

Map the Meal Gap 2018:



Overall Food Insecurity in Tennessee by County in 2016 $^{\scriptscriptstyle 1}$

					Likely Income Eligibility for Federal Nutrition Assistance ²			
Inderson 75,545 13.48 10.56 598 133% 27% inderson 16,173 15.28 13.69 07% 25% 38% 166ton 16,173 15.28 2,455 07% 144% 165% 166ton 16,173 15.28 2,455 06% 124% 165% 160ton 170,173 15.6% 2,200 160% 144% 20% 160ton 170,173 15.6% 2,200 160% 144% 20% 160ton 170,173 15.6% 2,200 160% 144% 24% 165% 160ton 170,173 15.6% 2,200 160% 144% 24% 165% 160ton 170,173 15.5% 13.5% 1,000 172 174% 124% 24% 160ton 170,173 15.5% 1,000 15.5% 1,000 15.5% 1,000 15.5% 1,000 15.5% 1,000 15.5% 1,000 15.5% 1,000 15.5% 1,000 15.5% 1,000 15.5% 1,000 172 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 170	County	Population	insecurity	food insecure	% below 130% poverty	% between 130% and 185% poverty	% above 185% poverty	
Interface								
Berkon	Anderson	•		·				
New York 14,073 15,664 2,000 6664 14% 20% 20% 20km 26,162 11,226 11,226 13,256 13,550 22% 14% 24%								
South 126,192 11,296 14,100 5096 15% 3096 3016		· ·						
aradley 10.2,860 13.2% 6.200 72% 13% 24% 24% 24m								
Campbell 40,008 15.5% 6.00 72% 1.7% 1.1% 1.1% 1.2% 1.2% 1.00 6.3% 1.0% 2.1% 1.2% 1								
Camon 1,885 1,2 3% 1,700 63% 1.6% 2.24% Carrel 28,417 15,5% 4,410 613% 19% 20% Carrel 56,707 15,2% 8,600 72% 10% 18% Chester 17,355 13,0% 2,00 57% 13% 33% Claiborne 31,701 15,1% 4,780 66% 17% 19% Clay 7,799 15,4% 1,00 82% 13% 5% Corket 35,266 16,4% 5,790 76% 12% 12% Corket 14,558 31,30% 1,980 69% 19% 12% Corket 14,558 31,30% 1,980 69% 19% 12% Corket 14,558 13,0% 1,980 69% 19% 12% Corket 14,558 13,0% 1,980 69% 19% 12% Corket 14,568 1,60% 1,0%	,							
Carroll								
Carbon Section Secti								
Chestham								
Chester 17,355 3,38% 2,400 5,7% 13% 3,1% Claiporne 31,701 15,1% 4,780 64% 1,7% 19% Clay 7,760 15,4% 1,700 82% 13% 5% Cocket 35,256 16,4% 5,790 76% 12% 12% Cocket 14,558 33,0% 1,980 69% 19% 12% Cockett 14,558 33,0% 1,980 69% 19% 12% Cockett 11,703 41,558 15,6% 103,900 66% 15% 28% Dekation 11,703 41,5% 1,690 66% 15% 28% Dickson 50,266 12,2% 6,210 62% 10% 29% Sylver 37,970 15,5% 6,650 61% 16% 23% Sylver 37,970 15,9% 6,650 14% 11% 40% Sylver 13,94 1,26%<								
Claiborne 31,701 15,15k 4,780 64% 17% 19% Clocke 35,256 16,4% 1,200 82% 13% 5% Coffee 33,308 12,4% 6,660 6,2% 128k 12% Corckett 14,558 13,6% 1,980 6,660 6,2% 18% 20% Cumberland 57,895 12,2% 7,040 6,2% 20% 19% Savision 667,885 15,6% 103,900 65% 15% 28% Deckath 119,193 14,0% 2,600 71% 8% 21% Dickson 50,926 12,2% 6,610 66% 15% 19% Syer 37,970 15,9% 6,650 61% 16% 23% Syer 37,970 15,9% 6,650 61% 16% 23% Syer 37,970 15,9% 6,650 61% 11% 40% Syer 4,9 1,0 <td></td> <td>·</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		·						
Clay 7,769 15,4% 1,200 82% 13% 5% Cockec 35,256 16,4% 5,790 76% 12% 12% Cocket 35,308 12,4% 6,660 62% 18% 20% Cockett 14,558 13,6% 1,980 69% 19% 12% Davidson 667,885 15,0% 103,900 56% 15% 28% Dectaur 11,103 14,5% 1,600 66% 15% 28% Dectaur 11,103 14,5% 1,600 66% 15% 28% Dectaur 11,103 14,6% 2,600 71,8% 8% 2,1% Ockson 5,926 12,2% 6,210 62% 10% 2,2% Ockson 5,936 4,9% 1,1% 40% 2,600 79% 17% 4% Fentres 12,736 14,8% 2,600 61% 14% 10% 10% 10% 12%								
cocke 35,256 16.4% 5,700 76% 12% 12% Crofefee 53,808 12.4% 6,660 62% 18% 20% Crockett 14,558 13.6% 1,980 69% 19% 12% Cumberland 57,895 12.2% 7,040 62% 20% 19% Jourdston 667,885 15,6% 103,900 66% 15% 19% Joekalb 19,159 14,0% 2,600 66% 15% 19% Dickson 50,926 12.2% 6,210 62% 10% 2.9% Olyer 37,970 1.5% 6,600 61% 16% 2.2% Olyer 37,970 1.5% 6,600 61% 16% 2.2% Olyer 37,970 1.5% 6,600 61% 16% 2.2% Oyer 3,920 1.5% 2,660 79% 1.7% 4% Fanklin 41,348 1.25% 7,510<								
Confect	Cocke							
Trackett	Coffee							
Camberland 57,895 12.2% 7,040 62% 20% 19% lawdson 667,885 15.6% 103,900 56% 15% 28% locatur 11,703 14.5% 1,690 66% 15% 19% leys locatur 11,703 14.5% 1,690 66% 15% 19% 29% locatur 11,703 14.5% 6,000 61% 16% 23% locatur 11,704 14.6% 15,690 61% 16% 23% locatur 11,705 14.6% 5,690 49% 111% 40% leys locatur 11,705 14.8% 2,660 79% 17% 44% leys locatur 11,705 14.8% 2,660 79% 17% 44% leys locatur 11,705 14.8% 2,660 79% 17% 44% locatur 11,705 14.8% 2,660 79% 17% 44% locatur 11,705 14.8% 2,660 19% 17% 17% 44% locatur 11,705 14.8% 2,660 19% 17% 17% 17% locatur 11,705 14.8% 2,660 19% 17% 17% 17% locatur 11,705 18.8% 7,840 61% 23% 17% locatur 11,705 18.8% 7,840 61% 12,700 18.8% 11,705 19% 19% 19% 19% 19% 19% 19% 19% 19% 19%	Crockett							
Decautr 11,703 14,5% 1,690 66% 15% 19% Dekalb 19,159 14,0% 2,690 71% 8% 21% Dickson 50,926 12,2% 6,210 62% 10% 29% Oyer 37,970 15,9% 6,050 61% 16% 23% Fearly 39,071 14.6% 5,590 49% 11% 40% Fearly 39,071 14.8% 2,660 79% 17% 4% Fearly 49,511 15.8% 3,500 62% 18% 21% Sibson 49,511 15.8% 3,920 62% 21% 17% Silsson 49,511 31.5% 3,920 62% 21% 17% Screene 68,502 13.5% 3,290 65% 15% 19% Screene 68,502 13.5% 9,230 65% 15% 9,4 Fearly 13.4% 16.5% 2,200	Cumberland	57,895	12.2%	7,040	62%	20%	19%	
Dekalb 19,159 14,0% 2,690 71% 8% 21% Dickson 50,965 12,2% 6,210 62% 10% 29% Syper 37,970 15,9% 6,050 61% 10% 23% ayette 39,071 14.6% 5,690 49% 11% 40% Fentless 17,936 14.8% 2,660 79% 11% 40% Fentless 17,936 14.8% 2,660 79% 11% 40% Fentless 17,936 14.8% 2,660 79% 11% 40% Franklin 41,338 12.5% 5,150 62% 18% 21% Gilles 29,041 13.5% 3,940 61% 23% 17% Gringer 22,813 13.0% 2,970 67% 14% 19% Grandy 13,494 1,53 2,230 65% 1.5% 20% France 68,502 13.5% 2,230 <td>Davidson</td> <td>667,885</td> <td>15.6%</td> <td>103,900</td> <td>56%</td> <td>15%</td> <td>28%</td>	Davidson	667,885	15.6%	103,900	56%	15%	28%	
Dickson 50,926 12.2% 6,210 62% 10% 29% Oyer 37,970 15.9% 6,050 61% 16% 23% ayete 39,071 11.6% 5,990 49% 11% 40% Fentress 17,936 14.8% 2,660 79% 17% 4% Fentress 17,936 14.8% 2,660 79% 17% 4% Franklin 41,348 12.5% 5,150 62% 18% 21% Silbson 49,511 15.8% 7,840 61% 23% 17% Giles 29,041 13.5% 3,320 62% 21% 17% Grainger 22,813 13.0% 2,970 67% 14% 19% Greene 68,502 13.5% 9,230 65% 15% 20% Fundy 13.494 16.5% 2,220 76% 15% 9% Fundy 13.494 16.5% 1,220	Decatur	11,703	14.5%	1,690	66%	15%	19%	
Deper 37,970 15.9% 6,050 61% 16% 23% 174 extete 39,071 14.6% 5,690 49% 11% 40% extertes 17,936 14.8% 2,660 79% 17% 4% 474 entertes 17,936 14.8% 2,660 79% 17% 4% 17% 4% 174 174 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175	DeKalb	19,159	14.0%	2,690	71%	8%	21%	
Feyette 39,071 14.6% 5,690 49% 11% 40% Februess 17,936 14.8% 2,660 79% 17% 4% Fernankin 41,348 12.5% 5,150 62% 18% 21% 21% 21% 21% 21% 21% 21% 21% 21% 21	Dickson	50,926	12.2%	6,210	62%	10%	29%	
Fertress 17,936 14.8% 2,660 79% 17% 4% 17% 4% 17% 14.8% 12.5% 5.150 62% 18% 21% 318% 21% 31800 49.511 15.8% 7,840 613% 223% 17% 6318c 29.034 13.5% 3,920 62% 21% 17% 17% 637einger 22.813 13.0% 2,970 67% 14% 19% 637einger 66.56.02 13.5% 9,230 65% 15% 12% 20% 637einger 66.50.02 13.5% 9,230 65% 15% 15% 9% 14% 19% 637einger 13.494 16.5% 2,220 76% 15% 9% 14% 19% 637einger 66.50.03 13.3% 8,420 66% 15% 15% 17% 14milton 331,305 14.3% 50,180 53% 16% 32% 14milton 351,305 14.3% 50,180 53% 16% 32% 14rdeman 25,975 20.4% 5,290 56% 19% 25% 14rdeman 25,975 20.4% 5,290 56% 19% 25% 14rdeman 25,839 14.5% 3,750 68% 10% 22% 14rdeman 27,952 15.6% 4,370 68% 14% 19% 14milton 32.5,291 14.6% 4,700 62% 123% 17% 14milton 24,251 14.1% 3,430 64% 15% 12% 14milton 24,251 14.1% 3,430 64% 15% 15% 11% 14% 14winton 24,251 14.1% 3,430 64% 15% 15% 11% 14winton 24,251 14.1% 3,430 64% 15% 15% 11% 14winton 24,251 14.1% 3,430 64% 15% 15% 12% 14winton 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 14% 14winton 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 12% 12% 10% 10% 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 12% 12% 10% 10% 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 12% 12% 10% 10% 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 12% 12% 10% 10% 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 12% 12% 10% 10% 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 12% 12% 10% 10% 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 12% 12% 10% 10% 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 12% 12% 10% 10% 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 12% 12% 10% 10% 11% 10% 10% 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 12% 12% 10% 10% 11% 10% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 10	Dyer	37,970	15.9%	6,050	61%	16%	23%	
Franklin 41,348 12.5% 5,150 62% 18% 21% 1558 15580 49,511 15.8% 7,840 61% 23% 17% 17% 17% 17% 17% 17% 17% 17% 17% 17	Fayette	39,071	14.6%	5,690	49%	11%	40%	
Gibson 49,511 15.8% 7,840 61% 23% 17% Giles 29,034 13.5% 3,920 62% 21% 17% Greene 68,502 13.5% 2,970 65% 15% 20% Grundy 13,494 16.5% 2,220 76% 15% 9% Hamblen 63,203 13.3% 8,420 68% 15% 17% Hamilton 351,305 14.3% 50,180 53% 16% 32% Hancock 6,609 16.8% 1,110 78% 13% 9% Hardman 25,975 20.4% 5,290 56% 19% 25% Hardman 25,975 20.4% 5,290 56% 19% 25% Hardman 25,975 20.4% 5,290 56% 19% 22% Hardman 25,975 20.4% 5,290 56% 19% 25% Hardman 25,975 13.5% 7,630 <td>Fentress</td> <td>17,936</td> <td>14.8%</td> <td>2,660</td> <td>79%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>4%</td>	Fentress	17,936	14.8%	2,660	79%	17%	4%	
Giles 29,034 13.5% 3,920 62% 21% 17% Grainger 22,813 13.0% 2,970 67% 14% 19% Greene 68,502 13.5% 9,230 65% 15% 20% Grundy 13,494 16.5% 2,220 76% 15% 9% Hamblen 63,203 13.3% 8,420 68% 15% 17% Hamblen 351,305 14.3% 50,180 53% 16% 32% Hardin 25,975 20.4% 5,290 56% 19% 25% Hardin 25,839 14.5% 3,750 68% 10% 22% Hawkins 56,567 31.5% 7,630 68% 14% 19% Hawyood 18,129 21.3% 3,870 60% 23% 17% Henderson 27,952 15.6% 4,370 62% 20% 18% Heinderson 32,291 14.6% 4,7	Franklin	41,348	12.5%		62%	18%	21%	
Grainger 22,813 13.0% 2,970 67% 14% 19% Greene 68,502 13.5% 9,220 65% 15% 20% Grundy 13,494 16.5% 2,220 65% 15% 9% Hamblen 63,203 13.3% 8,420 68% 15% 17% Hamilton 351,305 14.3% 50,180 53% 16% 32% Hardeman 25,975 20.4% 5,290 56% 19% 25% Hardin 25,839 14.5% 3,750 68% 10% 22% Hawkins 56,567 13.5% 7,630 68% 14% 19% Henderson 27,952 15.6% 4,370 62% 12% 26% Henderson 27,952 15.6% 4,370 62% 12% 26% Henderson 27,952 15.6% 4,370 62% 12% 26% Helmy 32,291 14.6% <td< td=""><td>Gibson</td><td>· ·</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Gibson	· ·						
Greene 68,502 13.5% 9,230 65% 15% 20% Grundy 13,494 16.5% 2,220 76% 15% 9% Hamblen 63,203 13.3% 8,420 68% 15% 17% Hamblen 63,203 13.3% 8,420 68% 15% 17% Hamilton 351,305 14.3% 50,180 53% 16% 32% Hardcock 6,609 16.8% 1,110 78% 13% 9% Hardman 25,975 20.4% 5,290 56% 19% 25% Hardin 25,839 14.5% 3,750 68% 14% 19% Hardin 25,839 14.5% 3,750 68% 14% 19% Hardin 25,557 15.6% 4,370 62% 12% 26% Hardin 27,521 14.6% 4,700 62% 12% 26% Heleny 32,291 14.6% 4,700	Giles							
Grundy 13,494 16.5% 2,220 76% 15% 9% Hamblen 63,203 13.3% 8,420 68% 15% 17% Hamilton 351,305 14.3% 50,180 53% 16% 32% Hardcock 6,609 16.8% 1,110 78% 13% 9% Harddeman 25,975 20.4% 5,290 56% 19% 25% Hardin 25,839 14.5% 3,750 68% 10% 22% Hawkins 56,567 13.5% 7,630 68% 14% 19% Haywood 18,129 21.3% 3,870 60% 23% 17% Helenderson 27,952 15.6% 4,370 62% 20% 18% Helendy 32,291 14.6% 4,700 62% 20% 18% Helendy 32,241 15.0% 1,230 70% 17% 14% Houston 8,234 15.0%	Grainger	·						
Hamblen 63,203 13.3% 8,420 68% 15% 17% 14milton 351,305 14.3% 50,180 53% 16% 32% 14milton 66,609 16.8% 1,110 78% 13% 9% 14milton 25,875 20.4% 5,290 56% 19% 25% 14milton 25,839 14.5% 3,750 68% 10% 22% 14milton 25,839 14.5% 3,750 68% 10% 22% 14milton 25,839 14.5% 3,750 68% 14% 19% 14milton 25,839 14.5% 3,750 68% 14% 19% 14milton 25,839 14.5% 3,870 60% 23% 17% 14milton 25,851 14.6% 4,700 60% 23% 17% 14milton 24,251 14.6% 4,700 62% 20% 18% 14milton 24,251 14.6% 4,700 62% 20% 18% 14milton 24,251 14.1% 3,430 64% 15% 21% 14milton 18,234 15.0% 1,230 70% 17% 17% 14Milton 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 12% 22% 12% 12% 12% 12% 12% 12% 12	Greene							
Hamilton 351,305 14.3% 50,180 53% 16% 32% Hancock 6,609 16.8% 1,110 78% 13% 9% Hardeman 25,975 20.4% 5,290 56% 19% 25% Hardin 25,839 14.5% 3,750 68% 10% 22% Hawkins 56,567 13.5% 7,630 68% 14% 19% Hawkins 26,567 13.5% 3,870 60% 23% 17% Hawkins 27,952 15.6% 4,370 62% 12% 26% Henry 32,291 14.6% 4,700 62% 12% 26% Henry 32,291 14.6% 4,700 62% 12% 26% Houston 8,234 15.0% 1,230 70% 17% 14% Humphreys 18,216 13.5% 2,450 55% 16% 29% Jackson 17,923 15.5% 2,780<		· ·						
Hancock 6,609 16.8% 1,110 78% 13% 9% Hardeman 25,975 20.4% 5,290 56% 19% 25% Hardeman 25,839 14.5% 3,750 68% 10% 22% Hardin 25,839 14.5% 3,750 68% 10% 22% Hardwins 56,567 13.5% 7,638 68% 14% 19% Hawkins 18,129 21.3% 3,870 66% 23% 17% Hardeman 27,952 15.6% 4,370 62% 12% 26% Henry 32,291 14.6% 4,700 62% 20% 18% Houston 8,234 15.0% 1,230 70% 17% 14% Humphreys 18,216 13.5% 2,450 55% 16% 29% Harderson 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 14% 166 165% 12% 12% 14.1% 13.3% 59,550 15% 12% 23% 100nson 17,923 15.5% 2,780 67% 12% 22% 14.8% 14.86 13.3% 59,550 15% 12% 33% 12.86 14.86 14.86 14.33% 59,550 15% 12% 33% 12.86 14.								
Hardeman 25,975 20.4% 5,290 56% 19% 25% Hardin 25,839 14.5% 3,750 68% 10% 22% Hawkins 56,567 13.5% 7,630 68% 14% 19% Haywood 18,129 21.3% 3,870 60% 23% 17% Henderson 27,952 15.6% 4,370 62% 12% 26% Henry 32,291 14.6% 4,700 62% 20% 18% Heinry 32,291 14.6% 4,700 62% 17% 14% Heinry 18,216 13.5% 2,450		· ·						
Hardin 25,839 14.5% 3,750 68% 10% 22% Hawkins 56,567 13.5% 7,630 68% 14% 19% Hawkins 56,567 13.5% 7,630 68% 14% 19% Hawkins 56,567 13.5% 3,870 60% 23% 17% Henderson 27,952 15.6% 4,370 62% 12% 26% Henry 32,291 14.6% 4,700 62% 20% 18% Henry 32,291 14.6% 4,700 62% 20% 18% Houston 8,234 15.0% 1,230 70% 17% 14% Houston 8,234 15.0% 1,230 70% 17% 14% Houston 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% Jackson 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% Johnson 17,923 15.5% 2,780 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>								
Hawkins 56,567 13.5% 7,630 68% 14% 19% Haywood 18,129 21.3% 3,870 60% 23% 17% Henderson 27,952 15.6% 4,370 62% 12% 26% Henry 32,291 14.6% 4,700 62% 20% 18% Houston 8,234 15.0% 1,230 70% 17% 14% 14whickson 11,526 13.5% 2,450 55% 16% 29% 18% Houston 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 11% 16ferson 52,851 12.1% 6,420 57% 21% 23% 10hson 17,923 15.5% 2,780 67% 12% 22% 10hson 17,923 15.5% 2,780 67% 12% 23% 10hson 17,923 15.5% 2,780 66% 19% 15% 15% 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0		·						
Haywood 18,129 21.3% 3,870 60% 23% 17% Henderson 27,952 15.6% 4,370 62% 12% 26% Henry 32,291 14.6% 4,700 62% 20% 18% Hickman 24,251 14.1% 3,430 64% 15% 21% Houston 8,234 15.0% 1,230 70% 17% 14% Humphreys 18,216 13.5% 2,450 55% 16% 29% Jackson 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% Johnson 17,923 15.5% 2,780 67% 12% 23% Knox 448,164 13.3% 59,550 55% 12% 33% Jacke 7,643 22.1% 1,690 45% 7% 48% Jacke 7,643 22.1% 5,880 66% 19% 15% Jacke 11,907 33.5% 1,650								
Henderson 27,952 15.6% 4,370 62% 12% 26% Henry 32,291 14.6% 4,700 62% 20% 18% Heinry 32,291 14.6% 4,700 62% 20% 18% Heinry 32,291 14.1% 3,430 64% 15% 21% Houston 8,234 15.0% 1,230 70% 17% 14% Humphreys 18,216 13.5% 2,450 55% 16% 29% Jackson 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% Johnson 17,923 15.5% 2,780 67% 12% 23% Knox 448,164 13.3% 59,550 55% 12% 33% Jack 7,643 22.1% 1,690 45% 7% 48% Jack 2,766 21.6% 5,880 66% 19% 15% Jack 2,240 13.6% 5,760		·						
Henry 32,291 14.6% 4,700 62% 20% 18% Hickman 24,251 14.1% 3,430 64% 15% 21% Houston 8,234 15.0% 1,230 70% 17% 14% 14% Humphreys 18,216 13.5% 2,450 55% 16% 29% lackson 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% lefferson 52,851 12.1% 6,420 57% 21% 23% lohnson 17,923 15.5% 2,780 67% 12% 22% Knox 448,164 13.3% 59,550 55% 12% 33% lacke 7,643 22.1% 1,690 45% 7% 48% lacker 27,261 21.6% 5,880 66% 19% 15% lawrence 42,406 13.6% 5,760 70% 14% 16% lacker 33,582 13.0% 4,370 69% 18% 14% lacker 33,582 13.0% 4,370 69% 18% 14% lacker 30,637 10.0% 5,070 60% 18% 22% lacker 30,637 10.0% 5,070 60% 13% 22% lacker 30,637 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0%								
Hickman 24,251 14.1% 3,430 64% 15% 21% 14with thouston 8,234 15.0% 1,230 70% 17% 14% 14% 14winhireys 18,216 13.5% 2,450 55% 16% 29% 16.0% 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 11% 11% 11% 11% 11% 11% 11% 11								
Houston 8,234 15.0% 1,230 70% 17% 14% 14% 14mphreys 18,216 13.5% 2,450 55% 16% 29% 14mphreys 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 11% 14% 16ferson 52,851 12.1% 6,420 57% 21% 23% 15.5% 16,00m 17,923 15.5% 2,780 67% 12% 22% 15.6% 1	Hickman							
Humphreys 18,216 13.5% 2,450 55% 16% 29% 1ackson 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% 11% 18ferson 52,851 12.1% 6,420 57% 21% 23% 10hnson 17,923 15.5% 2,780 67% 12% 22% (Anox 448,164 13.3% 59,550 55% 12% 33% 2ake 7,643 22.1% 1,690 45% 7% 48% 2auderdale 27,261 21.6% 5,880 66% 19% 15% 2.awrence 42,406 13.6% 5,760 70% 14% 16% 2.ewis 11,907 13.8% 1,650 64% 15% 21% 21% 2.incoln 33,582 13.0% 4,370 69% 18% 14% 22% 1.oudon 50,637 10.0% 5,070 60% 18% 22% 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000								
Jackson 11,526 15.6% 1,800 79% 10% 11% Jefferson 52,851 12.1% 6,420 57% 21% 23% Johnson 17,923 15.5% 2,780 67% 12% 22% Knox 448,164 13.3% 59,550 55% 12% 33% Lake 7,643 22.1% 1,690 45% 7% 48% Lauderdale 27,261 21.6% 5,880 66% 19% 15% Lawrence 42,406 13.6% 5,760 70% 14% 16% Lewis 11,907 13.8% 1,650 64% 15% 21% Lincoln 33,582 13.0% 4,370 69% 18% 14% Loudon 50,637 10.0% 5,070 60% 18% 22% WCNinn 52,606 13.6% 7,160 65% 13% 22% McNairy 26,057 16.0% 4,160 72% 16% 13% McNairy 26,057 16.0% <	Humphreys							
lefferson 52,851 12.1% 6,420 57% 21% 23% Johnson 17,923 15.5% 2,780 67% 12% 22% Knox 448,164 13.3% 59,550 55% 12% 33% Lake 7,643 22.1% 1,690 45% 7% 48% Lauderdale 27,261 21.6% 5,880 66% 19% 15% Lawrence 42,406 13.6% 5,760 70% 14% 16% Lewis 11,907 13.8% 1,650 64% 15% 21% Lincoln 33,582 13.0% 4,370 69% 18% 14% Loudon 50,637 10.0% 5,070 60% 18% 22% McNinn 52,606 13.6% 7,160 65% 13% 22% McNairy 26,057 16.0% 4,160 72% 16% 13% McNairy 22,924 12.2% 2,790 <td>Jackson</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Jackson							
Johnson 17,923 15.5% 2,780 67% 12% 22% Knox 448,164 13.3% 59,550 55% 12% 33% Lake 7,643 22.1% 1,690 45% 7% 48% Lawrence 27,261 21.6% 5,880 66% 19% 15% Lawrence 42,406 13.6% 5,760 70% 14% 16% Lewis 11,907 13.8% 1,650 64% 15% 21% Lincoln 33,582 13.0% 4,370 69% 18% 14% Loudon 50,637 10.0% 5,070 60% 18% 22% McMairy 26,057 16.0% 4,160 72% 16% 13% McNairy 22,924 12.2% 2,790 72% 17% 11%	Jefferson							
Knox 448,164 13.3% 59,550 55% 12% 33% Lake 7,643 22.1% 1,690 45% 7% 48% Lawrence 27,261 21.6% 5,880 66% 19% 15% Lawrence 42,406 13.6% 5,760 70% 14% 16% Lewis 11,907 13.8% 1,650 64% 15% 21% Lincoln 33,582 13.0% 4,370 69% 18% 14% Loudon 50,637 10.0% 5,070 60% 18% 22% McMinn 52,606 13.6% 7,160 65% 13% 22% McNairy 26,057 16.0% 4,160 72% 16% 13% McNairy 22,924 12.2% 2,790 72% 17% 11%	Johnson							
Lauderdale 27,261 21.6% 5,880 66% 19% 15% Lawrence 42,406 13.6% 5,760 70% 14% 16% Lewis 11,907 13.8% 1,650 64% 15% 21% Lincoln 33,582 13.0% 4,370 69% 18% 14% Loudon 50,637 10.0% 5,070 60% 18% 22% McMinn 52,606 13.6% 7,160 65% 13% 22% McNairy 26,057 16.0% 4,160 72% 16% 13% Macon 22,924 12.2% 2,790 72% 17% 11%	Knox		13.3%			12%		
Lawrence 42,406 13.6% 5,760 70% 14% 16% Lewis 11,907 13.8% 1,650 64% 15% 21% Lincoln 33,582 13.0% 4,370 69% 18% 14% Loudon 50,637 10.0% 5,070 60% 18% 22% McMinn 52,606 13.6% 7,160 65% 13% 22% McNairy 26,057 16.0% 4,160 72% 16% 13% Macon 22,924 12.2% 2,790 72% 17% 11%	Lake	7,643	22.1%	1,690	45%	7%	48%	
Lewis 11,907 13.8% 1,650 64% 15% 21% Lincoln 33,582 13.0% 4,370 69% 18% 14% Loudon 50,637 10.0% 5,070 60% 18% 22% McMinn 52,606 13.6% 7,160 65% 13% 22% McNairy 26,057 16.0% 4,160 72% 16% 13% Macon 22,924 12.2% 2,790 72% 17% 11%	Lauderdale	27,261	21.6%	5,880	66%	19%	15%	
Lincoln 33,582 13.0% 4,370 69% 18% 14% Loudon 50,637 10.0% 5,070 60% 18% 22% McMinn 52,606 13.6% 7,160 65% 13% 22% McNairy 26,057 16.0% 4,160 72% 16% 13% Wacon 22,924 12.2% 2,790 72% 17% 11%	Lawrence	42,406	13.6%	5,760	70%	14%	16%	
Loudon 50,637 10.0% 5,070 60% 18% 22% McMinn 52,606 13.6% 7,160 65% 13% 22% McNairy 26,057 16.0% 4,160 72% 16% 13% Wacon 22,924 12.2% 2,790 72% 17% 11%	Lewis	11,907	13.8%	1,650	64%	15%	21%	
VicMinn 52,606 13.6% 7,160 65% 13% 22% VicNairy 26,057 16.0% 4,160 72% 16% 13% Videon 22,924 12.2% 2,790 72% 17% 11%	Lincoln	33,582	13.0%	4,370	69%	18%	14%	
McNairy 26,057 16.0% 4,160 72% 16% 13% Macon 22,924 12.2% 2,790 72% 17% 11%	Loudon	50,637	10.0%	5,070	60%	18%	22%	
Macon 22,924 12.2% 2,790 72% 17% 11%	McMinn	52,606	13.6%	7,160	65%	13%	22%	
·	McNairy	26,057			72%	16%	13%	
	Macon					17%		
vladison 98,128 18.2% 17,900 56% 14% 30%	Madison	98,128	18.2%	17,900	56%	14%	30%	

			Likely Income El	Eligibility for Federal Nutrition Assistance ²		
		Food	Estimated number	% below 130%	% between 130%	% above 185%
County	Population	insecurity	food insecure	poverty	and 185% poverty	poverty
	·	rate	individuals (rounded)	SNAP, WIC, free school meals, CSFP, TEFAP	WIC, reduced price school meals	Charitable Response
Marion	28,363	14.1%	3,990	62%	11%	28%
Marshall	31,335	12.2%	3,840	57%	21%	22%
Maury	85,767	12.7%	10,880	58%	13%	30%
Meigs	11,804	13.9%	1,640	64%	19%	17%
Monroe	45,482	13.0%	5,910	73%	17%	10%
Montgomery	189,709	14.5%	27,430	53%	20%	28%
Moore	6,314	10.1%	640	51%	17%	32%
Morgan	21,688	15.0%	3,250	63%	12%	26%
Obion	30,900	16.3%	5,030	63%	17%	20%
Overton	22,090	13.3%	2,940	71%	11%	18%
Perry	7,891	15.9%	1,260	75%	8%	17%
Pickett	5,096	12.5%	630	59%	25%	17%
Polk	16,697	12.8%	2,140	65%	14%	21%
Putnam	74,652	15.0%	11,170	69%	9%	22%
Rhea	32,461	15.4%	5,000	65%	14%	22%
Roane	52,983	12.8%	6,780	61%	16%	24%
Robertson	67,905	10.1%	6,880	51%	19%	30%
Rutherford	290,289	12.0%	34,810	51%	14%	35%
Scott	22,029	17.2%	3,800	73%	9%	19%
Sequatchie	14,710	12.2%	1,800	64%	14%	22%
Sevier	94,537	12.0%	11,300	66%	23%	11%
Shelby	936,990	21.2%	198,610	58%	16%	27%
Smith	19,176	12.2%	2,330	62%	20%	18%
Stewart	13,257	13.9%	1,840	58%	11%	31%
Sullivan	156,644	12.9%	20,220	62%	16%	22%
Sumner	172,786	10.2%	17,550	48%	16%	36%
Tipton	61,558	14.3%	8,770	51%	15%	35%
Trousdale	7,970	12.7%	1,010	58%	29%	14%
Unicoi	17,945	14.4%	2,580	66%	19%	15%
Union	19,081	14.5%	2,760	68%	16%	16%
Van Buren	5,641	12.5%	700	63%	15%	22%
Warren	40,099	12.8%	5,140	72%	18%	9%
Washington	126,044	13.4%	16,860	59%	13%	27%
Wayne	16,842	13.9%	2,330	62%	15%	23%
Weakley	34,024	15.2%	5,160	61%	12%	27%
White	26,373	12.7%	3,350	70%	25%	5%
Williamson	205,645	7.0%	14,450	34%	9%	57%
Wilson	125,616	9.7%	12,130	43%	15%	42%
State Total ⁶	6,651,194	14.5%	967,430	55.4%	16.3%	28.3%

For additional data and maps by county, state, and congressional district, please visit map.feedingamerica.org.

Gundersen, C., A. Dewey, A. Crumbaugh, M. Kato & E. Engelhard. Map the Meal Gap 2018: A Report on County and Congressional District Food Insecurity and County Food Cost in the United States in 2016. Feeding America, 2018. This research is generously supported by The Howard G. Buffett Foundation and Nielsen.

¹Map the Meal Gap's food insecurity rates are determined using data from the 2001-2016 Current Population Survey on individuals in food insecure households; data from the 2016 American Community Survey on median household incomes, poverty rates, homeownership, and race and ethnic demographics; and 2016 data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics on unemployment rates.

²Numbers reflect percentage of food insecure individuals living in households with incomes within the income bands indicated. Eligibility for federal nutrition programs is determined in part by these income thresholds which can vary by state.

⁶Population and food insecurity data in the state totals row do not reflect the sum of all counties in that state. The state totals are aggregated from the congressional districts data in that state. All data in the state totals row pertaining to the cost of food or the "Meal Gap" reflect state-level data and are not aggregations of either counties or congressional districts.



Map the Meal Gap 2018:



Overall Food Insecurity in Tennessee by Congressional District in 2016 ¹

				Likely Income Eligibility for Federal Nutrition Assistance ²		
Congressional District	Population	Food insecurity rate	Estimated number food insecure individuals (rounded)	% below 130% poverty SNAP, WIC, free school meals, CSFP, TEFAP	% between 130% and 185% poverty WIC, reduced price school meals	% above 185% poverty Charitable Response
1	714,504	13.4%	95,910	64%	17%	19%
2	740,182	12.4%	91,690	53%	14%	32%
3	728,254	13.6%	98,850	53%	17%	30%
4	767,655	12.4%	95,230	53%	15%	32%
5	762,535	14.6%	111,440	50%	17%	33%
6	761,538	11.0%	84,000	57%	17%	26%
7	765,730	13.0%	99,640	52%	14%	34%
8	706,468	14.9%	105,160	50%	16%	34%
9	704,328	26.3%	185,510	62%	18%	20%

 $For \ additional \ data \ and \ maps \ by \ county, \ state, \ and \ congressional \ district, \ please \ visit \ \ \underline{map.feedingamerica.org}.$

Gundersen, C., A. Dewey, A. Crumbaugh, M. Kato & E. Engelhard. Map the Meal Gap 2018: A Report on County and Congressional District Food Insecurity and County Food Cost in the United States in 2016. Feeding America, 2018. This research is generously supported by The Howard G. Buffett Foundation and Nielsen.

¹Map the Meal Gap's food insecurity rates are determined using data from the 2001-2016 Current Population Survey on individuals in food insecure households; and data from the 2016 American Community Survey on median household incomes, unemployment rates, poverty rates, homeownership, and race and ethnic demographics.

²Numbers reflect percentage of food insecure individuals living in households with incomes within the income bands indicated. Eligibility for federal nutrition programs is determined in part by these income thresholds which can vary by state.