INTERIM REPORT - MAY 1, 2015 - MAY 31, 2016

DATE ISSUED: OCTOBER 11, 2016

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	
Performance Audit Initiation	1
Background	1 - 2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
Scope of Performance Audit.	3 - 4
PERFORMANCE AUDIT OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	
AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES	
Conflicts of Interest	5
Program and Related Project Budget Costs vs. Actual Results and Financial	
Data Tracking within the PMIS Database and Metro Finance	5
Process for Changing Project Budget Costs	
Program Management Internal Controls for Payment Processing	
Project Cost Reconciliation between PMIS Database and Metro Finance	8
Compliance with Metro Procurement Regulations	9
Program Management Processes for Quality Controls and Risk Assessment	
Program and Related Projects Timeline Performance	11
Project Performance in Accordance with Design	12
EPA and TDEC Reporting Requirements Compliance	12
Project Site Visits	13
Process for Reassignment of Unused Budgeted Funds	13 -14
APPENDIX A - CAP/ER and LTCP Implementation Plans and Schedules	15 - 16

INTRODUCTION

Performance Audit Initiation

Metro Water Services ("MWS") engaged Crosslin & Associates ("C&A") in May 2016 to design and implement a performance audit for the Clean Water Nashville Overflow Abatement Program (the "Program"). The design phase of the engagement included three tasks as follows:

- 1. Identify specific objectives and strategies for achieving the performance engagement goals through discussion with Program personnel, review of available documentation, and review of both legal and internal control requirements.
- 2. Identify relevant operational and financial performance measures to attain Program goals and objectives.
- 3. Assist MWS by developing a program to report performance measurement information which will allow MWS to monitor progress toward achieving Program goals and objectives.

The implementation phase of the engagement included testing these determined performance measurement objectives and goals and issuing the results of the engagement procedures in an annual report that includes both observations and any related recommendations. An annual report will be issued throughout the duration of the Program. This is the fourth annual performance audit report for the Program.

Background

MWS began an aggressive improvement and rehabilitation program in 1990 through 2006 to reduce the number of combined sewer overflows ("CSOs") and sanitary sewer overflows ("SSOs"), making tremendous progress toward improving water quality in the Cumberland River and its major tributaries. However, despite these improvements, a significant number of overflows still remained, prompting state and federal regulatory agencies to approach MWS in 2006 about the need for additional work within the sewer system.

INTRODUCTION - Continued

Background - Continued

In March 2009, a Consent Decree between the United States of America, the State of Tennessee, and the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County was approved and entered with the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee. The Consent Decree was filed on behalf of the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") and the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation ("TDEC"), requiring MWS to use its best efforts to achieve the following goals:

- 1. Full compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permits, the Clean Water Act ("CWA"), the Tennessee Water Quality Control Act, and related regulations.
- 2. Elimination of SSOs, due to a later submitted design storm.
- 3. Compliance with EPA's CSO Control Policy.

Under the Consent Decree, MWS is required to fully develop, in two years, a Corrective Action Plan/Engineering Report ("CAP/ER") for its sanitary sewer system, a Long-term Control Plan ("LTCP") for its combined sewer system to achieve the goals of the CWA, and meet water quality requirements in the Cumberland River. Due to the impacts of the May 2010 flood, MWS received a six month extension for the CAP/ER and the LTCP to be fully developed, and further a two year extension for final compliance. As such, these reports were developed and filed with the EPA, effective September 12, 2011. At a total estimated cost of \$1.0-\$1.5 billion, the Program represents a major investment in overflow abatement for the Nashville community. As of October 11, 2016, the EPA has not yet given final approval for either of the CAP/ER or LTCP plans.

See Appendix A for both the CAP/ER and LTCP Implementation Plans and Schedules submitted to the EPA.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Scope of Performance Audit

MWS engaged C&A to perform the fourth annual performance audit of the Clean Water Nashville Overflow Abatement Program (the "Program") for interim period of May 1, 2015 through May 31, 2016. The performance audit was conducted over a three-month period from May 2016 through July 2016. As of May 31, 2016, the Program had 37 active projects (each in various phases of the project) that are covered under the Consent Decree (see Appendix A for complete list of Consent Decree projects). As of May 31, 2016, a total of approximately \$202.6 million out of a budgeted \$1.5 billion had been incurred for projects (See detail of these expenditures by project at Appendix A).

C&A selected 16 active projects for testing performance measurement objectives. As of May 31, 2016, the following projects were active and selected for testing:

Project Name	Escalated Budget	Project Phase
Mill Creek Opryland Equalization Facility- Phase III	\$98.2 million	Planning
Central WWTP Capacity	\$7.8 million	Design
Improvements and CSO Reduction - A		
Central WWTP - Sludge	\$-0-	Design
Transfer Facility	¢10.2:11:	Cti
28 th Avenue Rehabilitation -Area 1 Clifton Avenue	\$10.3 million	Construction
Cowan Riverside Rehabilitation	\$8.9 million	Construction
-Area 3 West Trinity Lane		
Lakewood Rehabilitation	\$-0-	Construction
-Area 1 Sewer		
Shelby Park Rehabilitation	\$10.5 million	Construction
-Area 4 Brush Hill Road	ΦΟ Ο '11'	
Davidson and Brook Hollow	\$8.9 million	Construction
Sewer Improvements Smith Springs Rehabilitation	\$8.3 million	Construction
-Area 1 Priest Lake Meadows	\$6.5 IIIIIIOII	Construction
West Park Equalization Facility	\$15.4 million	Construction
Phase II	Ψ10	
Mill Creek Opryland	\$19.3 million	Closeout
Equalization Facility - Phase II		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - Continued

Scope of Performance Audit - Continued

Project Name	Escalated Budget	Project Phase
Westchester Drive Rehabilitation	\$-0-	Closeout
Dodson Chapel Equalization Facility	\$25.1 million	Completed
Apex Sewer Corrections	\$3.3 million	Completed
Neely's Bend Rehabilitation	\$2.4 million	Completed
Joelton Rehabilitation	\$7.0 million	Completed

See the <u>Performance Audit Observations</u>, <u>Recommendations and Management Responses</u> section of the report for detailed observations, recommendations and management responses for each performance measurement tested.

PERFORMANCE AUDIT OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Observation

None.

During fieldwork, C&A noted that conflict of interest disclosures had been disseminated to all key individuals and the signed copies were properly filed in the Program Management Information System ("PMIS"). Signed conflict of interest disclosures are required to be obtained annually for all key individuals. Any disclosures are reviewed for potential conflicts and controls have been put into place for any potential ethics violations. Signed conflict of interest disclosures and related controls are being monitored regularly for compliance.

obtained aimidally for all key marviadals. They disclosures are reviewed for potential conflict
and controls have been put into place for any potential ethics violations. Signed conflict o
interest disclosures and related controls are being monitored regularly for compliance.
Recommendation

Management's Response

No response necessary.

PROGRAM AND RELATED PROJECT BUDGET COSTS VS. ACTUAL RESULTS AND FINANCIAL DATA TRACKING WITHIN THE PMIS DATABASE AND METRO FINANCE

Observations

During fieldwork, C&A noted actual costs for all projects tested were closely monitored to respective budget costs within the PMIS database. For each of the projects tested, we observed that the project's budget is properly supported by cost estimates. Actual costs to date through May 31, 2016, are either below or in line with budgeted costs to date.

Recommend	<u>ations</u>

None.

Management's Response

PERFORMANCE AUDIT OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES - Continued

PROCESS FOR CHANGING PROJECT BUDGET COSTS

Observation

C&A reviewed certain project budget cost changes to verify that the changes were made with proper approvals, had a justification document properly completed, and appeared reasonable in nature. During our testing, we observed that three projects tested had significant budget changes.

We noted that the significant changes to the three projects' budgets were supported by source documents, approved by appropriate Program management, and noted in meeting minutes.

Recommendation

None.

Management's Response

No response necessary.

Observation

C&A reviewed project budget cost changes for potential non-related Program costs ("CIP") added to a project's facility. CIP costs are costs related to MWS capital projects for water or storm water enhancements. During our fieldwork, C&A noted two projects with budget cost changes that included CIP costs. These two projects were Lakewood Rehabilitation - Area 1 Sewer and Central WWTP - Sludge Transfer Facility.

Lakewood Rehabilitation - Area 1 Sewer had an approved change justification order to increase the project's budget to \$10.3 million in construction costs of which \$5.3 million was Program costs and \$5 million was CIP costs. C&A reviewed the most recent actual project costs to date through May 31, 2016, noting \$5.8 million is CIP costs.

Central WWTP - Sludge Transfer Facility project was created in March 2016 with an approved change justification order for total project costs of \$3.2 million. This project was created to capture the design and construction work for an existing maintenance building to screen sludge and scum prior to transferring it to the Biosolids Facility for processing. This was the first subproject created under one of the Program's projects, Central WWTP Capacity Improvement and CSO Reduction.

PERFORMANCE AUDIT OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES - Continued

PROCESS FOR CHANGING PROJECT BUDGET COSTS - Continued

Observation - Continued

C&A's review of the Central WWTP - Sludge Transfer Facility project details and further meetings with MWS and Program Controls Group led to discovering this project is not a direct capacity improvement and CSO reduction project. As a result, Program Controls Group submitted an approved change justification order, which removed the project out of the Program and transferred it to MWS CIP budget.

Recommendation

C&A recommends that Program Controls Group should work with MWS in allocating CIP costs out of the current purchase order for the Lakewood Rehabilitation - Area 1 Sewer project and creating a separate purchase order for MWS CIP budget.

Management's Response

The Program Management Team will determine the final allocation of costs between Program and non-Program (i.e. CIP) sources upon conclusion of construction closeout which is currently active. Any changes that require updates to the project cost or funding will be addressed in coordination with MWS Accounting.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT INTERNAL CONTROLS FOR PAYMENT PROCESSING

Observation

During fieldwork, payments were tested for evidence of proper review of documentation, accuracy and timeliness. It was noted that in one of our projects tested, a selected invoice for the project was not transmitted by the Program Management Team to Metro Finance for payment within the two-day requirement as outlined in the Program Management Plan ("PMP") - Vol II - Procedures - Invoice Review. This two-day requirement was effective until April 2016. In April 2016, PMP-Vol II - Procedures - Invoice Review was updated to change the timeframe for Program Controls Group to transmit the approved invoice/construction pay application package from two to twenty days.

The invoice dated August 14, 2015, was transmitted by the Program Controls Group to Metro Finance four business days after approval.

Effective for the interim period under audit until April 2016, invoice review procedures stated that the Program Controls Group had two business days to assemble and send to Metro Finance the approved invoice/construction pay application package.

PERFORMANCE AUDIT OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES - Continued

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT INTERNAL CONTROLS FOR PAYMENT PROCESSING - Continued

Recommendation

C&A recommends that the Program Controls Group assemble and send the approved invoice/construction pay application packages for all projects within the specified timeframe, outlined in the PMP-Vol. 11- Procedures-Invoice Review.

Management's Response

The Program Management Team now tracks invoice and pay application turnaround time metrics as part of the monthly Program Assessment Report. These metrics will be used to identify invoices or pay applications that are not processed in the specified timeframe as well as to monitor trends in processing times.

PROJECT COST RECONCILIATION BETWEEN PMIS DATABASE AND METRO FINANCE

Observation

During the current period procedures, C&A noted that the Programs Control Group reconciles actual invoice costs processed in PMIS to EBS on a monthly basis. C&A selected the reconciliation for monthly period of April 2016 and further selected 10 of the 16 tested projects to verify the propriety of the reconciliation process by the Programs Control Group. For each of the selected 10 projects, C&A verified all invoice amounts from inception of the project through April 30, 2016, processed in PMIS were properly posted as payments in EBS, with no exceptions noted.

Recommendation

None.

Management's Response

PERFORMANCE AUDIT OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES - Continued

COMPLIANCE WITH METRO PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS

Observation

C&A reviewed selected projects to ensure proper procurement procedures were followed and to confirm whether relevant data was entered correctly in the project cost sheets within PMIS, consistent with each individual contract. We also reviewed change orders to confirm that proper signatures were obtained. We compared the contracted amounts with the budgets to see if there were any unsupported variations. No unexplained deviations were noted. We noted that, in certain circumstances, only limited procurement documentation existed. We inquired about the limited documentation as it related to the procurement process. It was noted that the procurement process is handled by the Metro Procurement Department and communicated to the PMT through a liaison and that management did not think that it is prudent to place sensitive documents within the file that is viewed by various contractors and subcontractors. Due to the sensitive nature of the information, C&A contacted both the MWS Finance Department and Procurement Department to request the items noted that was not included within PMIS in order to ensure that the proper procurement procedures were followed. C&A reviewed all documents noting no exceptions.

Recommendation None.

Management's Response

No response necessary.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT PROCESSES FOR QUALITY CONTROLS AND RISK ASSESSMENT

Observation

C&A conducted an assessment of quality control documents that are required to be prepared, reviewed and signed by designated responsible parties at various phases of the projects. C&A found documentation was properly filed, with no exceptions noted.

T					1	. •	
v	ecc	m	m	an	വവ	t ₁ \wedge	n
11		,,,,,			เเล	,	

None.

PERFORMANCE AUDIT OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES - Continued

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT PROCESSES FOR QUALITY CONTROLS AND RISK ASSESSMENT - Continued

AND RISK ASSESSIVE	LN1 - Continued	
Management's Response		

No response necessary.

<u>Observation</u>

The Program Management Plan ("PMP") - Vol. I, section 6, states that risk assessment should be performed at the project level with a defined set of documentation (risk assessment matrix including consequence ratings and likelihood of occurrence rating). We noted that formal project specific risk assessments were prepared and placed into PMIS in order to comply with the PMP.

Recommendation

None.

Management's Response

No response necessary.

Observation

The PMIS database is designed in such a way that it can be utilized by all members of the Project Management Team, and all contractors and subcontractors at a level appropriate for their needs. We noted in the PMP that training for individuals at various levels should be provided to allow for full utilization of the resources provided and for consistency in documentation placed in the file.

C&A selected and tested 10 program management consultant staff members and 5 each of design and construction management consultants on current active projects. We verified that each consultant's training dates were included in a training log in PMIS without exception.

PERFORMANCE AUDIT OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES - Continued

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT PROCESSES FOR QUALITY CONTROLS AND RISK ASSESSMENT - Continued

Recommendation
None.
Management's Response
No response necessary.
Observation
The PMP states that periodic audits are to be performed internally. C&A noted that two internal audits were conducted by the PMC Quality Manager as described in the Quality Management Plan during the period covered by our procedures.
Recommendation
None.
Management's Response
No response necessary.
PROGRAM AND RELATED PROJECTS TIMELINE PERFORMANCE
Observation
C&A reviewed the timeline for tested projects to determine if any significant changes had been made, and if so, we obtained support for the justification and approval of these timeline changes. For any significant delays, we found that there was documentation to support that the proper members of management (both Program Management and MWS) had been informed.
Recommendation
None.
Management's Response

PERFORMANCE AUDIT OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS **AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES - Continued**

PROJECT PERFORMANCE IN ACCORDANCE WITH DESIGN

Observation

C&A noted that there were several projects in the construction phase that had been processed through the PMP. Of the projects reviewed the designs submitted appeared to represent the

through the rivir. Of the projects reviewed, the designs submitted appeared to represent the
RFPs. Reviews of the designs at various milestones were being performed by management and
the engineers of record were monitoring changes that may impact the intent of the design for
maximizing resources to resolve problems. We also noted field visits are being performed by the
Construction Managers with cross-references to the expectations.
Recommendation

None.

Management's Response

No response necessary.

EPA AND TDEC REPORTING REQUIREMENTS COMPLIANCE

Observation

C&A reviewed MWS's compliance with the various reporting requirements as it relates to the Consent Decree with particular attention to the Project Management Team's maintenance of documentation, content, and deadlines. C&A did not note any non-compliance.

Recommendation

None.

Management's Response

PERFORMANCE AUDIT OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES - Continued

PROJECT SITE VISITS

<u>Observation</u>

C&A conducted on-site visits for 10 of the 13 projects currently in either the construction or closeout phase. For each of these 10 projects, C&A met with the Site Construction Manager and performed a walkthrough of the site location, noting the current status of the project, including description/design of the project. Each project's timeline of completion in its current phase and percentage of completion costs were in line with that reported on the respective project summary reports reviewed and tested with no exception.

Recommendation

None

Management's Response

No response necessary.

PROCESS FOR REASSIGNMENT OF UNUSED BUDGETED FUNDS

Observation

During the prior year engagement, several projects were moved into the close out phase and the Program Management Team documented procedures to address the process for the reassignment of unused budgeted funds. Based on discussions with the Program Management Team and per review of PMIS, C&A observed that any unused budgeted funds from projects that have been closed out have been transferred from the individual project's detail cost sheet as Contingency-Forecasted Adjustments to the OAP Program detail cost sheet as Cross Phase-Contingency-Budgeted Changes (Approved). As of May 31, 2016, a total of \$50.2 million of unused budgeted funds from the various OAP projects that have closed out from inception of the Program through May 2016 have been captured in this contingency reserve fund for the overall CWN Program. C&A reviewed the forecasted adjustments along with the budget changes and verified that these processes are the same noting no exceptions. Therefore, it appears that the Program Management Team has implemented its process for tracking unused budgeted funds from projects closed out and is transferring these unused budgeted funds back into the overall Program reserve.

PERFORMANCE AUDIT OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES - Continued

PROCESS FOR REASSIGNMENT OF UNUSED BUDGETED FUNDS - Continued

Recommendation	
None.	
Management's Response	

Clean Water Nashville Overflow Abatement Program

CAP/ER & LTCP Implementation Plans & Schedules

CAP/ER & LTCP implementation	JII FIAIIS & S	criedules		
CD Name	Sub-Program	Expended Amount	Start	End
Early Action Projects (EAP)				
Barker Road Omohundro Equalization Storage Phase I	CAP-ER	\$12,310,818	5/15/2006	5/14/2008
Broadway Improvements	LTCP	\$646,794	7/1/2010	11/1/2011
Dodson Chapel Equalization Facility	CAP-ER	\$15,712,251	12/6/2010	11/25/2013
Driftwood Equalization Facility	LTCP	\$2,577,921	1/4/2011	11/27/2013
Dry Creek Waste Water Treatment Plant Optimization	CAP-ER	\$0	7/1/2003	12/31/2007
Holiday Travel Park Gravity Conversion	CAP-ER	\$114,638	6/2/2007	9/1/2012
Lakewood Rehabilitation (EAP)	CAP-ER	\$12,460,646	1/10/2011	3/24/2016
Mill Creek 36 in Trunk Sewer System Rehabilitation	CAP-ER	\$1,682,251	1/2/2008	9/30/2011
Rockwood Conveyance Improvement	CAP-ER	\$1,215,193	12/1/2011	5/1/2012
Smith Springs Equalization Storage	CAP-ER	\$0	7/11/2005	4/7/2006
Van Buren Improvements	LTCP	\$646,794	7/1/2010	11/1/2011
Washington CSO Facility Improvements	LTCP	\$19,613,899	7/1/2010	4/27/2012
West Park Equalization Storage Phase I	CAP-ER	\$9,366,031	1/2/2006	6/29/2011
Whites Creek Pump Station Improvements	CAP-ER	\$21,832,738	7/1/2009	11/14/2013
Whites Creek WWTP Disinfection & Optimization	CAP-ER	\$6,498,937	7/1/2008	12/21/2012
Subtotal:		\$104,678,911		
Overflow Abatement Program (OAP)		Ψ10 4,0 70,511		
28th Avenue Rehabilitation	CAP-ER	\$552,660	3/1/2012	2/5/2023
Apex Sewer Corrections	LTCP	\$1,198,909	7/5/2012	7/1/2014
Bandywood - Green Hills Rehabilitation (SU03A)	CAP-ER	\$0	7/31/2017	1/6/2020
Benedict & Crutcher Equalization Facility	LTCP	\$877	12/4/2018	9/3/2022
Berwick Trail Pipe Improvements	CAP-ER	\$408	11/13/2018	7/9/2022
Berwick Trail Pump Station Upgrades	CAP-ER	\$111,831	5/7/2012	7/9/2022
Boscobel Equalization Facility	LTCP	\$0	12/4/2018	9/3/2022
Brick Church Pike Pipe Improvements	CAP-ER	\$2,593,541	4/12/2012	11/19/2018
Central Wastewater Treatment Plant Equalization - Phase I	LTCP	\$0	1/28/2014	8/7/2019
Central Wastewater Treatment Plant Equalization - Phase II	LTCP	\$0	4/8/2015	11/4/2020
Central Wastewater Treatment Plant Equalization - Phase III	LTCP	\$0	6/4/2018	3/7/2023
Central Wastewater Treatment Plant Grit and Pump Station Upgrades	LTCP	\$0	1/28/2014	5/7/2020
Central Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity Improvements and CSO Reduction-A	LTCP	\$638,177	6/11/2014	8/31/2021
Central Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity Improvements and CSO Reduction-B	LTCP	\$973,875	6/11/2014	10/21/2021
Cleece Ferry Rehabilitation	CAP-ER	\$0	1/1/2017	12/26/2021
Combined Sewer System and First Avenue Tunnel Rehabilitation	LTCP	\$0	9/2/2019	11/24/2022
Cowan Riverside Rehabilitation	CAP-ER	\$10,632,181	12/30/2011	10/11/2017
Cowan Street Pipe Improvements	CAP-ER	\$0	8/3/2017	2/27/2023
Cowan Street Pump Station Upgrades	CAP-ER	\$0	6/30/2019	10/10/2022
Davidson and Brook Hollow Sewer Improvements	CAP-ER	\$1,047,610	12/28/2012	7/1/2016
Davidson Branch Pump Station and Equalization Facility	CAP-ER	\$1,240,944	5/7/2012	1/13/2019
Dodson Chapel Pipe Improvements	CAP-ER	\$4,436,614	11/30/2011	11/11/2015
Dry Creek Pipe Improvements	CAP-ER	\$85,076	8/31/2012	2/11/2023
Ewing Creek - Brick Church Equalization Facility	CAP-ER	\$1,719,347	5/7/2012	6/13/2018
First Avenue Tunnel Access	LTCP	\$0	3/29/2017	8/19/2020
Foster Avenue Rehabilitation GL01	CAP-ER	\$0	2/1/2019	10/27/2021

Clean Water Nashville Overflow Abatement Program

CAP/ER & LTCP Implementation Plans & Schedules

Or it /Elt a El Ol implomentation	i i iano a o	oriodaloo		
CD Name	Sub-Program	Expended Amount	Start	End
Gibson Creek Equalization Facility	CAP-ER	\$57,394	2/3/2013	2/20/2019
Gibson Creek Rehabilitation	CAP-ER	\$246,212	12/3/2012	7/29/2017
Green Improvements	LTCP	\$252,168	7/31/2012	7/30/2023
Henry Ford Drive Pipe Improvements	CAP-ER	\$0	12/3/2017	4/25/2022
Hidden Acres Pump Station Upgrades	CAP-ER	\$2,748	6/1/2016	4/25/2023
Highway 100 Tyne Boulevard Pipe Improvements	CAP-ER	\$4,085,881	12/1/2011	7/13/2025
Hurricane Creek Pipe Improvements	CAP-ER	\$90,523	11/1/2014	7/20/2020
Joelton Rehabilitation	CAP-ER	\$907,222	3/6/2012	6/16/2014
Kerrigan Trash Trap Replacement	LTCP	\$0	11/20/2019	4/12/2023
Kerrigan Weir Dynamic Addition	LTCP	\$198	6/1/2019	9/7/2022
Lakewood Rehabilitation	CAP-ER	\$133,641	1/10/2011	12/6/2019
Langford Farms-Madison Heights Rehabilitation	CAP-ER	\$71,778	5/30/2015	5/19/2017
Loves Branch Pump Station Upgrades	CAP-ER	\$494,976	5/7/2012	5/18/2023
Madison Heights Rainbow Terrace Rehabilitation	CAP-ER	\$2,682	5/30/2015	6/1/2017
Mill Creek Opryland Equalization Facility - Phase II	CAP-ER	\$11,734,199	2/2/2012	4/3/2015
Mill Creek Opryland Equalization Facility - Phase III	CAP-ER	\$0	8/9/2014	7/10/2023
Mill Creek Trunk Improvements	CAP-ER	\$42,989	1/31/2016	10/10/2022
Neely's Bend Pump Station Upgrades	CAP-ER	\$276,609	5/7/2012	4/15/2023
Neely's Bend Rehabilitation	CAP-ER	\$3,010,081	12/30/2011	12/8/2014
Norman Drive Pipe Improvements GC14	CAP-ER	\$19,277	1/31/2017	3/25/2021
Parthenon Area Improvements	LTCP	\$278,379	3/26/2012	2/13/2020
Program Cross-Phase	N/A	\$22,053,470	6/1/2016	6/1/2016
River Drive Rehabilitation	CAP-ER	\$0	1/31/2018	11/25/2020
Riverside Drive Pump Station Upgrades	CAP-ER	\$0	6/30/2019	2/28/2024
Schrader Equalization Facility	LTCP	\$0	2/12/2018	5/1/2022
Shelby Park Rehabilitation	CAP-ER	\$20,174,685	2/1/2012	1/25/2022
Smith Springs Rehabilitation	CAP-ER	\$889,163	4/3/2012	11/25/2020
Vandiver Pump Station Upgrades	CAP-ER	\$197,395	5/7/2012	3/14/2023
West Park Equalization Facility Phase II	CAP-ER	\$7,627,090	1/3/2012	2/3/2017
West Park Equalization Facility Phase III	CAP-ER	\$0	1/3/2012	11/8/2016
Subtotal:		\$97,880,810		
Total:		\$202,559,721		
Count: 71				
	Total for LTCP	\$26,827,001		

 Total for LTCP:
 \$26,827,991

 Total for CAP-ER:
 \$153,678,260

 Total for Program Cross-Phase:
 \$22,053,470

 Total:
 \$202,559,721