\$601,910.83	35%
Hamilton	East Ridge	60	22,167	0.32%	\$561,798.00	\$801,162.74	\$1,170,163.37	\$2,533,124.10	25%
McNairy	Eastview	40	763	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$27,576.45	\$60,416.47	\$649,790.92	15%
Carter	Elizabethton	30	14,546	0.21%	\$561,798.00	\$525,723.51	\$1,343,758.45	\$2,431,279.97	15%
Giles	Elkton	70	545	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$19,697.46	\$21,577.31	\$603,072.78	25%
McMinn	Englewood	30	1,483	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$53,598.79	\$136,999.44	\$752,396.22	15%
Houston	Erin	40	1,224	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$44,237.97	\$96,919.74	\$702,955.72	15%
Unicoi	Erwin	10	6,083	0.09%	\$561,798.00	\$219,852.62	\$722,503.43	\$1,504,154.04	15%
Franklin	Estill Springs	70	2,267	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$81,934.22	\$89,753.70	\$733,485.92	25%
McMinn	Etowah	40	3,603	0.05%	\$561,798.00	\$130,220.12	\$285,295.62	\$977,313.73	15%
Knox	Farragut	90	23,506	0.34%	\$561,798.00	\$849,557.06	\$310,211.80	\$1,721,566.86	35%
Lincoln	Fayetteville	30	7,068	0.10%	\$561,798.00	\$255,452.62	\$652,941.34	\$1,470,191.96	15%
Davidson	Forest Hills	100	5,038	0.07%	\$561,798.00	\$182,084.08	\$0.00	\$743,882.08	35%
Williamson	Franklin	90	83,454	1.21%	\$561,798.00	\$3,016,205.84	\$1,101,353.52	\$4,679,357.36	35%
Crockett	Friendship	20	613	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$22,155.13	\$64,718.74	\$648,671.87	15%
Blount	Friendsville	70	896	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$32,383.35	\$35,473.89	\$629,655.25	25%
Jackson	Gainesboro	20	920	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$33,250.77	\$97,130.90	\$692,179.66	15%
Sumner	Gallatin	70	44,431	0.64%	\$561,798.00	\$1,605,831.26	\$1,759,085.42	\$3,926,714.68	25%
Fayette	Gallaway	0	528	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$19,083.05	\$69,680.86	\$650,561.91	15%
Lauderdale	Gates	10	664	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$23,998.38	\$78,866.07	\$664,662.44	15%
Sevier	Gatlinburg	70	3,577	0.05%	\$561,798.00	\$129,280.42	\$141,618.43	\$832,696.85	25%
Shelby	Germantown	90	41,333	0.60%	\$561,798.00	\$1,493,862.92	\$545,477.09	\$2,601,138.01	35%
Gibson	Gibson	60	366	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$13,228.02	\$19,320.60	\$594,346.62	25%
Weakley	Gleason	30	1,369	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$49,478.58	\$126,468.12	\$737,744.71	15%
Davidson	Goodlettsville	70	17,789	0.26%	\$561,798.00	\$642,932.46	\$704,291.38	\$1,909,021.85	25%

County	City	ATPI	Representative Population		Base Allocation	Population Allocation	ATPI-Population Allocation	Total Allocation	Co-Funding Level
Smith	Gordonsville	60	1,363	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$49,261.73	\$71,950.77	\$683,010.50	25%
Hardeman	Grand Junction	30	338	0.00%	\$561,798.00	\$12,216.04	\$31,224.42	\$605,238.46	15%
Rhea	Graysville	40	1,471	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$53,165.08	\$116,477.89	\$731,440.98	15%
Robertson	Greenbrier	70	6,898	0.10%	\$561,798.00	\$249,308.46	\$273,101.47	\$1,084,207.92	25%
Greene	Greeneville	40	15,479	0.22%	\$561,798.00	\$559,444.13	\$1,225,670.51	\$2,346,912.64	15%
Weakley	Greenfield	40	2,031	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$73,404.68	\$160,820.26	\$796,022.94	15%
Lauderdale	Halls	10	2,091	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$75,573.21	\$248,356.84	\$885,728.05	15%
Roane	Harriman	30	5,892	0.09%	\$561,798.00	\$212,949.47	\$544,302.54	\$1,319,050.01	15%
Claiborne	Harrogate	60	4,400	0.06%	\$561,798.00	\$159,025.40	\$232,269.54	\$953,092.94	25%
Chester	Henderson	50	6,308	0.09%	\$561,798.00	\$227,984.60	\$416,237.57	\$1,206,020.16	15%
Sumner	Hendersonville	80	61,753	0.89%	\$561,798.00	\$2,231,885.34	\$1,629,925.08	\$4,423,608.42	35%
Lauderdale	Henning	0	871	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$31,479.80	\$114,947.03	\$708,224.83	15%
Henry	Henry	30	446	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$16,119.39	\$41,201.45	\$619,118.84	15%
Lewis	Hohenwald	20	3,668	0.05%	\$561,798.00	\$132,569.36	\$387,256.66	\$1,081,624.02	15%
Carroll	Hollow Rock	30	683	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$24,685.08	\$63,095.49	\$649,578.57	15%
Obion	Hornbeak	50	511	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$18,468.63	\$33,718.67	\$613,985.31	15%
Hardeman	Hornsby	40	264	0.00%	\$561,798.00	\$9,541.52	\$20,904.26	\$592,243.78	15%
Gibson	Humboldt	20	7,874	0.11%	\$561,798.00	\$284,583.18	\$831,313.79	\$1,677,694.97	15%
Carroll	Huntingdon	10	4,439	0.06%	\$561,798.00	\$160,434.94	\$527,238.65	\$1,249,471.59	15%
Franklin	Huntland	60	886	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$32,021.93	\$46,770.64	\$640,590.57	25%
Scott	Huntsville	0	1,270	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$45,900.51	\$167,603.59	\$775,302.10	15%
Campbell	Jacksboro	50	2,306	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$83,416.00	\$152,453.00	\$797,667.00	15%
Madison	Jackson	30	68,205	0.99%	\$561,798.00	\$2,465,074.41	\$6,300,773.08	\$9,327,645.49	15%
Fentress	Jamestown	0	1,935	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$69,935.03	\$255,364.52	\$887,097.55	15%
Marion	Jasper	50	3,612	0.05%	\$561,798.00	\$130,545.40	\$238,340.22	\$930,683.61	15%
Jefferson	Jefferson City	40	8,419	0.12%	\$561,798.00	\$304,280.65	\$666,639.96	\$1,532,718.61	15%
Campbell	Jellico	0	2,154	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$77,850.16	\$284,266.24	\$923,914.40	15%
Washington	Johnson City	50	71,046	1.03%	\$561,798.00	\$2,567,754.22	\$4,688,017.47	\$7,817,569.69	15%

County	City	ATPI	Representative Population		Base Allocation	Population Allocation	ATPI-Population Allocation	Total Allocation	Co-Funding Level
Washington	Jonesborough	70	5,860	0.08%	\$561,798.00	\$211,792.92	\$232,005.59	\$1,005,596.51	25%
Obion	Kenton	40	1,205	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$43,551.27	\$95,415.27	\$700,764.54	15%
Marion	Kimball	60	1,545	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$55,839.60	\$81,558.28	\$699,195.88	25%
Sullivan	Kingsport	40	55,442	0.80%	\$561,798.00	\$2,003,792.32	\$4,390,052.61	\$6,955,642.93	15%
Roane	Kingston	60	5,953	0.09%	\$561,798.00	\$215,154.14	\$314,250.13	\$1,091,202.26	25%
Cheatham	Kingston Springs	90	2,824	0.04%	\$561,798.00	\$102,065.39	\$37,268.70	\$701,132.10	35%
Knox	Knoxville	50	190,740	2.76%	\$561,798.00	\$6,893,751.08	\$12,586,105.52	\$20,041,654.60	15%
Campbell	La Follette	10	7,430	0.11%	\$561,798.00	\$268,536.07	\$882,492.27	\$1,712,826.34	15%
Fayette	La Grange	60	123	0.00%	\$561,798.00	\$4,445.48	\$6,492.99	\$572,736.47	25%
Rutherford	La Vergne	70	38,719	0.56%	\$561,798.00	\$1,399,387.38	\$1,532,939.35	\$3,494,124.73	25%
Macon	Lafayette	40	5,584	0.08%	\$561,798.00	\$201,817.69	\$442,156.74	\$1,205,772.43	15%
Shelby	Lakeland	70	13,904	0.20%	\$561,798.00	\$502,520.26	\$550,478.80	\$1,614,797.07	25%
Hamilton	Lakesite	80	1,856	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$67,079.81	\$48,987.76	\$677,865.56	35%
Lawrence	Lawrenceburg	30	11,633	0.17%	\$561,798.00	\$420,441.47	\$1,074,655.72	\$2,056,895.19	15%
Wilson	Lebanon	60	38,431	0.56%	\$561,798.00	\$1,388,978.44	\$2,028,716.04	\$3,979,492.48	25%
Loudon	Lenoir City	50	10,117	0.15%	\$561,798.00	\$365,649.99	\$667,576.96	\$1,595,024.95	15%
Marshall	Lewisburg	50	12,288	0.18%	\$561,798.00	\$444,114.57	\$810,831.84	\$1,816,744.41	15%
Henderson	Lexington	30	7,956	0.12%	\$561,798.00	\$287,546.84	\$734,974.72	\$1,584,319.55	15%
DeKalb	Liberty	30	334	0.00%	\$561,798.00	\$12,216.00	\$31,224.00	\$605,238.00	15%
Perry	Linden	10	997	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$36,033.71	\$118,417.87	\$716,249.58	15%
Overton	Livingston	50	3,905	0.06%	\$561,798.00	\$141,135.04	\$257,674.02	\$960,607.06	15%
Perry	Lobelville	30	919	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$33,214.62	\$84,897.16	\$679,909.78	15%
Hamilton	Lookout Mountain	90	2,058	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$74,380.52	\$27,159.70	\$663,338.22	35%
Lawrence	Loretto	50	1,739	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$62,851.18	\$114,749.07	\$739,398.24	15%
Loudon	Loudon	60	5,991	0.09%	\$561,798.00	\$216,527.54	\$316,256.09	\$1,094,581.63	25%
Union	Luttrell	20	1,017	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$36,756.55	\$107,371.87	\$705,926.42	15%
Giles	Lynnville	50	292	0.00%	\$561,798.00	\$10,553.50	\$19,267.81	\$591,619.32	15%

County	City	ATPI	Representative Population		Base Allocation	Population Allocation	ATPI-Population Allocation	Total Allocation	Co-Funding Level
Monroe	Madisonville	50	5,132	0.07%	\$561,798.00	\$185,481.44	\$338,638.43	\$1,085,917.87	15%
Coffee	Manchester	60	12,212	0.18%	\$561,798.00	\$441,367.77	\$644,653.54	\$1,647,819.31	25%
Weakley	Martin	30	10,825	0.16%	\$561,798.00	\$391,238.63	\$1,000,012.74	\$1,953,049.36	15%
Blount	Maryville	70	31,907	0.46%	\$561,798.00	\$1,153,187.14	\$1,263,242.75	\$2,978,227.89	25%
Tipton	Mason	0	1,337	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$48,322.04	\$176,445.67	\$786,565.70	15%
Crockett	Maury City	50	583	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$21,070.87	\$38,469.64	\$621,338.51	15%
Union	Maynardville	30	2,456	0.04%	\$561,798.00	\$88,765.09	\$226,885.11	\$877,448.19	15%
Humphreys	McEwen	50	1,643	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$59,381.53	\$108,414.45	\$729,593.98	15%
Carroll	McKenzie	30	5,529	0.08%	\$561,798.00	\$199,829.87	\$510,768.63	\$1,272,396.50	15%
Carroll	McLemoresville	70	288	0.00%	\$561,798.00	\$10,408.94	\$11,402.32	\$583,609.26	25%
Warren	McMinnville	20	13,788	0.20%	\$561,798.00	\$498,327.78	\$1,455,696.53	\$2,515,822.31	15%
Shelby	Memphis	10	633,104	9.15%	\$561,798.00	\$22,881,731.08	\$75,196,417.88	\$98,639,946.95	15%
McNairy	Michie	40	679	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$24,540.51	\$53,765.12	\$640,103.63	15%
Hardeman	Middleton	30	658	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$23,781.53	\$60,785.99	\$646,365.52	15%
Gibson	Milan	40	8,171	0.12%	\$561,798.00	\$295,317.40	\$647,002.63	\$1,504,118.03	15%
Sumner	Millersville	80	6,299	0.09%	\$561,798.00	\$227,659.32	\$166,257.48	\$955,714.80	35%
Shelby	Millington	40	10,582	0.15%	\$561,798.00	\$382,456.09	\$837,912.35	\$1,782,166.44	15%
Sumner	Mitchellville	60	163	0.00%	\$561,798.00	\$5,891.17	\$8,604.53	\$576,293.70	25%
Grundy	Monteagle	40	1,393	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$50,346.00	\$110,301.64	\$722,445.63	15%
Putnam	Monterey	30	2,746	0.04%	\$561,798.00	\$99,246.31	\$253,675.29	\$914,719.59	15%
Hamblen	Morristown	30	30,431	0.44%	\$561,798.00	\$1,099,841.35	\$2,811,213.63	\$4,472,852.98	15%
Fayette	Moscow	40	572	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$20,673.30	\$45,292.56	\$627,763.86	15%
Greene	Mosheim	50	2,479	0.04%	\$561,798.00	\$89,596.36	\$163,578.46	\$814,972.82	15%
Hawkins	Mount Carmel	50	5,473	0.08%	\$561,798.00	\$197,805.91	\$361,139.54	\$1,120,743.45	15%
Wilson	Mount Juliet	90	39,289	0.57%	\$561,798.00	\$1,419,988.39	\$518,502.15	\$2,500,288.54	35%
Maury	Mount Pleasant	50	4,784	0.07%	\$561,798.00	\$172,903.98	\$315,675.42	\$1,050,377.40	15%
Johnson	Mountain City	10	2,415	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$87,283.26	\$286,839.68	\$935,920.94	15%
Tipton	Munford	60	6,302	0.09%	\$561,798.00	\$227,767.74	\$332,673.32	\$1,122,239.07	25%

County	City	ATPI	Representative Population		Base Allocation	Population Allocation	ATPI-Population Allocation	Total Allocation	Co-Funding Level
Rutherford	Murfreesboro	80	152,769	2.21%	\$561,798.00	\$5,521,398.02	\$4,032,225.55	\$10,115,421.57	35%
Humphreys	New Johnsonville	70	1,804	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$65,200.41	\$71,422.88	\$698,421.30	25%
Dyer	Newbern	40	3,349	0.05%	\$561,798.00	\$121,040.01	\$265,183.19	\$948,021.20	15%
Cocke	Newport	0	6,868	0.10%	\$561,798.00	\$248,224.19	\$906,379.08	\$1,716,401.27	15%
McMinn	Niota	40	772	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$27,901.73	\$61,129.12	\$650,828.85	15%
Williamson	Nolensville	100	13,829	0.20%	\$561,798.00	\$499,809.60	\$0.00	\$1,061,607.60	35%
Anderson	Norris	70	1,599	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$57,791.28	\$63,306.65	\$682,895.92	25%
Davidson	Oak Hill	100	4,891	0.07%	\$561,798.00	\$176,771.19	\$0.00	\$738,569.19	35%
Anderson	Oak Ridge	80	31,402	0.45%	\$561,798.00	\$1,134,935.36	\$828,832.73	\$2,525,566.09	35%
Morgan	Oakdale	20	191	0.00%	\$561,798.00	\$6,903.15	\$20,165.22	\$588,866.37	15%
Fayette	Oakland	90	8,936	0.13%	\$561,798.00	\$322,966.13	\$117,929.58	\$1,002,693.71	35%
Obion	Obion	20	991	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$35,816.86	\$104,626.87	\$702,241.73	15%
Anderson	Oliver Springs	50	3,297	0.05%	\$561,798.00	\$119,160.62	\$217,554.73	\$898,513.36	15%
Scott	Oneida	0	3,787	0.05%	\$561,798.00	\$136,870.27	\$499,775.42	\$1,198,443.69	15%
Henry	Paris	30	10,316	0.15%	\$561,798.00	\$372,842.28	\$952,991.35	\$1,887,631.63	15%
Cocke	Parrottsville	50	217	0.00%	\$561,798.00	\$7,842.84	\$14,318.89	\$583,959.73	15%
Decatur	Parsons	10	2,100	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$75,898.49	\$249,425.81	\$887,122.30	15%
Cheatham	Pegram	80	2,072	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$74,886.51	\$54,688.92	\$691,373.42	35%
Lincoln	Petersburg	30	528	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$19,083.05	\$48,776.60	\$629,657.65	15%
Sevier	Pigeon Forge	70	6,343	0.09%	\$561,798.00	\$229,249.57	\$251,128.24	\$1,042,175.81	25%
Bledsoe	Pikeville	0	1,824	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$65,923.26	\$240,715.70	\$868,436.96	15%
Fayette	Piperton	90	2,263	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$81,789.65	\$29,865.11	\$673,452.77	35%
Sevier	Pittman Center	80	2,263	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$16,408.53	\$59,730.22	\$637,936.75	35%
Sumner	Portland	70	13,156	0.19%	\$561,798.00	\$475,485.95	\$520,864.44	\$1,558,148.38	25%
Giles	Pulaski	20	8,397	0.12%	\$561,798.00	\$303,485.52	\$886,530.59	\$1,751,814.11	15%
Henry	Puryear	40	706	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$25,516.35	\$55,903.05	\$643,217.40	15%
McNairy	Ramer	30	325	0.00%	\$561,798.00	\$11,746.19	\$30,023.48	\$603,567.67	15%

County	City	ATPI	Representative Population		Base Allocation	Population Allocation	ATPI-Population Allocation	Total Allocation	Co-Funding Level
Hamilton	Red Bank	60	11,899	0.17%	\$561,798.00	\$430,055.28	\$628,130.73	\$1,619,984.01	25%
Macon	Red Boiling Springs	10	1,205	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$43,551.27	\$143,122.90	\$748,472.18	15%
Lake	Ridgely	0	1,690	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$61,080.21	\$223,031.54	\$845,909.75	15%
Hamilton	Ridgeside	90	446	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$16,119.39	\$5,885.92	\$583,803.31	35%
Robertson	Ridgetop	80	2,155	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$77,886.30	\$56,879.64	\$696,563.95	35%
Lauderdale	Ripley	10	7,800	0.11%	\$561,798.00	\$281,908.66	\$926,438.72	\$1,770,145.38	15%
Obion	Rives	40	246	0.00%	\$561,798.00	\$8,890.97	\$19,478.97	\$590,167.93	15%
Roane	Rockwood	30	5,444	0.08%	\$561,798.00	\$196,757.79	\$502,916.34	\$1,261,472.13	15%
Anderson	Rocky Top	20	1,628	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$58,839.40	\$171,879.46	\$792,516.86	15%
Hawkins	Rogersville	30	4,671	0.07%	\$561,798.00	\$168,819.92	\$431,506.65	\$1,162,124.57	15%
Fayette	Rossville	80	1,041	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$37,623.96	\$27,476.43	\$626,898.39	35%
Gibson	Rutherford	50	1,163	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$42,033.30	\$76,741.33	\$680,572.63	15%
Grainger	Rutledge	20	1,321	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$47,743.76	\$139,467.30	\$749,009.06	15%
Henderson	Sardis	50	414	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$14,962.84	\$27,318.06	\$604,078.91	15%
Hardin	Savannah	10	7,213	0.10%	\$561,798.00	\$260,693.23	\$856,718.27	\$1,679,209.50	15%
Henderson	Scotts Hill	40	877	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$31,696.65	\$69,443.31	\$662,937.97	15%
McNairy	Selmer	20	4,446	0.06%	\$561,798.00	\$160,687.94	\$469,395.62	\$1,191,881.56	15%
Sevier	Sevierville	50	17,889	0.26%	\$561,798.00	\$646,546.68	\$1,180,417.54	\$2,388,762.22	15%
Weakley	Sharon	40	935	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$33,792.90	\$74,035.91	\$669,626.81	15%
Bedford	Shelbyville	50	23,557	0.34%	\$561,798.00	\$851,400.31	\$1,554,424.28	\$2,967,622.59	15%
Hamilton	Signal Mountain	90	8,852	0.13%	\$561,798.00	\$319,930.19	\$116,821.02	\$998,549.21	35%
DeKalb	Smithville	10	5,004	0.07%	\$561,798.00	\$180,855.25	\$594,346.07	\$1,336,999.32	15%
Rutherford	Smyrna	80	53,070	0.77%	\$561,798.00	\$1,918,063.17	\$1,400,743.67	\$3,880,604.85	35%
Hancock	Sneedville	0	1,282	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$46,334.22	\$169,187.24	\$777,319.46	15%
Hamilton	Soddy-Daisy	60	13,070	0.19%	\$561,798.00	\$472,377.72	\$689,946.10	\$1,724,121.82	25%
Fayette	Somerville	10	3,415	0.05%	\$561,798.00	\$123,425.40	\$405,613.88	\$1,090,837.27	15%
Smith	South Carthage	50	1,490	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$53,851.78	\$98,318.64	\$713,968.42	15%

County	City	ATPI	Representative Population		Base Allocation	Population Allocation	ATPI-Population Allocation	Total Allocation	Co-Funding Level
Obion	South Fulton	20	2,245	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$81,139.10	\$237,020.50	\$879,957.60	15%
Marion	South Pittsburg	30	3,106	0.04%	\$561,798.00	\$112,257.48	\$286,932.06	\$960,987.54	15%
White	Sparta	50	4,998	0.07%	\$561,798.00	\$180,638.40	\$329,796.35	\$1,072,232.75	15%
Van Buren	Spencer	20	1,462	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$52,839.80	\$154,353.66	\$768,991.47	15%
Rhea	Spring City	20	1,949	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$70,441.02	\$205,769.69	\$838,008.72	15%
Maury	Spring Hill	100	50,005	0.72%	\$561,798.00	\$1,807,287.53	\$0.00	\$2,369,085.53	35%
Robertson	Springfield	50	18,782	0.27%	\$561,798.00	\$678,821.60	\$1,239,342.74	\$2,479,962.34	15%
Lawrence	St. Joseph	50	790	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$28,552.29	\$52,128.67	\$642,478.96	15%
Haywood	Stanton	0	417	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$15,071.27	\$55,032.04	\$631,901.31	15%
Morgan	Sunbright	20	519	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$18,757.77	\$54,794.50	\$635,350.26	15%
Hawkins	Surgoinsville	40	1,882	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$68,019.50	\$149,022.02	\$778,839.52	15%
Monroe	Sweetwater	50	6,312	0.09%	\$561,798.00	\$228,129.16	\$416,501.51	\$1,206,428.67	15%
Monroe	Tellico Plains	20	762	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$27,540.31	\$80,449.72	\$669,788.03	15%
Houston	Tennessee Ridge	50	1,332	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$48,141.33	\$87,892.90	\$697,832.23	15%
Williamson	Thompson's Station	100	7,485	0.11%	\$561,798.00	\$270,523.89	\$0.00	\$832,321.89	35%
Lake	Tiptonville	0	3,976	0.06%	\$561,798.00	\$143,701.13	\$524,718.00	\$1,230,217.13	15%
Hardeman	Toone	0	270	0.00%	\$561,798.00	\$9,758.38	\$35,632.26	\$607,188.64	15%
Grundy	Tracy City	40	1,406	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$50,815.84	\$111,331.01	\$723,944.86	15%
Gibson	Trenton	40	4,240	0.06%	\$561,798.00	\$153,242.66	\$335,735.06	\$1,050,775.72	15%
Carroll	Trezevant	30	799	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$28,877.57	\$73,811.56	\$664,487.13	15%
Dyer	Trimble	40	547	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$19,769.75	\$43,312.99	\$624,880.74	15%
Obion	Troy	40	1,423	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$51,430.26	\$112,677.12	\$725,905.38	15%
Coffee	Tullahoma	60	20,339	0.29%	\$561,798.00	\$735,094.91	\$1,073,665.93	\$2,370,558.84	25%
Greene	Tusculum	60	3,298	0.05%	\$561,798.00	\$119,196.77	\$174,096.58	\$855,091.34	25%
Obion	Union City	20	11,170	0.16%	\$561,798.00	\$403,707.66	\$1,179,295.78	\$2,144,801.45	15%
Dickson	Vanleer	50	374	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$13,517.16	\$24,678.64	\$599,993.80	15%

County	City	ATPI	Representative Population		Base Allocation	Population Allocation	ATPI-Population Allocation	Total Allocation	Co-Funding Level
Monroe	Vonore	60	1,574	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$56,887.72	\$83,089.15	\$701,774.87	25%
Hamilton	Walden	80	1,981	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$71,597.57	\$52,287.04	\$685,682.61	35%
Morgan	Wartburg	20	848	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$30,648.53	\$89,529.35	\$681,975.88	15%
Bedford	Wartrace	40	653	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$23,600.82	\$51,706.37	\$637,105.18	15%
Wilson	Watertown	60	1,553	0.02%	\$561,798.00	\$56,128.74	\$81,980.59	\$699,907.33	25%
Humphreys	Waverly	60	4,297	0.06%	\$561,798.00	\$155,302.76	\$226,832.32	\$943,933.08	25%
Wayne	Waynesboro	30	2,317	0.03%	\$561,798.00	\$83,741.33	\$214,044.30	\$859,583.63	15%
Sumner	Westmoreland	40	2,718	0.04%	\$561,798.00	\$98,234.33	\$215,218.84	\$875,251.17	15%
Robertson	White House	80	12,982	0.19%	\$561,798.00	\$469,197.21	\$342,650.36	\$1,373,645.57	35%
Jefferson	White Pine	40	2,471	0.04%	\$561,798.00	\$89,307.22	\$195,660.69	\$846,765.91	15%
Hardeman	Whiteville	20	2,606	0.04%	\$561,798.00	\$94,186.41	\$275,133.82	\$931,118.23	15%
Franklin	Winchester	60	9,375	0.14%	\$561,798.00	\$338,832.53	\$494,892.48	\$1,395,523.01	25%
Cannon	Woodbury	40	2,703	0.04%	\$561,798.00	\$97,692.19	\$214,031.10	\$873,521.29	15%
Obion	Woodland Mills	60	346	0.01%	\$561,798.00	\$12,505.18	\$18,264.83	\$592,568.01	25%