

## Attachment: Grant Match Requirement

<b>Anderson</b>	40%
<b>Bedford</b>	30%
<b>Benton</b>	20%
<b>Bledsoe</b>	10%
<b>Blount</b>	50%
<b>Bradley</b>	30%
<b>Campbell</b>	20%
<b>Cannon</b>	30%
<b>Carroll</b>	20%
<b>Carter</b>	10%
<b>Cheatham</b>	50%
<b>Chester</b>	10%
<b>Claiborne</b>	20%
<b>Clay</b>	10%
<b>Cocke</b>	10%
<b>Coffee</b>	30%
<b>Crockett</b>	40%
<b>Cumberland</b>	30%
<b>Davidson</b>	50%
<b>Decatur</b>	10%
<b>Dekalb</b>	30%
<b>Dickson</b>	40%
<b>Dyer</b>	40%
<b>Fayette</b>	50%
<b>Fentress</b>	20%
<b>Franklin</b>	30%
<b>Gibson</b>	30%
<b>Giles</b>	30%
<b>Grainger</b>	20%
<b>Greene</b>	20%
<b>Grundy</b>	10%
<b>Hamblen</b>	30%

<b>Hamilton</b>	50%
<b>Hancock</b>	10%
<b>Hardeman</b>	10%
<b>Hardin</b>	30%
<b>Hawkins</b>	20%
<b>Haywood</b>	10%
<b>Henderson</b>	20%
<b>Henry</b>	30%
<b>Hickman</b>	20%
<b>Houston</b>	10%
<b>Humphreys</b>	30%
<b>Jackson</b>	10%
<b>Jefferson</b>	30%
<b>Johnson</b>	10%
<b>Knox</b>	50%
<b>Lake</b>	10%
<b>Lauderdale</b>	20%
<b>Lawrence</b>	20%
<b>Lewis</b>	20%
<b>Lincoln</b>	40%
<b>Loudon</b>	50%
<b>Macon</b>	20%
<b>Madison</b>	40%
<b>Marion</b>	30%
<b>Marshall</b>	20%
<b>Maury</b>	50%
<b>McMinn</b>	40%
<b>McNairy</b>	20%
<b>Meigs</b>	10%
<b>Monroe</b>	20%
<b>Montgomery</b>	40%
<b>Moore</b>	40%

<b>Morgan</b>	10%
<b>Obion</b>	40%
<b>Overton</b>	10%
<b>Perry</b>	10%
<b>Pickett</b>	20%
<b>Polk</b>	10%
<b>Putnam</b>	40%
<b>Rhea</b>	20%
<b>Roane</b>	40%
<b>Robertson</b>	50%
<b>Rutherford</b>	40%
<b>Scott</b>	10%
<b>Sequatchie</b>	20%
<b>Sevier</b>	50%
<b>Shelby</b>	50%
<b>Smith</b>	30%
<b>Stewart</b>	40%
<b>Sullivan</b>	40%
<b>Sumner</b>	50%
<b>Tipton</b>	40%
<b>Trousdale</b>	10%
<b>Unicoi</b>	20%
<b>Union</b>	10%
<b>Van Buren</b>	10%
<b>Warren</b>	20%
<b>Washington</b>	50%
<b>Wayne</b>	10%
<b>Weakley</b>	30%
<b>White</b>	20%
<b>Williamson</b>	50%
<b>Wilson</b>	50%

<sup>1</sup>FY24-25 Grants Matching Table was created using a combination of average individual income and property tax revenue per county with ECD economic status factored in as to final match placement.