

## LOUISVILLE AND ITS PEERS

The consultants conducted a two-part analysis of how the Louisville Free Public Library (LFPL) compares with a group of peer libraries located in Louisville's trade region.

The first analysis consisted of a survey of library building projects completed, underway, or funded and planned by a group of 16 libraries. The second part of the peer analysis was the development of a series of charts comparing and ranking Louisville with 15 of the 16 libraries.<sup>1</sup>

### SURVEY OF PEER LIBRARY BUILDING PROJECTS

Many public libraries across the United States experienced a "building boom" in the 1990s, building new central (or main) and branch libraries and renovating and expanding existing facilities. Sixteen of these libraries were contacted for information concerning their recent and current building projects. Those contacted were:

- Atlanta-Fulton Public Library System
- The Public Library of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County
- The Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County
- Cleveland Public Library
- Columbus Metropolitan Library
- Cuyahoga County Public Library
- Dayton and Montgomery County Public Library
- Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library
- Jacksonville Public Library
- Lexington Public Library
- Memphis-Shelby County Public Library and Information Center
- Milwaukee Public Library
- Nashville Public Library
- St. Louis County Library
- St. Louis Public Library
- Toledo-Lucas County.

---

<sup>1</sup> Jacksonville, Florida was included in the survey of building projects because it is located in the southeast although not in the Louisville trade region.

To gain information about their building projects and experiences, staff at each of the libraries was interviewed via telephone. The exception was the Cleveland Public Library, which is currently in the planning stages for a capital campaign to support an extensive branch transformation. Additional information was also gathered from the websites of the libraries.

## Overview

Of the 16 libraries, Indianapolis and Jacksonville have Central Library construction projects in progress. For Indianapolis the project is an addition; in Jacksonville the project will result in a new Central Library. St. Louis Public is in the planning stages for a major renovation of the Central Library. Columbus is planning a Central renovation. Memphis, Milwaukee, Nashville, and Toledo completed Central facility projects in 2001. Cincinnati and Cleveland completed Central projects in 1997 and 1998 respectively. The largest of these central library projects were in Memphis and Nashville where the new facilities were 330,000 square feet (SF) and 300,000 SF respectively. The additions in Cleveland and in Indianapolis are each over 267,000 SF.

*The largest of these central library projects were in Memphis and Nashville where the new facilities were 330,000 square feet (SF) and 300,000 SF respectively.*

Jacksonville, which is in the early stages of its system wide building plan, will have the highest number of branch projects, 18. Of these six will be new facilities. Jacksonville will more than double of the amount of library space. It now has 355,000 SF, it will have 735,000 SF when all of its projects are completed.<sup>2</sup>

Of the libraries, Indianapolis had the highest number of new branch buildings, nine.

The chart on the following page does not include those projects that did not add square footage to the buildings. Those projects often involved “updating” a facility, adding an elevator or improving accessibility, or creating a computer lab. Providing additional parking was often mentioned in the interviews as an element of the building renovation projects. Several libraries were “co-locating” branch libraries with other governmental bodies or schools in joint use campuses or single buildings.

*Jacksonville has 18 branch library projects including six new buildings. Indianapolis had nine new branch library building projects in the 1990s.*

---

<sup>2</sup> "Jacksonville Ads 60 Positions Will Double Square Feet of PLs." *Library Hotline*, December 9, 2002, p. 1

## **Funding**

Funding for all or part of the building programs in Charlotte, Cleveland, Dayton, Indianapolis, Jacksonville, Memphis, Nashville, St. Louis County, St. Louis Public, and Toledo required voter approval. For some of the libraries, Indianapolis and St. Louis, for example, there was extensive library involvement in those voter campaigns. In others, such as Jacksonville, library involvement in the campaign was minimal. Only Toledo reported having lost a funding vote, and that was in 1991. Toledo voters have approved operating and construction levies since then. However, Indianapolis reported “stalling” their project for a year “to get the politics in line,” and it took “a couple of budget cycles” in the City of Memphis to garner the necessary support. The Library did not get approval to build for three years.

Funding for the building projects ran the gamut from bonds requiring voter referenda to “cash.” St. Louis County has paid for all of its buildings from a building fund tax, five cents per \$100 of property tax levied in the early 1970s. Six of the libraries are in Ohio, a State that supports its public libraries through a specially earmarked 5.7 percent allocation of the State’s collection of personal income taxes. This support has allowed Ohio public libraries to build facilities from accumulated, unspent state aid.

## **Project Oversight and Staffing**

The scope and scale of the building projects varied tremendously. The projected size and number of facilities involved generally determined who on the library staff was involved and whether construction and project managers were hired. In some locations, such as Atlanta, the county or city government provided the additional outside expertise. In others, such as Indianapolis, hiring additional staff expertise was part of the overall funding package and the library positions thus funded will be eliminated when the construction projects are completed. Nashville and Jacksonville, with system wide projects that involve the Central Library and multiple branch libraries at the same time, used or are using a program management firm to coordinate the multiple projects. For most of the libraries one or more people in library administration, the head of the facility being renovated or built, and the library’s facilities department manager were the individuals most likely to be intensely involved in the building projects.

Providing staff for the expanded and new facilities is an issue that came up several times in the interviews. Memphis added new pages (shelvers) in anticipation of the increased usage, but they have been unable to keep up thus far with re-shelving the increased volume of items being checked out and returned. Jacksonville, understaffed in its current configuration, is systematically requesting new positions with each operating budget submission in anticipation of opening the new branch libraries. At least two other individuals interviewed said they would not open new branch libraries without adequate staff to serve in those facilities.

**Table 4.1**  
**Construction Projects Past Five Years of Peer Libraries**

SEE CHART ON NEXT PAGE

**Impact**

Some of the libraries, such as Columbus, have carefully documented the impact of their building projects. Others, such as St. Louis County, have not measured the impact. All the libraries reported increased usage when a branch was expanded or a new facility was built. At some libraries, such as Nashville, the overall impact of a new Central Library and branch building programs has been “huge” increases in usage. Libraries in other cities noted increases overall, but also shifts in the usage patterns of nearby branch libraries. Some reported that existing branch libraries near a new or an existing branch library being expanded and/or renovated suffered some decrease in circulation and visits when the new or renovated facility was opened. However, in the longer term the total usage figures for the library system increased.

*All the libraries reported increased usage when a branch was expanded or a new facility was built.*

Several factors seem to be important. The major point stressed by several of the individuals interviewed was that the renovations and new construction made many more computers and general library resources available to people in an area. Suddenly there was Internet access or computers or more books available in the neighborhood and people rushed in to take advantage of those new resources. Further, Toledo and St. Louis emphasized that with their new facilities they were able to market library resources much better than in the old facilities with better layouts and brighter, more inviting colors.

Louisville Free Public Library  
Peer Construction Projects in the Last Five Years  
(including those in progress)

Library	Central Library Construction	SF Constructed	No. Branch Library Projects	No. New Buildings	Average New Square Feet	No. Addition Projects	Average Addition Square Feet	Funding Source
Atlanta	None	-	6	6	13,500	0	NA	County General Fund
Charlotte	None	-	6	6	12,350	0		General Obligation Bonds; COPS
Cincinnati	Completed 1997	182,527	8	3	13470 *	3	3,934	LLGSF (State Aid)
Cleveland	Completed 1998	267,891	-	-	-	-	-	Bond Referendum
Columbus	Remodel planned	-	7	5	27,000	2	NA	Cash
Cuyahoga	(No Central Library)	-	3 in progress	2	32,500	-	-	Municipal Bonds
Dayton	Renovation	820	1	1	9,845	0		Capital Improvements Levy
Indianapolis	In Progress	267,318	10	9	15,811	1	7,000	General Obligation Bonds; Fund Raising
Jacksonville	In Progress	300,000	18	6	25,167	4	8,250	Sales tax
Lexington	None	-	2	2	21,000	0		Bonds (no voter referendum)
Memphis	Completed 2001	330,000	5	5	28,800	0		Combination of sources
Milwaukee	Completed 2001	30,000	1	1	20,000	0		City Capital Budget; Foundation
Nashville	Completed 2001	300,000	5	5	23,000	0		Bonds (no voter referendum)
St. Louis County	None	-	4	2	16,900	2	8,000	Property tax
St. Louis Public	In Planning	20,000	9	4	12,950 **	5	4,026	Property tax
Toledo	Completed 2001	85,000	11	2	15,625	6	2,000	Capital Improvements Bond
* Excludes those projects that consisted solely of adding an elevator.								
** Includes an 840 SF storefront; average without storefront is 19,000 SF.								

New includes converting existing buildings from other purposes to become libs.

\*Excludes those adding only elevator.

\*\*New includes 840 SF storefront; mean without storefront is 19,000 SF

## Key Things Learned From Your Experience

All of the interview responses related to good advice and learning from the experience bear careful reading and thought. While some of the advice is heavily influenced by local factors, many place heavy emphasis on advance planning, involving staff, watching the money, and hiring the expertise that the library lacks. They also recommend traveling to see other libraries and taking local officials along on these visits. Those interviewed say to “communicate, communicate, communicate” -- with staff and with the local community. If on a ballot, pick running mates wisely. For further information please see Appendix A.

## COMPARISONS AND RANKINGS

With assistance from the staff of the LFPL and using the latest edition of *Public Library Data Service*<sup>3</sup> the consultants compared and ranked Louisville with 15 other locales. As the following pages will attest, the Louisville Free Public Library ranks quite low, and in more than a few instances the lowest, among the peer group.

For instance, Louisville ranks in the lowest quartile in seven of the 14 measurable categories -- and two of the 14 are Service Area Population and Square Miles of Service Area.

Louisville is last -- 16<sup>th</sup> out of 16 -- in three of the categories:

- Total Branch Library Square Feet Per Capita
- Library Materials Per Capita
- Population Served Per FTE Librarian

Louisville is next to last in two additional categories:

- Total Library Size (Square Feet) Per Capita
- Per Capita Library Income.

The LFPL's annual operating income of \$15,384,137 ( $\$22.18 \times 693,604 = \$15,384,137$ ) is \$17.8 million less than the total operating budget of those libraries that served 500,000 or more, according to a recent report in *Library Journal*.<sup>4</sup>

The series of 14 charts begins on the next page, starting with Service Area Population.

---

<sup>3</sup> *PUBLIC LIBRARY DATA SERVICE: Statistical Report 2002*. Chicago, Public Library Association, 2002.

<sup>4</sup> Oder, Norman. "The Format Dilemma." *Library Journal*, November 15, 2002, p. 38. The same story reveals that the average materials budget of the largest group of libraries is in excess of \$4.5 million.

## Service Area Population

Public libraries are about service. The goal of every public library is, whether stated formally or not, is to strive to service every man, woman, and child who resides in the library's service area. For the LFPL, its service area is all of Jefferson County. It ranks eight of among the peer group in terms of service area population.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Service Area Population</i>	<i>Rank</i>
St. Louis County, MO	873,490	1
Memphis, TN	868,825	2
Cincinnati, OH	845,303	3
Atlanta, GA	845,000	4
Indianapolis, IN	832,162	5
Columbus, OH	790,770	6
Charlotte, NC	720,490	7
<i>Louisville</i>	<i>693,604</i>	<i>8</i>
Cuyahoga County, OH	629,334	9
Milwaukee, WI	608,150	10
Dayton, OH	559,062	11
Nashville, TN	530,050	12
Cleveland, OH	478,403	13
Toledo, OH	455,054	14
St. Louis, MO	348,189	15
Lexington, KY	260,512	16
<b><i>Average of Peers</i></b>	<b><i>646,150</i></b>	

## Size of Service Area

The size of a library's service area, as measured in square miles, is an important consideration when the number of library facilities is also considered. In a large service area, such as Memphis or Charlotte, if there are only a few library facilities, the residents of those locales will have greater distances to travel to a library building assuming a reasonably widespread distribution of the population throughout the service area.

Louisville, with a 385.0 square mile service area, ranks eighth. The next analysis looks at service area size and number of library facilities.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Size (Square Miles) of Service Area</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Memphis, TN	755.0	1
Charlotte, NC	530.0	2
Atlanta, GA	529.0	3
Nashville, TN	502.3	4
Dayton, OH	462.0	5
St. Louis County, MO	460.0	6
Cincinnati, OH	407.4	7
<i>Louisville</i>	<i>385.0</i>	<i>8</i>
Indianapolis, IN	380.3	9
Columbus, OH	343.0	10
Toledo, OH	340.0	11
Lexington, KY	285.0	12
Milwaukee, WI	106.0	13
Cleveland, OH	77.0	14
St. Louis, MO	62.0	15
Cuyahoga County, OH	NA	NA
<b><i>Average of Peers</i></b>	<b><i>374.9</i></b>	

## Facilities Per Square Mile

As stated in the previous chart, those libraries with large service areas and a lesser number of facilities results in a locale where the residents of the area have a greater distance to travel.

Louisville ranks number 10. It is in the lower quartile of the peers as far as the number of library facilities available.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Square Miles Service Area</i>	<i>Number of Facilities</i>	<i>Facilities Per Square Mile</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Cleveland, OH	77.0	29	1/2.6	1
St. Louis, MO	62.0	16	1/3.9	2
Milwaukee, WI	106.0	13	1/8.2	3
Cincinnati, OH	407.4	42	1/9.7	4
Atlanta, GA	529.0	33	1/16.0	5
Columbus, OH	343.0	21	1/16.3	6
Indianapolis, IN	380.3	23	1/16.5	7
Toledo, OH	340.0	19	1/17.9	8
Dayton, OH	462.0	23	1/20.1	9
<i>Louisville</i>	<i>385.0</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>1/22.6</i>	<i>10</i>
Charlotte, NC	530.0	23	1/23.0	11
Nashville, TN	502.3	21	1/23.9	12
St. Louis County, MO	460.0	19	1/24.2	13
Memphis, TN	755.0	23	1/32.8	14
Lexington, KY	285.0	5	1/57.0	15
Cuyahoga County, OH	NA	28	NA	NA
<b><i>Average of Peers</i></b>	<b><i>374.9</i></b>	<b><i>22</i></b>	<b><i>1/17.0</i></b>	

## Population Served Per Branch Library

There is a direct relationship between the number of branch library facilities and the service area population. The greater the number of facilities and/or the fewer the number of people in the service area, the lesser the number of persons each branch library has to serve. A high number, as in the case of Louisville, indicates an inadequate number of facilities for the population served.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Population Served Per Branch Library</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Cleveland, OH	17,086	1
Cincinnati, OH	20,617	2
Cuyahoga County, OH	22,476	3
St. Louis, MO	23,213	4
Toledo, OH	25,281	5
Dayton, OH	25,412	6
Atlanta, GA	26,406	7
Nashville, TN	26,503	8
Charlotte, NC	32,750	9
Indianapolis, IN	37,826	10
Memphis, TN	39,432	11
Columbus, OH	39,539	12
<i>Louisville</i>	<i>43,350</i>	<i>13</i>
St. Louis County, MO	48,527	14
Milwaukee, WI	50,679	15
Lexington, KY	65,128	16
<b><i>Average of Peers</i></b>	<b><i>34,018</i></b>	

### Total Branch Library Square Feet Per Capita

The total amount of space, i.e. square feet, divided by the service area population, produces the amount of space per capita. The State of Kentucky calls for a figure of 0.6 SF per capita. The LFPL has 0.21, the lowest number among the peer libraries.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Total Branch Library SF Per Capita</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Cuyahoga County, OH	0.91	1
Cleveland, OH	0.60	2
St. Louis, MO	0.55	3
Toledo, OH	0.50	4
Memphis, TN	0.43	5
Cincinnati, OH	0.43	5
Atlanta, GA	0.40	7
Nashville, TN	0.39	8
Dayton, OH	0.36	9
Charlotte, NC	0.36	9
St. Louis County, MO	0.35	11
Columbus, OH	0.33	12
Indianapolis, IN	0.30	13
Milwaukee, WI	0.29	14
Lexington, KY	0.25	15
<i>Louisville</i>	<i>0.21</i>	<i>16</i>
<b><i>Average of Peers</i></b>	<b><i>0.42</i></b>	

## Main Library Size (Square Feet) Per Capita

Main Library size is, of course, the measurement of only one building divided by the total population of the service area. Although the LFPL ranks 10<sup>th</sup>, it is well below the average of the peers.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Main Library SF Per Capita</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Cleveland, OH	1.11	1
Milwaukee, WI	0.75	2
Cincinnati, OH	0.64	3
Toledo, OH	0.60	4
Nashville, TN	0.57	5
St. Louis, MO	0.55	6
Lexington, KY	0.36	7
Columbus, OH	0.32	8
Atlanta, GA	0.30	9
<i>Louisville</i>	<i>0.24</i>	<i>10</i>
Dayton, OH	0.23	11
Charlotte, NC	0.22	12
Memphis, TN	0.16	13
Indianapolis, IN	0.14	14
St. Louis County, MO	0.14	14
Cuyahoga County, OH (Does not have a Central Library facility.)	NA	NA
<b><i>Average of Peers</i></b>		<b><i>0.42</i></b>

## Total Library Size (Square Feet) Per Capita

When combining the square feet of the branch libraries with the Main Library size, the total amount of space is how the Commonwealth determines whether or not a community is meeting its standards. Louisville, with 0.45 SF per capita, is well below the average of the peers and 0.15 SF below the standards of the state.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Total Library SF Per Capita</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Cleveland, OH	1.71	1
Toledo, OH	1.10	2
St. Louis, MO	1.09	3
Cincinnati, OH	1.07	4
Milwaukee, WI	1.04	5
Nashville, TN	0.96	6
Cuyahoga County, OH	0.91	7
Atlanta, GA	0.70	8
Lexington, KY	0.68	9
Columbus, OH	0.65	10
Dayton, OH	0.59	11
Memphis, TN	0.59	12
Charlotte, NC	0.57	13
St. Louis County, MO	0.49	14
<i>Louisville</i>	<i>0.45</i>	<i>15</i>
Indianapolis, IN	0.44	16
<b><i>Average of Peers</i></b>	<b><i>0.82</i></b>	

## Library Materials Per Capita

Louisville ranks dead last in the all important element of library materials per capita. Its holdings are less than one-half that of the peer libraries, and 0.5 items per capita than the next lowest, Memphis.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Library Materials Per Capita</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Cincinnati, OH	11.8	1
St. Louis, MO	9.9	2
Cleveland, OH	8.1	3
Toledo, OH	5.9	4
Cuyahoga County, OH	5.2	5
Milwaukee, WI	4.9	6
Columbus, OH	3.7	7
Dayton, OH	3.3	8
Lexington, KY	3.0	9
St. Louis County, MO	2.9	10
Atlanta, GA	2.7	11
Indianapolis, IN	2.6	12
Nashville, TN	2.5	13
Charlotte, NC	2.4	14
Memphis, TN	2.3	15
<i>Louisville</i>	<i>1.8</i>	<i>16</i>
<b><i>Average of Peers</i></b>	<b><i>4.6</i></b>	

## Internet Workstations for Public Use

The efforts made the past few years to improve the information technology capabilities of the library system are reflected in this and the following chart. The LFPL's ranking in terms of the number of Internet Workstations for Public Use is quite good, and slightly better than the average of its peer group.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Internet Workstations for Public Use</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Charlotte, NC	612	1
Columbus, OH	580	2
St. Louis County, MO	520	3
Nashville, TN	511	4
Milwaukee, WI	454	5
Memphis, TN	397	6
<i>Louisville</i>	372	7
Dayton, OH	333	8
Toledo, OH	323	9
Atlanta, GA	300	10
Indianapolis, IN	300	10
Cincinnati, OH	298	12
Cleveland, OH	289	13
St. Louis, MO	156	14
Lexington, KY	60	15
Cuyahoga County, OH (No reported data.)	NA	NA
<b><i>Average of Peers</i></b>	<b>367</b>	

## Population Per Internet Workstation

This ranking is another indication of the Library's commitment to information technology for its customers and staff.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Population Per Internet Workstation</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Nashville, TN	1,037	1
Charlotte, NC	1,177	2
Milwaukee, WI	1,340	3
Columbus, OH	1,363	4
Toledo, OH	1,409	5
Cleveland, OH	1,655	6
Dayton, OH	1,679	7
St. Louis County, MO	1,680	8
<i>Louisville</i>	<i>1,865</i>	<i>9</i>
Memphis, TN	2,188	10
St. Louis, MO	2,232	11
Indianapolis, IN	2,774	12
Atlanta, GA	2,817	13
Cincinnati, OH	2,856	14
Lexington, KY	4,342	15
Cuyahoga County, OH (No reported data.)	NA	NA
<b><i>Average of Peers</i></b>	<b><i>2,028</i></b>	

## Population Per FTE Librarian

With regard to professional staff, the LFPL ranks last in terms of the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) librarians per number of persons in the service area. The numbers indicate that there is one librarian for every almost every 12,000 residents of Greater Louisville. This means less service, less available time for the staff to spend working with and assisting the customers.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Population Per FTE Librarian</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Cincinnati, OH	3,522	1
Cleveland, OH	3,570	2
Cuyahoga County, OH	3,735	3
Toledo, OH	4,461	4
Atlanta, GA	5,090	5
Columbus, OH	5,237	6
Milwaukee, WI	5,382	7
Memphis, TN	5,516	8
Indianapolis, IN	5,600	9
Nashville, TN	5,699	10
St. Louis, MO	6,218	11
Charlotte, NC	6,265	12
Dayton, OH	7,167	13
Lexington, KY	7,443	14
St. Louis County, MO	11,493	15
<i>Louisville</i>	<i>11,959</i>	<i>16</i>
<b><i>Average of Peers</i></b>	<b><i>6,147</i></b>	

## Population Served Per FTE Staff

Louisville fares only slightly better in terms of the total FTE staff and the total population served. It has less total staff than the average of the peer group.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Population Served Per FTE Staff</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Dayton, OH	871	1
Cleveland, OH	918	2
Cuyahoga County, OH	958	3
Columbus, OH	1,168	4
Cincinnati, OH	1,204	5
St. Louis, MO	1,398	6
Toledo, OH	1,420	7
Milwaukee, WI	1,583	8
Charlotte, NC	1,638	9
Nashville, TN	1,680	10
Indianapolis, IN	1,736	11
St. Louis County, MO	1,743	12
Atlanta, GA	1,912	13
<i>Louisville</i>	<i>1,987</i>	<i>14</i>
Memphis, TN	2,037	15
Lexington, KY	3,065	16
<b>AVERAGE OF PEERS</b>	<b>1,582</b>	

## Per Capita Library Income

With an annual operating budget that is 117 percent less than that of the peer group it is easy to see why the LFPL trails the peer group in so many of the comparative categories.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Per Capita Library Income</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Cleveland, OH	\$112.01	1
Cuyahoga County, OH	\$79.34	2
Cincinnati, OH	\$66.95	3
Toledo, OH	\$65.24	4
Columbus, OH	\$63.43	5
St. Louis, MO	\$54.78	6
Dayton, OH	\$42.32	7
Lexington, KY	\$39.19	8
Milwaukee, WI	\$39.06	9
Indianapolis, IN	\$38.93	10
Charlotte, NC	\$34.95	11
Atlanta, GA	\$32.04	12
St. Louis County, MO	\$30.27	13
Nashville, TN	\$28.00	14
<i>Louisville</i>	<i>\$22.19</i>	<i>15</i>
Memphis, TN	\$22.18	16
<b><i>Average of Peers</i></b>	<b><i>\$48.18</i></b>	

## Beginning Librarian Salary

When the total operating income is so low it is manifested in a number of ways, including the starting salary for new librarians. This low figure means the LFPL has a more difficult time competing for new talent, which is one reason the number of FTE Librarians per Population Served figure is so low. There is a cause and effect.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Beginning Librarian Salary</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Atlanta, GA	\$44,903	1
Cleveland, OH	\$39,272	2
Dayton, OH	\$34,341	3
Cincinnati, OH	\$34,136	4
Toledo, OH	\$33,487	5
Milwaukee, WI	\$33,442	6
St. Louis County, MO	\$33,178	7
Nashville, TN	\$32,854	8
Columbus, OH	\$32,490	9
Lexington, KY	\$32,187	10
Charlotte, NC	\$31,391	11
Cuyahoga County, OH	\$31,356	12
Indianapolis, IN	\$30,564	13
<i>Louisville</i>	<i>\$30,194</i>	<i>14</i>
St. Louis, MO	\$30,000	15
Memphis, TN	\$27,506	16
<b><i>Average of Peers</i></b>	<b><i>\$33,206</i></b>	