

Appendix D: Community Impact Assessment Technical Memorandum

State Route 19

Environmental Assessment

*From East of Eastland Avenue to East of SR-87
Lauderdale and Haywood Counties, Tennessee*

PIN 102251.00



Contents

1.0	Introduction.....	5
1.1	Project Background.....	5
1.2	Alternatives Under Consideration.....	8
1.2.1	No-Build Alternative	8
1.2.2	Build Alternative	8
1.3	Environmental Technical Study Area	10
2.0	Community History	10
2.1	Lauderdale County	10
2.2	Haywood County	12
3.0	Community Characteristics.....	13
3.1	Population and Demographic Characteristics.....	13
3.1.1	Population Trends and Forecasts	13
3.1.2	Social Characteristics	16
3.2	Community Services and Facilities.....	21
3.2.1	Community Facilities Within or Adjacent to the Project Footprint.....	21
3.2.2	Additional Services and Facilities Serving the Project Area	23
3.2.3	Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Resources	24
3.3	Economic Conditions	26
3.3.1	Economic Status	26
3.3.2	Labor Force.....	27
3.3.3	Commuting Patterns.....	28
3.3.4	Investments Currently Planned or Under Development in Lauderdale County and Haywood County	29
4.0	Community Impacts.....	30
4.1	Preliminary Relocations and Land Acquisition.....	30
4.2	Community Stability and Cohesion Impacts.....	30

4.2.1	No-Build Alternative	30
4.2.2	Build Alternative	30
4.3	Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Impacts	31
4.3.1	No-Build Alternative	31
4.3.2	Build Alternative	31
4.4	Economic Impacts	31
4.4.1	No-Build Alternative	31
4.4.2	Build Alternative	32
5.0	Minimization/Mitigation Measures to Address Impacts	32
5.1	Minimization/Mitigation Measures to Address Relocations.....	32
5.1.1	TDOT’s Right-of-Way Relocation Process	32
5.1.2	If Replacement Housing is not Available Within the Project Vicinity.....	33
5.2	Minimization/Mitigation Measures to Address Community Stability and Community Cohesion Impacts	34
5.3	Minimization/Mitigation Measures to Address Economic Impacts.....	35
6.0	Community Impacts Memorandum Summary	35

Tables

Table 1	Census Tracts and Block Groups that the Build Alternative Intersects	15
Table 2	Population Data 2000 to 2040	16
Table 3	Social Characteristics	19
Table 4	Subsidized Housing Availability and Occupancy	20
Table 5	Community Facilities Within or Adjacent to the Limits of the Build Alternative.....	21
Table 6	ARC Economic Classification Descriptions	26
Table 7	Economic Status Lauderdale and Haywood Counties	27
Table 8	Top Three Industries by State and County in 2023	27
Table 9	Labor Force and Employment 2000 to 2024	28
Table 10	2022 Commuting Patterns for Lauderdale and Haywood County	29
Table 11	Community Impact Memorandum Summary	36

Figures

Figure 1 Project Location..... 6

Figure 2 PIN Identification..... 7

Figure 3 SR-19 Improvement Locations 9

Figure 4 Census Block Groups Within or Adjacent to the SR-19 Project Area 14

Figure 5 Community Services and Facilities Within or Adjacent the SR-19 Project Area 22

Attachments

- Attachment A Population Data
- Attachment B Social Data
- Attachment C Economic Data
- Attachment D Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan (CSRP)

1.0 Introduction

The Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT), in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is proposing improvements to approximately 15.2 miles of State Route (SR) 19 from east of Eastland Avenue in Lauderdale County to east of SR-87 in Haywood County, Tennessee (**Figure 1**). Since the proposed project would be funded in part with federal transportation funds, it is subject to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). An Environmental Assessment (EA) is being prepared in accordance with NEPA to identify and evaluate the environmental effects of the proposed project and to identify measures to minimize harm.

This technical memorandum includes a Community Impact Assessment (CIA), which provides background and context for the SR-19 project and discusses the services and facilities that serve the community along the SR-19 project corridor. This technical memorandum also identifies preliminary anticipated relocations and land acquisition, as well as potential community stability and cohesion impacts for both the No-Build and Build Alternatives. Additionally, this technical memorandum discusses existing economic and social conditions along the SR-19 project corridor.

1.1 Project Background

On February 1, 2018, the FHWA approved a D-List Categorical Exclusion for the proposed widening of SR-19 from east of Eastland Avenue to east of SR-87 under TDOT project identification number (PIN) 102251.00.

Since the approval of 2018 D-List CE, the proposed SR-19 project has been divided into three segments for funding purposes; PIN 102251.01, 102251.02, and PIN 102251.03. The current EA effort is analyzing entirety of the proposed SR-19 corridor from east of Eastland Avenue to east of SR-87 (PIN 102251.00) which is comprised of PIN 102251.01, PIN 102251.02, and PIN 102251.03 (**Figure 2**).

For more information on the project background, please refer to Chapter 1 in the EA.

Figure 1 Project Location





Figure 2 PIN Identification



1.2 Alternatives Under Consideration

A No-Build Alternative and one Build Alternative are being evaluated in the EA. Each alternative is described in the subsequent text below.

1.2.1 No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative would leave the segment of SR-19 from east of Eastland Avenue to east of SR-87 as it currently exists except for routine maintenance and safety upgrades, as needed, or modifications that have been programmed and approved for implementation through TDOT's 25-Year Long Range Transportation Policy Plan, State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), or TDOT 10-Year Project Plan. The No-Build Alternative is required by federal regulations to be evaluated in the EA and provides a baseline for comparing other alternatives.

1.2.2 Build Alternative

The Build Alternative proposes various roadway improvements along SR-19, from east of Eastland Avenue to east of SR-87. Proposed improvements would include widening, resurfacing, realignment of select intersections, and slope improvements (**Figure 3**).


From east of Eastland Avenue in Lauderdale County to just west of Gill Brackin Road in Haywood County, the proposed project would widen the existing 11-foot travel lanes (one in each direction) to two 12-foot travel lanes with 2-foot to 10-foot shoulders (8-foot paved). Along this segment of the proposed project, the roadway would be widened primarily to the north side of the existing roadway in the Lauderdale County portion and to the south side in Haywood County. In this section, the following intersections are proposed to be realigned:

- Willie Paris Road
- Ross Road/Gause Lane
- Tall Oaks Cove
- Sanford Road/Conner Whitefield Road
- Watson Road/Carney Road
- Springhill Road

From just west of Gill Brackin Road to Nunn Road, the proposed project would mill and resurface the existing 11-foot travel lanes and 2-foot shoulders. In this section, the following intersections are proposed to be realigned:

- Forked Deer Road (SR-180)
- Nunn Road

Figure 3 SR-19 Improvement Locations



From Nunn Road to east of Jim Binford Lane, the proposed project would widen the two existing 11-foot travel lanes and 2-foot shoulders to two 12-foot travel lanes with 10-foot shoulders (8-foot paved). In this section, the following SR-19 intersection is proposed to be realigned:

- Jim Binford Lane

From east of Jim Binford Lane to east of SR-87, the proposed project would mill and resurface the existing 11-foot travel lanes and 2-foot shoulders. Additionally, the proposed project would correct erosion/slope issues from approximately 4,351 feet east of Woodlawn Road to approximately 4,411 feet west of Old SR-19 (approximately 1,700 feet) and from approximately 3,417 feet east of Patton Road to approximately 279 feet east of Westpointe Road (approximately 1,800 feet). In this section, the following intersections are proposed to be realigned:

- Small Road at SR-19
- Woodlawn Road/Briar Creek Road at SR-19
- Old SR-19 at SR-19

1.3 Environmental Technical Study Area

An Environmental Technical Study Area (ETSA) was developed for the proposed SR-19 project in order to document natural, cultural, and community resources within a broader study area than the immediate project footprint. Generally, the ETSA boundary is 250 feet on either side of the proposed centerline, 300 feet from the project termini, and 150 feet from intersections with sideroads. That way, if shifts to the proposed project design shift during project development, TDOT staff are aware of any resources that are present in the larger ETSA boundary.

2.0 Community History

The community history of the project provides background and context for the SR-19 project area through a discussion of the history of Lauderdale and Haywood counties, within which the project is located.

2.1 Lauderdale County

Lauderdale County was established in 1838 from portions of Tipton, Dyer, and Haywood Counties; it was named for Lieutenant Colonel James Lauderdale, who was killed at the Battle of New Orleans. The earliest history of the county is associated with the Chickasaw Nation that claimed West Tennessee. Woodland and Mississippian Period sites, many with burial mounds, are scattered throughout the region.

The earliest Euro-Americans in this area came during the late-eighteenth century. Despite Chickasaw claims to this land, North Carolina sent surveyor Henry Rutherford to establish claims in western Tennessee; in 1785, he established “Key Corner” as a survey site. The claim was carved into a large Sycamore on the first high ground east of Mississippi and south of the Forked Deer River. Following the Jackson Purchase, Rutherford and his brothers settled near Key Corner; the first grist mill was built here in 1826, and the first cotton gin was added the following year. Ripley, the county seat, was established in 1862, and it quickly became a center for trade between Dyersburg and Covington.

Due to rich soil and access to markets, commercial agriculture developed quickly. Initially, corn was planted, and as farms became more established, cash crops, such as cotton and tobacco, were raised. One good acre of land could yield eight to ten barrels of corn and one to five thousand pounds of cotton¹. Cotton dominated the antebellum commerce with steamboats carrying bales from landings on the Forked Deer, Hatchie, and Mississippi Rivers. Plantations in Lauderdale were small to average in size; the largest averaged 86 slaves.

The Civil War devastated the local economy with occupation of the county by both Union and Confederate forces during the conflict. The largest engagement took place at Fort Pillow on April 12, 1864, when General Nathan Bedford Forrest overran the Union outpost and killed nearly half a garrison of African American troops. After that conflict, occupation of the area see-sawed between Confederate and Union troops; both groups bivouacked in Ripley at various times.

Post-Civil War Lauderdale County recovered slowly; agriculture continued to be profitable, and railroad construction through the county in the 1870s boosted the cotton and tobacco markets. The railroad reached Ripley in 1874; local produce shipped on the line, such as strawberries, were a staple. Later in the century, timber became a large industry for the area.

During World War II, the U.S. Army established a 2,450-acre air base, where over 7,700 troops were trained in the tiny community of Halls. After the base was closed and the land sold at auction, a portion of the property was developed as an industrial park; Tupperware was the first plant to locate there in 1969. Other industrial employers include SR of Tennessee, a motor vehicles parts company; Marvin Windows; Tennessee Electroplating; and A.O. Smith, a motor and generator manufacturer. The two largest employers in the

¹ Tilly, Bette, “Aspects of Social and Economic Life in West Tennessee Before the Civil War”, 1974, p. 88-89

county are the Lauderdale County School System and Cold Creek Correctional Facility, which is operated by the state.²

Today the county still presents a combination of scenic natural areas, rural life, and small urban centers.

2.2 Haywood County

Haywood County was created from part of Madison County by the Tennessee General Assembly in 1823-24; Brownsville was established as the county seat. The growth of cotton and production of cotton fiber has dominated the economy of Haywood County from its beginning. The first cotton gin in the county began operation here in 1828, and Haywood County soon became one of the largest cotton producers in the state of Tennessee.

Southwestern Tennessee is part of the upper section of the Mississippi Delta with its associated deep, rich soil that produced a high grade of cotton with a long and heavy staple. Cotton picking was a demanding, labor-intensive job, and the growth of the plantation system supported by slave labor was directly related. This slave/planter system of agriculture was nurtured by the crop, and the resulting cultural landscape was unique. By the 1840s large scale commercial agriculture had already been achieved; three southwestern Tennessee Counties, Fayette, Hardeman and Haywood each produced over three million pounds of cotton yearly.

By 1850, Tennessee was fifth in the production of cotton among the cotton growing states; the following decade saw a tremendous rise in the prices for cotton, fueling a boom in the growth of slave labor and cotton production. Memphis, Tennessee, 70 miles southwest of Haywood County, became known as the "Biggest Inland Cotton Market in the World." Although the counties bordering the Mississippi Delta, particularly Shelby, Tipton, Lauderdale, and parts of Dyer and Obion, had the richest land in the district, they also had an unhealthful reputation due to the swamp areas nearest the river. Slightly east in Haywood, the soil was excellent for the production of cotton, minus the disadvantages of living near the river.

Throughout the nineteenth century, most planters operated their own private gins; the buildings were usually two-story structures that housed the storage bin, saw gin, and lint room. Outside was a large wooden screw press that processed the cotton in large bales for

² This Lauderdale County historic documentation was taken from Ann Toplovich at Lauderdale County | Tennessee Encyclopedia

shipping. During the first part of the twentieth century, independent gins that offered other services, such as a general store and a feed and seed business, began to replace the privately owned cotton gins. In 1902, Tennessee had 833 private gins; that number shrank to only one plantation gin by 1938.

Other important crops in Haywood County included corn, fruit, grasses, and livestock. Strawberries, tomatoes, and other small fruits and vegetables were grown as field crops for shipment to other markets. An 1882 article in the “Rural Record” compares the fruit grown in Tennessee to that in California. The Tennessee Crop Map of peanuts, Irish potatoes, fruits, and vegetables identified Brownsville in Haywood County as a center for shipment of strawberries and other small fruit. Brownsville was located on the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, the significant reason behind this status. L&N was the most profitable railroad in the southern market. Legislatures in both Kentucky and Tennessee granted a charter in 1850; the first train to complete the journey was in 1859.

Education in Haywood County echoed education in rural Tennessee: early public education was provided through private, local efforts. In 1909, the General Education Act unified the state school system and provided some funding; however, the largest influence on public education in Tennessee was in 1937 when the state legislature earmarked four million dollars to fund public education³.

3.0 Community Characteristics

3.1 Population and Demographic Characteristics

This section of this technical memorandum discusses various social characteristics for Tennessee, Lauderdale County, and Haywood County. See **Attachment B** for supporting documentation related to the social characteristics data discussed in this section, including data tables related to age, race, national origin, education, literacy, limited english proficiency, disability, health, car ownership, internet access, poverty, and median household income in Tennessee, Lauderdale County, and Haywood County.

3.1.1 Population Trends and Forecasts

The proposed project is located within U.S. Census Bureau designated Census Tracts (CTs) and Block Groups (BGs) in Lauderdale County and Haywood County shown on **Figure 4** and listed in **Table 1**.

³ This Haywood County historical documentation was taken from Emma Nunn at Haywood County | Tennessee Encyclopedia

Figure 4 Census Block Groups Within or Adjacent to the SR-19 Project Area




Table 1 Census Tracts and Block Groups that the Build Alternative Intersects

County	Census Tract (CT) Block Group (BG)
Haywood	CT 9302 BG 1
Haywood	CT 9302 BG 2
Haywood	CT 9303.01 BG 1
Haywood	CT 9303.01 BG 3
Lauderdale	CT 505.06 BG 1
Lauderdale	CT 505.06 BG 2

Population trends for Tennessee, Lauderdale County, Haywood County are shown in **Table 2**. The population in Lauderdale County slightly increased from 2000 to 2010, but decreased between 2010 and 2020. **Table 2**, population projections from the [Boyd Center for Business and Economic Research](#)⁴ indicate that Lauderdale County's population is anticipated to decrease considerably between 2020 and 2040.

The population in Haywood County decreased from 2000 to 2010, and continued a relatively steady decrease between 2010 and 2020 (**Table 2**). As shown in **Table 2**, population projections from the [Boyd Center for Business and Economic Research](#)⁵ indicate that Haywood County's population is anticipated to decrease considerably between 2020 and 2040.

Between 2010 and 2020, Census data shows population declines for all of the identified block groups. The highest decline was in CT 9302 BG 2 in Haywood County with a decline of approximately 12.5 percent. The smallest decline was in CT 9303.01 BG 3, which was also in Haywood County with a decline of less than 2.2 percent, which is within the margin of error. Population data for 2000 or for 2040 was not available for these geographic areas.

⁴ Boyd Center for Business and Economic Research, University of Tennessee, Knoxville. 2022-2070 Projections. Population projections are published every two years, with the latest release date being August 7, 2024. See **Attachment A**. Available at: <https://tnsdc.utk.edu/estimates-and-projections/boyd-center-population-projections/>

⁵ Boyd Center for Business and Economic Research, University of Tennessee, Knoxville. 2022-2070 Projections. Population projections are published every two years, with the latest release date being August 7, 2024. See **Attachment A**. Available at: <https://tnsdc.utk.edu/estimates-and-projections/boyd-center-population-projections/>

Table 2 Population Data 2000 to 2040

Geographic Area	Population			Population Projection	Percent Change ⁶		
	2000 ⁷	2010 ⁸	2020 ⁹	2040 ¹⁰	2000-2010	2010-2020	2020-2040
Tennessee	5,689,283	6,346,105	6,910,840	7,940,301	11.54	8.90	14.90
Lauderdale County	27,101	27,815	25,143	20,442	2.63	-9.61	-18.70
Haywood County	19,797	18,787	17,864	15,115	-5.10	-4.91	-15.39
CT 9302 BG1	Not Available	1,064	967	Not Available	Not Available	-9.12	Not Available
CT 9302 BG 2		675	591			-12.44	
CT 9303.01 BG1		1,402	1,231			-12.20	
CT 9303.01 BG 3		2,077	2,031			-2.21	
CT 505.06 BG1		1,266	1,133			-10.51	
CT 505.06 BG 2		1,254	1,166			-7.02	

3.1.2 Social Characteristics

The following sections provide information on various social characteristics for Lauderdale County, Haywood County, and the State of Tennessee. See **Attachment B** for supporting documentation. The information for Sections 3.2.1 through 3.2.12 is summarized in **Table 3**.

3.1.2.1 Age

In Lauderdale County, the percent of the population under the age of 18 (22%) and the percent of the population over the age of 65 (16.3%) is slightly lower than the statewide averages of 22.3% for under 18 and 16.8% for over 65. In Haywood County, the percent of the population under the age of 18 (22.3%) is the same as the statewide average (22.3%) and the percent of the population over the age of 65 (20.2%) is higher than the statewide average of 16.8%.

⁶ Percent Change = (Later Year Population – Earlier Year Population) / Earlier Year Population x 100

⁷ 2000 Decennial Census, U.S. Census Bureau. Table ID: DP1, See **Attachment A**.

⁸ 2010 Decennial Census, U.S. Census Bureau. Table ID: P1, See **Attachment A**.

⁹ 2020 Decennial Census, U.S. Census Bureau. Table ID: P1, See **Attachment A**.

¹⁰ Boyd Center for Business and Economic Research, University of Tennessee, Knoxville. 2022-2070 Projections. Population projections are published every two years, with the latest release date being August 7, 2024. See **Attachment A**.

3.1.2.2 Education

The percent of the population with a high school degree, General Educational Development (GED) certification, or similar alternate credential in Lauderdale (82.8 percent) and Haywood counties (82.8 percent) is lower than the statewide average (89.6 percent). The percent of the population with a bachelor's degree or higher in Lauderdale (10.9 percent) and Haywood counties (13.1 percent) is lower than the statewide average (20.4 percent) as summarized in **Table 3**.

3.1.2.3 Literacy

The *Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies* (PIAAC)¹¹ is a multicycle survey of adult skills and competencies. PIAAC reports literacy proficiency as the percentage of adults with Level 1 (low), Level 2 (medium), and Level 3 (high) proficiency. PIAAC defines the three levels as follows:

- **Level 1:** Represents adults that can be considered at risk for difficulties using or comprehending print material. Adults at the upper end of this level can read short texts, in print or online, and understand the meaning well enough to perform simple tasks, such as filling out a short form, but drawing inferences or combining multiple sources of text may be too difficult. Adults who are *below Level 1* may only be able to understand very basic vocabulary or find very specific information on a familiar topic.
- **Level 2:** Represents adults that can be considered nearing proficiency but still struggling to perform tasks with text-based information. Such adults may be able to read print and digital texts, relate multiple pieces of information within or across a couple of documents, compare and contrast, and draw simple inferences. They can navigate in a digital environment to access key information, such as finding two main benefits of one product over another. However, more complex inferencing and evaluation may be too difficult.
- **Level 3:** Represents adults that can be considered proficient at working with information and ideas in texts. Their higher literacy skills range from the ability to understand, interpret, and synthesize information across multiple, complex texts to the ability to evaluate the reliability of sources and infer sophisticated meanings and complex ideas from written sources.

Both Lauderdale County (36.0 percent) and Haywood County (34.0 percent) have a higher percent of their population at or below Level 1) when compared to Tennessee (22 percent). Both

¹¹ PIAAC - U.S. State and County Est <https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/piaac/state-county-estimates.asp#functions>
imates Resources

Lauderdale County (47 percent) and Haywood County (47 percent) have a higher percent of the population at Level 2 when compared to Tennessee (38 percent). Both Lauderdale County (17.0 percent) and Haywood County (19.0 percent) have a lower percent of the population at or above Level 3 when compared to Tennessee (40.0 percent).

3.1.2.4 Limited English Proficiency

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) households are households where English is not the first language spoken. Both Lauderdale County (0.5 percent) and Haywood County (0.6 percent) have a lower percent of LEP households than the statewide percentage (1.7 percent) as summarized in **Table 3**.

3.1.2.5 Disability

Both Lauderdale County (22.7 percent) and Haywood County (26.1 percent) have a higher percent of non-institutionalized population with a disability than the statewide percentage (15.0 percent) as summarized in **Table 3**.

3.1.2.6 Health

The leading cause of death in Lauderdale County, Haywood County, and the State of Tennessee are diseases of the heart followed by malignant neoplasms as summarized in **Table 3**.

3.1.2.7 Vehicle Ownership

Both Lauderdale County (8.7 percent) and Haywood County (11.0 percent) have a higher percent of households with no vehicles available than the state of Tennessee (5.2 percent) as summarized in **Table 3**.

3.1.2.8 Internet Access

Both Lauderdale County (84.0 percent) and Haywood County (76.2 percent) have a lower percent of households with access to Internet subscriptions when compared to the state of Tennessee (87.6 percent) as summarized in **Table 3**.

3.1.2.9 Median Household Income

The median household income for both Lauderdale County (\$49,205) and Haywood County (\$43,513) is lower than the statewide average (\$67,097) as summarized in **Table 3**.

3.1.2.10 Subsidized Housing

The federal government provides housing assistance to low-income renters, predominantly through subsidies provided under programs administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The occupancy rate for subsidized housing in Lauderdale County (91 percent) and Haywood County (83 percent) are each consistent with that of the State of Tennessee (87 percent).

Table 4 summarizes the availability and occupancy for subsidized housing in Tennessee, Lauderdale County, and Haywood County. HUD categorizes some properties as resources for low-moderate income families. These resources include, but are not limited to, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Housing, Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Properties, Public Housing Authorities, and multifamily housing properties that have subsidized housing units or offer project-based rental assistance. In total, there are 33 of these resources in the Brownsville, Ripley, and Henning area.¹² None of these properties are anticipated to be impacted by the Build Alternative. A full list of all nearby HUD resources can be found in **Attachment B**.

Table 3 Social Characteristics^{13, 14, 15}

Social Characteristics		Lauderdale County	Haywood County	Tennessee
Age	Under Age 18	22.0%	22.3%	22.3%
	Age 65 and Above	16.3%	20.2%	16.8%
Education	High School Degree, GED, or Alternative Credential	82.8%	82.8%	89.6%
	Bachelor's Degree or Higher	10.9%	13.1%	20.4%
Literacy	At or Below Level 1	36.0%	34.0%	22.0%
	At Level 2	47.0%	47.0%	38.0%
	At or Above Level 3	17.0%	19.0%	40.0%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP)	LEP Households	0.5%	0.6%	1.7%
Disability	Non-institutionalized Population with a Disability	22.7%	26.1%	15.0%
Health	Leading Cause of Death (Top 3)	• Diseases of the Heart • Malignant Neoplasms • Chronic Lower	• Diseases of the Heart • Malignant Neoplasms • Cerebrovascular Disease	• Diseases of the Heart • Malignant Neoplasms • Chronic Lower

¹² U.S. Department of HUD Resource Locator App. Accessed April 2025. See **Attachment B**.

¹³ For the following Social Characteristics: Age, Education, English Proficiency, Disability, Vehicle Ownership, Internet Access, and Median Income: 2019-2023 ACS 5-Year Estimates; U.S. Census Bureau. See **Attachment B**.

¹⁴ Literacy: 2012/2014/2017 Comparison Charts of State and County Estimates for Tennessee; PIAAC. See **Attachment B**.

¹⁵ 2021 Tennessee Department of Health, Division of Vital Records and Statistics; Leading Causes of Death in Tennessee; 2021 Tennessee Department of Health, Division of Vital Records and Statistics; Leading Causes of Death in Lauderdale County; 2014-2017 Tennessee Department of Health, Division of Vital Records and Statistics; Leading Causes of Death in Haywood County. (<https://www.tn.gov/health/health-program-areas/statistics/health-data/death-statistics.html>) See **Attachment B**.

Social Characteristics		Lauderdale County	Haywood County	Tennessee
		Respiratory Diseases		Respiratory Diseases
Vehicle Ownership	Households with No Vehicles Available	8.7%	11.0%	5.2%
Internet Access	Households with Internet Access	84.0%	76.2%	87.6%
Median Household Income	Median Household Income	\$49,205	\$43,513	\$67,097

Table 4 Subsidized Housing Availability and Occupancy^{16,17}

Metric	Tennessee	Lauderdale County	Haywood County
Subsidized Units Available	106,908	506	462
Percent Occupied	87%	91%	83%

¹⁶ U.S. Department of HUD. Picture of Subsidized Households Dataset. 2024 Based on 2020 Census. <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/assthsg.html> Accessed October 2024.

*Please Note, the Picture of Subsidized Households Dataset only includes information on HUD administered subsidies and does not cover other housing subsidy programs unless they also receive subsidies from HUD programs.

¹⁷ Data from <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/assthsg.html> was sorted and displayed based on relevance. See **Attachment B**.

3.2 Community Services and Facilities

3.2.1 Community Facilities Within or Adjacent to the Project Footprint

Community services and facilities include places of worship, public parks and recreational facilities, educational facilities, social services, healthcare facilities, and public safety facilities (police, fire, and rescue). The existing community facilities within the project footprint and adjacent¹⁸ to the limits of the Build Alternative are listed in

Each county has an ambulance authority that serves the area. The Lauderdale Community Hospital, multiple urgent cares, and Haywood Park Community Hospital are also located nearby and serve the area. and shown on **Figure 5**.


Table 5 Community Facilities Within or Adjacent to the Limits of the Build Alternative¹⁹

Facility	Address
The Forerunner Church	361 Eastland Avenue, Ripley, Tennessee 38063
Wood Family Cemetery	Willie Paris Road Ripley, Tennessee 38063
Praise & Deliverance Temple New Pentecostal Church	660 Willie Paris Road, Ripley, Tennessee, 38063
Elam Baptist Church	46 Durhamville Road, Ripley, Tennessee, 38063
Springhill Baptist Church	251 Springhill Road, Ripley, Tennessee, 38063
Springhill Cemetery	Springhill Road Ripley, Tennessee 38063
Edward Grove Cemetery	12314 Highway 19, Ripley, Tennessee 38063
Light House Full Gospel Church	11565 Highway 19, Ripley, Tennessee 38063
Woodlawn Baptist Church	Tibbs Road, Ripley, Tennessee 38063
Trinity Methodist Church and Cemetery	Old Highway 19 and Nunn Road, Nutbush, Tennessee 38012
Woodlawn Baptist Church	363 Woodlawn Road, Brownsville, Tennessee 38012
Woodlawn Missionary Baptist Church Cemetery	364 Woodlawn Road Brownsville, Tennessee 38012
Mann Family Cemetery	852 Old Highway 19, Brownsville, Tennessee 38012
New Vision Community Church	612 Fulton Rd, Brownsville, Tennessee, 38012

¹⁸ Community services and facilities were considered adjacent to the limits of the Build Alternative if they are located within an approximately 0.5-mile radius of the centerline of the Build Alternative, but beyond the proposed right-of-way and easements as documented in the Revised Line and Grade Plans (July, 2025), which serve as the focus of the EA currently underway (included in **Appendix B** of the EA).

¹⁹ Source: U.S. Geological Survey, ArcGIS REST Services Directory, Structures (<https://apps.nationalmap.gov/downloader/>), Google Earth (Reviewed on April 16, 2025)

Figure 5 Community Services and Facilities Within or Adjacent the SR-19 Project Area



3.2.2 Additional Services and Facilities Serving the Project Area

Multiple law enforcement jurisdictions overlap with the project area including city police and county sheriff's offices. The Lauderdale County Sheriff's Office is in Ripley and the Haywood County Sheriff's Office is in Brownsville; and both are within 10 miles of the project area. The Ripley Police Department, Brownsville Police Department and Henning Police Department all have offices within 10 miles of the project area along with 14 fire stations. Each county has a Justice Complex near the project area and the Lauderdale County Courthouse is near their Justice Complex.

Each county has an ambulance authority that serves the area. The Lauderdale Community Hospital, multiple urgent cares, and Haywood Park Community Hospital are also located nearby and serve the area.

There are 10 schools, including elementary, middle, and high schools, within a 10 mile radius along with institutions of higher education such as the Tennessee College of Applied Technology at Ripley. The nearest high schools are Ripley High School and Haywood High School which are about two to three miles from the project termini in Lauderdale and Haywood counties, respectively. It is unlikely that county public school buses would regularly use the section of SR-19 within the project area because it is split by two counties and does not connect a residential area to any of the schools. Many recreational opportunities can be found around the project area. To the northwest is the Chickasaw National Wildlife Refuge, to the west is the Lower Hatchie National Wildlife Refuge, and to the southeast is the Hatchie National Wildlife Refuge. All except the Hatchie National Wildlife Refuge are over 10 miles away. There are many trails within 10 miles of the project area, including some that are outside of the national wildlife refuges such as West Crutcher Trail and Middle Crutcher Trail.

There are many additional churches outside of the previously defined 0.5-mile radius of the project area. There are no mosques or temples within 20 miles of the project area, however, there is a synagogue within 10 miles of the project area in Brownsville.

Fixed-route transit service is currently not available in the project area. The Delta Human Resources Agency provides the West Tennessee RPO region with demand-response transit within the region. In the 2017-2018 fiscal year, the Delta Human Resources Agency had 63,794 total riders, and about 33 percent were from Lauderdale County.²⁰ The Southwest Human Resources Agency provides the Southwest RPO with demand-response transit within the

²⁰https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/tdot/long-range-planning/oct/rural_regional_plans/WestTNDraft_20191022reduced.pdf

region. In the 2018 fiscal year, there were a total of 107,208 riders in the region, and about 24 percent were from Haywood County.²¹ Both demand-response transit systems require reservations at least 2 to 3 days before the trip and charge a nominal fee based on pick-up and drop-off locations, length of ride, and/or number of stops.^{22,23}

Utility services in the SR-19 project area include electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, internet, telephone, and cable. The Ripley Power and Light Company serves the electrical needs of Ripley, while the Ripley Gas, Water, and Wastewater Department manages natural gas, potable water, and wastewater. Brownsville Energy Authority supplies Brownsville and parts of Haywood County with water, wastewater, electricity, propane, and natural gas. Underground and/or above-ground utilities are currently located within the existing right-of-way or immediately adjacent to it.

3.2.3 Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Resources

3.2.3.1 Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) Act of 1966

Under the provisions of [Section 4\(f\) of the U.S. DOT Act of 1966 \(49 USC §303 \(c\)\)](#)²⁴, the FHWA may approve the use of land from publicly owned parks or recreation areas, publicly owned wildlife or waterfowl refuges, or historic sites that are listed in, or eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) for federal-aid highway projects if it determines that there is no feasible and prudent avoidance alternative and the action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property. The FHWA also may approve the use of land from such properties if it determines that that use of the property, including any measure(s) to minimize harm (such as any avoidance, minimization, mitigation, or enhancement measures) committed to by the applicant would have a de minimis impact, as identified in [23 CFR § 774.17](#)²⁵, on the property.

Pursuant to 23 CFR § 774.17, a “use” of a Section 4(f) property occurs:

- (1) when land is permanently incorporated into a transportation facility;
- (2) when there is a temporary occupancy of land that is adverse in terms of the statute’s preservation purpose; or
- (3) when there is a constructive use of a Section 4(f) property

²¹ https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/tdot/long-range-planning/oct/rural_regional_plans/Southwest%20RPO%20Full%20Draft%209-4-2019%20Reduced.pdf

²² <https://deltahumanresourceagency.com/ride-fares/>

²³ <https://www.swhra.org/transportation-fares/>

²⁴ https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/env_topics/4f_tutorial/overview.aspx?h=e

²⁵ <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/chapter-I/subchapter-H/part-774/section-774.17>

There are no parks, trails, greenways, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuge within or adjacent to the proposed project footprint. For information on Section 106 resources subject to Section 4(f) within the vicinity of the proposed project, see the SR-19 Cultural Resources Technical Memorandum in **Appendix F** of the EA.

3.2.3.2 Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965

The [Land and Water Conservation \(LWCF\) Act of 1965 \(Public Law 88-578\)](#)²⁶ was enacted to preserve, develop, and assure accessibility to outdoor recreation resources by:

- Providing funds for and authorizing federal assistance to the states in planning, acquisition, and development of needed land and water areas and facilities, and
- Providing funds for the federal acquisition and development of certain lands and other areas.

The Act authorized the establishment of the [LWCF](#)²⁷, which is funded by the revenue from fees paid to the federal government for offshore drilling, surplus property sales, motorboat fuel tax, and other revenues. The program is administered by the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service (NPS) through regulations outlined in [36 CFR § 59](#)²⁸.

Section 6(f) refers to the original Section within the LWCF Act and is codified under [36 CFR § 59.3](#)²⁹. Section 6(f) prohibits the conversion of property acquired or developed with grants from this fund to a non-recreational purpose without the approval of the NPS. The NPS can approve such conversion only if it is in accordance with the existing comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan and only upon such conditions as deemed necessary to “*assure the substitution of other recreational properties of at least equal fair market value and of reasonably equivalent usefulness and location*” ([36 CFR § 59.3](#)).

Protection of lands under Section 6(f) includes all parks and other sites that have been the subject of LWCF grants to states and localities whether for acquisition of park land, development, or rehabilitation of facilities.

Within Tennessee, the Section 6(f) conversion process is administered jointly by the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) and the NPS.

²⁶ <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-78/pdf/STATUTE-78-Pg897.pdf>

²⁷ Congressional Acts - Land and Water Conservation Fund (U.S. National Park Service)

²⁸ <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-36/chapter-I/part-59>

²⁹ <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-36/chapter-I/part-59/section-59.3>

There are no parks, trails, greenways, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuge within or adjacent to the proposed project footprint, therefore there are no Section 6(f) resources within or adjacent to the proposed project footprint.

3.3 Economic Conditions

This section of this technical memorandum describes the existing economic conditions of Lauderdale and Haywood counties, including information on the labor force and commuting patterns, and discusses impacts to economic conditions anticipated to result from the No-Build and Build Alternatives.

3.3.1 Economic Status

Each year the Appalachia Regional Commission (ARC) prepares an index of county economic status for every county in the United States. Economic status designations are identified through a composite measure of each county's three-year average unemployment rate, per capita market income, and poverty rate. Based on these indicators, each county is then classified as distressed, at-risk, transitional, competitive or attainment.

Table 6 describes ARC's economic status classifications³⁰. The ARC economic status for Lauderdale County and Haywood County is shown in **Table 7**. As of fiscal year 2026, Lauderdale County is one of 24 at-risk counties in Tennessee. Haywood County is one of 11 distressed counties in Tennessee.

Table 6 ARC Economic Classification Descriptions

Classification	Description
Distressed	Distressed counties are the most economically depressed counties. They rank in the worst 10 percent of the nation's counties.
At-Risk	At-Risk counties are at risk of becoming economically distressed. They rank between the worst 10 percent and the worst 25 percent of the nation's counties.
Transitional	Transitional counties are those transitioning between strong and weak economies. They make up the largest economic status designation. Transitional counties rank between the worst 25 percent and the best 25 percent of the nation's counties.
Competitive	Competitive counties are those that can compete in the national economy but are not in the highest 10 percent of the nation's counties. Counties ranking between the best 10 percent and the best 25 percent of the nation's counties are classified competitive.
Attainment	Attainment counties are the economically strongest counties. Counties ranking in the best 10 percent of the nation's counties are classified as attainment.

³⁰ <https://www.arc.gov/distressed-designation-and-county-economic-status-classification-system/>

Table 7 Economic Status Lauderdale and Haywood Counties³¹

County	Economic Status	Index Value Rank (Of 3,113 counties in the US, 1 is best). FY 2026	Per Capita Market Income, 2023	Poverty Rate, 2019-2023	Three Year Average Unemployment Rate, 2021-2023
Lauderdale	At-Risk	2,783	\$26,958	18.7%	5.3%
Haywood	Distressed	2,888	\$25,623	22.8%	5.0%

3.3.2 Labor Force

The current top three industries in the state and in each county are shown in **Table 8** along with the percent of those employed who work in that industry.

As shown in **Table 9** and **Table 10**, for the years reviewed, unemployment rates in Tennessee, Lauderdale County and Haywood County follow similar trends of peaking in 2010, decreasing in 2019, increasing in 2020 and decreasing in 2024. The decreases correspond with the Great Recession and the Covid-19 Recession.

Table 8 Top Three Industries by State and County in 2023³²

Geographic Area	Top Three Industries
Tennessee	• Educational services, and health care and social assistance (22.26%) • Manufacturing (12.79%) • Retail Trade (11.50%)
Lauderdale County	• Manufacturing (27.10%) • Educational services, and health care and social assistance (16.99%) • Retail Trade (11.61%)
Haywood County	• Manufacturing (22.78%) • Educational services, and health care and social assistance (21.82%) • Retail Trade (13.33%)

³¹ <https://www.arc.gov/classifying-economic-distress-in-appalachian-counties/>

³² US Census Bureau, 2019-2023 American Community Survey 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates, Table ID: C24030 (see **Attachment C**).

Table 9 Labor Force and Employment 2000 to 2024³³

Geographic Area	Year ³⁴	Labor Force ³⁵	Employed	Unemployed	Unemployment Rate (%)
Tennessee	2024	3,420,373	3,303,023	117,350	3.4
	2020	3,294,793	3,049,480	245,313	7.4
	2019	3,329,437	3,218,077	111,360	3.3
	2010	3,094,834	2,791,618	303,216	9.8
	2000	2,845,308	2,735,994	109,314	3.8
Lauderdale County	2024	8,829	8,396	433	4.9
	2020	9,779	8,927	852	8.7
	2019	9,809	9,287	522	5.3
	2010	10,804	9,249	1,555	14.4
	2000	11,185	10,623	562	5.0
Haywood County	2024	10,784	10,448	336	3.1
	2020	8,419	7,739	680	8.1
	2019	8,387	8,014	373	4.4
	2010	8,981	7,561	1,420	15.8
	2000	9,256	8,749	507	5.5

3.3.3 Commuting Patterns

SR-19 is a main route between Haywood and Lauderdale Counties. Based on the most recent Tennessee Department of Labor and Workforce Development commuter data available (**Table 10**), a majority of the labor force that lives in Lauderdale County commutes outside of the county to work, largely traveling to Shelby County. A majority of the labor force that lives in Haywood County commutes outside of the county to work, largely traveling to Madison County. About 281 individuals commute from Lauderdale County to Haywood County, while about 207

³³ Bureau of Labor Statistics Local Area Unemployment Statistics (see **Attachment C**).

³⁴ Data for this table is generally provided for ten-year increments; however, due to likely impacts to employment and unemployment rates resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, data for 2019 is provided to serve as a pre-pandemic comparison point. Data for 2024 is also provided as the most current annual labor force and employment data.

³⁵ Civilian labor force as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor includes all persons aged 16 or older in the civilian noninstitutional population (not confined to, or living in, institutions or facilities such as residential care facilities, correctional institutions, or detention centers) classified as either employed or unemployed.

individuals commute from Haywood County to Lauderdale County.³⁶ Since the commute between Lauderdale and Haywood are the commute trips that are pertinent to this analysis and the number of commuters are minimal, the commuting patterns will not be further assessed.

Table 10 2022 Commuting Patterns for Lauderdale and Haywood County³⁷

County	Number of Persons Who Live & Work in the Same County	Out Flow (Number of Persons Who Live in the County and Commute to Another County to Work)	In Flow (Number of Persons Living Outside the County Commuting into the County to Work)	Top 3 Counties that are the Highest Outflow Destinations
Lauderdale	3,581	5,945	2,676	Shelby (1,677) Tipton (988) Dyer (888)
Haywood	2,525	4,616	2,390	Madison (1,436) Shelby (724) Crockett (362)

3.3.4 Investments Currently Planned or Under Development in Lauderdale County and Haywood County

In 2021, Ford Motor Company announced plans to build a \$5.6 billion dollar manufacturing facility near Stanton, Tennessee, approximately 12 miles south of Brownsville, Tennessee. The facility, known as Blue Oval City, will assemble Ford's next-generation electric truck. Production was initially scheduled to begin in early 2025 but has been delayed to 2027.

³⁶ The Tennessee Department of Labor and Workforce Development County Commuter Data dashboard includes an option to filter by home county, with out-flow and in-flow data broken down to include the number of persons commuting from the designated home county to all other counties in Tennessee. <https://www.tn.gov/workforce/tennessee-economic-data-/commute-patterns/commuter-data-county.html> Accessed March 20, 2025.

³⁷ Tennessee Department of Labor and Workforce Development County Commuter Data. Survey date: 2022. <https://www.tn.gov/workforce/tennessee-economic-data-/commute-patterns/commuter-data-county.html>, Accessed March 20, 2025.

4.0 Community Impacts

4.1 Preliminary Relocations and Land Acquisition

An examination of the Lauderdale and Haywood counties residential real estate market within 20 miles of the project area indicates an adequate supply of available residential property to satisfy the relocation requirements of the 20 potential residential relocations and six mobile home relocations. There are also replacement options for the two potential business relocations, with five locations for lease and nine locations for sale within 20 miles of the project.

4.2 Community Stability and Cohesion Impacts

There are several ways that transportation projects can disrupt community cohesion:

- Through large-scale relocation of residents and/or businesses;
- By removing popular meeting places or community facilities; and/or
- By creating a physical or perceived barrier that discourages interaction across the roadway.

4.2.1 No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative would keep the SR-19 project area in its current condition, except for programmed and approved roadway modifications or routine maintenance and safety upgrades. As a result, it would not affect community cohesion because it would not relocate residences or businesses, disrupt access to community facilities, or create new physical or perceived barriers that discourage interaction.

4.2.2 Build Alternative

4.2.2.1 Community Cohesion Impacts Related to the Relocation of Residences and Businesses

Structures located within the limits of the proposed Build Alternative have the potential to be relocated. There are 20 potential residential relocations and two potential business relocations and six potential mobile home relocations.

4.2.2.2 Community Cohesion Impacts Related to Community Facilities

As currently proposed, the Build Alternative would not require right-of-way from, or the relocation of, any community facilities within the project area. It would require approximately 270 square feet of construction easement from the Elam Baptist Church property. This impact would be temporary in nature and would not interfere with activities at the church.

Construction of the proposed Build Alternative might create a temporary inconvenience for those attempting to reach community facilities within the SR-19 project area.

As proposed, the Build Alternative would not affect any public parks, recreation areas, or wildlife or waterfowl refuges therefore, it would not result in any Section 4(f) or Section 6(f) impacts.

4.2.2.3 Community Cohesion Impacts Related to Barriers

SR-19 was constructed in the early 1900s as a two-lane roadway. It has served as an important link between Ripley and Brownsville. Due to the development of residences and businesses in the area since the construction of SR-19, and accounting for the scope of the proposed project to improve the existing roadway, it is unlikely that the Build Alternative would introduce a new perceived barrier or alter current perceived barriers in a way that discourages interaction across the roadway. Therefore, impacts are anticipated to be minimal as they relate to the creation of a new physical barrier in the community.

4.3 Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Impacts

4.3.1 No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative would leave the SR-19 project area as it currently exists, except for those modifications to the roadway network that have been programmed and approved for implementation, or for routine maintenance and safety upgrades of the existing roadway system as needed. As a result, it would not affect any recreational resources protected under the provisions of [Section 4\(f\) of the U.S. DOT Act of 1966](#) or the [LWCF](#).

4.3.2 Build Alternative

There are no parks, trails, greenways, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuge within or adjacent to the proposed project footprint, therefore no recreational resources protected under the provisions of [Section 4\(f\) of the U.S. DOT Act of 1966](#) or the [LWCF](#) would be impacted by the proposed Build Alternative.

4.4 Economic Impacts

4.4.1 No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative would leave the SR-19 project area as it currently exists, except for those modifications to the roadway network that have been programmed and approved for implementation, or for routine maintenance and safety upgrades of the existing roadway system as needed.

4.4.2 Build Alternative

While Lauderdale County is considered an at-risk county and Haywood County is considered a distressed county, it is not anticipated that the Build Alternative would negatively affect employment in the current top three industries in each county or impact the unemployment rate.

Commuter data from the Tennessee Department of Labor and Workforce Development indicates that the majority of the labor force living in Lauderdale and Haywood counties commute to other counties to work. Shelby, Tipton, Dyer, Madison, and Crockett counties are the major counties to which the work force of Lauderdale and Haywood counties are commuting. Commuters are more likely to use other routes, such as US-51, to get to these counties instead of SR-19 .

Ford Motor Company's investment in its assembly plant in Haywood County near Stanton, Tennessee has the potential to influence the labor force and local economy. However, the plans for the facility would not be influenced by the Build Alternative.

5.0 Minimization/Mitigation Measures to Address Impacts

5.1 Minimization/Mitigation Measures to Address Relocations

5.1.1 TDOT's Right-of-Way Relocation Process

TDOT will make relocation assistance available to all eligible persons impacted by this project, including residences, businesses, farm operations, non-profit organizations, and those requiring special services or assistance. The TDOT Regional Relocation Staff will administer the relocation program under the rules, policies, and procedures set forth in the [Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970](#),³⁸ as amended, the [Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1972, implementing federal regulations, Tennessee Code Annotated \(TCA\) 13-11-101 through 119](#),³⁹ [The State of Tennessee Relocation Assistance Brochure](#),⁴⁰ and [Chapter IX of the State of Tennessee Department of Transportation Right-of-Way Manual](#).⁴¹ TDOT's relocation program is practical and will allow for the efficient relocation of all eligible displaced persons in accordance with State and Federal Guidelines.

³⁸ <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?path=/prelim@title42/chapter61&edition=prelim>

³⁹ <https://law.justia.com/codes/tennessee/title-13/chapter-11/>

⁴⁰ https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/tdot/right-of-way-division/brochures/New_Residential_09-26-18.pdf

⁴¹ https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/tdot/right-of-way-division/ROW_Procedures_Manual.pdf

TDOT provides advance notification of proposed right-of-way acquisition. The TDOT Right-of-Way Division has the responsibility, once a project is approved, of appraising, purchasing and, if required, assisting individuals, families or businesses in relocating. Before acquiring property, all properties are appraised based on comparable sales and land use values in the surrounding areas.

The value of the property to be acquired is established by using independent real estate appraisers who prepare, for TDOT's use, written appraisals using actual sales data in the surrounding community.

An informational [TDOT Relocation Assistance Program Brochure](#) outlines the services offered and any payments for which impacted individuals may be eligible, such as moving expenses and replacement housing benefits for owners and tenants. The pamphlet also outlines the eligibility requirements for receiving these payments.

More detailed information on TDOT's Relocation Assistance Program can be found at: <https://www.tn.gov/tdot/right-of-way-division.html>.

5.1.2 If Replacement Housing is not Available Within the Project Vicinity

In the event suitable replacement housing is not identified in the immediate vicinity of the SR-19 project area, the replacement housing payment may be calculated by using an estimate for new construction costs based on a detailed estimate from a licensed contractor who is willing and able to construct the replacement dwelling at the specified cost.⁴² Additionally, the asking price of an available site in a neighborhood of equivalent value to the property to be displaced would be added to the cost estimate.

Impacted residents do not have to build on the site used in determining the cost estimate and are given the option to identify alternate vacant land for the construction of the replacement dwelling. At this point, TDOT would provide an acquisition payment towards the construction of the new home. Impacted residents would have 12 months to construct their new home. Additionally, the new replacement property must be determined to be "[Decent, Safe, and Sanitary](#),"⁴³ a standard which, among other criteria, requires that the replacement dwelling have one bedroom per family member. Furthermore, it is TDOT's intent to keep children in the

⁴² Refer to TDOT's Right-of-Way Procedures Manual (available at: <https://www.tn.gov/tdot/right-of-way-division.html>) for additional information on when a displacement may qualify for payment based on new construction and how that payment amount would be determined.

⁴³ <https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/25/700.55>

same school zone and in some cases the actual square footage of the home could increase in the replacement home.

5.2 Minimization/Mitigation Measures to Address Community Stability and Community Cohesion Impacts

As the design of the proposed project is refined, impacts to residential and business properties within the SR-19 project area may be reduced. Should a property be acquired, compensation would be at fair market value. TDOT will make relocation assistance available to all eligible persons impacted by this project, including residences, businesses, farm operations, non-profit organizations, and those requiring special services or assistance. The TDOT Regional Relocation Staff will administer the relocation program under the rules, policies, and procedures set forth in the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1972, implementing federal regulations, TCA 13-11-101 through 119, The State of Tennessee Relocation Assistance Brochure, and Chapter IX of the State of Tennessee Department of Transportation Right-of-Way Manual.

Additionally, in the event that suitable replacement housing is not available in the immediate SR-19 project area, TDOT will work with individuals to identify alternate options, potentially including the construction of a new home. Both renters and mobile homeowners will also be compensated and will receive assistance from TDOT in the identification of and relocation of their home to a new location. Businesses subject to relocation under the Build Alternative will be compensated for their relocation to a new location, including moving costs, incidentals, and the cost to reestablish the business in a new location.

TDOT will provide advance notification of proposed right-of-way acquisition. The TDOT Right-of-Way Office has the responsibility, once a project is approved, of appraising, purchasing and, if required, assisting individuals, families or businesses in relocating. Before acquiring property, all properties are appraised based on comparable sales and land use values in the surrounding areas.

Access to community facilities along the SR-19 project corridor will remain open throughout the duration of construction.

As the project advances through the project development process, more defined traffic control plans will be developed and reviewed to minimize traffic disruptions during construction.

Additionally, the Build Alternative has been designed to minimize impacts to the community by avoiding the creation of a new physical barrier by widening the existing SR-19 roadway except in locations where minor alignment shifts are needed to correct roadway geometric deficiencies.

5.3 Minimization/Mitigation Measures to Address Economic Impacts

The Build Alternative would not result in adverse economic impacts; therefore, no mitigation is proposed.

6.0 Community Impacts Memorandum Summary

Table 11 summarizes potential community impacts and proposed minimization and mitigation efforts, as necessary, for the No-Build and Build Alternatives.

Table 11 Community Impact Memorandum Summary

	No-Build Alternative	Build Alternative	
Impact Category	Effect Determination	Effect Determination	Minimization/Mitigation Measures to Address Impacts
Residential/Business Relocations	No Effect	The proposed project would result in approximately 20 proposed single-family relocations, 2 proposed business relocations, and 6 proposed mobile home relocations along the SR-19 corridor. ⁴⁴	As the design of the proposed Build Alternative is refined, impacts to residential and business properties within the SR-19 project area may be reduced. Should a property be acquired, compensation would be at fair market value. TDOT will make relocation assistance available to all eligible persons impacted by this project, including residences, businesses, farm operations, non-profit organizations, and those requiring special services or assistance. The TDOT Regional Relocation Staff will administer the relocation program under the rules, policies, and procedures set forth in the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1972, implementing federal regulations, TCA 13-11-101 through 119, The State of Tennessee Relocation Assistance Brochure, and Chapter IX of the State of Tennessee Department of Transportation Right-of-Way Manual. Additionally, in the event that suitable replacement housing is not available in the immediate SR-19 project area, TDOT will work with individuals to identify alternate options, potentially including the construction of a new home. Both renters and mobile homeowners will also be compensated and will receive assistance from TDOT in the identification of and relocation of their home to a new location. Businesses subject to relocation under the Build Alternative will be compensated for their relocation to a new location, including moving costs, incidentals, and the cost to reestablish the business in a new location. TDOT will provide advance notification of proposed right-of-way acquisition. The TDOT Right-of-Way Office has the responsibility, once a project is approved, of appraising, purchasing and, if required, assisting individuals, families or businesses in relocating. Before acquiring property, all properties are appraised based on comparable sales and land use values in the surrounding areas.
Community Stability and Cohesion	No Effect	While the proposed Build Alternative would result in the following, it is not anticipated to have an adverse effect on community cohesion: • 26 residential relocations/2 business relocations • 240 square foot construction easement (temporary) from Elam Baptist Church • Temporary inconvenience accessing community facilities within the SR-19 project area. It is unlikely that the Build Alternative would introduce a new perceived barrier or alter current perceived barriers in a way that discourages interaction across the roadway.	As the design of the proposed Build Alternative is refined, impacts to residential and business properties within the SR-19 project area may be reduced. Should a property be acquired, compensation would be at fair market value. TDOT will make relocation assistance available to all eligible persons impacted by this project, including residences, businesses, farm operations, non-profit organizations, and those requiring special services or assistance. The TDOT Regional Relocation Staff will administer the relocation program under the rules, policies, and procedures set forth in the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1972, implementing federal regulations, TCA 13-11-101 through 119, The State of Tennessee Relocation Assistance Brochure, and Chapter IX of the State of Tennessee Department of Transportation Right-of-Way Manual. Additionally, in the event that suitable replacement housing is not available in the immediate SR-19 project area, TDOT will work with individuals to identify alternate options, potentially including the construction of a new home. Both renters and mobile homeowners will also be compensated and will receive assistance from TDOT in the identification of and relocation of their home to a new location. Businesses subject to relocation under the Build Alternative will be compensated for their relocation to a new location, including moving costs, incidentals, and the cost to reestablish the business in a new location. TDOT will provide advance notification of proposed right-of-way acquisition. The TDOT Right-of-Way Office has the responsibility, once a project is approved, of appraising, purchasing and, if required, assisting individuals, families or businesses in relocating. Before acquiring property, all properties are appraised based on comparable sales and land use values in the surrounding areas. Access to community facilities along the SR-19 project corridor will remain open throughout the duration of construction. As the project advances through the project development process, more defined traffic control plans will be developed and reviewed to minimize traffic disruptions during construction.

⁴⁴ Source: SR-19 Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan, November 2025. See Attachment D.

	No-Build Alternative	Build Alternative	
Impact Category	Effect Determination	Effect Determination	Minimization/Mitigation Measures to Address Impacts
			Additionally, the Build Alternative has been designed to minimize impacts to the community by avoiding the creation of a new physical barrier by widening the existing SR-66 roadway except in locations where minor alignment shifts are needed to correct roadway geometric deficiencies.
Section 4(f) Recreational Resources and Section 6(f) Resources	No Effect	No Effect	The Build Alternative would not result in Section 4(f) or Section 6(f) impacts; therefore, no mitigation is proposed.
Economic Conditions	No Effect	While Lauderdale County is considered an at-risk county and Haywood County is considered a distressed county, it is not anticipated that the proposed Build Alternative would negatively affect employment in the current top three industries in each county or impact the unemployment rate. The proposed Build Alternative is not likely to change commuting patterns. The proposed Build Alternative would not influence development decisions regarding Ford Motor Company's Blue Oval City.	The Build Alternative would not result in adverse economic impacts; therefore, no mitigation is proposed.

ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT A

Population Data

STNAME	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040
Tennessee	7051572	7117168	7181570	7242733	7300003	7355209	7410264	7462831	7513757	7563635	7611268	7655583	7697729	7738908	7779075	7819195	7859483	7899629	7940301

GEOID	CTYNAME	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040
47075	Haywood	17550	17434	17331	17222	17106	16983	16856	16723	16586	16445	16301	16154	16006	15857	15707	15558	15410	15261	15115
47097	Lauderdale	24793	24569	24358	24139	23909	23672	23432	23186	22937	22686	22433	22180	21924	21671	21420	21170	20923	20680	20442

Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000		United States [®] Census Bureau
Note: The table shown may have been modified by user selections. Some information may be missing.		
DATA NOTES		
TABLE ID:	DP1	
SURVEY/PROGRAM:	Decennial Census	
VINTAGE:	2000	
DATASET:	DECENNIALDPSF22000	
PRODUCT:	DEC Summary File 2 Demographic Profile	
UNIVERSE:	None	
MLA:	U.S. Census Bureau. "Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000." Decennial Census, DEC Summary File 2 Demographic Profile, Table DP1, 2000, https://data.census.gov/table/DECENNIALDPSF22000.DP1?q=dp1&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097 . Accessed on	
FTP URL:	None	
API URL:	https://api.census.gov/data/2000/dec/sf2profile	
USER SELECTIONS		
TABLES	DP1	
GEOS	Haywood County, Tennessee; Lauderdale County, Tennessee; Tennessee	
EXCLUDED COLUMNS	None	
APPLIED FILTERS	None	
APPLIED SORTS	None	
PIVOT & GROUPING		
PIVOT COLUMNS	None	
PIVOT MODE	Off	

Table: DECENNIALDPSF22000.DP1

ROW GROUPS	None
VALUE COLUMNS	None
WEB ADDRESS	https://data.census.gov/table/DECENNIALDPSF22000.DP1?q=dp1&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097
TABLE NOTES	
	NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, definitions, and count corrections see http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf2.pdf
	Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 2, Matrices PCT3, PCT4, PCT8, PCT9, PCT10, PCT11, PCT14, PCT18, PCT19, PCT23, PCT26, HCT2, and HCT5.
	When a race or ethnic group is selected, the data in this table refer to the race, Hispanic or Latino origin, or American Indian or Alaska Native tribe of the householder.
	(X) Not applicable.
COLUMN NOTES	None

Table: DECENNIALDPSF22000.DP1

	Tennessee		Haywood County, Tennessee	
	Total population		Total population	
Label	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total population	5,689,283	100.0	19,797	100.0
SEX AND AGE				
Male	2,770,275	48.7	9,255	46.7
Female	2,919,008	51.3	10,542	53.3
Under 5 years	374,880	6.6	1,424	7.2
5 to 9 years	395,813	7.0	1,618	8.2
10 to 14 years	395,155	6.9	1,449	7.3
15 to 19 years	395,184	6.9	1,488	7.5
20 to 24 years	386,345	6.8	1,338	6.8
25 to 34 years	815,901	14.3	2,506	12.7
35 to 44 years	902,527	15.9	2,900	14.6
45 to 54 years	786,916	13.8	2,696	13.6
55 to 59 years	293,942	5.2	860	4.3
60 to 64 years	239,309	4.2	783	4.0
65 to 74 years	382,852	6.7	1,427	7.2
75 to 84 years	238,994	4.2	915	4.6
85 years and over	81,465	1.4	393	2.0
Median age (years)	35.9	(X)	35.3	(X)
18 years and over	4,290,762	75.4	14,417	72.8
Male	2,051,741	36.1	6,511	32.9
Female	2,239,021	39.4	7,906	39.9
21 years and over	4,046,450	71.1	13,541	68.4
62 years and over	842,141	14.8	3,179	16.1
65 years and over	703,311	12.4	2,735	13.8
Male	281,882	5.0	1,067	5.4
Female	421,429	7.4	1,668	8.4
RELATIONSHIP				
Population	5,689,283	100.0	19,797	100.0

Table: DECENNIALDPSF22000.DP1

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee	
	Total population	
Label	Number	Percent
Total population	27,101	100.0
SEX AND AGE		
Male	14,076	51.9
Female	13,025	48.1
Under 5 years	1,838	6.8
5 to 9 years	1,911	7.1
10 to 14 years	1,847	6.8
15 to 19 years	1,871	6.9
20 to 24 years	2,040	7.5
25 to 34 years	4,100	15.1
35 to 44 years	4,342	16.0
45 to 54 years	3,457	12.8
55 to 59 years	1,371	5.1
60 to 64 years	1,056	3.9
65 to 74 years	1,633	6.0
75 to 84 years	1,197	4.4
85 years and over	438	1.6
Median age (years)	34.9	(X)
18 years and over	20,382	75.2
Male	10,628	39.2
Female	9,754	36.0
21 years and over	19,215	70.9
62 years and over	3,908	14.4
65 years and over	3,268	12.1
Male	1,285	4.7
Female	1,983	7.3
RELATIONSHIP		
Population	27,101	100.0

Table: DECENNIALDPSF22000.DP1

	Tennessee		Haywood County, Tennessee	
	Total population		Total population	
Label	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
In households	5,541,337	97.4	19,544	98.7
Householder	2,232,905	39.2	7,558	38.2
Spouse	1,173,960	20.6	3,462	17.5
Child	1,611,789	28.3	6,230	31.5
Own child under 18 years	1,239,200	21.8	4,442	22.4
Other relatives	287,253	5.0	1,646	8.3
Under 18 years	126,284	2.2	818	4.1
Nonrelatives	235,430	4.1	648	3.3
Unmarried partner	93,948	1.7	307	1.6
In group quarters	147,946	2.6	253	1.3
Institutionalized population	83,397	1.5	224	1.1
Noninstitutionalized population	64,549	1.1	29	0.1
HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE				
Households	2,232,905	100.0	7,558	100.0
Family households (families)	1,547,835	69.3	5,418	71.7
With own children under 18 years	707,305	31.7	2,521	33.4
Married-couple family	1,173,960	52.6	3,462	45.8
With own children under 18 years	499,298	22.4	1,452	19.2
Female householder, no husband present	287,899	12.9	1,659	22.0
With own children under 18 years	165,842	7.4	945	12.5
Nonfamily households	685,070	30.7	2,140	28.3
Householder living alone	576,401	25.8	1,923	25.4

Table: DECENNIALDPSF22000.DP1

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee	
	Total population	
Label	Number	Percent
In households	24,413	90.1
Householder	9,567	35.3
Spouse	4,754	17.5
Child	7,463	27.5
Own child under 18 years	5,607	20.7
Other relatives	1,795	6.6
Under 18 years	972	3.6
Nonrelatives	834	3.1
Unmarried partner	436	1.6
In group quarters	2,688	9.9
Institutionalized population	2,678	9.9
Noninstitutionalized population	10	0.0
HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE		
Households	9,567	100.0
Family households (families)	6,816	71.2
With own children under 18 years	3,141	32.8
Married-couple family	4,754	49.7
With own children under 18 years	1,988	20.8
Female householder, no husband present	1,681	17.6
With own children under 18 years	975	10.2
Nonfamily households	2,751	28.8
Householder living alone	2,453	25.6

Table: DECENNIALDPSF22000.DP1

	Tennessee		Haywood County, Tennessee	
	Total population		Total population	
Label	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Householder 65 years and over	201,850	9.0	841	11.1
Households with individuals under 18 years	785,816	35.2	2,954	39.1
Households with individuals 65 years and over	502,332	22.5	2,026	26.8
Average household size	2.48	(X)	2.59	(X)
Average family size	2.99	(X)	3.09	(X)
HOUSING TENURE				
Occupied housing units	2,232,905	100.0	7,558	100.0
Owner-occupied housing units	1,561,363	69.9	4,984	65.9
Renter-occupied housing units	671,542	30.1	2,574	34.1
Average household size of owner-occupied unit	2.57	(X)	2.60	(X)
Average household size of renter-occupied unit	2.29	(X)	2.55	(X)

Table: DECENNIALDPSF22000.DP1

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee	
	Total population	
Label	Number	Percent
Householder 65 years and over	1,061	11.1
Households with individuals under 18 years	3,693	38.6
Households with individuals 65 years and over	2,416	25.3
Average household size	2.55	(X)
Average family size	3.06	(X)
HOUSING TENURE		
Occupied housing units	9,567	100.0
Owner-occupied housing units	6,198	64.8
Renter-occupied housing units	3,369	35.2
Average household size of owner-occupied unit	2.60	(X)
Average household size of renter-occupied unit	2.46	(X)

TOTAL POPULATION		United States [®] Census Bureau
Note: The table shown may have been modified by user selections. Some information may be missing.		
DATA NOTES		
TABLE ID:	P1	
SURVEY/PROGRAM:	Decennial Census	
VINTAGE:	2010	
DATASET:	DECENNIALSF12010	
PRODUCT:	DEC Summary File 1	
UNIVERSE:	Total population	
MLA:	U.S. Census Bureau. "TOTAL POPULATION." Decennial Census, DEC Summary File 1, Table P1, 2010, https://data.census.gov/table/DECENNIALSF12010.P1?q=p1&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097 . Accessed on April 22, 2025.	
FTP URL:	https://www2.census.gov/census_2010/04-Summary_File_1/	
API URL:	https://api.census.gov/data/2010/dec/sf1	
USER SELECTIONS		
TABLES	P1	
GEOS	Lauderdale County, Tennessee; Haywood County, Tennessee; Tennessee	
EXCLUDED COLUMNS	None	
APPLIED FILTERS	None	
APPLIED SORTS	None	
PIVOT & GROUPING		
PIVOT COLUMNS	None	
PIVOT MODE	Off	

Table: DECENNIALSF12010.P1

ROW GROUPS	None
VALUE COLUMNS	None
WEB ADDRESS	https://data.census.gov/table/DECENNIALSF12010.P1?q=p1&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097
TABLE NOTES	
	NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/doc/sf1.pdf .
	Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census.
COLUMN NOTES	None

Table: DECENNIALSF12010.P1

Label	Tennessee	Haywood County, Tennessee	Lauderdale County, Tennessee
Total	6,346,105	18,787	27,815

RACE		United States[®] Census Bureau
Note: The table shown may have been modified by user selections. Some information may be missing.		
DATA NOTES		
TABLE ID:	P1	
SURVEY/PROGRAM:	Decennial Census	
VINTAGE:	2020	
DATASET:	DECENNIALPL2020	
PRODUCT:	DEC Redistricting Data (PL 94-171)	
UNIVERSE:	Total population	
MLA:	U.S. Census Bureau. "RACE." Decennial Census, DEC Redistricting Data (PL 94-171), Table P1, 2020, https://data.census.gov/table/DECENNIALPL2020.P1?q=p1&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097 . Accessed on April 22, 2025.	
FTP URL:	https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/2020/data/	
API URL:	https://api.census.gov/data/2020/dec/pl	
USER SELECTIONS		
TABLES	P1	
GEOS	Lauderdale County, Tennessee; Haywood County, Tennessee; Tennessee	
EXCLUDED COLUMNS	None	
APPLIED FILTERS	None	
APPLIED SORTS	None	
PIVOT & GROUPING		
PIVOT COLUMNS	None	

Table: DECENNIALPL2020.P1

PIVOT MODE	Off
ROW GROUPS	None
VALUE COLUMNS	None
WEB ADDRESS	https://data.census.gov/table/DECENNIALPL2020.P1?q=p1&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097
TABLE NOTES	
	Note: For information on data collection, confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File Technical Documentation.
	For information on the statistical methods used to protect confidentiality in these tables, see Disclosure Avoidance and the 2020 Census.
	Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171)
COLUMN NOTES	None

Table: DECENNIALPL2020.P1

Label	Tennessee	Haywood County, Tennessee	Lauderdale County, Tennessee
Total:	6,910,840	17,864	25,143
Population of one race:	6,497,942	17,345	24,098
White alone	4,990,938	7,695	15,144
Black or African American alone	1,092,948	9,032	8,421
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	28,044	59	138
Asian alone	135,615	26	55
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	4,115	9	11
Some Other Race alone	246,282	524	329
Population of two or more races:	412,898	519	1,045
Population of two races:	391,747	470	959
White; Black or African American	71,033	168	252
White; American Indian and Alaska Native	109,625	84	393
White; Asian	31,467	7	43
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	2,453	0	2
White; Some Other Race	153,279	168	185
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	6,326	21	40
Black or African American; Asian	2,814	0	4
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	534	0	0
Black or African American; Some Other Race	8,615	16	24

Table: DECENNIALPL2020.P1

Label	Tennessee	Haywood County, Tennessee	Lauderdale County, Tennessee
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	347	0	6
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	104	0	2
American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	2,801	0	6
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	926	0	1
Asian; Some Other Race	1,082	4	1
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	341	2	0
Population of three races:	19,049	33	49
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	6,873	6	20
White; Black or African American; Asian	1,565	0	6
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	261	0	0
White; Black or African American; Some Other Race	2,599	4	10
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	1,380	3	9
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	210	1	0

Table: DECENNIALPL2020.P1

Label	Tennessee	Haywood County, Tennessee	Lauderdale County, Tennessee
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	3,407	14	0
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1,046	2	2
White; Asian; Some Other Race	777	1	0
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	132	0	0
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	140	0	2
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	49	2	0
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	250	0	0
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	166	0	0
Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	67	0	0
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	32	0	0

Table: DECENNIALPL2020.P1

Label	Tennessee	Haywood County, Tennessee	Lauderdale County, Tennessee
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	30	0	0
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	12	0	0
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	6	0	0
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	47	0	0
Population of four races:	1,832	13	31
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	466	3	3
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	82	0	1
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	770	0	3
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	79	2	3

Table: DECENNIALPL2020.P1

Label	Tennessee	Haywood County, Tennessee	Lauderdale County, Tennessee
White; Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	113	3	8
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	12	0	2
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	112	1	3
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	83	2	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	16	0	0
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	36	2	0
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	25	0	6
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	6	0	0

Table: DECENNIALPL2020.P1

Label	Tennessee	Haywood County, Tennessee	Lauderdale County, Tennessee
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	8	0	0
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	16	0	1
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	8	0	1
Population of five races:	250	3	3
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	107	0	1
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	108	3	0
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	12	0	0
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	14	0	2

Table: DECENNIALPL2020.P1

Label	Tennessee	Haywood County, Tennessee	Lauderdale County, Tennessee
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	5	0	0
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	4	0	0
Population of six races:	20	0	3
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	20	0	3

ATTACHMENT B

Social Data

Age and Sex		United States [®] Census Bureau
Note: The table shown may have been modified by user selections. Some information may be missing.		
DATA NOTES		
TABLE ID:	S0101	
SURVEY/PROGRAM:	American Community Survey	
VINTAGE:	2023	
DATASET:	ACSST5Y2023	
PRODUCT:	ACS 5-Year Estimates Subject Tables	
UNIVERSE:	None	
MLA:	U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. "Age and Sex." American Community Survey, ACS 5-Year Estimates Subject Tables, Table S0101, 2023, https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST5Y2023.S0101?g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097&y=2023 . Accessed on April 22, 2025.	
FTP URL:	None	
API URL:	https://api.census.gov/data/2023/acs/acs5/subject	
USER SELECTIONS		
GEOS	Lauderdale County, Tennessee; Haywood County, Tennessee; Tennessee	
VINTAGES	2023	
EXCLUDED COLUMNS	None	
APPLIED FILTERS	None	
APPLIED SORTS	None	
PIVOT & GROUPING		
PIVOT COLUMNS	None	
PIVOT MODE	Off	
ROW GROUPS	None	
VALUE COLUMNS	None	
WEB ADDRESS	https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST5Y2023.S0101?g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097&y=2023	

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

TABLE NOTES	
	Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, the decennial census is the official source of population totals for April 1st of each decennial year. In between censuses, the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities, and towns and estimates of housing units and the group quarters population for states and
	Information about the American Community Survey (ACS) can be found on the ACS website. Supporting documentation including code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing, and a full list of ACS tables and table shells (without estimates) can be found on the Technical Documentation section of the ACS website. Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.
	Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2019-2023 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
	ACS data generally reflect the geographic boundaries of legal and statistical areas as of January 1 of the estimate year. For more information, see Geography Boundaries by Year.
	Data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The degree of uncertainty for an estimate arising from sampling variability is represented through the use of a margin of error. The value shown here is the 90 percent margin of error. The margin of error can be interpreted roughly as providing a 90 percent probability that the interval defined by the estimate minus the margin of error and the estimate plus the margin of error (the lower and upper confidence bounds) contains the true value. In addition to sampling variability, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error (for a discussion of nonsampling variability, see ACS Technical Documentation). The effect of nonsampling error is not represented
	Users must consider potential differences in geographic boundaries, questionnaire content or coding, or other methodological issues when comparing ACS data from different years. Statistically significant differences shown in ACS Comparison Profiles, or in data users' own analysis, may be the result of these differences and thus might not necessarily reflect changes to the social, economic, housing, or demographic characteristics being compared. For more information, see
	The age dependency ratio is derived by dividing the combined under-18 and 65-and-over populations by the 18-to-64 population and multiplying by 100.
	The old-age dependency ratio is derived by dividing the population 65 and over by the 18-to-64 population and multiplying by 100.
	The child dependency ratio is derived by dividing the population under 18 by the 18-to-64 population and multiplying by 100.

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	When information is missing or inconsistent, the Census Bureau logically assigns an acceptable value using the response to a related question or questions. If a logical assignment is not possible, data are filled using a statistical process called allocation, which uses a similar individual or household to provide a donor value. The "Allocated" section is the number of respondents who received an allocated value for a particular subject.
	Estimates of urban and rural populations, housing units, and characteristics reflect boundaries of urban areas defined based on 2020 Census data. As a result, data for urban and rural areas from the ACS do not necessarily reflect the results of ongoing urbanization.
	Explanation of Symbols:- The estimate could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations. For a ratio of medians estimate, one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution. For a 5-year median estimate, the margin of error associated with a median was larger than the median itself.N The estimate or margin of error cannot be displayed because there were an insufficient number of sample cases in the selected geographic area. (X) The estimate or margin of error is not applicable or not available.median- The median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "2,500-")median+ The median falls in the highest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "250,000+").** The margin of error could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations.*** The margin of error could not be computed because the median falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution.***** A margin of error is not appropriate because the corresponding estimate is controlled to an independent population or housing
COLUMN NOTES	None

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total population	6,986,082	*****	(X)	(X)
AGE				
Under 5 years	409,675	±866	5.9%	±0.1
5 to 9 years	425,838	±4,169	6.1%	±0.1
10 to 14 years	449,622	±4,231	6.4%	±0.1
15 to 19 years	444,195	±1,444	6.4%	±0.1
20 to 24 years	451,219	±1,547	6.5%	±0.1
25 to 29 years	483,233	±1,211	6.9%	±0.1
30 to 34 years	480,211	±1,043	6.9%	±0.1
35 to 39 years	450,985	±4,604	6.5%	±0.1
40 to 44 years	437,934	±4,370	6.3%	±0.1
45 to 49 years	427,254	±1,153	6.1%	±0.1
50 to 54 years	446,647	±1,116	6.4%	±0.1
55 to 59 years	453,973	±4,798	6.5%	±0.1
60 to 64 years	452,556	±4,868	6.5%	±0.1
65 to 69 years	390,948	±3,475	5.6%	±0.1
70 to 74 years	322,551	±3,433	4.6%	±0.1
75 to 79 years	215,103	±2,812	3.1%	±0.1
80 to 84 years	132,326	±2,491	1.9%	±0.1
85 years and over	111,812	±2,455	1.6%	±0.1
SELECTED AGE CATEGORIES				
5 to 14 years	875,460	±1,175	12.5%	±0.1
15 to 17 years	272,871	±863	3.9%	±0.1
Under 18 years	1,558,006	±718	22.3%	±0.1
18 to 24 years	622,543	±1,310	8.9%	±0.1
15 to 44 years	2,747,777	±1,842	39.3%	±0.1
16 years and over	5,612,667	±2,021	80.3%	±0.1
18 years and over	5,428,076	±716	77.7%	±0.1

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Male		Percent Male	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total population	3,428,050	±1,431	(X)	(X)
AGE				
Under 5 years	209,481	±853	6.1%	±0.1
5 to 9 years	217,871	±2,960	6.4%	±0.1
10 to 14 years	230,116	±2,900	6.7%	±0.1
15 to 19 years	228,485	±1,145	6.7%	±0.1
20 to 24 years	227,232	±955	6.6%	±0.1
25 to 29 years	240,325	±945	7.0%	±0.1
30 to 34 years	237,485	±768	6.9%	±0.1
35 to 39 years	222,895	±3,052	6.5%	±0.1
40 to 44 years	217,821	±3,020	6.4%	±0.1
45 to 49 years	211,516	±863	6.2%	±0.1
50 to 54 years	220,698	±795	6.4%	±0.1
55 to 59 years	220,630	±2,791	6.4%	±0.1
60 to 64 years	217,710	±2,839	6.4%	±0.1
65 to 69 years	183,582	±2,311	5.4%	±0.1
70 to 74 years	149,580	±2,306	4.4%	±0.1
75 to 79 years	97,300	±1,655	2.8%	±0.1
80 to 84 years	55,473	±1,517	1.6%	±0.1
85 years and over	39,850	±1,372	1.2%	±0.1
SELECTED AGE CATEGORIES				
5 to 14 years	447,987	±892	13.1%	±0.1
15 to 17 years	139,917	±871	4.1%	±0.1
Under 18 years	797,385	±1,184	23.3%	±0.1
18 to 24 years	315,800	±937	9.2%	±0.1
15 to 44 years	1,374,243	±1,381	40.1%	±0.1
16 years and over	2,725,739	±1,465	79.5%	±0.1
18 years and over	2,630,665	±1,015	76.7%	±0.1

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Female		Percent Female	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total population	3,558,032	±1,431	(X)	(X)
AGE				
Under 5 years	200,194	±910	5.6%	±0.1
5 to 9 years	207,967	±2,790	5.8%	±0.1
10 to 14 years	219,506	±2,944	6.2%	±0.1
15 to 19 years	215,710	±1,195	6.1%	±0.1
20 to 24 years	223,987	±987	6.3%	±0.1
25 to 29 years	242,908	±739	6.8%	±0.1
30 to 34 years	242,726	±773	6.8%	±0.1
35 to 39 years	228,090	±3,213	6.4%	±0.1
40 to 44 years	220,113	±3,144	6.2%	±0.1
45 to 49 years	215,738	±837	6.1%	±0.1
50 to 54 years	225,949	±685	6.4%	±0.1
55 to 59 years	233,343	±3,276	6.6%	±0.1
60 to 64 years	234,846	±3,340	6.6%	±0.1
65 to 69 years	207,366	±2,061	5.8%	±0.1
70 to 74 years	172,971	±2,135	4.9%	±0.1
75 to 79 years	117,803	±2,005	3.3%	±0.1
80 to 84 years	76,853	±1,856	2.2%	±0.1
85 years and over	71,962	±1,766	2.0%	±0.1
SELECTED AGE CATEGORIES				
5 to 14 years	427,473	±841	12.0%	±0.1
15 to 17 years	132,954	±749	3.7%	±0.1
Under 18 years	760,621	±1,141	21.4%	±0.1
18 to 24 years	306,743	±1,032	8.6%	±0.1
15 to 44 years	1,373,534	±1,423	38.6%	±0.1
16 years and over	2,886,928	±1,630	81.1%	±0.1
18 years and over	2,797,411	±888	78.6%	±0.1

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Haywood County, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total population	17,672	*****	(X)	(X)
AGE				
Under 5 years	964	±34	5.5%	±0.2
5 to 9 years	1,167	±226	6.6%	±1.3
10 to 14 years	1,065	±230	6.0%	±1.3
15 to 19 years	1,127	±128	6.4%	±0.7
20 to 24 years	942	±126	5.3%	±0.7
25 to 29 years	1,037	±39	5.9%	±0.2
30 to 34 years	1,032	±40	5.8%	±0.2
35 to 39 years	681	±160	3.9%	±0.9
40 to 44 years	1,418	±161	8.0%	±0.9
45 to 49 years	919	±100	5.2%	±0.6
50 to 54 years	1,134	±50	6.4%	±0.3
55 to 59 years	1,240	±187	7.0%	±1.1
60 to 64 years	1,369	±191	7.7%	±1.1
65 to 69 years	1,255	±147	7.1%	±0.8
70 to 74 years	977	±145	5.5%	±0.8
75 to 79 years	607	±117	3.4%	±0.7
80 to 84 years	464	±122	2.6%	±0.7
85 years and over	274	±82	1.6%	±0.5
SELECTED AGE CATEGORIES				
5 to 14 years	2,232	±45	12.6%	±0.3
15 to 17 years	740	±23	4.2%	±0.1
Under 18 years	3,936	*****	22.3%	*****
18 to 24 years	1,329	±20	7.5%	±0.1
15 to 44 years	6,237	±101	35.3%	±0.6
16 years and over	14,230	±64	80.5%	±0.4
18 years and over	13,736	*****	77.7%	*****

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Male		Percent Male	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total population	8,408	±56	(X)	(X)
AGE				
Under 5 years	505	±28	6.0%	±0.3
5 to 9 years	562	±121	6.7%	±1.4
10 to 14 years	598	±132	7.1%	±1.6
15 to 19 years	688	±131	8.2%	±1.5
20 to 24 years	388	±113	4.6%	±1.3
25 to 29 years	513	±28	6.1%	±0.3
30 to 34 years	462	±34	5.5%	±0.4
35 to 39 years	244	±85	2.9%	±1.0
40 to 44 years	652	±87	7.8%	±1.0
45 to 49 years	465	±44	5.5%	±0.5
50 to 54 years	552	±49	6.6%	±0.6
55 to 59 years	684	±132	8.1%	±1.6
60 to 64 years	565	±137	6.7%	±1.6
65 to 69 years	667	±103	7.9%	±1.2
70 to 74 years	340	±103	4.0%	±1.2
75 to 79 years	302	±70	3.6%	±0.8
80 to 84 years	163	±66	1.9%	±0.8
85 years and over	58	±31	0.7%	±0.4
SELECTED AGE CATEGORIES				
5 to 14 years	1,160	±33	13.8%	±0.4
15 to 17 years	414	±50	4.9%	±0.6
Under 18 years	2,079	±56	24.7%	±0.5
18 to 24 years	662	±21	7.9%	±0.1
15 to 44 years	2,947	±64	35.0%	±0.7
16 years and over	6,565	±61	78.1%	±0.5
18 years and over	6,329	±20	75.3%	±0.5

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Female		Percent Female	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total population	9,264	±56	(X)	(X)
AGE				
Under 5 years	459	±19	5.0%	±0.2
5 to 9 years	605	±164	6.5%	±1.8
10 to 14 years	467	±165	5.0%	±1.8
15 to 19 years	439	±78	4.7%	±0.8
20 to 24 years	554	±50	6.0%	±0.5
25 to 29 years	524	±33	5.7%	±0.3
30 to 34 years	570	±30	6.2%	±0.3
35 to 39 years	437	±123	4.7%	±1.3
40 to 44 years	766	±118	8.3%	±1.3
45 to 49 years	454	±93	4.9%	±1.0
50 to 54 years	582	±2	6.3%	±0.1
55 to 59 years	556	±126	6.0%	±1.4
60 to 64 years	804	±125	8.7%	±1.4
65 to 69 years	588	±96	6.3%	±1.0
70 to 74 years	637	±94	6.9%	±1.0
75 to 79 years	305	±107	3.3%	±1.2
80 to 84 years	301	±99	3.2%	±1.1
85 years and over	216	±80	2.3%	±0.9
SELECTED AGE CATEGORIES				
5 to 14 years	1,072	±24	11.6%	±0.3
15 to 17 years	326	±56	3.5%	±0.6
Under 18 years	1,857	±56	20.0%	±0.5
18 to 24 years	667	±20	7.2%	±0.2
15 to 44 years	3,290	±108	35.5%	±1.1
16 years and over	7,665	±66	82.7%	±0.6
18 years and over	7,407	±21	80.0%	±0.5

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total population	24,933	*****	(X)	(X)
AGE				
Under 5 years	1,435	±46	5.8%	±0.2
5 to 9 years	1,487	±149	6.0%	±0.6
10 to 14 years	1,556	±148	6.2%	±0.6
15 to 19 years	1,631	±111	6.5%	±0.4
20 to 24 years	1,873	±152	7.5%	±0.6
25 to 29 years	1,593	±123	6.4%	±0.5
30 to 34 years	1,620	±45	6.5%	±0.2
35 to 39 years	1,535	±194	6.2%	±0.8
40 to 44 years	1,807	±226	7.2%	±0.9
45 to 49 years	1,413	±102	5.7%	±0.4
50 to 54 years	1,607	±35	6.4%	±0.1
55 to 59 years	1,770	±171	7.1%	±0.7
60 to 64 years	1,548	±172	6.2%	±0.7
65 to 69 years	1,474	±154	5.9%	±0.6
70 to 74 years	1,005	±147	4.0%	±0.6
75 to 79 years	615	±110	2.5%	±0.4
80 to 84 years	510	±102	2.0%	±0.4
85 years and over	454	±100	1.8%	±0.4
SELECTED AGE CATEGORIES				
5 to 14 years	3,043	±38	12.2%	±0.2
15 to 17 years	1,003	±35	4.0%	±0.1
Under 18 years	5,481	±15	22.0%	±0.1
18 to 24 years	2,501	±151	10.0%	±0.6
15 to 44 years	10,059	±112	40.3%	±0.4
16 years and over	20,028	±103	80.3%	±0.4
18 years and over	19,452	±15	78.0%	±0.1

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Male		Percent Male	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total population	12,865	±75	(X)	(X)
AGE				
Under 5 years	749	±39	5.8%	±0.3
5 to 9 years	638	±119	5.0%	±0.9
10 to 14 years	863	±116	6.7%	±0.9
15 to 19 years	891	±99	6.9%	±0.8
20 to 24 years	1,134	±119	8.8%	±0.9
25 to 29 years	885	±119	6.9%	±0.9
30 to 34 years	917	±26	7.1%	±0.2
35 to 39 years	866	±152	6.7%	±1.2
40 to 44 years	974	±159	7.6%	±1.2
45 to 49 years	724	±102	5.6%	±0.8
50 to 54 years	814	±26	6.3%	±0.2
55 to 59 years	822	±120	6.4%	±0.9
60 to 64 years	789	±119	6.1%	±0.9
65 to 69 years	660	±106	5.1%	±0.8
70 to 74 years	465	±102	3.6%	±0.8
75 to 79 years	283	±77	2.2%	±0.6
80 to 84 years	271	±71	2.1%	±0.6
85 years and over	120	±51	0.9%	±0.4
SELECTED AGE CATEGORIES				
5 to 14 years	1,501	±35	11.7%	±0.3
15 to 17 years	499	±2	3.9%	±0.1
Under 18 years	2,749	±23	21.4%	±0.1
18 to 24 years	1,526	±125	11.9%	±1.0
15 to 44 years	5,667	±107	44.0%	±0.8
16 years and over	10,379	±92	80.7%	±0.6
18 years and over	10,116	±63	78.6%	±0.1

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Female		Percent Female	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total population	12,068	±75	(X)	(X)
AGE				
Under 5 years	686	±62	5.7%	±0.5
5 to 9 years	849	±116	7.0%	±1.0
10 to 14 years	693	±112	5.7%	±0.9
15 to 19 years	740	±35	6.1%	±0.3
20 to 24 years	739	±88	6.1%	±0.7
25 to 29 years	708	±17	5.9%	±0.1
30 to 34 years	703	±39	5.8%	±0.3
35 to 39 years	669	±119	5.5%	±1.0
40 to 44 years	833	±140	6.9%	±1.2
45 to 49 years	689	±25	5.7%	±0.1
50 to 54 years	793	±24	6.6%	±0.2
55 to 59 years	948	±126	7.9%	±1.0
60 to 64 years	759	±125	6.3%	±1.0
65 to 69 years	814	±114	6.7%	±0.9
70 to 74 years	540	±113	4.5%	±0.9
75 to 79 years	332	±87	2.8%	±0.7
80 to 84 years	239	±77	2.0%	±0.6
85 years and over	334	±82	2.8%	±0.7
SELECTED AGE CATEGORIES				
5 to 14 years	1,542	±67	12.8%	±0.6
15 to 17 years	504	±35	4.2%	±0.3
Under 18 years	2,732	±25	22.6%	±0.2
18 to 24 years	975	±87	8.1%	±0.7
15 to 44 years	4,392	±76	36.4%	±0.5
16 years and over	9,649	±104	80.0%	±0.7
18 years and over	9,336	±64	77.4%	±0.2

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
21 years and over	5,161,998	±2,668	73.9%	±0.1
60 years and over	1,625,296	±4,865	23.3%	±0.1
62 years and over	1,439,801	±4,176	20.6%	±0.1
65 years and over	1,172,740	±921	16.8%	±0.1
75 years and over	459,241	±718	6.6%	±0.1
SUMMARY INDICATORS				
Median age (years)	38.9	±0.1	(X)	(X)
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	96.3	±0.1	(X)	(X)
Age dependency ratio	64.2	±0.1	(X)	(X)
Old-age dependency ratio	27.6	±0.1	(X)	(X)
Child dependency ratio	36.6	±0.1	(X)	(X)
PERCENT ALLOCATED				
Sex	(X)	(X)	0.0%	(X)
Age	(X)	(X)	1.5%	(X)

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Male		Percent Male	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
21 years and over	2,493,212	±2,113	72.7%	±0.1
60 years and over	743,495	±2,872	21.7%	±0.1
62 years and over	654,117	±2,604	19.1%	±0.1
65 years and over	525,785	±738	15.3%	±0.1
75 years and over	192,623	±512	5.6%	±0.1
SUMMARY INDICATORS				
Median age (years)	37.8	±0.2	(X)	(X)
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Age dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Old-age dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Child dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
PERCENT ALLOCATED				
Sex	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Age	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Female		Percent Female	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
21 years and over	2,668,786	±1,972	75.0%	±0.1
60 years and over	881,801	±3,435	24.8%	±0.1
62 years and over	785,684	±2,622	22.1%	±0.1
65 years and over	646,955	±583	18.2%	±0.1
75 years and over	266,618	±536	7.5%	±0.1
SUMMARY INDICATORS				
Median age (years)	40.0	±0.2	(X)	(X)
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Age dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Old-age dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Child dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
PERCENT ALLOCATED				
Sex	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Age	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Haywood County, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
21 years and over	13,136	±130	74.3%	±0.7
60 years and over	4,946	±186	28.0%	±1.1
62 years and over	4,430	±173	25.1%	±1.0
65 years and over	3,577	±26	20.2%	±0.1
75 years and over	1,345	±26	7.6%	±0.1
SUMMARY INDICATORS				
Median age (years)	43.1	±0.5	(X)	(X)
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	90.8	±1.2	(X)	(X)
Age dependency ratio	74.0	±0.4	(X)	(X)
Old-age dependency ratio	35.2	±0.3	(X)	(X)
Child dependency ratio	38.7	±0.1	(X)	(X)
PERCENT ALLOCATED				
Sex	(X)	(X)	0.0%	(X)
Age	(X)	(X)	1.1%	(X)

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Male		Percent Male	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
21 years and over	5,907	±106	70.3%	±1.3
60 years and over	2,095	±134	24.9%	±1.6
62 years and over	1,842	±108	21.9%	±1.3
65 years and over	1,530	±10	18.2%	±0.2
75 years and over	523	±10	6.2%	±0.1
SUMMARY INDICATORS				
Median age (years)	42.2	±1.0	(X)	(X)
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Age dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Old-age dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Child dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
PERCENT ALLOCATED				
Sex	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Age	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Female		Percent Female	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
21 years and over	7,229	±76	78.0%	±0.9
60 years and over	2,851	±129	30.8%	±1.4
62 years and over	2,588	±140	27.9%	±1.5
65 years and over	2,047	±25	22.1%	±0.3
75 years and over	822	±24	8.9%	±0.3
SUMMARY INDICATORS				
Median age (years)	43.7	±0.5	(X)	(X)
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Age dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Old-age dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Child dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
PERCENT ALLOCATED				
Sex	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Age	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
21 years and over	18,499	±172	74.2%	±0.7
60 years and over	5,606	±181	22.5%	±0.7
62 years and over	5,125	±169	20.6%	±0.7
65 years and over	4,058	±44	16.3%	±0.2
75 years and over	1,579	±22	6.3%	±0.1
SUMMARY INDICATORS				
Median age (years)	39.4	±0.6	(X)	(X)
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	106.6	±1.3	(X)	(X)
Age dependency ratio	62.0	±0.5	(X)	(X)
Old-age dependency ratio	26.4	±0.4	(X)	(X)
Child dependency ratio	35.6	±0.2	(X)	(X)
PERCENT ALLOCATED				
Sex	(X)	(X)	0.1%	(X)
Age	(X)	(X)	1.5%	(X)

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Male		Percent Male	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
21 years and over	9,468	±168	73.6%	±1.2
60 years and over	2,588	±123	20.1%	±0.9
62 years and over	2,416	±115	18.8%	±0.9
65 years and over	1,799	±26	14.0%	±0.2
75 years and over	674	±22	5.2%	±0.2
SUMMARY INDICATORS				
Median age (years)	36.7	±0.8	(X)	(X)
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Age dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Old-age dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Child dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
PERCENT ALLOCATED				
Sex	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Age	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S0101

	Female		Percent Female	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
21 years and over	9,031	±81	74.8%	±0.4
60 years and over	3,018	±136	25.0%	±1.1
62 years and over	2,709	±114	22.4%	±0.9
65 years and over	2,259	±38	18.7%	±0.3
75 years and over	905	±25	7.5%	±0.1
SUMMARY INDICATORS				
Median age (years)	41.0	±0.5	(X)	(X)
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Age dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Old-age dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Child dependency ratio	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
PERCENT ALLOCATED				
Sex	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Age	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)

Educational Attainment for the Population 25 Years and Over		United States [®] Census Bureau
Note: The table shown may have been modified by user selections. Some information may be missing.		
DATA NOTES		
TABLE ID:	B15003	
SURVEY/PROGRAM:	American Community Survey	
VINTAGE:	2023	
DATASET:	ACSDT5Y2023	
PRODUCT:	ACS 5-Year Estimates Detailed Tables	
UNIVERSE:	Population 25 years and over	
MLA:	U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. "Educational Attainment for the Population 25 Years and Over." American Community Survey, ACS 5-Year Estimates Detailed Tables, Table B15003, 2023, https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2023.B15003?q=b15003&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097&y=2023 . Accessed April 22, 2025.	
FTP URL:	None	
API URL:	https://api.census.gov/data/2023/acs/acs5	
USER SELECTIONS		
TABLES	B15003	
GEOS	Lauderdale County, Tennessee; Haywood County, Tennessee; Tennessee	
VINTAGES	2023	
EXCLUDED COLUMNS	None	
APPLIED FILTERS	None	
APPLIED SORTS	None	
PIVOT & GROUPING		
PIVOT COLUMNS	None	
PIVOT MODE	Off	
ROW GROUPS	None	
VALUE COLUMNS	None	

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.B15003

WEB ADDRESS	https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2023.B15003?q=b15003&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097&y=2023
TABLE NOTES	
	Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, the decennial census is the official source of population totals for April 1st of each decennial year. In between censuses, the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities, and towns and estimates of housing units and the group quarters population for states and
	Information about the American Community Survey (ACS) can be found on the ACS website. Supporting documentation including code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing, and a full list of ACS tables and table shells (without estimates) can be found on the Technical Documentation section of the ACS website. Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.
	Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2019-2023 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
	ACS data generally reflect the geographic boundaries of legal and statistical areas as of January 1 of the estimate year. For more information, see Geography Boundaries by Year .
	Data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The degree of uncertainty for an estimate arising from sampling variability is represented through the use of a margin of error. The value shown here is the 90 percent margin of error. The margin of error can be interpreted roughly as providing a 90 percent probability that the interval defined by the estimate minus the margin of error and the estimate plus the margin of error (the lower and upper confidence bounds) contains the true value. In addition to sampling variability, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error (for a discussion of nonsampling variability, see ACS Technical Documentation). The effect of nonsampling error is not represented
	Users must consider potential differences in geographic boundaries, questionnaire content or coding, or other methodological issues when comparing ACS data from different years. Statistically significant differences shown in ACS Comparison Profiles, or in data users' own analysis, may be the result of these differences and thus might not necessarily reflect changes to the social, economic, housing, or demographic characteristics being compared. For more information, see
	Estimates of urban and rural populations, housing units, and characteristics reflect boundaries of urban areas defined based on 2020 Census data. As a result, data for urban and rural areas from the ACS do not necessarily reflect the results of ongoing urbanization.

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.B15003

	Explanation of Symbols:- The estimate could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations. For a ratio of medians estimate, one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution. For a 5-year median estimate, the margin of error associated with a median was larger than the median itself.N The estimate or margin of error cannot be displayed because there were an insufficient number of sample cases in the selected geographic area. (X) The estimate or margin of error is not applicable or not available.median- The median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "2,500-")median+ The median falls in the highest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "250,000+").** The margin of error could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations.*** The margin of error could not be computed because the median falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution.***** A margin of error is not appropriate because the corresponding estimate is controlled to an independent population or housing
COLUMN NOTES	None

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.B15003

	Tennessee		Haywood County, Tennessee	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total:	4,805,533	±1,359	12,407	±21
No schooling completed	60,910	±2,397	79	±50
Nursery school	1,092	±255	0	±21
Kindergarten	847	±224	0	±21
1st grade	1,452	±378	0	±21
2nd grade	2,451	±495	0	±21
3rd grade	6,066	±702	5	±11
4th grade	5,030	±633	42	±48
5th grade	6,980	±728	14	±20
6th grade	24,362	±1,724	111	±87
7th grade	16,458	±1,116	92	±62
8th grade	59,084	±1,805	381	±135
9th grade	61,886	±2,294	205	±79
10th grade	79,904	±2,694	276	±100
11th grade	89,861	±2,737	619	±181
12th grade, no diploma	83,114	±2,493	316	±101
Regular high school diploma	1,245,245	±9,748	4,769	±350
GED or alternative credential	263,047	±3,816	967	±212
Some college, less than 1 year	314,990	±5,718	946	±199
Some college, 1 or more years, no degree	646,948	±8,138	1,245	±196
Associate's degree	375,305	±5,481	714	±160
Bachelor's degree	913,559	±9,360	1,018	±196
Master's degree	386,013	±5,745	513	±133
Professional school degree	90,905	±3,041	27	±25
Doctorate degree	70,024	±2,289	68	±48
# of High School Degree, GED, or Alternative Credential or Higher	4,306,036		10,267	

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.B15003

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total:	16,951	±152
No schooling completed	197	±87
Nursery school	0	±25
Kindergarten	0	±25
1st grade	13	±20
2nd grade	10	±16
3rd grade	8	±13
4th grade	10	±11
5th grade	38	±37
6th grade	32	±27
7th grade	123	±77
8th grade	300	±98
9th grade	438	±150
10th grade	594	±143
11th grade	710	±190
12th grade, no diploma	446	±154
Regular high school diploma	6,191	±391
GED or alternative credential	1,943	±241
Some college, less than 1 year	1,082	±170
Some college, 1 or more years, no degree	1,812	±238
Associate's degree	1,153	±238
Bachelor's degree	1,163	±255
Master's degree	554	±128
Professional school degree	104	±62
Doctorate degree	30	±29
# of High School Degree, GED, or Alternative Credential or Higher	14,032	

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.B15003

	Tennessee		Haywood County, Tennessee	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
# of Bachelor's Degree or Higher	1,460,501		1,626	
% High School Degree, GED, or Alternative Credential or Higher	89.6%		82.8%	
% Bachelor's Degree or Higher	30.4%		13.1%	

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.B15003

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error
# of Bachelor's Degree or Higher	1,851	
% High School Degree, GED, or Alternative Credential or Higher	82.8%	
% Bachelor's Degree or Higher	10.9%	

Comparison Charts of State and County Estimates

Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC)

Tennessee




Table of Contents | Tennessee

► Literacy

Average Literacy Scale
Scores of Counties in Tennessee..... 1

Percentage with Literacy Skills
At or Below Level 1 in Counties in Tennessee 5

Percentage with Literacy Skills
At Level 2 in Counties in Tennessee..... 9

Percentage with Literacy Skills
At or Above Level 3 in Counties in Tennessee 13

► Numeracy


Average Numeracy Scale
Scores of Counties in Tennessee..... 17

Percentage with Numeracy Skills
At or Below Level 1 in Counties in Tennessee 21

Percentage with Numeracy Skills
At Level 2 in Counties in Tennessee..... 25


Percentage with Numeracy Skills
At or Above Level 3 in Counties in Tennessee 29

Average Literacy Scale Scores of Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017



See notes at end of chart.

Average Literacy Scale Scores of Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017—Continued



SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), 2012/2014/2017.

Average Literacy Scale Scores of Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017

County	Indirect estimate	Lower bound of credible interval	Upper bound of credible interval
Tennessee	260	256	264
Williamson	291	281	300
Knox	272	266	280
Wilson	272	263	281
Rutherford	269	260	278
Sumner	269	259	278
Montgomery	268	261	274
Washington	267	258	276
Hamilton	266	257	275
Blount	266	257	275
Davidson	266	258	274
Moore	263	253	272
Maury	262	253	271
Anderson	262	253	271
Coffee	262	253	272
Sullivan	261	252	271
Cheatham	261	252	271
Roane	260	251	270
Loudon	260	251	269
Fayette	260	251	269
Bradley	260	251	269
Franklin	259	250	268
Robertson	259	250	268
Cumberland	258	249	267
Stewart	257	248	266
Marion	257	247	266
Jefferson	256	247	265
Tipton	256	246	265
Putnam	256	246	265
Chester	255	246	264
Marshall	255	246	265
Lincoln	255	246	264
Sequatchie	255	246	264
Cannon	255	244	264
Weakley	254	245	264
Gibson	254	245	263
Unicoi	254	244	263
Madison	254	245	262
Polk	254	244	263
Sevier	254	243	264
Dyer	253	244	262
McMinn	253	243	262
Dickson	253	243	262
Shelby	253	244	261
Henderson	252	243	262
Humphreys	252	243	262
Greene	252	243	261
Hawkins	252	242	261
Lewis	252	242	262
Smith	252	242	261
Giles	252	243	261
Carter	251	241	261
Meigs	251	242	261
White	251	242	260


See notes at end of table.

Average Literacy Scale Scores of Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017—Continued

County	Indirect estimate	Lower bound of credible interval	Upper bound of credible interval
Henry	251	241	260
Claiborne	251	241	260
Hamblen	250	241	259
Decatur	250	241	260
Lawrence	250	241	259
Bedford	250	240	259
DeKalb	250	240	260
Carroll	250	241	259
Grainger	250	240	259
Rhea	250	240	259
Obion	249	240	259
Overton	249	239	258
Monroe	249	239	258
McNairy	248	239	258
Trousdale	248	238	259
Warren	248	238	257
Hardin	248	239	257
Benton	247	237	257
Hickman	247	237	256
Scott	247	236	257
Campbell	246	236	256
Johnson	246	236	255
Crockett	246	236	255
Perry	245	235	256
Macon	245	236	255
Pickett	245	235	255
Hancock	245	235	255
Wayne	245	235	254
Jackson	245	235	254
Union	244	235	254
Bledsoe	244	234	254
Van Buren	244	234	254
Cocke	243	233	253
Houston	243	233	253
Fentress	243	232	253
Morgan	241	232	251
Clay	241	231	251
Grundy	241	230	251
Haywood	236	226	247
Lauderdale	234	224	243
Hardeman	234	223	244
Lake	228	218	238


SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), 2012/2014/2017.

Percentage with Literacy Skills At or Below Level 1 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017



See notes at end of chart.

Percentage with Literacy Skills At or Below Level 1 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017
 —Continued



SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), 2012/2014/2017.

Percentage with Literacy Skills At or Below Level 1 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017

County	Indirect estimate (%)	Lower bound of credible interval (%)	Upper bound of credible interval (%)
Tennessee	22	19	24
Lake	39	34	44
Lauderdale	36	32	41
Hardeman	35	30	39
Haywood	34	29	39
Grundy	32	27	38
Perry	32	26	37
Bledsoe	31	26	36
Clay	30	26	35
Pickett	30	25	36
Johnson	30	25	34
Hancock	29	25	34
Campbell	29	25	34
Fentress	29	24	34
Crockett	29	25	33
Cocke	29	24	33
Houston	29	24	33
Union	29	24	33
Rhea	29	24	33
Jackson	28	24	33
Scott	28	23	33
Wayne	28	24	32
Monroe	28	24	32
Hickman	28	24	32
Macon	28	24	32
Warren	28	23	32
Morgan	28	23	32
Claiborne	27	23	31
Shelby	27	23	31
DeKalb	27	22	32
Hardin	27	23	31
McNairy	27	22	31
Carroll	26	23	30
Bedford	26	23	30
Overton	26	22	31
Van Buren	26	22	30
Hamblen	26	22	30
Obion	26	22	30
Trousdale	26	21	31
Henderson	26	22	30
Benton	25	21	30
Grainger	25	21	29
Carter	25	21	29
Lawrence	25	21	29
Decatur	25	20	29
Dyer	25	21	28
Polk	24	21	29
Madison	24	20	28
Gibson	24	21	28
Weakley	24	20	27
White	24	20	28
Unicoi	24	20	28
Humphreys	24	20	28
Hawkins	24	20	28


See notes at end of table.

Percentage with Literacy Skills At or Below Level 1 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017—Continued

County	Indirect estimate (%)	Lower bound of credible interval (%)	Upper bound of credible interval (%)
Marion	24	20	28
Lincoln	24	20	28
Lewis	24	20	28
Meigs	24	20	28
Henry	24	20	28
Greene	24	20	27
McMinn	23	20	27
Giles	23	19	27
Dickson	23	19	27
Putnam	23	19	27
Chester	23	19	27
Smith	23	18	27
Sequatchie	22	19	26
Sevier	22	18	27
Fayette	22	18	26
Tipton	22	18	26
Bradley	22	18	26
Jefferson	22	18	26
Cannon	22	17	27
Marshall	22	18	26
Davidson	22	18	25
Cumberland	21	18	25
Franklin	21	17	24
Loudon	21	17	24
Stewart	20	16	24
Robertson	20	17	24
Anderson	20	17	24
Sullivan	20	17	24
Hamilton	19	16	23
Roane	19	16	23
Cheatham	19	16	23
Coffee	19	15	23
Maury	18	15	22
Montgomery	18	15	21
Washington	17	14	21
Blount	17	14	21
Moore	17	13	21
Rutherford	17	13	20
Sumner	16	13	20
Knox	16	13	19
Wilson	15	12	18
Williamson	8	4	12


SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), 2012/2014/2017.

Percentage with Literacy Skills At Level 2 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017



See notes at end of chart.

Percentage with Literacy Skills At Level 2 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017—Continued



SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), 2012/2014/2017.

Percentage with Literacy Skills At Level 2 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017

County	Indirect estimate (%)	Lower bound of credible interval (%)	Upper bound of credible interval (%)
Tennessee	38	34	42
Morgan	51	45	57
Van Buren	50	44	56
Hardeman	49	43	56
Benton	48	43	54
Lake	48	42	55
Houston	48	42	54
Smith	48	42	54
Macon	48	42	54
Jackson	48	42	54
Union	48	42	54
Henry	47	42	53
Haywood	47	40	54
Clay	47	41	53
Cannon	47	40	54
Cocke	47	41	53
Meigs	47	42	53
Lauderdale	47	41	53
Wayne	47	41	53
Overton	47	41	53
Fentress	47	40	53
White	46	41	52
Lawrence	46	41	52
Giles	46	41	52
Scott	46	40	53
Grainger	46	41	52
McNairy	46	40	52
Decatur	46	40	52
Hickman	46	40	51
Hardin	45	40	51
Lewis	45	40	51
Humphreys	45	40	51
Dickson	45	40	51
Grundy	45	38	53
Hawkins	45	40	51
Trousdale	45	39	52
Marshall	45	39	51
Greene	45	40	50
Hancock	45	39	51
McMinn	45	40	51
DeKalb	45	38	51
Obion	45	39	50
Warren	44	38	51
Stewart	44	39	50
Bledsoe	44	38	51
Campbell	44	38	51
Crockett	44	39	50
Moore	44	38	50
Chester	44	39	49
Pickett	44	37	51
Johnson	44	38	50
Carter	44	38	50
Carroll	44	39	49
Monroe	44	38	49


See notes at end of table.

Percentage with Literacy Skills At Level 2 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017—Continued

County	Indirect estimate (%)	Lower bound of credible interval (%)	Upper bound of credible interval (%)
Sequatchie	44	39	49
Bedford	43	38	49
Hamblen	43	38	49
Lincoln	43	38	49
Tipton	43	38	48
Polk	43	38	49
Unicoi	43	38	48
Claiborne	43	37	49
Henderson	43	37	48
Sevier	43	36	49
Robertson	42	37	48
Weakley	42	37	47
Dyer	42	38	47
Jefferson	42	37	48
Cumberland	42	37	47
Perry	42	35	49
Gibson	42	37	47
Cheatham	41	37	47
Marion	41	36	47
Franklin	41	36	46
Roane	41	36	46
Coffee	41	36	46
Putnam	41	36	47
Rhea	41	35	47
Maury	40	36	46
Sullivan	40	35	45
Blount	39	35	45
Madison	39	34	44
Loudon	39	34	44
Fayette	39	33	44
Anderson	38	33	43
Bradley	38	33	43
Sumner	37	32	42
Washington	36	31	41
Montgomery	36	31	41
Wilson	35	31	40
Shelby	35	30	41
Rutherford	35	30	40
Hamilton	34	30	39
Knox	33	28	38
Davidson	32	27	37
Williamson	24	19	30


SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), 2012/2014/2017.

Percentage with Literacy Skills At or Above Level 3 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017



See notes at end of chart.

Percentage with Literacy Skills At or Above Level 3 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017
—Continued



SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), 2012/2014/2017.

Percentage with Literacy Skills At or Above Level 3 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017

County	Indirect estimate (%)	Lower bound of credible interval (%)	Upper bound of credible interval (%)
Tennessee	40	37	43
Williamson	68	62	73
Knox	51	46	55
Wilson	50	45	54
Rutherford	48	43	53
Sumner	47	42	52
Washington	47	42	51
Davidson	47	42	52
Montgomery	47	42	51
Hamilton	46	41	50
Blount	44	39	48
Anderson	42	37	46
Maury	41	36	46
Loudon	41	36	46
Sullivan	40	35	45
Bradley	40	35	45
Coffee	40	35	45
Cheatham	39	34	44
Roane	39	34	44
Moore	39	34	45
Fayette	39	34	44
Shelby	38	32	43
Franklin	38	33	43
Robertson	38	32	42
Cumberland	37	32	42
Madison	37	32	41
Putnam	36	31	41
Jefferson	36	31	41
Stewart	35	30	40
Sevier	35	29	41
Marion	35	30	40
Tipton	35	30	40
Gibson	34	29	39
Sequatchie	34	29	39
Weakley	34	29	38
Chester	34	29	38
Unicoi	33	28	38
Marshall	33	28	38
Lincoln	33	28	38
Dyer	33	28	38
Polk	33	27	38
Henderson	32	27	37
McMinn	32	26	36
Dickson	32	26	36
Carter	31	26	37
Greene	31	26	36
Hawkins	31	26	36
Cannon	31	25	37
Lewis	31	25	36
Rhea	31	26	36
Humphreys	31	26	36
Hamblen	31	26	36
Giles	31	26	36
Bedford	30	25	35


See notes at end of table.

Percentage with Literacy Skills At or Above Level 3 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017—Continued

County	Indirect estimate (%)	Lower bound of credible interval (%)	Upper bound of credible interval (%)
Claiborne	30	25	36
White	30	25	35
Carroll	30	25	35
Decatur	30	24	35
Smith	30	24	35
Obion	29	24	34
Meigs	29	24	34
Henry	29	24	34
Trousdale	29	23	35
Lawrence	29	24	34
Monroe	29	24	34
DeKalb	29	23	34
Grainger	29	23	34
Warren	28	23	33
Hardin	28	23	33
McNairy	27	22	33
Overton	27	22	33
Crockett	27	22	32
Hickman	27	22	32
Johnson	27	21	32
Campbell	26	21	32
Perry	26	20	33
Benton	26	21	32
Pickett	26	20	32
Hancock	26	20	31
Scott	25	19	32
Wayne	25	20	30
Macon	25	19	30
Bledsoe	25	19	30
Fentress	24	18	30
Cocke	24	19	30
Van Buren	24	18	30
Jackson	24	18	29
Union	24	18	29
Houston	23	18	29
Clay	22	17	28
Grundy	22	16	29
Morgan	22	16	27
Haywood	19	13	26
Lauderdale	17	11	23
Hardeman	16	10	22
Lake	13	7	19


SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), 2012/2014/2017.

Average Numeracy Scale Scores of Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017



See notes at end of chart.

Average Numeracy Scale Scores of Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017—Continued



SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), 2012/2014/2017.

Average Numeracy Scale Scores of Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017

County	Indirect estimate	Lower bound of credible interval	Upper bound of credible interval
Tennessee	245	240	250
Williamson	283	273	293
Wilson	260	250	270
Knox	260	252	268
Sumner	256	246	266
Rutherford	256	246	265
Washington	254	244	264
Montgomery	253	246	261
Blount	253	243	262
Hamilton	252	242	261
Moore	251	240	262
Anderson	249	239	259
Davidson	249	240	257
Cheatham	249	239	258
Coffee	248	238	258
Sullivan	248	238	258
Maury	248	238	258
Loudon	247	237	257
Roane	247	237	257
Bradley	246	236	256
Franklin	246	236	256
Robertson	245	235	255
Fayette	245	235	254
Cumberland	244	234	254
Jefferson	243	233	253
Marion	243	233	253
Sequatchie	241	231	251
Stewart	241	231	251
Polk	241	230	251
Lincoln	241	230	250
Tipton	240	230	251
Marshall	240	230	251
Cannon	240	229	250
Putnam	240	229	250
Sevier	239	228	251
Chester	239	230	249
Unicoi	239	229	249
Dickson	239	229	249
Weakley	239	229	248
Gibson	238	229	248
Smith	238	227	248
Dyer	238	228	247
Henderson	238	228	247
Humphreys	238	228	248
Greene	238	228	247
McMinn	237	227	247
Hawkins	237	227	247
Meigs	237	226	247
Giles	236	227	246
Claiborne	236	226	247
White	236	226	246
Lewis	236	226	246
Madison	236	227	244
Rhea	236	225	246

See notes at end of table.

Average Numeracy Scale Scores of Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017—Continued

County	Indirect estimate	Lower bound of credible interval	Upper bound of credible interval
DeKalb	235	225	246
Lawrence	235	225	246
Carter	235	225	245
Grainger	235	225	245
Bedford	235	224	245
Hamblen	235	224	245
Carroll	234	224	244
Monroe	234	224	244
Overton	234	224	244
Trousdale	234	223	245
Henry	234	223	244
Decatur	234	224	244
Shelby	233	224	242
McNairy	233	222	243
Warren	232	222	243
Campbell	232	222	242
Hardin	232	222	243
Pickett	232	221	243
Obion	232	222	242
Hickman	232	222	242
Scott	231	220	241
Benton	230	220	240
Johnson	230	220	241
Macon	230	219	241
Crockett	230	220	240
Bledsoe	230	219	241
Wayne	229	219	239
Jackson	229	219	239
Hancock	229	219	239
Union	229	219	239
Perry	229	218	240
Houston	229	218	240
Van Buren	228	217	239
Fentress	227	216	238
Cocke	226	215	237
Clay	225	214	235
Grundy	224	213	235
Morgan	224	214	234
Haywood	216	205	227
Lauderdale	215	205	225
Hardeman	214	203	224
Lake	208	197	219

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), 2012/2014/2017.

Percentage with Numeracy Skills At or Below Level 1 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017



See notes at end of chart.

Percentage with Numeracy Skills At or Below Level 1 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017
 —Continued



SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), 2012/2014/2017.

Percentage with Numeracy Skills At or Below Level 1 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017

County	Indirect estimate (%)	Lower bound of credible interval (%)	Upper bound of credible interval (%)
Tennessee	34	31	37
Lake	58	52	64
Lauderdale	54	49	60
Hardeman	53	48	59
Haywood	52	46	59
Grundy	48	42	54
Perry	46	40	53
Clay	46	41	51
Bledsoe	45	39	51
Cocke	44	39	49
Hancock	44	39	49
Johnson	44	39	49
Fentress	44	38	49
Morgan	44	38	49
Shelby	43	39	49
Pickett	43	37	49
Scott	43	37	49
Union	43	38	48
Crockett	43	38	48
Jackson	43	38	48
Houston	43	37	48
Campbell	42	37	48
Wayne	42	38	47
Hickman	41	37	46
Rhea	41	36	46
Macon	41	36	46
Warren	41	36	46
Van Buren	41	36	46
Monroe	41	36	46
McNairy	41	36	46
Hardin	41	36	45
Obion	41	36	45
Carroll	40	36	45
Benton	40	35	45
Claiborne	40	35	45
Madison	40	35	45
Overton	40	34	45
DeKalb	39	34	46
Trousdale	39	33	45
Bedford	39	34	44
Hamblen	39	34	44
Carter	39	34	44
Decatur	39	34	44
Henderson	39	34	44
Grainger	38	34	43
Henry	38	33	43
Lawrence	38	33	43
Dyer	38	34	43
Gibson	38	33	42
Lewis	37	33	43
Weakley	37	33	42
White	37	33	42
Hawkins	37	32	42
Humphreys	37	32	42


See notes at end of table.

Percentage with Numeracy Skills At or Below Level 1 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017—Continued

County	Indirect estimate (%)	Lower bound of credible interval (%)	Upper bound of credible interval (%)
McMinn	37	32	42
Giles	37	32	41
Meigs	37	32	41
Unicoi	36	32	41
Greene	36	32	41
Polk	36	32	41
Lincoln	36	31	41
Putnam	36	31	41
Chester	36	31	41
Dickson	36	31	40
Marion	35	31	40
Smith	35	30	41
Tipton	35	31	40
Fayette	35	30	40
Cannon	35	29	41
Sevier	35	29	40
Sequatchie	34	30	39
Marshall	34	29	39
Davidson	34	30	38
Bradley	33	29	38
Jefferson	33	29	38
Stewart	33	29	38
Cumberland	33	28	37
Franklin	32	28	37
Robertson	31	27	36
Loudon	31	27	36
Sullivan	31	27	36
Anderson	31	27	35
Roane	31	27	35
Hamilton	31	27	35
Coffee	30	26	35
Maury	30	26	35
Cheatham	30	26	34
Montgomery	29	25	34
Washington	28	24	32
Blount	27	23	32
Moore	27	22	32
Rutherford	27	23	31
Knox	26	22	30
Sumner	26	22	30
Wilson	24	20	28
Williamson	12	8	17

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), 2012/2014/2017.

Percentage with Numeracy Skills At Level 2 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017



See notes at end of chart.

Percentage with Numeracy Skills At Level 2 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017—Continued



Percentage with Numeracy Skills At Level 2 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017

County	Indirect estimate (%)	Lower bound of credible interval (%)	Upper bound of credible interval (%)
Tennessee	35	32	39
Smith	46	39	52
Cannon	45	38	53
Morgan	45	39	52
Van Buren	45	39	51
Moore	45	39	51
Meigs	44	38	50
Henry	44	38	51
Benton	44	38	50
Marshall	44	38	50
Giles	44	38	49
White	43	38	49
Macon	43	37	49
Dickson	43	38	49
Lawrence	43	37	49
Stewart	43	37	49
Grainger	43	37	49
Lewis	42	36	48
Humphreys	42	36	48
Overton	42	36	49
Jackson	42	36	49
Houston	42	36	48
Greene	42	37	48
McMinn	42	36	48
Union	42	36	48
Robertson	42	36	48
Decatur	42	36	48
Hawkins	42	36	47
Sequatchie	41	36	47
McNairy	41	35	48
Wayne	41	35	47
Chester	41	35	47
DeKalb	41	34	48
Cheatham	41	36	46
Trousdale	41	34	48
Coffee	41	35	47
Cocke	41	34	47
Sevier	41	34	47
Hardin	41	35	46
Tipton	40	35	46
Maury	40	35	46
Hickman	40	34	46
Cumberland	40	35	46
Bedford	40	35	46
Scott	40	33	47
Hamblen	40	34	46
Warren	40	34	47
Lincoln	40	34	46
Jefferson	40	35	46
Roane	40	35	45
Obion	40	34	46
Fentress	40	33	47
Clay	40	33	46
Blount	40	35	46


See notes at end of table.

Percentage with Numeracy Skills At Level 2 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017—Continued

County	Indirect estimate (%)	Lower bound of credible interval (%)	Upper bound of credible interval (%)
Unicoi	40	34	46
Crockett	40	34	46
Franklin	40	34	45
Hardeman	39	33	46
Polk	39	34	45
Carter	39	33	45
Carroll	39	33	44
Monroe	38	33	44
Weakley	38	33	44
Dyer	38	33	43
Marion	38	32	44
Henderson	38	32	44
Haywood	38	31	46
Sumner	38	33	44
Putnam	38	32	44
Hancock	38	32	44
Campbell	38	32	45
Sullivan	38	33	43
Loudon	38	33	43
Gibson	38	32	43
Bledsoe	37	30	44
Claiborne	37	31	44
Grundy	37	29	45
Johnson	37	31	43
Wilson	37	32	42
Pickett	37	30	44
Anderson	36	31	42
Lauderdale	36	29	42
Washington	36	30	41
Fayette	36	30	42
Montgomery	36	31	41
Rutherford	36	30	41
Bradley	36	30	41
Lake	35	29	42
Rhea	35	29	41
Madison	34	29	40
Perry	34	26	41
Hamilton	33	28	38
Knox	33	28	38
Davidson	29	24	35
Williamson	29	23	35
Shelby	29	23	35


SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), 2012/2014/2017.

Percentage with Numeracy Skills At or Above Level 3 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017



See notes at end of chart.

Percentage with Numeracy Skills At or Above Level 3 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017
 —Continued



NOTES:
 The lower bound of the credible interval for Hardeman County is rounded to 0%.
 The lower bound of the credible interval for Lake County is less than 0% and set to 0%.
 The predictions for a small number of counties become negative due to the unconstrained linear nature of the model.
 For more information, please refer to the PIAAC State and County Estimation Methodology Report.
 SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), 2012/2014/2017.

Percentage with Numeracy Skills At or Above Level 3 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017

County	Indirect estimate (%)	Lower bound of credible interval (%)	Upper bound of credible interval (%)
Tennessee	31	27	34
Williamson	59	52	64
Knox	41	36	47
Wilson	39	33	45
Rutherford	37	32	43
Davidson	37	31	42
Washington	36	30	42
Hamilton	36	31	42
Sumner	36	31	42
Montgomery	35	29	40
Blount	33	27	39
Anderson	33	27	38
Bradley	31	25	37
Loudon	31	25	37
Sullivan	31	25	37
Maury	30	23	35
Fayette	29	23	35
Cheatham	29	23	35
Roane	29	23	35
Coffee	29	23	35
Franklin	28	22	34
Moore	28	21	34
Shelby	28	22	33
Cumberland	27	21	33
Robertson	27	21	33
Jefferson	27	20	32
Marion	26	20	32
Madison	26	20	31
Putnam	26	20	32
Sevier	25	18	32
Gibson	25	19	30
Weakley	24	19	30
Sequatchie	24	19	30
Polk	24	18	30
Stewart	24	18	30
Tipton	24	18	30
Rhea	24	18	30
Unicoi	24	18	30
Dyer	24	18	30
Lincoln	24	18	30
Henderson	23	17	29
Chester	23	17	29
Claiborne	23	17	29
Marshall	22	16	28
Carter	22	16	28
Greene	21	16	27
Hawkins	21	15	27
Dickson	21	15	27
McMinn	21	15	27
Carroll	21	15	27
Humphreys	21	15	27
Hamblen	21	15	27
Monroe	21	15	27
Bedford	21	15	26

See notes at end of table.

Percentage with Numeracy Skills At or Above Level 3 in Counties in Tennessee: 2012/2014/2017—Continued

County	Indirect estimate (%)	Lower bound of credible interval (%)	Upper bound of credible interval (%)
Lewis	20	14	26
Pickett	20	13	27
Perry	20	13	27
Trousdale	20	13	27
Cannon	20	12	27
Giles	20	14	26
White	20	14	25
Campbell	20	13	26
DeKalb	19	13	26
Obion	19	14	25
Decatur	19	13	25
Johnson	19	13	25
Meigs	19	13	25
Grainger	19	13	25
Lawrence	19	13	25
Warren	19	13	25
Smith	19	12	25
Hardin	19	13	25
Overton	18	12	24
Hickman	18	12	24
Hancock	18	12	25
Bledsoe	18	11	25
McNairy	18	12	24
Henry	18	12	24
Crockett	18	11	23
Scott	17	10	24
Wayne	16	11	23
Fentress	16	10	23
Benton	16	9	22
Macon	15	9	21
Cocke	15	9	22
Grundy	15	8	23
Houston	15	9	22
Union	15	9	22
Jackson	15	9	21
Clay	14	8	21
Van Buren	14	8	21
Morgan	11	5	18
Lauderdale	10	4	16
Haywood	10	2	17
Hardeman	7	0	14
Lake	6	0	13

NOTES:

The lower bound of the credible interval for Hardeman County is rounded to 0%.

The lower bound of the credible interval for Lake County is less than 0% and set to 0%.

The predictions for a small number of counties become negative due to the unconstrained linear nature of the model.

For more information, please refer to the PIAAC State and County Estimation Methodology Report.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), 2012/2014/2017.

Household Language by Household Limited English Speaking Status		United States [®] Census Bureau
Note: The table shown may have been modified by user selections. Some information may be missing.		
DATA NOTES		
TABLE ID:	C16002	
SURVEY/PROGRAM:	American Community Survey	
VINTAGE:	2023	
DATASET:	ACSDT5Y2023	
PRODUCT:	ACS 5-Year Estimates Detailed Tables	
UNIVERSE:	Households	
MLA:	U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. "Household Language by Household Limited English Speaking Status." American Community Survey, ACS 5-Year Estimates Detailed Tables, Table C16002, 2023, https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2023.C16002?q=c16002&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097 . Accessed on April 22, 2025.	
FTP URL:	None	
API URL:	https://api.census.gov/data/2023/acs/acs5	
USER SELECTIONS		
TABLES	C16002	
GEOS	Lauderdale County, Tennessee; Haywood County, Tennessee; Tennessee	
EXCLUDED COLUMNS	None	
APPLIED FILTERS	None	
APPLIED SORTS	None	
PIVOT & GROUPING		
PIVOT COLUMNS	None	
PIVOT MODE	Off	
ROW GROUPS	None	
VALUE COLUMNS	None	
WEB ADDRESS	https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2023.C16002?q=c16002&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097	

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.C16002

TABLE NOTES	
	Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, the decennial census is the official source of population totals for April 1st of each decennial year. In between censuses, the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities, and towns and estimates of housing units and the group quarters population for states and
	Information about the American Community Survey (ACS) can be found on the ACS website. Supporting documentation including code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing, and a full list of ACS tables and table shells (without estimates) can be found on the Technical Documentation section of the ACS website. Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.
	Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2019-2023 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
	ACS data generally reflect the geographic boundaries of legal and statistical areas as of January 1 of the estimate year. For more information, see Geography Boundaries by Year .
	Data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The degree of uncertainty for an estimate arising from sampling variability is represented through the use of a margin of error. The value shown here is the 90 percent margin of error. The margin of error can be interpreted roughly as providing a 90 percent probability that the interval defined by the estimate minus the margin of error and the estimate plus the margin of error (the lower and upper confidence bounds) contains the true value. In addition to sampling variability, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error (for a discussion of nonsampling variability, see ACS Technical Documentation). The effect of nonsampling error is not represented
	Users must consider potential differences in geographic boundaries, questionnaire content or coding, or other methodological issues when comparing ACS data from different years. Statistically significant differences shown in ACS Comparison Profiles, or in data users' own analysis, may be the result of these differences and thus might not necessarily reflect changes to the social, economic, housing, or demographic characteristics being compared. For more information, see
	A "limited English speaking household" is one in which no member 14 years old and over (1) speaks only English or (2) speaks a non-English language and speaks English "very well." In other words, all members 14 years old and over have at least some difficulty with English. By definition, English-only households cannot belong to this group. Previous Census Bureau data products have referred to these households as "linguistically isolated" and "Households in which no one 14 and over speaks English only or speaks a language other than English at home and speaks English 'very well'." This table is directly comparable to tables from earlier years that used these labels.

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.C16002

	The household language assigned to the housing unit is the non-English language spoken by the first person with a non-English language in the following order: reference person, spouse, parent, sibling, child, grandchild, in-law, other relative, unmarried partner, housemate/roommate, roomer/boarder, foster child, or other nonrelative. If no member of the household age 5 and over speaks a language other than English at home then the household language is English only.
	Estimates of urban and rural populations, housing units, and characteristics reflect boundaries of urban areas defined based on 2020 Census data. As a result, data for urban and rural areas from the ACS do not necessarily reflect the results of ongoing urbanization.
	Explanation of Symbols:- The estimate could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations. For a ratio of medians estimate, one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution. For a 5-year median estimate, the margin of error associated with a median was larger than the median itself.N The estimate or margin of error cannot be displayed because there were an insufficient number of sample cases in the selected geographic area. (X) The estimate or margin of error is not applicable or not available.median- The median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "2,500-")median+ The median falls in the highest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "250,000+").** The margin of error could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations.*** The margin of error could not be computed because the median falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution.***** A margin of error is not appropriate because the corresponding estimate is controlled to an independent population or housing
COLUMN NOTES	None

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.C16002

	Tennessee		Haywood County, Tennessee	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total:	2,768,743	±7,134	7,166	±242
English only	2,534,461	±7,476	6,963	±249
Spanish:	130,697	±2,134	183	±59
Limited English speaking household	31,950	±1,579	27	±28
Not a limited English speaking household	98,747	±2,129	156	±53
Other Indo-European languages:	46,029	±1,938	0	±21
Limited English speaking household	3,937	±570	0	±21
Not a limited English speaking household	42,092	±1,829	0	±21
Asian and Pacific Island languages:	35,047	±1,402	4	±7
Limited English speaking household	7,199	±679	4	±7
Not a limited English speaking household	27,848	±1,222	0	±21
Other languages:	22,509	±1,501	16	±19
Limited English speaking household	5,245	±703	14	±18
Not a limited English speaking household	17,264	±1,344	2	±5
# Limited English Speaking Households	48331		45	
% Limited English Speaking Households	1.7%		0.6%	

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.C16002

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total:	9,214	±232
English only	8,926	±224
Spanish:	181	±60
Limited English speaking household	47	±62
Not a limited English speaking household	134	±65
Other Indo-European languages:	62	±48
Limited English speaking household	0	±25
Not a limited English speaking household	62	±48
Asian and Pacific Island languages:	41	±17
Limited English speaking household	0	±25
Not a limited English speaking household	41	±17
Other languages:	4	±10
Limited English speaking household	0	±25
Not a limited English speaking household	4	±10
# Limited English Speaking Households	47	
% Limited English Speaking Households	0.5%	

Disability Characteristics		United States [®] Census Bureau
Note: The table shown may have been modified by user selections. Some information may be missing.		
DATA NOTES		
TABLE ID:	S1810	
SURVEY/PROGRAM:	American Community Survey	
VINTAGE:	2023	
DATASET:	ACSST5Y2023	
PRODUCT:	ACS 5-Year Estimates Subject Tables	
UNIVERSE:	None	
MLA:	U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. "Disability Characteristics." American Community Survey, ACS 5-Year Estimates Subject Tables, Table S1810, 2023, https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST5Y2023.S1810?q=disability&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097_160XX00US4708920.4763340	
FTP URL:	None	
API URL:	https://api.census.gov/data/2023/acs/acs5/subject	
USER SELECTIONS		
TOPICS	Disability	
GEOS	Haywood County, Tennessee; Lauderdale County, Tennessee; Brownsville city, Tennessee; Ripley city, Tennessee; Tennessee	
EXCLUDED COLUMNS	None	
APPLIED FILTERS	None	
APPLIED SORTS	None	
PIVOT & GROUPING		
PIVOT COLUMNS	None	
PIVOT MODE	Off	
ROW GROUPS	None	
VALUE COLUMNS	None	
WEB ADDRESS	https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST5Y2023.S1810?q=disability&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097_160XX00US4708920.4763340	

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

TABLE NOTES	
	Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, the decennial census is the official source of population totals for April 1st of each decennial year. In between censuses, the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities, and towns and estimates of housing units and the group quarters population for states and
	Information about the American Community Survey (ACS) can be found on the ACS website. Supporting documentation including code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing, and a full list of ACS tables and table shells (without estimates) can be found on the Technical Documentation section of the ACS website. Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.
	Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2019-2023 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
	ACS data generally reflect the geographic boundaries of legal and statistical areas as of January 1 of the estimate year. For more information, see Geography Boundaries by Year .
	Data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The degree of uncertainty for an estimate arising from sampling variability is represented through the use of a margin of error. The value shown here is the 90 percent margin of error. The margin of error can be interpreted roughly as providing a 90 percent probability that the interval defined by the estimate minus the margin of error and the estimate plus the margin of error (the lower and upper confidence bounds) contains the true value. In addition to sampling variability, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error (for a discussion of nonsampling variability, see ACS Technical Documentation). The effect of nonsampling error is not represented
	Users must consider potential differences in geographic boundaries, questionnaire content or coding, or other methodological issues when comparing ACS data from different years. Statistically significant differences shown in ACS Comparison Profiles, or in data users' own analysis, may be the result of these differences and thus might not necessarily reflect changes to the social, economic, housing, or demographic characteristics being compared. For more information, see
	For cognitive difficulty, ambulatory difficulty, and self-care difficulty, the 'Population under 18 years' includes persons aged 5 to 17. Children under 5 are not included in these measures.
	Estimates of urban and rural populations, housing units, and characteristics reflect boundaries of urban areas defined based on 2020 Census data. As a result, data for urban and rural areas from the ACS do not necessarily reflect the results of ongoing urbanization.

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Explanation of Symbols:- The estimate could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations. For a ratio of medians estimate, one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution. For a 5-year median estimate, the margin of error associated with a median was larger than the median itself.N The estimate or margin of error cannot be displayed because there were an insufficient number of sample cases in the selected geographic area. (X) The estimate or margin of error is not applicable or not available.median- The median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "2,500-")median+ The median falls in the highest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "250,000+").** The margin of error could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations.*** The margin of error could not be computed because the median falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution.***** A margin of error is not appropriate because the corresponding estimate is controlled to an independent population or housing
COLUMN NOTES	None

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Tennessee			
	Total		With a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total civilian noninstitutionalized population	6,888,125	±1,234	1,034,275	±9,327
SEX				
Male	3,358,548	±2,029	502,018	±6,423
Female	3,529,577	±1,664	532,257	±5,686
RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN				
White alone	5,069,538	±6,193	805,741	±7,531
Black or African American alone	1,081,941	±4,719	153,551	±4,215
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	16,776	±1,792	3,110	±434
Asian alone	128,510	±1,843	10,012	±916
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	4,851	±948	455	±234
Some other race alone	173,639	±5,723	12,043	±1,027
Two or more races	412,870	±7,048	49,363	±2,259
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino	4,932,791	±3,492	794,478	±7,399
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	491,679	±525	37,715	±2,142
AGE				
Under 5 years	409,631	±869	3,771	±728
5 to 17 years	1,146,309	±1,054	77,388	±2,318
18 to 34 years	1,551,832	±1,870	126,211	±3,480
35 to 64 years	2,633,870	±1,938	406,671	±5,477
65 to 74 years	704,991	±980	199,228	±2,732
75 years and over	441,492	±974	221,006	±2,900

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

			Haywood County, Tennessee	
	Percent with a disability		Total	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total civilian noninstitutionalized population	15.00%	±0.1	17,467	±5
SEX				
Male	14.90%	±0.2	8,298	±60
Female	15.10%	±0.2	9,169	±60
RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN				
White alone	15.90%	±0.1	7,588	±93
Black or African American alone	14.20%	±0.4	8,771	±193
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	18.50%	±3.0	7	±12
Asian alone	7.80%	±0.7	17	±29
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	9.40%	±4.5	0	±21
Some other race alone	6.90%	±0.6	663	±145
Two or more races	12.00%	±0.5	421	±155
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino	16.10%	±0.2	7,481	±63
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	7.70%	±0.4	831	±6
AGE				
Under 5 years	0.90%	±0.2	964	±34
5 to 17 years	6.80%	±0.2	2,970	±34
18 to 34 years	8.10%	±0.2	3,346	±78
35 to 64 years	15.40%	±0.2	6,710	±83
65 to 74 years	28.30%	±0.4	2,205	±38
75 years and over	50.10%	±0.7	1,272	±44

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	With a disability		Percent with a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total civilian noninstitutionalized population	4,552	±412	26.10%	±2.4
SEX				
Male	1,905	±258	23.00%	±3.1
Female	2,647	±271	28.90%	±2.9
RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN				
White alone	1,986	±262	26.20%	±3.4
Black or African American alone	2,336	±318	26.60%	±3.6
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	7	±12	100.00%	±100.0
Asian alone	4	±7	23.50%	±12.9
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	0	±21	-	**
Some other race alone	60	±42	9.00%	±7.1
Two or more races	159	±85	37.80%	±15.2
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino	1,962	±262	26.20%	±3.5
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	135	±78	16.20%	±9.4
AGE				
Under 5 years	0	±21	0.00%	±4.3
5 to 17 years	481	±153	16.20%	±5.2
18 to 34 years	449	±189	13.40%	±5.7
35 to 64 years	1,856	±287	27.70%	±4.2
65 to 74 years	1,037	±183	47.00%	±8.2
75 years and over	729	±107	57.30%	±8.0

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee			
	Total		With a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total civilian noninstitutionalized population	22,808	±72	5,181	±454
SEX				
Male	11,089	±290	2,283	±258
Female	11,719	±282	2,898	±352
RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN				
White alone	13,721	±296	3,087	±287
Black or African American alone	7,604	±235	1,737	±280
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	71	±37	14	±19
Asian alone	178	±53	35	±19
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	0	±25	0	±25
Some other race alone	255	±202	0	±25
Two or more races	979	±290	308	±122
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino	13,478	±186	3,040	±279
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	587	±47	57	±59
AGE				
Under 5 years	1,435	±46	137	±106
5 to 17 years	4,046	±45	366	±131
18 to 34 years	4,779	±190	556	±160
35 to 64 years	8,608	±194	2,318	±303
65 to 74 years	2,414	±55	908	±144
75 years and over	1,526	±43	896	±127

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

			Brownsville city, Tennessee	
	Percent with a disability		Total	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total civilian noninstitutionalized population	22.7%	±2.0	9,526	±53
SEX				
Male	20.6%	±2.4	4,384	±205
Female	24.7%	±2.9	5,142	±194
RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN				
White alone	22.5%	±2.1	2,258	±330
Black or African American alone	22.8%	±3.7	6,666	±315
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	19.7%	±28.7	0	±19
Asian alone	19.7%	±9.4	0	±19
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	-	**	0	±19
Some other race alone	0.0%	±15.3	460	±214
Two or more races	31.5%	±11.8	142	±90
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino	22.6%	±2.1	2,183	±329
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	9.7%	±10.1	509	±201
AGE				
Under 5 years	9.5%	±7.4	559	±77
5 to 17 years	9.0%	±3.2	1,800	±139
18 to 34 years	11.6%	±3.3	2,022	±166
35 to 64 years	26.9%	±3.4	3,510	±187
65 to 74 years	37.6%	±5.8	1,004	±132
75 years and over	58.7%	±8.4	631	±122

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	With a disability		Percent with a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total civilian noninstitutionalized population	2,688	±346	28.2%	±3.6
SEX				
Male	1,086	±213	24.8%	±4.6
Female	1,602	±231	31.2%	±4.4
RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN				
White alone	745	±160	33.0%	±6.6
Black or African American alone	1,867	±325	28.0%	±4.6
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	0	±19	-	**
Asian alone	0	±19	-	**
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	0	±19	-	**
Some other race alone	34	±39	7.4%	±8.9
Two or more races	42	±38	29.6%	±24.0
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino	726	±159	33.3%	±7.0
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	72	±59	14.1%	±11.0
AGE				
Under 5 years	0	±19	0.0%	±7.3
5 to 17 years	314	±139	17.4%	±7.6
18 to 34 years	332	±175	16.4%	±8.8
35 to 64 years	1,058	±218	30.1%	±6.3
65 to 74 years	610	±154	60.8%	±11.8
75 years and over	374	±103	59.3%	±13.1

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Ripley city, Tennessee			
	Total		With a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total civilian noninstitutionalized population	7,517	±24	1,924	±317
SEX				
Male	3,684	±210	779	±190
Female	3,833	±211	1,145	±258
RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN				
White alone	2,862	±283	722	±137
Black or African American alone	4,170	±356	1,115	±283
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	33	±30	0	±19
Asian alone	1	±4	1	±4
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	0	±19	0	±19
Some other race alone	75	±82	0	±19
Two or more races	376	±247	86	±70
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino	2,862	±283	722	±137
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	75	±82	0	±19
AGE				
Under 5 years	610	±122	137	±106
5 to 17 years	1,309	±199	198	±109
18 to 34 years	1,811	±227	279	±112
35 to 64 years	2,839	±222	853	±187
65 to 74 years	642	±119	283	±91
75 years and over	306	±87	174	±84

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Percent with a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total civilian noninstitutionalized population	25.6%	±4.2
SEX		
Male	21.1%	±4.9
Female	29.9%	±6.4
RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN		
White alone	25.2%	±4.7
Black or African American alone	26.7%	±6.4
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	0.0%	±59.0
Asian alone	100.0%	±100.0
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	-	**
Some other race alone	0.0%	±39.2
Two or more races	22.9%	±18.2
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino	25.2%	±4.7
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	0.0%	±39.2
AGE		
Under 5 years	22.5%	±16.6
5 to 17 years	15.1%	±8.3
18 to 34 years	15.4%	±5.8
35 to 64 years	30.0%	±6.4
65 to 74 years	44.1%	±11.0
75 years and over	56.9%	±17.7

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Tennessee			
	Total		With a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
DISABILITY TYPE BY DETAILED AGE				
With a hearing difficulty	(X)	(X)	293,297	±4,907
Population under 18 years	1,555,940	±738	8,986	±1,017
Population under 5 years	409,631	±869	2,260	±556
Population 5 to 17 years	1,146,309	±1,054	6,726	±798
Population 18 to 64 years	4,185,702	±1,595	107,046	±3,314
Population 18 to 34 years	1,551,832	±1,870	17,697	±1,282
Population 35 to 64 years	2,633,870	±1,938	89,349	±3,002
Population 65 years and over	1,146,483	±1,173	177,265	±2,712
Population 65 to 74 years	704,991	±980	73,052	±1,567
Population 75 years and over	441,492	±974	104,213	±2,331
With a vision difficulty	(X)	(X)	209,811	±4,416
Population under 18 years	1,555,940	±738	17,180	±1,250
Population under 5 years	409,631	±869	2,413	±524
Population 5 to 17 years	1,146,309	±1,054	14,767	±1,164
Population 18 to 64 years	4,185,702	±1,595	110,916	±2,959
Population 18 to 34 years	1,551,832	±1,870	25,543	±1,666
Population 35 to 64 years	2,633,870	±1,938	85,373	±2,593
Population 65 years and over	1,146,483	±1,173	81,715	±2,163
Population 65 to 74 years	704,991	±980	37,299	±1,450
Population 75 years and over	441,492	±974	44,416	±1,531
With a cognitive difficulty	(X)	(X)	405,840	±6,731
Population under 18 years	1,146,309	±1,054	60,361	±1,834

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

			Haywood County, Tennessee	
	Percent with a disability		Total	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
DISABILITY TYPE BY DETAILED AGE				
With a hearing difficulty	4.30%	±0.1	(X)	(X)
Population under 18 years	0.60%	±0.1	3,934	±6
Population under 5 years	0.60%	±0.1	964	±34
Population 5 to 17 years	0.60%	±0.1	2,970	±34
Population 18 to 64 years	2.60%	±0.1	10,056	±27
Population 18 to 34 years	1.10%	±0.1	3,346	±78
Population 35 to 64 years	3.40%	±0.1	6,710	±83
Population 65 years and over	15.50%	±0.2	3,477	±27
Population 65 to 74 years	10.40%	±0.2	2,205	±38
Population 75 years and over	23.60%	±0.5	1,272	±44
With a vision difficulty	3.00%	±0.1	(X)	(X)
Population under 18 years	1.10%	±0.1	3,934	±6
Population under 5 years	0.60%	±0.1	964	±34
Population 5 to 17 years	1.30%	±0.1	2,970	±34
Population 18 to 64 years	2.60%	±0.1	10,056	±27
Population 18 to 34 years	1.60%	±0.1	3,346	±78
Population 35 to 64 years	3.20%	±0.1	6,710	±83
Population 65 years and over	7.10%	±0.2	3,477	±27
Population 65 to 74 years	5.30%	±0.2	2,205	±38
Population 75 years and over	10.10%	±0.3	1,272	±44
With a cognitive difficulty	6.30%	±0.1	(X)	(X)
Population under 18 years	5.30%	±0.2	2,970	±34

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	With a disability		Percent with a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
DISABILITY TYPE BY DETAILED AGE				
With a hearing difficulty	1,294	±271	7.40%	±1.5
Population under 18 years	93	±66	2.40%	±1.7
Population under 5 years	0	±21	0.00%	±4.3
Population 5 to 17 years	93	±66	3.10%	±2.2
Population 18 to 64 years	510	±173	5.10%	±1.7
Population 18 to 34 years	81	±75	2.40%	±2.2
Population 35 to 64 years	429	±147	6.40%	±2.2
Population 65 years and over	691	±207	19.90%	±5.9
Population 65 to 74 years	416	±197	18.90%	±8.9
Population 75 years and over	275	±97	21.60%	±7.6
With a vision difficulty	1,456	±277	8.30%	±1.6
Population under 18 years	99	±64	2.50%	±1.6
Population under 5 years	0	±21	0.00%	±4.3
Population 5 to 17 years	99	±64	3.30%	±2.2
Population 18 to 64 years	835	±227	8.30%	±2.3
Population 18 to 34 years	111	±94	3.30%	±2.8
Population 35 to 64 years	724	±207	10.80%	±3.1
Population 65 years and over	522	±144	15.00%	±4.1
Population 65 to 74 years	263	±107	11.90%	±4.9
Population 75 years and over	259	±85	20.40%	±6.6
With a cognitive difficulty	2,027	±317	12.30%	±1.9
Population under 18 years	387	±146	13.00%	±4.9

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee			
	Total		With a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
DISABILITY TYPE BY DETAILED AGE				
With a hearing difficulty	(X)	(X)	1,492	±279
Population under 18 years	5,481	±15	14	±19
Population under 5 years	1,435	±46	0	±25
Population 5 to 17 years	4,046	±45	14	±19
Population 18 to 64 years	13,387	±92	641	±201
Population 18 to 34 years	4,779	±190	19	±25
Population 35 to 64 years	8,608	±194	622	±196
Population 65 years and over	3,940	±58	837	±172
Population 65 to 74 years	2,414	±55	391	±104
Population 75 years and over	1,526	±43	446	±139
With a vision difficulty	(X)	(X)	1,186	±261
Population under 18 years	5,481	±15	248	±148
Population under 5 years	1,435	±46	137	±106
Population 5 to 17 years	4,046	±45	111	±64
Population 18 to 64 years	13,387	±92	571	±181
Population 18 to 34 years	4,779	±190	77	±41
Population 35 to 64 years	8,608	±194	494	±177
Population 65 years and over	3,940	±58	367	±124
Population 65 to 74 years	2,414	±55	166	±94
Population 75 years and over	1,526	±43	201	±76
With a cognitive difficulty	(X)	(X)	2,528	±374
Population under 18 years	4,046	±45	291	±122

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

			Brownsville city, Tennessee	
	Percent with a disability		Total	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
DISABILITY TYPE BY DETAILED AGE				
With a hearing difficulty	6.5%	±1.2	(X)	(X)
Population under 18 years	0.3%	±0.3	2,359	±150
Population under 5 years	0.0%	±2.9	559	±77
Population 5 to 17 years	0.3%	±0.5	1,800	±139
Population 18 to 64 years	4.8%	±1.5	5,532	±155
Population 18 to 34 years	0.4%	±0.5	2,022	±166
Population 35 to 64 years	7.2%	±2.3	3,510	±187
Population 65 years and over	21.2%	±4.4	1,635	±157
Population 65 to 74 years	16.2%	±4.3	1,004	±132
Population 75 years and over	29.20%	±9.1	631	±122
With a vision difficulty	5.20%	±1.1	(X)	(X)
Population under 18 years	4.50%	±2.7	2,359	±150
Population under 5 years	9.50%	±7.4	559	±77
Population 5 to 17 years	2.70%	±1.6	1,800	±139
Population 18 to 64 years	4.30%	±1.3	5,532	±155
Population 18 to 34 years	1.60%	±0.9	2,022	±166
Population 35 to 64 years	5.70%	±2.0	3,510	±187
Population 65 years and over	9.30%	±3.1	1,635	±157
Population 65 to 74 years	6.90%	±3.9	1,004	±132
Population 75 years and over	13.20%	±5.0	631	±122
With a cognitive difficulty	11.80%	±1.8	(X)	(X)
Population under 18 years	7.20%	±3.0	1,800	±139

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	With a disability		Percent with a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
DISABILITY TYPE BY DETAILED AGE				
With a hearing difficulty	682	±191	7.2%	±2.0
Population under 18 years	70	±60	3.0%	±2.5
Population under 5 years	0	±19	0.0%	±7.3
Population 5 to 17 years	70	±60	3.9%	±3.3
Population 18 to 64 years	257	±138	4.6%	±2.5
Population 18 to 34 years	43	±69	2.1%	±3.4
Population 35 to 64 years	214	±108	6.1%	±3.1
Population 65 years and over	355	±120	21.7%	±7.0
Population 65 to 74 years	189	±117	18.8%	±10.8
Population 75 years and over	166	±75	26.3%	±10.2
With a vision difficulty	878	±216	9.2%	±2.3
Population under 18 years	82	±57	3.5%	±2.3
Population under 5 years	0	±19	0.0%	±7.3
Population 5 to 17 years	82	±57	4.6%	±3.1
Population 18 to 64 years	484	±178	8.7%	±3.2
Population 18 to 34 years	71	±71	3.5%	±3.5
Population 35 to 64 years	413	±159	11.8%	±4.5
Population 65 years and over	312	±125	19.1%	±7.3
Population 65 to 74 years	137	±82	13.6%	±7.7
Population 75 years and over	175	±79	27.7%	±13.1
With a cognitive difficulty	1,278	±313	14.3%	±3.5
Population under 18 years	260	±137	14.4%	±7.5

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Ripley city, Tennessee			
	Total		With a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
DISABILITY TYPE BY DETAILED AGE				
With a hearing difficulty	(X)	(X)	443	±173
Population under 18 years	1,919	±219	6	±12
Population under 5 years	610	±122	0	±19
Population 5 to 17 years	1,309	±199	6	±12
Population 18 to 64 years	4,650	±243	215	±139
Population 18 to 34 years	1,811	±227	9	±19
Population 35 to 64 years	2,839	±222	206	±136
Population 65 years and over	948	±140	222	±87
Population 65 to 74 years	642	±119	112	±64
Population 75 years and over	306	±87	110	±64
With a vision difficulty	(X)	(X)	504	±193
Population under 18 years	1,919	±219	207	±150
Population under 5 years	610	±122	137	±106
Population 5 to 17 years	1,309	±199	70	±68
Population 18 to 64 years	4,650	±243	195	±87
Population 18 to 34 years	1,811	±227	52	±38
Population 35 to 64 years	2,839	±222	143	±82
Population 65 years and over	948	±140	102	±81
Population 65 to 74 years	642	±119	46	±55
Population 75 years and over	306	±87	56	±52
With a cognitive difficulty	(X)	(X)	938	±208
Population under 18 years	1,309	±199	148	±97

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Percent with a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error
DISABILITY TYPE BY DETAILED AGE		
With a hearing difficulty	5.9%	±2.3
Population under 18 years	0.3%	±0.6
Population under 5 years	0.0%	±6.7
Population 5 to 17 years	0.5%	±0.9
Population 18 to 64 years	4.6%	±2.9
Population 18 to 34 years	0.5%	±1.0
Population 35 to 64 years	7.3%	±4.8
Population 65 years and over	23.4%	±8.2
Population 65 to 74 years	17.4%	±10.1
Population 75 years and over	35.9%	±17.6
With a vision difficulty	6.7%	±2.6
Population under 18 years	10.8%	±7.7
Population under 5 years	22.5%	±16.6
Population 5 to 17 years	5.3%	±5.3
Population 18 to 64 years	4.2%	±1.8
Population 18 to 34 years	2.9%	±2.2
Population 35 to 64 years	5.0%	±2.9
Population 65 years and over	10.8%	±8.0
Population 65 to 74 years	7.2%	±8.3
Population 75 years and over	18.3%	±15.7
With a cognitive difficulty	13.6%	±3.0
Population under 18 years	11.3%	±7.2

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Tennessee			
	Total		With a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Population 18 to 64 years	4,185,702	±1,595	240,474	±5,283
Population 18 to 34 years	1,551,832	±1,870	81,337	±2,661
Population 35 to 64 years	2,633,870	±1,938	159,137	±3,658
Population 65 years and over	1,146,483	±1,173	105,005	±2,772
Population 65 to 74 years	704,991	±980	43,602	±1,700
Population 75 years and over	441,492	±974	61,403	±1,969
With an ambulatory difficulty	(X)	(X)	520,012	±5,967
Population under 18 years	1,146,309	±1,054	8,079	±830
Population 18 to 64 years	4,185,702	±1,595	243,318	±4,513
Population 18 to 34 years	1,551,832	±1,870	22,487	±1,549
Population 35 to 64 years	2,633,870	±1,938	220,831	±4,219
Population 65 years and over	1,146,483	±1,173	268,615	±3,437
Population 65 to 74 years	704,991	±980	124,151	±2,175
Population 75 years and over	441,492	±974	144,464	±2,717
With a self-care difficulty	(X)	(X)	181,662	±3,599
Population under 18 years	1,146,309	±1,054	12,567	±891
Population 18 to 64 years	4,185,702	±1,595	81,594	±2,890
Population 18 to 34 years	1,551,832	±1,870	13,753	±1,164
Population 35 to 64 years	2,633,870	±1,938	67,841	±2,465
Population 65 years and over	1,146,483	±1,173	87,501	±2,009
Population 65 to 74 years	704,991	±980	33,182	±1,341
Population 75 years and over	441,492	±974	54,319	±1,614

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

			Haywood County, Tennessee	
	Percent with a disability		Total	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Population 18 to 64 years	5.70%	±0.1	10,056	±27
Population 18 to 34 years	5.20%	±0.2	3,346	±78
Population 35 to 64 years	6.00%	±0.1	6,710	±83
Population 65 years and over	9.20%	±0.2	3,477	±27
Population 65 to 74 years	6.20%	±0.2	2,205	±38
Population 75 years and over	13.90%	±0.4	1,272	±44
With an ambulatory difficulty	8.00%	±0.1	(X)	(X)
Population under 18 years	0.70%	±0.1	2,970	±34
Population 18 to 64 years	5.80%	±0.1	10,056	±27
Population 18 to 34 years	1.40%	±0.1	3,346	±78
Population 35 to 64 years	8.40%	±0.2	6,710	±83
Population 65 years and over	23.40%	±0.3	3,477	±27
Population 65 to 74 years	17.60%	±0.3	2,205	±38
Population 75 years and over	32.70%	±0.6	1,272	±44
With a self-care difficulty	2.80%	±0.1	(X)	(X)
Population under 18 years	1.10%	±0.1	2,970	±34
Population 18 to 64 years	1.90%	±0.1	10,056	±27
Population 18 to 34 years	0.90%	±0.1	3,346	±78
Population 35 to 64 years	2.60%	±0.1	6,710	±83
Population 65 years and over	7.60%	±0.2	3,477	±27
Population 65 to 74 years	4.70%	±0.2	2,205	±38
Population 75 years and over	12.30%	±0.4	1,272	±44

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	With a disability		Percent with a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Population 18 to 64 years	1,156	±264	11.50%	±2.6
Population 18 to 34 years	317	±157	9.50%	±4.7
Population 35 to 64 years	839	±190	12.50%	±2.8
Population 65 years and over	484	±149	13.90%	±4.3
Population 65 to 74 years	287	±127	13.00%	±5.8
Population 75 years and over	197	±80	15.50%	±6.2
With an ambulatory difficulty	2,461	±328	14.90%	±2.0
Population under 18 years	35	±36	1.20%	±1.2
Population 18 to 64 years	1,370	±285	13.60%	±2.8
Population 18 to 34 years	87	±95	2.60%	±2.8
Population 35 to 64 years	1,283	±261	19.10%	±3.9
Population 65 years and over	1,056	±170	30.40%	±4.9
Population 65 to 74 years	587	±119	26.60%	±5.4
Population 75 years and over	469	±114	36.90%	±8.7
With a self-care difficulty	900	±225	5.50%	±1.4
Population under 18 years	67	±47	2.30%	±1.6
Population 18 to 64 years	470	±179	4.70%	±1.8
Population 18 to 34 years	77	±93	2.30%	±2.8
Population 35 to 64 years	393	±129	5.90%	±1.9
Population 65 years and over	363	±124	10.40%	±3.6
Population 65 to 74 years	239	±103	10.80%	±4.6
Population 75 years and over	124	±60	9.70%	±4.6

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee			
	Total		With a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Population 18 to 64 years	13,387	±92	1,681	±309
Population 18 to 34 years	4,779	±190	383	±117
Population 35 to 64 years	8,608	±194	1,298	±274
Population 65 years and over	3,940	±58	556	±134
Population 65 to 74 years	2,414	±55	239	±105
Population 75 years and over	1,526	±43	317	±109
With an ambulatory difficulty	(X)	(X)	2,688	±283
Population under 18 years	4,046	±45	36	±41
Population 18 to 64 years	13,387	±92	1,438	±236
Population 18 to 34 years	4,779	±190	136	±79
Population 35 to 64 years	8,608	±194	1,302	±228
Population 65 years and over	3,940	±58	1,214	±161
Population 65 to 74 years	2,414	±55	602	±130
Population 75 years and over	1,526	±43	612	±125
With a self-care difficulty	(X)	(X)	1,047	±182
Population under 18 years	4,046	±45	9	±13
Population 18 to 64 years	13,387	±92	526	±140
Population 18 to 34 years	4,779	±190	73	±53
Population 35 to 64 years	8,608	±194	453	±142
Population 65 years and over	3,940	±58	512	±123
Population 65 to 74 years	2,414	±55	201	±81
Population 75 years and over	1,526	±43	311	±99

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

			Brownsville city, Tennessee	
	Percent with a disability		Total	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Population 18 to 64 years	12.60%	±2.3	5,532	±155
Population 18 to 34 years	8.00%	±2.4	2,022	±166
Population 35 to 64 years	15.10%	±3.1	3,510	±187
Population 65 years and over	14.10%	±3.4	1,635	±157
Population 65 to 74 years	9.90%	±4.3	1,004	±132
Population 75 years and over	20.80%	±7.2	631	±122
With an ambulatory difficulty	12.60%	±1.3	(X)	(X)
Population under 18 years	0.90%	±1.0	1,800	±139
Population 18 to 64 years	10.70%	±1.8	5,532	±155
Population 18 to 34 years	2.80%	±1.6	2,022	±166
Population 35 to 64 years	15.10%	±2.6	3,510	±187
Population 65 years and over	30.80%	±4.1	1,635	±157
Population 65 to 74 years	24.90%	±5.3	1,004	±132
Population 75 years and over	40.10%	±8.2	631	±122
With a self-care difficulty	4.90%	±0.9	(X)	(X)
Population under 18 years	0.20%	±0.3	1,800	±139
Population 18 to 64 years	3.90%	±1.0	5,532	±155
Population 18 to 34 years	1.50%	±1.1	2,022	±166
Population 35 to 64 years	5.30%	±1.6	3,510	±187
Population 65 years and over	13.00%	±3.1	1,635	±157
Population 65 to 74 years	8.30%	±3.3	1,004	±132
Population 75 years and over	20.40%	±6.5	631	±122

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	With a disability		Percent with a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Population 18 to 64 years	701	±247	12.7%	±4.5
Population 18 to 34 years	255	±149	12.6%	±7.5
Population 35 to 64 years	446	±162	12.7%	±4.6
Population 65 years and over	317	±144	19.4%	±8.8
Population 65 to 74 years	194	±126	19.3%	±12.2
Population 75 years and over	123	±68	19.5%	±10.2
With an ambulatory difficulty	1,452	±275	16.2%	±3.1
Population under 18 years	35	±36	1.9%	±2.0
Population 18 to 64 years	837	±231	15.1%	±4.1
Population 18 to 34 years	70	±92	3.5%	±4.6
Population 35 to 64 years	767	±207	21.9%	±5.8
Population 65 years and over	580	±140	35.5%	±7.8
Population 65 to 74 years	372	±115	37.1%	±10.0
Population 75 years and over	208	±80	33.0%	±10.8
With a self-care difficulty	699	±213	7.8%	±2.4
Population under 18 years	67	±47	3.7%	±2.6
Population 18 to 64 years	302	±162	5.5%	±2.9
Population 18 to 34 years	69	±92	3.4%	±4.6
Population 35 to 64 years	233	±108	6.6%	±3.1
Population 65 years and over	330	±123	20.2%	±7.0
Population 65 to 74 years	232	±104	23.1%	±9.4
Population 75 years and over	98	±61	15.5%	±9.8

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Ripley city, Tennessee			
	Total		With a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Population 18 to 64 years	4,650	±243	677	±190
Population 18 to 34 years	1,811	±227	144	±69
Population 35 to 64 years	2,839	±222	533	±169
Population 65 years and over	948	±140	113	±79
Population 65 to 74 years	642	±119	65	±65
Population 75 years and over	306	±87	48	±51
With an ambulatory difficulty	(X)	(X)	995	±197
Population under 18 years	1,309	±199	36	±41
Population 18 to 64 years	4,650	±243	631	±176
Population 18 to 34 years	1,811	±227	103	±77
Population 35 to 64 years	2,839	±222	528	±152
Population 65 years and over	948	±140	328	±111
Population 65 to 74 years	642	±119	200	±87
Population 75 years and over	306	±87	128	±65
With a self-care difficulty	(X)	(X)	350	±136
Population under 18 years	1,309	±199	6	±12
Population 18 to 64 years	4,650	±243	258	±133
Population 18 to 34 years	1,811	±227	23	±28
Population 35 to 64 years	2,839	±222	235	±127
Population 65 years and over	948	±140	86	±61
Population 65 to 74 years	642	±119	26	±37
Population 75 years and over	306	±87	60	±48

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Percent with a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error
Population 18 to 64 years	14.6%	±4.1
Population 18 to 34 years	8.0%	±3.8
Population 35 to 64 years	18.8%	±5.8
Population 65 years and over	11.9%	±8.5
Population 65 to 74 years	10.1%	±10.6
Population 75 years and over	15.7%	±15.5
With an ambulatory difficulty	14.4%	±2.9
Population under 18 years	2.8%	±3.2
Population 18 to 64 years	13.6%	±3.7
Population 18 to 34 years	5.7%	±4.0
Population 35 to 64 years	18.6%	±5.3
Population 65 years and over	34.6%	±9.9
Population 65 to 74 years	31.2%	±12.5
Population 75 years and over	41.8%	±15.4
With a self-care difficulty	5.1%	±2.0
Population under 18 years	0.5%	±0.9
Population 18 to 64 years	5.5%	±2.8
Population 18 to 34 years	1.3%	±1.5
Population 35 to 64 years	8.3%	±4.5
Population 65 years and over	9.1%	±6.4
Population 65 to 74 years	4.0%	±5.8
Population 75 years and over	19.6%	±14.4

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Tennessee			
	Total		With a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
With an independent living difficulty	(X)	(X)	352,584	±5,316
Population 18 to 64 years	4,185,702	±1,595	186,628	±4,008
Population 18 to 34 years	1,551,832	±1,870	49,934	±1,968
Population 35 to 64 years	2,633,870	±1,938	136,694	±3,319
Population 65 years and over	1,146,483	±1,173	165,956	±2,963
Population 65 to 74 years	704,991	±980	60,338	±1,685
Population 75 years and over	441,492	±974	105,618	±2,442

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

			Haywood County, Tennessee	
	Percent with a disability		Total	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
With an independent living difficulty	6.60%	±0.1	(X)	(X)
Population 18 to 64 years	4.50%	±0.1	10,056	±27
Population 18 to 34 years	3.20%	±0.1	3,346	±78
Population 35 to 64 years	5.20%	±0.1	6,710	±83
Population 65 years and over	14.50%	±0.3	3,477	±27
Population 65 to 74 years	8.60%	±0.2	2,205	±38
Population 75 years and over	23.90%	±0.5	1,272	±44

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	With a disability		Percent with a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
With an independent living difficulty	1,626	±252	12.00%	±1.9
Population 18 to 64 years	883	±224	8.80%	±2.2
Population 18 to 34 years	187	±129	5.60%	±3.9
Population 35 to 64 years	696	±164	10.40%	±2.4
Population 65 years and over	743	±143	21.40%	±4.1
Population 65 to 74 years	404	±113	18.30%	±5.1
Population 75 years and over	339	±85	26.70%	±6.5

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee			
	Total		With a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
With an independent living difficulty	(X)	(X)	1,686	±259
Population 18 to 64 years	13,387	±92	1,074	±232
Population 18 to 34 years	4,779	±190	184	±79
Population 35 to 64 years	8,608	±194	890	±205
Population 65 years and over	3,940	±58	612	±123
Population 65 to 74 years	2,414	±55	240	±91
Population 75 years and over	1,526	±43	372	±103

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

			Brownsville city, Tennessee	
	Percent with a disability		Total	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
With an independent living difficulty	9.70%	±1.5	(X)	(X)
Population 18 to 64 years	8.00%	±1.7	5,532	±155
Population 18 to 34 years	3.90%	±1.6	2,022	±166
Population 35 to 64 years	10.30%	±2.4	3,510	±187
Population 65 years and over	15.50%	±3.1	1,635	±157
Population 65 to 74 years	9.90%	±3.7	1,004	±132
Population 75 years and over	24.40%	±6.8	631	±122

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	With a disability		Percent with a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
With an independent living difficulty	1,066	±221	14.9%	±3.0
Population 18 to 64 years	573	±187	10.4%	±3.4
Population 18 to 34 years	145	±117	7.2%	±5.9
Population 35 to 64 years	428	±141	12.2%	±4.0
Population 65 years and over	493	±135	30.2%	±7.4
Population 65 to 74 years	311	±110	31.0%	±9.9
Population 75 years and over	182	±73	28.8%	±11.7

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Ripley city, Tennessee			
	Total		With a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
With an independent living difficulty	(X)	(X)	624	±188
Population 18 to 64 years	4,650	±243	536	±185
Population 18 to 34 years	1,811	±227	96	±64
Population 35 to 64 years	2,839	±222	440	±152
Population 65 years and over	948	±140	88	±63
Population 65 to 74 years	642	±119	39	±48
Population 75 years and over	306	±87	49	±41

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S1810

	Percent with a disability	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error
With an independent living difficulty	11.1%	±3.3
Population 18 to 64 years	11.5%	±3.9
Population 18 to 34 years	5.3%	±3.4
Population 35 to 64 years	15.5%	±5.4
Population 65 years and over	9.3%	±6.7
Population 65 to 74 years	6.1%	±7.8
Population 75 years and over	16.0%	±12.0

Leading Causes of Death, Tennessee, Resident Data, 2014-2017

LEADING CAUSES OF DEATH IN STATE OF TENNESSEE, ALL AGES TENNESSEE RESIDENT DATA, 2014-2017

Leading Cause	Deaths
TOTAL DEATHS	268,881
DISEASES OF HEART	62,317
MALIGNANT NEOPLASMS	57,083
CHRONIC LOWER RESPIRATORY DISEASES	17,177
ACCIDENTS AND ADVERSE EFFECTS	16,282
CEREBROVASCULAR DISEASE	13,792
ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE	12,552
DIABETES MELLITUS	7,315
PNEUMONIA AND INFLUENZA	6,503
NEPHRITIS, NEPHROTIC SYNDROME, NEPHROSIS	4,406
SUICIDE	4,283
CHRONIC LIVER DISEASE AND CIRRHOSIS	3,870
SEPTICEMIA	3,671
OTHER DISEASES OF RESPIRATORY SYSTEM	3,420
HYPERTENSION AND RENAL DISEASE	2,686
PARKINSON'S DISEASE	2,490
PNEUMONITIS DUE TO SOLIDS AND LIQUIDS	2,251
ASSAULT (HOMICIDE)	1,946
OTHER DISEASES OF CIRCULATORY SYSTEM	1,902
BENIGN NEOPLASMS	1,321
CERTAIN PERINATAL CONDITIONS	1,014
CERTAIN OTHER INTESTINAL INFECTIONS	972
CONGENITAL ANOMALIES	968
VIRAL HEPATITIS	849
HUMAN IMMUNODEFICIENCY VIRUS (HIV) DIS	572
ALL OTHER INFECTIOUS AND PARASITIC DIS	572
NUTRITIONAL DEFICIENCIES	503
EVENTS OF UNDETERMINED INTENT	503
OTHER DISORDERS OF CIRCULATORY SYSTEM	478
ANEMIAS	440
COMPLICATIONS OF MEDICAL & SURGICAL CARE	367
ATHEROSCLEROSIS	350
CHOLELITHIASIS AND OTHER DISORDERS OF GALLBLADDER	348
PEPTIC ULCER	309
HERNIA	200
PREGNANCY, CHILDBIRTH AND THE PUERPERIUM	117
INFECTIONS OF KIDNEY	86
PNEUMOCONIOSES AND CHEMICAL EFFECTS	81
MENINGITIS	52
LEGAL INTERVENTION	39
DISEASES OF APPENDIX	35
OTHER ACUTE LOWER RESPIRATORY INFECTIONS	34
TUBERCULOSIS, ALL FORMS	33
HYPERPLASIA OF PROSTATE	30

Leading Causes of Death, Tennessee, Resident Data, 2014-2017

INFLAMMATORY DIS-FEMALE PELVIC ORGANS	19
SALMONELLA INFECTIONS	6

SOURCE: TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, DIVISION OF VITAL RECORDS AND STATISTICS

Leading Causes of Death, Haywood County, TN, Resident Data, 2014-2017

LEADING CAUSES OF DEATH IN HAYWOOD COUNTY, ALL AGES TENNESSEE RESIDENT DATA, 2014-2017

Leading Cause	Deaths
TOTAL DEATHS	829
DISEASES OF HEART	244
MALIGNANT NEOPLASMS	174
CEREBROVASCULAR DISEASE	54
CHRONIC LOWER RESPIRATORY DISEASES	48
ACCIDENTS AND ADVERSE EFFECTS	33
DIABETES MELLITUS	20
ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE	20
PNEUMONIA AND INFLUENZA	19
NEPHRITIS, NEPHROTIC SYNDROME, NEPHROSIS	18
SEPTICEMIA	13
PNEUMONITIS DUE TO SOLIDS AND LIQUIDS	12
HYPERTENSION AND RENAL DISEASE	11
OTHER DISEASES OF RESPIRATORY SYSTEM	8
SUICIDE	8
BENIGN NEOPLASMS	7
CHRONIC LIVER DISEASE AND CIRRHOSIS	7
ASSAULT (HOMICIDE)	5
CERTAIN PERINATAL CONDITIONS	4

SOURCE: TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, DIVISION OF VITAL RECORDS AND STATISTICS

Leading Causes of Death, Lauderdale County, TN, Resident Data, 2014-2017

LEADING CAUSES OF DEATH IN LAUDERDALE COUNTY, ALL AGES TENNESSEE RESIDENT DATA, 2014-2017

Leading Cause	Deaths
TOTAL DEATHS	1,219
DISEASES OF HEART	341
MALIGNANT NEOPLASMS	277
CHRONIC LOWER RESPIRATORY DISEASES	72
ACCIDENTS AND ADVERSE EFFECTS	70
CEREBROVASCULAR DISEASE	69
ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE	50
NEPHRITIS, NEPHROTIC SYNDROME, NEPHROSIS	33
PNEUMONIA AND INFLUENZA	24
DIABETES MELLITUS	21
SUICIDE	18
CHRONIC LIVER DISEASE AND CIRRHOSIS	16
SEPTICEMIA	14
PNEUMONITIS DUE TO SOLIDS AND LIQUIDS	10
ASSAULT (HOMICIDE)	9
HYPERTENSION AND RENAL DISEASE	8
BENIGN NEOPLASMS	6
OTHER DISEASES OF CIRCULATORY SYSTEM	6
OTHER DISEASES OF RESPIRATORY SYSTEM	6
CONGENITAL ANOMALIES	6
ALL OTHER INFECTIOUS AND PARASITIC DIS	5
CERTAIN PERINATAL CONDITIONS	4

SOURCE: TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, DIVISION OF VITAL RECORDS AND STATISTICS

Tenure by Vehicles Available		United States [®] Census Bureau
Note: The table shown may have been modified by user selections. Some information may be missing.		
DATA NOTES		
TABLE ID:	B25044	
SURVEY/PROGRAM:	American Community Survey	
VINTAGE:	2023	
DATASET:	ACSDT5Y2023	
PRODUCT:	ACS 5-Year Estimates Detailed Tables	
UNIVERSE:	Occupied housing units	
MLA:	U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. "Tenure by Vehicles Available." American Community Survey, ACS 5-Year Estimates Detailed Tables, Table B25044, 2023, https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2023.B25044?q=vehicle available&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097_160XX00US4708920,4763340 . Accessed on January 31, 2025.	
FTP URL:	None	
API URL:	https://api.census.gov/data/2023/acs/acs5	
USER SELECTIONS		
GEOS	Haywood County, Tennessee; Lauderdale County, Tennessee; Brownsville city, Tennessee; Ripley city, Tennessee; Tennessee	
EXCLUDED COLUMNS	None	
APPLIED FILTERS	None	
APPLIED SORTS	None	
PIVOT & GROUPING		
PIVOT COLUMNS	None	
PIVOT MODE	Off	
ROW GROUPS	None	
VALUE COLUMNS	None	
WEB ADDRESS	https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2023.B25044?q=vehicle%20available&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097_160XX00US4708920,4763340	

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.B25044

TABLE NOTES	
	Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, the decennial census is the official source of population totals for April 1st of each decennial year. In between censuses, the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities, and towns and estimates of housing units and the group quarters population for states and
	Information about the American Community Survey (ACS) can be found on the ACS website. Supporting documentation including code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing, and a full list of ACS tables and table shells (without estimates) can be found on the Technical Documentation section of the ACS website. Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.
	Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2019-2023 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
	ACS data generally reflect the geographic boundaries of legal and statistical areas as of January 1 of the estimate year. For more information, see Geography Boundaries by Year .
	Data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The degree of uncertainty for an estimate arising from sampling variability is represented through the use of a margin of error. The value shown here is the 90 percent margin of error. The margin of error can be interpreted roughly as providing a 90 percent probability that the interval defined by the estimate minus the margin of error and the estimate plus the margin of error (the lower and upper confidence bounds) contains the true value. In addition to sampling variability, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error (for a discussion of nonsampling variability, see ACS Technical Documentation). The effect of nonsampling error is not represented
	Users must consider potential differences in geographic boundaries, questionnaire content or coding, or other methodological issues when comparing ACS data from different years. Statistically significant differences shown in ACS Comparison Profiles, or in data users' own analysis, may be the result of these differences and thus might not necessarily reflect changes to the social, economic, housing, or demographic characteristics being compared. For more information, see
	Estimates of urban and rural populations, housing units, and characteristics reflect boundaries of urban areas defined based on 2020 Census data. As a result, data for urban and rural areas from the ACS do not necessarily reflect the results of ongoing urbanization.

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.B25044

	Explanation of Symbols:- The estimate could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations. For a ratio of medians estimate, one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution. For a 5-year median estimate, the margin of error associated with a median was larger than the median itself.N The estimate or margin of error cannot be displayed because there were an insufficient number of sample cases in the selected geographic area. (X) The estimate or margin of error is not applicable or not available.median- The median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "2,500-")median+ The median falls in the highest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "250,000+").** The margin of error could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations.*** The margin of error could not be computed because the median falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution.***** A margin of error is not appropriate because the corresponding estimate is controlled to an independent population or housing
COLUMN NOTES	None

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.B25044

	Tennessee		Haywood County, Tennessee	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total:	2,768,743	±7,134	7,166	±242
Owner occupied:	1,855,793	±11,563	4,109	±286
No vehicle available	42,744	±1,514	122	±62
1 vehicle available	422,470	±5,766	827	±178
2 vehicles available	772,359	±7,781	1,599	±229
3 vehicles available	392,174	±5,004	1,091	±190
4 vehicles available	154,053	±3,148	295	±113
5 or more vehicles available	71,993	±2,124	175	±86
Renter occupied:	912,950	±7,740	3,057	±311
No vehicle available	101,665	±2,685	668	±202
1 vehicle available	431,928	±5,910	1,367	±250
2 vehicles available	278,267	±4,976	708	±157
3 vehicles available	73,990	±2,765	240	±84
4 vehicles available	20,473	±1,212	66	±53
5 or more vehicles available	6,627	±706	8	±14
Total No Vehicle	144,409		790	
% Households with no vehicle	5.2%		11.0%	

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.B25044

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee		Brownsville city, Tennessee	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total:	9,214	±232	3,885	±217
Owner occupied:	5,759	±275	1,677	±198
No vehicle available	193	±91	43	±37
1 vehicle available	1,636	±226	424	±129
2 vehicles available	2,305	±256	693	±161
3 vehicles available	1,077	±189	271	±112
4 vehicles available	366	±105	134	±85
5 or more vehicles available	182	±84	112	±79
Renter occupied:	3,455	±291	2,208	±258
No vehicle available	607	±186	612	±204
1 vehicle available	1,685	±254	990	±217
2 vehicles available	740	±164	497	±130
3 vehicles available	374	±124	78	±49
4 vehicles available	35	±35	31	±42
5 or more vehicles available	14	±18	0	±19
Total No Vehicle	800			
% Households with no vehicle	8.7%			

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.B25044

	Ripley city, Tennessee	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total:	2,799	±205
Owner occupied:	1,226	±186
No vehicle available	57	±46
1 vehicle available	349	±106
2 vehicles available	546	±130
3 vehicles available	168	±70
4 vehicles available	70	±49
5 or more vehicles available	36	±30
Renter occupied:	1,573	±170
No vehicle available	406	±159
1 vehicle available	865	±176
2 vehicles available	163	±80
3 vehicles available	131	±86
4 vehicles available	8	±15
5 or more vehicles available	0	±19
Total No Vehicle		
% Households with no vehicle		

Types of Computers and Internet Subscriptions		United States [®] Census Bureau
Note: The table shown may have been modified by user selections. Some information may be missing.		
DATA NOTES		
TABLE ID:	S2801	
SURVEY/PROGRAM:	American Community Survey	
VINTAGE:	2023	
DATASET:	ACSST5Y2023	
PRODUCT:	ACS 5-Year Estimates Subject Tables	
UNIVERSE:	None	
MLA:	U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. "Types of Computers and Internet Subscriptions." American Community Survey, ACS 5-Year Estimates Subject Tables, Table S2801, 2023, https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST5Y2023.S2801?q=Telephone, Computer, and Internet Access&g=040XX00US47050XX00US4707547097160XX00US47089204763340	
FTP URL:	None	
API URL:	https://api.census.gov/data/2023/acs/acs5/subject	
USER SELECTIONS		
TOPICS	Telephone, Computer, and Internet Access	
GEOS	Haywood County, Tennessee; Lauderdale County, Tennessee; Brownsville city, Tennessee; Ripley city, Tennessee; Tennessee	
EXCLUDED COLUMNS	None	
APPLIED FILTERS	None	
APPLIED SORTS	None	
PIVOT & GROUPING		
PIVOT COLUMNS	None	
PIVOT MODE	Off	
ROW GROUPS	None	
VALUE COLUMNS	None	
WEB ADDRESS	https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST5Y2023.S2801?q=Telephone,%20Computer,%20and%20Internet%20Access&g=040XX00US47050XX00US4707547097160XX00US47089204763340	

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

TABLE NOTES	
	Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, the decennial census is the official source of population totals for April 1st of each decennial year. In between censuses, the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities, and towns and estimates of housing units and the group quarters population for states and
	Information about the American Community Survey (ACS) can be found on the ACS website. Supporting documentation including code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing, and a full list of ACS tables and table shells (without estimates) can be found on the Technical Documentation section of the ACS website. Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.
	Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2019-2023 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
	ACS data generally reflect the geographic boundaries of legal and statistical areas as of January 1 of the estimate year. For more information, see Geography Boundaries by Year .
	Data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The degree of uncertainty for an estimate arising from sampling variability is represented through the use of a margin of error. The value shown here is the 90 percent margin of error. The margin of error can be interpreted roughly as providing a 90 percent probability that the interval defined by the estimate minus the margin of error and the estimate plus the margin of error (the lower and upper confidence bounds) contains the true value. In addition to sampling variability, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error (for a discussion of nonsampling variability, see ACS Technical Documentation). The effect of nonsampling error is not represented
	Users must consider potential differences in geographic boundaries, questionnaire content or coding, or other methodological issues when comparing ACS data from different years. Statistically significant differences shown in ACS Comparison Profiles, or in data users' own analysis, may be the result of these differences and thus might not necessarily reflect changes to the social, economic, housing, or demographic characteristics being compared. For more information, see
	Estimates of urban and rural populations, housing units, and characteristics reflect boundaries of urban areas defined based on 2020 Census data. As a result, data for urban and rural areas from the ACS do not necessarily reflect the results of ongoing urbanization.

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Explanation of Symbols:- The estimate could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations. For a ratio of medians estimate, one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution. For a 5-year median estimate, the margin of error associated with a median was larger than the median itself.N The estimate or margin of error cannot be displayed because there were an insufficient number of sample cases in the selected geographic area. (X) The estimate or margin of error is not applicable or not available.median- The median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "2,500-")median+ The median falls in the highest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "250,000+").** The margin of error could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations.*** The margin of error could not be computed because the median falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution.***** A margin of error is not appropriate because the corresponding estimate is controlled to an independent population or housing
COLUMN NOTES	None

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total households	2,768,743	±7,134	(X)	(X)
TYPES OF COMPUTER				
Has one or more types of computing devices:	2,587,850	±7,827	93.5%	±0.1
Desktop or laptop	2,069,113	±11,072	74.7%	±0.3
Desktop or laptop with no other type of computing device	73,612	±2,302	2.7%	±0.1
Smartphone	2,456,047	±7,844	88.7%	±0.2
Smartphone with no other type of computing device	335,447	±5,879	12.1%	±0.2
Tablet or other portable wireless computer	1,682,181	±10,943	60.8%	±0.3
Tablet or other portable wireless computer with no other type of computing device	22,600	±1,220	0.8%	±0.1
Other computer	77,727	±2,741	2.8%	±0.1
Other computer with no other type of computing device	738	±186	0.0%	±0.1
No computer	180,893	±3,517	6.5%	±0.1
TYPE OF INTERNET SUBSCRIPTIONS				
With an Internet subscription:	2,424,499	±9,855	87.6%	±0.2
Dial-up with no other type of Internet subscription	3,314	±411	0.1%	±0.1

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Haywood County, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total households	7,166	±242	(X)	(X)
TYPES OF COMPUTER				
Has one or more types of computing devices:	6,267	±273	87.5%	±2.2
Desktop or laptop	3,823	±342	53.3%	±4.3
Desktop or laptop with no other type of computing device	221	±96	3.1%	±1.3
Smartphone	5,850	±292	81.6%	±2.7
Smartphone with no other type of computing device	1,677	±325	23.4%	±4.4
Tablet or other portable wireless computer	3,225	±295	45.0%	±3.8
Tablet or other portable wireless computer with no other type of computing device	41	±44	0.6%	±0.6
Other computer	108	±72	1.5%	±1.0
Other computer with no other type of computing device	8	±16	0.1%	±0.2
No computer	899	±155	12.5%	±2.2
TYPE OF INTERNET SUBSCRIPTIONS				
With an Internet subscription:	5,463	±282	76.2%	±2.8
Dial-up with no other type of Internet subscription	0	±21	0.0%	±0.6

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total households	9,214	±232	(X)	(X)
TYPES OF COMPUTER				
Has one or more types of computing devices:	8,284	±288	89.9%	±1.8
Desktop or laptop	5,545	±356	60.2%	±3.5
Desktop or laptop with no other type of computing device	362	±106	3.9%	±1.1
Smartphone	7,683	±302	83.4%	±2.3
Smartphone with no other type of computing device	1,762	±257	19.1%	±2.7
Tablet or other portable wireless computer	4,390	±300	47.6%	±3.1
Tablet or other portable wireless computer with no other type of computing device	77	±46	0.8%	±0.5
Other computer	104	±53	1.1%	±0.6
Other computer with no other type of computing device	0	±25	0.0%	±0.5
No computer	930	±165	10.1%	±1.8
TYPE OF INTERNET SUBSCRIPTIONS				
With an Internet subscription:	7,740	±278	84.0%	±2.3
Dial-up with no other type of Internet subscription	13	±15	0.1%	±0.2

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Brownsville city, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total households	3,885	±217	(X)	(X)
TYPES OF COMPUTER				
Has one or more types of computing devices:	3,402	±245	87.6%	±3.6
Desktop or laptop	2,046	±237	52.7%	±5.2
Desktop or laptop with no other type of computing device	106	±71	2.7%	±1.8
Smartphone	3,197	±255	82.3%	±4.3
Smartphone with no other type of computing device	899	±226	23.1%	±5.4
Tablet or other portable wireless computer	1,701	±192	43.8%	±4.9
Tablet or other portable wireless computer with no other type of computing device	40	±44	1.0%	±1.1
Other computer	64	±56	1.6%	±1.4
Other computer with no other type of computing device	8	±16	0.2%	±0.4
No computer	483	±142	12.4%	±3.6
TYPE OF INTERNET SUBSCRIPTIONS				
With an Internet subscription:	3,144	±219	80.9%	±4.2
Dial-up with no other type of Internet subscription	0	±19	0.0%	±1.1

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Ripley city, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Total households	2,799	±205	(X)	(X)
TYPES OF COMPUTER				
Has one or more types of computing devices:	2,432	±208	86.9%	±4.3
Desktop or laptop	1,604	±235	57.3%	±7.3
Desktop or laptop with no other type of computing device	75	±53	2.7%	±1.9
Smartphone	2,254	±206	80.5%	±5.2
Smartphone with no other type of computing device	569	±173	20.3%	±6.0
Tablet or other portable wireless computer	1,381	±192	49.3%	±5.9
Tablet or other portable wireless computer with no other type of computing device	33	±30	1.2%	±1.0
Other computer	33	±34	1.2%	±1.2
Other computer with no other type of computing device	0	±19	0.0%	±1.5
No computer	367	±125	13.1%	±4.3
TYPE OF INTERNET SUBSCRIPTIONS				
With an Internet subscription:	2,240	±199	80.0%	±5.4
Dial-up with no other type of Internet subscription	0	±19	0.0%	±1.5

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Broadband of any type	2,421,185	±9,842	87.4%	±0.2
Cellular data plan	2,223,738	±10,967	80.3%	±0.3
Cellular data plan with no other type of Internet subscription	344,275	±4,686	12.4%	±0.2
Broadband such as cable, fiber optic or DSL	1,969,001	±9,670	71.1%	±0.2
Satellite Internet service	172,937	±4,049	6.2%	±0.1
Without an Internet subscription	344,244	±5,057	12.4%	±0.2
HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS (IN 2023 INFLATION-ADJUSTED DOLLARS)				
Less than \$20,000:	364,470	±5,165	(X)	(X)
With dial-up Internet subscription alone	662	±189	0.2%	±0.1
With a broadband Internet subscription	245,756	±4,368	67.4%	±0.7
Without an Internet subscription	118,052	±3,036	32.4%	±0.7
\$20,000 to \$74,999:	1,155,998	±7,818	(X)	(X)
With dial-up Internet subscription alone	1,851	±287	0.2%	±0.1
With a broadband Internet subscription	979,774	±7,778	84.8%	±0.3
Without an Internet subscription	174,373	±3,727	15.1%	±0.3

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Haywood County, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Broadband of any type	5,463	±282	76.2%	±2.8
Cellular data plan	5,137	±304	71.7%	±3.2
Cellular data plan with no other type of Internet subscription	1,394	±238	19.5%	±3.2
Broadband such as cable, fiber optic or DSL	3,457	±245	48.2%	±2.9
Satellite Internet service	762	±163	10.6%	±2.3
Without an Internet subscription	1,703	±209	23.8%	±2.8
HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS (IN 2023 INFLATION-ADJUSTED DOLLARS)				
Less than \$20,000:	1,765	±240	(X)	(X)
With dial-up Internet subscription alone	0	±21	0.0%	±2.4
With a broadband Internet subscription	1,041	±219	59.0%	±8.0
Without an Internet subscription	724	±150	41.0%	±8.0
\$20,000 to \$74,999:	3,348	±313	(X)	(X)
With dial-up Internet subscription alone	0	±21	0.0%	±1.3
With a broadband Internet subscription	2,653	±314	79.2%	±5.7
Without an Internet subscription	695	±200	20.8%	±5.7

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Broadband of any type	7,727	±278	83.9%	±2.2
Cellular data plan	7,086	±292	76.9%	±2.8
Cellular data plan with no other type of Internet subscription	2,095	±302	22.7%	±3.3
Broadband such as cable, fiber optic or DSL	5,126	±355	55.6%	±3.7
Satellite Internet service	737	±143	8.0%	±1.5
Without an Internet subscription	1,474	±212	16.0%	±2.3
HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS (IN 2023 INFLATION-ADJUSTED DOLLARS)				
Less than \$20,000:	1,856	±271	(X)	(X)
With dial-up Internet subscription alone	0	±25	0.0%	±2.3
With a broadband Internet subscription	1,349	±230	72.7%	±6.2
Without an Internet subscription	507	±134	27.3%	±6.2
\$20,000 to \$74,999:	4,344	±305	(X)	(X)
With dial-up Internet subscription alone	5	±8	0.1%	±0.2
With a broadband Internet subscription	3,533	±315	81.3%	±3.6
Without an Internet subscription	806	±156	18.6%	±3.6

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Brownsville city, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Broadband of any type	3,144	±219	80.9%	±4.2
Cellular data plan	2,893	±238	74.5%	±4.9
Cellular data plan with no other type of Internet subscription	581	±160	15.0%	±4.1
Broadband such as cable, fiber optic or DSL	2,362	±220	60.8%	±4.8
Satellite Internet service	324	±114	8.3%	±2.9
Without an Internet subscription	741	±173	19.1%	±4.2
HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS (IN 2023 INFLATION-ADJUSTED DOLLARS)				
Less than \$20,000:	1,127	±223	(X)	(X)
With dial-up Internet subscription alone	0	±19	0.0%	±3.7
With a broadband Internet subscription	665	±190	59.0%	±10.9
Without an Internet subscription	462	±140	41.0%	±10.9
\$20,000 to \$74,999:	1,905	±211	(X)	(X)
With dial-up Internet subscription alone	0	±19	0.0%	±2.2
With a broadband Internet subscription	1,662	±226	87.2%	±5.9
Without an Internet subscription	243	±112	12.8%	±5.9

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Ripley city, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Broadband of any type	2,240	±199	80.0%	±5.4
Cellular data plan	2,166	±196	77.4%	±5.6
Cellular data plan with no other type of Internet subscription	575	±173	20.5%	±5.9
Broadband such as cable, fiber optic or DSL	1,559	±197	55.7%	±6.7
Satellite Internet service	203	±82	7.3%	±2.8
Without an Internet subscription	559	±164	20.0%	±5.4
HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS (IN 2023 INFLATION-ADJUSTED DOLLARS)				
Less than \$20,000:	874	±188	(X)	(X)
With dial-up Internet subscription alone	0	±19	0.0%	±4.7
With a broadband Internet subscription	695	±172	79.5%	±9.4
Without an Internet subscription	179	±87	20.5%	±9.4
\$20,000 to \$74,999:	1,188	±200	(X)	(X)
With dial-up Internet subscription alone	0	±19	0.0%	±3.5
With a broadband Internet subscription	818	±180	68.9%	±9.3
Without an Internet subscription	370	±127	31.1%	±9.3

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
\$75,000 or more:	1,248,275	±8,561	(X)	(X)
With dial-up Internet subscription alone	801	±183	0.1%	±0.1
With a broadband Internet subscription	1,195,655	±8,755	95.8%	±0.2
Without an Internet subscription	51,819	±2,038	4.2%	±0.2

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Haywood County, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
\$75,000 or more:	2,053	±268	(X)	(X)
With dial-up Internet subscription alone	0	±21	0.0%	±2.0
With a broadband Internet subscription	1,769	±243	86.2%	±6.5
Without an Internet subscription	284	±145	13.8%	±6.5

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
\$75,000 or more:	3,014	±282	(X)	(X)
With dial-up Internet subscription alone	8	±12	0.3%	±0.4
With a broadband Internet subscription	2,845	±269	94.4%	±2.8
Without an Internet subscription	161	±86	5.3%	±2.8

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Brownsville city, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
\$75,000 or more:	853	±168	(X)	(X)
With dial-up Internet subscription alone	0	±19	0.0%	±4.9
With a broadband Internet subscription	817	±171	95.8%	±4.1
Without an Internet subscription	36	±35	4.2%	±4.1

Table: ACSST5Y2023.S2801

	Ripley city, Tennessee			
	Total		Percent	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
\$75,000 or more:	737	±127	(X)	(X)
With dial-up Internet subscription alone	0	±19	0.0%	±5.6
With a broadband Internet subscription	727	±127	98.6%	±1.7
Without an Internet subscription	10	±12	1.4%	±1.7

Median Household Income in the Past 12 Months (in 2023 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars)		United States[®] Census Bureau
Note: The table shown may have been modified by user selections. Some information may be missing.		
DATA NOTES		
TABLE ID:	B19013	
SURVEY/PROGRAM:	American Community Survey	
VINTAGE:	2023	
DATASET:	ACSDT5Y2023	
PRODUCT:	ACS 5-Year Estimates Detailed Tables	
UNIVERSE:	Households	
MLA:	U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. "Median Household Income in the Past 12 Months (in 2023 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars)." American Community Survey, ACS 5-Year Estimates Detailed Tables, Table B19013, 2023, https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2023.B19013?q=B19013&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097 . Accessed on April 22, 2025.	
FTP URL:	None	
API URL:	https://api.census.gov/data/2023/acs/acs5	
USER SELECTIONS		
TABLES	B19013	
GEOS	Lauderdale County, Tennessee; Haywood County, Tennessee; Tennessee	
EXCLUDED COLUMNS	None	
APPLIED FILTERS	None	
APPLIED SORTS	None	
PIVOT & GROUPING		
PIVOT COLUMNS	None	

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.B19013

PIVOT MODE	Off
ROW GROUPS	None
VALUE COLUMNS	None
WEB ADDRESS	https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2023.B19013?q=B19013&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097
TABLE NOTES	
	Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, the decennial census is the official source of population totals for April 1st of each decennial year. In between censuses, the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities, and towns and estimates of housing units and the group quarters population for states and counties.
	Information about the American Community Survey (ACS) can be found on the ACS website. Supporting documentation including code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing, and a full list of ACS tables and table shells (without estimates) can be found on the Technical Documentation section of the ACS website. Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.
	Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2019-2023 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
	ACS data generally reflect the geographic boundaries of legal and statistical areas as of January 1 of the estimate year. For more information, see Geography Boundaries by Year .
	Data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The degree of uncertainty for an estimate arising from sampling variability is represented through the use of a margin of error. The value shown here is the 90 percent margin of error. The margin of error can be interpreted roughly as providing a 90 percent probability that the interval defined by the estimate minus the margin of error and the estimate plus the margin of error (the lower and upper confidence bounds) contains the true value. In addition to sampling variability, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error (for a discussion of nonsampling variability, see ACS Technical Documentation). The effect of nonsampling error is not represented in these tables.

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.B19013


	Users must consider potential differences in geographic boundaries, questionnaire content or coding, or other methodological issues when comparing ACS data from different years. Statistically significant differences shown in ACS Comparison Profiles, or in data users' own analysis, may be the result of these differences and thus might not necessarily reflect changes to the social, economic, housing, or demographic characteristics being compared. For more information, see Comparing ACS Data.
	Estimates of urban and rural populations, housing units, and characteristics reflect boundaries of urban areas defined based on 2020 Census data. As a result, data for urban and rural areas from the ACS do not necessarily reflect the results of ongoing urbanization.
	Explanation of Symbols:- The estimate could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations. For a ratio of medians estimate, one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution. For a 5-year median estimate, the margin of error associated with a median was larger than the median itself.N The estimate or margin of error cannot be displayed because there were an insufficient number of sample cases in the selected geographic area. (X) The estimate or margin of error is not applicable or not available.median- The median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "2,500-")median+ The median falls in the highest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "250,000+").** The margin of error could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations.*** The margin of error could not be computed because the median falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution.***** A margin of error is not appropriate because the corresponding estimate is controlled to an independent population or housing estimate. Effectively, the corresponding estimate has no sampling error and the margin of error may be treated as zero.
COLUMN NOTES	None

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.B19013

	Tennessee		Haywood County, Tennessee	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Median household income in the past 12 months (in 2023 inflation-adjusted dollars)	67,097	±360	43,513	±3,321

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.B19013

	Lauderdale County, Tennessee	
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error
Median household income in the past 12 months (in 2023 inflation-adjusted dollars)	49,205	±3,388



Summary level	Program label	Program	Sub-program	Name	Code	Subsidized units available	% Occupied	# Reported	% Reported	Average months since report	% moved in past year	Number of people per unit	Number of people: total	Average Family Expenditure per month (\$\$)	Average HUD Expenditure per month (\$\$)	Household income per year	Household income per year per person
9	Summary of All HUD Programs	1	NA	Haywood County	47075	462	83	387	100	5	17	2.4	922	357	559	15606	6551
9	Summary of All HUD Programs	1	NA	Lauderdale County	47097	506	91	458	99	7	16	2	935	254	641	10641	5212
3	Summary of All HUD Programs	1	NA	Tennessee	47	106908	87	95193	100	6	15	2	193490	346	784	14767	7265

Picture of Subsidized Households Dataset. 2024 based on 2020 Census. Accessed October 2025

ATTACHMENT C

Economic Data

County Economic Status in the United States, Fiscal Year 2026

Appalachian Regional Commission

FIPS	State	County	Absolute Data Values				Indicator Index Values					Composite Index Value, FY 2026	Index Value Rank (of 3,106 counties in U.S., 1 is the best), FY 2026	Quartile (1 is the best), FY 2026
			ARC County	County Economic Status, FY 2026	Three-Year Average Unemployment Rate, 2021-2023	Per Capita Market Income, 2023	Poverty Rate, 2019-2023	Three-Year Avg. Unemp.Rate, Percent of U.S., 2021-2023	PCMI, Percent of U.S., 2023	PCMI, Percent of U.S., Inversed, 2023	Poverty Rate, Percent of U.S., 2019-2023			
47075	Tennessee	Haywood	NA	Distressed	5.0	25,623	22.8	118.3	44.9	222.7	183.1	174.7	2,888	4
47097	Tennessee	Lauderdale	NA	At-Risk	5.3	26,958	18.7	126.9	47.2	211.7	150.3	163.0	2,783	4

Appalachian Regional Commission, May 2025

Sex by Industry for the Civilian Employed Population 16 Years and Over		United States® Census Bureau
Note: The table shown may have been modified by user selections. Some information may be missing.		
DATA NOTES		
TABLE ID:	C24030	
SURVEY/PROGRAM:	American Community Survey	
VINTAGE:	2023	
DATASET:	ACSDT5Y2023	
PRODUCT:	ACS 5-Year Estimates Detailed Tables	
UNIVERSE:	Civilian employed population 16 years and over	
MLA:	U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. "Sex by Industry for the Civilian Employed Population 16 Years and Over." American Community Survey, ACS 5-Year Estimates Detailed Tables, Table C24030, 2023, https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2023.C24030?q=C24030&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097 . Accessed on March 18, 2025	
FTP URL:	None	
API URL:	https://api.census.gov/data/2023/acs/acs5	
USER SELECTIONS		
TABLES	C24030	
GEOS	Haywood County, Tennessee; Lauderdale County, Tennessee; Tennessee	
EXCLUDED COLUMNS	None	
APPLIED FILTERS	None	
APPLIED SORTS	None	
PIVOT & GROUPING		
PIVOT COLUMNS	None	
PIVOT MODE	Off	
ROW GROUPS	None	
VALUE COLUMNS	None	

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.C24030

WEB ADDRESS	https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2023.C24030?q=C24030&g=040XX00US47_050XX00US47075,47097
TABLE NOTES	
	Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, the decennial census is the official source of population totals for April 1st of each decennial year. In between censuses, the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities, and towns and estimates of housing units and the group quarters population for states and counties.
	Information about the American Community Survey (ACS) can be found on the ACS website. Supporting documentation including code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing, and a full list of ACS tables and table shells (without estimates) can be found on the Technical Documentation section of the ACS website. Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.
	Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2019-2023 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
	ACS data generally reflect the geographic boundaries of legal and statistical areas as of January 1 of the estimate year. For more information, see Geography Boundaries by Year .
	Data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The degree of uncertainty for an estimate arising from sampling variability is represented through the use of a margin of error. The value shown here is the 90 percent margin of error. The margin of error can be interpreted roughly as providing a 90 percent probability that the interval defined by the estimate minus the margin of error and the estimate plus the margin of error (the lower and upper confidence bounds) contains the true value. In addition to sampling variability, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error (for a discussion of nonsampling variability, see ACS Technical Documentation). The effect of nonsampling error is not represented
	Users must consider potential differences in geographic boundaries, questionnaire content or coding, or other methodological issues when comparing ACS data from different years. Statistically significant differences shown in ACS Comparison Profiles, or in data users' own analysis, may be the result of these differences and thus might not necessarily reflect changes to the social, economic, housing, or demographic characteristics being compared. For more information, see Comparing ACS Data .

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.C24030

	Industry titles and their 4-digit codes are based on the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). The Census industry codes for 2023 and later years are based on the 2022 revision of the NAICS. To allow for the creation of multiyear tables, industry data in the multiyear files (prior to data year 2023) were recoded to the 2022 Census industry codes. We recommend using caution when comparing data coded using 2022 Census industry codes with data coded using Census industry codes prior to data year 2023. For more information on the Census industry code changes, please visit our website at https://www.census.gov/topics/employment/industry-occupation/guidance/code-lists.html .
	Estimates of urban and rural populations, housing units, and characteristics reflect boundaries of urban areas defined based on 2020 Census data. As a result, data for urban and rural areas from the ACS do not necessarily reflect the results of ongoing urbanization.
	Explanation of Symbols:- The estimate could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations. For a ratio of medians estimate, one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution. For a 5-year median estimate, the margin of error associated with a median was larger than the median itself.N The estimate or margin of error cannot be displayed because there were an insufficient number of sample cases in the selected geographic area. (X) The estimate or margin of error is not applicable or not available.median- The median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "2,500-")median+ The median falls in the highest interval of an open-ended distribution (for example "250,000+").** The margin of error could not be computed because there were an insufficient number of sample observations.*** The margin of error could not be computed because the median falls in the lowest interval or highest interval of an open-ended distribution.***** A margin of error is not appropriate because the corresponding estimate is controlled to an independent population or housing estimate. Effectively, the corresponding estimate has no sampling error and the margin of error may be treated as zero.
COLUMN NOTES	None

	Tennessee			Haywood County, Tennessee			Lauderdale County, Tennessee		
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error		Estimate	Margin of Error		Estimate	Margin of Error	
Total:	3,301,152	±9,616		7,291	±452		9,087	±418	
Male:	1,728,320	±6,687		3,684	±276		4,779	±356	
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining:	22,158	±1,051		245	±96		172	±83	
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting	18,419	±971		245	±96		172	±83	
Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction	3,739	±451		0	±21		0	±25	
Construction	205,587	±4,434		505	±164		423	±157	
Manufacturing	297,521	±5,276		1,085	±242		1,719	±279	
Wholesale trade	53,965	±1,976		63	±50		277	±116	
Retail trade	193,660	±3,351		578	±169		489	±161	
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities:	170,508	±3,535		307	±113		539	±170	
Transportation and warehousing	146,621	±3,460		251	±107		521	±168	
Utilities	23,887	±1,188		56	±44		18	±22	
Information	31,119	±1,644		35	±40		0	±25	
Finance and insurance, and real estate, and rental and leasing:	84,405	±2,217		42	±36		50	±35	
Finance and insurance	55,497	±1,780		29	±29		16	±19	
Real estate and rental and leasing	28,908	±1,199		13	±21		34	±28	
Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative, and waste management services:	192,262	±4,015		150	±90		136	±73	
Professional, scientific, and technical services	107,263	±2,798		31	±27		60	±53	
Management of companies and	3,031	±566		0	±21		0	±25	
Administrative and support and waste management services	81,968	±2,776		119	±78		76	±41	
Educational services, and health care and social assistance:	183,731	±3,841		192	±114		239	±93	
Educational services	81,084	±2,642		93	±57		148	±77	
Health care and social assistance	102,647	±2,748		99	±97		91	±50	
Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services:	141,902	±3,072		103	±93		207	±121	
Arts, entertainment, and recreation	36,729	±1,642		70	±76		23	±20	
Accommodation and food services	105,173	±2,627		33	±48		184	±119	
Other services, except public administration	77,756	±2,858		127	±69		166	±81	
Public administration	73,746	±2,671		252	±112		362	±116	
Female:	1,572,832	±7,094		3,607	±262		4,308	±326	
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining:	6,661	±721		0	±21		67	±57	
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting	6,108	±706		0	±21		67	±57	
Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction	553	±161		0	±21		0	±25	
Construction	23,899	±1,455		25	±34		23	±29	
Manufacturing	124,655	±2,887		576	±153		744	±174	
Wholesale trade	21,716	±1,174		16	±25		121	±70	
Retail trade	185,851	±3,627		394	±138		566	±145	
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities:	65,617	±2,473		159	±86		220	±79	

Table: ACSDT5Y2023.C24030

	Tennessee			Haywood County, Tennessee			Lauderdale County, Tennessee		
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error		Estimate	Margin of Error		Estimate	Margin of Error	
Transportation and warehousing	58,430	±2,519		102	±69		143	±68	
Utilities	7,187	±594		57	±53		77	±51	
Information	21,034	±1,424		27	±38		20	±27	
Finance and insurance, and real estate, and rental and leasing:	114,672	±3,039		116	±54		207	±104	
Finance and insurance	86,923	±2,792		101	±49		183	±96	
Real estate and rental and leasing	27,749	±1,365		15	±22		24	±26	
Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative, and waste management services:	155,669	±3,389		175	±95		297	±107	
Professional, scientific, and technical services	90,472	±2,696		18	±20		49	±35	
Management of companies and	3,660	±580		0	±21		0	±25	
Administrative and support and waste management services	61,537	±2,052		157	±91		248	±106	
Educational services, and health care and social assistance:	551,138	±5,716		1,399	±184		1,305	±216	
Educational services	196,047	±3,683		428	±120		468	±133	
Health care and social assistance	355,091	±5,421		971	±148		837	±181	
Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services:	156,637	±3,809		315	±123		249	±75	
Arts, entertainment, and recreation	24,635	±1,526		37	±50		46	±27	
Accommodation and food services	132,002	±3,613		278	±119		203	±71	
Other services, except public administration	81,312	±2,375		90	±63		148	±75	
Public administration	63,971	±2,263		315	±117		341	±84	
Industries (Total)		Percentage	Ranking		Percentage	Ranking		Percentage	Ranking
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining:	28,819	0.87%	13	245	3.36%	9	239	2.63%	12
Construction	229,486	6.95%	7	530	7.27%	5	446	4.91%	7
Manufacturing	422,176	12.79%	2	1,661	22.78%	1	2,463	27.10%	1
Wholesale trade	75,681	2.29%	11	79	1.08%	12	398	4.38%	9
Retail trade	379,511	11.50%	3	972	13.33%	3	1,055	11.61%	3
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities:	236,125	7.15%	6	466	6.39%	6	759	8.35%	4
Information	52,153	1.58%	12	62	0.85%	13	20	0.22%	13
Finance and insurance, and real estate, and rental and leasing:	199,077	6.03%	8	158	2.17%	11	257	2.83%	11
Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative, and waste management services:	347,931	10.54%	4	325	4.46%	8	433	4.77%	8
Educational services, and health care and social assistance:	734,869	22.26%	1	1,591	21.82%	2	1,544	16.99%	2
Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services:	298,539	9.04%	5	418	5.73%	7	456	5.02%	6

	Tennessee			Haywood County, Tennessee			Lauderdale County, Tennessee		
Label	Estimate	Margin of Error		Estimate	Margin of Error		Estimate	Margin of Error	
Other services, except public administration	159,068	4.82%	9	217	2.98%	10	314	3.46%	10
Public administration	137,717	4.17%	10	567	7.78%	4	703	7.74%	5

Local Area Unemployment Statistics-Statewide
Years: 2000 to 2025

Series ID	Annual 2000	Annual 2001	Annual 2002	Annual 2003	Annual 2004	Annual 2005	Annual 2006	Annual 2007	Annual 2008	Annual 2009	Annual 2010	Annual 2011	Annual 2012	Annual 2013	Annual 2014	Annual 2015	Annual 2016	Annual 2017	Annual 2018	Annual 2019	Annual 2020	Annual 2021	Annual 2022	Annual 2023	Annual 2024	Annual 2025
LAUST4700000000000003 (unemployment rate)	3.8	4.6	5.2	5.5	5.3	5.5	5.2	4.6	6.5	10.4	9.8	9.0	7.9	7.7	6.5	5.5	4.7	3.7	3.5	3.3	7.4	4.5	3.4	3.2	3.4	
LAUST4700000000000004 (unemployed)	109314	131493	149757	161041	154639	159490	156856	141577	198425	317163	303216	282154	246043	236448	199900	170873	148043	119531	113062	111360	245313	148290	113396	109506	117350	
LAUST4700000000000005 (employed)	2735994	2726557	2748563	2746039	2745192	2740356	2858723	2906077	2869477	2733219	2791618	2837073	2856495	2849509	2852672	2907967	2987176	3068306	3136967	3218077	3049480	3168586	3248260	3270602	3303023	
LAUST4700000000000006 (labor force)	2845308	2858050	2898320	2907080	2899831	2899846	3015579	3047654	3067902	3050382	3094834	3119227	3102538	3085957	3052572	3078840	3135219	3187837	3250029	3329437	3294793	3316876	3361656	3380108	3420373	

Local Area Unemployment Statistics-Haywood County and Lauderdale County, TN
Years: 2000 to 2025

Series ID	Annual 2000	Annual 2001	Annual 2002	Annual 2003	Annual 2004	Annual 2005	Annual 2006	Annual 2007	Annual 2008	Annual 2009	Annual 2010	Annual 2011	Annual 2012	Annual 2013	Annual 2014	Annual 2015	Annual 2016	Annual 2017	Annual 2018	Annual 2019	Annual 2020	Annual 2021	Annual 2022	Annual 2023	Annual 2024	Annual 2025	
Haywood County																											
LAUCN470750000000003 (unemployment rate)	5.5	7.2	8.0	9.2	8.4	8.2	7.6	6.9	10.3	15.8	15.8	13.9	11.7	11.6	9.8	8.3	6.1	4.9	4.9	4.4	8.1	5.6	4.2	3.8	3.1		
LAUCN470750000000004 (unemployed)	507	677	771	883	791	749	741	682	984	1472	1420	1182	963	946	763	632	505	414	414	373	680	467	342	340	336		
LAUCN470750000000005 (employed)	8749	8675	8861	8747	8582	8349	8983	9176	8539	7816	7561	7307	7275	7195	7033	7021	7814	8025	7964	8014	7739	7808	7876	8629	10448		
LAUCN470750000000006 (labor force)	9256	9352	9632	9630	9373	9098	9724	9858	9523	9288	8981	8489	8238	8141	7796	7653	8319	8439	8378	8387	8419	8275	8218	8969	10784		
Lauderdale County																											
LAUCN470970000000003 (unemployment rate)	5.0	7.9	8.2	10.5	9.8	8.6	8.0	6.5	12.2	18.7	14.4	12.5	11.0	11.5	9.8	8.7	7.7	5.9	5.8	5.3	8.7	6.2	4.6	4.9	4.9		
LAUCN470970000000004 (unemployed)	562	865	871	1100	977	828	804	682	1271	1942	1555	1330	1164	1183	963	841	727	560	562	522	852	592	435	453	433		
LAUCN470970000000005 (employed)	10623	10142	9802	9349	8986	8750	9203	9740	9119	8458	9249	9300	9371	9096	8909	8786	8710	8929	9178	9287	8927	9019	8950	8718	8396		
LAUCN470970000000006 (labor force)	11185	11007	10673	10449	9963	9578	10007	10422	10390	10400	10804	10630	10535	10279	9872	9627	9437	9489	9740	9809	9779	9611	9385	9171	8829		

ATTACHMENT D
Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan



**STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

RIGHT OF WAY DIVISION
SUITE 600, JAMES K. POLK BUILDING
505 DEADERICK STREET
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37243-1402
(615) 741-3196

WILL REID
COMMISSIONER

BILL LEE
GOVERNOR

CONCEPTUAL STAGE RELOCATION PLAN

County Lauderdale - Haywood
Route SR-19 from East of Eastland Ave. in Lauderdale County
To East of SR-87 in Haywood County
PIN 102251.01 - 102251.02 - 102251.03
State Project No. 49005-1228-14 - 38004-1219-14 - 385019-F2-003
Federal Project No. STP-19(54) - STP-19(55) - STP-19(60)

Termini: SR-19E (Eastland Ave) To SR-19W East of SR-87

PROJECT INFORMATION: In order to improve safety, the Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT) is proposing: widening, grading, improving drainage, and paving State Route 19. The section of the project with PIN 102251.03 does not have a continuous roadway design but has 5 spot improvement areas described as the following: *Spot 1 realignment of Small Rd. and SR-19*

Plans indicate the realignment of Small Rd. and SR-19 from STA.447+65.00 on Small Rd. to STA. 652+51.79 on SR-19

Spot 2 realignment of Briarcreek Rd. and Woodlawn Rd. to SR-19

Plans indicate the realignment of Briarcreek Rd. and Woodlawn Rd. on SR-19.

From STA.106+36.00 on Briarcreek Rd. and from STA.97+50.00 on Woodlawn Rd. to Intersecting at STA. 100+37.90 on SR-19

Spot 3 plans indicate widening SR-19 on both the northeast side and southwest sides from approximately STA.764+00 to approximately STA.782+00

Spot 4 realignment of Old SR-19 and SR-19W

Plans indicate the realignment of Old SR-19 and SR-19 from STA. 148+45.00 on Old SR-19 to STA. 826+18.47 on Hwy 19

Spot 5 proposed widening SR-19W on the northeast side only

Plans indicate the widening of SR-19 from approximately STA. 919+00 to STA.937+31.82 and tying in Westpointe Drive to SR-19

A map showing the location of the proposed project is provided on Page 4 of this report.

According to the submitted preliminary plans, typical sections will contain the following:

Reconstruct existing 2 lane to a super 2 lane (12 foot lanes with 10 foot shoulders and improve site distances)

Right-of-way width will vary, depending on construction requirements.

For specific details regarding typical sections and other project information, refer to the separately attached CSRP Marked Plans.

AREA INFORMATION: The subject area is located in the mid-eastern portion of Lauderdale County and travels to the southwestern portion of Haywood County. Current land use in the project area is primarily agricultural with several residential communities and businesses. .

According to the U. S. Census Bureau, the population for Lauderdale County in 2020 was estimated to be 24,933 persons. This reflects a 10.06% decrease since the 2010 census. And in Haywood County the population in 2020 was 17,864 which was a 5.03% decrease since the 2010 Census.

DISPLACEMENTS: Please note that all displacements were on the .01 and .02 PINs.

ANTICIPATED RELOCATIONS	
Project PIN: 102251.01	
SINGLE FAMILY RELOCATIONS	14
BUSINESS RELOCATIONS	1
MOBILE HOME	6

ANTICIPATED RELOCATIONS	
Project PIN: 102251.02	
SINGLE FAMILY RELOCATIONS	6
BUSINESS RELOCATIONS	1

DISPLACEMENT EFFECTS AND ANALYSIS

Single Family: 20 single family residences are considered as potential relocations. Most homes are on septic. Some structures that were not within the proposed right of way are considered to be relocations due to septic field lines being impacted. There are a few additional tracts that TDOT is assuming impacted field lines may be repaired on site and those are not considered relocations at this time. If repair on site is not possible on one or more of these tracts, the number of residential relocations may increase.

Business: There are 2 businesses identified within the proposed project corridor. One located on the 102251.01 section has been identified as

Jackson Septic Tank and the other is located on the 102251.02 section and is unknown. There is one additional non-residential structure on the .01 PIN that is not occupied. Should a business occupy it prior to the project, the number of non-residential relocations may increase.


Mobile Home: 6 mobile homes were identified within the proposed right of way on the 102251.01 section in Lauderdale County. All six are within the proposed right of way.

Availability of Replacement Housing:

Based on a survey of the Lauderdale and Haywood Counties real estate markets, the supply of available residential real estate for purchase or for rent, primarily in Ripley and Brownsville, appears to be adequate to satisfy the relocation requirements for the 20 single family residences and 6 mobile home relocations. There are also several commercial properties available for purchase or rent. The project areas in Lauderdale and Haywood Counties have 4 churches, 2 cemeteries, a local grocery store, a medical equipment supply company, a local furniture store and a business which supplies boiler shop products. There are no impacts to these along the corridor of the project due to the alignment and design of intersection improvements.


ASSURANCES: The Tennessee Department of Transportation will make relocation assistance available to all eligible persons impacted by this project, including residences, businesses, farm operations, non-profit organizations, and those requiring special services or assistance. The Regional Relocation Staff will administer the relocation program under the rules, policies, and procedures set forth in the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 as amended, the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1972, implementing federal regulations, TCA 13-11-101 through 119, The State of Tennessee Relocation Assistance Brochure and Chapter IX of the State of Tennessee Department of Transportation Right-of-Way Manual. TDOT's relocation program is practical and will allow for the efficient relocation of all eligible displaced persons in accordance with State and Federal Guidelines.

Prepared By:


 Digitally signed by
Katherine Kahlon
Date: 2025.11.25
08:11:29 -06'00'

Katherine Kahlon
TDOT Relocation Team Lead

Approved by:

 DN: cn=Gale Wagner, o=TDOT,
ou=Right of Way,
email=gale.wagner@tn.gov, c=US
Date: 2025.11.25 08:18:15 -06'00'

Gale Wagner
Manager



Index Of Sheets

TITLE SHEET.....	1
TYPICAL SECTIONS.....	2B-201,202
RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION TABLES and PROPERTY MAPS.....	3A - 3H
PRESENT LAYOUTS.....	4 - 22
RIGHT-OF-WAY DETAILS.....	4A - 22A
PROPOSED LAYOUTS.....	4B - 22B
PROPOSED PROFILES.....	4C - 22C
SIDE ROADS PROFILES.....	23 - 29
DRAINAGE MAPS.....	30 - 34
ROADWAY CROSS SECTIONS.....	35 - 232
SIDE ROAD CROSS SECTIONS.....	233 - 276

STATE OF TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BUREAU OF ENGINEERING

LAUDERDALE COUNTY

STATE ROUTE 19
NEAR EASTLAND AVENUE (L.M. 21.95) TO
HAYWOOD COUNTY LINE (L.M. 26.14)

FUNCTIONAL PLANS WIDENING, PAVE, DRAIN, BRIDGE



STATE HIGHWAY NO. 19 F.A.H.S. NO.

DOES THIS PROJECT QUALIFY
FOR UTILITY CHAPTER 86

YES X NO

TENN.	YEAR	SHEET NO.
	2025	1
FED. AID PROJ. NO.	STP-19(54)	
STATE PROJ. NO.	49005-1228-14	

PROJECT LOCATION
BRIDGE ID, # 49SR0190035



NO EXCLUSIONS

ROAD TO BE CONSTRUCTED
WHILE UNDER TRAFFIC.

FUNCTIONAL
DESIGN FIELD
REVIEW

SEALED BY

WILL REID,
CHIEF ENGINEER

DATE:

APPROVED:

HOWARD H. ELEY,
COMMISSIONER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

APPROVED:

DIVISION ADMINISTRATOR DATE

49005-1228-14
BEGIN PROJECT NO. STP-19(54) R.O.W.

STA. 201+35.80 SR-19
N 524815.4941 E 928255.7949

49005-1228-14
END PROJECT NO. STP-19(54) R.O.W.

STA. 421+93.61 SR-19
N 519276.8894 E 947256.7179

SPECIAL NOTES

PROPOSALS MAY BE REJECTED BY THE COMMISSIONER IF ANY OF THE UNIT PRICES CONTAINED THEREIN ARE OBVIOUSLY UNBALANCED, EITHER EXCESSIVE OR BELOW THE REASONABLE COST ANALYSIS VALUE.

THIS PROJECT TO BE CONSTRUCTED UNDER THE STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS OF THE TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DATED JANUARY 1, 2021 AND ADDITIONAL SPECIFICATIONS AND SPECIAL PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THE PLANS AND IN THE PROPOSAL CONTRACT.

TDOT TRANSPORTATION MANAGER 1: BENJAMIN WEBB, PE

DESIGNED BY: SSR

DESIGNER: JEFFERY P. KARAFI, PE CHECKED BY: LAYNE DAWSON, PE

P.E. NO. 49005-1228-14 (PE-D)

PIN NO. 102251.01




R.O.W. LENGTH 4.231 MILES
ROADWAY LENGTH 4.177 MILES
BRIDGE LENGTH MILES
BOX BRIDGE LENGTH MILES
BOX BRIDGE LENGTH MILES ▲
PROJECT LENGTH MILES

Not included in the project length (Non Riding Surface).

SURVEY 06-24-14	TRAFFIC DATA
UPDATED 04-26-23	ADT (2029) 3350
UPDATED 07-05-23	ADT (2049) 3820
UPDATED 02-29-24	DHV (2049) 420
	D 65 - 35
	T (ADT) 6 %
	T (DHV) 4 %
	V 45 MPH


COORDINATES ARE NAD(83)/1985 ADJUSTED BY
THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGN. ALL ELEVATIONS
ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 USING GEOID 03

- (A) THE SLOPE OF THE SHOULDER AND THE ROADWAY PAVEMENT SHALL NOT EXCEED AN ALGEBRAIC DIFFERENCE OF 7%.
- (B) SEE STANDARD DRAWINGS RD11-S-11 AND RD11-S-18 FOR FILL AND CUT SLOPE TABLES, ROUNDING ON TOP OF CUT SLOPES AND TOE OF FILL SLOPES, SPECIAL ROCK TREATMENT AND SUB GRADE ROUNDING IF APPLICABLE.
- (C) SEE STANDARD DRAWING RD11-S-11A FOR ROUNDING OF ROADSIDE DITCH SLOPES.
- (D) SEE STANDARD DRAWING S-P-6 FOR TYPICAL GUARDRAIL PLACEMENT.
- (E) SEE STANDARD DRAWING S-CZ-1 FOR CLEAR ZONE CRITERIA. SEE THE "ROADSIDE DESIGN GUIDE", AASHTO, 2011, FOR FURTHER INFORMATION REGARDING CLEAR ZONES.



TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	2B2

① ADTS OVER 400 AND DESIGN SPEEDS OF 50 MILES PER HOUR AND GREATER SHALL REQUIRE 6:1 SLOPES. 6:1 Slope Require A 21' Ditch Width And A Depth of 3'-6". 4:1 Slope Require A 12' Ditch Width And A Depth of 3'-0".




SUPERELEVATED SECTION (SR-19: PHASE 1)

(BASED ON STD. DWG. RD11-TS-3)
FROM STA. + . TO STA. + .
FROM STA. + . TO STA. + .

- A THE SLOPE OF THE SHOULDER AND THE ROADWAY PAVEMENT SHALL NOT EXCEED AN ALGEBRAIC DIFFERENCE OF 7%.
- B SEE STANDARD DRAWINGS RD11-S-11 AND RD11-S-11B FOR FILL AND CUT SLOPE TABLES, ROUNDING ON TOP OF CUT SLOPES AND TOE OF FILL SLOPES, SPECIAL ROCK TREATMENT AND SUB GRADE ROUNDING IF APPLICABLE.
- C SEE STANDARD DRAWING RD11-S-11A FOR ROUNDING OF ROADSIDE DITCH SLOPES.
- D SEE STANDARD DRAWING S-PL-6 FOR TYPICAL GUARDRAIL PLACEMENT.
- E SEE STANDARD DRAWING S-CZ-1 FOR CLEAR ZONE CRITERIA. SEE THE 'ROADSIDE DESIGN GUIDE', AASHTO, 2011, FOR FURTHER INFORMATION REGARDING CLEAR ZONES.


① ADTS OVER 400 AND DESIGN SPEEDS OF 50 MILES PER HOUR AND GREATER SHALL REQUIRE 6:1 SLOPES. 6:1 Slope Require A 21' Ditch Width And A Depth of 3'-6". 4:1 Slope Require A 12' Ditch Width And A Depth of 3'-0".



TANGENT SECTION (SR-19: PHASE 2)

(BASED ON STD. DWG. RD11-TS-3)
FROM STA. + . TO STA. + .
FROM STA. + . TO STA. + .

- A THE SLOPE OF THE SHOULDER AND THE ROADWAY PAVEMENT SHALL NOT EXCEED AN ALGEBRAIC DIFFERENCE OF 7%.
- B SEE STANDARD DRAWINGS RD11-S-11 AND RD11-S-11B FOR FILL AND CUT SLOPE TABLES, ROUNDING ON TOP OF CUT SLOPES AND TOE OF FILL SLOPES, SPECIAL ROCK TREATMENT AND SUB GRADE ROUNDING IF APPLICABLE.
- C SEE STANDARD DRAWING RD11-S-11A FOR ROUNDING OF ROADSIDE DITCH SLOPES.
- D SEE STANDARD DRAWING S-PL-6 FOR TYPICAL GUARDRAIL PLACEMENT.
- E SEE STANDARD DRAWING S-CZ-1 FOR CLEAR ZONE CRITERIA. SEE THE 'ROADSIDE DESIGN GUIDE', AASHTO, 2011, FOR FURTHER INFORMATION REGARDING CLEAR ZONES.



TANGENT SECTION (SIDE ROADS)

(BASED ON STD. DWG. RD11-TS-1)
WILLIE PARIS RD.: FROM STA. 3+30.00 TO STA. 5+95.84
ROSS RD.: FROM STA. 11+37.06 TO STA. 13+75.37
GAUSS LN.: FROM STA. 20+00.00 TO STA. 23+02.58
DURHAMVILLE RD.: FROM STA. 30+24.95 TO STA. 33+63.61
RED BIRD RD.: FROM STA. 41+01.00 TO STA. 43+62.50
TALL OAKS CV.: FROM STA. 50+00.00 TO STA. 52+28.85
MAPLE HILL CIR. W.: FROM STA. 60+00.00 TO STA. 63+26.40
MAPLE HILL CIR. E.: FROM STA. 70+00.00 TO STA. 72+82.07
SANFORD CORNER WHITEFIELD RD.: FROM STA. 80+00.00 TO STA. 82+00.00
SANFORD RD.: FROM STA. 80+05.52 TO STA. 94+01.26
WATSON RD.: FROM STA. 102+58.88 TO STA. 105+01.83
CARNEY RD.: FROM STA. 110+00.00 TO STA. 113+11.25
SPRINGHILL RD.: FROM STA. 121+25.00 TO STA. 124+95.45

ROADWAY TRANSITIONS						
ROAD	BEG. STA.	OFFSET	ROWY WIDTH	END STA.	OFFSET	ROWY WIDTH
ROSS	11+37.06	9.25'	16.5'	11+57.36	10'	20'
GAUSS	22+87.58	10'	20'	23+02.58	9.25'	18.5'
RED BIRD	41+01.00	7'	14'	42+11.00	10'	20'
TALL OAKS	52+08.85	10'	20'	52+28.85	8.25'	16.5'
MAPLE HILL W	63+16.40	10'	20'	63+26.40	9.75'	19.5'
MAPLE HILL E	72+82.07	10'	20'	72+82.07	8.75'	17.5'
SANFORD	90+05.52	8.75'	17.5'	90+25.52	10'	20'
WATSON	104+76.83	10'	20'	105+01.83	7.25'	14.5'
CARNEY	112+96.25	10'	20'	113+11.25	9'	18'
SPRINGHILL	121+25.00	7.25'	14.5'	121+60.00	10'	20'

- B MAXIMUM 2(H):1(V) OR AS RECOMMENDED BY THE GEOTECHNICAL OFFICE. WHEN A 2(H):1(V) SLOPE IS USED, AND THE FILL HEIGHT EXCEEDS SIX FEET, GUARDRAIL SHOULD BE CONSIDERED. WHERE RIGHT-OF-WAY IS NOT AN ISSUE, STANDARD DRAWING RD11-S-11 (CASE II) SLOPES MAY BE USED.
- C SEE STANDARD DRAWING RD11-S-11A FOR ROUNDING OF ROADSIDE DITCH SLOPES.
- D SEE STANDARD DRAWING S-PL-6 FOR TYPICAL GUARDRAIL PLACEMENT.
- E SITE-SPECIFIC CONDITIONS AND ENGINEERING JUDGMENT OF THE DESIGNER SHOULD BE THE TWO PRIMARY DETERMINANTS OF THE APPROPRIATE CLEAR ZONE WIDTH FOR LOW-VOLUME LOCAL ROADS. AT LOCATIONS WHERE A CLEAR ZONE OF 6 FEET OR MORE IN WIDTH CAN BE PROVIDED AT LOW COST AND WITH MINIMUM SOCIAL/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT, SUCH CLEAR ZONE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED. WHERE PROVISION OF A CLEAR ZONE IS NOT PRACTICAL, NONE IS REQUIRED.

FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW


SEALED BY

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION


TYPICAL
SECTIONS

NOT TO SCALE

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	2B



- A THE SLOPE OF THE SHOULDER AND THE ROADWAY PAVEMENT SHALL NOT EXCEED AN ALGEBRAIC DIFFERENCE OF 7%.
- B SEE STANDARD DRAWINGS RD11-S-11 AND RD11-S-11B FOR FILL AND CUT SLOPE TABLES. ROUNDING ON TOP OF CUT SLOPES AND TOE OF FILL SLOPES, SPECIAL ROCK TREATMENT AND SUB GRADE ROUNDING IF APPLICABLE.
- C SEE STANDARD DRAWING RD11-S-11A FOR ROUNDING OF ROADSIDE DITCH SLOPES.
- D SEE STANDARD DRAWING S-PL-6 FOR TYPICAL GUARDRAIL PLACEMENT.
- E SEE STANDARD DRAWING S-CZ-1 FOR CLEAR ZONE CRITERIA. SEE THE "ROADSIDE DESIGN GUIDE", AASHTO, 2011, FOR FURTHER INFORMATION REGARDING CLEAR ZONES.



- A THE SLOPE OF THE SHOULDER AND THE ROADWAY PAVEMENT SHALL NOT EXCEED AN ALGEBRAIC DIFFERENCE OF 7%.
- B SEE STANDARD DRAWINGS RD11-S-11 AND RD11-S-11B FOR FILL AND CUT SLOPE TABLES. ROUNDING ON TOP OF CUT SLOPES AND TOE OF FILL SLOPES, SPECIAL ROCK TREATMENT AND SUB GRADE ROUNDING IF APPLICABLE.
- C SEE STANDARD DRAWING RD11-S-11A FOR ROUNDING OF ROADSIDE DITCH SLOPES.
- D SEE STANDARD DRAWING S-PL-6 FOR TYPICAL GUARDRAIL PLACEMENT.
- E SEE STANDARD DRAWING S-CZ-1 FOR CLEAR ZONE CRITERIA. SEE THE "ROADSIDE DESIGN GUIDE", AASHTO, 2011, FOR FURTHER INFORMATION REGARDING CLEAR ZONES.

FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

PROPOSED PAVEMENT SCHEDULE	
MINERAL AGGREGATE 303-01 MINERAL AGGREGATE, TYPE "A" BASE, GRADING "D"	TACK COAT 403-01 BITUMINOUS MATERIAL FOR TACK COAT (TC) RATE = 0.05 - 0.10 GAL./SQ. YD. (GENERAL USE) SEE 403.05 FOR DETERMINING APPLICATION RATE IN FIELD. RATE = 0.08 - 0.12 GAL./SQ. YD. (MILLING - COLD PLANE)
BITUMINOUS PLANT MIX BASE (HOT MIX) PG64-22 GRADING "B-M2" @ . " THICK (APPROX. LB./S.Y.) 307-01.08 ASPHALT CONCRETE MIX (PG64-22) (BPM-B-HM) GRADING "B-M2"	ASPHALTIC CONCRETE SURFACE (HOT MIX) PG64-22 GRADING "E" SHOULDERS @ . " THICK (APPROX. LB./S.Y.) 411-01.07 ACS MIX (PG64-22) GRADING "E" SHOULDER
BITUMINOUS PLANT MIX BASE (HOT MIX) PG70-22 GRADING "A" @ . " THICK (APPROX. LB./S.Y.) 307-02.01 ASPHALT CONCRETE MIX (PG70-22) (BPM-B-HM) GRADING "A"	ASPHALTIC CONCRETE SURFACE (HOT MIX) PG64-22 GRADING "D" SURFACE @ . " THICK (APPROX. LB./S.Y.) 411-01.10 ACS MIX (PG64-22) GRADING "D"
BITUMINOUS PLANT MIX BASE (HOT MIX) PG70-22 GRADING "B-M2" @ . " THICK (APPROX. LB./S.Y.) 307-02.08 ASPHALT CONCRETE MIX (PG70-22) (BPM-B-HM) GRADING "B-M2"	ASPHALTIC CONCRETE SURFACE (HOT MIX) PG70-22 GRADING "D" SURFACE @ . " THICK (APPROX. LB./S.Y.) 411-02.10 ACS MIX (PG70-22) GRADING "D"
PRIME COAT 402-01 BITUMINOUS MATERIAL FOR PRIME COAT (PC) RATE 0.30 - 0.35 GAL./SQ. YD. 402-02 AGGREGATE FOR COVER MATERIAL (PC) RATE 8 - 12 LB./SQ. YD. (ITEM TO BE USED AS DIRECTED BY ENGINEER.)	

SEALED BY

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

TYPICAL
SECTIONS AND
PAVEMENT
SCHEDULE
NOT TO SCALE

7/21/2025 3:30:22 PM Z:\OPENROADS\DESIGNER\CONFIGURATION\WORKSPACES\TDO_ STANDARDS\WORKSETS\102251.01_SR19DCN485019-SHT-R/W ACQUISITION TABLE.DGN

R.O.W. ACQUISITION TABLE																	
TRACT NO.	PROPERTY OWNERS	COUNTY RECORDS				TOTAL AREA (ACRES)			AREA TO BE ACQUIRED (ACRES)			AREA REMAINING (ACRES)		EASEMENT (ACRES)			
		TAX MAP NO.	PARCEL NO.	DEED DOCUMENT REFERENCE		LEFT	RIGHT	TOTAL	LEFT	RIGHT	TOTAL	LEFT	RIGHT	PERMANENT	SLOPE	CONSTRUCTION	AIR RIGHTS
				BOOK	PAGE												
1	JAMES COOPER, JR. AND WIFE, MAY ALLINE COOPER	100	6-00	266	65		1.063	1.063					1.063				
2	TOM/ G. GAINES & MARLO G. HALLIBURTON	100	7-00	715	271		12.086	12.086					12.086			721 S.F.	
3	THOMPSON, AUSTIN JR. AND DIONNE	100	5-00	609	717	11.669		11.669				11.669					
4	SHIPLEY, J. CRAIG	100	24-00	38	587	0.683		0.683				0.683					
5	QUIDDEBA, L. BURNETT AND PEGGY A. SMITH	100	23-00	636	637	2.762		2.762				2.762					
6	JAMES VANNESS AND WIFE, RUBY J. VANNESS	100	22-00	299	286	3.804		3.804	3679 S.F.		3679 S.F.	3.720					
7	HAROLD E. WINBUSH AND WIFE, SYVELIA C. WINBUSH	100	9-00	260	267		9.639	9.639					9.639				
8	DONNELL BALTIMORE AND JEANETTE BALTIMORE	100	19-00	221	269		3.903	3.903	0.198		0.198	3.705					
9	SEAMON TALIAFERRO AND WIFE, ELEANOR TALIAFERRO	100	8-02	281	26		0.839	0.839					0.839				
10	RICHARD M. HAYES AND WIFE, ETHEL HAYES	100	8-01	241	348		0.923	0.923					0.923				
11	J.C. BONDS	100	19-01	335	548	0.349		0.349	3912 S.F.		3912 S.F.	0.259					
12	ORA TAYLOR	100	19-00			7.799		7.799					7.799				
13	WILMA JEAN COOPER	100	19-05	281	28	0.369		0.369	0.109		0.109	0.260					
14	KAYE JORDAN	100	10-04	541	169		1.772	1.772					1.772			1484 S.F.	
15	ROBERT LEWIS MANN, WILMA JEAN COOPER SAM MANN JR.	100	19-02	616	254	0.671		0.671	0.135		0.135	0.536				2785 S.F.	
16	WILL ANDREW LEWIS	100	11-00	318	69		0.484	0.484					0.484			862 S.F.	
17	DOROTHY SCOTT, LAVERN SCOTT, TERESA SCOTT AND JERRY	100	19-03	476	652	0.293	34 S.F.	0.294	0.145	34 S.F.	0.146	0.148		891 S.F.		848 S.F.	
18	KIM NEAL APPERSON	100	18-00	611	558	25.316	0.114	25.430	2.541	0.114	2.655	22.775					
19	JAMES H. PERKINS AND WIFE, LEFLOYD PERKINS	100	11-03	221	184		0.388	0.388					0.388			1784 S.F.	
20	ALONZO BEARD AND WIFE, DIANE BEARD	100	11-02	178	147		1.019	1.019					1.019				
21	WILL ANDREW LEWIS	100	10-01&10-02	196	224		6.661	6.661					6.661				
22	JAMES THOMAS DEWALT AND WIFE, CHRISTY MAE DEWALT	100	11-01	198	93		0.229	0.229					0.229			846 S.F.	
23	ALONZO BEARD AND WIFE, DIANE BEARD, AND EVERETT FIEL	100	multiple	289	162		0.652	0.652			2861 S.F.	2861 S.F.	0.586	286 S.F.			
24	NATHANIEL J. BEARD AND WIFE, ALETHA SOFREL BEARD	100C	5-00	355	420		0.514	0.514			2306 S.F.	2306 S.F.	0.461				
25	DEBRA BRADEN	100	17-00	787	699	0.856	884 S.F.	0.876	0.365	884 S.F.	0.415	0.461				171 S.F.	
26	CHRISTOPHER L. SHOEMAKE & ANGELA ALLUANI TR-CHARLE	100	25-00	748	274	161.941	0.151	164.092	3.05	0.151	3.206	168.886		3117 S.F.		1378 S.F.	
27	G. K. BALLARD AND WIFE, GERALDINE BALLARD	100	26-00	5-4	319		7.998	7.998			3335 S.F.	3335 S.F.	7.921				
28	BRUN O'NEAL PHILLIPS	100	25-02	648	211		0.912	685 S.F.	0.928	0.303	685 S.F.	0.319	0.809			177 S.F.	
29	ROBERT A. PHILLIPS AND WIFE, BRENDA A. PHILLIPS	100	25-03	422	197	0.875	624 S.F.	0.889	0.185	624 S.F.	0.199	0.890				473 S.F.	
30	CHARLES HARRISON AND TATIANA DIAZ HARRISON C/O VETER	100	27-00	797	837		0.960	0.960					0.960			0.112	
31	AMY ELDER GAMMEL	100	28-00	750	831		0.942	0.942					0.942			3253 S.F.	
32	WILLIE F. BONDS AND WIFE, MARY DELOIS BONDS	100	29-00	378	857		0.946	0.946					0.946			2224 S.F.	
33	WILLIAM RICHARD ELDER	100	30-01	99	303		3.165	3.165	0.159		0.159		3.006				
34	NATHANIEL BEARD AND WIFE, ALETHA BEARD	100	25-01	514	338	3.956	2501 S.F.	4.013	0.990	2501 S.F.	1.047	2.966				663 S.F.	
35	CECL CROWDER	100E	1-00	98			0.816	0.816		0.134	0.134		0.684			272 S.F.	
36	CECL CROWDER AND WIFE, MARTHA CROWDER	100E	2-00	331	543		0.303	0.303		1776 S.F.	1776 S.F.		0.262			505 S.F.	
37	LAUREN JENNINGS AND TERRY AMANDA	100E	2-01	303	656		0.306	0.306		2557 S.F.	2557 S.F.		0.247				
38	KATHY BROOKS	100E	1-00	521	692	1.212	467 S.F.	1.223	0.314	467 S.F.	0.325	0.898					
39	CAROLYN R. ALLEN	100E	3-59	613	264		1.342	1.342					1.342				
40	CHARLETTA CAMPBELL NORFOLK AND TONIA ESTES AND KAR	100E	4-00	729	470		1.416	1.416		248 S.F.	248 S.F.		1.410			1553 S.F.	
41	AUSTIN THOMPSON	100E	5-00	678	329		0.795	0.795		307 S.F.	307 S.F.		0.788			895 S.F.	
42	DONALD R. CREW AND WIFE, LACAY F. CREW	100E	30-00	416	383	1.099	1699 S.F.	1.138	1.099	1699 S.F.	1.138						
43	KAREN J. LEE	100E	29-00	461	164		0.826	0.826				0.826				1611 S.F.	
44	OSCAR W. JEFFRIES AND WIFE, ROSEMARY JEFFRIES	100E	5-02	352	415		4.995	4.995					4.995			648 S.F.	
45	MONTTELL QUALLS c/o WILLIE R QUALLS	100E	5-01	466	156		0.634	0.634					0.634			1286 S.F.	
46	KAREN A. BENNETT	100E	6-00	334	568		0.398	0.398					0.398			1440 S.F.	
47	JEROME SCOTT AND WIFE, MAMIE SCOTT	100E	1-00	416	635	1.171	0.103	1.274	0.208	0.103	0.311	0.963				503 S.F.	
48	SAMUEL MORGAN AND WIFE, LINDA FAY MORGAN	100E	7-00	110	375		0.380	0.380					0.380			1163 S.F.	
49	WILLIE LEE POUNDS AND WIFE, TENTHY V. POUNDS	100E	11-00	303	242	0.984	450 S.F.	0.994	0.144	450 S.F.	0.154	0.840				1247 S.F.	
50	CYNTHIA V. WARD C/O BANK OF RIPLEY	100E	8-00	731	280		0.382	0.382					0.382			1265 S.F.	
ACQUISITION TOTALS (ACRES)									11.133				4294 S.F.			0.830	

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	3A

FUNCTIONAL
DESIGN FIELD
REVIEW

SEALED BY

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

RIGHT-OF-WAY
ACQUISITION TABLE

R.O.W. ACQUISITION TABLE																	
TRACT NO.	PROPERTY OWNERS	COUNTY RECORDS				TOTAL AREA (ACRES)			AREA TO BE ACQUIRED (ACRES)			AREA REMAINING (ACRES)		EASEMENT (ACRES)			
		TAX MAP NO.	PARCEL NO.	DEED DOCUMENT REFERENCE		LEFT	RIGHT	TOTAL	LEFT	RIGHT	TOTAL	LEFT	RIGHT	PERMANENT	SLOPE	CONSTRUCTION	AIR RIGHTS
				BOOK	PAGE												
51	ROY LEE BONDS AND WIFE, EMMA JEAN BONDS	100E	9.00	99	375		0.369	0.369					0.369				1614 S.F.
52	LILLE V. GAUSE REVOCABLE TRUST	100	32.00	413	704	27.430	1771 S.F.	27.471	0.708	1771 S.F.	0.749	26.722					604 S.F.
53	LORETTA COLEMAN EVANS	100E	10.00	290	340		0.534	0.534					0.534				1358 S.F.
54	MONTELL GUALLS LIVING TRUST	100	37.00	628	615		2.217	2.217		2628 S.F.	2628 S.F.						
55	CLIFFORD C. DAVIS AND WIFE, REGINA D. DAVIS	100	33.01	202	34	0.974	597 S.F.	0.988	0.201	597 S.F.	0.245	0.743					405 S.F.
56	MELVIN DEWALT	100	34.01	605	653	11.855	2607 S.F.	10.915	1.010	2607 S.F.	1.070	9.845					1679 S.F.
57	CRANS FARMACY LLC CO TEMPLE CRAIN STEVENSON	100	36.00	86	35		134.027	134.027					134.027				227 S.F.
58	ELLEN H. CRAIN	100	34.00	360	17	21.150	90 S.F.	21.152	1378 S.F.	90 S.F.	1468 S.F.	21.118					540 S.F.
59	STELLA HARRIS AND MARGIE HELEN ANDERSON	100	35.00	301	371	0.354	564 S.F.	0.367	0.207	564 S.F.	0.220	0.147					387 S.F.
60	STELLA HARRIS AND MARGIE HELEN ANDERSON CO CORLISS	100	35.03	301	371	0.214	322 S.F.	0.221	0.111	322 S.F.	0.118	0.103					
61	JULIUS COOPER	100	35.01	673	655	0.290	400 S.F.	0.299	0.145	400 S.F.	0.154	0.145					
62	WILLIE B. OBIE AND EDDIE WEBSTER	99	3.00	206	79	0.460	599 S.F.	0.474	0.215	599 S.F.	0.229	0.245					137 S.F.
63	CRANS FARMACY LLC	99	1.00	813	372	97.265	90 S.F.	97.267	1306 S.F.	90 S.F.	1396 S.F.	97.235					524 S.F.
64	CRANS FARMACY LLC	99	25.02-25.03	813	372	2.993	2742 S.F.	3.056	0.941	2742 S.F.	1.004	2.052		3165 S.F.			2520 S.F.
65	KATHY L. JACKSON C/O MICHAEL RUTHERFORD	99	25.01	624	601	0.728	1402 S.F.	0.760	0.390	1402 S.F.	0.422	0.338		784 S.F.			2134 S.F.
66	THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND DEACONS OF ELAM MISSIONA	99	43.00	550	588		3.420	3.420					3.420				270 S.F.
67	ANTHONY MCKINIS	99	4.00	682	439	0.323	283 S.F.	0.329	0.105	283 S.F.	0.111	0.218					
68	KEVIN DARNALL AND ANITA DARNALL	99	5.00	790	718	0.317	415 S.F.	0.327	0.141	415 S.F.	0.151	0.176					
69	JESSIE L. HARRIS	99	24.00	580	759		1.231	1.231					1.231				1652 S.F.
70	H. P. WEBB II AND WIFE, PATRICIA M. WEBB	99	6.01	465	26	31.792	0.229	32.021	1.141	0.229	1.370	30.651					1247 S.F.
71	PATWEBB ET AL	99	6.00	265	261		7.920	7.920					7.920				1185 S.F.
72	DAVID LYNN GANNON	99	6.02	579	227		0.481	0.481					0.481				
73	LARRY TAYLOR, SR. AND WIFE, LILLIE TAYLOR	99	7.00	428	263	16.518	0.119	16.637	0.317	0.119	0.496	16.141					694 S.F.
74	LAVERNE COLEMAN	99	23.04	409	201		0.996	0.996					0.996				85 S.F.
75	DANNY UNGERECHT AND JASON BAYNES	99	8.00	608	698	102.867	0.558	103.425	1.441	0.558	1.999	101.426					
76	BRUCE F. NEWMAN AND GEORGIA ANN BOSHC C/O CARRING	99	23.02	754	415		3.285	3.285					3.285				962 S.F.
77	MARGIE GAUSE MCWILLIAMS AND EDWARD G. GAUSE, JR.	99	23.00	438	504		6.056	6.056					6.056				
78	DOROTHY GAUSE SCOTT	99	23.01	622	665		4.174	4.174					4.174				694 S.F.
79	JAMES HUGHES FAMILY ,IMITED PARTNERSHP	99	22.06	653	36	17.132	0.873	18.005	1.882	0.873	2.755	15.250					2831 S.F.
80	MIKE AND STEVE DOUGLAS	99	26.00	804	319		369.121	369.121			1303 S.F.	1303 S.F.	369.091				
81	JOHN LEWIS MCBROOM	99	22.08	677	22	25.731	3215 S.F.	29.805	0.115	3215 S.F.	0.249	26.556					977 S.F.
82	SAMUEL A. TURNEY AND CAROLYN SUE TURNEY	99	22.18	818	518		0.789	2407 S.F.	0.844	0.124	2407 S.F.	0.179	0.865				1382 S.F.
83	BRANDY L. LENDERMAN	99	22.07	818	243		1.923	4222 S.F.	2.020	0.240	4222 S.F.	0.337	1.883				942 S.F.
84	JOHN L. MCBROOM	99	22.16	523	521		0.920	1.047	0.415	0.127	0.542	0.505					325 S.F.
85	DANNY LEE WATSON AND WIFE, ANITA WATSON	99	22.01	314	555		1.075	1.075			1703 S.F.	1703 S.F.	1.036				382 S.F.
86	ANTONIO V. MICHAEL AND WIFE, SUSAN P. MICHAEL	99	22.03	648	44	1.726	0.283	2.009	0.892	0.283	1.175	0.834					
87	DONALD E. GOOLEY AND WIFE, BARBRA J. GOOLEY	99	22.10	530	600		2.513	2.513					2.513				
88	EVERETTE CULVER	99	22.04-22.13	625	784		6.847	6.847					6.847				
89	WILLIAM D. WYNN AND WIFE, ROBBIE WYNN	99	22.14	357	375	0.945	0.150	1.095	0.400	0.150	0.610	0.485					1286 S.F.
90	PAMELA BANTNER-BALL	99	22.11	608	728		0.681	0.681					0.681				1226 S.F.
91	JAMES T. PITTS AND WIFE, JANICE PITTS	99	22.15	357	780	0.563	0.201	0.764	0.563	0.201	0.764						
92	SHIRLEY DEWALT	99	22.12	352	155		0.800	0.800					0.800				2002 S.F.
93	TIMOTHY L. OWENS ANDDAISY OWENS	99	22.17				0.851	0.851	1596 S.F.		1596 S.F.	0.814					3879 S.F.
94	LORETTA PARKER AND JENNETTE PARKER	99G	19.00	299	555		0.871	0.871					0.871				1289 S.F.
95	LUCAS L. BROWN	99G	20.00	672	79	0.698	0.178	0.876	0.357	0.178	0.535	0.341		112 S.F.			1870 S.F.
96	LEE WRIGHT	99G	22.20	426	662		0.677	0.677					0.677				
97	RAYMOND EVANS	99G	21.00	468	394	0.892	0.166	0.858	0.311	0.166	0.537	0.321					3753 S.F.
98	TAMMY MCCLISH	99G	22.00	357	201	0.883	0.883						0.883				1595 S.F.
99	LAURETTA J. WILLIAMS	99G	32.00	600	810	0.620	0.620		0.275		0.275	0.345		948 S.F.			1104 S.F.
100	DAVID WILLIS	99G	31.00	782	783	0.886	0.886	0.886				0.886					
ACQUISITION TOTALS (ACRES)									16.526					0.124		1.003	

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	38

FUNCTIONAL
DESIGN FIELD
REVIEW

SEALED BY

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

RIGHT-OF-WAY
ACQUISITION TABLE

R.O.W. ACQUISITION TABLE																		
TRACT NO.	PROPERTY OWNERS	COUNTY RECORDS				TOTAL AREA (ACRES)			AREA TO BE ACQUIRED (ACRES)			AREA REMAINING (ACRES)		EASEMENT (ACRES)				
		TAX MAP NO.	PARCEL NO.	DEED DOCUMENT REFERENCE		LEFT	RIGHT	TOTAL	LEFT	RIGHT	TOTAL	LEFT	RIGHT	PERMANENT	SLOPE	CONSTRUCTION	AIR RIGHTS	
				BOOK	PAGE													
101	DAVID RESTER	99G	33.00	816	137	0.622		0.622	0.339		0.339	0.283		1104 S.F.		1584 S.F.		
102	DWAYNE GLADNEY	99G	34.00	696	19	0.663		0.663				0.663						
103	GEORGE NEWMAN	99	22.09	774	452		5.159	5.159					5.159	1933 S.F.				
104	TENNESSEE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT, INC.	99	20.01	508	688		4.764	4.764					4.764	780 S.F.		2247 S.F.		
105	WESLEY D. CROWDER AND WIFE, MARILYN K. CROWDER	99	20.06	357	552	16.783	0.463	20.246	1.513	0.463	1.976	18.270				2605 S.F.		
106	TEJAK K. PATEL	99	20.04	605	631		0.585	0.585					0.585			331 S.F.		
107	TEDDY BURNS	99	27.00	613	360		42.596	42.596					42.596					
108	WINTERS WILLIAM C & DONNA J TRUSTEES, BILL & DONNA WINTERS	99	19.00	817	727	141.906	109.777	254.683	9.004	2.260	11.294	135.872				2701 S.F.		
109	BILL & DONNA WINTERS LIVING TRUST	99	2.01	808	105		114.783	114.783					114.783			138 S.F.		
110	FARRIS ROWLAND	99	18.02-18.05	606	815		4.126	4.126					4.126					
111	JIM GOODMAN	99	18.06	567	102		1.509	1.509					1.509					
112	STEPHEN J. WHITE & STEPHEN J. WHITE	99	18.06	731	162		2.590	2.590					2.590					
113	JAMES HARRISON TODD & AMANDA KAY C/O CMG MORTGAGE	99	18.01	768	311		13.436	13.436		0.264	0.264		13.172					
114	MIKE DOUGLAS AND WIFE, LEIGH DOUGLAS	99	18.00	804	319	171.306	0.213	171.519	4.604	0.213	4.817	166.702				1035 S.F.		
115	DARYL B. STEPHENS	120	3.00	379	83		163.474	163.474					163.474					
116	NITA LEE	99	30.00				1.603	1.603		0.182	0.182		1.421			565 S.F.		
117	FLORA V. MORTON	99	31.00	387	82		1.120	1.120					1.120					
118	RICK NELSON	99	30.01	769	655		0.563	0.563		0.198	0.198		0.365			735 S.F.		
119	CHRISTOPHER G. LANGLEY AND WIFE, SONJ, DARLENE STAR	98	8.01	411	285	688 S.F.	32.707	32.723	688 S.F.	1.225	1.241		31.482			183 S.F.		
120	ROY LEE GRAVES, JIMMY GRAVES, AND LARRY TAYLOR	98	6.00	320	696		2.027	2.027		0.181		1.846						
121	SHIPLEY L. REID	98	8.00	799	637		2.452	2.452		0.290		2.162				712 S.F.		
122	CHARLES O. COOPER AND WIFE, LILLIAN K. COOPER	98	6.02			61.121		61.121	2070 S.F.		2070 S.F.		61073			1156 S.F.		
123	RICK NELSON ETUX RENEE G	25	15.00			95 S.F.	25.417	25.419	95 S.F.	204 S.F.	299 S.F.		25.412					
124	ALONZO BEARD AND WIFE, DIANE BEARD, AND EVERETT FIEL	100C	8.00	289	162		0.622	0.622					0.622					
125	ALONZO BEARD AND WIFE, DIANE BEARD, AND EVERETT FIEL	100C	6.00	289	162		0.785	0.785		741 S.F.	741 S.F.		0.768					
126	RANDY LANKFORD	100C	9.00	565	306		0.754	0.754					0.754					
127	SHERRIAN BOYD	100C	10.00	534	517		0.671	0.671					0.671					
128	SHERRIAN BOYD	100C	11.00	534	517		0.736	0.736					0.736					
129	WILLIAM S. WYNN AND ROBBIE WYNN	100C	12.00	726	378		0.546	0.546					0.546					
130	NATHANIEL J. BEARD AND WIFE, ALETHA SORREL BEARD	100C	4.00	355	420		0.510	0.510		3793 S.F.	3793 S.F.		0.423			794 S.F.		
131	ALONZO BEARD AND WIFE, DIANE BEARD, AND EVERETT FIEL	100C	3.00	289	162		0.428	0.428		2630 S.F.	2630 S.F.		0.368					
132	ALONZO BEARD AND WIFE, DIANE BEARD, AND EVERETT FIEL	100C	2.00	289	162		0.427	0.427		2411 S.F.	2411 S.F.		0.372					
133	ALONZO BEARD AND WIFE, DIANE BEARD, AND EVERETT FIEL	100C	1.00	289	162		0.647	0.647		1952 S.F.	1952 S.F.		0.602					
134	G.K. BALLARD	100	26.01	371	265		0.575	0.575		0.100	0.100		0.475					
135	G.K. BALLARD AND WIFE GERALDINE BALLARD	100	26	580			3.606	3.606					3.606					
136	G.K. BALLARD AND WIFE, GERAL DEAN BALLARD	100	26	580	300		2.222	2.222		0.115	0.115		2.107					
137	B.C. DURIAM, JR.	99	25.05 & 25.06	30	565		4.154	4.154					4.154					
138	JUNE DARLENE GILLILAND	99	22.19	771	742		0.915	0.915					0.915					
139	JIMMY GRAVES	98	6.01	602	50	1648		1.648				1.648						
				549	69													
ACQUISITION TOTALS (ACRES)																		
										21.316			3816 S.F.		0.339			

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	3C


FUNCTIONAL
DESIGN FIELD
REVIEW

SEALED BY

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

RIGHT-OF-WAY
ACQUISITION TABLE

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	4



FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW


SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1985), ARE
DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR
OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN.
ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED
TO THE NAVD 1983 WITH GEOID 03.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 201+35 TO STA. 209+00
SCALE: 1" = 50'



Single Family Residential
2188 Hwy. 19E
Ripley, TN 38063

Single Family Residential
2204 Hwy. 19E
Ripley, TN 38063

TRACT NO.	OWNER NAME
10	RICHARD M. HAYES AND WIFE, ETHEL HAYES
11	J.C. BONDS
12	ORA TAYLOR
13	WILMA JEAN COOPER
15	ROBERT LEWIS MANN, WILMA JEAN COOPER, SAM MANN JR., MICHAEL DONALD MANN, AND TERRY L. MANN
16	WILL ANDREW LEWIS
17	DOROTHY SCOTT, LAVERN SCOTT, TERESA SCOTT, AND JERRY SCOTT
19	JAMES H. PERKINS AND WIFE, LEFLOYD PERKINS
22	JAMES THOMAS DEWALT AND WIFE, CHRISTY MAE DEWALT
23	ALONZO BEARD AND WIFE, DIANE BEARD, AND EVERETT FIELDS AND WIFE, MARTHA FIELDS
24	NATHANIEL J. BEARD AND WIFE, ALETHA SORREL BEARD
26	CHRISTOPHER L. SHOEMAKE AND ANGELA ALLMAND TR-CHARLES AND MARGARET SHOEMAKE IRR TRUST
124	ALONZO BEARD AND WIFE, DIANE BEARD, AND EVERETT FIELDS AND WIFE, MARTHA FIELDS

Point	North	East	Elevation	Feature	Description	Station	Offset
S1	524764.6037	926289.9745	450.10	XCP	GPS49-019-01	201+90.48	27.71
S2	524501.9671	926859.0780	456.32	XCP	GPS49-019-02	208+15.93	-4.80
S3	524070.1671	927548.6787	419.42	XCP	GPS49-019-03	216+28.74	51.84
S4	523529.4493	928510.1187	392.61	XCP	GPS49-019-04	227+31.80	52.31
S5	523154.9015	929256.5030	430.92	XCP	GPS49-019-05	235+65.93	13.24
S6	522746.9319	929894.8909	415.77	XCP	GPS49-019-06	243+22.37	56.21
S7	522126.3809	931777.9914	378.82	XCP	GPS49-019-07	263+11.72	51.55
S8	521986.7332	932594.6584	370.92	XCP	GPS49-019-08	271+38.30	51.49
S9	521854.6604	933500.1136	369.23	XCP	GPS49-019-09	280+55.14	53.94
S10	521769.7862	934281.3834	375.78	XCP	GPS49-019-10	288+39.11	30.33
S11	521637.8209	934917.9664	376.94	XCP	GPS49-019-11	294+89.75	73.94
S12	521519.8178	935866.3235	365.68	XCP	GPS49-019-12	304+45.00	45.45
S13	521398.2640	936450.6418	365.50	XCP	GPS49-019-13	310+41.04	76.16
S14	521100.0789	938549.1311	377.30	XCP	GPS49-019-14	331+60.44	49.74
S15	520968.0716	939127.7323	375.89	XCP	GPS49-019-15	337+52.43	91.66
S16	520860.9041	939851.3211	384.41	XCP	GPS49-019-16	344+83.26	87.11
S17	520634.6799	944095.5062	420.67	XCP	GPS49-019-17	387+29.59	22.63
S18	520522.4170	944588.4802	416.54	XCP	GPS49-019-18	392+38.79	14.81
S19	519883.8526	945944.3289	400.22	XCP	GPS49-019-19	407+39.35	54.96
S20	519535.8578	946812.0145	395.64	XCP	GPS49-019-20	416+71.58	-25.10
S21	519326.8370	947199.4757	382.15	XCP	GPS49-019-21	421+13.20	-17.60

LEGEND	
T.C.E.	TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT
	PERMANENT DRAINAGE EASEMENT

LEGEND	
	WETLAND IMPACTS (WTL-1)
	AREA OF PERMANENT IMPACT = 6,376 S.F. VOL. OF PERMANENT IMPACT = 118 C.Y.
	AREA OF TEMPORARY IMPACT = 1,069 S.F. VOL. OF TEMPORARY IMPACT = 20 C.Y.

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	5

FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID 03.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT LAYOUT


STA. 209+00 TO STA. 221+00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

7/21/2025 2:38:22 PM Z:\OPENROADS\DESIGNER\CONFIGURATION\WORKSPACES\TODOT_STANDARDS\WORKSETS\102251.01_SR19\DOT\495019-SHT-PRESENT LAYOUT.DGN

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	6

TRACT NO	OWNER NAME
24	NATHANIEL J. BEARD AND WIFE, ALETHA SORREL BEARD
130	NATHANIEL J. BEARD AND WIFE, ALETHA SORREL BEARD
134	G.K. BALLARD

LEGEND	
T.C.E.	TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT
	PERMANENT DRAINAGE EASEMENT



FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE
DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR
OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN.
ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED
TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID 03.


STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 221+00 TO STA. 233+00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT	2025	STP-19(54)	7

LEGEND	
T.C.E.	TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT
	PERMANENT DRAINAGE EASEMENT



Single Family Residential
2648 Hwy. 19E
Ripley, TN 38063

FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1985), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID 03.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT LAYOUT

STA. 233+00 TO STA. 245+00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	8

FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW


SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE
DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR
OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN.
ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED
TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID 03

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 245+00 TO STA. 257+00
SCALE: 1" = 50'




7/21/2025 2:38:26 PM Z:\OPENROADS\DESIGNER\CONFIGURATION\WORKSPACES\DOT_STANDARD\WORKSETS\102251.01_SR19\DGN\493019-SHT-PRESENT LAYOUT.DGN

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	10

TRACT NO.	OWNER NAME
56	MELVIN DEWALT
58	ELLEN H. CRAIN
59	STELLA HARRIS AND MARGIE HELEN ANDERSON
60	STELLA HARRIS AND MARGIE HELEN ANDERSON
61	JULIUS COOPER
62	WILLIE B. OBIE AND EDDIE WEBSTER
65	KATHY L. JACKSON C/O MICHAEL RUTHERFORD
66	THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND DEACONS OF ELAM MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

CRAINS FARMACY LLC



FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID 03.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT LAYOUT


STA. 269+00 TO STA. 281+00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

7/21/2025 2:38:33 PM Z:\OPENROADS\DESIGNER\CONFIGURATION\WORKSPACES\TDOT_STANDARDS\WORKSETS\102251.01_SR19\IGN49S019-SHT-PRESENT LAYOUT.DGN

LEGEND	
T.C.E.	TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT

LEGEND	WETLAND IMPACTS (WTL-4)
	AREA OF PERMANENT IMPACT = 329 S.F. VOL. OF PERMANENT IMPACT = 12 C.Y.

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	12



FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

SEALED BY


COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE
DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR
OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN.
ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED
TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID 03.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 293+00 TO STA. 305+00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

7/21/2025 2:38:34 PM Z:\OPENROADSDSIGNER\CONFIGURATION\WORKSPACES\TDOT_STANDARD\WORKSETS\102251.01_SR19\19DGN\49019-SHT-PRESENT LAYOUT.DGN



LEGEND	
T.C.E.	TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	13

FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW


SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID 03.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 305+00 TO STA. 316+50
SCALE: 1" = 50'



TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT	2025	STP-19(54)	14

TRACT NO.	OWNER NAME
89	WILLIAM D. WYNN AND WIFE, ROBBIE WYNN
95	LUCAS L. BROWN

FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID 03.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT LAYOUT

STA. 316+50 TO STA. 328+00
SCALE: 1" = 50'


MAPLE HILL W.
CURVE MH1
PI 60+49.23
N 52132.7127
E 938339.3799
Δ 06°01'19" LT
D 11'27'33"
R 500.00'
L 52.55'
T 26.30'
LC 52.53'
BC N05°47'26"E
SE 0.00 FT/FT
TRANS. LENGTH
DESIGN SPEED MPH

TRACT NO.	OWNER NAME
94	LORETTA PARKER AND JENNETTE PARKER
95	LUCAS L. BROWN
97	RAYMOND EVANS
99	DAVID RESTER

LEGEND	
	TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT
	PERMANENT DRAINAGE EASEMENT



TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	15



FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE
DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR
OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN,
ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED
TO THE NAVD 1985 WITH GEOID 03.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA 328+00 TO STA. 341+00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

LEGEND	
T.C.E.	TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT


CONNER WHITEFIELD RD
CURVE CW1
PI 80+93.32
N 521015.0252
E 940053.0430
Δ 10°00'00" LT.
D 19°05'55"
R 300.00'
L 52.36'
T 26.25'
LC 52.29'
BC N01°06'44"W
SE 0.00 FT/FT
TRANS. LENGTH 0'
DESIGN SPEED 30 MPH

CONNER WHITEFIELD RD
CURVE CW2
PI 81+55.56
N 521077.0476
E 940046.4015
Δ 10°37'34" RT
D 19°05'55"
R 300.00'
L 55.64'
T 27.90'
LC 55.56'
BC N00°47'56"W
SE 0.00 FT/FT
TRANS. LENGTH 0'
DESIGN SPEED 30 MPH

LEGEND	WETLAND IMPACTS (WTL-4)
	AREA OF PERMANENT IMPACT = 13,008 S.F. VOL. OF PERMANENT IMPACT = 241 C.Y.
	AREA OF TEMPORARY IMPACT = 4,862 S.F. VOL. OF TEMPORARY IMPACT = 90 C.Y.



TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	16



FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1985), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID 03.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION


PRESENT LAYOUT

STA. 341+00 TO STA. 353+00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	17



LEGEND	WETLAND IMPACTS (WTL-5)
	AREA OF PERMANENT IMPACT = 19,885 S.F. VOL. OF PERMANENT IMPACT = 368 C.Y.
	AREA OF TEMPORARY IMPACT = 1,480 S.F. VOL. OF TEMPORARY IMPACT = 28 C.Y.



FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID 03.


STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 353+00 TO STA. 365+00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

7/21/2025 2:38:42 PM Z:\OPENROADS\DESIGNER\CONFIGURATION\WORKSPACES\TDOT_STANDARD\WORKSETS\102251.01_SR19\19\49\9019-SHT-PRESENT LAYOUT.DGN

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	18



FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE
DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR
OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN.
ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED
TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID 03.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT


STA. 365+00 TO STA. 377+00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	19

LEGEND	
T.C.E.	TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT



SR-19
CURVE 7
PI 389+91.45
N 520658.4186
E 944361.9105
Δ 21°08'06" RT.
D 01°51'37"
R 3080.00'
L 1136.13'
T 574.60'
LC 1129.70'
BC S76°16'27"E
SE 0.04 FT/FT
TRANS. LENGTH 107'
DESIGN SPEED 55 MPH



FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE
DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR
OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN
ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED
TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID 03.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT


STA. 377+00 TO STA. 389+00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	20



LEGEND	
T.C.E.	TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT

CARNEY RD. CURVE C1	CARNEY RD. CURVE C2	SR-19 CURVE 7
PI 111+01.77	PI 112+57.67	PI 389+91.45
N 520632 7670	N 520788 7668	N 520658 4186
E 944626 0293	E 944583 0184	E 944361 9105
Δ 35°00'00" LT	Δ 18°38'50" RT	Δ 21°08'06" RT
D 19°05'55"	D 19°05'55"	D 01°51'37"
R 300 00'	R 300 00'	R 3080 00'
L 183 26'	L 97.64'	L 1136.13'
T 94 59'	T 49.25'	T 574 60'
LC 180.42'	LC 97.21'	LC 1129.70'
BC N02°05'09"E	BC N06°05'26"W	BC S76°16'27"E
SE 0.00 FT/FT	SE 0.00 FT/FT	SE 0.04 FT/FT
TRANS. LENGTH 0'	TRANS. LENGTH 0'	TRANS. LENGTH 107'
DESIGN SPEED 30 MPH	DESIGN SPEED 30 MPH	DESIGN SPEED 55 MPH



FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID 03.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 389+00 TO STA. 401+00
SCALE: 1" = 50'


TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	21

LEGEND	WETLAND IMPACTS (WTL-8)
	AREA OF PERMANENT IMPACT = 9,480 S.F. VOL. OF PERMANENT IMPACT = 176 C.Y.

LEGEND	WETLAND IMPACTS (WTL-7)
	AREA OF PERMANENT IMPACT = 159 S.F. VOL. OF PERMANENT IMPACT = 3 C.Y.
	AREA OF TEMPORARY IMPACT = 157 S.F. VOL. OF TEMPORARY IMPACT = 3 C.Y.

LEGEND	TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT
T.C.E.	

SR-19
CURVE 8
PI 410+43.47
N 519808 8276
E 948244.1333
Δ 03°25'15" RT
D 00°35'22"
R 9720.00'
L 580 34'
T 290 25'
LC 580.25'
BC S63°59'47"E
SE NONE
TRANS. LENGTH 0'
DESIGN SPEED 55 MPH



FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID 03.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 401+00 TO STA. 413+00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

7/21/2025 2:38:48 PM Z:\OPENROADSDSIGNER\CONFIGURATION\WORKSPACES\TDOT_STANDARD\WORKSPACES\102251.01_SR19\DGN\49019-SHT-PRESENT LAYOUT.DGN

SR-19
CURVE #
PI 410+43.47
N 519808 8276
E 946244 1333
A 03°25'15" RT
D 00°35'22"
R 9720 00'
L 580.34'
T 290.25'
LC 580.25'
BC S63°59'47"E
SE NONE
TRANS. LENGTH 0'
DESIGN SPEED 55 MPH

139

JIMMY GRAVES

121

SHIRLEY H. REID

122

CHARLES O. COOPER
AND WIFE,
LILLIAN K. COOPER

PASTURE

SEE PIN 102251.02 FOR SR-19
HAYWOOD COUNTY PLANS

MIKE DOUGLAS AND WIFE,
LEIGH DOUGLAS

ROY LEE GRAVES,
JIMMY GRAVES,
AND LARRY TAYLOR

Abandoned
Structure

PT STA. 413+33.55

SEE SHEET NO. 21

STA. 413+00

MATCH LINE

RICK NELSON

CHRISTOPHER G. LANGLEY
AND WIFE,
SONJA DARLENE STARNES LANGLEY

49005-1228-14
END PROJECT NO. STP-19(54) R.O.W.
STA. 421+87.15
N 519276.8665 E 947256.7613

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
FUNCT.	2025	STP-19(54)	22

FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE
DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR
OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN.
ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED
TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID 03.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 413+00 TO STA. 421+87
SCALE: 1" = 50'

Index Of Sheets

SHEET NO.	DESCRIPTION
1	TITLE SHEET
2B-2B3	TYPICAL SECTIONS
3A-3G	RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION TABLE(S) AND PROPERTY MAP(S)
4-21	PRESENT LAYOUT(S)
4A-21A	RIGHT-OF-WAY DETAIL(S)
4B-21B	PROPOSED LAYOUT(S)
4C-21C	PROPOSED PROFILE(S)
22-24	SIDE ROAD PROFILE(S)
25-27	DRAINAGE MAP(S)
100-440	ROADWAY CROSS SECTIONS
441-466	SIDE ROAD CROSS SECTIONS

STATE OF TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BUREAU OF ENGINEERING

HAYWOOD COUNTY SR-19 FROM NEAR LAUDERDALE COUNTY LINE TO EAST OF BINFORD LANE


LINE AND GRADE

WIDENING INCLUDING PAVE, GRADE & DRAIN, OVERLAY, SIGN, PAVEMENT MARKING

STATE HIGHWAY NO. 19 F.A.H.S. NO. N/A

DOES THIS PROJECT QUALIFY FOR UTILITY CHAPTER 86	YES X	NO
WORK ZONE SIGNIFICANCE DETERMINATION		
SIGNIFICANT	YES X	NO

TENN.	YEAR 2025	SHEET NO. 1
FED. AID PROJ. NO.	STP-19(55)	
STATE PROJ. NO.	38004-1219-14	



49005-1228-14
END PROJECT NO. STP-19(54) PRELIM

STA. 421+93.66 SR-19
N 519276.8665 E 947256.7613

38004-1219-14
BEGIN PROJECT NO. STP-19(55) PRELIM

STA. 422+50.45 SR-19
N 519276.8665 E 947256.7613

38004-1219-14
END PROJECT NO. STP-19(55) PRELIM

STA. 633+87.00 SR-19
N 506209.6449 E 963451.0507

38S019-F1-003
BEGIN PROJECT NO. STP-19(60) PRELIM

STA. 633+87.00 SR-19
N 506209.6449 E 963451.0507

SPECIAL NOTES

PROPOSALS MAY BE REJECTED BY THE COMMISSIONER IF ANY OF THE UNIT PRICES CONTAINED THEREIN ARE OBVIOUSLY UNBALANCED, EITHER EXCESSIVE OR BELOW THE REASONABLE COST ANALYSIS VALUE.

THIS PROJECT TO BE CONSTRUCTED UNDER THE STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS OF THE TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DATED JANUARY 1, 2021 AND ADDITIONAL SPECIFICATIONS AND SPECIAL PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THE PLANS AND IN THE PROPOSAL CONTRACT.

TDOT PROJECT MANAGER : BENJAMIN WEBB, P.E.

DESIGNED BY : KIMLEY-HORN & ASSOCIATES

DESIGNER : WILL HENKE, P.E.

CHECKED BY : HEATHER LEWIS, P.E.

P.E. NO. 38004-1219-14 (DESIGN)

PIN NO. 102251.02



R.O.W. LENGTH	4.003 MILES
ROADWAY LENGTH	4.003 MILES
BRIDGE LENGTH	- MILES
BOX BRIDGE LENGTH	- MILES
BOX BRIDGE LENGTH	- MILES ▲
PROJECT LENGTH	4.003 MILES

Not included in the project length (Non Riding Surface).

NO EXCLUSIONS

ROAD TO BE CONSTRUCTED
WHILE UNDER TRAFFIC

LINE
AND
GRADE

SEALED BY

APPROVED:
WILL REID, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER /
CHIEF ENGINEER

DATE:

APPROVED:
HOWARD H. ELEY, DEPUTY GOVERNOR &
COMMISSIONER

SURVEY 10-03-14	TRAFFIC DATA
UPDATE 09-11-2017	ADT (2029) 2860
	ADT (2049) 3230
	DHV (2049) 355
	D 65 - 35
	T (ADT) 7 %
	T (DHV) 5 %
	STA. 422+50.45 TO 499+50.00 60 MPH
	STA. 499+50.00 TO 534+69.62 50 MPH
	STA. 534+69.62 TO 633+87.00 60 MPH

STATE PLANE COORDINATES ARE BASED ON GPS MEASUREMENTS
OBTAINED 10-03-14 USING GEOID NAD83 MODEL AND DATUM
ADJUSTMENT FACTOR OF 1.00006



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

APPROVED:


DIVISION ADMINISTRATOR

DATE

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	280



TYPICAL SECTIONS		FEATURES				
ROAD NAME	STA. RANGE	SHOULDER	THRU LANE	THRU LANE	SHOULDER	EOP TO EOP
SR-19	422+50.45 TO 499+50.00	10'	12'	12'	10'	44'
SR-19	499+50.00 TO 500+25.00	2'-10"	11.05'-12'	11.48'-12'	2'-10"	VARIES
SR-19	500+25.00 TO 534+69.62	EX.	EX.	EX.	EX.	EX.
SR-19	534+69.62 TO 633+87.00	10'	12'	12'	10'	44'



SEE SHEET 2B3 FOR
PAVEMENT SCHEDULE

- (A) THE SLOPE OF THE SHOULDER AND THE ROADWAY PAVEMENT SHALL NOT EXCEED AN ALGEBRAIC DIFFERENCE OF 1%.
- (B) SEE STANDARD DRAWINGS RD11-S-11 AND RD11-S-11B FOR FILL AND CUT SLOPE TABLES, ROUNDING ON TOP OF CUT SLOPES AND TOE OF FILL SLOPES, SPECIAL ROCK TREATMENT AND SUB GRADE ROUNDING IF APPLICABLE.
- (C) SEE STANDARD DRAWING RD11-S-11A FOR ROUNDING OF ROADSIDE DITCH SLOPES.
- (D) AS REQUIRED, SEE STANDARD DRAWING S-PL-9 FOR TYPICAL GUARDRAIL PLACEMENT.




SEALED BY

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

TYPICAL
SECTIONS

NOT TO SCALE

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	2B1



SEE SHEET 2B3 FOR PAVEMENT SCHEDULE




- A THE SLOPE OF THE SHOULDER AND THE ROADWAY PAVEMENT SHALL NOT EXCEED AN ALGEBRAIC DIFFERENCE OF 1%.
- B SEE STANDARD DRAWINGS RD11-S-11 AND RD11-S-11B FOR FILL AND CUT SLOPE TABLES, ROUNDING ON TOP OF CUT SLOPES AND TOE OF FILL SLOPES, SPECIAL ROCK TREATMENT AND SUB GRADE ROUNDING IF APPLICABLE.
- C SEE STANDARD DRAWING RD11-S-11A FOR ROUNDING OF ROADSIDE DITCH SLOPES.
- D AS REQUIRED, SEE STANDARD DRAWING S-PL-9 FOR TYPICAL GUARDRAIL PLACEMENT.

SEALED BY

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

TYPICAL
SECTIONS

NOT TO SCALE



SEE SHEET 2B3 FOR
PAVEMENT SCHEDULE

- (A) THE SLOPE OF THE SHOULDER AND THE ROADWAY PAVEMENT SHALL NOT EXCEED AN ALGEBRAIC DIFFERENCE OF 1%.
- (B) SEE STANDARD DRAWINGS RD11-S-11 AND RD11-S-11B FOR FILL AND CUT SLOPE TABLES, ROUNDING ON TOP OF CUT SLOPES AND TOE OF FILL SLOPES, SPECIAL ROCK TREATMENT AND SUB GRADE ROUNDING IF APPLICABLE.
- (C) SEE STANDARD DRAWING RD11-S-11A FOR ROUNDING OF ROADSIDE DITCH SLOPES.
- (D) AS REQUIRED, SEE STANDARD DRAWING S-PL-9 FOR TYPICAL GUARDRAIL PLACEMENT.

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	2B2


SEALED BY

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

TYPICAL
SECTIONS


NOT TO SCALE

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	283



PROPOSED PAVEMENT SCHEDULE - ALL ROADWAYS AND DRIVEWAYS

① ASPHALTIC CONCRETE SURFACE (HOT MIX) PG64-22 GRADING "D" SURFACE @ 1.25" THICK (APPROX. 132.5 LB./S.Y.) ITEM NO. 411-01.10 ACS MIX (PG64-22) GRADING "D"	⑦ MINERAL AGGREGATE BASE COURSE @ 6.0" THICK ITEM NO. 303-01 MINERAL AGGREGATE, TYPE "A" BASE, GRADING "D"
② ASPHALTIC CONCRETE SURFACE (HOT MIX) PG64-22 GRADING "E" SHOULDERS @ 1.25" THICK (APPROX. 128.75 LB./S.Y.) ITEM NO. 411-01.07 ACS MIX (PG64-22) GRADING "E" SHOULDER	⑧ MINERAL AGGREGATE BASE COURSE @ 8.0" THICK ITEM NO. 303-01 MINERAL AGGREGATE, TYPE "A" BASE, GRADING "D"
③ BITUMINOUS PLANT MIX BASE (HOT MIX) PG64-22 GRADING "B-M2" @ 1.75" THICK (APPROX. 198 LB./S.Y.) ITEM NO. 307-01.08 ASPHALT CONCRETE MIX (PG64-22) (BPMB-HM) GRADING "B-M2"	⑨ MINERAL AGGREGATE BASE COURSE @ 9.0" THICK ITEM NO. 303-01 MINERAL AGGREGATE, TYPE "A" BASE, GRADING "D"
④ BITUMINOUS PLANT MIX BASE (HOT MIX) PG64-22 GRADING "B-M2" @ 2.00" THICK (APPROX. 226 LB./S.Y.) ITEM NO. 307-01.08 ASPHALT CONCRETE MIX (PG64-22) (BPMB-HM) GRADING "B-M2"	⑩ TACK COAT ITEM NO. 403-01 BITUMINOUS MATERIAL FOR TACK COAT (TC) AT 0.07 GALLONS/S.Y. (SEE 403.05 FOR DETERMINING APPLICATION RATE IN THE FIELD)
⑤ BITUMINOUS PLANT MIX BASE (HOT MIX) PG64-22 GRADING "A" @ 3.00" THICK (APPROX. 345 LB./S.Y.) ITEM NO. 307-01.01 ASPHALT CONCRETE MIX (PG64-22) (BPMB-HM) GRADING "A"	⑪ PRIME COAT ITEM NO. 402-01 BITUMINOUS MATERIAL FOR PRIME COAT (PC) (RATE = 0.30 - 0.35 GALLONS/S.Y.) ITEM NO. 402-02 AGGREGATE FOR COVER MATERIAL (PC) (RATE = 8 - 12 LB./S.Y.)
⑥ MINERAL AGGREGATE BASE COURSE @ 4.0" THICK ITEM NO. 303-01 MINERAL AGGREGATE, TYPE "A" BASE, GRADING "D"	⑫ COLD PLANING BITUMINOUS PAVEMENT ITEM NO. 415-01.01 COLD PLANING BITUMINOUS PAVEMENT



- ① THE SLOPE OF THE SHOULDER AND THE ROADWAY PAVEMENT SHALL NOT EXCEED AN ALGEBRAIC DIFFERENCE OF 1%.
- ② SEE STANDARD DRAWINGS RD11-S-11 AND RD11-S-11B FOR FILL AND CUT SLOPE TABLES, ROUNDING ON TOP OF CUT SLOPES AND TOE OF FILL SLOPES, SPECIAL ROCK TREATMENT AND SUB GRADE ROUNDING IF APPLICABLE.
- ③ SEE STANDARD DRAWING RD11-S-11A FOR ROUNDING OF ROADSIDE DITCH SLOPES.
- ④ AS REQUIRED, SEE STANDARD DRAWING SPL-9 FOR TYPICAL GUARDRAIL PLACEMENT.

SEALED BY

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

TYPICAL
SECTIONS

NOT TO SCALE

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	3A

R.O.W. ACQUISITION TABLE

TRACT NO.	PROPERTY/ OWNERS	COUNTY RECORDS				TOTAL AREA ACRES			AREA TO BE ACQUIRED ACRES			AREA REMAINING ACRES		EASEMENT (SQUARE FEET)		
		TAX MAP NO.	PARCEL NO.	DEED DOCUMENT REFERENCE		LEFT	RIGHT	TOTAL	LEFT	RIGHT	TOTAL	LEFT	RIGHT	PERM. DRAINAGE	SLOPE	CONST.
				BK.	PAGE											
1	CHRISTOPHER GENE LANGLEY AND WIFE, SONJA DARLENE STARNES LANGLEY	98	8.01	411	286		32.720	32.720					32.720			
		25	15.02	230	29											
2	CHARLES O. COOPER AND WIFE, LILLIAN K. COOPER	98	8.02	362	376	61.187		61.137	1491 S.F.		1491 S.F.	61.153				426
		23	14.00	210	457											
3	BEATRICE CATES FOWLER	25	15.00	225	069		25.524	25.524		2.265	2.265		23.259			415
4	DAVID R. DOBBS AND WIFE, EUNICE D. DOBBS	25	14.01	117	659		8.547	8.547		1.052	1.052		7.495			283
5	JOHNNY A. LAND AND CHRISTOPHER M. GRAY	25	14.02	232	686		8.706	8.706		1.247	1.247		7.459			1579
6	CHARLES O. COOPER	26	16.02	148	690	7.179		7.179				7.179				
7	SONJA D. STARNES	25	16.01	267	726		10.091	10.091		2.113	2.113		7.978			3908
8	LILLIAN K. COOPER AND CHARLES COOPER, WIFE AND HUSBAND	25	16.03	263	320	6.484		6.484				6.484				510
9	AFI JEMIMA MAULE	25	16.00	214	764	9.909		9.909	2570 S.F.		2570 S.F.	9.850				681
10	WOODROW W. GOIN	25	17.00	145	406	150.739		150.739	2510 S.F.		2510 S.F.	150.681				247
11	JOHN D. ENGLISH AND WIFE, JUDY B. ENGLISH	27	2.00	235	280		215.425	215.425		3.787	3.787		211.638			1075
12	DONALD HEFLIN	26	17.02	236	547	2.997		2.997				2.997				
13	EDDIE L. SWIFT AND WIFE, BETTE M. SWIFT	26	18.00	08	172	1.082		1.082				1.082				
14	EDWARD GROVE METHODIST CHURCH	26	18.00	09	000	0.397		0.397				0.397				
15	WILLIAM H. TAYLOR	27	25.03	268	374		1.684	1.684		0.423	0.423		1.261			633
16	CLINTON NEAL	27	3.01	230	707	0.900		0.900	3262 S.F.		3262 S.F.	0.825				1930
17	CHARLES NEAL AND WIFE, JOYCE ANN NEAL	27	3.00	151	573	3.344		3.344	1466 S.F.		1466 S.F.	3.310				796
18	JACKIE L. FINCHER	27	24.00	117	377		91.851	91.851		0.802	0.802		91.049			
19	BENNIE BARCROFT AND WIFE, E.AINE BARCROFT	27	3.02	38	858	4.997		4.997	0.269		0.269		4.728			216
20	JERRY WATSON AND KATHERINE WATSON	27	26.00	114	227		20.177	20.177		1.621	1.621		18.856			1070
21	JULIE BEILFUSS	27	3.03	117	346	2.455		2.455	0.287		0.287		2.168			
22	WALLACE MATHIS AND WADE MATHIS	27	3.04	257	292	1.533		1.533	0.184		0.184		1.349			
23	JIMMY NATION	27	3.05	52	433	3.611		3.611	0.317		0.317		3.294			1070
24	TOMMY HUGHES AND WIFE, CAROLYN HUGHES	27	5.00 & 23.00	182	767	104.235	98.011	202.246	0.540	1.909	2.449	103.695	96.102			1199
25	LAWRENCE ADKISSON AND WIFE, PAULINE ADKISSON	27	3.06	36	496	3.452		3.452	0.349		0.349		3.103			1109
26	JAMES T. YOUNG AND WIFE, RONDA S. YOUNG	27	4.00	101	784	1.068		1.068	0.328		0.328		0.740			260
27	TIM TURNER AND WIFE, JO TURNER	27	6.02	78	815	31.684		31.684	0.287		0.287		31.397			
28	EDWARD L. MANESS AND WIFE, DOROTHY E. MANESS	27	22.01	08	411		2.275	2.275					2.275			
29	EDWARD RAY MILES AND WIFE, LINDA KAYE MILES	27	6.00	135	371	0.909		0.909					0.909			
30	EDWARD LOUIS MANESS, JR.	27	22.00	12	169		0.509	0.509					0.509			
31	RONNIE ETHRIDGE AND WILLIAM E. SMITH	27	6.00	91	610	1.514		1.514					1.514			
32	JACK GAUSS	27	21.00	WB Q	629		34.887	34.887					34.887			
33	ROBERTA A. WILSON AND WIFE, CONSTANCE M. WILSON	27	6.00	111	227	1.053		1.053					1.053			
34	JASON BYRD AND WIFE, CHRISTI BYRD	27	6.01	206	668	2.023		2.023					2.023			
35	HAROLD F. MAXWELL AND WIFE, DIANA JEAN MAXWELL	27	21.01	210	230		4.228	4.228					4.228			
36	GEORGIANNA P. HANNAH	27	9.00	31	261	1.465		1.465					1.465			
37	NUTBUSH GIN COMPANY, INC.	27	6.00	267	180	51.880		51.880					51.880			
38	LENEREAUX VEU CASOVIC AND ADA SUE HOPKINS	27	20.00	WB-K	536	1.152	69.473	70.625		0.180	0.180		69.293			
39	BEVERLY SUE MILLER	27	6.01	160	335	4.160		4.160					4.160			
40	R.A. WILLIAMS, C.C. COLEMAN, J.M. DIXON, A.S. HIGGINS, A.C. DIXON AND H.B. BRACKIN, ELDERS OF THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH	27	18.00	49	391	1.154		1.154					1.154			
41	NUTBUSH GIN COMPANY, INC.	27	37.00	183	674	4.158		4.158	1648 S.F.		1648 S.F.	4.120				
		27	38.00	116	009											
42	NUTBUSH GIN COMPANY, INC.	27	36.00	211	677		6.509	6.509		1.411	1.411		5.098			1676
		27	37.00	183	014											
		27	38.00	170	558											
43	MARY SIMMERMAN	27	42.00	167	254	0.778		0.778					0.778			
44	TERRY PARKS AND WIFE, JOAN PARKS	27	44.00	58	30	16.576		16.576	2.455		2.455		14.121			2241
45	LARRY G. LANGLEY AND WIFE, NANCY KAY LANGLEY	27	32.00	109	99		2.453	2.453		0.600	0.600		1.853			
ACQUISITION TOTALS (ACRES)											42.616			0	0	0.710

SEALED BY

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATIONPROPERTY MAP
AND
RIGHT-OF-WAY
ACQUISITION
TABLE

R.O.W. ACQUISITION TABLE																
TRACT NO.	PROPERTY OWNERS	COUNTY RECORDS				TOTAL AREA ACRES			AREA TO BE ACQUIRED ACRES			AREA REMAINING ACRES		EASEMENT (SQUARE FEET)		
		TAX MAP NO.	PARCEL NO.	DEED DOCUMENT REFERENCE		LEFT	RIGHT	TOTAL	LEFT	RIGHT	TOTAL	LEFT	RIGHT	PERM. DRAINAGE	SLOPE	CONST.
				BK.	PAGE											
46	BARBARA PHILLIPS	27	33.00	54	890		1.170	1.170		2542 S.F.	2542 S.F.		1.112			108
47	BILLY R. BURROUGHS	27	50.00	WB-R	597		54.442	54.442		0.273	0.273		54.169			833
48	LEANNE SOLOMON	27	45.00	170	343	54.714		54.714	900 S.F.		900 S.F.	54.693				
49	MAUDIE L. SOLOMON	27	48.00	179	163	45.849		45.849	3.600		3.600	42.249				
50	STEPHEN D. CARLTON	27	48.01	239	290	1.985		1.985	0.705		0.705	1.280				1094
51	WILLIAM RAY BURROUGHS, JR. AND WIFE, JANNA L. BURROUGHS	27	50.01	175	428		1.994	1.994		724 S.F.	724 S.F.		1.977			59
52	ROBERT GOIN AND WIFE, PATSY R. GOIN	27	49.00	164	634	0.455		0.455	0.315		0.315	0.140				234
53	JOHN H. WILLIS	27	51.00	201	696		98.823	98.823		2.801	2.801	96.022				889
54	LEANNE SOLOMON	27	47.00	183	684	53.778		53.778	1.371		1.371	52.407				
55	ROBERT MORRIS ENGLISH, JR. AND WIFE, LISA S. ENGLISH	27	47.01	84	379	53.204		53.204	1.430		1.430	51.774				64
56	ROBERT W. DAVIS AND WIFE, DE LA DAVIS	27	51.01	200	428		2.058	2.058		0.328	0.328		1.730			741
57	ROBERT MORRIS ENGLISH	28	40.00	WB-Q	742	79.373		79.373	0.311		0.311	79.062				863
58	LISA S. ENGLISH	41	1.00	95	774	37.357	71.927	109.284	2207 S.F.	2.249	2.300	37.306	69.678			1203
59	ROBERT MORRIS ENGLISH	41	2.00	266	734	5.538		5.538	0.107		0.107	5.431				121
60	TIMOTHY BENDALL AND WIFE, JEWIPHER BENDALL	41	1.01	74	221	1.890		1.890	2093 S.F.		2093 S.F.	1.842				35
61	JOHN H. WILLIS	41	4.00	201	696	45.363		45.363	2.464		2.464	42.899				
62	GEORGE WALLACE JEFFERIES LIVING TRUST	41	33.00	221	94		42.923	42.923		2.108	2.108		40.815			227
63	BARBARA MILAM	41	33.01	263	624		1.446	1.446		0.187	0.187		1.259			
64	JAMES E. EARNEST	41	32.00	WB-Q	241		58.016	58.016		0.787	0.787		57.229			1181
65	DAVID N. WHITE, JOHN S. WHITE, AND WILLIAM B. WHITE	41	30.00	117	71	84.053	194.614	278.667	0.344	0.318	0.662	83.709	194.296			1957
ACQUISITION TOTALS (ACRES)										42.616				0		0.710

① Note
②
③
④
⑤
⑥
⑦
⑧

DISTURBED AREA		
AREA BETWEEN SLOPE LINES	51.895	(AC)
AREA OUTSIDE SLOPE LINES (15' MIN. WIDTH)	13.416	(AC)
TOTAL DISTURBED AREA	65.311	(AC)
TOTAL PROJECT AREA	75.535	(AC)


TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	38

SEALED BY

STATE OF TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PROPERTY MAP AND RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION TABLE

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	4

CONTROL POINTS					
POINT	NORTH	EAST	ELEV.	STATION	OFFSET
TBM-#19	519149.6560	947232.4260	377.34	422+88.02	163.20' (RT)
S32	518992.9879	947934.4089	375.19	429+87.17	20.92' (LT)



7/3/2025 4:41:40 PM C:\PW\KH1\00405433385019-02-P1-SHT-PRESENT LAYOUT.DGN

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID.


STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 420+00.00 TO STA. 432+00.00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

CONTROL POINTS					
POINT	NORTH	EAST	ELEV.	STATION	OFFSET
TBM #20	518793.5430	948664.0420	376.77	437+25.80	184.44' (LT)
SMJ121	518992.6030	948308.7550	386.05	433+18.69	195.29' (LT)
SMJ122	518705.4130	948653.2700	374.13	437+57.28	101.43' (LT)

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	5



SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID .


**STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**PRESENT
LAYOUT**

STA 432+00.00 TO STA. 444+00.00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	6

CONTROL POINTS					
POINT	NORTH	EAST	ELEV.	STATION	OFFSET
TBM #21	518001.7420	949535.9640	394.50	448+66.00	110.65' (RT)
S33	517837.5873	950023.8532	390.89	453+74.26	29.07' (RT)



SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID.


STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 444+00.00 TO STA. 456+00.00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

CONTROL POINTS					
POINT	NORTH	EAST	ELEV	STATION	OFFSET
TBM #22	517618.6060	950829.1950	384.45	461+89.05	151.60' (LT)
S34	517617.7745	950541.7711	380.19	459+34.98	17.20' (LT)

CURVE EDWARD GROVE-1			CURVE EDWARD GROVE-2			CURVE EDWARD GROVE-3		
PI	50+58.09		PI	51+44.21		PI	53+44.03	
N	517323.0399		N	517408.5507		N	517605.6401	
E	951100.9160		E	951113.7372		E	951146.6536	
Δ	19°11'13" LT.		Δ	00°57'16" RT		Δ	01°36'15" LT.	
D	53°32'51"		D	01°00'00"		D	01°00'00"	
R	107.00'		R	5729.58'		R	5729.58'	
L	35.83'		L	95.44'		L	160.40'	
T	18.09'		T	47.72'		T	80.21'	
LC	35.66'		LC	95.44'		LC	160.40'	
BC	N18°07'14.4"E		BC	N08°00'15.8"E		BC	N08°40'46.5"E	
SE	N/A		SE	N/A		SE	N/A	
TRANS. LENGTH	N/A		TRANS. LENGTH	N/A		TRANS. LENGTH	N/A	
DESIGN SPEED	30 MPH		DESIGN SPEED	30 MPH		DESIGN SPEED	30 MPH	



TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	7


SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995). ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 456+00.00 TO STA. 468+00.00
SCALE: 1" = 50'



CONTROL POINTS					
POINT	NORTH	EAST	ELEV.	STATION	OFFSET
TBM #24	516380.6740	953335.7830	345.87	489+83.79	221.41' (LT)
S37	516371.5945	952844.0805	358.91	485+52.72	15.30' (RT)

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	9

CURVE SR-19-2
PI 477+58.53
N 516752.6837
E 952151.5567
A 02°51'54" RT.
D 00°29'54"
R 11500.00'
L 575.05'
T 287.59'
LC 574.99'
BC S63°43'06.1"E
SE N/A
TRANS. LENGTH N/A
DESIGN SPEED 60 MPH

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE T.G.R.N. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID


STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 480+00.00 TO STA. 492+00.00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

CONTROL POINTS					
POINT	NORTH	EAST	ELEV.	STATION	OFFSET
TBM #25	518982.9879	947934.4089	375.19	429+87.17	20.92' (LT)
S38	515995.9217	953655.1065	340.00	494+45.41	29.30' (LT)
S39	515652.3772	954304.6367	343.43	501+80.20	27.24' (LT)

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	10



SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID.


STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 492+00.00 TO STA. 504+00.00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	11

CONTROL POINTS					
POINT	NORTH	EAST	ELEV.	STATION	OFFSET
TBM #26	515295.9010	955340.7610	338.67	512+45.40	216.54' (LT)
S40	515020.5576	955300.9962	335.87	513+60.97	35.74' (RT)



SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE T.GRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1983 WITH GEOID.


STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 504+00.00 TO STA. 516+00.00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

CONTROL POINTS					
POINT	NORTH	EAST	ELEV.	STATION	OFFSET
TBM #27	514261.6230	956495.4300	350.49	527+52.20	157.47' (LT)
S41	514382.5802	956196.1401	347.80	524+60.35	29.31' (LT)

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	12



CURVE SR-19-3
PI 518+30.43
N 514858.9470
E 955756.4277
Δ 20°37'38" RT.
D 00°56'21"
R 6100.00'
L 2196.08'
T 1110.05'
LC 2184.24'
BC S51°58'20.0"E

LENEREAUX VEU CASOVIC
AND ADA SUE HOPKINS

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995). ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION



PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 516+00.00 TO STA. 528+00.00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	13

CONTROL POINTS					
POINT	NORTH	EAST	ELEV.	STATION	OFFSET
TBM #28	513324.8880	956832.4910	354.57	536+71.77	215.73(RT)
S42	513700.5175	956829.7422	354.81	533+89.31	31.90' (LT)

CURVE SR-180-2		CURVE SR-180-1	
PI	203+37.29	PI	201+45.92
N	513898.1677	N	513713.3147
E	956839.5661	E	956970.9787
Δ	24°15'42" RT	Δ	83°45'02" LT
D	17°12'21"	D	53°32'51"
R	333.00'	R	107.00'
L	141.01'	L	156.40'
T	71.58'	T	95.92'
LC	139.96'	LC	142.85'
BC	N23°16'42.0"W	BC	N06°27'58.0"E
SE	N/A	SE	N/A
TRANS. LENGTH	N/A	TRANS. LENGTH	N/A
DESIGN SPEED	30 MPH	DESIGN SPEED	20 MPH



CURVE SR-19-3		CURVE SR-19-4	
PI	518+30.43	PI	538+14.91
N	514858.9470	N	513358.3454
E	955756.4277	E	957091.4717
Δ	20°37'38" RT	Δ	03°30'00" LT
D	00°56'21"	D	00°40'44"
R	6100.00'	R	8440.00'
L	2196.08'	L	515.57'
T	1110.05'	T	257.87'
LC	2184.24'	LC	515.49'
BC	S51°58'20.0"E	BC	S43°24'31.0"E
SE	N/A	SE	N/A
TRANS. LENGTH	N/A	TRANS. LENGTH	N/A
DESIGN SPEED	50 MPH	DESIGN SPEED	50 MPH

CURVE NUNN-1		CURVE NUNN-2	
PI	243+71.47	PI	249+01.25
N	513067.7490	N	513532.9716
E	957024.5079	E	956768.2714
Δ	14°14'14" LT	Δ	77°11'12" RT
D	05°30'52"	D	53°32'51"
R	1039.00'	R	107.00'
L	258.18'	L	144.15'
T	129.76'	T	85.40'
LC	257.51'	LC	133.49'
BC	N21°43'35.9"W	BC	N09°44'53.1"E
SE	N/A	SE	N/A
TRANS. LENGTH	N/A	TRANS. LENGTH	N/A
DESIGN SPEED	30 MPH	DESIGN SPEED	20 MPH

Possible Business Relocation
10924 Hwy. 19W
Brownsville, TN
38012

Single Family Residential
10924 Hwy. 19W
Brownsville, TN
38012

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE T.G.R.N. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID


STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT LAYOUT

STA. 528+00.00 TO STA. 540+00.00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	14

CURVE SR-19-4	CURVE SR-19-5
PI 538+14.91	PI 544+80.49
N 51358 3454	N 512888 9077
E 957091 4717	E 957563 5157
Δ 03°30'00" LT	Δ 03°30'00" RT
D 00°40'44"	D 00°40'44"
R 8440 00'	R 8440 00'
L 515 57'	L 515 57'
T 257 87'	T 257 87'
LC 515 49'	LC 515 49'
BC S43°24'31 0"E	BC S43°24'31 0"E
SE N/A	SE 0.020 FT/FT
TRANS. LENGTH N/A	TRANS. LENGTH 107'
DESIGN SPEED 50 MPH	DESIGN SPEED 60 MPH



CONTROL POINTS					
POINT	NORTH	EAST	ELEV.	STATION	OFFSET
TBM #29	512914.6580	957725.0450	356.80	545+71.54	178.44'(LT)
S43	513090.7911	957305.8003	360.59	541+61.28	17.71'(RT)
S44	512511.2460	957867.0124	362.37	549+67.30	16.36'(LT)

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOD.


STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 540+00.00 TO STA. 552+00.00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	15

CONTROL POINTS					
POINT	NORTH	EAST	ELEV.	STATION	OFFSET
TBM #30	512032.3710	958466.0410	376.97	557+23.24	145.60'(LT)
S45	512178.3641	958163.2247	372.38	554+12.89	16.40'(LT)
S46	511692.9097	958594.5369	361.25	560+62.27	15.97'(LT)



SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID.


STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 552+00.00 TO STA. 564+00.00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	16

CURVE SR-19-6
PI 572+94.26
N 510786 5640
E 958433 9131
Δ 03°30'00" RT.
D 00°40'44"
R 8440.00'
L 515.57'
T 257.87'
LC 515.49'
BC S39°54'31.0"E
SE 0.02 FT/FT
TRANS LENGTH 107'
DESIGN SPEED 60 MPH



Single Family
Residential
10413 Hwy. 19W
Brownsville, TN 38012
PATSY R. GOIN

CONTROL POINTS					
POINT	NORTH	EAST	ELEV.	STATION	OFFSET
TBM #31	510791 9120	959247 3630	368 18	571+69 35	95.18'(RT)
S47	510849.0951	959347.1171	372.71	571+92 93	17.36' (LT)

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995). ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1983 WITH GEOID

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION


PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 564+00.00 TO STA. 576+00.00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	17

CONTROL POINTS					
POINT	NORTH	EAST	ELEV.	STATION	OFFSET
TBM #32	510199.2530	960004.8760	368.13	581+15.65	76.84'(LT)
S48	510390.4615	959757.5378	372.51	578+08.39	19.14'(LT)
S49	509908.6370	960136.2290	359.28	584+20.08	18.19'(RT)

CURVE SR-19-7
PI 586+25.56
N 509739.6315
E 960256.5439
Δ 03°30'00" LT
D 00°40'44"
R 8440.00'
L 515.57'
T 257.87'
LC 515.49'
BC S38°54'31.0"E
SE 0.020 FT/FT
TRANS. LENGTH 107'
DESIGN SPEED 60 MPH



Single Family
Residential
10192 Hwy. 19W
Brownsville, TN 38012

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 576+00.00 TO STA. 588+00.00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	19

ROBERT MORRIS
ENGLISH

LISA S. ENGLISH

CURVE SR-19-8
PI 602+76.72
N 508505.8971
E 961354.1635
Δ 03°30'00" LT
D 00°40'44"
R 8440.00'
L 515.57'
T 257.87'
LC 515.49'
BC S43°24'31.0"E
SE 0.020 FT/FT
TRANS. LENGTH 107'
DESIGN SPEED 60 MPH



TIMOTHY BENDALL
AND WIFE,
JENIPHER BENDALL

605

610

JOHN H. WILLIS

CURVE SR-19-9
PI 609+42.30
N 508036.4594
E 961826.2075
Δ 03°30'00" RT
D 00°40'44"
R 8440.00'
L 515.57'
T 257.87'
LC 515.49'
BC S43°24'31.0"E
SE 0.020 FT/FT
TRANS. LENGTH 107'
DESIGN SPEED 60 MPH



LISA S. ENGLISH

GEORGE WALLACE JEFFERIES
LIVING TRUST

CONTROL POINTS

POINT	NORTH	EAST	ELEV.	STATION	OFFSET
TBM #34	508258.8620	961470.4930	331.65	605+39.53	117.93' (RT)
SS2	508251.4461	961613.7205	331.54	606+40.28	15.85' (RT)
CP1	508094.5630	961424.9900	330.68	606+32.04	261.14' (RT)
CP2	508087.8620	961495.4340	330.10	606+83.87	212.96' (RT)
CP3	507945.6870	961448.5910	330.26	607+58.95	342.46' (RT)
CP4	508417.0860	962077.2100	326.64	608+24.60	440.53' (LT)
CP5	508493.5760	962061.7690	326.07	607+57.19	479.83' (LT)
CP6	508251.8020	961947.9100	327.37	608+62.14	234.06' (LT)
CP7	508316.0890	962027.8990	326.55	608+67.28	336.55' (LT)

BRANCH A CALL TABLE

Element	From	To	Direction	Distance
1	SP104	SP125	S 77° 2' 47.65" E	41.0696
2	SP125	SP105	N 89° 0' 45.68" E	30.1586
3	SP105	SP106	S 82° 21' 43.39" E	21.8131
4	SP106	SP107	S 80° 9' 33.48" E	28.3502
5	SP107	SP108	S 75° 20' 10.09" E	20.4056
6	SP108	SP109	S 62° 47' 7.89" E	39.9850
7	SP109	SP110	N 87° 15' 37.93" E	14.3021
8	SP110	SP111	N 50° 5' 14.64" E	58.6036
9	SP111	SP112	N 69° 25' 56.91" E	110.1601
10	SP112	SP113	N 83° 26' 27.66" E	29.3161
11	SP113	SP114	N 48° 1' 2.01" E	204.4252
12	SP114	SP115	N 79° 40' 3.25" E	32.4005
13	SP115	SP116	N 30° 11' 19.70" E	66.8310
14	SP116	SP117	N 45° 41' 39.49" E	54.6704
15	SP117	SP118	N 62° 17' 21.84" E	61.5077
16	SP118	STS105	N 36° 13' 18.60" E	45.3650

BRANCH B CALL TABLE

Element	From	To	Direction	Distance
1	STS224	STS191	N 3° 11' 21.17" E	158.5015
2	STS191	STS188	N 26° 55' 11.48" W	12.8550
3	STS188	STS184	N 26° 6' 14.02" E	18.2250
4	STS184	STS165	N 54° 42' 36.66" E	12.2817

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE
DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR
OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN.
ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED
TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEDID


STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 600+00.00 TO STA. 612+00.00
SCALE: 1" = 50'

CONTROL POINTS					
POINT	NORTH	EAST	ELEV.	STATION	OFFSET
TBM #36	518992.9879	963213.3680	324.08	629+49.97	70.80' (LT)
S54	506826.9338	962878.3360	329.94	625+45.13	17.90' (RT)
S55	506075.7506	963604.8858	333.94	635+89.29	25.62' (LT)

TYPE	YEAR	PROJECT NO.	SHEET NO.
L&G	2025	STP-19(55)	21



CURVE JIM BINFORD-1		CURVE JIM BINFORD-2	
PI	301+21.42	PI	302+96.48
N	506594.6273	N	506777.6635
E	963271.1427	E	963282.8065
Δ	44°42'16" LT.	Δ	01°20'56" RT.
D	28°56'14"	D	00°39'41"
R	198.00'	R	8653.43'
L	154.49'	L	203.95'
T	81.42'	T	101.98'
LC	150.60'	LC	203.94'
BC	N25°59'54.1"E	BC	N04°19'14.2"E
SE	N/A	SE	N/A
TRANS. LENGTH	N/A	TRANS. LENGTH	N/A
DESIGN SPEED	25 MPH	DESIGN SPEED	30 MPH

SEALED BY

COORDINATES ARE NAD 83(1995), ARE DATUM ADJUSTED BY THE FACTOR OF 1.00006 AND TIED TO THE TGRN. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO THE NAVD 1988 WITH GEOID

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENT
LAYOUT

STA. 624+00.00 TO STA. 636+00.00
SCALE: 1" = 50'