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Peer Analysis

- You asked us to compare Dickson County to your set of peers
  - Cheatham County
  - Giles County
  - Hickman County
  - Robertson County
1990 Analysis

- 1990 analysis of Dickson, Giles, Hickman, Lawrence, and Lewis Counties

- Dickson County:
  - Population: 35,975
  - 25 and Older with a High School Education: 48% (1980)
  - Per Capita Personal Income: $13,158
1990 Analysis

- Giles County:
  - Population: 25,200
  - 25 and Older with a High School Education: 48% (1980)
  - Per Capita Personal Income: $14,197

- Hickman County:
  - Population: 17,111
  - 25 and Older with a High School Education: 41% (1980)
  - Per Capita Personal Income: $10,466
Dickson County & Peers

Population
- Dickson Co.’s 2006 population was 46,583, 2nd among its peers. Robertson ranked higher.
- 1950 - 2006, median population grew at a 1.6% rate, 2nd in the peers, and 12th in the state.

Poverty and Income
- 2000 – 2005: Dickson Co.’s average growth rate in poverty for children under 18 grew at an average annual rate of 3.34%, 2nd lowest of the peers.
- 2000 - 2005: Dickson Co.’s average growth rate in poverty for all ages grew at an average rate of 4.7%, which ranked 3rd in the peer group. Robertson was lowest; Cheatham was highest.
- Dickson Co’s MHI, $40,485, was 3rd among peers. Cheatham and Robertson ranked higher.
Dickson County & Peers

Tax Base
- 2006 median property assessments per capita were $18,822 in Dickson Co. and highest among the peers.
- Property tax rates in Dickson Co. were $3.21, the highest of the peers. Robertson Co. was lowest, with rate of $2.66.
- Sales tax base per capita was the highest of the peers, with $10,092 per capita.

Education
- Dickson Co.’s school spending, $6,802 per ADA, was 2nd in the peer group. Giles was 1st, spending $7,465 per ADA.
- Dickson Co. is the only one of the peers that did not have all its secondary schools SACS accredited.
- Dickson Co. ranked 4th in high school graduation rates, with 82% of seniors graduating. Cheatham was the highest, with 93% and Robertson was the lowest with 80%.
Dickson County & Peers

**Employment**

- Roughly 60% of Dickson Co. residents live and work in the county. Of the peers, Giles had the highest percentage - 71% - Cheatham had the lowest, 28%

- Dickson Co. is strong in the food services sector. Of the peers, Dickson Co. has 35% of establishments in the accommodations and food services sector and about the same percent of employees. In sales and payroll, they have a commanding lead over their peers, with 40% of sales and 42% of payroll.

- Dickson Co. is strong in the retail trade. Compared with its peers, Dickson accounts for 31% of establishments, 35% of employees, 38% of sales, and 38% of payroll. The closest of the peers is Robertson.

- Dickson Co.’s strength in the healthcare and social assistance sector is shown in their sales figures, where they capture 40% of sales in the 5-county market. The closet competitor is Robertson, which captures only about 28% of sales.
Index Comparison

- TACIR staff conducted a statewide comparison of counties using two indexes
  - Personal & Family Economic Well Being
  - Local Economic Activity
- 10 point scales that measure the current status and momentum separately
Personal & Family Economic Well Being

- Blended measure of four factors:
  - Per Capita Personal Income
  - Median Household Income
  - Not in Poverty – All Ages
  - Not in Poverty – Under 18
  - Wages

- Current status is for 2005
- Momentum measures change from 1989-2005
Local Economic Activity

- Blended measure of five factors:
  - Per Capita Property Value (2006)
  - Per Capita Bus./Ind./Util. Property Value (2006)
  - Per Capita Sales (2006)
  - Per Capita Payroll (2005)
  - # Commuting into County Per Capita (2000)

- Momentum period varies
# Dickson County Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Per Capita Personal Income</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Not in Poverty - All Ages</th>
<th>Not in Poverty - Under 18</th>
<th>Wages</th>
<th>Current 10 Point Scale</th>
<th>Momentum 10 Point Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal/Family Economic Well Being</strong></td>
<td>$26,509</td>
<td>$42,021</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>$29,050</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Economic Activity</strong></td>
<td>$77,515</td>
<td>$22,621</td>
<td>$10,092</td>
<td>$18,763</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal and Family Economic Well Being
County Ratings for Current Status (2005)
Personal and Family Economic Well Being
County Ratings for Momentum (1989-2005)

Dickson County: 4.9
Best in State: Fayette County (5.7)
Worst in State: Hawkins County (4.7)
Local Economic Activity
County Ratings for Current Status

Dickson County: 6.1
Best in State: Davidson County (9.2)
Worst in State: Grundy County (3.6)
Dickson County: 5.7
Best in State: Wilson County (6.0)
Worst in State: Clay County (3.7)
## Personal and Family Economic Well Being

Dickson County & Requested Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Capita Personal Income</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Not in Poverty - All Ages</th>
<th>Not in Poverty - Under 18</th>
<th>Wages</th>
<th>Current 10 Point Scale</th>
<th>Momentum 10 Point Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dickson Co.</td>
<td>$26,509</td>
<td>$42,021</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>$29,050</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheatham Co.</td>
<td>$29,466</td>
<td>$49,287</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>$29,710</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles Co.</td>
<td>$25,218</td>
<td>$36,681</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>$29,175</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickman Co.</td>
<td>$20,414</td>
<td>$31,965</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$24,558</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson Co.</td>
<td>$29,372</td>
<td>$49,256</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>$28,414</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$30,969</td>
<td>$38,947</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>$35,241</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Economic Activity
Dickson County & Requested Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Capita Property</th>
<th>Per Capita Bus./ Ind./ Utility</th>
<th>Per Capita Sales</th>
<th>Per Capita Payroll</th>
<th>Per Capita Commuters</th>
<th>Current 10 Point Scale</th>
<th>Momentum 10 Point Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dickson Co.</td>
<td>$77,515</td>
<td>$22,621</td>
<td>$10,092</td>
<td>$18,763</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheatham Co.</td>
<td>$70,036</td>
<td>$10,764</td>
<td>$4,629</td>
<td>$12,200</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles Co.</td>
<td>$53,977</td>
<td>$15,347</td>
<td>$6,984</td>
<td>$18,715</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickman Co.</td>
<td>$53,135</td>
<td>$9,294</td>
<td>$2,877</td>
<td>$5,835</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson Co.</td>
<td>$72,649</td>
<td>$16,994</td>
<td>$7,218</td>
<td>$16,864</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of Peers: 5.1, 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Capita Property</th>
<th>Per Capita Bus./ Ind./ Utility</th>
<th>Per Capita Sales</th>
<th>Per Capita Payroll</th>
<th>Per Capita Commuters</th>
<th>Current 10 Point Scale</th>
<th>Momentum 10 Point Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$69,303</td>
<td>$21,661</td>
<td>$10,826</td>
<td>$32,091</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Peers

- We identified two additional peer sets
  - Geographically Similar
  - Income/Wage Similar
Geographically Similar

- Population
- Land Area
- Water Area
- Miles to Metro Central City
- Miles to Interstate
- Miles to Port
Personal and Family Economic Well Being
County Ratings for Current Status (2005)
Dickson County and Other Peers (Geographic Factors)

Legend
Current Rating (Scale = 1 to 10)

- Central City
- Interstate
Personal and Family Economic Well-Being
County Ratings for Momentum (1989-2005)
Dickson County and Other Peers (Geographic Factors)

Legend
Current Rating (Scale = 1 to 10)

- Central City
- Interstate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Economic Activity
County Ratings for Current Status
Dickson County and Other Peers (Geographic Factors)
Local Economic Activity
County Ratings for Momentum
Dickson County and Other Peers (Geographic Factors)
Income/Wage Similar

- Population
- Per Capita Personal Income (2005)
- Change in PCI (1990-2005)
- PCI Growth Rate (1990-2005)
- MHI (2004)
- Poverty Rate (2004)
- Child Poverty Rate (2004)
- Average Wage (2005)
- Change in Average Wage (1990-2005)
- Average Wage Growth Rate (1990-2005)
Personal and Family Economic Well Being
County Ratings for Current Status (2005)
Dickson County and Other Peers (Income/Wage Factors)

Legend
Current Rating (Scale = 1 to 10)
Personal and Family Economic Well Being
County Ratings for Momentum (1989-2005)
Dickson County and Other Peers (Income/Wage Factors)

Legend
Current Rating (Scale = 1 to 10)
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Local Economic Activity
County Ratings for Current Status
Dickson County and Other Peers (Income/Wage Factors)
Local Economic Activity
County Ratings for Momentum
Dickson County and Other Peers (Income/Wage Factors)

Legend
Current Rating (Scale = 1 to 10)
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Dickson County
Roane County
### Summary Comparison
Dickson County vs. Peer and State Avg. on 10 Point Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dickson Co. Compared to:</th>
<th>Personal &amp; Economic Well Being</th>
<th>Local Economic Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requested Peers</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Peers</strong></td>
<td>+!</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income/Wage Peers</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Avg.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = Above avg.  
+! = Well above avg. (.5 or more)  
- = Below avg.
Regional Perspective

- Much of the population growth in Tennessee continues to concentrate in MSAs.
- High paying jobs are also concentrating in MSAs.
- Dickson County is well-positioned as part of the Nashville-Davidson -- Franklin -- Murfreesboro MSA, the fastest growing region in the state.
Tennessee MSA and Non-MSA Regions
Employment and “Well-Heeled 6” Employment

Notes
Total Employment = 2,880,620.
Total Employment includes employees in non-TN counties that are part of certain TN Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA).
Non-MSA regions are shown as defined by the US BLS.
*MSA with figures that include data for non-TN counties.

Well-Heeled 6 employment refers to the six occupational groups¹ that have a mean salary greater than $51,000 in TN...150% or more of the mean salary of $34,000 for all TN employees.


Legend
- % of Total Employees / % of Total Well-Heeled 6 Employees / MSA’s Well Heeled 6 Employees as % of MSA’s Employees
- East TN Non-MSA Counties
- North Central TN Non-MSA Counties
- South Central TN Non-MSA Counties
- West TN Non-MSA Counties


Total Employment = 2,880,620.
Total Employment includes employees in non-TN counties that are part of certain TN Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA).
Non-MSA regions are shown as defined by the US BLS.
*MSA with figures that include data for non-TN counties.

Well-Heeled 6 employment refers to the six occupational groups¹ that have a mean salary greater than $51,000 in TN...150% or more of the mean salary of $34,000 for all TN employees.

Conclusion

- Dickson County has come a long way since 1990
- The county is competitive among its peers, especially in local economic activity
- The county slightly lags state averages in measures of personal and family economic well being, as well as current economic activity
- The county is near the top in the state in local economic activity momentum
- The county is part of a vibrant region
Questions?

Please feel free to contact me at 615-741-3012 or cliff.lippard@state.tn.us with any additional questions or comments.