Building Tennessee's Tomorrow:

Anticipating the State's Infrastructure Needs

July 2002 through June 2007

Appendix D: Reported Infrastructure Needs by County

Table D-1a	Total Public Infrastructure Needs by County	59
Table D-1b	Total Public Infrastructure Needs by County and by Stage of Development	61
Table D-2a	Transportation Projects by County	64
Table D-2b	Transportation Projects by County and by Stage of Development	66
Table D-3a	Other Utility Projects by County	69
Table D-3b	Other Utility Projects by County and by Stage of Development	70
Table D-4a	Navigation Projects by County	71
Table D-4b	Navigation Projects by County and by Stage of Development	71
Table D-5a	Telecommunications Projects by County	72
Table D-5b	Telecommunications Projects by County and by Stage of Development	73
Table D-6	Improvement Projects at Existing Schools by County	74
Table D-7a	New Public School Construction Projects by County	76
Table D-7b	New Public School Construction Projects by County and by Stage of Development	78
Table D-8a	Non-K-12 Education Projects by County	80
Table D-8b	Non-K-12 Education Projects by County and by Stage of Development	81
Table D-9a	School System-wide Needs Projects by County	83

Table D-9b	Public School System-wide Needs Projects by County and by Stage of Development	
Table D-10a	Water and Wastewater Projects by County	85
Table D-10b	Water and Wastewater Projects by County and by Stage of Development	87
Table D-11a	Law Enforcement Projects by County	90
Table D-11b	Law Enforcement Projects by County and by Stage of Development	92
Table D-12a	Storm Water Projects by County	
Table D12b	Storm Water Projects by County and by Stage of Development	95
Table D-13a	Solid Waste Projects by County	
Table D-13b	Solid Waste Projects by County and by Stage of Development	
Table D-14a	Fire Protection Projects by County	100
Table D-14b	Fire Protection Projects by County and by Stage of Development	102
Table D-15a	Public Health Facility Projects by County	104
Table D-15b	Public Health Facility Projects by County and by Stage of Development	105
Table D-16a	Housing Projects by County	107
Table D-16b	Housing Projects by County and by Stage of Development	108
Table D-17a	Recreation Projects by County	109
Table D-17b	Recreation Projects by County and by Stage of Development	111
Table D-18a	Libraries and Museums Projects by County	114
Table D-18b	Libraries and Museums Projects by County and by Stage of Development	115
Table D-19a	Community Development Projects by County	117

Table D-19b	Community Development Projects by County and by Stage of Development	119
Table D-20a	Business District Development Projects by County	121
Table D-20b	Business District Development Projects by County and by Stage of Development	122
Table D-21a	Industrial Sites and Parks Projects by County	124
Table D-21b	Industrial Sites and Parks Projects by County and by Stage of Development	126
Table D-22a	Public Building Projects by County	129
Table D-22b	Public Building Projects by County and by Stage of Development	131
Table D-23a	Other Facilities Projects by County	133
Table D-23b	Other Facilities Projects by County and by Stage of Development	134
Table D-24a	Property Acquisition Projects by County	135
Table D-24b	Property Acquisition Projects by County and by Stage of Development	135

Number and Estimated Cost Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007 Number of										
			_	A (A	0004					
	Schools or	Total Estimated	Percent of	Cost Per	2001					
County	Projects	Cost	Total	Capita	Population					
Anderson	96	\$ 106,705,063	0.5%	\$ 1,493						
Bedford	67	192,325,000	0.9%	\$ 5,018						
Benton	14	6,105,164	0.0%	\$ 367						
Bledsoe	28	94,770,000	0.4%	\$ 7,572						
Blount	121	281,446,418	1.3%	\$ 2,599						
Bradley	120	186,783,050	0.9%	\$ 2,102						
Campbell	57	107,252,549	0.5%	\$ 2,678						
Cannon	32	40,594,181	0.2%	\$ 3,136						
Carroll	54	26,068,388	0.1%	\$ 883						
Carter	83	150,899,748	0.7%	\$ 2,651						
Cheatham	69	128,076,500	0.6%	\$ 3,504						
Chester	29	42,169,000	0.2%	\$ 2,684						
Claiborne	38	122,140,008	0.6%	\$ 4,052	30,146					
Clay	10	45,430,000	0.2%	\$ 5,738	7,918					
Cocke	52	62,879,000	0.3%	\$ 1,856	33,884					
Coffee	68	192,428,997	0.9%	\$ 3,954	48,667					
Crockett	15	14,084,000	0.1%	\$ 968	14,547					
Cumberland	63	297,654,000	1.4%	\$ 6,194	48,058					
Davidson	555	3,216,940,250	14.9%	\$ 5,690	565,352					
Decatur	29	38,175,567	0.2%	\$ 3,264	11,697					
DeKalb	30	121,597,782	0.6%	\$ 6,928	17,552					
Dickson	48	370,603,150	1.7%	\$ 8,453	43,843					
Dyer	39	45,294,981	0.2%	\$ 1,220	37,121					
Fayette	45	50,469,200	0.2%	\$ 1,653	30,536					
Fentress	26	55,680,000	0.3%	\$ 3,313	16,805					
Franklin	51	106,217,655	0.5%	\$ 2,671	39,770					
Gibson	63	102,025,756	0.5%	\$ 2,124	48,031					
Giles	43	65,164,928	0.3%	\$ 2,196	29,675					
Grainger	29	48,099,600	0.2%	\$ 2,298	20,934					
Greene	82	126,614,252	0.6%	\$ 1,997	63,388					
Grundy	32	29,680,400	0.1%	\$ 2,077	14,288					
Hamblen	60	125,277,852	0.6%	\$ 2,147	58,337					
Hamilton	268	1,032,708,355	4.8%	\$ 3,360	307,377					
Hancock	20	12,505,888	0.1%							
Hardeman	70	85,938,000	0.4%	\$ 3,030						
Hardin	45	114,945,851	0.5%	\$ 4,457						
Hawkins	88	124,771,278	0.6%	\$ 2,295						
Haywood	34	55,846,000	0.3%	\$ 2,826						
Henderson	59	122,295,519	0.6%	\$ 4,753						
Henry	27	40,259,318								
Hickman	26	187,444,000	0.9%	\$ 8,243						
Houston	26	58,487,000	0.3%	\$ 7,388						
Humphreys	44	125,208,112	0.6%							
Jackson	31	109,861,400	0.5%	\$ 9,842						
Jefferson	48	58,319,441	0.3%	\$ 1,294						
Johnson	41	38,266,532	0.2%	\$ 2,170						
Knox	293	1,089,111,912	5.1%							
Lake	11	3,236,000	0.0%							

Table D-1a. Total Public Infrastructure Needs by County Number and Estimated Cost -- Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007

Table D-1a. (continued)										
	Number of Schools or	Total Estimated	Percent of	Cost Per	2001					
County	Projects	Cost	Total	Capita	Population					
Lauderdale	14	20,662,000	0.1%	\$ 765	27,021					
Lawrence	55	93,045,667	0.4%	\$ 2,326	40,003					
Lewis	15	13,468,000	0.1%	\$ 1,178	11,437					
Lincoln	44	61,835,000	0.3%	\$ 1,956	31,616					
Loudon	63	118,004,008	0.5%	\$ 2,933	40,240					
McMinn	77	217,710,100	1.0%	\$ 4,367	49,857					
McNairy	90	140,798,062	0.7%	\$ 5,713	24,644					
Macon	30	66,941,500	0.3%	\$ 3,207	20,873					
Madison	153	418,236,160	1.9%	\$ 4,527	92,389					
Marion	52	78,674,115	0.4%	\$ 2,835	27,750					
Marshall	69	83,757,000	0.4%	\$ 3,090	27,106					
Maury	74	139,279,311	0.6%	\$ 1,979	70,376					
Meigs	22	72,022,375	0.3%	\$ 6,434	11,194					
Monroe	50	41,644,543	0.2%	\$ 1,045	39,846					
Montgomery	169	465,191,802	2.2%	\$ 3,445	135,023					
Moore	7	23,271,000	0.1%	\$ 3,953	5,887					
Morgan	32	36,422,000	0.2%	\$ 1,821	20,003					
Obion	45	34,439,000	0.2%	\$ 1,065	32,346					
Overton	24	41,431,626	0.2%	\$ 2,052	20,186					
Perry	15	18,882,000	0.1%	\$ 2,516	7,504					
Pickett	15	15,198,000	0.1%	\$ 3,011	5,048					
Polk	34	307,240,250	1.4%	\$ 18,935	16,226					
Putnam	83	257,377,612	1.2%	\$ 4,073	63,188					
Rhea	33	42,384,900	0.2%	\$ 1,482	28,608					
Roane	94	124,043,973	0.6%	\$ 2,384	52,033					
Robertson	71	226,833,900	1.1%	\$ 4,045	56,083					
Rutherford	195	842,515,686	3.9%	\$ 4,431	190,143					
Scott	40	60,065,000	0.3%	\$ 2,787	21,548					
Sequatchie	18	62,133,750	0.3%	\$ 5,349	11,616					
Sevier	127	432,527,049	2.0%	\$ 5,869	73,703					
Shelby	771	3,870,086,114	18.0%	\$ 4,319	896,013					
Smith	53	88,157,500	0.4%	\$ 4,901	17,988					
Stewart	27	77,599,000	0.4%	\$ 6,134	12,650					
Sullivan	232	406,155,497	1.9%	\$ 2,658	152,787					
Sumner	171	554,650,513	2.6%	\$ 4,129	134,336					
Tipton	47	41,542,112	0.2%	\$ 784	52,956					
Trousdale	20	36,495,000	0.2%	\$ 4,969	7,345					
Unicoi	63	61,662,025	0.3%	\$ 3,481	17,713					
Union	22	49,660,615	0.2%	\$ 2,697	18,414					
Van Buren	16	33,056,000	0.2%		5,477					
Warren	55	204,719,900	0.9%		38,565					
Washington	131	332,302,385	1.5%		108,380					
Wayne	36	22,847,696	0.1%		16,845					
Weakley	51	36,950,952	0.2%	\$ 1,067	34,644					
White	25	37,264,000	0.2%		23,364					
Williamson	245	736,222,999	3.4%		133,825					
Wilson	81	494,616,325	2.3%		91,696					
Areawide/Statewide	16	60,930,234	0.3%		5,740,021					
Statewide	7,151	\$ 21,559,811,301	100.0%		5,740,021					

Table D-1b.	Total Public Infrastructure	Needs by Count	v and by Stage (of Development
			,	

	Conceptual					-	ng and Desig	n		Со	nstruction	
County	Nur	mber	Cost [in n	nillions]	Nur	nber		millions]	Nu	mber		millions]
Anderson	33	40.7%	\$ 25.1	31.7%	25	30.9%	\$ 18.3	23.2%	23	28.4%	\$ 35.7	45.1%
Bedford	35	53.8%	95.0	53.6%	25	38.5%	75.9	42.8%	5	7.7%	6.3	3.6%
Benton	2	28.6%	1.2	21.5%	3	42.9%	1.8	33.1%	2	28.6%	2.4	45.4%
Bledsoe	18	72.0%	45.7	50.0%	5	20.0%	25.7	28.2%	2	8.0%	20.0	21.9%
Blount	47	45.6%	182.0	65.3%	32	31.1%	55.3	19.8%	24	23.3%	41.3	14.8%
Bradley	32	32.7%	33.7	21.7%	61	62.2%	98.0	63.2%	5	5.1%	23.4	15.1%
Campbell	22	41.5%	60.8	56.9%	23	43.4%	38.5	36.0%	8	15.1%	7.6	7.1%
Cannon	7	28.0%	3.7	12.3%	7	28.0%	0.8	2.7%	11	44.0%	25.2	85.0%
Carroll	22	55.0%	8.9	36.3%	12	30.0%	6.9	28.2%	6	15.0%	8.7	35.5%
Carter	31	42.5%	95.5	63.8%	30	41.1%	44.6	29.8%	12	16.4%	9.6	6.4%
Cheatham	27	48.2%	74.2	58.2%	16	28.6%	32.0	25.1%	13	23.2%	21.3	16.7%
Chester	10	38.5%	13.2	31.4%	15	57.7%	23.3	55.5%	1	3.8%	5.5	13.1%
Claiborne	11	28.9%	22.1	18.1%	15	39.5%	40.0	32.7%	12	31.6%	60.1	49.2%
Clay	3	37.5%	1.4	3.3%	3	37.5%	32.5	79.4%	2	25.0%	7.1	17.2%
Cocke	33	75.0%	43.3	80.8%	7	15.9%	4.6	8.6%	4	9.1%	5.7	10.6%
Coffee	26	53.1%	72.6	43.9%	12	24.5%	22.8	13.8%	11	22.4%	69.8	42.2%
Crockett	8	66.7%	6.2	45.2%	2	16.7%	0.6	4.0%	2	16.7%	7.0	50.8%
Cumberland	32	56.1%	76.2	25.8%	10	17.5%	129.9	44.0%	15	26.3%	89.1	30.2%
Davidson	102	23.6%	577.8	19.4%	159	36.8%	804.2	27.0%	171	39.6%	1,601.6	53.7%
Decatur	14	50.0%	9.3	24.3%	12	42.9%	28.3	74.2%	2	7.1%	0.6	1.5%
DeKalb	13	50.0%	16.9	14.1%	1	3.8%	25.0	20.8%	12	46.2%	78.3	65.1%
Dickson	28	62.2%	318.9	86.2%	11	24.4%	12.1	3.3%	6	13.3%	39.1	10.6%
Dyer	18	64.3%	24.2	53.9%	8	28.6%	20.3	45.2%	2	7.1%	0.4	1.0%
Fayette	30	81.1%	31.2	62.2%	7	18.9%	19.0	37.8%	0	0.0%	-	0.0%
Fentress	17	77.3%	31.2	21.1%	0	0.0%	-	0.0%	5	22.7%	116.5	78.9%
Franklin	21	42.0%	60.1	57.5%	18	36.0%	12.7	12.2%	11	22.0%	31.8	30.3%
Gibson	30	61.2%	24.7	24.8%	14	28.6%	70.8	71.1%	5	10.2%	4.1	4.1%
Giles	17	39.5%	34.7	53.3%	17	39.5%	22.7	34.9%	9	20.9%	7.7	11.9%
Grainger	12	52.2%	35.2	74.9%	6	26.1%	8.0	17.0%	5	21.7%	3.8	8.1%
Greene	29	48.3%	36.0	43.0%	17	28.3%	8.2	9.8%	14	23.3%	39.4	47.1%
Grundy	15	60.0%	17.3	77.9%	9	36.0%	4.8	21.8%	1	4.0%	0.1	0.3%
Hamblen	17	42.5%	53.5	43.2%	15	37.5%	32.2	26.0%	8	20.0%	38.0	30.8%
Hamilton	58	29.3%	226.8	22.8%	128	64.6%	666.7	67.1%	12	6.1%	100.2	10.1%
Hancock	9	45.0%	6.7	53.7%	9	45.0%	4.8	38.6%	2	10.0%	1.0	7.7%
Hardeman	28	45.9%	45.8	53.7%	31	50.8%	39.0	45.7%	2	3.3%	0.5	0.6%
Hardin	20	54.1%	7.0	6.2%	13	35.1%	102.7	91.1%	4	10.8%	3.0	2.7%

Number and Estimated Cost -- Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007

	Conceptual					Planni	ng and Desigr	<u> </u>		Cor	nstruction	
County	Nur	nber	Cost [in n	hillionsl	Nu	nber	Cost [in r		Nur	nber	Cost [in n	nillions1
Hawkins	42	57.5%	76.9	67.8%	23	31.5%	22.8	20.1%	8	11.0%	13.7	12.0%
Haywood	12	40.0%	18.5	35.8%	12	40.0%	24.5	47.5%	6	20.0%	8.7	16.7%
Henderson	21	40.4%	19.5	16.2%	24	46.2%	73.5	61.2%	7	13.5%	27.2	22.6%
Henry	13	61.9%	32.0	87.3%	6	28.6%	3.9	10.6%	2	9.5%	0.8	2.1%
Hickman	18	69.2%	176.3	94.0%	7	26.9%	9.7	5.2%	1	3.8%	1.5	0.8%
Houston	18	75.0%	56.5	97.1%	6	25.0%	1.7	2.9%	0	0.0%	-	0.0%
Humphreys	22	57.9%	87.4	70.1%	14	36.8%	37.0	29.7%	2	5.3%	0.3	0.2%
Jackson	21	87.5%	12.6	87.2%	2	8.3%	1.4	9.3%	1	4.2%	0.5	3.5%
Jefferson	23	51.1%	33.9	58.7%	15	33.3%	15.7	27.1%	7	15.6%	8.2	14.2%
Johnson	24	64.9%	20.0	55.0%	13	35.1%	16.3	45.0%	0	0.0%	-	0.0%
Knox	97	46.9%	454.0	48.7%	57	27.5%	211.5	22.7%	53	25.6%	265.9	28.5%
Lake	6	75.0%	1.7	55.4%	1	12.5%	0.1	4.4%	1	12.5%	1.2	40.3%
Lauderdale	11	78.6%	16.9	81.6%	3	21.4%	3.8	18.4%	0	0.0%	-	0.0%
Lawrence	22	42.3%	51.8	57.2%	22	42.3%	32.0	35.3%	8	15.4%	6.8	7.5%
Lewis	13	86.7%	13.0	96.3%	0	0.0%	-	0.0%	2	13.3%	0.5	3.7%
Lincoln	20	46.5%	12.9	20.9%	16	37.2%	21.5	34.8%	7	16.3%	27.4	44.3%
Loudon	21	38.9%	23.2	20.5%	21	38.9%	49.2	43.5%	12	22.2%	40.8	36.1%
McMinn	39	60.0%	137.8	68.0%	19	29.2%	53.9	26.6%	7	10.8%	10.9	5.4%
McNairy	46	56.1%	28.3	20.2%	25	30.5%	12.7	9.1%	11	13.4%	99.2	70.7%
Macon	10	45.5%	20.1	30.9%	4	18.2%	28.2	43.3%	8	36.4%	16.9	25.9%
Madison	85	65.9%	290.5	70.5%	34	26.4%	97.8	23.7%	10	7.8%	23.9	5.8%
Marion	24	53.3%	28.5	42.8%	18	40.0%	22.1	33.3%	3	6.7%	15.9	23.9%
Marshall	24	38.7%	40.8	49.3%	28	45.2%	21.7	26.3%	10	16.1%	20.1	24.4%
Maury	33	45.2%	81.3	58.4%	26	35.6%	30.7	22.1%	14	19.2%	27.1	19.5%
Meigs	8	44.4%	12.4	17.5%	7	38.9%	17.7	24.8%	3	16.7%	41.0	57.7%
Monroe	14	38.9%	10.1	25.3%	16	44.4%	13.7	34.4%	6	16.7%	16.1	40.4%
Montgomery	51	31.3%	194.2	43.9%	57	35.0%	136.4	30.8%	55	33.7%	111.8	25.3%
Moore	6	85.7%	22.9	98.4%	1	14.3%	0.4	1.6%	0	0.0%	-	0.0%
Morgan	18	72.0%	19.9	65.3%	2	8.0%	2.2	7.4%	5	20.0%	8.3	27.3%
Obion	28	80.0%	27.5	84.5%	6	17.1%	3.3	10.2%	1	2.9%	1.7	5.3%
Overton	13	68.4%	9.7	26.1%	3	15.8%	4.0	10.7%	3	15.8%	23.5	63.1%
Perry	6	40.0%	6.2	32.6%	5	33.3%	6.8	35.9%	4	26.7%	6.0	31.5%
Pickett	8	61.5%	2.8	19.9%	3	23.1%	5.8	41.1%	2	15.4%	5.5	39.0%
Polk	18	64.3%	289.0	95.3%	8	28.6%	5.1	1.7%	2	7.1%	9.2	3.0%
Putnam	53	73.6%	148.2	59.4%	5	6.9%	18.6	7.4%	14	19.4%	82.6	33.1%
Rhea	18	64.3%	30.5	80.2%	8	28.6%	5.8	15.2%	2	7.1%	1.8	4.6%

	Conceptual					Planni	ng and Desig	gn		Co	nstruction	
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in ı	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]
Roane	48	56.5%	65.6	48.7%	21	24.7%	33.5	24.9%	16	18.8%	35.6	26.4%
Robertson	33	46.5%	169.2	74.6%	22	31.0%	34.0	15.0%	16	22.5%	23.6	10.4%
Rutherford	74	46.0%	474.7	58.0%	47	29.2%	184.6	22.6%	40	24.8%	158.8	19.4%
Scott	11	35.5%	13.1	31.9%	14	45.2%	14.3	34.7%	6	19.4%	13.7	33.3%
Sequatchie	7	43.8%	2.8	4.6%	8	50.0%	7.2	12.0%	1	6.3%	50.0	83.4%
Sevier	65	61.9%	279.5	68.0%	27	25.7%	82.5	20.1%	13	12.4%	49.1	11.9%
Shelby	107	19.4%	458.8	16.1%	284	51.5%	1,246.1	43.8%	160	29.0%	1,139.0	40.1%
Smith	22	48.9%	21.4	24.4%	10	22.2%	13.9	15.9%	13	28.9%	52.3	59.7%
Stewart	16	64.0%	59.7	77.0%	8	32.0%	17.7	22.9%	1	4.0%	0.1	0.1%
Sullivan	89	48.1%	132.3	38.6%	62	33.5%	124.0	36.2%	34	18.4%	86.6	25.3%
Sumner	76	55.1%	332.3	61.0%	40	29.0%	148.9	27.4%	22	15.9%	63.1	11.6%
Tipton	30	88.2%	31.8	78.9%	2	5.9%	8.3	20.6%	2	5.9%	0.2	0.5%
Trousdale	10	55.6%	16.9	46.4%	6	33.3%	8.0	22.0%	2	11.1%	11.5	31.6%
Unicoi	34	59.6%	31.7	52.7%	14	24.6%	26.6	44.3%	9	15.8%	1.9	3.1%
Union	10	62.5%	46.3	97.0%	4	25.0%	0.9	1.8%	2	12.5%	0.6	1.2%
Van Buren	10	66.7%	13.8	42.4%	4	26.7%	18.7	57.3%	1	6.7%	0.1	0.3%
Warren	21	46.7%	120.7	60.2%	16	35.6%	53.8	26.8%	8	17.8%	26.1	13.0%
Washington	62	56.9%	249.9	77.6%	33	30.3%	47.9	14.9%	14	12.8%	24.5	7.6%
Wayne	14	48.3%	12.6	59.3%	9	31.0%	7.3	34.5%	6	20.7%	1.3	6.2%
Weakley	40	88.9%	25.1	70.4%	1	2.2%	5.0	14.0%	4	8.9%	5.6	15.6%
White	13	61.9%	24.3	66.8%	1	4.8%	0.3	0.8%	7	33.3%	11.8	32.3%
Williamson	114	53.8%	416.9	57.6%	51	24.1%	140.8	19.5%	47	22.2%	165.7	22.9%
Wilson	38	53.5%	293.0	59.4%	12	16.9%	66.6	13.5%	21	29.6%	133.4	27.1%
Regional	16	100.0%	60.9	100.0%	0	0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Statewide	2,743	46.6%	\$ 8,278.7	42.2%	1,991	33.8%	\$ 5,835.4	29.8%	1,151	19.6%	\$ 5,491.0	28.0%

Table D-1b. (continued)

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP* —Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**											
County		Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cost Per						
-	Projects	Cost		Cost in CIP	Capita						
Anderson	15		0.2%		\$ 213						
Bedford	14	52,099,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 1,359						
Bledsoe	4	29,090,000	0.4%	85.9%	\$ 2,324						
Blount	42	49,721,860	0.6%	52.5%	\$ 459						
Bradley	39	80,632,750	1.0%	38.4%	\$ 908						
Campbell	13	28,979,577	0.4%	2.3%	\$ 724						
Cannon	9	4,137,800	0.1%	48.3%	\$ 320						
Carroll	17	6,474,056	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 219						
Carter	21	40,104,500	0.5%	73.4%	\$ 704						
Cheatham	21	83,385,000	1.0%	0.8%	\$ 2,281						
Chester	12	20,562,000	0.3%	77.3%	\$ 1,309						
Claiborne	11	42,829,633	0.5%		\$ 1,421						
Clay	4	37,050,000	0.5%	32.4%	\$ 4,679						
Cocke	21	21,359,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 630						
Coffee	9	52,122,000	0.6%	1.9%	\$ 1,071						
Crockett	6	3,484,000	0.0%		\$ 239						
Cumberland	21	124,534,000	1.5%	86.2%	\$ 2,591						
Davidson	142	732,054,254	9.0%	97.1%	\$ 1,295						
Decatur	4	15,975,567	0.2%	25.0%	\$ 1,366						
DeKalb	6	90,700,000	1.1%	82.7%	\$ 5,168						
Dickson	24	305,917,000	3.8%	0.0%	\$ 6,978						
Dyer	7	2,331,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 63						
Fayette	20	12,712,500	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 416						
Fentress	6	42,600,000	0.2 %	99.8%	\$ 2,535						
Franklin	4	3,222,000	0.0%		\$ <u>2,555</u> \$ 81						
Gibson	22			82.2%							
Giles		69,954,348	0.9%	02.2% 0.0%	\$ 1,456 \$ 495						
	10	14,691,000	0.2%		-						
Grainger	1	3,000,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 143 \$ 200						
Greene	14	25,126,702	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 396						
Grundy	5	2,865,000	0.0%	4.7%	\$ 201						
Hamblen	9	19,487,314	0.2%	83.1%	\$ 334						
Hamilton	91	325,252,545	4.0%	81.1%	\$ 1,058						
Hancock	8		0.0%								
Hardeman	28	66,403,000	0.8%	65.1%	\$ 2,341						
Hardin	9	88,519,726	1.1%	0.0%	\$ 3,432						
Hawkins	23	36,966,800	0.5%	6.2%	\$ 680						
Haywood	7	37,832,000	0.5%	18.5%	\$ 1,914						
Henderson	20	93,293,519	1.2%	40.7%	\$ 3,626						
Henry	8	4,456,000	0.1%	1.3%	\$ 143						
Hickman	4	122,853,000	1.5%	0.0%	\$ 5,403						
Houston	6	48,285,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 6,100						
Humphreys	14	83,738,112	1.0%	0.0%	\$ 4,623						
Jackson	12	91,418,000	1.1%	99.1%	\$ 8,190						
Jefferson	7	19,017,000	0.2%	52.6%	\$ 422						
Johnson	6	3,769,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 214						
Knox	52	141,754,103	1.8%	63.2%	\$ 368						
Lauderdale	5	1,694,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 63						
Lawrence	14	16,587,363	0.2%	0.0%							

Table D-2a. Transportation Projects by County Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP*

l able D-2a. (continued)											
County	Number of Projects	Total Estimated Cost		Percent Cost in CIP		ost Per Capita					
Lewis	3	2,400,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	210					
Lincoln	8	4,905,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	155					
Loudon	9	19,461,000	0.2%	10.8%	\$	484					
McMinn	18	160,525,000	2.0%	64.9%	\$	3,220					
McNairy	22	103,153,062	1.3%	47.6%	\$	4,186					
Macon	10	37,369,000	0.5%	97.7%	\$	1,790					
Madison	40	265,363,760	3.3%	84.4%	\$	2,872					
Marion	10	29,475,315	0.4%	0.0%	\$	1,062					
Marshall	5	7,394,000	0.1%		\$	273					
Maury	15	17,919,111	0.2%	78.7%	\$	255					
Meigs	6	60,066,375	0.7%	14.2%	\$	5,366					
Monroe	5	3,010,192	0.0%	3.5%	\$	76					
Montgomery	37	82,285,262	1.0%	92.6%	\$	609					
Morgan	6	2,347,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	117					
Obion	16	6,368,000	0.1%	7.9%	\$	197					
Overton	10	13,574,034	0.2%		\$	672					
Perry	3	10,292,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	1,372					
Pickett	6	5,433,000	0.1%	15.6%	\$	1,072					
Polk	3	280,500,000	3.5%	0.0%		17,287					
Putnam	25	153,937,679	1.9%	98.2%	φ \$	2,436					
Rhea	5	1,888,700	0.0%	0.0%	\$	<u>2,430</u> 66					
Roane	19	29,628,473	0.0%	0.0%	φ \$	569					
Robertson	13	110,185,000	1.4%	2.7%	φ \$	1,965					
Rutherford	55	193,208,353	2.4%	65.8%	\$	1,016					
Scott	5	5,065,283	0.1%	79.0%	\$	235					
Sequatchie	4	50,825,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$	4,375					
Sevier	33	233,930,505	2.9%	9.1%	\$	3,174					
Shelby	223	1,519,729,989	18.8%	87.7%	\$	1,696					
Smith	13	35,330,000	0.4%	87.7%	\$	1,964					
Stewart	5	61,950,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	4,897					
Sullivan	65	111,744,491	1.4%	81.9%	\$	731					
Sumner	48	303,019,428	3.7%	0.0%	\$	2,256					
Tipton	22	5,083,600	0.1%	0.0%	\$	<u>2,230</u> 96					
Trousdale	1	3,200,000	0.0%	0.0%		436					
Unicoi	11	21,295,460	0.0%	0.0%	\$	1,202					
Union	6	15,032,000	0.3%	1.7%	φ \$	816					
Van Buren	5	11,945,000	0.2%	89.6%	3 \$	2,181					
Warren	19	64,930,100	0.1%	85.5%	э \$	1,684					
Washington	23	70,278,060	0.8%	86.8%	э \$	1,004 648					
Wayne	6	8,822,736	0.9%	00.0% 0.0%	э \$	646 524					
Weakley	20	4,279,000	0.1%	0.0%	ֆ \$	<u> </u>					
White	20		0.1%	0.0% 95.2%	э \$	486					
		11,349,000		95.2% 45.7%							
Williamson	67	386,684,379	4.8%		\$	2,889					
Wilson	27	345,314,325	4.3%	17.8%	\$	3,766					
Regional Statewide Total	5	3,525,000	0.0%		\$	1 422					
Statewide Total	1,831	\$ 8,091,867,520	100.0%	54.1%	\$	1,422					

Table D-2a. (continued)

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

		Nur	nber and Es	timated Co	<u>ostFiv</u>	e-year Per	iod July 200	2 through	June 20			
		Cor	nceptual			Plannir	ng & Design			Con	struction	
County	Νι	umber	Cost [in r	nillions]	Νι	ımber	Cost [in ı	millions]	Νι	ımber	Cost [in ı	millions]
Anderson	9	60.0%	\$ 2.9	19.2%	1	6.7%	\$ 0.6	3.9%	5	33.3%	\$ 11.7	76.8%
Bedford	7	50.0%	46.0	88.2%	7	50.0%	6.1	11.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Bledsoe	2	50.0%	14.0	48.1%	2	50.0%	15.1	51.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Blount	25	59.5%	38.7	77.9%	14	33.3%	10.2	20.5%	3	7.1%	0.8	1.6%
Bradley	3	7.7%	5.0	6.2%	34	87.2%	72.3	89.7%	2	5.1%	3.3	4.1%
Campbell	4	30.8%	10.6	36.5%	7	53.8%	16.3	56.2%	2	15.4%	2.1	7.3%
Cannon	2	22.2%	1.3	31.1%	4	44.4%	0.5	10.9%	3	33.3%	2.4	58.0%
Carroll	16	94.1%	6.1	93.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.9%	0.4	6.2%
Carter	4	19.0%	1.3	3.1%	13	61.9%	37.9	94.5%	4	19.0%	1.0	2.4%
Cheatham	6	28.6%	47.1	56.4%	11	52.4%	27.5	33.0%	4	19.0%	8.8	10.6%
Chester	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	100.0%	20.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Claiborne	1	9.1%	0.3	0.6%	8	72.7%	28.5	66.5%	2	18.2%	14.1	32.9%
Clay	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	30.0	81.0%	2	50.0%	7.1	19.0%
Cocke	21	100.0%	21.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Coffee	4	44.4%	3.3	6.4%	4	44.4%	3.8	7.3%	1	11.1%	45.0	86.3%
Crockett	6	100.0%	3.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cumberland	7	33.3%	7.0	5.6%	7	33.3%	89.3	71.7%	7	33.3%	28.2	22.7%
Davidson	26	18.3%	192.3	26.3%	68	47.9%	248.2	33.9%	48	33.8%	291.6	39.8%
Decatur	1	25.0%	0.1	0.6%	3	75.0%	15.9	99.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
DeKalb	1	16.7%	6.5	7.1%	1	16.7%	25.0	27.6%	4	66.7%	59.3	65.3%
Dickson	17	70.8%	302.7	98.9%	6	25.0%	3.0	1.0%	1	4.2%	0.3	0.1%
Dyer	5	71.4%	2.2	94.0%	1	14.3%	0.1	2.1%	1	14.3%	0.1	3.9%
Fayette	19	95.0%	11.2	88.2%	1	5.0%	1.5	11.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fentress	4	66.7%	16.6	39.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	26.0	61.0%
Franklin	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	2.8	86.0%	2	50.0%	0.5	14.0%
Gibson	15	68.2%	10.6	15.1%	4	18.2%	58.1	83.1%	3	13.6%	1.3	1.8%
Giles	3	30.0%	1.3	8.8%	7	70.0%	13.4	91.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grainger	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.0	100.0%
Greene	2	14.3%	2.5	9.9%	10	71.4%	6.3	25.1%	2	14.3%	16.3	65.0%
Grundy	2	40.0%	1.5	51.8%	2	40.0%	1.3	45.7%	1	20.0%	0.1	2.4%
Hamblen	2	22.2%	2.4	12.4%	6	66.7%	16.2	83.0%	1	11.1%	0.9	4.6%
Hamilton	18	19.8%	74.3	22.8%	69	75.8%	216.2	66.5%	4	4.4%	34.8	10.7%
Hancock	3	37.5%	0.6	15.7%	5	62.5%	3.0	84.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardeman	14	50.0%	34.3	51.6%	13	46.4%	32.0	48.3%	1	3.6%	0.1	0.2%
Hardin	3	33.3%	1.2	1.3%	6	66.7%	87.3	98.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

 Table D-2b.
 Transportation Projects by County and by Stage of Development

 Development
 Development

		Сог	nceptual			Plannir	ng & Design			Con	struction	
County	Nu	ımber	Cost [in r	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]	Nu	ımber	Cost [in n	nillions]
Hawkins	10	43.5%	18.1	48.9%	10	43.5%	10.0	27.1%	3	13.0%	8.9	24.0%
Haywood	3	42.9%	15.7	41.4%	3	42.9%	19.0	50.2%	1	14.3%	3.2	8.5%
Henderson	6	30.0%	3.1	3.3%	9	45.0%	64.5	69.1%	5	25.0%	25.7	27.6%
Henry	7	87.5%	4.4	98.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	0.1	1.3%
Hickman	3	75.0%	121.1	98.5%	1	25.0%	1.8	1.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Houston	4	66.7%	48.0	99.4%	2	33.3%	0.3	0.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Humphreys	6	42.9%	53.7	64.1%	8	57.1%	30.1	35.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jackson	10	83.3%	0.9	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	16.7%	90.5	99.0%
Jefferson	5	71.4%	8.6	45.3%	2	28.6%	10.4	54.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Johnson	3	50.0%	2.6	69.0%	3	50.0%	1.2	31.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	28	53.8%	65.9	46.5%	10	19.2%	31.2	22.0%	14	26.9%	44.6	31.5%
Lauderdale	5	100.0%	1.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lawrence	6	42.9%	7.2	43.2%	5	35.7%	5.9	35.4%	3	21.4%	3.6	21.4%
Lewis	2	66.7%	2.3	93.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.2	6.3%
Lincoln	2	25.0%	1.7	33.6%	4	50.0%	2.1	41.9%	2	25.0%	1.2	24.5%
Loudon	3	33.3%	1.8	9.5%	3	33.3%	0.7	3.8%	3	33.3%	16.9	86.8%
McMinn	11	61.1%	116.2	72.4%	6	33.3%	43.9	27.4%	1	5.6%	0.4	0.3%
McNairy	11	50.0%	4.4	4.3%	4	18.2%	2.2	2.2%	7	31.8%	96.5	93.6%
Macon	6	60.0%	3.9	10.4%	1	10.0%	25.0	66.9%	3	30.0%	8.5	22.7%
Madison	16	40.0%	186.3	70.2%	17	42.5%	56.9	21.4%	7	17.5%	22.2	8.4%
Marion	3	30.0%	0.4	1.4%	6	60.0%	14.1	47.7%	1	10.0%	15.0	50.9%
Marshall	1	20.0%	0.2	2.9%	3	60.0%	4.0	53.8%	1	20.0%	3.2	43.3%
Maury	3	20.0%	5.3	29.8%	8	53.3%	11.5	64.5%	4	26.7%	1.0	5.7%
Meigs	1	16.7%	8.5	14.2%	4	66.7%	11.6	19.3%	1	16.7%	40.0	66.6%
Monroe	4	80.0%	0.5	16.9%	1	20.0%	2.5	83.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Montgomery	8	21.6%	19.1	23.2%	10	27.0%	34.3	41.6%	19	51.4%	28.9	35.1%
Morgan	6	100.0%	2.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Obion	14	87.5%	5.6	87.6%	2	12.5%	0.8	12.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Overton	7	70.0%	4.1	30.0%	2	20.0%	2.5	18.4%	1	10.0%	7.0	51.6%
Perry	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	5.9	57.4%	1	33.3%	4.4	42.6%
Pickett	4	66.7%	1.3	24.5%	1	16.7%	0.1	1.8%	1	16.7%	4.0	73.6%
Polk	1	33.3%	280.0	99.8%	2	66.7%	0.5	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam	17	68.0%	99.2	64.4%	3	12.0%	18.2	11.8%	5	20.0%	36.5	23.7%
Rhea	1	20.0%	0.4	18.6%	4	80.0%	1.5	81.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Roane	11	57.9%	23.7	80.0%	7	36.8%	5.3	17.8%	1	5.3%	0.7	2.2%
Robertson	9	75.0%	106.9	97.0%	2	16.7%	0.8	0.7%	1	8.3%	2.5	2.3%

Table D-2b. (continued)

ľ		0				Diami			Construction				
			nceptual				ng & Design						
County		ımber	Cost [in r			ımber	Cost [in ı			mber	Cost [in n	_	
Rutherford	15	27.3%	39.3	20.4%	25	45.5%	113.1	58.6%	15	27.3%	40.7	21.1%	
Scott	2	40.0%	0.8	16.4%	1	20.0%	0.1	1.4%	2	40.0%	4.2	82.1%	
Sequatchie	1	25.0%	0.3	0.6%	2	50.0%	0.5	1.0%	1	25.0%	50.0	98.4%	
Sevier	19	57.6%	186.0	79.5%	10	30.3%	19.5	8.3%	4	12.1%	28.5	12.2%	
Shelby	37	16.6%	181.3	11.9%	133	59.6%	865.9	57.0%	53	23.8%	472.5	31.1%	
Smith	10	76.9%	9.8	27.8%	1	7.7%	5.5	15.6%	2	15.4%	20.0	56.6%	
Stewart	2	40.0%	48.9	78.9%	2	40.0%	13.0	21.0%	1	20.0%	0.1	0.1%	
Sullivan	22	33.8%	15.3	13.6%	36	55.4%	85.0	76.0%	7	10.8%	11.5	10.3%	
Sumner	23	47.9%	184.7	61.0%	17	35.4%	107.3	35.4%	8	16.7%	11.0	3.6%	
Tipton	22	100.0%	5.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Trousdale	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Unicoi	5	45.5%	5.5	25.8%	5	45.5%	15.3	71.8%	1	9.1%	0.5	2.3%	
Union	3	50.0%	14.7	97.7%	3	50.0%	0.4	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Van Buren	3	60.0%	1.6	13.8%	2	40.0%	10.3	86.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Warren	12	63.2%	11.4	17.6%	4	21.1%	30.5	47.0%	3	15.8%	23.0	35.4%	
Washington	7	30.4%	55.9	79.5%	14	60.9%	13.7	19.5%	2	8.7%	0.7	1.1%	
Wayne	3	50.0%	8.5	96.2%	1	16.7%	0.2	2.2%	2	33.3%	0.1	1.6%	
Weakley	20	100.0%	4.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
White	5	62.5%	1.0	9.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	37.5%	10.3	90.8%	
Williamson	30	44.8%	244.9	63.3%	19	28.4%	71.9	18.6%	18	26.9%	69.8	18.1%	
Wilson	14	51.9%	221.2	64.1%	5	18.5%	39.0	11.3%	8	29.6%	85.1	24.6%	
Regional	5	100.0%	3.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Statewide	749	40.9%	\$3,337.4	41.2%	756	41.3%	\$2,901.9	35.9%	326	17.8%	\$1,852.6	22.9%	

Table D-2b. (continued)

County	Number of Projects	Total Estimated Cost	Percent of Total Cost	Percent Cost in CIP		st Per apita
Anderson	4	\$ 5,139,760	0.8%	96.1%	\$	арна 72
Bedford	4	3,000,000	0.8%	0.0%	φ \$	72
Benton	1	817,000	0.3%	0.0%	φ \$	49
Bledsoe	2	5,200,000	0.1%	0.0%	φ \$	415
Blount	8	16,300,000	2.6%	100.0%	\$	151
Chester	1	200,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	13
Cocke	8	8,557,000	1.4%	100.0%	Ψ \$	253
Davidson	1	430,305,000	69.5%	100.0%	∳ \$	761
Fayette	2	2,300,000	03.3%	47.8%	\$	75
Franklin	1	1,000,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	25
Greene	3	975,000	0.2%	89.7%	Ψ \$	15
Hawkins	3	1,535,000	0.2%	0.0%	Ψ \$	28
Henderson	1	1,000,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	39
Jackson	1	750,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	67
Lauderdale	1	3,500,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	130
Lawrence	3	2,374,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	59
Lincoln	1	3,500,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$	111
Loudon	4	5,100,000	0.8%	29.4%	\$	127
McNairy	2	1,200,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	49
Meigs	1	250,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	22
Montgomery	8	19,850,000	3.2%	100.0%	\$	147
Putnam	1	1,000,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	16
Roane	4	2,895,000	0.5%	96.5%	\$	56
Robertson	4	3,478,900	0.6%	100.0%	\$	62
Rutherford	3	2,001,692	0.3%	100.0%	\$	11
Sevier	2	39,298,000	6.3%	100.0%	\$	533
Shelby	1	700,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	1
Stewart	1	2,000,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	158
Sumner	2	585,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	4
Unicoi	3	1,300,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	73
Washington	3	51,388,000	8.3%	2.7%	\$	474
Wayne	2	550,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	33
Wilson	1	1,000,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	11
Statewide Total	85	\$ 619,049,352	100.0%	87.4%		109

Table D-3a. Other Utility Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP* —Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

			eptual				g & Desigr	1 1	Construction			
County	Nur	nber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber		millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Anderson	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	3	75.0%	\$ 3.4	66.9%	1	25.0%	\$ 1.7	33.1%
Bedford	1	50.0%	1.5	50.0%	1	50.0%	1.5	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Benton	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%
Bledsoe	1	50.0%	0.2	3.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	5.0	96.2%
Blount	3	37.5%	10.4	63.8%	1	12.5%	2.0	12.3%	4	50.0%	3.9	23.9%
Chester	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cocke	4	50.0%	4.2	49.2%	3	37.5%	3.1	36.8%	1	12.5%	1.2	14.0%
Davidson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	430.3	100.0%
Fayette	1	50.0%	1.2	52.2%	1	50.0%	1.1	47.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Franklin	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Greene	1	33.3%	0.1	10.3%	2	66.7%	0.9	89.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hawkins	1	33.3%	0.1	5.5%	1	33.3%	0.8	48.9%	1	33.3%	0.7	45.6%
Henderson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%
Jackson	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lauderdale	1	100.0%	3.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lawrence	1	33.3%	0.1	3.3%	1	33.3%	1.0	44.0%	1	33.3%	1.3	52.7%
Lincoln	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Loudon	3	75.0%	3.3	64.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	1.8	35.3%
McNairy	1	50.0%	0.2	16.7%	1	50.0%	1.0	83.3%	0		0	0.0%
Meigs	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%
Montgomery	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%	19.9	100.0%
Putnam	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%
Roane	2	50.0%	0.9	29.4%	2	50.0%	2.0	70.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Robertson	1	25.0%	1.3	37.4%	1	25.0%	0.4	10.8%	2		1.8	51.9%
Rutherford	3	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%
Sevier	1	50.0%	1.5	3.8%	1	50.0%	37.8	96.2%	0		0	0.0%
Shelby	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Stewart	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%
Sumner	2	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%
Unicoi	3	100.0%	1.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%
Washington	1	33.3%	50.0	97.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	1.4	2.7%
Wayne	1	50.0%	0.3	45.5%	1	50.0%	0.3	54.5%	0		0	0.0%
Wilson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%
Statewide	37	43.5%		14.0%	21	24.7%	\$ 59.6	9.6%	27	31.8%	\$ 472.7	76.4%
* Only those count	ies that re	ported proje	ects in this c	ategory are	shown.							

Table D-3b. Other Utility Projects by County and by Stage of Development Number and Estimated Cost--Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

* Only 가 proje gory

Table D-4a. Navigation Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP*

—Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

County	Number of	Number of Total Estimate		Percent	Percent Cost	Cost Per		
County	Proiects		Cost	of Total	in CIP		Capita	
Decatur	1	\$	4,000,000	1.2%	0.0%	\$	342	
Hamilton	1		300,000,000	87.4%	100.0%	\$	976	
Marion	1		175,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	6	
Shelby	1		38,929,977	11.3%	100.0%	\$	43	
Statewide Total	4	\$	343,104,977	100.0%	98.8%	\$	60	

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

**Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-4b. Navigation Projects by County and by Stage of Development

						Planning & Design					Construction			
		Conceptual					Plannin	g٥	Design		Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost	[in	millions]	Nu	mber	С	ost [in I	millions]	Nur	nber	Cost [ii	n millions]
Decatur	1	100.0%	\$ 4	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	\$	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%
Hamilton	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	1	100.0%		300.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marion	1	100.0%	C).2	100.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Shelby	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	1	100.0%	38.9	100.0%
Statewide	2	50.0%	\$ 4	4.2	1.2%	1	25.0%	\$	300.0	87.4%	1	25.0%	\$ 38.9	11.3%

Number and Estimated Cost--Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

Table D-5a. Telecommunications Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP* —Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

County	Number of Projects	Total Estimated Cost	Percent of Total Cost	Percent Cost in CIP	Cost Per Capita
Cannon	2	200,000	1.0%	0.0%	\$ 15
Carter	1	750,000	3.9%	100.0%	\$ 13
Chester	1	100,000	0.5%	100.0%	\$ 6
Cumberland	2	500,000	2.6%	100.0%	\$ 10
Davidson	4	3,790,000	19.6%	100.0%	\$ 7
Dyer	1	500,000	2.6%	0.0%	\$ 13
Fentress	2	800,000	4.1%	100.0%	\$ 48
Hamblen	1	1,500,000	7.8%	100.0%	\$ 26
Hardeman	1	750,000	3.9%	100.0%	\$ 26
Haywood	1	140,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$7
McNairy	1	66,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$3
Macon	1	300,000	1.6%	100.0%	\$ 14
Pickett	1	600,000	3.1%	100.0%	\$ 119
Putnam	4	5,700,000	29.5%	100.0%	\$ 90
Shelby	3	898,675	4.6%	100.0%	\$1
Smith	4	800,000	4.1%	100.0%	\$ 44
Sullivan	1	185,000	1.0%	100.0%	\$1
Warren	4	1,100,000	5.7%	100.0%	\$ 29
Washington	1	160,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$1
White	2	500,000	2.6%	100.0%	\$ 21
Statewide Total	38	\$ 19,339,675	100.0%	94.8%	\$3

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

		Cond	ceptual		Planning & Design				Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	nber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]
Cannon	1	50.0%	\$ 0.1	50.0%	1	50.0%	\$ 0.1	50.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%
Carter	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Chester	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cumberland	2	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Davidson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	2.5	66.0%	2	50.0%	1.3	34.0%
Dyer	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fentress	1	50.0%	0.5	62.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.3	37.5%
Hamblen	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardeman	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Haywood	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
McNairy	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Macon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%
Pickett	1	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam	3	75.0%	5.3	93.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0.4	7.0%
Shelby	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.4	48.3%	2	66.7%	0.5	51.7%
Smith	3	75.0%	0.6	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0.2	25.0%
Sullivan	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Warren	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	0.9	77.3%	1	25.0%	0.3	22.7%
Washington	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
White	1	50.0%	0.2	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.3	60.0%
Statewide	18	47.4%	\$ 10.2	53.0%	10	26.3%	\$ 5.6	28.9%	10	26.3%	\$ 3.5	18.1%

Table D-5b. Telecommunications Projects by County and by Stage of Development
Number and Estimated CostFive-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

Number and E		ive-year Period July	2002 through Ju	une 2	007^
	Number of				
	Schools with	Total Estimated	Percent of		Per
County	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	C	apita
Anderson	11	\$ 9,897,872	0.5%	\$	139
Bedford	2	15,165,000	0.8%	\$	396
Benton	7	709,164	0.0%	\$	43
Bledsoe	3	3,370,000	0.2%	\$	269
Blount	18	2,940,000	0.2%	\$	27
Bradley	22	31,725,300	1.6%	\$	357
Campbell	4	310,000	0.0%	\$	8
Cannon	7	10,889,346	0.6%	\$	841
Carroll	14	1,630,332	0.1%	\$	55
Carter	10	1,187,248	0.1%	\$	21
Cheatham	13	577,500	0.0%	\$	16
Chester	3	200,000	0.0%	\$	13
Claiborne	0	0	0.0%	\$	0
Clay	2	4,510,000	0.2%	\$	570
Cocke	8	9,348,000	0.5%	\$	276
Coffee	19	27,126,700	1.4%	\$	557
Crockett	3	300,000	0.0%	\$	21
Cumberland	6	2,485,000	0.1%	\$	52
Davidson	123	233,386,388	11.9%	\$	413
Decatur	1	50,000	0.0%	\$	4
DeKalb	4	1,353,400	0.1%	\$	77
Dickson	3	516,150	0.0%	\$	12
Dyer	11	453,981	0.0%	\$	12
Fayette	8	266,700	0.0%	\$	9
Fentress	7	2,325,000	0.1%	\$	138
Franklin	1	1,600,000	0.1%	\$	40
Gibson	14	2,381,300	0.1%	\$	50
Giles	0	0	0.0%	\$	0
Grainger	6	1,090,000	0.1%	\$	52
Greene	22	42,919,550	2.2%	\$	677
Grundy	7	7,472,400	0.4%	\$	523
Hamblen	20	1,611,556	0.1%	\$	28
Hamilton	70	38,979,800	2.0%	\$	127
Hancock	0	0	0.0%	\$	0
Hardeman	9	720,000	0.0%	\$	25
Hardin	8	2,257,600	0.1%	\$	88
Hawkins	15	11,397,528	0.6%	\$	210
Haywood	4	4,164,000	0.2%	\$	211
Henderson	7	2,174,000	0.1%	\$	84
Henry	6	3,590,000	0.2%	\$	115
Hickman	0	0	0.0%	\$	0
Houston	2	247,000	0.0%	\$	31
Humphreys	6	455,000	0.0%	\$	25
Jackson	4	1,163,400	0.1%	\$	104
Jefferson	3	510,000	0.0%	\$	11
Johnson	4	1,953,332	0.1%	\$	111
Knox	86	157,714,150	8.1%	\$	409

Table D-6. Improvement Projects at Existing Schools by County Number and Estimated Cost--Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

		e D-6. (continued)			
	Number of		-		_
C	Schools with	Total Estimated	Percent of	~	Per
County	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	_	apita
Lake	3	256,000	0.0%	\$	33
Lauderdale	0	0	0.0%	\$	0
Lawrence	3	2,400,000	0.1%	\$	60
Lewis	0	0	0.0%	\$	0
Lincoln	1	50,000	0.0%	\$	2
Loudon	9	4,791,000	0.2%	\$	119
McMinn	12	15,038,500	0.8%	\$	302
McNairy	8	554,000	0.0%	\$	22
Macon	8	1,720,000	0.1%	\$	82
Madison	24	6,087,850	0.3%	\$	66
Marion	7	12,231,200	0.6%	\$	441
Marshall	7	1,100,000	0.1%	\$	41
Maury	1	100,000	0.0%	\$	1
Meigs	4	921,000	0.0%	\$	82
Monroe	14	1,827,500	0.1%	\$	46
Montgomery	6	22,844,200	1.2%	\$	169
Moore	0	0	0.0%	\$	0
Morgan	7	6,010,000	0.3%	\$	300
Obion	10	1,875,000	0.1%	\$	58
Overton	5	4,207,592	0.2%	\$	208
Perry	0	0	0.0%	\$	0
Pickett	2	1,095,000	0.1%	\$	217
Polk	6	3,985,000	0.2%	\$	246
Putnam	11	8,039,233	0.4%	\$	127
Rhea	5	4,340,000	0.2%	\$	152
Roane	13	7,066,000	0.4%	\$	136
Robertson	0	0	0.0%	\$	0
Rutherford	34	24,406,138	1.2%	\$	128
Scott	9	18,922,851	1.0%	\$	878
Sequatchie	2	2,183,500	0.1%	\$	188
Sevier	22	21,456,916	1.1%	\$	291
Shelby	220	1,026,115,585	52.5%	\$	1,145
Smith	8	541,000	0.0%	\$	30
Stewart	2	80,000	0.0%	\$	6
Sullivan	47	63,311,650	3.2%	\$	414
Sumner	33	10,384,900	0.5%	\$	77
Tipton	13	1,265,632	0.1%	\$	24
Trousdale	2	120,000	0.0%	\$	16
Unicoi	6	1,472,050	0.1%	\$	83
Union	6	1,966,615	0.1%	\$	107
Van Buren	1	440,000	0.0%	\$	80
Warren	10	4,088,800	0.2%	\$	106
Washington	22	10,059,440	0.5%	\$	93
Wayne	7	1,600,000	0.1%	\$	95
Weakley	6	1,230,000	0.1%	\$	36
White	4	915,000	0.0%	\$	39
Williamson	33	12,835,230	0.7%	\$	96
Wilson	10	1,650,000	0.1%	\$	18
Statewide	1,266	\$ 1,954,708,079	100.0%	\$	341

Table D-	I able D-/a. New Public School Construction Projects by County Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP*									
		eriod July 2002 thro								
	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	C	ost Per				
County	Projects	Cost	Total Cost			Capita				
Bedford	6	\$ 43,800,000	2.7%	0.0%	\$	1,143				
Blount	6	81,870,000	5.0%	93.5%	\$	756				
Bradley	2	12,348,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$	139				
Campbell	4	35,000,000	2.1%	0.0%	\$	874				
Cannon	2	20,657,035	1.3%	0.0%	\$	1,596				
Carroll	1	6,200,000	0.4%	100.0%	\$	210				
Claiborne	2	36,000,000	2.2%	0.0%		1,194				
Clay	1	2,500,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	316				
Coffee	3	32,375,000	2.0%	44.8%	\$	665				
Crockett	2	7,000,000	0.4%	50.0%	\$	481				
Cumberland	2	36,210,000	2.2%	100.0%	\$	753				
Davidson	21	150,168,200	9.1%	100.0%	\$	266				
Dickson	2	8,000,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	182				
Fayette	1	14,500,000	0.9%	100.0%		475				
Franklin	3	50,000,000	3.0%	0.0%		1,257				
Gibson	1	8,000,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	167				
Grainger	1	20,000,000	1.2%	0.0%	\$	955				
Greene	1	13,500,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$	213				
Hamblen	1	25,000,000	1.5%	0.0%	\$	429				
Hamilton	1	11,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$	36				
Henderson	2	7,000,000	0.4%	50.0%	\$	272				
Henry	2	21,000,000	1.3%	100.0%	\$	676				
Hickman	2	38,000,000	2.3%	0.0%	\$	1,671				
Knox	11	128,415,983	7.8%	73.5%	\$	333				
Madison	4	25,000,000	1.5%	76.0%	\$	271				
Marion	1	12,500,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$	450				
Marshall	3	20,800,000	1.3%	0.0%	\$	767				
Maury	2	26,233,000	1.6%	0.0%	\$	373				
Monroe	2	14,232,000	0.9%	0.0%	\$	357				
Montgomery	6	31,105,840	1.9%	100.0%	\$	230				
Morgan	2	6,000,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	300				
Obion	1	4,000,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	124				
Overton	1	14,500,000	0.9%	100.0%		718				
Polk	1	8,500,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	524				
Putnam	1	33,000,000	2.0%	100.0%	\$	522				
Rhea	3	12,240,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$	428				
Roane	5	16,200,000	1.0%	37.0%	\$	311				
Robertson	10	41,900,000	2.5%	100.0%	\$	747				
Rutherford	13	201,834,600	12.3%	65.8%	\$	1,061				
Scott	2	10,000,000	0.6%	0.0%		464				
Sevier	5	33,000,000	2.0%	100.0%	\$	448				
Shelby	6	40,099,851	2.4%	75.8%	\$	45				
Smith	3	27,476,500	1.7%	100.0%	\$	1,527				
Sullivan	1	300,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	2				

Table D-7a. New Public School Construction Projects by County

76

County	Number of Projects	Total Estimated Cost		Percent Cost in CIP	st Per apita
Sumner	7	80,216,585	4.9%	73.5%	\$ 597
Tipton	3	25,000,000	1.5%	32.0%	\$ 472
Trousdale	1	8,500,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$ 1,157
Warren	1	1,500,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 39
Washington	1	16,000,000	1.0%	0.0%	\$ 148
Williamson	10	118,500,000	7.2%	20.9%	\$ 885
Wilson	1	6,100,000	0.4%	100.0%	\$ 67
Statewide Total	176	\$ 1,643,282,594	100.0%	54.3%	\$ 289

Table D-7a. (continued)

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP). **Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

				<u>mated Cos</u>	stFive-y	<u>e-year Period July 2002 through J</u>						
			ceptual				a & Design		Construction			
County	Nur	nber	Cost [in		Nur	nber		millions]	Nur	nber	Cost [in	millions]
Bedford	3	50.0%	\$ 18.8	42.9%	3	50.0%	\$ 25.0	57.1%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%
Blount	3	50.0%	63.0	77.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	18.9	23.0%
Bradley	2	100.0%	12.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Campbell	4	100.0%	35.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cannon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	20.7	100.0%
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	6.2	100.0%
Claiborne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	36.0	100.0%
Clay	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Coffee	2	66.7%	24.4	75.3%	1	33.3%	8.0	24.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Crockett	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	7.0	100.0%
Cumberland	2	100.0%	36.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Davidson	12	57.1%	89.4	59.5%	4	19.0%	25.6	17.0%	5	23.8%	35.2	23.4%
Dickson	0	0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	8.0	100.0%
Fayette	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	14.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Franklin	1	33.3%	24.0	48.0%	1	33.3%	3.0	6.0%	1	33.3%	23.0	46.0%
Gibson	1	100.0%	8.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grainger	1	100.0%	20.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Greene	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	13.5	100.0%
Hamblen	1	100.0%	25.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamilton	1	100.0%	11.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Henderson	2	100.0%	7.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Henry	2	100.0%	21.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hickman	2	100.0%	38.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	4	36.4%	60.0	46.7%	6	54.5%	53.9	42.0%	1	9.1%	14.5	11.3%
Madison	1	25.0%	6.0	24.0%	3	75.0%	19.0	76.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marion	1	100.0%	12.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marshall	1	33.3%	7.0	33.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	13.8	66.3%
Maury	2	100.0%	26.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Monroe	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	14.2	100.0%
Montgomery	2	33.3%	15.5	49.8%	4	66.7%	15.6	50.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Morgan	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	6.0	100.0%
Obion	1	100.0%	4.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Overton	0	0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	14.5	100.0%
Polk	0	0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%		100.0%
Putnam	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	33.0	100.0%

Table D-7b. New Public School Construction Projects by County and by Stage of Development Number and Estimated Cost-Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

				Та	able D-7	b. (contir	nued)					
		Cond	ceptual			Planning	a & Design		Construction			
County	Nur	nber	Cost [in ı	millions]	Nu	nber	Cost [in	millions]	Nur	nber	Cost [in	millions]
Rhea	3	100.0%	\$ 12.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%
Roane	1	20.0%	4.0	24.7%	1	20.0%	6.0	37.0%	3	60.0%	6.2	38.3%
Robertson	7	70.0%	27.6	65.9%	1	10.0%	3.3	7.9%	2	20.0%	11.0	26.3%
Rutherford	10	76.9%	147.5	73.1%	1	7.7%	11.5	5.7%	2	15.4%	42.8	21.2%
Scott	2	100.0%	10.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sevier	4	80.0%	25.7	77.7%	1	20.0%	7.4	22.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Shelby	1	16.7%	9.5	23.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	83.3%	30.6	76.4%
Smith	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	27.5	100.0%
Sullivan	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sumner	3	42.9%	31.7	39.6%	1	14.3%	11.0	13.7%	3	42.9%	37.5	46.7%
Tipton	2	66.7%	17.0	68.0%	1	33.3%	8.0	32.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Trousdale	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	8.5	100.0%
Warren	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Washington	1	100.0%	16.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Williamson	4	40.0%	42.5	35.9%	1	10.0%	8.5	7.2%	5	50.0%	67.5	57.0%
Wilson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	6.1	100.0%
Statewide	90	51.1%	\$ 908.4	55.3%	32	18.2%	\$ 224.2	13.6%	54	30.7%	\$ 510.7	31.1%

Table D-8a. Non K-12 Education Projects by County

—Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**											
County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cost Per						
	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	Cost in CIP	Capita						
Blount	3	\$ 21,120,000	1.4%	0.0%	\$ 195						
Bradley	2	340,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 4						
Campbell	2	4,500,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 112						
Cheatham	1	1,500,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 41						
Cumberland	3	9,560,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 199						
Davidson	15	56,627,408	3.8%	0.0%	\$ 100						
Dickson	1	6,610,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$ 151						
Dyer	8	20,870,000	1.4%	0.0%	\$ 562						
Franklin	2	8,050,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$ 202						
Grainger	1	850,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 41						
Greene	1	495,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$8						
Hamblen	10	23,729,000	1.6%	0.0%	\$ 407						
Hamilton	14	114,615,000	7.7%	0.0%	\$ 373						
Henry	2	1,603,318	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 52						
Humphreys	1	20,000,000	1.3%	0.0%	\$ 1,104						
Johnson	1	150,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 9						
Knox	42	245,556,427	16.5%	0.0%	\$ 637						
Lawrence	1	1,400,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 35						
Lewis	1	218,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 19						
Lincoln	1	5,300,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$ 168						
Madison	8	22,430,000	1.5%	0.0%	\$ 243						
Marion	1	200,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 7						
Maury	4	25,170,000	1.7%	0.0%	\$ 358						
Montgomery	15	90,795,000	6.1%	0.0%	\$ 672						
Moore	3	15,405,000	1.0%	0.0%	\$ 2,617						
Putnam	6	24,795,700	1.7%	0.0%	\$ 392						
Roane	3	3,207,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 62						
Rutherford	15	219,232,136	14.8%	0.0%	\$ 1,153						
Scott	2	400,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 19						
Shelby	28	236,837,440	15.9%	2.1%	\$ 264						
Sullivan	9	57,370,000	3.9%	1.9%							
Sumner	5	20,675,000	1.4%	0.0%	\$ 154						
Tipton	1	5,500,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$ 104						
Trousdale	1	3,870,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 527						
Warren	2	102,830,000	6.9%	97.2%	\$ 2,666						
Washington	9	24,180,000	1.6%	0.0%	\$ 223						
Weakley	8	15,720,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$ 454						
Williamson	1	18,330,000	1.2%	0.0%	\$ 137						
Regional	7	56,215,234	3.8%	0.0%	\$ 19						
Statewide Total	· ·	\$ 1,486,256,663	100.0%	7.1%							

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP* —Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Table D-8b. Non K-12 Education Projects by County and by Stage of Development

					—Five-year Period July 2002 through Ju							
			nceptual			Planning			Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]	Nu	mber	Cost [i	n millions]	Nu	mber		n millions]
Blount	3	100.0%	\$ 21.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%
Bradley	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Campbell	1	50.0%	1.0	22.2%	1	50.0%	3.5	77.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cheatham	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cumberland	3	100.0%	9.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Davidson	15	100.0%	56.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dickson	1	100.0%	6.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dyer	8	100.0%	20.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Franklin	2	100.0%	8.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grainger	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Greene	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamblen	10	100.0%	23.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamilton	12	85.7%	111.8	97.5%	1	7.1%	1.4	1.2%	1	7.1%	1.5	1.3%
Henry	1	50.0%	1.3	81.3%	1	50.0%	0.3	18.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Humphreys	1	100.0%	20.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Johnson	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	34	81.0%	219.0	89.2%	5	11.9%	24.0	9.8%	3	7.1%	2.5	1.0%
Lawrence	1	100.0%	1.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lewis	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lincoln	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	5.3	100.0%
Madison	8	100.0%	22.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marion	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Maury	4	100.0%	25.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Montgomery	14	93.3%	89.8	98.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	1.0	1.1%
Moore	3	100.0%	15.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam	6	100.0%	24.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Roane	3	100.0%	3.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Rutherford	15	100.0%	219.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Scott	2	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Shelby	21	75.0%	207.2	87.5%	3	10.7%	24.7	10.4%	4	14.3%	5.0	2.1%
Sullivan	8	88.9%	56.3	98.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	1.1	1.9%
Sumner	5	100.0%	20.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Number and Estimated Cost—Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

Building Tennessee's Tomorrow: Anticipating the State's Infrastructure Needs
omorrow:
Anticipating
ting the State's Infrast
Infrastructure Need
Veeds

[Conceptual				Planning	& Desig	gn	Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]	Nu	mber	Cost [i	n millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [ir	millions]
Tipton	1	100.0%	5.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Trousdale	1	100.0%	3.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Warren	2	100.0%	102.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Washington	9	100.0%	24.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Weakley	7	87.5%	13.8	87.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	1.9	12.3%
Williamson	1	100.0%	18.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Regional	7	100.0%	56.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Statewide	215	89.6%	\$ 1,413.0	95.10%	13	5.4%	\$ 54.9	3.7%	12	5.0%	\$ 18.3	1.2%

Table D-8b. (continued)

Table D-9a. School System-wide Needs Projects by County

County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cost Pe
County	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	Cost in CIP	Capita
Anderson	2	\$ 6,925,000	22.4%	93.9%	\$97
Davidson	4	3,780,000	12.2%	97.4%	\$7
Fentress	1	1,815,000	5.9%	0.0%	\$ 108
Gibson	2	680,000	2.2%	41.2%	\$ 14
Hamblen	1	400,000	1.3%	100.0%	\$ 7
Henry	1	200,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$6
Johnson	1	225,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$ 13
Knox	2	4,450,000	14.4%	0.0%	\$ 12
McMinn	1	250,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$5
Madison	1	1,145,000	3.7%	0.0%	\$ 12
Maury	1	5,000,000	16.2%	0.0%	\$ 71
Meigs	1	85,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$8
Roane	1	1,000,000	3.2%	100.0%	\$ 19
Rutherford	1	180,000	0.6%	100.0%	\$1
Scott	1	100,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$5
Sequatchie	2	1,100,000	3.6%	0.0%	\$ 95
Sevier	1	200,000	0.6%	100.0%	\$3
Sullivan	1	2,500,000	8.1%	100.0%	\$ 16
Van Buren	1	861,000	2.8%	0.0%	\$ 157
Statewide Total	26	\$ 30,896,000	100.0%	47.7%	\$5

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP* —Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

		Number and Estimated C				<u>stFive-year Period July 2002 through Ju</u>				une 2007*			
		Con	ceptual			Planning	g & Desi	gn	Construction				
County	Nur	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [i	n millions]	Νι	ımber	Cost [in	millions]	
Anderson	2	100.0%	\$ 6.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	
Davidson	1	25.0%	0.1	2.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	3.7	97.4%	
Fentress	1	100.0%	1.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Gibson	2	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Hamblen	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Henry	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Johnson	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Knox	2	100.0%	4.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
McMinn	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Madison	1	100.0%	1.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Maury	1	100.0%	5.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Meigs	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Roane	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	
Rutherford	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Scott	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sequatchie	1	50.0%	0.5	45.5%	1	50.0%	0.6	54.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sevier	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	
Sullivan	1	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Van Buren	1	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Statewide	19	73.1%	\$ 25.2	81.6%	2	7.7%	\$ 0.8	2.6%	5	19.2%	\$ 4.9	15.8%	

 Table D-9b. Public School System-wide Projects by County and by Stage of Development

 Number and Estimated Cost-Five-year Period, July 2002 through June 2007*

		stimated Cost and Per		Jounty		
		Period July 2002 throug		'**		
	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	C	ost Per
County	Projects	Cost		Cost in CIP		Capita
Anderson	19	\$ 37,938,500	1.3%	79.4%	\$	531
Bedford	19	32,615,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$	851
Benton	4	3,531,000	0.1%	28.3%	\$	213
Bledsoe	8	10,850,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	867
Blount	18	71,787,360	2.4%	50.4%	\$	663
Bradley	35	14,277,000	0.5%	71.3%	\$	161
Campbell	14	15,150,000	0.5%	46.8%	\$	378
Cannon	1	1,000,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	77
Carroll	8	3,848,000	0.1%	3.9%	\$	130
Carter	34	100,070,000	3.4%	58.3%	\$	1,758
Cheatham	11	14,339,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	392
Chester	3	2,350,000	0.1%	91.5%	\$	150
Claiborne	14	16,922,375	0.6%	49.2%	\$	561
Clay	2	1,150,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	145
Cocke	8	14,435,000	0.5%	9.2%	\$	426
Coffee	25	29,365,297	1.0%	16.0%	\$	603
Crockett	4	3,300,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	227
Cumberland	6	99,300,000	3.3%	100.0%	\$	2,066
Davidson	66	427,995,000	14.3%	86.6%	\$	757
Decatur	6	7,530,000	0.3%	60.4%	\$	644
DeKalb	9	19,550,000	0.7%	100.0%	\$	1,114
Dickson	5	34,540,000	1.2%	0.0%	\$	788
Dyer	4	3,100,000	0.1%	80.6%	\$	84
Fayette	3	1,670,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	55
Fentress	2	3,250,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	193
Franklin	18	32,808,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$	825
Gibson	10	12,220,108	0.4%	25.4%	\$	254
Giles	14	23,363,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$	787
Grainger	11	15,040,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	718
Greene	19	25,603,000	0.9%	25.2%	\$	404
Grundy	13	18,213,000	0.6%	16.5%	\$	1,275
Hamblen	8	21,530,000	0.7%			369
Hamilton	20	22,165,000	0.7%	13.1%	\$	72
Hancock	3	1,803,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	266
Hardeman	10	10,190,000	0.3%	87.7%	\$	359
Hardin	11	13,073,525	0.4%	92.5%	\$	507
Hawkins	22	60,136,450	2.0%	0.0%	\$	1,106
Haywood	8	7,065,000	0.2%	17.2%	\$	358
Henderson	14	12,923,000	0.4%	92.7%	\$	502
Henry	2	2,400,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	77
Hickman	8	7,986,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	351
Houston	12	8,695,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	1,098
Humphreys	8	6,875,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	380
Jackson	4	6,050,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	542
Jefferson	20	19,837,441	0.7%	68.4%	\$	440
Johnson	17	18,464,200	0.6%	0.0%	\$	1,047
Knox	36	134,254,682	4.5%	92.9%	\$	348
Lake	4	2,450,000	0.1%	20.4%	\$	316

Table D-10a. Water and Wastewater Projects by County

85

		Table D-Toa. (conti			
County	Number of Projects	Total Estimated Cost	Percent of Total Cost	Percent Cost in CIP	ost Per Capita
Lauderdale	3	9,065,000	0.3%	17.3%	\$ 335
Lawrence	20	28,547,500	1.0%	0.0%	\$ 714
Lewis	4	5,500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 481
Lincoln	23	18,280,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 578
Loudon	22	50,696,000	1.7%	72.8%	\$ 1,260
McMinn	19	12,896,600	0.4%	0.0%	\$ 259
McNairy	21	25,290,000	0.8%	73.3%	\$ 1,026
Macon	4	17,575,000	0.6%	100.0%	\$ 842
Madison	59	61,856,550	2.1%	98.7%	\$ 670
Marion	19	20,140,000	0.7%	14.9%	\$ 726
Marshall	36	25,455,000	0.9%	56.6%	\$ 939
Maury	17	27,841,000	0.9%	77.3%	\$ 396
Meigs	5	3,400,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 304
Monroe	11	8,536,351	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 214
Montgomery	56	129,645,000	4.3%	89.1%	\$ 960
Moore	3	6,866,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 1,166
Morgan	10	18,623,000	0.6%	50.4%	\$ 931
Obion	7	17,700,000	0.6%	2.8%	\$ 547
Overton	1	2,000,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 99
Perry	5	2,890,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 385
Pickett	1	1,500,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 297
Polk	15	9,549,250	0.3%	19.4%	\$ 589
Putnam	9	9,900,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$ 157
Rhea	10	10,716,200	0.4%	0.0%	\$ 375
Roane	24	36,712,500	1.2%	41.1%	\$ 706
Robertson	19	51,717,000	1.7%	79.1%	\$ 922
Rutherford	46	139,859,417	4.7%	70.6%	\$ 736
Scott	9	16,214,000	0.5%	40.4%	\$ 752
Sequatchie	6	7,225,250	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 622
Sevier	43	90,998,850	3.0%	49.6%	\$ 1,235
Shelby	22	67,583,533	2.3%	100.0%	\$ 75
Smith	9	10,170,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$ 565
Stewart	9	6,250,000	0.2%	33.2%	\$ 494
Sullivan	57	123,672,356	4.1%	76.2%	\$ 809
Sumner	34	72,169,500	2.4%	18.7%	\$ 537
Tipton	3	1,042,880	0.0%	43.9%	\$ 20
Trousdale	7	9,450,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 1,287
Unicoi	20	9,584,875	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 541
Union	2	27,500,000	0.9%	0.0%	\$ 1,493
Van Buren	1	8,000,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$ 1,461
Warren	11	13,476,000	0.5%	100.0%	\$ 349
Washington	32	112,843,500	3.8%	62.7%	\$ 1,041
Wayne	4	2,250,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 134
Weakley	8	11,321,952	0.4%	26.5%	\$ 327
White	3	22,000,000	0.7%	9.1%	\$ 942
Williamson	67	82,478,390	2.8%	91.4%	\$ 616
Wilson	26	85,255,000	2.9%	19.5%	\$ 930
Statewide	1,462	\$ 2,985,252,392	100.0%	59.5%	\$ 525

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP). **Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

			ceptual		t nvo ye		& Design	through o	Construction				
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in millions]		Number		Cost [in millions]		Number		Cost [in I	millions]	
Anderson	4	21.1%	\$ 5.7	15.0%	5	26.3%	\$ 3.5	9.2%	10	52.6%	\$ 28.8	75.8%	
Bedford	7	36.8%	14.5	44.5%	10	52.6%	12.1	37.1%		10.5%	6.0	18.5%	
Benton	1	25.0%	0.6	17.0%	2	50.0%	1.3	36.8%	1	25.0%	1.6	46.2%	
Bledsoe	7	87.5%	10.3	94.5%	1	12.5%	0.6	5.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Blount	4	22.2%	41.7	58.0%	5	27.8%	16.6	23.1%	9	50.0%	13.5	18.9%	
Bradley	19	54.3%	7.8	54.3%	15	42.9%	5.9	41.2%	1	2.9%	0.6	4.5%	
Campbell	2	14.3%	1.2	7.7%	8	57.1%	8.8	58.0%	4	28.6%	5.2	34.3%	
Cannon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	
Carroll	2	25.0%	1.1	28.6%	6	75.0%	2.7	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Carter	15	44.1%	86.6	86.5%	13	38.2%	5.6	5.6%	6	17.6%	7.9	7.9%	
Cheatham	5	45.5%	2.4	16.5%	1	9.1%	2.0	13.9%	5	45.5%	10.0	69.5%	
Chester	1	33.3%	0.2	8.5%	2	66.7%	2.2	91.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Claiborne	5	35.7%	6.7	39.6%	4	28.6%	1.5	8.7%	5	35.7%	8.7	51.7%	
Clay	2	100.0%	1.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Cocke	4	50.0%	13.2	91.4%	3	37.5%	0.6	4.5%	1	12.5%	0.6	4.1%	
Coffee	13	52.0%	10.6	36.0%	5	20.0%	3.0	10.0%	7	28.0%	15.8	53.9%	
Crockett	2	50.0%	2.8	83.3%	2	50.0%	0.6	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Cumberland	1	16.7%	5.0	5.0%	1	16.7%	40.0	40.3%		66.7%	54.3	54.7%	
Davidson	11	16.7%	75.8	17.7%	10	15.2%	39.5	9.2%	45	68.2%	312.7	73.1%	
Decatur	1	16.7%	0.5	6.6%	4	66.7%	6.6	87.0%	1	16.7%	0.5	6.4%	
DeKalb	1	11.1%	0.5	2.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	88.9%	19.1	97.4%	
Dickson	2	40.0%	2.5	7.1%	1	20.0%	1.3	3.8%	2	40.0%	30.8	89.1%	
Dyer	2	50.0%	0.3	8.1%	1	25.0%	2.5	80.6%	1	25.0%	0.4	11.3%	
Fayette	3	100.0%	1.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Fentress	2	100.0%	3.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%	
Franklin	7	38.9%	21.2	64.7%	8	44.4%	5.7	17.2%	3	16.7%	5.9	18.1%	
Gibson	3	30.0%	1.0	8.4%	6	60.0%	10.6	86.7%	1	10.0%	0.6	4.9%	
Giles	5	35.7%	12.7	54.4%	5	35.7%	8.3	35.3%	4	28.6%	2.4	10.3%	
Grainger	7	63.6%	8.8	58.2%	3	27.3%	6.2	41.5%		9.1%	0.1	0.3%	
Greene	9	47.4%	15.8	61.6%	2	10.5%	0.6	2.1%		42.1%	9.3	36.2%	
Grundy	7	53.8%	14.8	81.0%	6	46.2%	3.5	19.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%	
Hamblen	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	37.5%	10.4	48.3%	5	62.5%	11.1	51.7%	
Hamilton	7	35.0%	3.2	14.6%	9	45.0%	9.8	44.0%		20.0%	9.2	41.3%	
Hancock	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	1.3	74.2%	1	33.3%	0.5	25.8%	
Hardeman	2	20.0%	5.8	56.4%	8	80.0%	4.4	43.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	

Table D-10b. Water and Wastewater Projects by County and by Stage of Development Number and Estimated Cost--Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

Table D-10b. (continued)													
	Conceptual					Planning & Design				Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in n	-	Nur	nber	Cost [in		Nu	mber	Cost [in r		
Hardin	4	36.4%	2.8	21.7%	3	27.3%	7.2	55.3%	4	36.4%	3.0	23.0%	
Hawkins	9	40.9%	45.5	75.6%	9	40.9%	10.6	17.6%	4	18.2%	4.1	6.8%	
Haywood	3	37.5%	1.2	17.0%	4	50.0%	1.4	19.3%	1	12.5%	4.5	63.7%	
Henderson	4	28.6%	5.1	39.3%	9	64.3%	7.4	57.2%	1	7.1%	0.5	3.5%	
Henry	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	1.7	70.8%	1	50.0%	0.7	29.2%	
Hickman	3	37.5%	1.3	15.8%	4	50.0%	5.2	65.4%	1	12.5%	1.5	18.8%	
Houston	9	75.0%	7.4	85.5%	3	25.0%	1.3	14.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Humphreys	4	50.0%	3.1	45.5%	4	50.0%	3.8	54.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Jackson	3	75.0%	4.8	78.5%	1	25.0%	1.3	21.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Jefferson	7	35.0%	9.3	46.9%	9	45.0%	4.9	24.8%	4	20.0%	5.6	28.3%	
Johnson	10	58.8%	12.3	66.8%	7	41.2%	6.1	33.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Knox	7	19.4%	14.2	10.5%	10	27.8%	24.6	18.4%	19	52.8%	95.5	71.1%	
Lake	3	75.0%	1.3	51.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	1.2	49.0%	
Lauderdale	2	66.7%	7.5	82.7%	1	33.3%	1.6	17.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Lawrence	6	30.0%	17.1	60.0%	11	55.0%	10.9	38.1%	3	15.0%	0.5	1.9%	
Lewis	4	100.0%	5.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Lincoln	15	65.2%	9.6	52.3%	7	30.4%	7.1	39.0%	1	4.3%	1.6	8.8%	
Loudon	8	36.4%	9.6	18.9%	9	40.9%	35.9	70.8%	5	22.7%	5.2	10.2%	
McMinn	10	52.6%	5.9	45.4%	9	47.4%	7.0	54.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
McNairy	12	57.1%	18.7	74.0%	7	33.3%	5.0	19.7%	2	9.5%	1.6	6.3%	
Macon	1	25.0%	10.0	56.9%	1	25.0%	0.1	0.4%	2	50.0%	7.5	42.7%	
Madison	51	86.4%	55.0	88.9%	6	10.2%	5.5	8.9%	2	3.4%	1.4	2.2%	
Marion	11	57.9%	12.7	63.1%	6	31.6%	6.6	32.7%	2	10.5%	0.9	4.2%	
Marshall	11	30.6%	9.5	37.2%	21	58.3%	13.4	52.5%	4	11.1%	2.6	10.3%	
Maury	7	41.2%	6.7	24.0%	7	41.2%	12.3	44.1%	3	17.6%	8.9	31.9%	
Meigs	4	80.0%	2.9	85.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0.5	14.7%	
Monroe	1	9.1%	0.6	7.0%	8	72.7%	6.9	80.6%	2	18.2%	1.1	12.4%	
Montgomery	12	21.4%	43.3	33.4%	29	51.8%	57.3	44.2%	15		29.0	22.4%	
Moore	2	66.7%	6.5	94.7%	1	33.3%	0.4	5.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Morgan	6	60.0%	14.3	76.9%	2	20.0%	2.2	12.1%	2		2.1	11.1%	
Obion	6	85.7%	15.7	88.7%	1	14.3%	2.0	11.3%	0		0	0.0%	
Overton	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	
Perry	1	20.0%	1.0	34.6%	2	40.0%	0.8	28.4%	2		1.1	37.0%	
Pickett	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	
Polk	12	80.0%	7.8	81.9%	2	13.3%	1.1	11.2%	1	6.7%	0.7	6.8%	
Putnam	6	66.7%	1.4	14.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3		8.5	85.9%	

				Та	ble D-10)b. (conti	nued)						
	Conceptual					Planning & Design				Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in i	millions]	Nur	nber	Cost [in r	nillions]	
Rhea	7	70.0%	6.9	64.1%	2	20.0%	3.4	31.3%	1	10.0%	0.5	4.7%	
Roane	12	50.0%	17.1	46.6%	8	33.3%	14.2	38.6%	4	16.7%	5.4	14.8%	
Robertson	6	31.6%	28.4	54.9%	9	47.4%	19.1	36.9%	4	21.1%	4.2	8.2%	
Rutherford	14	30.4%	38.6	27.6%	15	32.6%	33.8	24.2%	17	37.0%	67.5	48.2%	
Scott	2	22.2%	1.3	7.7%	4	44.4%	5.5	33.7%	3	33.3%	9.5	58.6%	
Sequatchie	2	33.3%	1.3	18.0%	4	66.7%	5.9	82.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sevier	27	62.8%	55.5	61.0%	11	25.6%	16.8	18.5%	5	11.6%	18.7	20.5%	
Shelby	4	18.2%	8.7	12.8%	13	59.1%	42.1	62.2%	5	22.7%	16.9	25.0%	
Smith	1	11.1%	0.5	4.9%	2	22.2%	5.5	54.1%	6	66.7%	4.2	41.0%	
Stewart	5	55.6%	2.4	38.4%	4	44.4%	3.9	61.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sullivan	26	45.6%	25.9	20.9%	13	22.8%	30.5	24.7%	18	31.6%	67.3	54.4%	
Sumner	17	50.0%	47.8	66.3%	9	26.5%	11.7	16.2%	8	23.5%	12.6	17.5%	
Tipton	2	66.7%	1.0	91.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.1	8.1%	
Trousdale	5	71.4%	6.0	63.0%	1	14.3%	0.5	5.3%	1	14.3%	3.0	31.7%	
Unicoi	13	65.0%	7.1	74.5%	4	20.0%	2.2	23.0%	3	15.0%	0.2	2.5%	
Union	1	50.0%	27.0	98.2%	1	50.0%	0.5	1.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Van Buren	1	100.0%	8.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Warren	3	27.3%	5.5	41.0%	6	54.5%	6.6	49.2%	2	18.2%	1.3	9.8%	
Washington	16	50.0%	73.8	65.4%	10	31.3%	24.6	21.8%	6	18.8%	14.5	12.8%	
Wayne	1	25.0%	0.6	24.4%	3	75.0%	1.7	75.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Weakley	5	62.5%	2.9	25.4%	1	12.5%	5.0	44.2%	2	25.0%	3.5	30.5%	
White	3	100.0%	22.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Williamson	41	61.2%	39.5	47.8%	15	22.4%	28.6	34.6%	11	16.4%	14.4	17.5%	
Wilson	11	42.3%	33.0	38.7%	4	15.4%	11.0	12.9%	11	42.3%	41.2	48.4%	
Statewide	642	43.9%	\$1,208.8	40.5%	484	33.1%	\$741.9	24.9%	336	23.0%	\$1,034.5	34.7%	

T-11 D 401 (... ...

	-	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cr	st Per
County	Projects	Cost		Cost in CIP		apita
Bledsoe	2	\$ 13,150,000	1.8%			1,051
Blount	1	4,000,000	0.6%		\$	37
Bradley	4	22,462,000	3.1%		\$	253
Campbell	1	8,000,000	1.1%		\$	200
Carter	1	2,000,000	0.3%		\$	35
Cheatham	2	2,500,000	0.3%		\$	68
Chester	1	2,000,000	0.3%		\$	127
Claiborne	2	12,500,000	1.7%		\$	415
Cocke	1	3,000,000	0.4%		\$	89
Coffee	4	30,360,000	4.2%		\$	624
Cumberland	1	90,000	0.0%		\$	2
Davidson	24	232,626,000	32.1%		\$	411
Decatur	1	100,000	0.0%		\$	9
Dickson	2	7,000,000	1.0%	0.0%	\$	160
Dyer	2	8,660,000	1.2%	0.0%	\$	233
Fayette	2	13,590,000	1.9%		\$	445
Fentress	1	2,500,000	0.3%		\$	149
Franklin	3	2,750,000	0.4%		\$	69
Gibson	2	600,000	0.1%		\$	12
Grainger	2	5,050,000	0.7%		\$	241
Greene	1	2,000,000	0.3%		\$	32
Hamblen	1	700,000	0.1%		\$	12
Hamilton	6	13,093,530	1.8%		\$	43
Hardeman	1	2,000,000	0.3%		\$	71
Hardin	2	7,080,000	1.0%		\$	275
Hawkins	2	1,350,000	0.2%		\$	25
Haywood	1	2,000,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	101
Henderson	2	900,000	0.1%	88.9%	\$	35
Hickman	5	11,145,000	1.5%		\$	490
Jackson	1	5,500,000	0.8%	100.0%	\$	493
Jefferson	6	13,110,000	1.8%	0.8%	\$	291
Johnson	3	8,145,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$	462
Knox	4	56,734,638	7.8%		\$	147
Lauderdale	1	370,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	14
Lawrence	2	19,519,989	2.7%	0.0%	\$	488
Loudon	1	3,000,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	75
McMinn	4	6,740,000	0.9%	0.0%	\$	135
Marion	1	85,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	3
Marshall	2	2,900,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	107
Maury	3	3,849,700	0.5%	76.6%	\$	55
Monroe	2	371,000	0.1%	48.2%	\$	9
Montgomery	5	1,460,000	0.2%		\$	11
Morgan	1	1,200,000	0.2%		\$	60
Obion	1	1,000,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	31
Perry	2	3,150,000	0.4%		\$	420
Pickett	1	5,000,000	0.7%	100.0%	\$	990
Polk	1	1,250,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	77
Putnam	1	50,000	0.0%		\$	1

Table D-11a. Law Enforcement Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP* —Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Co	ost Per
County	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	Cost in CIP	C	Capita
Rhea	1	5,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$	175
Roane	1	5,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$	96
Robertson	1	1,300,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	23
Rutherford	2	850,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	4
Sevier	5	2,549,754	0.4%	31.8%	\$	35
Shelby	29	104,640,868	14.4%	99.0%	\$	117
Smith	2	7,650,000	1.1%	100.0%	\$	425
Stewart	1	3,000,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	237
Sullivan	2	7,725,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$	51
Sumner	2	1,200,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	9
Union	1	2,500,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	136
Van Buren	1	7,900,000	1.1%	100.0%	\$	1,442
Warren	1	14,000,000	1.9%	100.0%	\$	363
Washington	3	7,000,000	1.0%	0.0%	\$	65
Wayne	1	1,200,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	71
White	1	250,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	11
Williamson	5	3,210,000	0.4%	100.0%	\$	24
Wilson	2	3,697,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	40
Statewide	1	425,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	9
Statewide Total	184	\$ 725,739,479	100.0%	63.0%	\$	128

Table D-11a. (continued)

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

		Number			-		July 2002 ti	•		•		
			ceptual				g & Design		Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	millions]	Νι	Number Cost [in millions]			Nu	Number Cost [in millions]		
Bledsoe	1	50.0%	\$ 3.2	24.0%	1	50.0%	\$ 10.0	76.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%
Blount	1	100.0%	4.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Bradley	1	25.0%	0.3	1.4%	2	50.0%	9.7	43.0%	1	25.0%	12.5	55.6%
Campbell	1	100.0%	8.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Carter	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cheatham	2	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Chester	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Claiborne	2	100.0%	12.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cocke	1	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Coffee	4	100.0%	30.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cumberland	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Davidson	11	45.8%	41.2	17.7%	9	37.5%	158.7	68.2%	4	16.7%	32.7	14.1%
Decatur	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dickson	1	50.0%	1.0	14.3%	1	50.0%	6.0	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dyer	1	50.0%	0.2	1.8%	1	50.0%	8.5	98.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fayette	2	100.0%	13.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fentress	1	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Franklin	3	100.0%	2.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gibson	2	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grainger	2	100.0%	5.1	100.0%	0	0.070	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Greene	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamblen	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamilton	3	50.0%	1.2	9.3%	3	50.0%	11.9	90.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardeman	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.070	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardin	1	50.0%	0.1	1.1%	1	50.0%	7.0	98.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hawkins	1	50.0%	0.3	18.5%	1	50.0%	1.1	81.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Haywood	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Henderson	2	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.070	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hickman	5	100.0%	11.1	100.0%	0	0.070	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jackson	1	100.0%	5.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jefferson	5	83.3%	13.0	99.2%	1	16.7%	0.1	0.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Johnson	2	66.7%	2.1	26.3%	1	33.3%	6.0	73.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	2	50.0%	8.8	15.4%	0	0.070	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	48.0	84.6%
Lauderdale	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lawrence	2	100.0%	19.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Table D-11b. Law Enforcement Projects by County and by Stage of Development

Table D-11b. (continued)													
		Con	ceptual				g & Design			Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in]	nillions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]	Νι	umber	Cost [in r	nillions]	
Loudon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
McMinn	4	100.0%	6.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Marion	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Marshall	2	100.0%	2.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Maury	2	66.7%	2.9	75.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.9	24.7%	
Monroe	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	51.8%	1	50.0%	0.2	48.2%	
Montgomery	3	60.0%	1.2	82.9%	2	40.0%	0.3	17.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Morgan	1	100.0%	1.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Obion	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Perry	2	100.0%	3.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Pickett	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	5.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Polk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Putnam	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Rhea	1	100.0%	5.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Roane	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	5.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Robertson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.3	100.0%	
Rutherford	2	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sevier	5	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Shelby	6	20.7%	7.7	7.3%	16	55.2%	34.1	32.6%	7	24.1%	62.8	60.0%	
Smith	1	50.0%	7.5	98.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	2.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Stewart	1	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sullivan	2	100.0%	7.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sumner	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	16.7%	1	50.0%	1.0	83.3%	
Union	1	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Van Buren	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	7.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Warren	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	14.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Washington	2	66.7%	5.5	78.6%	1	33.3%	1.5	21.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Wayne	1	100.0%	1.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
White	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Williamson	3	60.0%	2.4	75.1%	2	40.0%	0.8	24.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Wilson	2	100.0%	3.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Regional	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Statewide	113	61.4%	\$ 271.2	37.4%	53	28.8%	\$ 295.0	40.7%	18	9.8%	\$ 159.5	22.0%	

Table D-11b. (continued)

County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cos	st Per
County	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	Cost in CIP	Ca	apita
Anderson	2	\$ 2,000,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	28
Blount	1	50,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	0
Bradley	2	5,010,000	1.2%	100.0%	\$	56
Campbell	1	1,000,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	25
Carroll	1	100,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	3
Carter	1	500,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	9
Cheatham	1	600,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	16
Coffee	1	100,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	2
Cumberland	1	300,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	6
Davidson	39	176,711,000	42.5%	100.0%	\$	313
Decatur	1	250,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	21
Franklin	2	1,420,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	36
Greene	1	500,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	8
Hamblen	1	900,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	15
Hamilton	9	51,260,000	12.3%	100.0%	\$	167
Haywood	2	400,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	20
Jefferson	2	650,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	14
Johnson	1	50,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	3
Knox	4	18,098,800	4.3%	100.0%	\$	47
Lawrence	2	5,022,000	1.2%	0.0%	\$	126
Loudon	2	1,320,000	0.3%	94.7%	\$	33
McMinn	3	1,535,000	0.4%	8.8%	\$	31
McNairy	2	2,100,000	0.5%	38.1%	\$	85
Madison	1	300,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	3
Maury	2	1,110,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	16
Montgomery	4	6,457,500	1.6%	100.0%	\$	48
Morgan	1	1,000,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	50
Obion	2	200,000	0.0%	25.0%	\$	6
Polk	1	500,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	31
Putnam	1	50,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	1
Robertson	2	1,363,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	24
Rutherford	1	250,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	1
Shelby	25	106,684,685	25.6%	100.0%	\$	119
Sullivan	3	540,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	4
Sumner	2	1,330,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	10
Unicoi	1	5,000,000	1.2%	0.0%	\$	282
Washington	2	6,400,000	1.5%	85.9%	\$	59
Wayne	1	250,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	15
Weakley	1	1,000,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	29
Williamson	9	13,810,000	3.3%	96.4%	\$	103
Statewide	141	\$ 416,121,985	100.0%	93.9%	\$	73

Table D-12a. Storm Water Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP* —Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Table D-12b. Storm Water Projects by County and by Stage of Development

		Conc	eptual			Planning	a & Design			Cons	truction	
County	Nur	nber	Cost [in ı	millions]	Nu	nber	Cost [in I	millions]	Nur	nber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Anderson	1	50.0%	\$ 1.0	50.0%	1	50.0%	\$ 1.0	50.0%	0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Blount	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Bradley	1	50.0%	1.5	29.9%	1	50.0%	3.5	70.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Campbell	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Carter	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cheatham	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Coffee	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cumberland	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Davidson	1	2.6%	6.5	3.7%	22	56.4%	27.3	15.5%	16	41.0%	142.9	80.9%
Decatur	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Franklin	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.4	29.6%	1	50.0%	1.0	70.4%
Greene	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamblen	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamilton	4	44.4%	2.9	5.6%	4	44.4%	38.4	74.9%	1	11.1%	10.0	19.5%
Haywood	1	50.0%	0.2	37.5%	1	50.0%	0.3	62.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jefferson	2	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Johnson	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	2	50.0%	15.1	83.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	3.0	16.8%
Lawrence	2	100.0%	5.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Loudon	1	50.0%	1.3	94.7%	1	50.0%	0.1	5.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
McMinn	1	33.3%	0.1	4.9%	2	66.7%	1.5	95.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
McNairy	1	50.0%	1.3	61.9%	1	50.0%	0.8	38.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Madison	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%
Maury	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	1.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Montgomery	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	4.7	72.0%	2	50.0%	1.8	28.0%
Morgan	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Obion	1	50.0%	0.1	25.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Polk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Robertson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	1.4	100.0%
Rutherford	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%

Number and Estimated Cost--Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

		Conc	ceptual			Planning	& Design			Cons	truction	
County	Nu	nber	Cost [in	millions]	Nur	nber	Cost [in r	millions]	Nur	nber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Shelby	5	20.0%	2.1	2.0%	7	28.0%	3.9	3.7%	13	52.0%	100.7	94.4%
Sullivan	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0.3	60.2%	1	33.3%	0.2	39.8%
Sumner	1	50.0%	1.0	75.2%	1	50.0%	0.3	24.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unicoi	1	100.0%	5.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	6.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Wayne	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Weakley	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Williamson	4	44.4%	2.7	19.6%	3	33.3%	9.4	67.8%	2	22.2%	1.8	12.7%
Statewide	40	28.4%	\$ 50.8	12.2%	58	41.1%	\$ 102.0	24.5%	43	30.5%	\$ 263.4	63.3%

 Table D-12b. (continued)

Country	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cost Per
County	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	Cost in CIP	Capita
Anderson	1	2,000,000	1.0%	0.0%	\$ 28
Bedford	2	450,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 12
Bledsoe	1	50,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 4
Campbell	1	1,100,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$ 27
Cannon	1	100,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$8
Carter	1	60,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$1
Cheatham	1	100,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$3
Cumberland	2	115,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$2
Davidson	8	16,206,000	7.7%	100.0%	\$ 29
Fayette	1	1,300,000	0.6%	100.0%	\$ 43
Fentress	2	105,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$6
Hamilton	3	7,015,000	3.3%	100.0%	\$ 23
Hardeman	2	875,000	0.4%	100.0%	\$ 31
Hawkins	3	410,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$8
Haywood	1	50,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 3
Henderson	1	90,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 3
Houston	1	100,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 13
Jackson	1	50,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 4
Knox	3	4,105,000	2.0%	100.0%	\$ 11
McMinn	1	150,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 3
Macon	1	80,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 4
Maury	1	120,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 2
Meigs	1	250,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 22
Monroe	1	50,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 1
Montgomery	2	300,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$2
Overton	1	1,500,000	0.7%	100.0%	\$ 74
Putnam	3	275,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 4
Roane	2	245,000	0.1%	51.0%	\$5
Robertson	1	75,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 1
Scott	1	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 23
Shelby	15	146,567,037	69.8%	100.0%	\$ 164
Smith	2	2,090,000	1.0%	4.3%	\$ 116
Sullivan	3	1,098,000	0.5%	36.4%	\$ 7
Sumner	4	8,800,000	4.2%	0.0%	\$ 66
Warren	2	665,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$ 17
Washington	3	1,375,000	0.7%	14.5%	\$ 13
Williamson	9	10,970,000	5.2%	81.1%	\$ 82
Wilson	2	600,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 7
Statewide	91	\$ 209,991,037	100.0%	90.1%	

Table D-13a. Solid Waste Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP* —Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Table D-13b. Solid Waste Projects by County and by Stage of Development

Number and Estimated Cost--Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

		Con	ceptual			Plannin	g & Desig	n		Cons	truction	
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	ımber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Anderson	0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	1	100.0%	\$ 2.0	100.0%
Bedford	2	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Bledsoe	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Campbell	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cannon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Carter	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cheatham	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Cumberland	2	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Davidson	1	12.5%	1.2	7.4%	2	25.0%	3.2	19.7%	5	62.5%	11.8	72.8%
Fayette	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fentress	2	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamilton	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	7.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardeman	1	50.0%	0.8	85.7%	1	50.0%	0.1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hawkins	3	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Haywood	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Henderson	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Houston	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jackson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	4.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
McMinn	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Macon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Maury	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Meigs	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Monroe	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Montgomery	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%
Overton	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam	3	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Roane	2	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Robertson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Scott	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Shelby	1	6.7%	3.0	2.0%	8	53.3%	54.7	37.3%	6	40.0%	88.9	60.6%
Smith	2	100.0%	2.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

		Con	ceptual			Plannin	g & Desig	n		Cons	struction	
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Νι	ımber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Sullivan	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	1.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sumner	4	100.0%	8.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Warren	2	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Washington	3	100.0%	1.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Williamson	2	22.2%	3.8	35.1%	5	55.6%	3.8	34.9%	2	22.2%	3.3	30.1%
Wilson	2	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Statewide	36	39.6%	\$ 24.3	11.6%	35	38.5%	\$ 79.0	37.6%	20	22.0%	\$ 106.6	50.8%

County Number of Projects Total Estimated Cost Percent Total Cost Cost nCP Cost nCP Capita Anderson 2 \$ 2,750,000 2.0% 72.7% \$ 38 Bedford 1 550,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 14 Bradley 4 1,068,000 0.3% 448.0% \$ 44 Campbell 2 400,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 13 Carroll 1 76,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 33 Carter 2 732,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 32 Cumberland 1 1,200,000 0.9% 100.0% \$ 24 Decatur 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 3.6% \$ 48 Greene 4 6,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 48 Greene 4 6,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 95 Hamblen 1 320,000 0.7% 0.0% </th <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th><u>J</u></th> <th></th> <th></th>				<u>J</u>		
Anderson 2 \$ 2,750,000 2.0% 72.7% \$ 38 Bedford 1 550,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 14 Blount 3 417,000 0.3% 48.0% \$ 4 Campbell 2 400,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 10 Carroll 1 76,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 33 Carter 2 732,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 33 Chester 1 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 25 Davidson 11 24,830,000 18.0% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Greene 4 6,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 24	County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cost Per
Bedford 1 550,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 14 Bount 3 417,000 0.3% 48.0% \$ 4 Bount 2 400,000 0.8% 19.4% \$ 10 Campbell 2 400,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 10 Carroll 1 76,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 33 Cheatham 4 1,435,000 1.0% 75.6% \$ 39 Cheatham 4 1,200,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 22 Davidson 11 24,80,000 18.0% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 23 Grainger 1 1000,000 0.4% 0.0% \$	Anderson	_				
Blount 3 417,000 0.3% 48.0% \$ 4 Bradley 4 1,068,000 0.8% 19.4% \$ 12 Campbell 2 400,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 10 Carroll 1 76,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 33 Cheatham 4 1,435,000 1.0% 75.6% \$ 39 Chester 1 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 25 Davidson 11 24,830,000 18.0% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% \$ 18 Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 15 <						
Bradley 4 1,068,000 0.8% 19.4% \$ 12 Campbell 2 400,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 10 Carrol 2 732,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 13 Cheater 2 732,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 33 Chester 1 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 32 Cumberland 1 1,200,000 0.3% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Gles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 15 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$						
Campbell 2 400,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 10 Carroll 1 76,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 3 Carter 2 732,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 33 Cheatham 4 1.435,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 25 Davidson 11 24,830,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1.000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 300,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ <						
Caroll 1 76,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 3 Carter 2 732,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 13 Cheatham 4 1,435,000 1.0% 75,6% \$ 39 Chester 1 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 225 Davidson 11 24,830,000 18.0% 45,6% \$ 444 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37,5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 23 Grainger 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$						
Carter 2 732,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 13 Cheatham 4 1,435,000 1.0% 75.6% \$ 39 Chester 1 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 32 Cumberland 1 1,200,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 24 Greene 4 6,00,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 15 Hamblen 1 500,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hamblen 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Hamblen 1 200,000 0.3% 68.4% \$						
Cheatham 4 1,435,000 1.0% 75.6% \$ 39 Chester 1 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 32 Cumberland 1 1,200,000 0.9% 100.0% \$ 32 Davidson 11 24,830,000 18.0% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 99 Hamiton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 151 Hancock 2 325,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 151						
Chester 1 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 32 Cumberland 1 1,200,000 0.9% 100.0% \$ 25 Davidson 11 24,830,000 18.0% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 15 Harcock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 15 Harcock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 22 Hawins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 5 22 Haweod<						
Cumberland 1 1,200,000 0.9% 100.0% \$ 25 Davidson 11 24,830,000 18.0% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Hamblen 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 15 Harcock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 15 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Hardeman 2 325,000 0.2% 0.0% \$						
Davidson 11 24,830,000 18.0% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Giles 1 750,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 48 Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 93 Hamblen 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 15 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Hawood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Gries 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 48 Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Hamblen 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% 17 Hawkood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 53.8% 13 3 <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		-				
Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1.000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 48 Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 280,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 Jefferson 1 100,000 0.4% 0.0% \$						
Fayette3550,0000.4%36.4%\$18Giles1750,0000.5%0.0%\$25Grainger11,000,0000.7%0.0%\$48Greene46,000,0004.4%0.0%\$95Grundy1325,0000.2%100.0%\$23Hamblen1500,0000.4%0.0%\$99Hamilton24,600,0003.3%0.0%\$15Hancock2750,0000.5%0.0%\$111Hardeman3475,0000.3%68.4%\$17Hawkins41,211,5000.9%0.0%\$15Henderson2325,0000.2%0.0%\$15Henderson2325,0000.2%0.0%\$35Jefferson1100,0000.1%100.0%\$2Johnson1280,0000.2%0.0%\$28Knox21,650,0001.2%100.0%\$4Lauderdale1300,0000.2%0.0%\$12Lincoln11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$35Morkairy8785,0000.3%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,			1			
Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 48 Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 15 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 Jefferson 1 100,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 2 Johnson 1 500,000 1.4% 0.0% \$ 28 Knox 2 1,650,000 1.2% 100.0% \$ <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>						
Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 48 Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 9 Hamblen 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 22 Johnson 1 100,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 28 Knox 2 1,650,000 1.2% 100.0% \$ 12 Lauderdale 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 9 Lou						
Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 9 Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 Jefferson 1 100,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 28 Knox 2 1,650,000 1.2% 100.0% \$ 4 Lauderdale 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 12 Lincoln 1 1,530,000 1.1% 100.0% \$		-				
Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 9 Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 Jefferson 1 100,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 2 Johnson 1 500,000 1.2% 100.0% \$ 4 Lawence 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 9 Loudon 1 1,530,000 1.2% 100.0% \$ 38						
Hamblen1500,0000.4%0.0%\$9Hamilton24,600,0003.3%0.0%\$15Hancock2750,0000.5%0.0%\$111Hardeman3475,0000.3%68.4%\$17Hawkins41,211,5000.9%0.0%\$22Haywood1300,0000.2%0.0%\$15Henderson2325,0000.2%53.8%\$13Houston1280,0000.2%0.0%\$22Johnson1500,0000.4%0.0%\$28Knox21,650,0001.2%100.0%\$4Lauderdale1300,0000.2%0.0%\$12Lincoln11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$32Marshall1375,0000.3%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.4%100.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.	Greene	4				
Hamilton24,600,0003.3%0.0%\$15Hancock2750,0000.5%0.0%\$111Hardeman3475,0000.3%68.4%\$17Hawkins41,211,5000.9%0.0%\$22Haywood1300,0000.2%0.0%\$15Henderson2325,0000.2%0.0%\$35Jefferson1280,0000.2%0.0%\$22Johnson1500,0000.4%0.0%\$28Knox21,650,0001.2%100.0%\$4Lauderdale1300,0000.2%0.0%\$12Lincoln11,530,0001.4%0.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$32Monroe11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$5Putnam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$5Rhea1250,0000.4%	Grundy	1				
Hancock2750,0000.5%0.0%\$111Hardeman3475,0000.3%68.4%\$17Hawkins41,211,5000.9%0.0%\$22Haywood1300,0000.2%0.0%\$15Henderson2325,0000.2%53.8%\$13Houston1280,0000.2%0.0%\$35Jefferson1100,0000.1%100.0%\$2Johnson1500,0000.4%0.0%\$28Knox21,650,0001.2%100.0%\$4Lauderdale1300,0000.2%100.0%\$11Lawrence1500,0000.4%0.0%\$12Lincoln11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$32Marshall1375,0000.3%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.4%100.0%\$8						
Hardeman3475,0000.3%68.4%\$17Hawkins41,211,5000.9%0.0%\$22Haywood1300,0000.2%0.0%\$15Henderson2325,0000.2%0.0%\$35Jefferson1280,0000.2%0.0%\$35Jefferson1100,0000.1%100.0%\$2Johnson1500,0000.4%0.0%\$28Knox21,650,0001.2%100.0%\$4Lauderdale1300,0000.2%100.0%\$11Lawrence1500,0000.4%0.0%\$12Lincoln11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$35McNairy8785,0000.6%31.8%\$32Marshall1375,0000.4%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%100.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$8Anam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2	Hamilton		4,600,000			
Hawkins41,211,5000.9%0.0%\$22Haywood1300,0000.2%0.0%\$15Henderson2325,0000.2%0.0%\$35Jefferson1100,0000.1%100.0%\$2Johnson1500,0000.4%0.0%\$28Knox21,650,0001.2%100.0%\$4Lauderdale1300,0000.2%100.0%\$11Lawrence1500,0000.4%0.0%\$12Lincoln1300,0000.2%0.0%\$9Loudon11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$32Marshall1375,0000.3%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$31Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$34Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$33Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea10.0000.1%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1% </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>750,000</td> <td>0.5%</td> <td>0.0%</td> <td>\$ 111</td>			750,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$ 111
Haywood1300,0000.2%0.0%\$15Henderson2325,0000.2%53.8%\$13Houston1280,0000.2%0.0%\$35Jefferson1100,0000.1%100.0%\$2Johnson1500,0000.4%0.0%\$28Knox21,650,0001.2%100.0%\$4Lauderdale1300,0000.2%100.0%\$11Lawrence1500,0000.4%0.0%\$12Lincoln11,530,0000.2%0.0%\$9Loudon11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$35McNairy8785,0000.6%31.8%\$32Marshall1375,0000.4%0.0%\$13Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$38Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$84Obion1150,0000.4%100.0%\$5Putnam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2	Hardeman	3	475,000	0.3%	68.4%	
Henderson2325,0000.2%53.8%\$13Houston1280,0000.2%0.0%\$35Jefferson1100,0000.1%100.0%\$2Johnson1500,0000.4%0.0%\$28Knox21,650,0001.2%100.0%\$4Lauderdale1300,0000.2%100.0%\$11Lawrence1500,0000.4%0.0%\$12Lincoln1300,0000.2%0.0%\$9Loudon11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$32Marshall1375,0000.3%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$4Abion1150,0000.4%0.0%\$5Putnam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2	Hawkins	4	1,211,500	0.9%	0.0%	\$ 22
Houston1280,0000.2%0.0%\$35Jefferson1100,0000.1%100.0%\$2Johnson1500,0000.4%0.0%\$28Knox21,650,0001.2%100.0%\$4Lauderdale1300,0000.2%100.0%\$11Lawrence1500,0000.4%0.0%\$12Lincoln1300,0000.2%0.0%\$9Loudon11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$35McNairy8785,0000.6%31.8%\$32Marshall1375,0000.4%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$5Putnam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.4%100.0%\$8Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2	Haywood		300,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 15
Jefferson1100,0000.1%100.0%\$2Johnson1500,0000.4%0.0%\$28Knox21,650,0001.2%100.0%\$4Lauderdale1300,0000.2%100.0%\$11Lawrence1500,0000.4%0.0%\$12Lincoln1300,0000.2%0.0%\$9Loudon11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$35McNairy8785,0000.6%31.8%\$32Marshall1375,0000.3%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$84Obion1150,0000.1%0.0%\$5Putnam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2	Henderson	2	325,000	0.2%	53.8%	\$ 13
Johnson1500,0000.4%0.0%\$28Knox21,650,0001.2%100.0%\$4Lauderdale1300,0000.2%100.0%\$11Lawrence1500,0000.4%0.0%\$12Lincoln1300,0000.2%0.0%\$9Loudon11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$35McNairy8785,0000.6%31.8%\$32Marshall1375,0000.3%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$84Obion1150,0000.1%0.0%\$5Putnam2500,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2	Houston	1	280,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 35
Knox21,650,0001.2%100.0%\$4Lauderdale1300,0000.2%100.0%\$11Lawrence1500,0000.4%0.0%\$12Lincoln1300,0000.2%0.0%\$9Loudon11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$35McNairy8785,0000.6%31.8%\$32Marshall1375,0000.3%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$84Obion1150,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.4%100.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2	Jefferson	1	100,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$2
Lauderdale1300,0000.2%100.0%\$11Lawrence1500,0000.4%0.0%\$12Lincoln1300,0000.2%0.0%\$9Loudon11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$35McNairy8785,0000.6%31.8%\$32Marshall1375,0000.3%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$84Obion1150,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2	Johnson	1	500,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$ 28
Lawrence1500,0000.4%0.0%\$12Lincoln1300,0000.2%0.0%\$9Loudon11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$35McNairy8785,0000.6%31.8%\$32Marshall1375,0000.3%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$84Obion1150,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2	Knox	2	1,650,000	1.2%	100.0%	\$ 4
Lawrence1500,0000.4%0.0%\$12Lincoln1300,0000.2%0.0%\$9Loudon11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$35McNairy8785,0000.6%31.8%\$32Marshall1375,0000.3%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$84Obion1150,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2	Lauderdale	1	300,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$ 11
Lincoln1300,0000.2%0.0%\$9Loudon11,530,0001.1%100.0%\$38McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$35McNairy8785,0000.6%31.8%\$32Marshall1375,0000.3%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$5Putnam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2	Lawrence	1		0.4%	0.0%	\$ 12
McMinn21,750,0001.3%0.0%\$ 35McNairy8785,0000.6%31.8%\$ 32Marshall1375,0000.3%0.0%\$ 14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$ 28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$ 13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$ 84Obion1150,0000.1%0.0%\$ 5Putnam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$ 8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$ 9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$ 2	Lincoln	1	300,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$9
McNairy8785,0000.6%31.8%\$ 32Marshall1375,0000.3%0.0%\$ 14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$ 28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$ 13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$ 84Obion1150,0000.1%0.0%\$ 5Putnam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$ 8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$ 9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$ 2	Loudon	1	1,530,000	1.1%	100.0%	\$ 38
Marshall1375,0000.3%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$84Obion1150,0000.1%0.0%\$5Putnam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2	McMinn	2			0.0%	\$ 35
Marshall1375,0000.3%0.0%\$14Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$84Obion1150,0000.1%0.0%\$5Putnam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2	McNairy	8	785,000	0.6%	31.8%	\$ 32
Maury41,975,0001.4%50.6%\$ 28Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$ 13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$ 84Obion1150,0000.1%0.0%\$ 5Putnam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$ 8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$ 9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$ 2						
Monroe1500,0000.4%0.0%\$13Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$84Obion1150,0000.1%0.0%\$5Putnam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2		4				
Montgomery811,350,0008.2%100.0%\$84Obion1150,0000.1%0.0%\$5Putnam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2						
Obion1150,0000.1%0.0%\$5Putnam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2						
Putnam2500,0000.4%100.0%\$8Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2	v .					-
Rhea1250,0000.2%0.0%\$9Roane1100,0000.1%0.0%\$2			1			
Roane 1 100,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 2						

Table D-14a. Fire Protection Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP* —Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cost Per
County	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	Cost in CIP	Capita
Rutherford	1	1,385,000	1.0%	100.0%	\$ 7
Scott	1	50,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 2
Sevier	4	3,095,000	2.2%	100.0%	\$ 42
Shelby	11	24,841,558	18.1%	100.0%	\$ 28
Stewart	1	790,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 62
Sullivan	3	2,080,000	1.5%	100.0%	\$ 14
Sumner	6	8,080,000	5.9%	0.0%	\$ 60
Tipton	1	300,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$6
Unicoi	4	1,070,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$ 60
Warren	1	350,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$9
Washington	9	5,435,000	3.9%	63.2%	\$ 50
Wayne	1	200,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 12
Weakley	2	1,300,000	0.9%	0.0%	\$ 38
Williamson	14	10,025,000	7.3%	72.7%	\$ 75
Wilson	2	1,500,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$ 16
Statewide	165	\$ 137,626,058	100.0%	57.6%	\$24

Table D-14a. (continued)

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Table D-14b. Fire Protection Projects by County and by Stage of Development
Number and Estimated CostFive-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

	Conceptual				Planning & Design				Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in I	nillions]	Nu	ımber	Cost [in r	nillions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]
Anderson	1	50.0%	\$ 2.0	72.7%	1	50.0%	\$ 0.8	27.3%	0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Bedford	1	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Blount	2	66.7%	0.3	64.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.2	36.0%
Bradley	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	1.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Campbell	1	50.0%	0.2	50.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Carroll	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Carter	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0.7	100.0%
Cheatham	1	25.0%	0.3	17.4%	1	25.0%	0.1	7.0%	2	50.0%	1.1	75.6%
Chester	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cumberland	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.2	100.0%
Davidson	1	9.1%	1.8	7.0%	7	63.6%	18.6	75.0%	3	27.3%	4.5	17.9%
Decatur	1	50.0%	0.3	62.5%	1	50.0%	0.2	37.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dyer	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fayette	1	33.3%	0.2	36.4%	2	66.7%	0.4	63.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Giles	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grainger	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Greene	4	100.0%	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grundy	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamblen	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamilton	1	50.0%	0.4	8.7%	1	50.0%	4.2	91.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hancock	1	50.0%	0.3	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.5	66.7%
Hardeman	1	33.3%	0.3	52.6%	2	66.7%	0.2	47.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hawkins	2	50.0%	0.8	68.1%	2	50.0%	0.4	31.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Haywood	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%
Henderson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Houston	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jefferson	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Johnson	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	2	100.0%	1.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lauderdale	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lawrence	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lincoln	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Loudon	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
McMinn	1	50.0%	1.5	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.3	14.3%
McNairy	4	50.0%	0.5	60.5%	4	50.0%	0.3	39.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

				Tab	le D-14	b. (contir	nued)						
	Conceptual					Planning & Design				Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in I	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	
Marshall	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Maury	3	75.0%	1.3	64.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0.7	35.4%	
Monroe	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Montgomery	5	62.5%	8.7	76.2%	2	25.0%	2.2	19.4%	1	12.5%	0.5	4.4%	
Obion	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Putnam	1	50.0%	0.3	50.0%	1	50.0%	0.3	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Rhea	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Roane	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Robertson	4	80.0%	1.4	63.4%	1	20.0%	0.8	36.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Rutherford	1	100.0%	1.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Scott	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sevier	3	75.0%	2.6	84.0%	1	25.0%	0.5	16.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Shelby	1	9.1%	1.0	4.0%	6	54.5%	12.6	50.8%	4	36.4%	11.2	45.2%	
Stewart	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sullivan	1	33.3%	0.9	45.2%	2	66.7%	1.1	54.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sumner	4	66.7%	6.5	80.2%	2	33.3%	1.6	19.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Tipton	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Unicoi	2	50.0%	0.2	15.9%	1	25.0%	0.5	46.7%	1	25.0%	0.4	37.4%	
Warren	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Washington	6	66.7%	4.3	79.1%	2	22.2%	0.2	4.3%	1	11.1%	0.9	16.6%	
Wayne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	
Weakley	2	100.0%	1.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Williamson	12	85.7%	7.4	73.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	14.3%	2.7	26.7%	
Wilson	1	50.0%	1.0	66.7%	1	50.0%	0.5	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Statewide	90	54.5%	\$ 63.4	46.1%	52	31.5%	\$ 49.0	35.6%	23	13.9%	\$ 25.3	18.4%	

able D 11b 1. 41.

County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent		st Per
Anderson	Projects 1	Cost \$ 1,500,000	1.1%	Cost in CIP 0.0%	\$	apita 21
Bledsoe	1	1,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	э \$	21 80
Cannon	2	210,000	0.7%	0.0%	э \$	16
Chester	1	1,500,000	0.2 <i>%</i> 1.1%	100.0%	э \$	95
Claiborne	1	6,000,000	4.4%	0.0%	\$ \$	199
Coffee	1	500,000	4.4 <i>%</i> 0.4%	0.0%	э \$	199
Cumberland	2	300,000	0.4%	100.0%	\$	6
Davidson	10	3,932,000	2.9%	68.2%	э \$	7
Greene	3	920,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$ \$	15
Grundy	1	240,000	0.7%	0.0%	Ф \$	17
Hamilton	1	675,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	2
Hancock	1	5,000,000	0.3 <i>%</i> 3.7%	0.0%	э \$	2 739
Hardin	1	300,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$ \$	12
Henderson	1	300,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	12
Hickman	1	400,000	0.2 %	0.0%	\$	18
Knox	2	910,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	2
Lauderdale	1	1,200,000	0.9%	0.0%	\$	44
Lewis	1	350,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	31
Lincoln	1	18,000,000	13.3%	0.0%	\$	569
Loudon	1	1,100,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$	27
Madison	2	12,400,000	9.1%	80.6%	\$	134
Maury	1	2,000,000	1.5%	0.0%	\$	28
Monroe	1	1,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$	25
Montgomery	3	5,100,000	3.8%	100.0%	\$	38
Morgan	1	300,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	15
Polk	1	300,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	18
Putnam	3	7,585,000	5.6%	4.0%	\$	120
Roane	1	1,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$	19
Robertson	1	200,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	4
Rutherford	2	880,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$	5
Scott	1	300,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	14
Shelby	8	55,132,000	40.7%	97.4%	\$	62
Smith	3	450,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	25
Sullivan	1	140,000	0.1%	0.0%		1
Sumner	1	500,000	0.4%	0.0%		4
Union	1	250,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	14
Van Buren	1	250,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	46
Warren	1	150,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	4
Wayne	1	2,000,000	1.5%	0.0%	\$	119
White	2	300,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	13
Wilson	1	1,000,000	0.7%	0.0%		11
Statewide	71	\$ 135,574,000	100.0%	55.6%		24

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP* —Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

Table D-15a. Public Health Facility Projects by County

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Table D-15b. Public Health Facility Projects by County and by Stage of Development

				· · ·								
			ceptual		Planning & Design Number Cost [in millions]				Construction			
County		mber		millions]	Nu	mber				mber	Cost [in I	
Anderson	0	0.0%	\$0		1	100.0%	\$ 1.5			0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Bledsoe	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%
Cannon	1	50.0%	0.2	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		50.0%	0.1	28.6%
Chester	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Claiborne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	6.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Coffee	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		100.0%	0.5	100.0%
Cumberland	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Davidson	4	40.0%	1.3	31.8%	4	40.0%	1.6	40.3%	2	20.0%	1.1	27.8%
Greene	3	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grundy	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamilton	1	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hancock	1	100.0%	5.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardin	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Henderson	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hickman	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	2	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lauderdale	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lewis	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%
Lincoln	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	18.0	100.0%
Loudon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Madison	1	50.0%	2.4	19.4%	1	50.0%	10.0	80.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Maury	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Monroe	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Montgomery	1	33.3%	0.2	4.3%	1	33.3%	4.3	83.3%	1	33.3%	0.6	12.4%
Morgan	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Polk	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam	3	100.0%	7.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Roane	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Robertson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Rutherford	2	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0			0.0%	0	0.0%
Scott	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%
Shelby	2	25.0%	1.5	2.7%	4	50.0%	3.6	6.6%		25.0%	50.0	90.7%

Number and Estimated Cost—Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

				Idu	ne D-1	bb. (conti	nueu)						
		Con	ceptual			Plannin	g & Desig	n		Construction			
County	Nu	ımber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	
Smith	2	66.7%	0.3	66.7%	1	33.3%	0.2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sullivan	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sumner	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Union	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Van Buren	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Warren	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Wayne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
White	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Wilson	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Statewide	41	57.7%	\$ 29.7	21.9%	21	29.6%	\$ 35.2	26.0%	9	12.7%	\$ 70.6	52.1%	

Table D-15b. (continued)

Table D-16a. Housing Projects by County

County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cost Per
County	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	Cost in CIP	Capita
Cannon	1	\$ 500,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 39
Carroll	1	500,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 17
Cheatham	1	1,000,000	1.3%	0.0%	\$ 27
Clay	1	220,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 28
Cumberland	2	775,000	1.0%	100.0%	\$ 16
Davidson	2	52,100,000	66.1%	100.0%	\$ 92
DeKalb	2	2,524,382	3.2%	0.0%	\$ 144
Gibson	2	1,300,000	1.6%	23.1%	\$ 27
Haywood	1	540,000	0.7%	100.0%	\$ 27
Humphreys	3	4,930,000	6.3%	0.0%	\$ 272
Jackson	3	2,580,000	3.3%	80.6%	\$ 231
Macon	1	137,500	0.2%	100.0%	\$7
Obion	1	146,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$5
Overton	3	1,500,000	1.9%	0.0%	\$ 74
Perry	2	1,500,000	1.9%	0.0%	\$ 200
Putnam	2	4,650,000	5.9%	100.0%	\$ 74
Rutherford	1	500,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$3
Wayne	2	2,943,000	3.7%	0.0%	\$ 175
White	1	500,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 21
Statewide Total	32	\$ 78,845,882	100.0%	76.8%	\$ 14

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP* —Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Number and Estimated CostFive-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*												
		Conc	ceptual		Planning & Design				Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in n	nillions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]
Cannon	0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	1	100.0%	\$ 0.5	100.0%
Carroll	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cheatham	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Clay	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cumberland	1	50.0%	0.5	64.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.3	35.5%
Davidson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	52.1	100.0%
DeKalb	2	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gibson	2	100.0%	1.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Haywood	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%
Humphreys	3	100.0%	4.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jackson	3	100.0%	2.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Macon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Obion	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Overton	3	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Perry	1	50.0%	1.0	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.5	33.3%
Putnam	1	50.0%	1.7	35.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	3.0	64.5%
Rutherford	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Wayne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
White	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Statewide	22	68.8%	\$ 18.9	23.9%	3	9.4%	\$ 3.1	3.9%	7	21.9%	\$ 56.9	72.2%

Table D-17a. Recreation Projects by County Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP*

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP*
—Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

	Number of	Total Catimated	Deveout of	Deveent	0	ant Dam
County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent		ost Per
	Projects	Cost		Cost in CIP		Capita
Anderson	27	\$ 8,489,800	1.0%		\$	119
Bedford	13	3,196,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	83
Benton	2	1,048,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	63
Bledsoe	2	14,060,000	1.7%	0.0%	\$	1,123
Blount	7	2,598,000	0.3%		\$	24
Bradley	2	395,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	4
Campbell	9	8,582,972	1.0%	74.3%	\$	214
Cannon	2	125,000	0.0%	60.0%	\$	10
Carroll	4	1,585,000	0.2%	88.3%	\$	54
Carter	8	3,886,000	0.5%	21.3%	\$	68
Cheatham	5	8,200,000	1.0%	0.0%	\$	224
Chester	3	8,575,000	1.0%	0.9%	\$	546
Claiborne	5	3,808,000	0.5%	11.8%	\$	126
Cumberland	3	2,225,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	46
Davidson	35	120,511,000	14.5%	100.0%	\$	213
Decatur	3	650,000	0.1%	76.9%	\$	56
DeKalb	1	870,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	50
Dickson	6	3,095,000	0.4%	8.1%	\$	71
Fayette	1	500,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	16
Fentress	2	1,710,000	0.2%	8.8%	\$	102
Franklin	5	2,562,510	0.3%	0.0%	\$	64
Gibson	4	5,090,000	0.6%	29.5%	\$	106
Giles	7	830,928	0.1%	0.0%	\$	28
Grainger	3	500,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	24
Greene	4	1,300,000	0.2%	50.0%	\$	21
Grundy	4	480,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	34
Hamblen	4	7,719,982	0.9%	93.3%	\$	132
Hamilton	38	17,202,480	2.1%	0.0%	\$	56
Hancock	2	180,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	27
Hardeman	6	415,000	0.0%	12.0%	\$	15
Hardin	8	2,015,000	0.2%	71.2%	\$	78
Hawkins	7	1,358,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	25
Haywood	3	555,000	0.1%	68.5%	\$	28
Henderson	3	2,290,000	0.3%	4.4%		89
Henry	4	5,610,000	0.7%	5.3%	\$	180
Hickman	1	160,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	7
Houston	3	380,000	0.0%		\$	48
Humphreys	3	410,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	23
Jefferson	5	2,629,000	0.3%	40.7%	\$	58
Johnson	3	3,430,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	194
Knox	29	99,420,716	11.9%	47.7%	\$	258
Lake	1	200,000	0.0%	0.0%	φ \$	250
Lauderdale	1	3,500,000	0.0%		э \$	130
	4		0.4%			39
Lawrence	4	1,565,815	0.2%	0.0%	\$	39

County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	st Per
	Projects	Cost		Cost in CIP	apita
Lewis	4	3,800,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$ 332
Lincoln	3	1,450,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 46
Loudon	7	17,290,000	2.1%	90.7%	\$ 430
McMinn	7	3,325,000	0.4%	97.0%	\$ 67
McNairy	14	4,508,000	0.5%	39.1%	\$ 183
Macon	3	6,560,000	0.8%	100.0%	\$ 314
Madison	6	4,453,000	0.5%	100.0%	\$ 48
Marion	2	150,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 5
Marshall	7	4,958,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 183
Maury	7	16,085,500	1.9%	95.7%	\$ 229
Meigs	1	700,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 63
Monroe	5	3,567,500	0.4%	54.0%	\$ 90
Montgomery	14	39,970,000	4.8%	91.2%	\$ 296
Morgan	2	342,000	0.0%	73.1%	\$ 17
Overton	1	150,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 7
Pickett	1	220,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 44
Polk	1	75,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 5
Putnam	5	2,445,000	0.3%	26.6%	\$ 39
Rhea	1	250,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 9
Roane	12	8,180,000	1.0%	2.2%	\$ 157
Robertson	7	9,345,000	1.1%	95.5%	\$ 167
Rutherford	14	26,428,350	3.2%	98.7%	\$ 139
Scott	4	4,352,240	0.5%	0.0%	\$ 202
Sequatchie	1	150,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 13
Sevier	5	1,526,470	0.2%	19.6%	\$ 21
Shelby	97	182,305,784	21.9%	97.9%	\$ 203
Smith	1	200,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 11
Stewart	6	2,929,000	0.4%	22.8%	\$ 232
Sullivan	23	15,860,000	1.9%	80.0%	\$ 104
Sumner	12	21,074,100	2.5%	3.1%	\$ 157
Tipton	1	500,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 9
Unicoi	9	2,359,340	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 133
Union	2	250,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 14
Van Buren	2	2,110,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 385
Warren	2	230,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 6
Washington	14	11,055,385	1.3%	92.8%	\$ 102
Wayne	4	1,252,700	0.2%	0.0%	74
Weakley	3	800,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 23
White	1	300,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 13
Williamson	21	55,490,000	6.7%	35.1%	\$ 415
Wilson	4	21,500,000	2.6%	0.0%	\$ 234
Regional	2	665,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 0
Statewide	630	\$ 833,076,572	100.0%	65.9%	146

Table D-17a.	(continued)
--------------	-------------

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP). **Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

			ceptual				g & Design		Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in n	nillions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in I	nillions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Anderson	13	48.1%	\$ 2.7	31.6%	11	40.7%	\$ 4.3	50.5%	3	11.1%	\$ 1.5	17.9%
Bedford	10	76.9%	2.9	90.8%	1	7.7%	0.1	4.1%	2	15.4%	0.2	5.2%
Benton	1	50.0%	0.6	53.4%	1	50.0%	0.5	46.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Bledsoe	2	100.0%	14.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Blount	2	28.6%	1.8	69.3%	4	57.1%	0.7	28.3%	1	14.3%	0.1	2.5%
Bradley	2	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Campbell	5	55.6%	1.9	22.4%	2	22.2%	6.4	74.3%	2	22.2%	0.3	3.4%
Cannon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Carroll	1	25.0%	0.1	6.9%	1	25.0%	0.1	4.7%	2	50.0%	1.4	88.3%
Carter	6	75.0%	3.3	85.2%	2	25.0%	0.6	14.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cheatham	3	60.0%	5.4	65.9%	1	20.0%	1.5	18.3%	1	20.0%	1.3	15.9%
Chester	3	100.0%	8.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Claiborne	2	40.0%	2.2	56.5%	1	20.0%	0.5	13.3%	2	40.0%	1.2	30.2%
Cumberland	3	100.0%	2.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Davidson	3	8.6%	3.0	2.5%	14	40.0%	47.5	39.4%	18	51.4%	70.0	58.1%
Decatur	3	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
DeKalb	1	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dickson	2	33.3%	1.2	39.1%	3	50.0%	1.8	58.5%	1	16.7%	0.1	2.4%
Fayette	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fentress	1	50.0%	1.6	91.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	8.8%
Franklin	2	40.0%	2.0	79.6%	2	40.0%	0.3	13.6%	1	20.0%	0.2	6.8%
Gibson	1	25.0%	1.5	29.5%	2	50.0%	1.3	26.3%	1	25.0%	2.3	44.2%
Giles	1	14.3%	0.2	18.1%	2	28.6%	0.4	43.4%	4	57.1%	0.3	38.5%
Grainger	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.1	20.0%	2	66.7%	0.4	80.0%
Greene	3	75.0%	1.2	88.5%	1	25.0%	0.2	11.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grundy	4	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamblen	2	50.0%	1.4	18.1%	1	25.0%	0.3	4.1%	1	25.0%	6.0	77.7%
Hamilton	6	15.8%	5.6	32.3%	31	81.6%	10.4	60.2%	1	2.6%	1.3	7.6%
Hancock	1	50.0%	0.1	55.6%	1	50.0%	0.1	44.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardeman	4	66.7%	0.2	57.8%	2	33.3%	0.2	42.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardin	8	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hawkins	7	100.0%	1.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Haywood	2	66.7%	0.3	45.9%	1	33.3%	0.3	54.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Henderson	1	33.3%	1.7	73.8%	2	66.7%	0.6	26.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Henry	3	75.0%	5.3	94.7%	1	25.0%	0.3	5.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Table D-17b. Recreation Projects by County and by Stage of Development Number and Estimated Cost—Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

Building Tennessee's Tomorrow: Anticipating the State's Infrastructure Needs

				Та	ble D-17	'b. (conti	nued)					
		Cond	ceptual			Planning	g & Design		Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	millions]	Nun	nber	Cost [in n	nillions]
Hickman	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Houston	2	66.7%	0.2	63.2%	1	33.3%	0.1	36.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Humphreys	1	33.3%	0.1	32.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0.3	67.1%
Jefferson	1	20.0%	0.1	3.8%	2	40.0%	0.1	4.9%	2	40.0%	2.4	91.3%
Johnson	2	66.7%	0.6	17.5%	1	33.3%	2.8	82.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	12	41.4%	63.2	63.6%	11	37.9%	4.9	5.0%	6	20.7%	31.3	31.5%
Lake	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lauderdale	1	100.0%	3.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lawrence	2	50.0%	0.9	56.2%	2	50.0%	0.7	43.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lewis	4	100.0%	3.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lincoln	1	33.3%	1.2	82.8%	1	33.3%	0.1	3.4%	1	33.3%	0.2	13.8%
Loudon	2	28.6%	3.2	18.2%	3	42.9%	3.7	21.3%	2	28.6%	10.5	60.4%
McMinn	5	71.4%	2.7	81.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0.6	18.8%
McNairy	9	64.3%	1.8	39.8%	5	35.7%	2.7	60.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Macon	2	66.7%	6.1	92.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.5	7.6%
Madison	3	50.0%	1.4	30.3%	3	50.0%	3.1	69.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marion	1	50.0%	0.1	66.7%	1	50.0%	0.1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marshall	4	57.1%	1.3	25.6%	2	28.6%	3.6	72.7%	1	14.3%	0.1	1.7%
Maury	3	42.9%	0.7	4.1%	3	42.9%	1.9	12.0%	1	14.3%	13.5	83.9%
Meigs	1	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Monroe	3	60.0%	3.2	89.7%	2	40.0%	0.4	10.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Montgomery	5	35.7%	12.7	31.8%	6	42.9%	16.7	41.7%	3	21.4%	10.6	26.6%
Morgan	1	50.0%	0.1	26.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.3	73.1%
Overton	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Pickett	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Polk	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam	4	80.0%	2.4	98.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0.1	2.0%
Rhea	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Roane	10	83.3%	8.0	97.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	16.7%	0.2	2.1%
Robertson	2	28.6%	0.2	1.6%	4	57.1%	8.9	95.2%	1	14.3%	0.3	3.2%
Rutherford	7	50.0%	17.4	65.8%	4	28.6%	7.6	28.9%	3	21.4%	1.4	5.3%
Scott	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	4.3	98.8%	1	25.0%	0.1	1.2%
Sequatchie	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sevier	2	40.0%	0.9	60.2%	2	40.0%	0.5	30.1%	1	20.0%	0.1	9.7%
Shelby	14	14.4%	15.3	8.4%	61	62.9%	102.3	56.1%	22	22.7%	64.7	35.5%
Smith	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

				10		<u>b. (conti</u>	,					
			ceptual				g & Desigr				truction	
County	Nur	nber	Cost [in r	nillions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in I	millions]	Nu	nber	Cost [in n	nillions]
Stewart	5	83.3%	2.3	77.2%	1	16.7%	0.7	22.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sullivan	17	73.9%	7.5	47.3%	3	13.0%	5.6	35.4%	3	13.0%	2.7	17.3%
Sumner	4	33.3%	4.1	19.5%	7	58.3%	16.5	78.1%	1	8.3%	0.5	2.4%
Tipton	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unicoi	3	33.3%	1.3	55.1%	2	22.2%	0.3	14.4%	4	44.4%	0.7	30.5%
Union	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Van Buren	2	100.0%	2.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Warren	1	50.0%	0.1	34.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	65.2%
Washington	9	64.3%	7.9	71.4%	3	21.4%	1.2	10.9%	2	14.3%	2.0	17.6%
Wayne	2	50.0%	0.4	29.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	0.9	70.1%
Weakley	2	66.7%	0.6	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.2	25.0%
White	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%
Williamson	14	66.7%	49.9	89.9%	4	19.0%	2.4	4.3%	3	14.3%	3.2	5.8%
Wilson	3	75.0%	6.5	30.2%	1	25.0%	15.0	69.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Regional	2	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Statewide	284	45.1%	\$ 313.3	37.6%	230	36.5%	\$ 285.3	34.3%	116	18.4%	\$ 234.4	28.1%

Table D-17b. (continued)

	-		<u> </u>		•	
County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent		st Per
	Projects	Cost		Cost in CIP		apita
Anderson		\$ 480,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	7
Bedford	1	4,500,000	0.9%	0.0%	\$	117
Blount	2	572,198	0.1%	0.0%	\$	5
Campbell	1	1,400,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	35
Cannon	1	75,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	6
Chester	1	100,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	6
Cumberland	3	2,475,000	0.5%	100.0%	\$	52
Davidson	13	356,135,000	71.1%	74.4%	\$	630
Decatur	1	180,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	15
DeKalb	2	600,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	34
Fentress	2	475,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	28
Franklin	3	450,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	11
Grainger	1	369,600	0.1%	0.0%	\$	18
Greene	1	300,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	5
Grundy	1	85,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	6
Hamilton	1	1,100,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	4
Hardeman	2	450,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	16
Hawkins	1	240,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	4
Henderson	1	250,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	10
Hickman	1	750,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	33
Humphreys	2	1,400,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	77
Jackson	2	1,400,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	125
Johnson	1	200,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	11
Knox	4	20,727,589	4.1%	100.0%	\$	54
Loudon	1	750,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	19
McNairy	1	140,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	6
Macon	1	200,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	10
Madison	1	420,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	5
Marion	3	900,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	32
Maury	1	350,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	5
Meigs	1	5,500,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$	491
Monroe	2	2,000,000	0.4%	50.0%	φ \$	50
Morgan	1	100,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	5
Overton	1	2,000,000	0.0%	100.0%	φ \$	99
Pickett	1	700,000	0.4 %	100.0%	φ \$	139
Polk		400,000	0.1%	0.0%	φ \$	25
	3	1,060,000	0.1%		φ \$	20
Roane		, ,				
Robertson	2	2,150,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	38
Rutherford	1	3,500,000	0.7%	100.0%	\$	18
Scott	1	291,916	0.1%	0.0%	\$	14
Sevier	1	2,500,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	34
Shelby	20	66,889,703	13.4%	100.0%	\$	75
Smith	2	350,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	19
Sullivan	1	6,000,000	1.2%	100.0%	\$	39
Sumner	2	2,300,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	17
Van Buren	1	200,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	37
Warren	1	1,400,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	36
White	1	300,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	13
Williamson	1	5,500,000	1.1%	100.0%	\$	41
Statewide	101	\$ 500,616,006	100.0%	76.4%	\$	88

Table D-18a. Libraries and Museums Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP* —Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Table D-18b. Library and Museum Projects by County and by Stage of Development

Number and Estimated Cost--Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

		Conce	eptual			Planning	& Design			Consti	ruction	
County	Nun	nber	Cost [in ı	millions]	Nun	nber	Cost [in r	millions]	Nun	nber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Anderson	0	0%	\$ 0	0%	0	0%	\$ 0	0%	1	100%	\$ 0.5	100%
Bedford	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	4.5	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Blount	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0.6	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Campbell	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1.4	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Cannon	1	100%	0.1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Chester	1	100%	0.1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cumberland	1	33%	2.0	81%	1	33%	0.4	14%	1	33%	0.1	5%
Davidson	7	54%	100.9	28%	4	31%	167.7	47%	2	15%	87.6	25%
Decatur	1	100%	0.2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
DeKalb	2	100%	0.6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Fentress	2	100%	0.5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Franklin	2	67%	0.3	56%	1	33%	0.2	44%	0	0%	0	0%
Grainger	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0.4	100%
Greene	1	100%	0.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Grundy	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0.1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Hamilton	1	100%	1.1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Hardeman	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0.5	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Hawkins	1	100%	0.2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Henderson	1	100%	0.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Hickman	1	100%	0.8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Humphreys	2	100%	1.4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Jackson	2	100%	1.4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Johnson	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0.2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Knox	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	4.0	19%	2	50%	16.7	81%
Loudon	1	100%	0.8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
McNairy	1	100%	0.1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Macon	1	100%	0.2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Madison	1	100%	0.4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Marion	2	67%	0.7	72%	1	33%	0.3	28%	0	0%	0	0%
Maury	1	100%	0.4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Meigs	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	5.5	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Monroe	2	100%	2.0	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

115

_							lucuj					
		Conce	eptual			Planning	& Design			Const	ruction	
County	Nun	nber	Cost [in	millions]	Nun	nber	Cost [in	millions]	Nun	nber	Cost [in	millions]
Morgan	1	100%	0.1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Overton	1	100%	2.0	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Pickett	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0.7	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Polk	1	100%	0.4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Roane	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	1.0	94%	1	33%	0.1	6%
Robertson	1	50%	2.0	93%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0.2	7%
Rutherford	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	3.5	100%
Scott	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Sevier	1	100%	2.5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Shelby	2	10%	8.2	12%	8	40%	35.1	53%	10	50%	23.6	35%
Smith	2	100%	0.4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sullivan	1	100%	6.0	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sumner	2	100%	2.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Van Buren	1	100%	0.2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Warren	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1.4	100%
White	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Williamson	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	5.5	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Statewide	48	48%	\$ 138.5	28%	32	32%	\$ 228.1	46%	21	21%	\$ 134.0	27%

Table D-18b. (continued)

	-	eriod July 2002 thro	5	07	
County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	ost Per
	Projects	Cost		Cost in CIP	Capita
Anderson	1	\$ 1,088,000	0.3%		\$ 15
Bedford	2	25,150,000	6.1%		656
Bledsoe	3	16,250,000	4.0%		\$ 1,298
Blount	2	2,050,000	0.5%		\$ 19
Bradley	2	9,500,000	2.3%		\$ 107
Cannon	1	500,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 39
Carroll	3	2,655,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 90
Carter	1	50,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 1
Cheatham	2	3,300,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$ 90
Cocke	2	300,000	0.1%	0.0%	9
Coffee	1	4,000,000	1.0%	0.0%	82
Cumberland	3	585,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 12
Davidson	12	129,576,000	31.6%	100.0%	\$ 229
DeKalb	3	3,000,000	0.7%	100.0%	\$ 171
Dickson	1	400,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 9
Fentress	1	100,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 6
Franklin	1	100,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 3
Giles	4	20,305,000	4.9%	0.0%	\$ 684
Greene	2	125,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 2
Hamilton	3	2,650,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 9
Hancock	2	700,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 103
Hardin	1	600,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 23
Hawkins	4	2,460,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 45
Haywood	1	60,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 3
Henderson	2	550,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 21
Henry	2	1,400,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$ 45
Jackson	2	700,000	0.2%	57.1%	\$ 63
Jefferson	1	125,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 3
Knox	2	2,668,750	0.7%	100.0%	\$ 7
Lake	2	200,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 26
Lawrence	1	7,500,000	1.8%	0.0%	\$ 187
Lincoln	1	3,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$ 95
Loudon	1	466,008	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 12
McNairy	3	500,000	0.1%	25.0%	\$ 20
Macon	1	3,000,000	0.7%	100.0%	\$ 144
Madison	1	130,000	0.0%		1
Marshall	4	1,550,000	0.4%		57
Maury	2	540,000	0.1%		8
Meigs	1	350,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 31
Monroe	1	600,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 15
Perry	2	550,000	0.1%	0.0%	73
Putnam	3	700,000	0.2%	85.7%	11
Roane	1	250,000	0.1%	100.0%	5
Robertson	5	1,735,000	0.4%	28.8%	31

Table D-19a. Community Development Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP*

-Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

County	Number of Projects	Total Estimated Cost		Percent Cost in CIP	Cost F Capit	
Scott	1	2,500,000	0.6%	0.0%	· · ·	16
Sevier	1	1,500,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	20
Shelby	19	122,869,294	29.9%	100.0%	\$ 1	37
Smith	3	600,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	33
Stewart	2	600,000	0.1%	33.3%	\$	47
Sullivan	1	400,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	3
Sumner	5	14,500,000	3.5%	0.0%	\$ 1	80
Tipton	2	350,000	0.1%	28.6%	\$	7
Unicoi	4	12,895,300	3.1%	0.0%	\$ 7	'28
Van Buren	1	100,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	18
Wayne	1	500,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	30
White	2	850,000	0.2%	11.8%	\$	36
Williamson	2	800,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	6
Statewide Total	140	\$ 410,483,352	100.0%	70.3%	\$	72

Table D-19a. (continued)

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

]			eptual	10100 000	Planning & Design				Construction			
County	Nur	nber	Cost [in r	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in		Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Anderson	0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	_	1	100.0%		100.0%
Bedford	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	25.0	99.4%	1	50.0%	0.2	0.6%
Bledsoe	2	66.7%	1.3	7.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	15.0	92.3%
Blount	1	50.0%	0.1	2.4%	1	50.0%	2.0	97.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Bradley	1	50.0%	2.5	26.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	7.0	73.7%
Cannon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	2.1	78.3%	1	33.3%	0.6	21.7%
Carter	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cheatham	2	100.0%	3.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cocke	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Coffee	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	4.0	100.0%
Cumberland	2	66.7%	0.4	68.4%	1	33.3%	0.2	31.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Davidson	1	8.3%	0.4	0.3%	6	50.0%	21.8	16.8%	5	41.7%	107.4	82.8%
DeKalb	3	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dickson	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fentress	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Franklin	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Giles	2	50.0%	15.1	74.2%	1	25.0%	0.2	1.1%	1	25.0%	5.0	24.6%
Greene	1	50.0%	0.1	60.0%	1	50.0%	0.1	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamilton	1	33.3%	0.1	4.7%	2	66.7%	2.5	95.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hancock	1	50.0%	0.3	42.9%	1	50.0%	0.4	57.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardin	1	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hawkins	4	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Haywood	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Henderson	1	50.0%	0.2	36.4%	1	50.0%	0.4	63.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Henry	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	1.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jackson	2	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jefferson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	6.3%	1	50.0%	2.5	93.7%
Lake	2	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lawrence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	7.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lincoln	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Loudon	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
McNairy	3	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Macon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Table D-19b. Community Development Projects by County and by Stage of Development Number and Estimated Cost--Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

<u> </u>
20

Table D-19b. (continued)

		Conc	eptual			Planning	g & Design			Cons	truction	
County	Nui	mber	Cost [in I	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in ı	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Madison	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marshall	2	50.0%	0.9	60.0%	1	25.0%	0.4	27.1%	1	25.0%	0.2	12.9%
Maury	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.1	25.9%	1	50.0%	0.4	74.1%
Meigs	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Monroe	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.6	100.0%
Perry	1	50.0%	0.5	90.9%	1	50.0%	0.1	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam	2	66.7%	0.6	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.1	14.3%
Roane	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%
Robertson	2	40.0%	0.8	43.2%	2	40.0%	0.5	28.0%	1	20.0%	0.5	28.8%
Scott	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sevier	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%
Shelby	1	5.3%	0.4	0.3%	6	31.6%	22.3	18.2%	12	63.2%	100.2	81.5%
Smith	1	33.3%	0.2	33.3%	2	66.7%	0.4	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Stewart	1	50.0%	0.4	66.7%	1	50.0%	0.2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sullivan	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sumner	4	80.0%	14.0	96.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0.5	3.4%
Tipton	1	50.0%	0.3	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.1	28.6%
Unicoi	2	50.0%	4.6	35.6%	2	50.0%	8.3	64.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Van Buren	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Wayne	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
White	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0.9	100.0%
Williamson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0.8	100.0%
Statewide	55	39.3%	\$ 56.0	13.6%	44	31.4%	\$ 105.2	25.6%	41	29.3%	\$ 249.3	60.7%

	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Co	st Per
County	Projects	Cost		Cost in CIP		apita
Blount	1	\$ 2,200,000	0.9%	0.0%	\$	20
Bradley	1	875,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	10
Carroll	1	500,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	17
Claiborne	1	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	17
Coffee	1	3,500,000	1.4%	0.0%	\$	72
Cumberland	1	6,000,000	2.4%	100.0%	\$	125
Davidson	1	3,050,000	1.2%	100.0%	\$	5
Dyer	1	50,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	1
Fayette	1	350,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	11
Giles	1	250,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	8
Greene	1	200,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	3
Hamblen	1	200,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	3
Hamilton	5	116,800,000	47.3%	1.3%	\$	380
Hardeman	1	75,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	3
Hardin	3	500,000	0.2%	40.0%	\$	19
Hawkins	1	706,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	13
Haywood	2	740,000	0.3%	32.4%	\$	37
Hickman	1	650,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	29
Knox	4	48,380,000	19.6%	100.0%	\$	125
McMinn	3	7,750,000	3.1%	85.2%	\$	155
McNairy	3	1,132,000	0.5%	39.8%	\$	46
Madison	2	15,000,000	6.1%	100.0%	\$	162
Marion	1	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	18
Marshall	1	225,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	8
Maury	4	5,750,000	2.3%	65.2%	\$	82
Obion	1	600,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	19
Polk	1	256,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	16
Putnam	1	2,000,000	0.8%	100.0%	\$	32
Rhea	1	750,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	26
Rutherford	2	11,500,000	4.7%	100.0%	\$	60
Sequatchie	1	300,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	26
Shelby	3	6,521,000	2.6%	100.0%	\$	7
Smith	1	1,000,000	0.4%	100.0%	\$	56
Sullivan	1	250,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	2
Unicoi	1	1,000,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	56
Washington	3	6,800,000	2.8%	92.6%	\$	63
Wayne	3	279,260	0.1%	0.0%	\$	17
Statewide Total	62	\$ 247,139,260	100.0%	46.0%	\$	43

Table D-20a. Business District Development Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP* —Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

		Conceptual					g & Desigr				truction	
County	Nur	nber	Cost [in	millions]	Nui	nber	Cost [in I	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	millions]
Blount	0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	1	100.0%	\$ 2.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Bradley	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Claiborne	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Coffee	1	100.0%	3.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cumberland	1	100.0%	6.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Davidson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.1	100.0%
Dyer	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fayette	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Giles	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Greene	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamblen	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamilton	1	20.0%	11.0	9.4%	3	60.0%	62.3	53.3%	1	20.0%	43.5	37.2%
Hardeman	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardin	2	66.7%	0.2	40.0%	1	33.3%	0.3	60.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hawkins	1	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Haywood	2	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hickman	1	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	48.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
McMinn	1	33.3%	0.7	8.4%	1	33.3%	0.5	6.5%	1	33.3%	6.6	85.2%
McNairy	1	33.3%	0.1	8.8%	1	33.3%	0.4	30.9%	1	33.3%	0.7	60.2%
Madison	2	100.0%	15.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marion	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marshall	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%
Maury	2	50.0%	5.0	87.0%	1	25.0%	0.1	1.7%	1	25.0%	0.7	11.3%
Obion	1	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Polk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Rhea	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Rutherford	1	50.0%	3.0	26.1%	1	50.0%	8.5	73.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sequatchie	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Shelby	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	2.8	42.6%	1	33.3%	3.7	57.4%

 Table D-20b. Business District Development Projects by County and by Stage of Development

 Number and Estimated Cost--Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

				Та	able D-2	0b. (cont	inued)					
		Cond	eptual			Planning	g & Design			Cons	truction	
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in I	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	millions]	Nu	nber	Cost [in	millions]
Smith	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sullivan	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unicoi	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Washington	2	66.7%	6.5	95.6%	1	33.3%	0.3	4.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Wayne	2	66.7%	0.2	64.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.1	35.8%
Statewide	31	50.0%	\$ 59.8	24.2%	23	37.1%	\$ 128.8	52.1%	8	12.9%	\$ 58.6	23.7%

County Projects Cost Total Cost Cost in CIP Anderson 4 \$7,350,000 2.3% 15.0% \$ Bedford 4 10,300,000 3.2% 0.0% \$ Bledsoe 1 1,500,000 0.5% 0.0% \$	\$ 269
Anderson 4 \$ 7,350,000 2.3% 15.0% \$ Bedford 4 10,300,000 3.2% 0.0% \$ Bledsoe 1 1,500,000 0.5% 0.0% \$	\$ 103 \$ 269 \$ 120 \$ 21
Bedford 4 10,300,000 3.2% 0.0% \$ Bledsoe 1 1,500,000 0.5% 0.0% \$	\$269 \$120 \$21
Bledsoe 1 1,500,000 0.5% 0.0% \$	\$ 120 \$ 21
	\$ 21
	\$ 11
Campbell 5 2,830,000 0.9% 0.0% \$	
Cannon 1 2,000,000 0.6% 100.0% \$	
Carroll 2 2,100,000 0.7% 52.4% \$	
Carter 2 1,500,000 0.5% 0.0% \$	
Cheatham 3 3,600,000 1.1% 0.0% \$	
Claiborne 1 3,500,000 1.1% 0.0% \$	
Cocke 2 4,200,000 1.3% 0.0% \$	
Coffee 4 12,980,000 4.1% 0.0% \$	
Cumberland 3 6,000,000 1.9% 100.0% \$	
Decatur 3 3,700,000 1.2% 32.4% \$	
DeKalb 3 3,000,000 0.9% 66.7% \$	<u>\$ 171</u>
Dickson 3 2,025,000 0.6% 0.0% \$	\$ 46
Dyer 1 180,000 0.1% 0.0% \$	\$5
Fayette 2 2,500,000 0.8% 0.0% \$	\$ 82
Franklin 3 685,145 0.2% 0.0% \$	
Gibson 4 1,500,000 0.5% 50.0% \$	\$31
Giles 3 3,225,000 1.0% 0.0% \$	\$ 109
Grainger 2 1,200,000 0.4% 0.0% \$	\$ 57
Greene 1 6,000,000 1.9% 0.0% \$	\$ 95
Hamblen 1 20,000,000 6.3% 0.0% \$	\$ 343
Hamilton 2 5,750,000 1.8% 100.0% \$	\$ 19
Hardeman 4 2,535,000 0.8% 80.3% \$	\$ 89
Hardin 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$	\$ 19
Hawkins 2 6,000,000 1.9% 0.0% \$	\$ 110
Haywood 2 2,000,000 0.6% 100.0% \$	\$ 101
Henderson 1 150,000 0.0% 100.0% \$	\$6
Hickman 2 4,000,000 1.3% 0.0% \$	\$ 176
Houston 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$	\$63
Humphreys 6 6,900,000 2.2% 0.0% \$	\$ 381
Jackson 1 250,000 0.1% 0.0% \$	\$ 22
Jefferson 1 2,000,000 0.6% 0.0% \$	\$ 44
Johnson 1 1,000,000 0.3% 0.0% \$	
Knox 3 7,880,000 2.5% 100.0% \$	
Lake 1 130,000 0.0% 0.0% \$	
Lawrence 2 6,500,000 2.1% 0.0% \$	
Lewis 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$	
Lincoln 3 6,850,000 2.2% 0.0% \$	
Loudon 2 8,000,000 2.5% 18.8% \$	
McMinn 2 2,500,000 0.8% 80.0% \$	

Table D-21a. Industrial Sites and Parks Projects by County Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP*

-Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

124

Marion 4 1,342,600 0.4% 0.0% \$ 48 Marshall 3 19,000,000 6.0% 0.0% \$ 701 Maury 2 2,900,000 0.9% 69.0% \$ 41 Meigs 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 45 Monroe 4 4,450,000 1.4% 0.0% \$ 163 Moore 1 1,000,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 163 Moore 1 1,000,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 25 Perry 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 129 Polk 3 1,925,000 0.6% 0.0% \$ 119 Putnam 2 2,250,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 154 Robaretson 2 1,200,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 14 Robretson 2 1,200,000 0.4% 0.0% \$	Table D-21a. (continued)										
Projects Cost Intal Cost Cost in CIP Capita Marion 4 1,342,600 0.2% 41.7% \$ 29 Marion 4 1,342,600 0.4% 0.0% \$ 48 Marshall 3 19,000,000 6.0% 0.0% \$ 701 Meigs 1 500,000 0.9% 69.0% \$ 41 Meigs 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 41 Montgomery 3 22,029,000 6.9% 100.0% \$ 112 Montgomery 3 22,029,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 170 Morgan 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 25 Perry 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 67 Pickett 2 650,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 129 Polk 3 1,925,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 36 Rhea 3 3,500,000 1.1% \$ 2122 Roane 1 </th <th>County</th> <th>Number of</th> <th>Total Estimated</th> <th>Percent of</th> <th>Percent</th> <th>Cc</th> <th>ost Per</th>	County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cc	ost Per				
Marion 4 1,342,600 0.4% 0.0% \$ 48 Marshall 3 19,000,000 6.0% 0.0% \$ 701 Maury 2 2,900,000 0.9% 69,0% \$ 41 Meigs 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 45 Monroe 4 4,450,000 1.4% 0.0% \$ 163 Moore 1 1,000,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 163 Moore 1 1,000,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 25 Perry 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 129 Polk 3 1,925,000 0.6% 0.0% \$ 119 Putnam 2 2,250,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 142 Roane 1 8,000,000 2.5% 100.0% \$ 154 Robertson 2 1,200,000 0.4% 0.0% \$	County	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	Cost in CIP	С	apita				
Marshall 3 19,000,000 6.0% 0.0% \$ 701 Maury 2 2,900,000 0.9% 69.0% \$ 41 Meigs 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 45 Monroe 4 4,450,000 1.4% 0.0% \$ 112 Montgomery 3 22,029,000 6.9% 100.0% \$ 163 Moore 1 1,000,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 170 Morgan 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 25 Perry 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 67 Pickett 2 650,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 119 Putnam 2 2,250,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 163 Robertson 2 1,200,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 212 Roane 1 8,000,000 2.5% 100.0% \$ 154 Robertson 2 1,200,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 27	McNairy	2	720,000	0.2%	41.7%	\$	29				
Maury 2 2,900,000 0.9% 69.0% \$ 41 Meigs 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 45 Monroe 4 4,450,000 1.4% 0.0% \$ 112 Montgomery 3 22,029,000 6.9% 100.0% \$ 163 Moore 1 1,000,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 170 Morgan 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 255 Perry 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 129 Polk 3 1,925,000 0.6% 0.0% \$ 119 Putnam 2 2,250,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 36 Rhea 3 3,500,000 1.1% 21.4% \$ 122 Roane 1 8,000,000 2.5% 100.0% \$ 212 Robertson 2 1,200,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 24 Setier 1 2,000,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 56 <td< td=""><td>Marion</td><td>4</td><td>1,342,600</td><td>0.4%</td><td>0.0%</td><td>\$</td><td>48</td></td<>	Marion	4	1,342,600	0.4%	0.0%	\$	48				
Meigs 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 45 Monroe 4 4,450,000 1.4% 0.0% \$ 112 Montgomery 3 22,029,000 6.9% 100.0% \$ 163 Moore 1 1,000,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 170 Morgan 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 67 Pickett 2 650,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 129 Polk 3 1,925,000 0.6% 0.0% \$ 119 Putnam 2 2,250,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 36 Rhea 3 3,500,000 1.1% \$ 122 Roane 1 8,000,000 2.5% 100.0% \$ 154 Robertson 2 1,260,000 4.0% 2.06% \$ 66 Scott 3 1,368,710 0.4% 0.0% \$ 27 Shelby 4 6,017,000 1.9% 51.5% 7 Smith	Marshall	3	19,000,000	6.0%	0.0%	\$	701				
Monoe 4 4,450,000 1.4% 0.0% \$ 112 Montgomery 3 22,029,000 6.9% 100.0% \$ 163 Moore 1 1,000,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 170 Morgan 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 25 Perry 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 67 Pickett 2 650,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 129 Polk 3 1,925,000 0.6% 0.0% \$ 112 Roane 1 8,000,000 2.5% 100.0% \$ 36 Rhea 3 3,550,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 122 Roane 1 8,000,000 2.5% 100.0% \$ 122 Robertson 2 1,200,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 21 Rutherford 2 12,600,000 4.0% 20.6% \$ 66 Scott 3 1,368,710 0.4% 0.0% \$ 77	Maury	2	2,900,000	0.9%	69.0%	\$	41				
Montgomery 3 22,029,000 6.9% 100.0% \$ 163 Moore 1 1,000,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 170 Morgan 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 25 Perry 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 67 Pickett 2 650,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 129 Polk 3 1,925,000 0.6% 0.0% \$ 119 Putnam 2 2,250,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 36 Rhea 3 3,500,000 1.1% 21.4% \$ 122 Roane 1 8,000,000 2.5% 100.0% \$ 21 Rutherford 2 12,600,000 4.0% 0.0% \$ 21 Secture 1 200,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 7 Setier 1 2,000,000 0.6% 0.0% \$	Meigs	1	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	45				
Moore 1 1,000,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 170 Morgan 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 25 Perry 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 67 Pickett 2 650,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 129 Polk 3 1,925,000 0.6% 0.0% \$ 119 Putnam 2 2,250,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 36 Rhea 3 3,500,000 1.1% 21.4% \$ 122 Roane 1 8,000,000 2.5% 100.0% \$ 154 Robertson 2 1,200,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 21 Rutherford 2 12,600,000 4.0% 20.6% \$ 64 Sequatchie 1 200,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 77 Shelby 4 6,017,000 1.9% 51.5% \$ 7 Smith 1 1,000,000 0.3% 100.0% \$ 52	Monroe	4	4,450,000	1.4%	0.0%	\$	112				
Morgan 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 25 Perry 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 67 Pickett 2 650,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 129 Polk 3 1,925,000 0.6% 0.0% \$ 119 Putnam 2 2,250,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 36 Rhea 3 3,500,000 1.1% 21.4% \$ 122 Roane 1 8,000,000 2.5% 100.0% \$ 21 Rutherford 2 12,600,000 4.0% 0.0% \$ 21 Rutherford 2 12,600,000 4.0% 0.0% \$ 66 Scott 3 1,368,710 0.4% 0.0% \$ 27 Shelby 4 6,017,000 1.9% \$ 51.5% \$ 7 Smith 1 1,000,000 0.3% 100.0% \$ 52 Sumner 2 1,000,000 0.3% 50.0% \$ 7 <	Montgomery	3	22,029,000	6.9%	100.0%	\$	163				
Perry 1 500,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 67 Pickett 2 650,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 129 Polk 3 1,925,000 0.6% 0.0% \$ 119 Putnam 2 2,250,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 36 Rhea 3 3,500,000 1.1% 21.4% \$ 122 Roane 1 8,000,000 2.5% 100.0% \$ 154 Robertson 2 1,200,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 21 Rutherford 2 12,600,000 4.0% 20.6% \$ 66 Scott 3 1,368,710 0.4% 0.0% \$ 17 Sevier 1 2,000,000 0.6% 0.0% \$ 27 Shelby 4 6,017,000 1.9% 51.5% \$ 7 Smith 1 1,000,000 0.3% 100.0% \$ 56 Sullivan 5 7,959,000 2.5% 22.1% \$ 52	Moore	1	1,000,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	170				
Pickett 2 650,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 129 Polk 3 1,925,000 0.6% 0.0% \$ 119 Putnam 2 2,250,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 36 Rhea 3 3,500,000 1.1% 21.4% \$ 122 Roane 1 8,000,000 2.5% 100.0% \$ 154 Robertson 2 1,200,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 21 Rutherford 2 12,600,000 4.0% 20.6% \$ 66 Scott 3 1,368,710 0.4% 0.0% \$ 21 Rutherford 2 12,000,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 27 Shelby 4 6,017,000 1.9% \$ 51.5% \$ 7 Smith 1 1,000,000 0.3% 100.0% \$ 56 Sullivan 5 7,959,000 2.5% 22.1% \$ 52 Summer 2 1,000,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 1,546	Morgan	1	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	25				
Polk31,925,0000.6%0.0%\$ 119Putnam22,250,0000.7%100.0%\$ 36Rhea33,500,0001.1%21.4%\$ 122Roane18,000,0002.5%100.0%\$ 154Robertson21,200,0000.4%0.0%\$ 21Rutherford212,600,0004.0%20.6%\$ 66Scott31,368,7100.4%0.0%\$ 17Sevier1200,0000.1%0.0%\$ 17Sevier12,000,0000.6%0.0%\$ 27Shelby46,017,0001.9%51.5%\$ 7Smith11,000,0000.3%100.0%\$ 56Sullivan57,959,0002.5%22.1%\$ 52Sumner21,000,0000.3%50.0%\$ 7Trousdale811,355,0003.6%0.0%\$ 198Union21,572,0000.5%0.0%\$ 85Van Buren1750,0001.9%100.0%\$ 55Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$ 55Wayne1500,0000.2%0.0%\$ 16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$ 229	Perry	1	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	67				
Putnam22,250,0000.7%100.0%\$ 36Rhea33,500,0001.1%21.4%\$ 122Roane18,000,0002.5%100.0%\$ 154Robertson21,200,0000.4%0.0%\$ 21Rutherford212,600,0004.0%20.6%\$ 66Scott31,368,7100.4%0.0%\$ 17Sevier1200,0000.1%0.0%\$ 17Sevier12,000,0000.6%0.0%\$ 27Shelby46,017,0001.9%51.5%\$ 7Smith11,000,0000.3%100.0%\$ 56Sullivan57,959,0002.5%22.1%\$ 52Sumner21,000,0000.3%50.0%\$ 7Trousdale811,355,0003.6%0.0%\$ 1,546Unicoi23,500,0001.1%0.0%\$ 85Van Buren1750,0000.2%100.0%\$ 55Wayne1500,0001.9%100.0%\$ 55Wayne1500,0000.2%100.0%\$ 30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$ 16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$ 229	Pickett	2	650,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	129				
Rhea 3 3,500,000 1.1% 21.4% \$ 122 Roane 1 8,000,000 2.5% 100.0% \$ 154 Robertson 2 1,200,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 21 Rutherford 2 12,600,000 4.0% 20.6% \$ 66 Scott 3 1,368,710 0.4% 0.0% \$ 64 Sequatchie 1 200,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 77 Sevier 1 2,000,000 0.6% 0.0% \$ 27 Shelby 4 6,017,000 1.9% \$1.5% \$ 7 Smith 1 1,000,000 0.3% 100.0% \$ 56 Sullivan 5 7,959,000 2.5% 22.1% \$ 52 Summer 2 1,000,000 0.3% 50.0% \$ 7 Trousdale 8 11,355,000 3.6% 0.0% \$ 1,546 Unicoi 2 3,500,000 1.1% 0.0% \$ 85 <t< td=""><td>Polk</td><td>3</td><td>1,925,000</td><td>0.6%</td><td>0.0%</td><td>\$</td><td>119</td></t<>	Polk	3	1,925,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$	119				
Roane18,000,0002.5%100.0%\$154Robertson21,200,0000.4%0.0%\$21Rutherford212,600,0004.0%20.6%\$66Scott31,368,7100.4%0.0%\$64Sequatchie1200,0000.1%0.0%\$17Sevier12,000,0000.6%0.0%\$27Shelby46,017,0001.9%51.5%\$7Smith11,000,0000.3%100.0%\$56Sullivan57,959,0002.5%22.1%\$52Sumner21,000,0000.3%50.0%\$7Trousdale811,355,0003.6%0.0%\$1,546Unicoi23,500,0001.1%0.0%\$137Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$55Wayne1500,0000.2%100.0%\$30Weakley2550,0000.2%100.0%\$30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$229	Putnam	2	2,250,000	0.7%	100.0%	\$	36				
Robertson21,200,0000.4%0.0%\$ 21Rutherford212,600,0004.0%20.6%\$ 66Scott31,368,7100.4%0.0%\$ 64Sequatchie1200,0000.1%0.0%\$ 17Sevier12,000,0000.6%0.0%\$ 27Shelby46,017,0001.9%51.5%\$ 7Smith11,000,0000.3%100.0%\$ 56Sullivan57,959,0002.5%22.1%\$ 52Sumner21,000,0000.3%50.0%7Trousdale811,355,0003.6%0.0%\$ 1,546Unicoi23,500,0001.1%0.0%\$ 137Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$ 55Wayne1500,0000.2%100.0%\$ 30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$ 16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$ 229	Rhea	3	3,500,000	1.1%	21.4%	\$	122				
Rutherford212,600,0004.0%20.6%\$66Scott31,368,7100.4%0.0%\$64Sequatchie1200,0000.1%0.0%\$17Sevier12,000,0000.6%0.0%\$27Shelby46,017,0001.9%51.5%\$7Smith11,000,0000.3%100.0%\$56Sullivan57,959,0002.5%22.1%\$52Sumner21,000,0000.3%50.0%\$7Trousdale811,355,0003.6%0.0%\$1,546Unicoi23,500,0001.1%0.0%\$198Union21,572,0000.5%0.0%\$85Van Buren1750,0000.2%100.0%\$30Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$229	Roane	1	8,000,000	2.5%	100.0%	\$	154				
Scott31,368,7100.4%0.0%\$64Sequatchie1200,0000.1%0.0%\$17Sevier12,000,0000.6%0.0%\$27Shelby46,017,0001.9%51.5%\$7Smith11,000,0000.3%100.0%\$56Sullivan57,959,0002.5%22.1%\$52Sumner21,000,0000.3%50.0%\$7Trousdale811,355,0003.6%0.0%\$1,546Unicoi23,500,0001.1%0.0%\$198Union21,572,0000.5%0.0%\$85Van Buren1750,0000.2%100.0%\$30Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$229	Robertson	2	1,200,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	21				
Sequatchie1200,0000.1%0.0%\$17Sevier12,000,0000.6%0.0%\$27Shelby46,017,0001.9%51.5%\$7Smith11,000,0000.3%100.0%\$56Sullivan57,959,0002.5%22.1%\$52Sumner21,000,0000.3%50.0%\$7Trousdale811,355,0003.6%0.0%\$1,546Unicoi23,500,0001.1%0.0%\$198Union21,572,0000.2%100.0%\$33Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$30Weakley2550,0000.2%100.0%\$16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$229	Rutherford	2	12,600,000	4.0%	20.6%	\$	66				
Sevier12,000,0000.6%0.0%\$ 27Shelby46,017,0001.9%51.5%\$ 7Smith11,000,0000.3%100.0%\$ 56Sullivan57,959,0002.5%22.1%\$ 52Sumner21,000,0000.3%50.0%\$ 7Trousdale811,355,0003.6%0.0%\$ 1,546Unicoi23,500,0001.1%0.0%\$ 198Union21,572,0000.5%0.0%\$ 85Van Buren1750,0000.2%100.0%\$ 137Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$ 30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$ 16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$ 229	Scott	3	1,368,710	0.4%	0.0%	\$	64				
Shelby46,017,0001.9%51.5%\$7Smith11,000,0000.3%100.0%\$56Sullivan57,959,0002.5%22.1%\$52Sumner21,000,0000.3%50.0%\$7Trousdale811,355,0003.6%0.0%\$1,546Unicoi23,500,0001.1%0.0%\$198Union21,572,0000.5%0.0%\$85Van Buren1750,0000.2%100.0%\$137Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$55Wayne1500,0000.2%100.0%\$30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$229	Sequatchie	1	200,000	0.1%	0.0%		17				
Smith11,000,0000.3%100.0%\$56Sullivan57,959,0002.5%22.1%\$52Sumner21,000,0000.3%50.0%\$7Trousdale811,355,0003.6%0.0%\$1,546Unicoi23,500,0001.1%0.0%\$198Union21,572,0000.5%0.0%\$85Van Buren1750,0000.2%100.0%\$137Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$55Wayne1500,0000.2%100.0%\$30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$229	Sevier		2,000,000	0.6%	0.0%		27				
Sullivan57,959,0002.5%22.1%\$52Sumner21,000,0000.3%50.0%\$7Trousdale811,355,0003.6%0.0%\$1,546Unicoi23,500,0001.1%0.0%\$198Union21,572,0000.5%0.0%\$855Van Buren1750,0000.2%100.0%\$137Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$55Wayne1500,0000.2%100.0%\$30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$229	Shelby	4	6,017,000	1.9%	51.5%	\$	7				
Sumner21,000,0000.3%50.0%\$7Trousdale811,355,0003.6%0.0%\$1,546Unicoi23,500,0001.1%0.0%\$198Union21,572,0000.5%0.0%\$85Van Buren1750,0000.2%100.0%\$137Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$55Wayne1500,0000.2%100.0%\$30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$229	Smith		1,000,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	56				
Trousdale811,355,0003.6%0.0%\$1,546Unicoi23,500,0001.1%0.0%\$198Union21,572,0000.5%0.0%\$85Van Buren1750,0000.2%100.0%\$137Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$55Wayne1500,0000.2%100.0%\$30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$229	Sullivan		7,959,000	2.5%	22.1%	\$	52				
Unicoi23,500,0001.1%0.0%\$198Union21,572,0000.5%0.0%\$85Van Buren1750,0000.2%100.0%\$137Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$55Wayne1500,0000.2%100.0%\$30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$229	Sumner	2	1,000,000	0.3%	50.0%	\$	7				
Union21,572,0000.5%0.0%\$85Van Buren1750,0000.2%100.0%\$137Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$55Wayne1500,0000.2%100.0%\$30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$229	Trousdale	8	11,355,000	3.6%	0.0%	\$	1,546				
Van Buren1750,0000.2%100.0%\$137Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$55Wayne1500,0000.2%100.0%\$30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$229	Unicoi	2	3,500,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$	198				
Washington26,000,0001.9%100.0%\$ 55Wayne1500,0000.2%100.0%\$ 30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$ 16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$ 229	Union	2	1,572,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	85				
Wayne1500,0000.2%100.0%\$30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$229	Van Buren	1	750,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	137				
Wayne1500,0000.2%100.0%\$30Weakley2550,0000.2%0.0%\$16Wilson321,000,0006.6%4.8%\$229	Washington	2	6,000,000	1.9%	100.0%	\$	55				
Wilson 3 21,000,000 6.6% 4.8% \$ 229	Wayne	1		0.2%	100.0%	\$	30				
Wilson 3 21,000,000 6.6% 4.8% \$ 229	Weakley	2	550,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	16				
Statewide 176 \$ 316,978,455 100.0% 28.0% \$ 56	Wilson	3		6.6%	4.8%	\$	229				
	Statewide	176	\$ 316,978,455	100.0%	28.0%	\$	56				

Table D-21a. (continued)

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).**Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

		Numbe	er and Estir	mated Cos	stFive-year Period July 2002 throug							
		Con	ceptual			Planning	g & Desig	n		Cons	truction	
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in I	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Νι	ımber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Anderson	1	25.0%	\$ 5.0	68.0%	1	25.0%	\$ 0.3	4.1%	2	50.0%	\$ 2.1	27.9%
Bedford	4	100.0%	10.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Bledsoe	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Blount	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0.6	26.7%	1	33.3%	1.7	73.3%
Bradley	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Campbell	3	60.0%	2.0	68.9%	2	40.0%	0.9	31.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cannon	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Carroll	1	50.0%	1.0	47.6%	1	50.0%	1.1	52.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Carter	2	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cheatham	3	100.0%	3.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Claiborne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cocke	1	50.0%	1.2	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	3.0	71.4%
Coffee	1	25.0%	0.4	2.9%	2	50.0%	8.1	62.4%	1	25.0%	4.5	34.7%
Cumberland	3	100.0%	6.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Decatur	2	66.7%	3.0	81.1%	1	33.3%	0.7	18.9%	0		0	0.0%
DeKalb	3	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dickson	3	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dyer	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fayette	2	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Franklin	1	33.3%	0.1	14.6%	1	33.3%	0.1	12.4%	1	33.3%	0.5	73.0%
Gibson	2	50.0%	0.8	50.0%	2	50.0%	0.8	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Giles	2	66.7%	3.0	93.0%	1	33.3%	0.2	7.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grainger	1	50.0%	0.4	33.3%	1	50.0%	0.8	66.7%	0		0	0.0%
Greene	1	100.0%	6.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%
Hamblen	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	20.0	100.0%
Hamilton	1	50.0%	3.0	52.2%	1	50.0%	2.8		0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardeman	2	50.0%	1.5	59.2%	1	25.0%	0.7	25.6%	1	25.0%	0.4	15.2%
Hardin	0		0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0		0	0.0%
Hawkins	2	100.0%	6.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%
Haywood	1	50.0%	0.5	25.0%	1	50.0%	1.5	75.0%	0		0	0.0%
Henderson	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%
Hickman	1	50.0%	1.5	37.5%	1	50.0%	2.5	62.5%	0		0	0.0%
Houston	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%
Humphreys	5	83.3%	4.2	60.9%	1	16.7%	2.7	39.1%	0		0	0.0%
Jackson	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Table D-21b. Industrial Site and Park Projects by County and by Stage of Development Number and Estimated Cost Five year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

126

Table D-21b. (continued)												
		Con	ceptual			Plannin	g & Desigr	า		Cons	struction	
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in I	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]
Jefferson	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Johnson	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	7.4	94.2%	1	33.3%	0.5	5.8%
Lake	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lawrence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	5.0	76.9%	1	50.0%	1.5	23.1%
Lewis	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lincoln	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	5.8	83.9%	1	33.3%	1.1	16.1%
Loudon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	1.5	18.8%	1	50.0%	6.5	81.3%
McMinn	1	50.0%	0.5	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	2.0	80.0%
McNairy	1	50.0%	0.3	41.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%		58.3%
Marion	1	25.0%	0.4	26.1%	3	75.0%	1.0	73.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marshall	3	100.0%	19.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Maury	1	50.0%	2.0	69.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.9	31.0%
Meigs	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%
Monroe	2	50.0%	1.8	39.3%	2	50.0%	2.7	60.7%	0	0.0%		0.0%
Montgomery	1	33.3%	3.8	17.0%	1	33.3%	1.2	5.4%	1	33.3%	17.1	77.5%
Moore	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Morgan	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%		0.0%
Perry	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Pickett	2	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Polk	2 2	66.7%	0.4	22.1%	1	33.3%		77.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam		100.0%	2.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Rhea	2	66.7%	2.3	64.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	1.3	35.7%
Roane	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	ii	100.0%
Robertson	1	50.0%	0.7	58.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.5	41.7%
Rutherford	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	10.0	79.4%	1	50.0%	2.6	20.6%
Scott	1	33.3%	0.5	36.5%	2	66.7%	0.9	63.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sequatchie	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sevier	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0.0%
Shelby	3	75.0%	2.9	48.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	3.1	51.5%
Smith	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sullivan	4	80.0%	7.8	97.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0.2	2.5%
Sumner	2	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Trousdale	4	50.0%	7.1	62.1%	4	50.0%	4.3	37.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unicoi	2	100.0%	3.5	100.0%	0	0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Union	1	50.0%	1.2	76.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.4	23.7%

Table D-21b. (continued)

				Tal	ble D-21	lb. (cont	inued)					
		Con	ceptual			Planning	g & Design	ı	Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in n	nillions]	Nur	nber	Cost [in r	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]
Van Buren	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Washington	1	50.0%	1.0	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	5.0	83.3%
Wayne	, 1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Weakley	2	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Wilson	2	66.7%	20.0	95.2%	1	33.3%	1.0	4.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Statewide	105	59.7%	\$ 161.3	50.9%	46	26.1%	\$ 72.0	22.7%	25	14.2%	\$ 83.6	26.4%

* Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Building Tennessee's Tomorrow: Anticipating the State's Infrastructure Needs

		riod July 2002 throu	0		-	
County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent		st Per
	Projects	Cost		Cost in CIP		apita
Anderson	5	\$ 2,920,000	0.9%	53.8%	\$	41
Bledsoe	1	250,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	20
Blount	5	21,500,000	7.0%	94.2%	\$	199
Bradley	2	3,650,000	1.2%	95.9%	\$	41
Cannon	2	200,000	0.1%	75.0%	\$	15
Cheatham	3	7,240,000	2.4%	0.0%	\$	198
Chester	2	6,082,000	2.0%	9.6%	\$	387
Claiborne	1	80,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	3
Cocke	2	1,680,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	50
Cumberland	1	5,000,000	1.6%	100.0%	\$	104
Davidson	20	50,069,000	16.3%	95.9%	\$	89
Decatur	5	3,340,000	1.1%	67.4%	\$	286
Dickson	1	2,500,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$	57
Dyer	2	8,250,000	2.7%	100.0%	\$	222
Fayette	- 1	230,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	8
Franklin	4	1,370,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	34
Gibson	2	300,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	6
Giles	3	1,750,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	59
Greene	1	150,000	0.0%	100.0%	Ψ \$	2
Hamblen	1	2,000,000	0.0%	0.0%	φ \$	2 34
Hamilton	1	550,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$	2
Hancock	2	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	φ \$	2 74
Hardeman	2	1,050,000	0.2 %	100.0%	Գ Տ	37
	3 1		0.3%	0.0%	ֆ \$	
Hardin Hawkins	1	100,000	0.0%	0.0%	ծ \$	4 18
		1,000,000			э \$	
Henderson	2	1,050,000	0.3%	100.0%		41
Hickman	1	1,500,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	66
Humphreys	1	500,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	28
Jefferson	1	191,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	4
Johnson	1	300,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	17
Knox	6	13,391,074	4.4%	93.7%	\$	35
Lauderdale	1	1,033,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	38
Lawrence	1	150,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	4
Lewis	1	700,000	0.2%	0.0%		61
Lincoln	1	200,000	0.1%	0.0%		6
Loudon	2	3,200,000	1.0%	100.0%	\$	80
McMinn	2	1,900,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$	38
McNairy	3	650,000	0.2%	53.8%	\$	26
Madison	4	3,650,000	1.2%	100.0%	\$	40
Marion	2	975,000	0.3%	76.9%	\$	35
Maury	5	2,001,000	0.7%	66.8%	\$	28
Monroe	1	1,500,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	38
Montgomery	1	1,700,000	0.6%	100.0%	\$	13
Obion	5	2,400,000	0.8%		\$	74

Table D-22a. Public Building Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP* —Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

	Iai	Sie D-22a. (Continu	icuj		
County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cost Per
County	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	Cost in CIP	Capita
Overton	1	2,000,000	0.7%	100.0%	\$99
Putnam	3	500,000	0.2%	60.0%	\$8
Rhea	2	2,650,000	0.9%	0.0%	\$ 93
Roane	2	2,000,000	0.7%	50.0%	\$ 38
Rutherford	2	3,900,000	1.3%	89.7%	\$ 21
Sequatchie	1	150,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 13
Sevier	2	158,554	0.1%	59.0%	\$2
Shelby	22	97,184,995	31.6%	100.0%	\$ 108
Smith	1	500,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$ 28
Sullivan	7	4,730,000	1.5%	75.1%	\$ 31
Sumner	6	8,816,000	2.9%	0.0%	\$ 66
Tipton	1	2,500,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$ 47
Unicoi	1	2,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$ 113
Union	2	590,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 32
Van Buren	1	500,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$91
Washington	2	3,000,000	1.0%	100.0%	\$ 28
Wayne	1	200,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 12
Weakley	1	750,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 22
Williamson	4	15,390,000	5.0%	100.0%	\$ 115
Wilson	1	1,000,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 11
Regional	1	100,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 0
Statewide	177	\$ 307,371,623	100.0%	79.6%	\$54

Table D-22a. (continued)

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP). **Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

	Conceptual			Planning & Design				Construction				
County	Nu	ımber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in I	millions]	Nur	nber	Cost [in ı	nillions]
Anderson	4	80.0%	\$ 2.7	91.4%	0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	1	20.0%	\$ 0.3	8.6%
Bledsoe	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Blount	2	40.0%	0.9	4.2%	2	40.0%	20.4	94.7%	1	20.0%	0.3	1.2%
Bradley	1	50.0%	3.5	95.9%	1	50.0%	0.2	4.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cannon	1	50.0%	0.1	25.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cheatham	3	100.0%	7.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Chester	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.6	9.6%	1	50.0%	5.5	90.4%
Claiborne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Cocke	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.8	47.6%	1	50.0%	0.9	52.4%
Cumberland	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	5.0	100.0%
Davidson	8	40.0%	7.4	14.8%	3	15.0%	28.8	57.5%	9	45.0%	13.8	27.6%
Decatur	2	40.0%	0.2	7.2%	2	40.0%	3.0	89.8%	1	20.0%	0.1	3.0%
Dickson	1	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dyer	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	8.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fayette	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Franklin	1	25.0%	0.6	43.8%	1	25.0%	0.1	5.1%	2	50.0%	0.7	51.1%
Gibson	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Giles	3	100.0%	1.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Greene	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%
Hamblen	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamilton	1	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hancock	2	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardeman	1	33.3%	0.2	19.0%	2	66.7%	0.9	81.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardin	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hawkins	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Henderson	1	50.0%	0.8	71.4%	1	50.0%	0.3	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hickman	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Humphreys	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jefferson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%
Johnson	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	2	33.3%	0.9	6.3%	2	33.3%	5.8	43.0%	2	33.3%	6.8	50.6%
Lauderdale	0		0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lawrence	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lewis	1	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lincoln	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Table D-22b. Public Building Projects by County and by Stage of Development Number and Estimated Cost--Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

Appendix D: Reported Infrastructure Needs by County

				1	able D	-22b. (cor	ntinued)					
		Con	ceptual			Plannin	g & Desigr	า		Cons	truction	
County	Νι	ımber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in ı	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in n	nillions]
Loudon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	3.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
McMinn	2	100.0%	1.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
McNairy	2	66.7%	0.4	53.8%	1	33.3%	0.3	46.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Madison	1	25.0%	0.5	13.7%	3	75.0%	3.2	86.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marion	2	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Maury	2	40.0%	0.4	20.7%	3	60.0%	1.6	79.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Monroe	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Montgomery	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.7	100.0%
Obion	2	40.0%	0.3	12.5%	2	40.0%	0.4	15.6%	1	20.0%	1.7	71.9%
Overton	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam	2	66.7%	0.4	80.0%	1	33.3%	0.1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Rhea	1	50.0%	2.0	75.5%	1	50.0%	0.7	24.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Roane	2	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Rutherford	2	100.0%	3.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sequatchie	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sevier	1	50.0%	0.1	41.0%	1	50.0%	0.1	59.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Shelby	2	9.1%	1.0		8	36.4%	30.5	31.3%	12	54.5%	65.7	67.6%
Smith	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%
Sullivan	2	28.6%	1.2	24.9%	3	42.9%	0.4	7.5%	2	28.6%	3.2	67.6%
Sumner	4	66.7%	8.5	96.6%	2	33.3%	0.3	3.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Tipton	1	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unicoi	1	100.0%	2.0		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Union	1	50.0%	0.4	67.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	32.2%
Van Buren	0		0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Washington	2	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Wayne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Weakley	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Williamson	2	50.0%	5.3	34.1%	1	25.0%	10.0	65.0%	1	25.0%	0.1	0.9%
Wilson	1	100.0%	1.0		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Regional	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Statewide	83	46.9%	\$ 76.4	24.8%	53	29.9%	\$ 124.1	40.4%	41	23.2%	\$ 106.9	34.8%

	,	stimated Cost and I			
	-	Period July 2002 thr	2		
County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cost Per
	Projects	Cost		Cost in CIP	Capita
Bedford		\$ 1,500,000	2.5%	0.0%	\$ 39
Blount		2,000,000	3.4%	100.0%	\$ 18
Bradley		3,500,000	5.9%	100.0%	\$ 39
Carroll	1	400,000	0.7%	0.0%	<u>\$ 14</u>
Carter	1	60,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 1
Cheatham	1	300,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$8
Davidson	3	10,570,000	17.8%	100.0%	\$ 19
Decatur	1	2,000,000	3.4%	100.0%	\$ 171
Franklin	1	200,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$5
Greene	3	500,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$8
Jefferson	1	150,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$3
Knox	1	3,000,000	5.1%	100.0%	\$8
Lawrence	1	979,000	1.7%	0.0%	\$ 24
Loudon	1	1,300,000	2.2%	100.0%	\$ 32
McMinn	3	3,350,000	5.7%	0.0%	\$67
Maury	2	335,000	0.6%	100.0%	\$5
Rhea	1	800,000	1.4%	0.0%	\$ 28
Roane	1	1,500,000	2.5%	100.0%	\$ 29
Sevier	1	63,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$1
Shelby	12	18,637,140	31.5%	100.0%	\$ 21
Sullivan	1	290,000	0.5%	100.0%	\$2
Unicoi	1	185,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 10
Washington	2	328,000	0.6%	100.0%	\$ 3
Wayne	1	300,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$ 18
Williamson	1	2,000,000	3.4%	100.0%	\$ 15
Wilson	1	5,000,000	8.4%	0.0%	

59,247,140

100.0%

76.7% \$

10

Table D-23a. Other Facilities Projects by County

Number Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP*

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

45

Statewide Total

**Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

\$

	Number and Estimated CostFive-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*													
		Cone	ceptual			Plannin	g & Desig	n	Construction					
County	ty Number Cost		Cost [in	millions]	Number		Cost [in millions]		Νι	ımber	Cost [in millions]			
Bedford	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	1	100.0%	\$ 1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%		
Blount	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%		
Bradley	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Carter	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Cheatham	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Davidson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	10.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Decatur	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Franklin	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Greene	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.3	60.0%	2	66.7%	0.2	40.0%		
Jefferson	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Knox	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Lawrence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Loudon	1	100.0%	1.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
McMinn	1	33.3%	1.4	40.3%	1	33.3%	1.0	29.9%	1	33.3%	1.0	29.9%		
Maury	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Rhea	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Roane	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Sevier	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%		
Shelby	6	50.0%	9.1	48.9%	6	50.0%	9.5	51.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Sullivan	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%		
Unicoi	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Washington	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Wayne	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Williamson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%		
Wilson	1	100.0%	5.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Statewide	19	42.2%	\$ 20.4	34.5%	19	42.2%	\$ 33.3	56.2%	7	15.6%	\$ 5.6	9.4%		

Table D-23b. Other Facility Projects by County and by Stage of Development

Table D-24a. Property Acquisition Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP* —Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007**

County	Number of	Tot	tal Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cost Per		
County	Projects		Cost	Total Cost	Cost in CIP	Ca	apita	
Anderson	1	\$	2,995,200	41.4%	100.0%	\$	42	
Davidson	1		2,518,000	34.8%	100.0%	\$	4	
Johnson	1		80,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$	5	
Montgomery	1		300,000	4.1%	100.0%	\$	2	
Sevier	1		250,000	3.5%	0.0%	\$	3	
Shelby	2		900,000	12.4%	100.0%	\$	1	
Williamson	1		200,000	2.8%	100.0%	\$	1	
Statewide Total	8	\$	7,243,200	100.0%	95.4%	\$	1	

* Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

**Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Number and Estimated CostFive-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*															
	Conceptual					Planning & Design					Construction				
County	Number		Cost [in millions]		Nu	Number		Cost [in millions]		Number		Cost [in m		millions]	
Anderson	0	0.0%	\$	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	\$	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	\$	0	0.0%
Davidson	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	1	100.0%		2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%
Johnson	1	100.0%		0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%
Montgomery	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	1	100.0%		0.3	100.0%
Sevier	1	100.0%		0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%
Shelby	1	50.0%		0.1	11.1%	1	50.0%		0.8	88.9%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%
Williamson	1	100.0%		0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%
Statewide	4	50.0%	\$	0.6	8.7%	3	37.5%	\$	6.3	87.2%	1	12.5%	\$	0.3	4.1%

Table D-24b. Property Acquisition Projects by County and by Stage of Development