City Council

Agenda

Tuesday, July 16, 2024
Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:00 PM

Members of the public are welcome to attend and give comments remotely; however, the in-person meeting may continue even if technology issues prevent remote participation.

- *You can call in to +1 719 359 4580 or 877 853 5247 (toll free)*
  Webinar ID #876 9127 0986.
- *You can log in via your computer. Please visit the City's website here to link to the meeting: www.louisvilleco.gov/council*

The Council will accommodate public comments during the meeting. Anyone may also email comments to the Council prior to the meeting at Council@LouisvilleCO.gov.

1. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA AND ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

Public comments are limited to 3 minutes per speaker. When several people wish to speak on the same position on a given item, Council requests they select a spokesperson to state that position.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

The following items on the City Council Agenda are considered routine by the City Manager and shall be approved, adopted, accepted, etc., by motion of the City Council and voice vote unless the Mayor or a City Council person specifically requests an item be considered under "Regular Business." In such an event the item shall be removed from the "Consent Agenda" and Council action taken separately on said item in the order appearing on the Agenda. Those items so approved under the heading "Consent Agenda" will appear in the Council Minutes in their proper order.

A. Approval of Bills
B. Award Contract for 2024 Crack Seal Project
C. Approval of Pollinator Mural at the Intersection of Main and Spruce Streets

---

Citizen Information

If you wish to speak at the City Council meeting in person, please fill out a sign-up card and present it to the City Clerk at the meeting; if you are attending remotely, please use the "raise hand" icon to show you wish to speak in public comments.

Persons planning to attend the meeting who need sign language interpretation, translation services, assisted listening systems, Braille, taped material, or special transportation, should contact the City Clerk's Office (303.335.4536 or 303.335.4574) or ClerksOffice@LouisvilleCO.gov. A forty-eight-hour notice is requested.

Si requiere una copia en español de esta publicación o necesita un intérprete durante la reunión del Consejo, por favor llame a la Ciudad al 303.335.4536 o 303.335.4574 o email ClerksOffice@LouisvilleCO.gov.

D. Approval of Resolution No. 29, Series 2024 – A Resolution Approving an Intergovernmental Agreement By and Between the City of Louisville and Boulder County for the Conduct and Administration of the 2024 Coordinated Election to be held November 5, 2024

6. COUNCIL INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS ON PERTINENT ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA (Council general comments are scheduled at the end of the Agenda.)

7. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

8. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. ORDINANCE NO. 1878, SERIES 2024 – AN ORDINANCE EXEMPTING CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS FROM THE CITY'S USE TAX FOR BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED FOR REPAIR AND RECONSTRUCTION OF FENCES, WALLS, AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES THAT SUSTAINED FIRE, SMOKE, HEAT, WATER, ASH OR OTHER DAMAGE AS A RESULT OF THE MARSHALL FIRE – 1ST READING – SET PUBLIC HEARING 8/6/24

- Introduction
- Action

B. ORDINANCE NO. 1879, SERIES 2024 – AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE VACATION OF AN EXISTING DRAINAGE EASEMENT ON LOTS 3 AND 4, BLOCK 1 OF THE ENCLAVE REPLAT – 1ST READING – SET PUBLIC HEARING 8/6/24

- Introduction
- Action

C. ORDINANCE NO. 1880, SERIES 2024 – AN ORDINANCE REPEALING SECTION 13.12.105 TO ELIMINATE A WATER USE REBATE PROGRAM – 1ST READING – SET PUBLIC HEARING 8/6/24

- Introduction
- Action

D. RESOLUTION NO. 30, SERIES 2024 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING A PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION GRANT FOR THE COLACCI HOUSE AT 1209 MAIN STREET

- Mayor Opens Public Hearing
- Staff Presentation
- Public Comments (Please limit to three minutes each)
- Council Questions & Comments
- Mayor Closes Public Hearing
- Action

E. COMMUNITY SURVEY PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

- Staff Presentation
- Public Comments (Please limit to three minutes each)
- Council Questions & Comments
- Action

F. DISCUSSION/DIRECTION/ACTION – INTERIM CITY MANAGER

- Staff Presentation
- Public Comments (Please limit to three minutes each)
- Council Questions & Comments
- Action

9. CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

10. COUNCIL COMMENTS, COMMITTEE REPORTS, AND IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

11. ADJOURN

ITEMS TENTATIVELY SCHEDULED FOR SPECIAL MEETING 7/30/24.

This list is not inclusive; items are subject to change; additional items may be added.

- Discussion/Direction – Home Hardening
- Joint Meeting with Revitalization Commission

ITEMS TENTATIVELY SCHEDULED FOR REGULAR MEETING 8/6/24.

This list is not inclusive; items are subject to change; additional items may be added.

- Italian American Month Proclamation
- Commercial Energy Code – 2nd Reading
- EV Charging – 2nd Reading
- Fence, Wall, Accessory Structure Use Tax Credits – 2nd Reading
- Third Replat of the Enclave – 2nd Reading
- Senior Rebate Update – 2nd Reading
- Discussion/Direction – Psilocybin Regulations
- Harper Minor Subdivision Easement Vacation – 1st Reading
- 2024 Storm System Maintenance Project Change Order

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 071624 07/16/2024

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
14669	AG INVESTIGATIONS LLC	PRE-EMPLOYMENT BACKGROUND	1,200.00
15333	AKILA ARUMUGAM	CULTURE OF INDIA WORKSHOP	250.00
13051	AMBERG ENTERTAINMENT CO	BAL DUE BOUNCE HOUSE 7/4/	1,258.83
15861	ATRIUM EDUCATION CONSULTING LL	MANAGING CHALLENGING BEHA	150.00
15457	AUTOMATED LOGIC CONTRACTING SE	CUST #62CITYO005	640.00
14251	BK TIRE INC	REF #38213	304.72
14251	BK TIRE INC	REF #38183	30.00
14251	BK TIRE INC	REF #38163	7.50
640	BOULDER COUNTY	MAY 2024 LOUISVILLE BC CO	11,409.13
14403	CALLAWAY GOLF	ACCT #18883	1,280.82
248	CDW GOVERNMENT	CUST #5143572	106.19
248	CDW GOVERNMENT	CUST #5143572	300.23
2220	CHEMTRADE CHEMICALS US LLC	ACCT #580079692	6,702.64
2220	CHEMTRADE CHEMICALS US LLC	ACCT #580079692	6,658.96
1120	COLORADO ANALYTICAL LABORATORI	WWTP - INFLUENT - WEEKLY	126.00
1130	COLORADO DEPT OF LABOR	BOILER INSPECTION 6/13/24	875.00
10606	COMMUTING SOLUTIONS	2024 ESRI SUBSCRIPTION	125.00
12428	CUMMINS SALES AND SERVICE	CUST #479194	3,134.07
15036	DAVID J. THROWER	JUNE 2024 MUNICIPAL JUDGE	2,800.00
11476	DBC IRRIGATION SUPPLY	CUST #1268	1,179.97
15149	DENALI WATER SOLUTIONS LLC	CUST #1120056	1,053.87
15823	DENVER PUBLIC SCHOOL	CHALLENGE COURT 6/28/24	1,000.00
1520	DRCOG	2024-2025 DUES CUST ID	9,600.00
13009	EIDE BAILLY LLP	CLIENT #80119	10,350.00
13184	ENGINEERED AIR	CUST #104020	93.39
1175	GEORGE T SANDERS COMPANY	CUST #5415	132.35
1175	GEORGE T SANDERS COMPANY	CUST #5415	83.71
2310	GRAINGER	ACCT #802864512	728.17

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 071624 07/16/2024

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
2405	HACH COMPANY	ACCT #094039	277.10
2405	HACH COMPANY	ACCT #094039	2,301.44
13107	HARRINGTON INDUSTRIAL PLASTICS	CUST #085103	132.84
15381	HICKS CONTRACTORS SERVICES LLC	INSTALL 3" BOX WIRE	2,485.00
15329	IMEG CORP	SERVICES THROUGH 6/23/24	3,000.00
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	306.13
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	384.58
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	293.59
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	285.96
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	221.16
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	399.80
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	190.43
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	255.12
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	221.69
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	194.53
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	495.88
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	272.69
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	210.25
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	267.05
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	227.36
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	374.57
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	261.90
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	276.30
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	354.46
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	396.46
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	278.71
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	228.45
2615	INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES INC	ACCT #2050766	236.69
13280	INSIGHT PUBLIC SECTOR INC	ACCT #10669545	144.30
10772	INTEGRATED SAFETY SERVICES LLC	WORK ORDER #4697 6/18/24	565.00
10772	INTEGRATED SAFETY SERVICES LLC	WORK ORDER #4062 6/11/2	1,370.00
10552	INTERNATIONAL MARTIAL ARTS ASS	JANUARY - JUNE 2024 KARAT	4,032.00
2780	KAISER LOCK & KEY SERVICE INC	DUPLICATE KEYS	22.50
15499	KATHRYN A MIHELIC	JUNE 2024 PICKLEBALL CONT	1,799.00
13692	LIGHTNING MOBILE SERVICES LLC	BI-MONTHLY SWEEPING JAN,	335.00
3070	LL JOHNSON DISTRIBUTING CO	CUST #158907	87.39
15134	LONGS PEAK HOSPITAL	ACCT #2078224853	3,571.17

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 071624 07/16/2024

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
14927	LOUISVILLE MASTER PLUMBING LLC	WATER TREATMENT FACILITY	1,385.00
13968	MAD SCIENCE OF COLORADO	CAMP FEES 5/28/24 - 5/31/	3,419.50
14940	MARKLEY DESIGNS LLC	Design Consultant for Int	6,505.89
15424	MIDWEST CONNECT	ACCT #CO79	3,194.00
14768	MOJOS CLEANING SERVICES INC	JULY 2024 JANITORIAL SERV	33,533.41
14768	MOJOS CLEANING SERVICES INC	JUNE 2024 PARKS JANITORIA	3,300.00
6168	MOTION & FLOW CONTROL PRODUCTS	CUST #104001	184.46
6168	MOTION & FLOW CONTROL PRODUCTS	ORDER #6031233	145.06
3505	NALCO COMPANY LLC	CUST #4012973	533.17
3630	NORTH STAR CLEANING SERVICES L	REC & SENIOR CENTER	950.00
99999	PATRICK ROLLO	REFUND LOUISVILLE REC CEN	117.00
99999	SAM DURAN	REFUND LOUISVILLE REC CEN	30.00
99999	TRC RESIDENTIAL INC.	945 LARKSPUR LANE FUNDS F	2,500.00
14899	OTAK INC	SERVICES THROUGH 5/31/24	7,193.25
15770	PARK CONSULTING GROUP, INC.	JUNE 2024 EPL ENHANCEMENT	3,425.00
14144	PING INC	CUST #40692	155.32
14844	REPUBLIC SERVICES INC #535	ACCT #3-0535-0176482	45.00
14844	REPUBLIC SERVICES INC #535	ACCT #3-0535-0109715	6,796.63
14560	SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	ACCT #A12877	4,875.00
14612	SOME LIKE IT GREEN, LLC	JULY 2024 PLANT CARE	94.00
15451	SYLVESTER'S MAINTENANCE & MECH	6/21/24 BAY DOORS	747.07
15451	SYLVESTER'S MAINTENANCE & MECH	6/21/24 BAY DOOR	322.07
14550	TAYLOR MADE GOLF COMPANY INC	ACCT #632413	241.17
7917	THE AQUEOUS SOLUTION INC	SODIUM HYPOCHLORITE	699.10
6644	THE EAST BOULDER DITCH COMPANY	2024 ASSESSMENT	150.00
15627	THE LOUISVILLE HISTORY FOUNDAT	2ND QTR HISTORY FOUND - L	325.00
12787	TRANE US INC	CUST #635445	610.89

CASH ACCOUNT: 001000 101001 WARRANT: 071624 07/16/2024

VENDOR	VENDOR NAME	PURPOSE	AMOUNT
15065	UNDERWATER RECOVERY SPECIALIST	Pond maintenance services	981.15
4875	UNIVAR SOLUTIONS USA INC	CUST #790754	2,778.30
14446	VECTOR DISEASE CONTROL	CUST ID #LOUISV01	2,137.96
14446	VECTOR DISEASE CONTROL	CUST ID #LOUISV01	2,137.96
14446	VECTOR DISEASE CONTROL	CUST ID #LOUISV01	2,137.96
13790	ZAYO GROUP LLC	ACCT #018253	3,935.00
	98 INVOICES	WARRANT TOTAL	183,922.37

CITY OF LOUISVILLE

PURCHASE CARD SUMMARY

STATEMENT PERIOD 5/21/24 - 6/20/24

SUPPLIER	SUPPLIER LOCATION	CARDHOLDER	DEPARTMENT	TRANS DATE	AMOUNT
1000BULBS.COM	8006244488	MATTHEW ROWE	FACILITIES	05/24/2024	57.68
1230 LKQ PULL N SAVE	AURORA	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	05/22/2024	5.00
1230 LKQ PULL N SAVE	AURORA	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	05/22/2024	29.34
3CMA ONLIN* DC	HERNDON	GRACE JOHNSON	CITY MANAGER	06/13/2024	845.00
7SHIFTS	WILMINGTON	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/12/2024	76.99
ACT*79476AADV-ENDTRIAL	DALLAS	ANIKA VAN WOUDENBERG	REC CENTER	06/16/2024	99.95
ADOBE *ADOBE	4085366000	KURT KOWAR	PUBLIC WORKS	06/09/2024	31.12
ADOBE *ADOBE	4085366000	DEREK COSSON	CITY MANAGER	06/02/2024	79.99
AIR CARE COLORADO BOUL	BOULDER	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/10/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	VICKIE ILKO	OPERATIONS	06/17/2024	25.00
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/12/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	06/12/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/11/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	06/11/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/10/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/10/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/10/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/10/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	06/07/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	06/07/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/06/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/06/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/06/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/06/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	06/06/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	06/06/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/05/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/05/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	06/05/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/05/2024	25.50
AIR CARE COLORADO BROO	BROOMFIELD	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	06/04/2024	25.50
ALISON	GALWAY	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	05/21/2024	39.00
ALISON	GALWAY	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	05/21/2024	39.00
ALLDATA	800-859-3282	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	06/02/2024	125.00
ALPHA GOLF	8187259720	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/18/2024	88.43
ALPHA GOLF	8187259720	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/18/2024	358.86
AMAZON MAR* 111-104761	SEATTLE	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	06/12/2024	47.50
AMAZON MAR* 112-153404	SEATTLE	KRISTEN BODINE	LIBRARY	06/16/2024	115.63
AMAZON MAR* 113-455895	SEATTLE	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	06/19/2024	14.75
AMAZON MAR* 113-672586	SEATTLE	PAMELA LEMON	REC CENTER	06/19/2024	79.83
AMAZON MAR* 113-697102	SEATTLE	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	05/28/2024	47.64
AMAZON MAR* 113-863620	SEATTLE	SCOTT MOORE	POLICE	05/28/2024	44.99
AMAZON MAR* 114-502866	SEATTLE	GREG VENETTE	WATER	05/21/2024	83.00
AMAZON MARKETPLACE* MP	SEATTLE	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/02/2024	11.59

AMAZON MARKETPLACE* MP	SEATTLE	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/01/2024	61.85
AMAZON MKTPL*2A9TV5BL3	AMZN.COM/BILL	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/19/2024	38.73
AMAZON MKTPL*4Z1TN91S3	AMZN.COM/BILL	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	06/19/2024	118.07
AMAZON MKTPL*5684K5SO3	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	06/19/2024	19.99
AMAZON MKTPL*885L68DK3	AMZN.COM/BILL	SARA PECK	POLICE	06/14/2024	25.99
AMAZON MKTPL*982R311T3	AMZN.COM/BILL	MICHELLE CLINGAN	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/15/2024	38.58
AMAZON MKTPL*H44F87XY3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	06/18/2024	60.74
AMAZON MKTPL*IZ37H5BQ3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GREG VENETTE	WATER	06/17/2024	31.98
AMAZON MKTPL*KY2WW5Y13	AMZN.COM/BILL	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	06/14/2024	18.99
AMAZON MKTPL*RG5FN3BL0	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	06/20/2024	137.48
AMAZON MKTPL*SQ5VW2AS3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GREG VENETTE	WATER	06/17/2024	12.99
AMAZON MKTPL*W10C34F63	AMZN.COM/BILL	RANDY DEWITZ	BUILDING SAFETY	06/14/2024	49.43
AMAZON MKTPL*Y75I29Z73	AMZN.COM/BILL	BARBARA MACFERRIN	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/18/2024	55.15
AMAZON MKTPL*YY3YS38Y3	AMZN.COM/BILL	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/16/2024	112.62
AMAZON MKTPLACE PMTS	AMZN.COM/BILL	CORY PETERSON	PUBLIC WORKS	06/19/2024	19.50
AMAZON MKTPLACE PMTS	AMZN.COM/BILL	CORY PETERSON	PUBLIC WORKS	06/19/2024	43.98
AMAZON RET* 114-291267	SEATTLE	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	05/30/2024	20.98
AMAZON RET* 114-598413	SEATTLE	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	05/30/2024	18.99
AMAZON RET* 114-750918	SEATTLE	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/05/2024	127.89
AMAZON RET* OPS UNIFOR	SEATTLE	KELLY THARP	OPERATIONS	06/05/2024	144.95
AMAZON.COM*370MM9WK3	SEATTLE	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	06/16/2024	245.99
AMAZON.COM*CS3W12WM3	SEATTLE	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	05/21/2024	22.34
AMAZON.COM*J48XD0TG3	SEATTLE	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	06/05/2024	178.78
AMAZON.COM*LH07O7RR3	SEATTLE	KELLY THARP	OPERATIONS	05/22/2024	38.34
AMAZON.COM*RG4XL6HI0	SEATTLE	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	06/20/2024	84.45
AMAZON.COM*RV3M70QH3	SEATTLE	KELLY THARP	OPERATIONS	05/22/2024	38.34
AMER ASSOC NOTARIES	713-644-2299	MEREDYTH MUTH	CITY MANAGER	06/05/2024	32.58
AMERICAN AED LLC	MIRAMAR	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	06/06/2024	557.00
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION F	NASHVILLE	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	05/22/2024	118.00
AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOC	860-347-6933	PEGGY NORRIS	LIBRARY	05/29/2024	71.10
AMERICAN RED CROSS	800-733-2767	DANNY WEIONSTOCK	REC CENTER	06/03/2024	215.00
AMERICAN RED CROSS	800-733-2767	DANNY WEIONSTOCK	REC CENTER	06/01/2024	38.00
AMERICAN RED CROSS	800-733-2767	NICK PAPPAS	REC CENTER	05/28/2024	230.00
AMERICAN RED CROSS	800-733-2767	ELI SALO	REC CENTER	05/28/2024	266.00
AMERICAN RED CROSS	800-733-2767	ELI SALO	REC CENTER	05/23/2024	322.00
AMERICAN WATER COLLEGE	VALLEY MILLS	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	05/31/2024	179.99
AMERLIBASSOC ECOMMERCE	866-746-7252	KRISTEN BODINE	LIBRARY	06/18/2024	215.00
AMERLIBASSOC ECOMMERCE	866-746-7252	KRISTEN BODINE	LIBRARY	06/18/2024	459.00
AMERLIBASSOC ECOMMERCE	866-746-7252	KRISTEN BODINE	LIBRARY	06/01/2024	399.00
AMZ*DRAIN-NET TECHNO	PAY.AMAZON.CO	GREG VENETTE	WATER	05/23/2024	923.00
AMZN MKTP US*011N34GP3	AMZN.COM/BILL	LANCE PFEIFER	GOLF COURSE	06/17/2024	76.90
AMZN MKTP US*0B3CF4UW3	AMZN.COM/BILL	SARA PECK	POLICE	05/24/2024	52.88
AMZN MKTP US*0N77U9O93	AMZN.COM/BILL	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	05/30/2024	227.69
AMZN MKTP US*1E58H46W3	AMZN.COM/BILL	DEVIN MADIGAN	WASTEWATER	06/13/2024	111.74
AMZN MKTP US*1M00M2Q33	AMZN.COM/BILL	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	06/13/2024	199.99
AMZN MKTP US*1R5RU6U23	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	05/30/2024	59.99
AMZN MKTP US*267XE2OJ3	AMZN.COM/BILL	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/10/2024	62.94
AMZN MKTP US*285W94403	AMZN.COM/BILL	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	06/17/2024	219.76
AMZN MKTP US*3743C73E3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	06/10/2024	108.95

AMZN MKTP US*3D9548TL3	AMZN.COM/BILL	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	06/17/2024	63.74
AMZN MKTP US*3E9ZM1FO3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	06/12/2024	476.13
AMZN MKTP US*4F9UK4Y83	AMZN.COM/BILL	MELISSA TRACY	PUBLIC WORKS	05/29/2024	22.86
AMZN MKTP US*4O9N69AG3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	06/07/2024	96.97
AMZN MKTP US*4P32G86C3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JESSE DEGRAW	REC CENTER	05/29/2024	74.95
AMZN MKTP US*4R14U96B3	AMZN.COM/BILL	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/10/2024	112.57
AMZN MKTP US*521WK6AX3	AMZN.COM/BILL	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	06/05/2024	40.35
AMZN MKTP US*5M96R6483	AMZN.COM/BILL	CORY PETERSON	PUBLIC WORKS	06/08/2024	19.50
AMZN MKTP US*5O4IE27A3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GREG VENETTE	WATER	06/04/2024	83.65
AMZN MKTP US*6H70O3733	AMZN.COM/BILL	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	06/11/2024	68.99
AMZN MKTP US*6M1O24SC3	AMZN.COM/BILL	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/04/2024	32.98
AMZN MKTP US*6O4WD4UN3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	05/23/2024	29.98
AMZN MKTP US*6Q4YP9TJ3	AMZN.COM/BILL	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/09/2024	15.47
AMZN MKTP US*781N35T73	AMZN.COM/BILL	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	05/26/2024	14.98
AMZN MKTP US*7J2QT4DO3	AMZN.COM/BILL	PAUL BORTH	REC CENTER	06/12/2024	17.98
AMZN MKTP US*856OV0OA3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JESSE DEGRAW	REC CENTER	06/04/2024	138.00
AMZN MKTP US*9H0ML14D3	AMZN.COM/BILL	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	05/22/2024	24.99
AMZN MKTP US*9N1M82RU3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GREG VENETTE	WATER	05/22/2024	17.98
AMZN MKTP US*9O83S2LZ3	AMZN.COM/BILL	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	05/29/2024	129.97
AMZN MKTP US*9Y0DZ5KU3	AMZN.COM/BILL	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	06/14/2024	229.76
AMZN MKTP US*A353G8K83	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	06/09/2024	135.41
AMZN MKTP US*BT7KX0KH3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	05/24/2024	34.90
AMZN MKTP US*C171P5T93	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	05/28/2024	23.00
AMZN MKTP US*CT6HY3PL3	AMZN.COM/BILL	MELISSA TRACY	PUBLIC WORKS	06/09/2024	43.98
AMZN MKTP US*DD6IY7HJ3	AMZN.COM/BILL	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	05/21/2024	23.99
AMZN MKTP US*DU9JK40N3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	06/05/2024	23.96
AMZN MKTP US*ED2SL65C3	AMZN.COM/BILL	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	05/24/2024	6.92
AMZN MKTP US*EO9B78SY3	AMZN.COM/BILL	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	06/11/2024	9.99
AMZN MKTP US*ES2RC2AZ3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEN KENNEY	POLICE	05/30/2024	44.68
AMZN MKTP US*F14W53S53	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEN KENNEY	POLICE	05/30/2024	149.99
AMZN MKTP US*FJ6632IJ3	AMZN.COM/BILL	KELLY THARP	OPERATIONS	06/12/2024	19.99
AMZN MKTP US*FL0VU6DQ3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	06/12/2024	6.91
AMZN MKTP US*G01958VI3	AMZN.COM/BILL	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	05/27/2024	12.86
AMZN MKTP US*GA4LE9YE3	AMZN.COM/BILL	PAMELA LEMON	REC CENTER	05/22/2024	33.98
AMZN MKTP US*HO44C7523	AMZN.COM/BILL	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	05/23/2024	141.96
AMZN MKTP US*HT7EC2Q63	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	06/09/2024	59.99
AMZN MKTP US*IQ4OO1HQ3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GREG VENETTE	WATER	05/21/2024	136.91
AMZN MKTP US*IS6174NG3	AMZN.COM/BILL	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/06/2024	19.97
AMZN MKTP US*J419793M3	AMZN.COM/BILL	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	06/10/2024	259.26
AMZN MKTP US*JS7GD4SF3	AMZN.COM/BILL	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	06/12/2024	45.19
AMZN MKTP US*K32831K43	AMZN.COM/BILL	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/08/2024	88.41
AMZN MKTP US*K45KB31I3	AMZN.COM/BILL	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	06/10/2024	55.66
AMZN MKTP US*KL05O3BK3	AMZN.COM/BILL	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	05/23/2024	12.97
AMZN MKTP US*L93ZY59O3	AMZN.COM/BILL	PAUL BORTH	REC CENTER	05/29/2024	32.96
AMZN MKTP US*LJ34H2Q63	AMZN.COM/BILL	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/06/2024	75.00
AMZN MKTP US*LX74W95N3	AMZN.COM/BILL	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/09/2024	26.45
AMZN MKTP US*MB3HC02F3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JESSE DEGRAW	REC CENTER	06/03/2024	59.89
AMZN MKTP US*MM8MS7OR3	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	06/11/2024	105.63
AMZN MKTP US*NK8T82T83	AMZN.COM/BILL	PAMELA LEMON	REC CENTER	05/22/2024	268.59

AMZN MKTP US*NS9QO3UW3	AMZN.COM/BILL	ERIK SWIATEK	PARKS	05/22/2024	27.82
AMZN MKTP US*NY8QW1CU3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JULIE SEYDEL	REC CENTER	06/07/2024	31.57
AMZN MKTP US*O09YP7Y13	AMZN.COM/BILL	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	05/27/2024	69.80
AMZN MKTP US*O46MK1XU3	AMZN.COM/BILL	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	05/22/2024	154.81
AMZN MKTP US*O91GQ59J3	AMZN.COM/BILL	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	05/30/2024	47.48
AMZN MKTP US*OF4CQ07L3	AMZN.COM/BILL	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/04/2024	29.99
AMZN MKTP US*OK2W27243	AMZN.COM/BILL	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	06/10/2024	69.98
AMZN MKTP US*OM6VR7JY3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	06/02/2024	129.19
AMZN MKTP US*PN1O21EA3	AMZN.COM/BILL	SARA PECK	POLICE	05/23/2024	18.99
AMZN MKTP US*QF6TS1FY3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JESSE DEGRAW	REC CENTER	06/03/2024	131.98
AMZN MKTP US*QJ2UM9UL3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	06/09/2024	33.66
AMZN MKTP US*QO50J9YA3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JESSE DEGRAW	REC CENTER	05/20/2024	370.00
AMZN MKTP US*QO6NE2WI3	AMZN.COM/BILL	SARA PECK	POLICE	05/23/2024	69.06
AMZN MKTP US*QV4VF57W3	AMZN.COM/BILL	LANCE PFEIFER	GOLF COURSE	05/26/2024	14.78
AMZN MKTP US*RB3US9BP3	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	06/13/2024	277.47
AMZN MKTP US*RD8ZR1TR2	AMZN.COM/BILL	CORY PETERSON	PUBLIC WORKS	06/08/2024	116.97
AMZN MKTP US*RE8FN10J2	AMZN.COM/BILL	CATHERINE JEPSON	PARKS	05/26/2024	41.49
AMZN MKTP US*RF73W8553	AMZN.COM/BILL	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/12/2024	51.63
AMZN MKTP US*RJ5BV3NY3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	05/25/2024	56.39
AMZN MKTP US*RS2QV3SX3	AMZN.COM/BILL	PAMELA LEMON	REC CENTER	05/22/2024	86.98
AMZN MKTP US*S78VW6TB3	AMZN.COM/BILL	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	06/11/2024	20.98
AMZN MKTP US*SG9J04R83	AMZN.COM/BILL	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	06/05/2024	21.99
AMZN MKTP US*SM5JX9UX3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	05/28/2024	81.46
AMZN MKTP US*ST5U812Y3	AMZN.COM/BILL	DANNY WEIONSTOCK	REC CENTER	05/31/2024	9.98
AMZN MKTP US*WE9KF3OB3	AMZN.COM/BILL	DANIEL BIDLEMEN	REC CENTER	06/12/2024	32.98
AMZN MKTP US*WO8992V33	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	06/03/2024	19.96
AMZN MKTP US*WX8KZ53O3	AMZN.COM/BILL	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/07/2024	31.98
AMZN MKTP US*YA20U8BD3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	06/14/2024	19.98
AMZN MKTP US*YB2FG3QY3	AMZN.COM/BILL	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	06/06/2024	15.47
AMZN MKTP US*YQ17P5243	AMZN.COM/BILL	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	05/24/2024	102.77
AMZN MKTP US*Z868L0GX3	AMZN.COM/BILL	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	05/23/2024	15.99
AMZN MKTP US*ZJ8A65RA3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JEFF OWENS	WATER	05/27/2024	15.98
AMZN MKTP US*ZK2ND6RA3	AMZN.COM/BILL	KRISTEN BODINE	LIBRARY	05/21/2024	40.82
AMZN MKTP US*ZQ4KM6023	AMZN.COM/BILL	LANCE PFEIFER	GOLF COURSE	05/26/2024	13.98
ANC*ANCESTRY.COM	LEHI	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	06/19/2024	435.68
ANC*ANCESTRY.COM	LEHI	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	06/15/2024	49.99
ANIMAL CARE EQUIPMENT	BROOMFIELD	BRENDON MEILI	PARKS	06/13/2024	294.76
ANIMAL CARE EQUIPMENT	BROOMFIELD	SUSAN KENNEY	POLICE	06/12/2024	555.52
ARROWSTAGELINES.COM	OMAHA	KATHY MARTIN	REC CENTER	06/18/2024	1,445.00
ARROWSTAGELINES.COM	OMAHA	KATHY MARTIN	REC CENTER	06/18/2024	1,245.00
ARROWSTAGELINES.COM	OMAHA	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	06/05/2024	1,445.00
ARROWSTAGELINES.COM	OMAHA	KATIE TOFTE	REC CENTER	06/05/2024	1,445.00
ARROWSTAGELINES.COM	OMAHA	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	06/05/2024	1,445.00
AUSTIN HARDWARE & SUPP	816-246-2800	MATTHEW ROWE	FACILITIES	06/07/2024	31.83
AUSTIN HARDWARE & SUPP	816-246-2800	MATTHEW ROWE	FACILITIES	06/06/2024	37.29
AUTOAUTH SERVICE	8888302884	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	06/12/2024	50.00
AWWA EVENTS	303-794-7711	KELLY THARP	OPERATIONS	06/04/2024	550.00
AWWA.ORG	303-347-6197	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	05/30/2024	639.36
AXS.COMDENVER	8889297849	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	06/13/2024	445.00

AMAZON.COM*0L64J4VI3	AMZN.COM/BILL	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	06/07/2024	218.00
AMAZON.COM*203P70IO3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	06/01/2024	36.73
AMAZON.COM*6Q2269Y83	AMZN.COM/BILL	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	05/22/2024	25.34
AMAZON.COM*7P6KC5013	AMZN.COM/BILL	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	05/30/2024	25.42
AMAZON.COM*8Y0LM45X3	AMZN.COM/BILL	GENEVIEVE KLINE	CITY CLERK	06/18/2024	37.41
AMAZON.COM*996MF7803	AMZN.COM/BILL	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	05/30/2024	89.99
AMAZON.COM*A19C871O3	AMZN.COM/BILL	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	05/30/2024	189.00
AMAZON.COM*AH49J8T63	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	05/21/2024	27.96
AMAZON.COM*BU8J715U3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	06/11/2024	19.96
AMAZON.COM*GD7J423F3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	05/21/2024	50.92
AMAZON.COM*HH6XZ2ZK3	AMZN.COM/BILL	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	06/19/2024	12.47
AMAZON.COM*K658Z3723	AMZN.COM/BILL	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	06/13/2024	167.58
AMAZON.COM*MU0LD1NA3	AMZN.COM/BILL	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	05/31/2024	34.96
AMAZON.COM*RF3HD7NU3	AMZN.COM/BILL	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/13/2024	74.20
AMAZON.COM*S693P1RQ3	AMZN.COM/BILL	JESSE DEGRAW	REC CENTER	05/29/2024	299.10
AMAZON.COM*SF4WF9353	AMZN.COM/BILL	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	06/12/2024	15.48
B&H PHOTO 800-606-6969	NEW YORK	GRACE JOHNSON	CITY MANAGER	05/23/2024	21.75
BATTERIES+BULBS #0777	LAFAYETTE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	06/13/2024	342.00
BEACON ATHLETICS, LLC	MIDDLETON	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	05/15/2024	681.00
BESTBUYCOM806940009505	888BESTBUY	PAULINA BENNETT	IT	05/31/2024	59.99
BESTBUYCOM806940009505	888BESTBUY	PAULINA BENNETT	IT	05/30/2024	829.98
BIZWEST-DIGITAL	GREELEY	ROBERT ZUCCARO	PLANNING	06/12/2024	11.00
BOSS PRINTING	BROOMFIELD	ROBERT ZUCCARO	PLANNING	05/30/2024	65.10
BOSS PRINTING	BROOMFIELD	ROBERT ZUCCARO	PLANNING	05/24/2024	140.43
BRIDGEPAY NETWORK SOLU	407-9008967	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	06/17/2024	37.30
CAPCUT	WILMINGTON	GINGER CROSS	GOLF COURSE	06/12/2024	89.99
CARAHSOFT TECHNOLOGY C	JILLIAN.SZCZE	PAULINA BENNETT	IT	06/06/2024	1,122.70
CARELPTCARELPARTS.COM	8008252148	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	06/15/2024	515.84
CENTER COPY PRINTING	303-4406000	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	06/06/2024	47.88
CENTER COPY PRINTING	303-4406000	DANNY WEIONSTOCK	REC CENTER	05/30/2024	99.94
CENTER COPY PRINTING	303-4406000	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	05/21/2024	79.56
CENTURYLINK LUMEN	888-646-0004	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	05/28/2024	1,378.20
CHILDHEALTHCONNECTION	FORT COLLINS	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/16/2024	80.00
CHILDHEALTHCONNECTION	FORT COLLINS	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/05/2024	220.00
CHIPETA LODGE LLC	RIDGWAY	CHAD ROOT	BUILDING SAFETY	06/13/2024	211.03
CHIPETA LODGE LLC	RIDGWAY	CHAD ROOT	BUILDING SAFETY	06/05/2024	167.97
CHIPOTLE 0114	LOUISVILLE	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	05/30/2024	100.00
CLUBCONNECT	9136615569	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	06/01/2024	149.00
CO GOVT SERVICES	DENVER	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/13/2024	31.44
CO MOTOR VEH SERV EMV	DENVER	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	06/11/2024	14.09
CO PARK* CO	WHEAT RIDGE	DANNY WEIONSTOCK	REC CENTER	06/19/2024	150.00
CO PARK* CO	WHEAT RIDGE	ADAM BLACKMORE	PARKS	06/11/2024	469.00
CO SECRETARY STATE FEE	DENVER	GENEVIEVE KLINE	CITY CLERK	06/04/2024	10.00
COACHING SYSTEMS	CENTENNIAL	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	06/11/2024	32.00
COACHING SYSTEMS	CENTENNIAL	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	05/28/2024	32.00
COAL CREEK ACE HARDWAR	LOUISVILLE	DEVIN MADIGAN	WASTEWATER	06/14/2024	3.87
COAL CREEK ACE HARDWAR	LOUISVILLE	DEVIN MADIGAN	WASTEWATER	06/13/2024	2.58
COAL CREEK ACE HARDWAR	LOUISVILLE	GREG VENETTE	WATER	06/11/2024	31.96
COAL CREEK ACE HARDWAR	LOUISVILLE	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	05/31/2024	19.77

COLOGRAPHIC INC	COMMERCE CITY	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/17/2024	132.50
COLOGRAPHIC INC	COMMERCE CITY	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/04/2024	450.00
COLORADO CWP	719-5456748	BRIAN SCHMID	OPERATIONS	06/14/2024	50.00
COLORADO CWP	719-5456748	BRIAN SCHMID	OPERATIONS	06/03/2024	50.00
COLORADO CWP	719-5456748	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/03/2024	50.00
COLORADO CWP	719-5456748	BRIAN SCHMID	OPERATIONS	05/20/2024	50.00
COLORADO GOLF ASSN	303-3664653	PAMELA PETERSON-HOHS	GOLF COURSE	05/20/2024	108.90
COLORADOMU* CO MUNICIP	NORTHGLENN	GENEVIEVE KLINE	CITY CLERK	06/18/2024	137.38
COLORADOMU* CO MUNICIP	NORTHGLENN	GENEVIEVE KLINE	CITY CLERK	06/17/2024	105.79
COMCAST CABLE COMM	800-COMCAST	RAFAEL GUTIERREZ	POLICE	06/13/2024	49.95
COMCAST CABLE COMM	800-COMCAST	SHARON NEMECHEK	LIBRARY	06/13/2024	111.95
COMCAST CABLE COMM	800-COMCAST	MARLA OLSON	PARKS	05/28/2024	458.62
COMCAST DENVER	800-266-2278	PAMELA PETERSON-HOHS	GOLF COURSE	06/19/2024	115.00
COMCAST DENVER	800-266-2278	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	06/13/2024	129.89
COMMUTINGSOLUTIONS.ORG	LOUISVILLE	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	06/07/2024	85.00
CONCENTRA INC	MECHANICSBURG	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/28/2024	756.00
CONCENTRA INC	MECHANICSBURG	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/24/2024	905.00
CONCENTRA INC	MECHANICSBURG	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/24/2024	724.00
CONCENTRA INC	MECHANICSBURG	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/24/2024	1,086.00
CONNECTWISE, LLC	813-463-4700	PAULINA BENNETT	IT	05/31/2024	1,272.00
CPRNATIONALCPR	6263434557	JEFFREY ROBINET	OPERATIONS	06/18/2024	19.94
CRAIGSLIST.ORG	415-399-5200	PENNY FORD	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/15/2024	25.00
CRAIGSLIST.ORG	415-399-5200	PENNY FORD	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/15/2024	25.00
CRAIGSLIST.ORG	415-399-5200	PENNY FORD	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/15/2024	25.00
CRAIGSLIST.ORG	415-399-5200	PENNY FORD	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/15/2024	25.00
CSU EXTENDED CAMPUS ON	970-4912274	VICKIE ILKO	OPERATIONS	05/28/2024	200.00
DAILY CAMERA	BOULDER	MELISSA TRACY	PUBLIC WORKS	06/07/2024	6.00
DAYLIGHT DONUTS OF DAC	DACONO	KELLY THARP	OPERATIONS	05/21/2024	23.10
DEMCO INC	800-9624463	JILL SIEWERT	LIBRARY	05/20/2024	104.30
DEN PUBLIC PARKING	DENVER	KURT KOWAR	PUBLIC WORKS	06/17/2024	48.00
DEN PUBLIC PARKING	DENVER	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	06/15/2024	180.00
DKC*DIGI KEY CORP	800-344-4539	STEVEN HUIZENGA	PARKS	06/19/2024	59.74
DLX FOR SMALLBUSINESS	800-865-1913	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	06/05/2024	394.23
DOLLARTREE	LOUISVILLE	PAMELA LEMON	REC CENTER	06/08/2024	86.25
DOLLARTREE	LOUISVILLE	KELLY THARP	OPERATIONS	05/22/2024	16.25
DOLLARTREE	LOUISVILLE	PAMELA LEMON	REC CENTER	05/20/2024	90.00
DOMINO'S 6286	LOUISVILLE	MELISSA TRACY	PUBLIC WORKS	06/05/2024	83.92
DOMINO'S 6286	LOUISVILLE	MELISSA TRACY	PUBLIC WORKS	06/05/2024	24.99
DOMINO'S 6286	LOUISVILLE	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	05/29/2024	106.69
DOMINO'S 6286	LOUISVILLE	MELISSA TRACY	PUBLIC WORKS	05/23/2024	69.92
DONORBOX PLATFORM	ALEXANDRIA	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	06/03/2024	2.23
DROPBOX*KT8ZYQ2MCGSY	DROPBOX.COM	MEREDYTH MUTH	CITY MANAGER	06/06/2024	119.88
E 470 EXPRESS TOLLS	AURORA	SARA PECK	POLICE	05/29/2024	35.00
E 470 EXPRESS TOLLS	AURORA	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	05/23/2024	6.65
EB FUTURE OF THE 36 C	8014137200	VANESSA ZARATE	PLANNING	06/05/2024	123.94
EB FUTURE OF THE 36 C	8014137200	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	05/30/2024	122.35
ESTES PARK LODGING	ESTES PARK	RAFAEL GUTIERREZ	POLICE	06/05/2024	555.00
EZCATERDJS WATERING H	8004881803	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	06/13/2024	116.55
EZCATEREINSTEIN BROS	8004881803	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	05/21/2024	137.80

EZCATERMODERN MARKET	8004881803	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	05/31/2024	142.52
EZCATERPAPA JOHNS	8004881803	KAYLA CORCELLI	PARKS	05/29/2024	76.00
EZCATERRENEGADE BURRI	8004881803	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	05/23/2024	148.70
EZCATERVILLA ITALIAN	8004881803	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	06/06/2024	150.60
FASTSIGNS 371501	BROOMFIELD	ROBERT ZUCCARO	PLANNING	06/10/2024	168.00
FASTSIGNS 371501	BROOMFIELD	ROBERT ZUCCARO	PLANNING	06/04/2024	60.28
FASTSIGNS 371501	BROOMFIELD	GINGER CROSS	GOLF COURSE	05/30/2024	120.00
FASTSIGNS 371501	BROOMFIELD	KAYLA CORCELLI	PARKS	05/24/2024	588.30
FASTSIGNS 371501	BROOMFIELD	KAYLA CORCELLI	PARKS	05/24/2024	196.10
FASTSIGNS 371501	BROOMFIELD	ROBERT ZUCCARO	PLANNING	05/24/2024	105.28
FASTSIGNS 371501	BROOMFIELD	IRIS BELENSKY	LIBRARY	05/21/2024	700.00
FEDEX OFFIC74200007427	LOUISVILLE	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/11/2024	22.74
FEDEX OFFIC74200007427	LOUISVILLE	RONDA HENGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/03/2024	85.99
FEDEX275426653748	MEMPHIS	STEVEN HUIZENGA	PARKS	06/03/2024	16.37
FIRST CHOICE-BOYER S C	303-9649400	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	06/19/2024	206.38
FIRST CHOICE-BOYER S C	303-9649400	GREG VENETTE	WATER	06/19/2024	60.85
FIRST CHOICE-BOYER S C	303-9649400	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	05/23/2024	148.93
FIRST CHOICE-BOYER S C	303-9649400	GREG VENETTE	WATER	05/23/2024	143.81
FIRST CHOICE-BOYER S C	303-9649400	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	05/23/2024	114.91
FRONT RANGE INFLATABLE	ERIE	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	05/22/2024	237.12
FRONTIER	DENVER	PAULA KNAPEK	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/05/2024	59.99
FRONTIER	DENVER	PAULA KNAPEK	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/27/2024	96.98
FS COM INC	NEW CASTLE	DANIEL WOOLDRIDGE		05/21/2024	196.00
G & G EQUIPMENT	FREDERICK	DARRICK LAYTON	PARKS	06/07/2024	120.27
GOLF AND SPORT SOLUTIO	LA SALLE	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	06/17/2024	440.63
GOLF AND SPORT SOLUTIO	LA SALLE	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	05/31/2024	447.92
GOLF AND SPORT SOLUTIO	LA SALLE	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	05/24/2024	542.68
GOLF AND SPORT SOLUTIO	LA SALLE	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	05/22/2024	535.54
GOOD TIMES BURGERS & C	LAFAYETTE	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/05/2024	58.35
GOOFY FACES	ROCHESTER HIL	IRIS BELENSKY	LIBRARY	06/11/2024	260.00
GOOFY FACES	ROCHESTER HIL	IRIS BELENSKY	LIBRARY	05/28/2024	250.00
GOVOS BOULDER RECORDS	DALLAS	GENEVIEVE KLINE	CITY CLERK	06/09/2024	20.00
GRAINGER	LAKE FOREST	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/12/2024	270.56
GRAINGER	LAKE FOREST	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/12/2024	114.68
GRAINGER	LAKE FOREST	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/12/2024	557.88
GRAINGER	LAKE FOREST	LANCE PFEIFER	GOLF COURSE	06/07/2024	421.32
GRAINGER	LAKE FOREST	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	06/05/2024	124.01
GRAINGER	LAKE FOREST	JEFF OWENS	WATER	05/23/2024	866.85
GRAINGER	LAKE FOREST	DANIEL BIDLEMEN	REC CENTER	05/23/2024	6.34
GRAINGER	LAKE FOREST	LANCE PFEIFER	GOLF COURSE	05/22/2024	85.59
GRAINGER	LAKE FOREST	DANIEL BIDLEMEN	REC CENTER	05/20/2024	26.30
GREEN CO2 SYSTEMS	970-482-0203	DANIEL BIDLEMEN	REC CENTER	06/05/2024	377.56
GREEN CO2 SYSTEMS	970-482-0203	DANIEL BIDLEMEN	REC CENTER	06/04/2024	964.04
GREEN CO2 SYSTEMS	970-482-0203	DANIEL BIDLEMEN	REC CENTER	06/03/2024	949.54
GREEN SPOT INC	LONGMONT	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	06/10/2024	1,000.00
GREEN SPOT INC	LONGMONT	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	06/05/2024	70.36
GREEN SPOT INC	LONGMONT	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	06/05/2024	1,068.07
GREEN SPOT INC	LONGMONT	CHRIS LICHTY	PARKS	05/29/2024	352.80
GRIZZLY PRESSURE WASHI	GREELEY	SARA PECK	POLICE	05/21/2024	455.00

HARRELL S, LLC	863-687-2774	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	05/23/2024	879.69
HILLYARD INC DENVER	DENVER	PAMELA PETERSON-HOHS	GOLF COURSE	06/17/2024	374.00
HILLYARD INC DENVER	DENVER	PAMELA PETERSON-HOHS	GOLF COURSE	05/23/2024	324.40
HISTORY COLORADO	DENVER	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	06/17/2024	1.00
HYATT HOTELS	INDIANAPOLIS	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/22/2024	859.95
HYATT HOTELS	INDIANAPOLIS	MICHELLE CLINGAN	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/22/2024	859.95
HYATT REGENCY INIDANAP	INDIANAPOLIS	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/22/2024	30.42
HYATT REGENCY INIDANAP	INDIANAPOLIS	MICHELLE CLINGAN	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/22/2024	31.11
HYATT REGENCY INIDANAP	INDIANAPOLIS	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/20/2024	31.11
HYATT REGENCY INIDANAP	INDIANAPOLIS	MICHELLE CLINGAN	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/20/2024	30.42
IACP	703-836-6767	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	06/04/2024	250.00
IACP	703-836-6767	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	06/04/2024	445.00
ICMA ONLINE	2022894262	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	06/12/2024	810.00
IEDC ONLINE	WASHINGTON	VANESSA ZARATE	PLANNING	05/28/2024	189.58
IIMC	RCH CUCAMONGA	GENEVIEVE KLINE	CITY CLERK	06/04/2024	80.00
IN *AMERICAN BIOIDENTI	303-8864747	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/08/2024	54.50
IN *ARROWHEAD AWARDS,	303-4479407	SHANE MAHAN	OPERATIONS	06/05/2024	35.00
IN *ARROWHEAD AWARDS,	303-4479407	GENEVIEVE KLINE	CITY CLERK	05/30/2024	20.00
IN *GRAFF'S TURF FARMS	970-8678873	KERRY KRAMER	PARKS	06/03/2024	612.00
IN *KAISER LOCK & KEY	303-4493880	ERIK SWIATEK	PARKS	06/18/2024	22.50
IN *KAISER LOCK & KEY	303-4493880	NICHOLAS POTOPCHUK	PARKS	06/10/2024	17.44
IN *LANGUAGEUSA, INC.	713-7833800	DEREK COSSON	CITY MANAGER	05/28/2024	180.96
IN *LANGUAGEUSA, INC.	713-7833800	DEREK COSSON	CITY MANAGER	05/28/2024	229.75
IN *LANGUAGEUSA, INC.	713-7833800	DEREK COSSON	CITY MANAGER	05/28/2024	45.00
IN *MODERN IMAGING SOL	800-262-3246	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/13/2024	159.90
IN *WYLD ENDURANCE	207-9305484	PAUL BORTH	REC CENTER	05/24/2024	519.40
INDUSTRIAL CHEMICALS C	ARVADA	JEFF OWENS	WATER	06/06/2024	834.61
INSTANT IMPRINTS LOUIS	LOUISVILLE	BARBARA MACFERRIN	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/10/2024	1,000.00
INT'L CODE COUNCIL INC	888-422-7233	RANDY DEWITZ	BUILDING SAFETY	06/10/2024	305.00
INTERNATIONAL FACILITY	HOUSTON	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	06/04/2024	638.00
IRON BEAR TRAILER	DENVER	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	05/20/2024	146.00
IRON BEAR TRAILER	DENVER	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	05/20/2024	9.80
JAX - 06	LAFAYETTE	JACOB MARINKOVICH	PARKS	06/07/2024	40.00
JAX - 06	LAFAYETTE	LUKE LAYTON	PARKS	06/05/2024	39.98
JAX - 06	LAFAYETTE	KERRY KRAMER	PARKS	05/30/2024	91.42
JAX - 06	LAFAYETTE	CATHERINE JEPSON	PARKS	05/29/2024	18.99
JERSEY MIKES ONLINE UC	MANASQUAN	SARA PECK	POLICE	06/12/2024	71.17
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	06/17/2024	80.73
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	06/14/2024	162.80
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/11/2024	37.97
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	NICHOLAS POTOPCHUK	PARKS	06/08/2024	62.79
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	06/07/2024	8.97
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	06/06/2024	77.34
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	MELISSA TRACY	PUBLIC WORKS	06/05/2024	28.98
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	06/04/2024	42.50
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	05/30/2024	197.51
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	05/28/2024	99.35
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	NICHOLAS POTOPCHUK	PARKS	05/25/2024	47.47
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	05/26/2024	16.97

KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	KATIE TOFTE	REC CENTER	05/23/2024	35.96
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	05/23/2024	72.00
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	MELISSA TRACY	PUBLIC WORKS	05/23/2024	39.94
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	05/22/2024	82.91
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	05/22/2024	59.97
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	KELLY THARP	OPERATIONS	05/21/2024	460.41
KING SOOPERS #0013	LOUISVILLE	KIANA FREEMAN	CITY MANAGER	05/21/2024	78.07
KING SOOPERS 0137	ARVADA	SARA PECK	POLICE	06/09/2024	28.26
LAFAYETTE LUMBER	LAFAYETTE	NICHOLAS POTOPCHUK	PARKS	06/10/2024	853.75
LANDS END BUS OUTFITTE	DODGEVILLE	JEN KENNEY	POLICE	06/14/2024	196.08
LANGUAGE LINE	MONTEREY	MEREDYTH MUTH	CITY MANAGER	06/07/2024	24.53
LES MILLS US TRADING	CHICAGO	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	06/07/2024	389.00
LL JOHNSON DIST CO	DENVER	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	05/21/2024	311.96
LL JOHNSON DIST CO	DENVER	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	05/21/2024	164.57
LOCO HERMANOS	LOUISVILLE	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	06/14/2024	38.85
LOVELAND LASER TAG	LOVELAND	ANIKA VAN WOUDENBERG	REC CENTER	06/05/2024	530.00
LOWES #03444*	ERIE	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/13/2024	159.00
LOWES #03444*	ERIE	LANCE PFEIFER	GOLF COURSE	05/23/2024	724.00
LS CELESTIAL SEASONIN	BOULDER	KATIE TOFTE	REC CENTER	06/04/2024	95.00
LS LOUISVILLE CYCLERY	LOUISVILLE	BENJAMIN WHITE-PATARIN	PARKS	06/17/2024	35.97
LS LOUISVILLE CYCLERY	LOUISVILLE	BEN REDARD	POLICE	06/13/2024	130.00
LS LOUISVILLE CYCLERY	LOUISVILLE	BEN REDARD	POLICE	05/31/2024	199.98
LYFT *1 RIDE 05-19	SAN FRANCISCO	NICK PROSSER	IT	05/20/2024	4.24
LYFT *1 RIDE 05-20	SAN FRANCISCO	NICK PROSSER	IT	05/21/2024	7.84
LYFT *1 RIDE 05-21	SAN FRANCISCO	NICK PROSSER	IT	05/22/2024	7.29
LYFT *4 RIDES 05-22	SAN FRANCISCO	NICK PROSSER	IT	05/23/2024	62.74
LAMARS DONUTS #45	LOUISVILLE	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/19/2024	17.99
LAMARS DONUTS #45	LOUISVILLE	JEFF DURBIN	CITY MANAGER	06/05/2024	21.89
LAMARS DONUTS #45	LOUISVILLE	KATIE TOFTE	REC CENTER	06/01/2024	71.96
LAMARS DONUTS #45	LOUISVILLE	VANESSA ZARATE	PLANNING	05/23/2024	39.98
LAMARS DONUTS #45	LOUISVILLE	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	05/20/2024	89.76
LINKEDIN JOB 965452772	MOUNTAIN VIEW	PENNY FORD	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/13/2024	206.00
MAC EQUIPMENT INC (LON	LONGMONT	LUKE LAYTON	PARKS	06/17/2024	103.26
MAC EQUIPMENT INC (LON	LONGMONT	NICHOLAS POTOPCHUK	PARKS	06/10/2024	23.90
MAILCHIMP *MISC	MAILCHIMP.COM	DEREK COSSON	CITY MANAGER	06/18/2024	514.25
MICROAGE	PHOENIX	DANIEL WOOLDRIDGE		06/12/2024	138.00
MICROAGE	PHOENIX	DANIEL WOOLDRIDGE		06/11/2024	914.00
MILE HIGH TURFGRASS LL	EVERGREEN	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	06/06/2024	1,397.00
MORRELL PRINTING SOLUT	LAFAYETTE	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	06/03/2024	64.80
MOTHER CABRINI	GOLDEN	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	06/06/2024	150.00
MOUNTAIN STATE EMPLOYE	3038395177	BARBARA MACFERRIN	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/18/2024	690.00
MOUNTAIN STATE EMPLOYE	3038395177	BARBARA MACFERRIN	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/17/2024	465.00
MOUNTAIN STATE EMPLOYE	3038395177	BARBARA MACFERRIN	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/20/2024	29.00
MUSCO SPORTS LIGHTING	OSKALOOSA	KAYLA CORCELLI	PARKS	06/17/2024	475.00
NAPA AUTO 0025122	BOULDER	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	06/07/2024	41.66
NAPA AUTO 0025122	BOULDER	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	06/07/2024	3,871.78
NAPA AUTO 0025122	BOULDER	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	05/30/2024	2,719.73
NEW YORK, NEW YORK HOTEL AND	LAS VEGAS	VANESSA ZARATE	PLANNING	05/21/2024	221.09
NORTHWEST PARKWAY LLC	303-9262500	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	05/22/2024	13.25

O MEARA FORD	NORTHGLENN	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/18/2024	658.30
O MEARA FORD	NORTHGLENN	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/13/2024	245.35
O MEARA FORD	NORTHGLENN	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/06/2024	108.39
O MEARA FORD	NORTHGLENN	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	06/03/2024	363.75
O MEARA FORD	NORTHGLENN	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	05/29/2024	398.75
O MEARA FORD	NORTHGLENN	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	05/28/2024	557.73
OFFICE DEPOT #1078	KENT	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	05/29/2024	78.99
OFFICE DEPOT #1080	DENVER	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/18/2024	591.87
OFFICE DEPOT #456	COLORADO SPGS	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	05/28/2024	10.89
OPENAI *CHATGPT SUBSCR	SAN FRANCISCO	PAULINA BENNETT	IT	06/13/2024	600.00
ORG SUB FEE	SAN FRANCISCO	DEREK COSSON	CITY MANAGER	05/23/2024	29.00
OTC BRANDS INC	OMAHA	LARISSA HOFFMAN	REC CENTER	05/28/2024	325.74
OTC BRANDS INC	OMAHA	LARISSA HOFFMAN	REC CENTER	05/27/2024	23.15
OTC BRANDS INC	OMAHA	LARISSA HOFFMAN	REC CENTER	05/24/2024	20.43
PANERA BREAD #202432 O	720-304-7000	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	05/23/2024	133.60
PAYFLOW/PAYPAL	LAVISTA	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	06/03/2024	59.95
PAYFLOW/PAYPAL	LAVISTA	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	06/03/2024	19.95
PAYPAL *ARTCHEESELL	4029357733	PATRICIA MORGAN	REC CENTER	05/20/2024	357.50
PEARSON EDUCATION LTD.	4401279623623	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	05/28/2024	345.09
PEARSON EDUCATION LTD.	4401279623623	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	05/28/2024	927.90
PEARSON EDUCATION LTD.	4401279623623	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	05/28/2024	345.09
PEARSON EDUCATION LTD.	4401279623623	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	05/28/2024	355.31
PEARSON EDUCATION LTD.	4401279623623	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	05/28/2024	746.41
PETSMART # 1015	SUPERIOR	GINGER CROSS	GOLF COURSE	05/21/2024	12.99
PFMC BOULDER	BOULDER	RONDA HENGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/14/2024	95.00
PFMC BOULDER	BOULDER	RONDA HENGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/12/2024	110.00
PFMC BOULDER	BOULDER	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/24/2024	190.00
PIONEER SAND CO	LONGMONT	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	06/12/2024	140.00
PIONEER SAND CO 15	BROOMFIELD	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	06/13/2024	94.15
PIONEER SAND CO 15	BROOMFIELD	KERRY KRAMER	PARKS	05/29/2024	358.80
PIONEER SAND CO 15	BROOMFIELD	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	05/23/2024	22.71
PIONEER SAND CO 15	BROOMFIELD	JACOB MARINKOVICH	PARKS	05/23/2024	299.00
PIONEER SAND CO 15	BROOMFIELD	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	05/23/2024	71.25
PIONEER SAND CO 15	BROOMFIELD	JACOB MARINKOVICH	PARKS	05/23/2024	209.30
PIONEER SAND CO 15	BROOMFIELD	JACOB MARINKOVICH	PARKS	05/23/2024	299.00
PIONEER SAND CO 15	BROOMFIELD	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	05/22/2024	92.61
PIONEER SAND CO 15	BROOMFIELD	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	05/22/2024	46.56
PIONEER SAND CO 15	BROOMFIELD	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	05/21/2024	94.15
PIONEER SAND CO HQ	COLORADO SPRI	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	06/19/2024	562.39
PIONEER SAND CO HQ	COLORADO SPRI	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	05/30/2024	301.20
POLL EVERYWHERE, INC.	8003882039	BARBARA MACFERRIN	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/31/2024	120.00
PRAIRIE MOUNTAIN MEDIA	BOULDER	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	06/12/2024	798.16
PSI SERVICES INC USD	GLENDALE	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	05/24/2024	180.00
PSI SERVICES INC USD	GLENDALE	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	05/24/2024	180.00
PSI SERVICES INC USD	GLENDALE	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	05/24/2024	180.00
PSI SERVICES INC USD	GLENDALE	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	05/24/2024	180.00
PSI SERVICES INC USD	GLENDALE	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	05/24/2024	180.00
PSI SERVICES INC USD	GLENDALE	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	05/24/2024	180.00
PSI SERVICES LLC USD	8188476180	BRIAN SCHMID	OPERATIONS	06/17/2024	104.00

PSI SERVICES LLC USD	8188476180	JEFFREY ROBINET	OPERATIONS	06/06/2024	104.00
PSI SERVICES LLC USD	8188476180	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/04/2024	104.00
PSI SERVICES LLC USD	8188476180	JEFFREY ROBINET	OPERATIONS	06/04/2024	104.00
PSI SERVICES LLC USD	8188476180	JEFFREY ROBINET	OPERATIONS	06/04/2024	104.00
PSI SERVICES LLC USD	8188476180	VICKIE ILKO	OPERATIONS	05/30/2024	104.00
PSI SERVICES LLC USD	8188476180	BRIAN SCHMID	OPERATIONS	05/21/2024	104.00
PSI SERVICES LLC USD	8188476180	SHANE MAHAN	OPERATIONS	05/20/2024	104.00
PY *STORQUEST-LOUISVIL	LOUISVILLE	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	05/30/2024	429.00
PY *SWEET COW LOUISVIL	LOUISVILLE	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	06/03/2024	110.00
PET SCOOP	DENVER	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	06/01/2024	558.00
PRESTIGE FLAG	SAN DIEGO	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	05/22/2024	1,805.03
R&R PRODUCTS	5208893593	LANCE PFEIFER	GOLF COURSE	06/13/2024	797.50
R&R PRODUCTS	5208893593	LANCE PFEIFER	GOLF COURSE	05/20/2024	643.25
RED WING SHOES #563	BRIGHTON	RICHARD RESENDEZ	OPERATIONS	06/06/2024	225.00
RME*THE GOLFWORKS	800-848-8358	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/12/2024	125.62
ROSATI S CHICAGO PIZZA	LOUISVILLE	SARA PECK	POLICE	06/11/2024	74.17
ROSATI S CHICAGO PIZZA	LOUISVILLE	PAUL BORTH	REC CENTER	06/08/2024	200.00
RVT*BOULDER VALLEY SCH	BOULDER	JESSE DEGRAW	REC CENTER	06/04/2024	385.00
S&S WORLDWIDE, INC.	COLCHESTER	LARISSA HOFFMAN	REC CENTER	06/12/2024	56.97
S&S WORLDWIDE, INC.	COLCHESTER	LARISSA HOFFMAN	REC CENTER	05/24/2024	143.45
SAFEWAY #2812	LOUISVILLE	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/13/2024	64.62
SAFEWAY #2812	LOUISVILLE	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	06/14/2024	11.09
SAFEWAY #2812	LOUISVILLE	DANNY WEIONSTOCK	REC CENTER	06/08/2024	48.28
SAFEWAY #2812	LOUISVILLE	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/05/2024	29.95
SAFEWAY #2812	LOUISVILLE	NORMAN MERLO	GOLF COURSE	05/30/2024	6.79
SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	303-7902777	KAYLA CORCELLI	PARKS	06/18/2024	100.63
SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	303-7902777	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	06/06/2024	102.30
SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	303-7902777	KAYLA CORCELLI	PARKS	05/30/2024	109.75
SAMEDAY OFFICE SUPPLY	303-7902777	KAYLA CORCELLI	PARKS	05/22/2024	167.00
SANTIAGOS MEXICAN REST	ARVADA	SARA PECK	POLICE	06/10/2024	30.99
SANTIAGOS MEXICAN REST	SUPERIOR	KATIE BEASLEY	REC CENTER	06/01/2024	272.00
SANTIAGOS MEXICAN REST	LAFAYETTE	MELISSA TRACY	PUBLIC WORKS	05/23/2024	52.25
SHERWIN WILLIAMS 70168	DENVER	SHANE MAHAN	OPERATIONS	06/10/2024	150.00
SIMPLOT T&H DEN 1417	DENVER	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	06/05/2024	195.50
SIP.US	ALPHARETTA	DEVIN MADIGAN	WASTEWATER	06/09/2024	30.67
SITEONE LANDSCAPE SUPP	BROOMFIELD	GEOFFREY KOZLOWSKI	PARKS	06/13/2024	125.00
SITEONE LANDSCAPE SUPP	BROOMFIELD	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	06/10/2024	104.42
SITEONE LANDSCAPE SUPP	BROOMFIELD	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	06/06/2024	563.93
SITEONE LANDSCAPE SUPP	BROOMFIELD	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	06/04/2024	1,634.94
SITEONE LANDSCAPE SUPP	BROOMFIELD	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	05/29/2024	211.91
SMK*SURVEYMONKEY.COM	PALO ALTO	JEN KENNEY	POLICE	06/05/2024	99.00
SMUGMUG.COM	MOUNTAIN VIEW	GINGER CROSS	GOLF COURSE	06/10/2024	120.00
SNARFS 34 LOUISVILLE	LOUISVILLE	KATHY MARTIN	REC CENTER	05/30/2024	100.00
SNARFS 34 LOUISVILLE	LOUISVILLE	KATHY MARTIN	REC CENTER	05/30/2024	130.85
SNARFS 34 LOUISVILLE	LOUISVILLE	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	05/23/2024	13.34
SNARFS 34 LOUISVILLE	LOUISVILLE	MARLA OLSON	PARKS	05/23/2024	98.89
SP GOLF CARS OF HOUSTO	HOUSTON	LANCE PFEIFER	GOLF COURSE	06/13/2024	183.08
SP GOLF CARS OF HOUSTO	HOUSTON	LANCE PFEIFER	GOLF COURSE	05/23/2024	274.26
SP NOTARYSTAMP.COM	BROOKFIELD	GENEVIEVE KLINE	CITY CLERK	06/14/2024	56.07

SPI*DIRECTV SERVICE	888-388-4249	PAMELA PETERSON-HOHS	GOLF COURSE	05/20/2024	243.92
SPLASH AT FOSSIL TRACE	GOLDEN	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/12/2024	437.50
SPO*PARMATRATTORIAMOZZ	LOUISVILLE	SARA PECK	POLICE	06/10/2024	207.65
SPRINGHILL SUITES	ANAHEIM	KURT KOWAR	PUBLIC WORKS	06/15/2024	2,148.60
SQ *ARTSHOW.COM	GOSQ.COM	IRIS BELENSKY	LIBRARY	05/31/2024	35.00
SQ *GIOVANNITTI COFFEE	LOUISVILLE	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	05/21/2024	50.00
SQ *HARLEQUIN'S GARDEN	BOULDER	NATHANIEL GOECKNER	PARKS	05/31/2024	132.90
SQ *HARLEQUIN'S GARDEN	BOULDER	NATHANIEL GOECKNER	PARKS	05/23/2024	396.81
SQ *PLAY IT FUNWARD	GOSQ.COM	IRIS BELENSKY	LIBRARY	06/11/2024	1,000.00
STAPLS7632994115000001	877-8267755	MARLA OLSON	PARKS	05/24/2024	88.98
STAPLS7633499651000001	877-8267755	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	06/01/2024	979.80
STARBUCKS STORE 05587	LOUISVILLE	SARA PECK	POLICE	06/10/2024	23.79
STERICYCLE INC/SHRED-I	BANNOCKBURN	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	06/13/2024	34.17
STERICYCLE INC/SHRED-I	BANNOCKBURN	SARA PECK	POLICE	06/11/2024	30.00
STERICYCLE INC/SHRED-I	BANNOCKBURN	MEREDYTH MUTH	CITY MANAGER	06/07/2024	30.00
STERICYCLE INC/SHRED-I	BANNOCKBURN	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/01/2024	30.00
STERICYCLE INC/SHRED-I	BANNOCKBURN	MARLA OLSON	PARKS	05/30/2024	183.54
STERICYCLE INC/SHRED-I	BANNOCKBURN	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	05/23/2024	34.02
STICKER MULE	AMSTERDAM	GRACE JOHNSON	CITY MANAGER	06/17/2024	113.00
STICKER MULE	AMSTERDAM	GRACE JOHNSON	CITY MANAGER	05/20/2024	129.50
SWA INFLIGHT WIFI	800-435-9792	KURT KOWAR	PUBLIC WORKS	06/18/2024	8.00
SWA INFLIGHT WIFI	800-435-9792	KURT KOWAR	PUBLIC WORKS	06/09/2024	8.00
STAPLES INC	STAPLES.COM	KELLY THARP	OPERATIONS	05/22/2024	99.98
TABLECOVERSN	2815338932	GRACE JOHNSON	CITY MANAGER	05/28/2024	292.86
THE GRILL AT COAL CREE	L	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/15/2024	999.50
THE GRILL AT COAL CREE	L	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/15/2024	839.59
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JACOB MARINKOVICH	PARKS	06/18/2024	26.00
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	GEOFFREY KOZLOWSKI	PARKS	06/18/2024	33.12
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	06/18/2024	20.60
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	GEOFFREY KOZLOWSKI	PARKS	06/18/2024	27.80
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	06/17/2024	15.64
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	06/18/2024	58.92
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	SHANE MAHAN	OPERATIONS	06/13/2024	30.73
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JACOB MARINKOVICH	PARKS	06/14/2024	6.28
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ABBY MCNEAL	PARKS	06/13/2024	184.19
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	06/13/2024	9.94
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	RICHARD RESENDEZ	OPERATIONS	06/13/2024	40.34
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	06/14/2024	165.89
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	06/13/2024	68.41
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	THOMAS CZAJKA	OPERATIONS	06/14/2024	76.91
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	GREG VENETTE	WATER	06/12/2024	103.82
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JILL MUNIZ	PARKS	06/12/2024	237.03
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	SHANE MAHAN	OPERATIONS	06/12/2024	24.67
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	THOMAS CZAJKA	OPERATIONS	06/12/2024	148.64
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	GEOFFREY KOZLOWSKI	PARKS	06/12/2024	34.97
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JACOB MARINKOVICH	PARKS	06/12/2024	309.40
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	06/12/2024	22.68
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	06/11/2024	11.94
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	MATTHEW ROWE	FACILITIES	06/11/2024	12.87

THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	06/11/2024	80.94
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	KEVIN FREY	FACILITIES	06/11/2024	97.94
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	RENEE LEWELLYN	OPERATIONS	06/11/2024	86.90
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	06/10/2024	84.53
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	STEVEN HUIZENGA	PARKS	06/10/2024	273.39
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	GREG VENETTE	WATER	06/10/2024	19.97
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL BIDLEMEN	REC CENTER	06/06/2024	62.39
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	06/06/2024	21.97
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	06/07/2024	13.82
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	06/06/2024	53.81
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	SHANE MAHAN	OPERATIONS	06/06/2024	9.98
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	MATT LOOMIS	PARKS	06/07/2024	23.28
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	IRIS BELENSKY	LIBRARY	06/06/2024	431.94
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/06/2024	93.45
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	06/07/2024	16.82
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	06/06/2024	41.58
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JILL MUNIZ	PARKS	06/05/2024	208.68
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFF ROBISON	FACILITIES	06/05/2024	10.65
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	SHANE MAHAN	OPERATIONS	06/05/2024	45.55
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DARRICK LAYTON	PARKS	06/05/2024	88.84
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	KEN MATHEWS	OPERATIONS	06/05/2024	20.97
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	06/05/2024	118.54
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	06/04/2024	133.38
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JACOB MARINKOVICH	PARKS	06/04/2024	69.55
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	KEN MATHEWS	OPERATIONS	06/04/2024	81.38
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	NICHOLAS POTOPCHUK	PARKS	06/04/2024	127.01
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	06/04/2024	15.58
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	HUGO VALDEZ	OPERATIONS	06/04/2024	63.95
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	AARON GRANT	PARKS	05/30/2024	23.96
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	05/30/2024	26.94
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFF OWENS	WATER	05/30/2024	23.54
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL BIDLEMEN	REC CENTER	05/30/2024	27.89
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	CATHERINE JEPSON	PARKS	05/30/2024	36.51
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	05/30/2024	10.98
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JACOB MARINKOVICH	PARKS	05/30/2024	18.84
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	NATHANIEL GOECKNER	PARKS	05/31/2024	629.87
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	VICKIE ILKO	OPERATIONS	05/30/2024	39.88
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFFREY ROBINET	OPERATIONS	05/30/2024	35.48
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	05/29/2024	79.97
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	HUGO VALDEZ	OPERATIONS	05/29/2024	498.09
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFF ROBISON	FACILITIES	05/29/2024	27.41
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFF ROBISON	FACILITIES	05/29/2024	49.49
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	05/29/2024	171.97
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	05/28/2024	88.35
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFF ROBISON	FACILITIES	05/28/2024	61.86
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL BIDLEMEN	REC CENTER	05/28/2024	81.72
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	LANCE PFEIFER	GOLF COURSE	05/28/2024	4.14
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	KERRY KRAMER	PARKS	05/28/2024	248.98
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JACOB MARINKOVICH	PARKS	05/24/2024	62.47

THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JACOB MARINKOVICH	PARKS	05/24/2024	10.47
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	NICHOLAS POTOPCHUK	PARKS	05/23/2024	363.10
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFF ROBISON	FACILITIES	05/23/2024	47.42
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	AARON GRANT	PARKS	05/23/2024	11.92
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	05/23/2024	71.55
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	05/24/2024	29.97
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	05/23/2024	9.81
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	MATT LOOMIS	PARKS	05/24/2024	35.76
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	RYAN MORRIS	POLICE	05/26/2024	11.98
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	MATTHEW ROWE	FACILITIES	05/23/2024	11.48
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	05/22/2024	106.96
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	PAUL BORTH	REC CENTER	05/22/2024	50.67
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JOSE TORRES	OPERATIONS	05/22/2024	21.98
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	MATT LOOMIS	PARKS	05/22/2024	8.59
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	ANDY ELLIS	PARKS	05/21/2024	79.88
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JOSEPH CAMPANA	OPERATIONS	05/21/2024	80.14
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	BRADLEY AUSTIN	PARKS	05/21/2024	28.01
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	05/21/2024	29.98
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	BENJAMIN FRANCISCO	OPERATIONS	05/21/2024	429.72
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	HUGO VALDEZ	OPERATIONS	05/21/2024	54.27
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	HUGO VALDEZ	OPERATIONS	05/21/2024	35.39
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	HUGO VALDEZ	OPERATIONS	05/21/2024	34.31
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JOSEPH CAMPANA	OPERATIONS	05/20/2024	59.73
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	05/20/2024	247.53
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFFREY ROBINET	OPERATIONS	05/20/2024	137.00
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JACK MANIAN	OPERATIONS	05/20/2024	29.16
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	DANIEL SALAS ROBLES	PARKS	05/20/2024	14.03
THE HOME DEPOT #1506	LOUISVILLE	JEFFREY ROBINET	OPERATIONS	05/20/2024	142.74
THE HOME DEPOT #1524	BROOMFIELD	JACK MANIAN	OPERATIONS	05/20/2024	58.32
THE HOME DEPOT PRO	ATLANTA	KATHLEEN D LORENZO	PARKS	06/15/2024	661.98
THE INSTITUTES	6106442100	DAWN BURGESS	CITY MANAGER	06/13/2024	476.75
THE INSTITUTES	6106442100	DAWN BURGESS	CITY MANAGER	06/06/2024	159.50
THE TORO COMPANY	BLOOMINGTON	LANCE PFEIFER	GOLF COURSE	05/30/2024	999.00
THE TREE FARM	LONGMONT	SANDRA GROW	GOLF COURSE	06/10/2024	134.70
THE WEBSTAURANT STORE	LANCASTER	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/07/2024	39.56
TOWN OF SUPERIOR	303-499-3675	ERIK SWIATEK	PARKS	06/05/2024	14.37
TRACTOR SUPPLY #2105	LAFAYETTE	JOSEPH CAMPANA	OPERATIONS	05/21/2024	39.13
TRELLO.COM* ATLASSIAN	NEW YORK	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	05/27/2024	102.00
TST* BUSABA THAI	LOUISVILLE	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	05/21/2024	216.74
TST* LULUS BBQ	LOUISVILLE	GREG VENETTE	WATER	06/18/2024	139.20
TST* LULUS BBQ	LOUISVILLE	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/03/2024	77.40
TST* LULUS BBQ	LOUISVILLE	DILLON FEE	OPERATIONS	06/01/2024	119.40
TST* RUBY RU'S - CENTA	LAFAYETTE	PAULINA BENNETT	IT	06/07/2024	85.63
TST* ST. ELMO	INDIANAPOLIS	MICHELLE CLINGAN	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/21/2024	71.94
TST* THE HUCKLEBERRY	LOUISVILLE	JEFF DURBIN	CITY MANAGER	05/23/2024	43.41
TST* TIBETS RESTAURANT	LOUISVILLE	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/04/2024	77.16
TST* WATERLOO	LOUISVILLE	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/15/2024	86.40
TRANSPARENT INFORMATIO	3032178747	LESLIE RINGER	HUMAN RESOURCES	06/05/2024	85.65
UBER TRIP	8005928996	KURT KOWAR	PUBLIC WORKS	06/17/2024	65.61

UBER TRIP	8005928996	KURT KOWAR	PUBLIC WORKS	06/10/2024	59.89
UBER TRIP	8005928996	MICHELLE CLINGAN	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/22/2024	24.32
UDEMY: ONLINE COURSES	SAN FRANCISCO	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	06/14/2024	92.34
ULINE *SHIP SUPPLIES	800-295-5510	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/15/2024	113.65
ULINE *SHIP SUPPLIES	800-295-5510	GREG VENETTE	WATER	06/15/2024	708.36
ULINE *SHIP SUPPLIES	800-295-5510	TREVOR DEPEW	WATER	06/08/2024	179.35
UNDERGROUNDSHIRTS.COM	YPSILANTI	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	05/27/2024	65.18
UNITED AIRLINES	UNITED.COM	JULIE SEYDEL	REC CENTER	06/06/2024	35.00
UNITED AIRLINES	UNITED.COM	JULIE SEYDEL	REC CENTER	06/06/2024	385.20
UNITED AIRLINES	UNITED.COM	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	06/04/2024	107.00
UNITED AIRLINES	UNITED.COM	KELLY THARP	OPERATIONS	06/04/2024	556.96
UNITED AIRLINES	UNITED.COM	KELLY THARP	OPERATIONS	06/04/2024	89.99
UNITED AIRLINES	UNITED.COM	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	06/04/2024	371.95
UNITED AIRLINES	UNITED.COM	MIKE MILLER	POLICE	06/04/2024	107.00
UNITED AIRLINES	UNITED.COM	KELLY THARP	OPERATIONS	06/04/2024	76.99
UNITED AIRLINES	UNITED.COM	PAULA KNAPEK	HUMAN RESOURCES	05/27/2024	108.47
USPS KIOSK 0756709550	SUPERIOR	LINDSEY WITTY	REC CENTER	06/19/2024	11.60
VALLEY CHRYSLER DODGE	BOULDER	MASON THOMPSON	OPERATIONS	05/28/2024	727.20
VSI*LOUISVILLE RECTRA	LOUISVILLE	GINGER CROSS	GOLF COURSE	06/17/2024	38.00
VSP*GAYLORD ARCHIVAL	SYRACUSE	GIGI YANG	LIBRARY	06/07/2024	192.70
VZWRLSS*MY VZ VB P	800-922-0204	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	05/23/2024	8,177.59
VZWRLSS*PRPAY AUTOPAY	888-294-6804	MINDY OLKJER	PUBLIC WORKS	06/08/2024	20.00
WAL-MART #1045	LAFAYETTE	ANIKA VAN WOUDENBERG	REC CENTER	05/28/2024	148.60
WAL-MART #5341	BROOMFIELD	SARA PECK	POLICE	06/07/2024	263.46
WAL-MART #5341	BROOMFIELD	SARA PECK	POLICE	05/26/2024	8.66
WALGREENS #7006	SUPERIOR	ELI SALO	REC CENTER	06/04/2024	10.99
WALGREENS #7006	SUPERIOR	LIGEA FERRARO	CITY MANAGER	05/21/2024	3.99
WARRIOR CHALLENGE AREN	BROOMFIELD	ANIKA VAN WOUDENBERG	REC CENTER	06/19/2024	800.80
WAVE - *SCHAEFER ATHLE	LONGMONT	AMANDA PERERA	REC CENTER	06/05/2024	510.15
WEBSTICKER.COM	STOWE	SARA PECK	POLICE	06/13/2024	385.00
WESTIN	SNOWMASS VLG	PAULINA BENNETT	IT	06/12/2024	511.07
WESTIN	SNOWMASS VLG	PAULINA BENNETT	IT	06/07/2024	263.95
WILBUR ELLIS DENVER	DENVER	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	05/31/2024	452.78
WILBUR ELLIS DENVER	DENVER	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	06/05/2024	292.80
WILBUR ELLIS DENVER	DENVER	DAVID DEAN	GOLF COURSE	05/31/2024	422.00
WWW COSTCO COM	800-955-2292	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/16/2024	252.70
XEROX BUSINESS SOLUTIO	PAYMYINVOICE@	TANYA SCOTT	FINANCE	05/29/2024	1,026.54
EBAY O*06-11646-82617	SAN JOSE	DAVID BARIL	GOLF COURSE	06/02/2024	22.99
					$146,129.72
				B.Francisco - Fraud	$2,719.80
					$143,409.92

SUBJECT: **AWARD CONTRACT FOR 2024 CRACK SEAL PROJECT**

DATE: **JULY 16, 2024**

PRESENTED BY: **KURT KOWAR, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT**

SUMMARY:
Staff recommends approval of the 2024 Crack Seal contract with CKC Operations, LLC for the base bid amount of $133,758.24 plus a 10% contingency in the amount of $14,000.00.

2024 CRACK SEAL PROJECT
Staff advertised the 2024 Crack Seal Project on June 7 and 14, 2024. Bids were received on June 24, 2024. Bids received are as follows:

Contractor	Base Bid
CKC Operations, LLC	$133.758.24
Coatings, INC	$156,340.80

Staff recommends CKC Operations, LLC as the lowest responsive bidder based upon staff review of bid line items, adherence to bid requirements, and contractor reference checks.

This work being approved supports the 2024 Pavement Management Program by completing crack seal city-wide, which helps maintain overall pavement condition by sealing cracks to prevent moisture intrusion that can cause further damage to asphalt.

Please refer to the attached map for locations included with the base bid.

FISCAL IMPACT:
The costs of the 2024 Crack Seal Project are funded from the Pavement Crackseal budget.

Projected Funding

Description	Account	Budget Amount
2024 Pavement Crackseal	301312-660294	$210,000

Projected Expenses (Pavement Crackseal)

Description	Amount
2024 Crack Seal	($133,758.24)
2024 Crack Seal 10% Contingency	($14,000)
Total Expenses:	**($147,758.24)**
Remaining Funds:	**$62,241.76**

PROGRAM/SUB-PROGRAM:
The recommended contracts support the Transportation-Infrastructure Maintenance goal of providing a safe, well-maintained effective and efficient multimodal transportation system at a reasonable cost.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval and award of the 2024 Crack Seal Project contract with CKC Operations, LLC for $133,758.24 plus a 10% contingency in the amount of $14,000 for a total authorized amount of $147,758.24 and authorizing the Mayor, City Manager, Public Works Director, and City Clerk to sign and execute contract documents on behalf of the City.

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. CKC Operations, LLC Contract
2. Map of crack seal locations

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPACT:

☒	**Financial Stewardship & Asset Management**	☒	**Reliable Core Services**
☒	**Vibrant Economic Climate**	☒	**Quality Programs & Amenities**
☐	**Engaged Community**	☐	**Healthy Workforce**
☐	**Supportive Technology**	☐	**Collaborative Regional Partner**

Agreement

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into this __ day of _____ in the year 2024 by and between:

CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO
(hereinafter called OWNER)

and

CKC Operations, LLC
(hereinafter called CONTRACTOR)

OWNER and CONTRACTOR, in consideration of the mutual covenants hereinafter set forth, agree as follows.

Article 1. Work

CONTRACTOR shall complete all Work as specified or indicated in the Contract Documents. The Work is generally described as follows:

PROJECT: **2024 CRACK SEAL PROJECT**
PROJECT NUMBER: **301312-660294**

Article 2. Contract Times

2.1. The CONTRACTOR shall substantially complete all work within **40 Contract Days** from the date when the Contract Time commences to run as identified in the Notice to Proceed. The Work shall be completed and ready for final payment in accordance with paragraph 14.13 of the General Conditions.

2.2. LIQUIDATED DAMAGES. The OWNER and the CONTRACTOR agree and recognize that time is of the essence in this contract and that the OWNER will suffer financial loss if the Work is not substantially complete by the date specified in paragraph 2.1 above, plus any extensions thereof allowed in accordance with the Article 12 of the General Conditions. OWNER and CONTRACTOR also agree that such damages are uncertain in amount and difficult to measure accurately. Accordingly, the OWNER and CONTRACTOR agree that as liquidated damages, and not as a penalty, for delay in performance the CONTRACTOR shall pay the OWNER **ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS ($1,000)** for each and every **Contract Day** and portion thereof that expires after the time specified above for substantial completion of the Work until the same is finally complete and ready for final payment. The liquidated damages herein specified shall only apply to the CONTRACTOR's delay in performance and shall not include litigation or attorneys' fees incurred by the OWNER, or other incidental or consequential damages suffered by the OWNER due to the CONTRACTOR's performance. If the OWNER charges liquidated damages to the CONTRACTOR, this shall not preclude the OWNER from commencing an action against the CONTRACTOR for other actual harm resulting from the CONTRACTOR's performance, which is not due to the CONTRACTOR's delay in performance.

Article 3. Contract Price

3.1. The OWNER shall pay in current funds, and the CONTRACTOR agrees to accept in full payment for performance of the Work, subject to additions and deductions from extra and/or omitted work and determinations of actual quantities as provided in the Contract Documents, the Contract Price of one hundred thirty three thousand seven hundred fifty eight dollars and twenty four cents ($133,758.24) set forth in the Bid Form of the CONTRACTOR dated June 24, 2024.

As provided in paragraph 11.9 of the General Conditions estimated quantities are not guaranteed, and determinations of actual quantities and classification are to be made by ENGINEER as provided in paragraph 9.10 of the General Conditions. Unit prices have been computed as provided in paragraph 11.9 of the General Conditions.

Article 4. Payment Procedures

CONTRACTOR shall submit Applications for Payment in accordance with Article 14 of the General Conditions. Applications for Payment will be processed by OWNER as provided in the General Conditions.

4.1 PROGRESS PAYMENTS. OWNER shall make progress payments on the basis of CONTRACTOR's Applications for Payment as recommended by ENGINEER, on or about the third Wednesday of each month during construction as provided below. All progress payments will be on the basis of the progress of the Unit Price Work based on the number of units completed as provided in the General Conditions.

4.1.1.1 Prior to final completion and acceptance, progress payments will be made in the amount equal to 95 percent of the calculated value of completed Work, and/or 95 percent of materials and equipment not incorporated in the Work (but delivered, suitably stored and accompanied by documentation satisfactory to OWNER as provided in 14.2 of the General Conditions), but in each case, less the aggregate of payments previously made and such less amounts as ENGINEER shall determine, or OWNER may withhold, in accordance with paragraph 14.7 of the General Conditions.
If OWNER finds that satisfactory progress is being made in any phase of the Work, it may, in its discretion and upon written request by the CONTRACTOR, authorize final payment from the withheld percentage to the CONTRACTOR or subcontractors who have completed their work in a manner finally acceptable to the OWNER. Before any such payment may be made, the OWNER must, in an exercise of its discretion, determine that satisfactory and substantial reasons exist for the payment and there must be provided to the OWNER written approval from any surety furnishing bonds for the Work.

Nothing contained in this provision shall preclude the OWNER and CONTRACTOR from making other arrangements consistent with C.R.S. 24-91-105 prior to contract award.

4.2 FINAL PAYMENT. Upon final completion and acceptance of the Work in accordance with paragraph 14.13 of the General Conditions, OWNER shall pay the remainder of the Contract Price as provided in said paragraph 14.13 of the General Conditions.

Article 5. CONTRACTOR's Representations

In order to induce OWNER to enter into this Agreement CONTRACTOR makes the following representations:

5.1. CONTRACTOR has examined and carefully studied the Contract Documents, (including the Addenda listed in paragraph 6.10) and the other related data identified in the Bidding Documents including "technical".

5.2. CONTRACTOR has inspected the site and become familiar with and is satisfied as to the general, local

and site conditions that may affect cost, progress, performance or furnishing of the Work.

5.3. CONTRACTOR is familiar with and is satisfied as to all federal, state and local Laws and Regulations that may affect cost, progress and furnishing of the Work.

5.4. CONTRACTOR has carefully studied all reports of exploration and tests of subsurface conditions at or contiguous to the site and all drawings of physical conditions relating to surface or subsurface structures at or contiguous to the site (Except Underground facilities) which have been identified in the General Conditions as provided in paragraph 4.2.1 of the General Conditions. CONTRACTOR accepts the determination set forth in paragraph 4.2 of the General Conditions. CONTRACTOR acknowledges that such reports and drawings are not Contract Documents and may not be complete for CONTRACTOR's purposes. CONTRACTOR acknowledges that OWNER and ENGINEER do not assume responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of information and data shown or indicated in the Contract Documents with respect to such reports, drawings or to Underground Facilities at or contiguous to the site. CONTRACTOR has conducted, obtained and carefully studied (or assume responsibility for having done so) all necessary examinations, investigations, explorations, tests, studies, and data concerning conditions (surface, subsurface and Underground Facilities) at or contiguous to the site or otherwise which may affect cost, progress, performance or furnishing of the Work or which relate to any aspect of the means, methods, techniques, sequences and procedures of construction to be employed by CONTRACTOR and safety precautions and programs incident thereto. CONTRACTOR does not consider that any additional examinations, investigations, explorations, tests, studies or data are necessary for the performance and furnishing of the Work at the Contract Price, within the Contract Times and in accordance with the other terms and conditions of the Contract Documents.

5.5. CONTRACTOR has reviewed and checked all information and data shown or indicated on the Contract Documents with respect to existing Underground Facilities at or contiguous to the site and assumes responsibility for the accurate location of said Underground Facilities. No additional examinations, investigations, explorations, tests, reports, studies or similar information or data in respect of said Underground Facilities are or will be required by CONTRACTOR in order to perform and furnish the Work at the Contract Price, within the Contract Time and in accordance with the other terms and conditions of the Contract Documents, including specifically the provisions of paragraph 4.3 of the General Conditions.

5.6. CONTRACTOR is aware of the general nature of work to be performed by OWNER and others at the site that relates to the Work as indicated in the Contract Documents.

5.7. CONTRACTOR has correlated the information known to CONTRACTOR, information and observations obtained from visits to the site, reports and drawings identified in the Contract Documents and all additional examinations, investigations, explorations, tests studies and data with the Contract Documents.

5.8. CONTRACTOR has given ENGINEER written notice of all conflicts, errors, ambiguities, or discrepancies that CONTRACTOR has discovered in the Contract Documents and the written resolution thereof by ENGINEER is acceptable to CONTRACTOR, and the Contract Documents are generally sufficient to indicate and convey understanding of all terms and conditions for performance and furnishing the Work.

Article 6. Contract Documents

The Contract Documents, which constitute the entire agreement between OWNER and CONTRACTOR concerning the Work, are all written documents, which define the Work and the obligations of the Contractor in performing the Work and the OWNER in providing compensation for the Work. The Contract Documents include the following:

6.1. Invitation to Bid.

6.2. Instruction to Bidders.
6.3. Bid Form.
6.4. This Agreement.
6.5. General Conditions.
6.6. Supplementary Conditions.
6.7. General Requirements.
6.8. Technical Specifications.
6.9. Drawings with each sheet bearing the title: **2024 Crack Seal Project.**
6.10. Change Orders, Addenda and other documents which may be required or specified including:
- 6.10.1. Addenda No. 0 to 0 exclusive
- 6.10.2. Documentation submitted by CONTRACTOR prior to Notice of Award
- 6.10.3. Schedule of Subcontractors
- 6.10.4. Anti-Collusion Affidavit
- 6.10.5. Certification of EEO Compliance
- 6.10.6. Notice of Award
- 6.10.7. Performance Bond
- 6.10.8. Labor and Material Payment Bond
- 6.10.9. Certificates of Insurance
- 6.10.10. Notice to Proceed
- 6.10.11. Contractor's Proposal Request
- 6.10.12. Contractor's Overtime Request
- 6.10.13. Field Order
- 6.10.14. Work Change Directive
- 6.10.15. Change Order
- 6.10.16. Application for Payment
- 6.10.17. Certificate of Substantial Completion
- 6.10.18. Claim Release
- 6.10.19. Final Inspection Report
- 6.10.20. Certificate of Final Completion
- 6.10.21. Guarantee Period Inspection Report

6.11. The following which may be delivered or issued after the Effective Date of the Agreement and are attached hereto: All Written Amendments and other documents amending, modifying, or supplementing the Contract Documents pursuant to paragraphs 3.5 and 3.6 of the General Conditions.

6.12. In the event of conflict between the above documents, the prevailing document shall be as follows:
1. Permits from other agencies as may be required.
2. Special Provisions and Detail Drawings.
3. Technical Specifications and Drawings. Drawings and Technical Specifications are intended to be complementary. Anything shown or called for in one and omitted in another is binding as if called for or shown by both.
4. Supplementary Conditions.
5. General Conditions.
6. City of Louisville Design and Construction Standards.
7. Reference Specifications.

In case of conflict between prevailing references above, the one having the more stringent requirements shall govern.

There are no Contract Documents other than those listed above in this Article 6. The Contract Documents may only be amended, modified, or supplemented as provided in paragraphs 3.5 and 3.6 of the General Conditions.

Article 7. Miscellaneous

7.1. Terms used in this Agreement, which are defined in Article 1 of the General Conditions, shall have the meanings indicated in the General Conditions.

7.2. No assignment by a party hereto of any rights under or interests in the Contract Documents will be binding on another party hereto without the written consent of the party sought to be bound; and specifically but without limitation, moneys that may become due and moneys that are due may not be assigned without such consent (except to the extent that the effect of this restriction may be limited by law), and unless specifically stated to the contrary in any written consent to an assignment no assignment will release or discharge that assignor from any duty or responsibility under the Contract Documents.

7.3. OWNER and CONTRACTOR each binds itself, its partners, successors, assigns and legal representatives to the other party hereto, its partners, successors, assigns and legal representatives in respect to all covenants, agreements and obligations contained in the Contract Documents.

7.4. OWNER AND CONTRACTOR consent to the use of electronic signatures on the Contract Documents. This Agreement, and any other Contract Documents requiring a signature hereunder, may be signed electronically by the Parties in the manner specified under the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act, Title 24, Article 71.3, Part 1, C.R.S.; provided that, electronic records of, and electronic signatures on, any required bonds, including required Performance, Labor and Material Payment, and Warranty Bonds, must be acceptable to the Contractor's selected surety. The Parties agree not to deny the legal effect or enforceability of a Contract Document solely because the document is in electronic form or because an electronic record was used in its formation. The Parties agree not to object to the admissibility of a Contract Document in the form of an electronic record, or a paper copy of an electronic document, or a paper copy or electronic record of a document bearing an electronic signature, on the ground that it is an electronic record or electronic signature or that it is not in its original form or is not an original.

Article 8. Other Provisions

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, OWNER, and CONTRACTOR have signed this Agreement in duplicate. One counterpart each has been delivered to OWNER and CONTRACTOR. All portions of the Contract Documents have been signed, initialed, or identified by OWNER and CONTRACTOR.

This Agreement will be effective on June 27, 2024.

OWNER: CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO

By: _____
Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

(CORPORATE SEAL)

Attest: _____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

Address for giving notices:

749 Main Street
Louisville, Colorado
80027

Attention: City Engineer

CONTRACTOR: JHC Operations


By: _____

(CORPORATE SEAL)

Attest: _____

Address for giving notices:

PO Box 841
Roosevelt UT 84066
435-724-8480



DISCLAIMER:

This draft document was prepared for internal use by the City of Louisville, Colorado. The City makes no claim as to the accuracy or completeness of the data contained hereon.

Due to security concerns, The City requests that you do not post this document on the internet or otherwise make it available to persons unknown to you.

N
W E
S

1 Inch = 700 Feet on 36"x36" Paper

The City of **Louisville, Colorado**

2024 Crack Seal Project

2024 CRACK SEAL PROJECT

Affected Streets

41,358.74 Linear Feet

7.83 Linear Miles

OTHER

City Limit

SUBJECT: **APPROVAL OF POLLINATOR MURAL AT THE INTERSECTION OF MAIN AND SPRUCE STREETS**

DATE: **JULY 16, 2024**

PRESENTED BY: **SHARON NEMECHEK, CULTURAL SERVICES**

SUMMARY:
On July 9th the Cultural Advisory Board unanimously approved a design, by a local Louisville artist, for a street mural to be painted in the intersection of Main and Spruce Streets. Staff is working with the artist to ensure that the bee in the final design is representative of a Colorado native bee species. The overall design will not change substantially, but the insect may be tweaked slightly.

This street mural is intended to celebrate the City of Louisville's designation as a Bee City, the community's commitment to pollinator health, and our residents' enjoyment of accessible public art. The artwork is vibrant and engaging, and will work well on the asphalt surface.

The mural is expected to be temporary, lasting about a year, due to the nature of the materials used and the traffic along the roadway.

The total cost of the mural including supplies and the artist's time is $3,000 to be paid by the City of Louisville's public art budget.

.



PROGRAM/SUB-PROGRAM:
This project supports the Cultural Arts and Special Events, Economic Vitality and the Parks "Bee City" programs.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends City Council approve the installation of the Pollinator mural.

ATTACHMENT(S):
None

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPACT:

☐	**Financial Stewardship & Asset Management**	☐	**Reliable Core Services**
☒	**Vibrant Economic Climate**	☒	**Quality Programs & Amenities**
☒	**Engaged Community**	☐	**Healthy Workforce**
☐	**Supportive Technology**	☐	**Collaborative Regional Partner**

SUBJECT: **APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION NO. 29, SERIES 2024 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE AND THE BOULDER COUNTY CLERK AND RECORDER FOR THE CONDUCT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE 2024 COORDINATED ELECTION TO BE HELD NOVEMBER 5, 2024**

DATE: **JULY 16, 2024**

PRESENTED BY: **MEREDYTH MUTH, CITY CLERK**

SUMMARY:
The City will hold an election on November 5, 2024 for the purpose of the election of one Councilmember from Ward I to fulfill the remaining one year of Mayor Leh's term. The election is part of a coordinated election pursuant to the Uniform Election Code of 1992 (the "Code") and the Rules and Regulations of the Colorado Secretary of State (the "Rules"). The election held on November 5, 2024 will be conducted as a coordinated mail ballot election.

Attached is an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with Boulder County for the conduct and administration of the coordinated election and provides for the City's contribution to the costs of County coordination of such election. The attached resolution authorizes the City Manager and City Clerk to negotiate and approve final, non-substantive revisions to the IGA prior to signing.

FISCAL IMPACT:
The City budgeted $40,000 for the 2024 election. The Boulder County Election Division has not yet provided a preliminary estimate for Louisville's portion of the election. Should the cost of the election be more than what is budgeted, staff will bring a budget amendment at the end of the year.

PROGRAM/SUB-PROGRAM IMPACT:
The goals of the City Clerk subprogram are to ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective, and efficient governance, administration, and support. This IGA allows the City to provide a transparent and efficient election that is also fiscally responsible for the City.

RECOMMENDATION:
Approve Resolution.

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. Resolution
2. Intergovernmental Agreement with the Boulder County Clerk and Recorder for the Conduct and Administration of the 2024 Coordinated Election to be held November 5, 2025

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPACT:

☐	**Financial Stewardship & Asset Management**	☒	**Reliable Core Services**
☐	**Vibrant Economic Climate**	☐	**Quality Programs & Amenities**
☒	**Engaged Community**	☐	**Healthy Workforce**
☐	**Supportive Technology**	☒	**Collaborative Regional Partner**

RESOLUTION NO. 29
SERIES 2024

A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE AND THE BOULDER COUNTY CLERK AND RECORDER FOR THE CONDUCT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE 2024 COORDINATED ELECTION TO BE HELD NOVEMBER 5, 2024

WHEREAS, the City will hold a special election on November 5, 2024 as a mail ballot election coordinated by the Boulder County Clerk and Recorder pursuant to the Uniform Election Code of 1992, as amended; and

WHEREAS, the attached Intergovernmental Agreement By and Between the City of Louisville and the Boulder County Clerk and Recorder for the Conduct and Administration of the 2024 Coordinated Election to be held November 5, 2025 ("Intergovernmental Agreement") provides for the conduct and financing of such coordinated election;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO:

Section 1. The proposed Intergovernmental Agreement, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, is hereby approved.

Section 2. The Mayor and City Clerk are hereby authorized to execute the attached Intergovernmental Agreement on behalf of the City of Louisville, except that such persons are hereby further authorized to negotiate and approve such revisions to the Intergovernmental Agreement as are determined necessary or desirable for the protection of the City, so long as the essential terms and conditions of the Intergovernmental Agreement are not altered.

Section 3. Pursuant to C.R.S. Section 31-10-102.7, the City will utilize the requirements and procedures of the Uniform Election Code of 1992, articles 1 to 13 of title 1, C.R.S., as amended, in lieu of the Colorado Municipal Election Code of 1965, article 10 of title 31, C.R.S., as amended, with respect to the special election to be held on November 5, 2024, and such election shall be conducted as part of the coordinated mail ballot election.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 16th day of July, 2024

_____
Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE AND THE BOULDER COUNTY CLERK AND RECORDER FOR THE CONDUCT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE 2024 GENERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD NOVEMBER 5, 2024

This Intergovernmental Agreement for the Conduct and Administration of the 2024 General Election ("IGA") is made and entered into by and between the Board of County Commissioners on behalf of the County of Boulder, State of Colorado, a body corporate and politic, for the benefit of the Boulder County Clerk and Recorder (the "County Clerk" or "Clerk") and the City of Louisville (the "Jurisdiction") (together "the Parties").

1. RECITALS AND PURPOSES

1.1 The County Clerk and the Jurisdiction are each authorized to conduct elections as provided by law; and

1.2 The election to be held on November 5, 2024 (the "Election") shall be conducted as a mail ballot election as defined in the Uniform Election Code of 1992 ("the Code") and the Rules and Regulations of the Colorado Secretary of State ("the Rules"); and

1.3 Pursuant to § 1-7-116(2), Colorado Revised Statutes ("C.R.S."), the County Clerk and the Jurisdiction are required to enter into an agreement for the administration of their respective duties and sharing of the actual costs related to the Election; and

1.4 Section 20 of Article X of the Colorado Constitution ("TABOR") requires the production of a mailed notice ("TABOR Notice") concerning tax and liability ballot issues that will be submitted to the electors of Boulder County; and

1.5 The County Clerk and the Jurisdiction have determined that it is in the best interests of the Jurisdiction, and its inhabitants and landowners, to cooperate and contract for the Election upon the terms and conditions contained in this IGA; and

1.6 The purpose of this IGA is to allocate responsibilities between the County Clerk and the Jurisdiction for the preparation and conduct of the Election and provide for a reasonable sharing of the actual costs of the Election among the County Clerk and participating jurisdictions.

For and in consideration of the mutual covenants and promises in this IGA, the sufficiency of which is acknowledged, the Parties agree as follows:

2. GENERAL MATTERS

2.1 The County Clerk shall act as the chief designated election official in accordance with C.R.S. §1-1-110 and will be responsible for the administration of the Election as detailed in the Code and the Rules.

2.2 Boulder County Clerk and Recorder Molly Fitzpatrick will be the primary liaison and contact for the County Clerk. The Jurisdiction designates Meredyth Muth, City Clerk as its "Election Officer" who shall act as the primary liaison between the Jurisdiction and the County Clerk and who shall have primary responsibility for the management and performance of the Jurisdiction's obligations under this IGA. If the Code requires a "designated election official" within the Jurisdiction to perform tasks, the Election Officer shall act as such designated election official. Nothing in this IGA relieves the County Clerk or the Jurisdiction's Governing Board from their official responsibilities for the conduct of the Election.

2.3 ***Term.*** The term of this IGA shall be from the date of signing through December 31, 2024.

3. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COUNTY CLERK

3.1 ***Initial ballot layout.*** Upon receipt of the certified ballot text provided by the Jurisdiction pursuant to Section 4.2 below, the County Clerk will create the layout of the text of the ballot in a format that complies with the Code. The County Clerk will provide the Jurisdiction with a copy of the draft ballot for the Jurisdiction's review along with any instructions for modifications to the ballot layout and the time period within which the Jurisdiction must return the modified ballot to the County Clerk. If modifications are made by the Jurisdiction, the Clerk will review the changes upon receipt from the Jurisdiction of the modified ballot and notify the Jurisdiction that the ballot is approved or return the ballot for further modifications and time requirements.

3.1.5 ***Ballot text translation.*** Boulder County must provide a Spanish language ballot option to voters pursuant to C.R.S. § 1-5-901, et seq. Upon receipt of the certified ballot text provided by the Jurisdiction pursuant to Section 4.2 below, the County Clerk will have the ballot text translated into Spanish using a qualified translator as defined in C.R.S. § 1-5-903(4). Unless the Jurisdiction elects to translate its ballot content into Spanish as provided for in Section 4.2.5 below, the County Clerk will use the translated ballot text to prepare a sample ballot and provide an in-person Spanish language ballot option to voters pursuant to C.R.S. § 1-5-906 and § 1-5-907. The County Clerk will provide the Spanish translation of the ballot content to the Jurisdiction for its review, and the Jurisdiction must provide any changes to the translated ballot content to the County Clerk within 48 hours of receipt of the translated content and ensure proper translation of its ballot content.

3.2 ***Final ballot layout.*** Once the Jurisdiction has made all changes to the ballot layout as required by the County Clerk and the ballot is in final draft form, the

Clerk will lay out the ballot text and submit it to the Jurisdiction for final review, proofreading, and approval. The Clerk is not responsible for ensuring that the final ballot text complies with the requirements of TABOR or any other constitutional or statutory requirement related to the text of ballot language.

3.3 ***Ballot printing and mailing.*** The County Clerk will contract with a vendor to prepare and print the ballots; prepare a mail ballot packet for each registered elector within the Jurisdiction; address a mail ballot packet to each elector within the Jurisdiction; and mail the ballots between 22 days and 18 days before Election Day, or between October 11, 2024, and October 18, 2024.

3.4 ***Voter Service and Polling Centers.*** The County Clerk shall provide Voter Service and Polling Centers from October 21, 2024, through Election Day. The County Clerk will hire and train staff to operate Voter Service and Polling Centers in up to 19 locations across Boulder County (Boulder, Lafayette, Longmont, Louisville, Lyons, Nederland, Superior and University of Colorado - Boulder).

3.5 ***Additional ballots.*** In addition to the mail ballots printed and mailed by the vendor as specified in subsection 3.3, the County Clerk will provide regular and provisional ballots to electors in the manner and method required by the Code.

3.6 ***Mail ballots.*** In cooperation with the vendor, the County Clerk will ensure that the mail ballot packets contain the materials required by the Code, including voter instructions; an inner verification/privacy return envelope; and the outer/mail envelope containing the appropriate postage, Official Election logo, and indicia for Return Service Requested.

3.7 ***Ballot security.*** The County Clerk will track inventory and provide security for all ballots as required by the Code.

3.8 ***Election Judges.*** The County Clerk will appoint, train, provide written materials to and pay a sufficient number of qualified election judges to receive and process the voted ballots.

3.9 ***TABOR Notice.*** If applicable, the County Clerk, through a vendor, will distribute to all Boulder County registered electors' households the printed TABOR Notice submitted by the Jurisdiction along with those of other participating jurisdictions. The County Clerk may determine the order of the TABOR Notice submitted by the Jurisdiction and those of other participating jurisdictions to be included in the TABOR Notice Package provided. However, the materials supplied by the Jurisdiction shall be kept together as a group and in the order supplied by the Jurisdiction. The cost for the printing and mailing of the TABOR Notice Package shall be shared on a prorated basis as further described in section 6 below. The Clerk is not responsible for ensuring that the TABOR Notice complies with the requirements of TABOR or any other constitutional or statutory requirement relating to notice.

3.10 ***Testing.*** The County Clerk will perform Logic and Accuracy Testing of the electronic vote counting equipment as required by the Code.

3.11 ***Election Support***. The County Clerk will provide support to the Election Officer via telephone, email or in person throughout the Election process and during all ballot-counting procedures for the Election.

3.12 ***Tally.*** The County Clerk will provide for the counting and tallying of ballots, including any recounts required by law. The Clerk will release initial election returns after 7:00 p.m. on the date of the Election. With the exception of Provisional Ballots, all ballots received by 7:00 p.m. on November 5, 2024, shall start to be counted the night of the Election and may extend past Election Day due to volume. The unofficial results will be published to the County website following the completion of the Election Day counting. The Clerk will count and tally valid cured and provisional ballots on or before 5:00 pm on November 15, 2024.

3.13 ***Certification of results.*** Jurisdictions shall be issued a certified statement of results by November 27, 2024.

4. RESPONSIBILITIES OF JURISDICTION

4.1 ***Boundaries of Jurisdiction.*** If any annexations to the Jurisdiction have occurred between January 1, 2024, and the date of the signing of this IGA, the Jurisdiction is responsible for informing the County Clerk in writing by the date of the signing of this IGA.

4.2 ***Ballot content and layout.*** No later than September 6, 2024, the Election Officer shall certify the ballot order and content for the Jurisdiction and deliver the certified ballot layout to the County Clerk. No content changes will be allowed after this date without the written approval of the Clerk or the Clerk's designee. The ballot layout shall be in a form acceptable to the Clerk. Ballot content layout shall not include any graphs, tables, charts, or diagrams. The ballot order and content shall include the names and office of each candidate for whom a petition has been filed with the Election Officer and any ballot issues or ballot questions the Jurisdiction has certified. The Jurisdiction shall be solely responsible for the accuracy of the information contained in the certificate and ballot content. The Jurisdiction shall make any modifications to the ballot layout requested by the County Clerk. The County Clerk will correct errors as specified in C.R.S. § 1-5-412 at the Jurisdiction's expense.

4.2.5. ***Translation of ballot content***. If the Jurisdiction prefers to translate its ballot content into Spanish rather than having the County Clerk translate the content, the Jurisdiction will use a qualified translator as defined in C.R.S. 1-5-903(4) to translate the ballot content into Spanish and will provide both the English and Spanish ballot content to the County Clerk no later than September 6, 2024. The Jurisdiction shall be solely responsible for the accuracy of the translated ballot content.

4.3 ***Audio for visually impaired.*** No later than the Jurisdiction's submission of the ballot layout to the County Clerk, the Jurisdiction shall confirm that each candidate has provided a clearly spoken recording of their name. This requirement aids the County Clerk in programming the audio component of the electromechanical voting equipment for the Election. The Jurisdiction shall timely make any modifications to the audio recording requested by the County Clerk.

4.4 ***TABOR Notice***. The Jurisdiction shall provide to the County Clerk all required TABOR Notices concerning ballot issue(s) in the manner required by Article X, Section 20 of the Colorado State Constitution on or before 4:00 pm on September 23, 2024. The submission will include the ballot title, text, and fiscal history or any other required wording for the TABOR Notice. The submission date will expedite print layout and review of the TABOR Notice.

4.5 ***Final layout***. The Jurisdiction shall timely make any modification to the ballot layout requested by the County Clerk. The Jurisdiction shall review and proofread and approve the layout, format, and text of the final draft form of the Jurisdiction's official ballot and, if applicable, TABOR Notice within 24 hours of the County Clerk providing the Jurisdiction with the copy to be proofed. The Jurisdiction shall return the final draft form ballot proofs on or before September 13, 2024.

4. ***Cancellation of Election by the Jurisdiction***. If the Jurisdiction resolves not to hold the election or to withdraw a ballot issue, the Jurisdiction shall immediately provide notice of such action to the County Clerk. Initial notice to the County Clerk may be informal. The Jurisdiction shall provide proof of the Jurisdiction's formal action canceling the election or withdrawing a ballot issue(s) as soon as practicable after the Jurisdiction's formal action. The Jurisdiction shall promptly pay the County Clerk the full actual costs relating to the Jurisdictions election, both before and after the County Clerk's receipt of such notice. The Jurisdiction shall provide notice by publication of such cancellation or withdrawal of ballot or question(s). The County Clerk shall post notice of the cancellation or withdrawal of ballot issue(s) or question(s) in the office of the County Clerk, and the Election Officer shall post notice of the cancellation at buildings of the Jurisdiction. The Jurisdiction shall not cancel the election after the 25th day prior to the Election as provided in C.R.S. § 1-5-208.

5. PROVISIONS UNIQUE TO SPECIAL DISTRICTS AND OTHER COORDINATING DISTRICTS

5.1 ***Boundaries of Jurisdiction.*** No later than the date this IGA is signed by the Jurisdiction, the Jurisdiction shall either confirm that the map of its boundaries provided to the County Clerk and County Assessor in January of 2024 is current and accurate or provide an accurate map. The Jurisdiction is responsible for ensuring that its boundaries are accurately defined in the Assessor's database because the County Clerk uses this database to identify eligible voters.

5.2 ***Multi-county special district jurisdictions.*** If the Jurisdiction's boundaries include areas outside of Boulder County, the County Clerk will communicate with the corresponding counties to create a master list of all property owner ballots issued in this jurisdiction.

5.3 ***Non-resident property owners entitled to vote.*** Where non-resident property owners may be entitled to vote in the Jurisdiction's election, the County will review a list of such property owners and identify those owners who may be entitled to vote in the Jurisdiction's election. The County will complete the review and create a list of potentially eligible non-resident property owners by September 18, 2024, or 48 days prior to Election Day. The County will send this list to the Jurisdiction for review and approval. Once this list has been approved by the Jurisdiction, the Clerk will send non-resident property owners on the final list a letter and self-affirmation to establish eligibility. See **Attachment A** – Non-Resident Property Owner Letter (attached only if applicable). The Clerk will send mail ballots to the non-resident property owners who return to the Clerk the signed affirmation establishing their eligibility.

6. PAYMENT

6.1 ***Intent.*** This section addresses the reasonable sharing of the actual cost of the Election among the County Clerk and the political subdivisions participating in the Election.

6.2 ***Responsibility for costs.*** The Jurisdiction shall be responsible for its share of the costs of administration of the Election. The Jurisdiction shall not be responsible for sharing any portion of the usual costs of maintaining the office of the County Clerk, including but not limited to overhead costs and personal service costs of permanent employees, except for such costs that are shown to be directly attributable to conducting the Election on behalf of the Jurisdiction.

6.3 ***State Election Costs.*** The State of Colorado's share of the costs of conducting the Election shall be reimbursed as established by the Code, and the Jurisdiction shall not be responsible for any portion of the election costs attributable to the State.

6.4 ***Invoice.*** The Jurisdiction shall pay the County Clerk the Jurisdiction's share of the Clerk's costs and expenses in administering the Election within 30 days of receiving an invoice from the Clerk. If the invoice is not timely paid by the Jurisdiction, the Clerk may charge a late fee not to exceed 1% of the total invoice per month.

6.5 ***Cost Allocation.*** The County Clerk will determine the Jurisdiction's invoice amount by allocating to all participants in the ballot a share of the costs specific to the administration of the Election as provided by law. If the Jurisdiction is placing a ballot question that qualifies as a TABOR election, a portion of the TABOR Notice publication and mailing costs will also be billed for in the invoice.

6.6 ***Disputes.*** The Parties shall attempt to resolve disputes about the invoice or payment of the invoice informally. If the Parties cannot reach an informal resolution, disputes regarding the invoice or the payment of the invoice shall be filed in Boulder County or District Court, depending on the amount.

7. MISCELLANEOUS

7.1 ***Notices to Parties.*** Notices required to be given by this IGA are deemed to have been received and to be effective: (1) three days after the same shall have been mailed by certified mail, return receipt requested; (2) immediately upon hand delivery; or (3) immediately upon receipt of confirmation that a fax or email was received to the fax numbers or email addresses of the Parties as set forth below or to such party or addresses as may hereafter be designated in writing.

To County Clerk:	To Election Officer:
Molly Fitzpatrick	Meredyth Muth
1750 33rd St., Suite 200	749 Main Street
Boulder, CO 80301-2546	Louisville, CO 80027
303-413-7700	303.335.4536
Fax: 303-413-7728	Fax: 303.335.4550
E-mail: mfitzpatrick@bouldercounty.gov	E-mail: muthm@louisvilleco.gov

7.2 ***Amendment.*** This IGA may be amended only in writing and following the same formality as the execution of the initial IGA.

7.3 ***Integration***. The Parties acknowledge that this IGA constitutes the sole agreement between them relating to the subject matter of this IGA and that no party is relying upon any oral representation made by another party or employee, agent or officer of that party.

7.4 ***Waiver of claims.*** The Jurisdiction has familiarized itself with the election process used by the County Clerk and waives any claims against the Clerk related to the Clerk's processing or administration of the Election except as specified in paragraph 7.5 below and claims arising out of willful and wanton acts of the Clerk.

7.5 ***Limitation of damages***. If a lawsuit is filed challenging the validity of the Jurisdiction's election, the Jurisdiction shall provide prompt notice to the County Clerk of such a lawsuit. If the Clerk chooses to intervene and defend its position, the Jurisdiction will support such intervention and cooperate in the defense of any such claims. If, as a result of a lawsuit against the Jurisdiction or against the Jurisdiction and other defendants by a third party, a court of competent jurisdiction finds that the Jurisdiction's election was void or otherwise fatally flawed due solely to a cause arising from the negligence of the County Clerk, then the Clerk shall refund all amounts paid to the Clerk under section 6 above. The Clerk shall not be responsible for any other judgment, damages, costs, or fees.

7.6 ***Conflicts of this IGA with the Law***. If any provision in this IGA conflicts with the law, this IGA shall be modified to conform to such law or resolution.

7.7 ***Time of the essence***. Time is of the essence in the performance of the work under this IGA. The statutory time requirements of the Code shall apply to completion of the tasks required by this IGA, unless earlier deadlines are required by this IGA.

7.8 ***Good faith***. The Parties shall implement this IGA in good faith, including acting in good faith in all matters that require joint or coordinated action.

7.9 ***Third party beneficiary***. The enforcement of the terms and conditions of this IGA and all rights of action relating to such enforcement shall be strictly reserved to the County Clerk and the Jurisdiction, and nothing contained in this IGA shall give or allow any claim or right of action by any other or third person. It is the express intent of the Parties that any person receiving services or benefits under this IGA shall be deemed an incidental beneficiary.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties have signed this IGA.

Boulder County

Molly Fitzpatrick Date
Boulder County Clerk and Recorder

Jurisdiction

Christopher M. Mayor Leh Date
Mayor

Meredyth Muth, Date
Designated Election Officer

SUBJECT: **ORDINANCE NO. 1878, SERIES 2024 – AN ORDINANCE EXEMPTING CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS FROM THE CITY'S USE TAX FOR BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED FOR REPAIR AND RECONSTRUCTION OF FENCES, WALLS, AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES THAT SUSTAINED FIRE, SMOKE, HEAT, WATER, ASH OR OTHER DAMAGE AS A RESULT OF THE MARSHALL FIRE – 1st READING – SET PUBLIC HEARING 8/6/24**

DATE: **JULY 16, 2024**

PRESENTED BY: **ROB ZUCCARO, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR**

SUMMARY:
Attached for consideration is an ordinance that would extend the current City use tax exemption program for the Marshall Fire to any structure requiring a city-issued building permit that is being repaired or rebuilt due to damage from the Marshall Fire (see Attachments 1). Previously approved use tax exemptions were limited to the rebuilding or repair of the residential structure itself, and did not cover other structures such as fences, walls and detached accessory structures (see Attachments 2 and 3 for Ordinance 1841, Series 2022 and Ordinance 1867, Series 2023 respectively).

PROPOSAL:
Use Tax Exemption
Ordinance No. 1878, Series 2024 would extend the City use tax exemption to the repair or rebuilding of any structure requiring a city-issued building permit that sustained damage from the Marshall Fire. This exemption would cover fences, walls and accessory structures such as storage sheds.

The City collects use tax at the time of issuing a building permit. This tax applies to the construction materials associated with the project and replaces the City's portion of sales tax at the point of sale for those materials. The City also collects County use tax and remits those funds to the County. State use tax is paid at the point of sale. This ordinance would only exempt the City's portion of the use tax.

The City's construction use tax totals 3.650%, broken out as follows:

- 3.000% restricted for capital improvements.
- 0.375% restricted for acquisition and maintenance of land in and around the city used for open space buffer zones, trails, wildlife habitats, wetlands preservation and parks.
- 0.125% restricted for historic preservation and operations of the Louisville Historical Museum.

- 0.150% restricted for operating and maintaining the Louisville Recreation & Senior Center and pool facilities at Memory Square Park.

The amount of use tax collected is determined by the reported valuation of the construction project. The formula assumes that a project's valuation is split 50/50 between labor and materials. Therefore, the use tax collected totals 50% of the reported valuation multiplied by 3.650%. For example, a permit for installation of new fence with a reported valuation of $10,000 would pay ($10,000/2) x .0365 = $182.50 in City use tax.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Current use tax collected for fences, walls and accessory structures on lots impacted by the Marshall Fire is estimated at $44,438. Assuming full compliance with city permitting requirements, staff estimates that total fiscal impact may be up to $200,000. Additional city staff time will also be needed to create communications and application procedures, and process refunds.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:
No public comments have been received.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval of Ordinance No. 1878, Series 2024.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Proposed Ordinance No. 1878, Series 2024
2. Ordinance 1841, Series 2022
3. Ordinance 1867, Series 2023

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPACT:

☒	**Financial Stewardship & Asset Management**	☒	**Reliable Core Services**
☐	**Vibrant Economic Climate**	☐	**Quality Programs & Amenities**
☒	**Engaged Community**	☐	**Healthy Workforce**
☐	**Supportive Technology**	☐	**Collaborative Regional Partner**

ORDINANCE NO. 1878
SERIES 2024

AN ORDINANCE EXEMPTING CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS FROM THE CITY'S USE TAX FOR BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED FOR REPAIR AND RECONSTRUCTION OF FENCES, WALLS, AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES THAT SUSTAINED FIRE, SMOKE, HEAT, WATER, ASH OR OTHER DAMAGE AS A RESULT OF THE MARSHALL FIRE

WHEREAS, on December 30, 2021, the Marshall Fire ignited and quickly spread to the City of Louisville, resulting in severe damage or total loss of almost six hundred (600) structures within the City of Louisville, most of them residential homes; and

WHEREAS, also on December 30, 2021, the Mayor of the City of Louisville, pursuant to Chapter 2.32 of the Louisville Municipal Code and C.R.S. § 24-33.5-709, executed a Declaration of Local Disaster Emergency in and for the City of Louisville, which Declaration was thereafter continued in effect by resolution of the City Council, and the Governor of the State of Colorado issued a Declaration of Statewide Emergency in response to the Marshall Fire; and

WHEREAS, on January 1, 2022, President Joseph R. Biden approved a Major Disaster Declaration for the Event (DR-4634-CO) beginning on December 30, 2021 and continuing thereafter; and

WHEREAS, the structures damaged and destroyed by the Marshall Fire comprise significant portions of several residential subdivisions within the City; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Sections 3.20.300 and 3.20.305 of the Louisville Municipal Code, the City imposes a use tax on construction and building materials; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 3.20.330 of the Louisville Municipal Code, the use tax for construction and building materials is determined based on fifty percent (50%) of the estimated general contract costs and fifty percent (50%) of the estimated mechanical contract costs, which is deemed to be the purchase price of such construction and building materials; and

WHEREAS, also pursuant to Section 3.20.330 of the Louisville Municipal Code, the full amount of the use tax is collected prior to issuance of a building permit; and

WHEREAS, many of the City's residents affected by the Marshall Fire have learned they may be significantly underinsured and will thus face financial hardships rebuilding their fire-damaged homes; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that repairing and rebuilding of homes lost to

the Marshall Fire is essential to maintaining the fabric of the community, and that providing a use tax exemption for homeowners affected by the Marshall Fire who are underinsured will help those residents return to the City; and

WHEREAS, the exemption of construction and building materials from the City's use tax may only be made based upon satisfaction of those criteria set forth herein, to ensure the exemption is provided only to the extent reasonably necessary to facilitate the repair and rebuilding of fire-damaged homes within the community; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that restoring a vibrant and robust community requires rebuilding to occur within a reasonable amount of time, and that the relief set forth herein afforded those who lost their homes in the Marshall Fire who are experiencing financial hardship is rationally related to the important government function of fostering and maintaining a vibrant and robust community; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds those persons who lost their homes or ability to live in their homes due to the Marshall Fire have experienced and been impacted by a natural disaster of epic proportions, and thus are differently situated from those within the City who choose to repair or remodel an existing residence, or build a new residence; and

WHEREAS, by this ordinance, the City Council furthers its established policy of facilitating rebuilding of structures damaged or destroyed by the Marshall Fire as set forth in previous actions of the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council recognizes those residents whose homes were damaged or destroyed by the Marshall Fire have suffered great losses and it is the policy of the City to assist and encourage these residents to return to the community; and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the City Council that adoption of this ordinance shall provide only the limited relief under the specific circumstances set forth herein, and the short-term exemption provided shall not alter the property and services taxed in Section 3.20.305 of the Louisville Municipal Code for construction and building materials, and as such will not constitute a new tax, tax increase, or tax policy change directly causing a net tax revenue gain as those terms are used in Article X, Section 20 of the Colorado Constitution (the "Taxpayer's Bill of Rights" or "TABOR") when the conditions for the exemption no longer exist; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO:

Section 1. Requirements for Exemption. In addition to those exemptions from the City's use tax set forth in Section 3.20.310 of the Louisville Municipal Code, and those exemptions approved by Ordinance 1841, Series 2022 and Ordinance 1867, Series 2023 for the repair and rebuilding of a residence that sustained fire damage, construction and

building materials shall be exempt, or partially exempt, from the imposition of the tax levied by Section 3.20.300 of the Louisville Municipal Code when all of the following requirements are met:

A. The building permit application is for repair or rebuilding of any structure requiring a city-issued building permit, including walls, fences, and accessory structures, that sustained direct fire, smoke, heat, water, ash or other damage from the Marshall Fire.

B. The building permit application has been filed by a person who, on December 30, 2021, was the owner of record of property in any jurisdiction on which a residence was damaged or destroyed by the Marshall Fire.

C. The building permit application is filed with the City of Louisville on or before December 31, 2025.

D. The building permit applicant attests on the building permit application that they are requesting a use tax exemption due to financial hardship caused by inadequate insurance or a gap in insurance coverage when compared to the cost of repairs.

Section 2. Amount of Exemption. The amount of the use tax exemption provided by this ordinance shall equal the full amount of the City use tax due for the construction and building materials.

Section 3. Refunds of City Use Taxes. City staff is authorized and directed to issue refunds of City use taxes paid in connection with building permits issued prior to the effective date of this ordinance, and which permits meet the requirements for exemption set forth in Section 1 of this ordinance. The amount of such refunds shall be determined as set forth in Section 2 of this ordinance.

Section 4. If any portion of this ordinance is held to be invalid for any reason, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each part hereof irrespective of the fact that any one part be declared invalid.

Section 5. The repeal or modification of any provision of the Municipal Code of the City of Louisville by this ordinance shall not release, extinguish, alter, modify, or change in whole or in part any penalty, forfeiture, or liability, either civil or criminal, which shall have been incurred under such provision, and each provision shall be treated and held as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any and all proper actions, suits, proceedings, and prosecutions for the enforcement of the penalty, forfeiture, or liability, as well as for the purpose of sustaining any judgment, decree, or order which can or may be rendered, entered, or made in such actions, suits, proceedings, or prosecutions.

Section 6. All other ordinances or portions thereof inconsistent or conflicting with this ordinance or any portion hereof are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency or conflict.

Section 7. The City Council herewith finds, determines and declares that this ordinance is genuinely and urgently necessary for the immediate preservation of the public health, safety, and welfare due to the impacts of the Marshall Fire set forth herein.

INTRODUCED, READ, PASSED ON FIRST READING AND ORDERED PUBLISHED this 16th day of July, 2024.

_____
Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
Kelly PC, City Attorney

PASSED AND ADOPTED ON SECOND AND FINAL READING, this 6th day of August, 2024.

_____
Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

ORDINANCE NO. 1841
SERIES 2022

AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE EXEMPTING CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS FROM THE CITY'S USE TAX FOR BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED FOR RECONSTRUCTION OF HOMES DAMAGED OR DESTROYED IN THE MARSHALL FIRE BURN AREA

WHEREAS, on December 30, 2021, the Marshall Fire ignited and quickly spread to the City of Louisville, resulting in severe damage or total loss of almost six hundred (600) structures within the City of Louisville, most of them residential homes; and

WHEREAS, also on December 30, 2021, the Mayor of the City of Louisville, pursuant to Chapter 2.32 of the Louisville Municipal Code and C.R.S. § 24-33.5-709, executed a Declaration of Local Disaster Emergency in and for the City of Louisville, which Declaration was thereafter continued in effect by resolution of the City Council, and the Governor of the State of Colorado issued a Declaration of Statewide Emergency in response to the Marshall Fire; and

WHEREAS, on January 1, 2022, President Joseph R. Biden approved a Major Disaster Declaration for the Event (DR-4634-CO) beginning on December 30, 2021 and continuing thereafter; and

WHEREAS, the structures damaged and destroyed by the Marshall Fire comprise significant portions of several residential subdivisions within the City; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Sections 3.20.300 and 3.20.305 of the Louisville Municipal Code, the City imposes a use tax on construction and building materials; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 3.20.330 of the Louisville Municipal Code, the use tax for construction and building materials is determined based on fifty percent (50%) of the estimated general contract costs and fifty percent (50%) of the estimated mechanical contract costs, which is deemed to be the purchase price of such construction and building materials; and

WHEREAS, also pursuant to Section 3.20.330 of the Louisville Municipal Code, the full amount of the use tax is collected prior to issuance of a building permit; and

WHEREAS, many of the City's residents affected by the Marshall Fire have learned they may be significantly underinsured and will thus face financial hardships rebuilding their fire-damaged homes; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that rebuilding of homes lost to the Marshall Fire is essential to maintaining the fabric of the community, and that providing a use tax exemption for homeowners affected by the Marshall Fire who are underinsured will help those residents return to the City; and

WHEREAS, the City Council further finds its adoption of the 2021 IECC was in furtherance of its important policy objectives contained in the City's Sustainability Action Plan, and the incentive provided by the full City use tax exemption set forth in this ordinance for rebuilding of residences pursuant to the 2021 IECC will facilitate such policy objectives to the greatest extent possible; and

WHEREAS, the exemption of construction and building materials from the City's use tax may only be made based upon satisfaction of those criteria set forth herein, to ensure the exemption is provided only to the extent reasonably necessary to facilitate the rebuilding of fire-damaged homes within the community; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that restoring a vibrant and robust community requires rebuilding to occur within a reasonable amount of time, and that the relief set forth herein afforded those who lost their homes in the Marshall Fire who are experiencing financial hardship is rationally related to the important government function of fostering and maintaining a vibrant and robust community; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds those persons who lost their homes in the Marshall Fire have experienced and been impacted by a natural disaster of epic proportions, and thus are differently situated from those within the City who choose to repair or remodel an existing residence, or build a new residence; and

WHEREAS, by this ordinance, the City Council furthers its established policy of facilitating rebuilding of structures damaged or destroyed by the Marshall Fire as set forth in previous actions of the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council recognizes those residents whose homes were damaged or destroyed by the Marshall Fire have suffered great losses and it is the policy of the City to assist and encourage these residents to return to the community; and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the City Council that adoption of this ordinance shall provide only the limited relief under the specific circumstances set forth herein, and the short-term exemption provided shall not alter the property and services taxed in Section 3.20.305 of the Louisville Municipal Code for construction and building materials, and as such will not constitute a new tax, tax increase, or tax policy change directly causing a net tax revenue gain as those terms are used in Article X, Section 20 of the Colorado Constitution (the "Taxpayer's Bill of Rights" or "TABOR") when the conditions for the exemption no longer exist; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that an emergency exists because the preservation of public property, health, safety, and welfare requires the City to take immediate action to provide the relief set forth herein to those whose homes were damaged or destroyed due to the Marshall Fire.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO:

Section 1. Requirements for Exemption. In addition to those exemptions from the City's use tax set forth in Section 3.20.310 of the Louisville Municipal Code, construction and building materials shall be exempt, or partially exempt, from the imposition of the tax levied by Section 3.20.300 of the Louisville Municipal Code when all of the following requirements are met:

A. The building permit application is for major structural repair or rebuilding of a residence that sustained fire damage from the Marshall Fire, not consisting solely of smoke or ash damage, which rendered the residence not habitable.

B. The building permit application has been filed by a person who, on December 30, 2021, was the owner of record of property in any jurisdiction on which a residence was damaged or destroyed by the Marshall Fire.

C. The building permit application is filed with the City of Louisville on or before December 31, 2024.

D. The building permit applicant attests on the building permit application they are requesting a use tax exemption due to financial hardship caused by inadequate insurance coverage.

Section 2. Amount of Exemption. The amount of the use tax exemption provided by this ordinance shall be determined as follows:

A. For permits issued pursuant to the 2021 IECC as adopted by the City, with or without Appendix RC, the use tax exemption shall equal the full amount of the City use tax due for the construction and building materials regardless of any increase in the size of the home.

B. For permits issued pursuant to the 2018 IECC as adopted by the City, the use tax exemption shall be a percentage of the City use tax due, based on the size of the home to be rebuilt as compared to the previous home that was located on the lot for which the building permit is issued. The home to be rebuilt will be considered the same size if it is not more than ten percent (10%) larger than the home that was previously located on the lot. For example, if the home that was previously located on the lot for which the building permit is issued was 2,000 square feet, and the home to be rebuilt is 2,200 square feet or smaller, the use tax exemption shall equal the full amount of the City use tax. If the home to be rebuilt on such lot is 3,000 square feet, two-thirds (2/3) of the City use tax due for construction and building materials shall be exempt.

Section 3. Refunds of City Use Taxes. City staff is authorized and directed to issue refunds of City use taxes paid in connection with building permits issued prior to the effective date of this ordinance, and which permits meet the requirements for exemption set forth in Section 1 of this ordinance. The amount of such refunds shall be determined as set forth in Section 2 of this ordinance.

Section 4. If any portion of this ordinance is held to be invalid for any reason, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each part hereof irrespective of the fact that any one part be declared invalid.

Section 5. The repeal or modification of any provision of the Municipal Code of the City of Louisville by this ordinance shall not release, extinguish, alter, modify, or change in whole or in part any penalty, forfeiture, or liability, either civil or criminal, which shall have been incurred under such provision, and each provision shall be treated and held as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any and all proper actions, suits, proceedings, and prosecutions for the enforcement of the penalty, forfeiture, or liability, as well as for the purpose of sustaining any judgment, decree, or order which can or may be rendered, entered, or made in such actions, suits, proceedings, or prosecutions.

Section 6. All other ordinances or portions thereof inconsistent or conflicting with this ordinance or any portion hereof are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency or conflict.

Section 7. The City Council herewith finds, determines and declares that this ordinance is genuinely and urgently necessary for the immediate preservation of the public health, safety, and welfare due to the impacts of the Marshall Fire set forth herein.

INTRODUCED, READ, PASSED AND ADOPTED AS AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE BY TWO-THIRDS OF THE ENTIRE CITY COUNCIL, AND ORDERED PUBLISHED this 3rd day of October, 2022.

~~Ashley Stolzmann, Mayor~~
Dennis Maloney, Mayor Pro Tem

ATTEST:

Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

CITY OF LOUISVILLE SEAL COLORADO

received
10/14/22

PUBLIC NOTICE
ORDINANCE NO. 1841, SERIES 2022

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Louisville, Colorado, held on February 15, 2022 at the hour of 6:00 p.m., at 749 Main Street, Louisville, Colorado, the City Council held a Public Hearing on the passage and adoption of a proposed emergency Ordinance No. 1841, Series 2022.

AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE EXEMPTING CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS FROM THE CITY'S USE TAX FOR BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED FOR RECONSTRUCTION OF HOMES DAMAGED OR DESTROYED IN THE MARSHALL FIRE BURN AREA

INTRODUCED, READ, PASSED AND ADOPTED AS AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE AND ORDERED PUBLISHED IN FULL this 3rd DAY OF OCTOBER, 2022.

Dennis Maloney, Mayor Pro Tem

ATTEST:
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

Published with full ordinance in the Daily Camera 10/9/22.

ORDINANCE NO. 1841
SERIES 2022

AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE EXEMPTING CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS FROM THE CITY'S USE TAX FOR BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED FOR RECONSTRUCTION OF HOMES DAMAGED OR DESTROYED IN THE MARSHALL FIRE BURN AREA

WHEREAS, on December 30, 2021, the Marshall Fire ignited and quickly spread to the City of Louisville, resulting in severe damage or total loss of almost six hundred (600) structures within the City of Louisville, most of them residential homes; and

WHEREAS, also on December 30, 2021, the Mayor of the City of Louisville, pursuant to Chapter 2.32 of the Louisville Municipal Code and C.R.S. § 24-33.5-709, executed a Declaration of Local Disaster Emergency in and for the City of Louisville, which Declaration was thereafter continued in effect by resolution of the City Council, and the Governor of the State of Colorado issued a Declaration of Statewide Emergency in response to the Marshall Fire; and

WHEREAS, on January 1, 2022, President Joseph R. Biden approved a Major Disaster Declaration for the Event (DR-4634-CO) beginning on December 30, 2021 and continuing thereafter; and

WHEREAS, the structures damaged and destroyed by the Marshall Fire comprise significant portions of several residential subdivisions within the City; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Sections 3.20.300 and 3.20.305 of the Louisville Municipal Code, the City imposes a use tax on construction and building materials; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 3.20.330 of the Louisville Municipal Code, the use tax for construction and building materials is determined based on fifty percent (50%) of the estimated general contract costs and fifty percent (50%) of the estimated mechanical contract costs, which is deemed to be the purchase price of such construction and building materials; and

WHEREAS, also pursuant to Section 3.20.330 of the Louisville Municipal Code, the full amount of the use tax is collected prior to issuance of a building permit; and

WHEREAS, many of the City's residents affected by the Marshall Fire have learned they may be significantly underinsured and will thus face financial hardships rebuilding their fire-damaged homes; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that rebuilding of homes lost to the Marshall Fire is essential to maintaining the fabric of the community, and that providing a use tax exemption for homeowners affected by the Marshall Fire who are underinsured will help those residents return to the City; and

WHEREAS, the City Council further finds its adoption of the 2021 IECC was in furtherance of its important policy objectives contained in the City's Sustainability Action Plan, and the incentive provided by the full City use tax exemption set forth in this ordinance for rebuilding of residences pursuant to the 2021 IECC will facilitate such policy objectives to the greatest extent possible; and

WHEREAS, the exemption of construction and building materials from the City's use tax may only be made based upon satisfaction of those criteria set forth herein, to ensure the exemption is provided only to the extent reasonably necessary to facilitate the rebuilding of fire-damaged homes within the community; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that restoring a vibrant and robust community requires rebuilding to occur within a reasonable amount of time, and that the relief set forth herein afforded those who lost their homes in the Marshall Fire who are experiencing financial hardship is rationally related to the important government function of fostering and maintaining a vibrant and robust community; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds those persons who lost their homes in the Marshall Fire have experienced and been impacted by a natural disaster of epic proportions, and thus are differently situated from those within the City who choose to repair or remodel an existing residence, or build a new residence; and

WHEREAS, by this ordinance, the City Council furthers its established policy of facilitating rebuilding of structures damaged or destroyed by the Marshall Fire as set forth in previous actions of the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council recognizes those residents whose homes were damaged or destroyed by the Marshall Fire have suffered great losses and it is the policy of the City to assist and encourage these residents to return to the community; and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the City Council that adoption of this ordinance shall provide only the limited relief under the specific circumstances set forth herein, and the short-term exemption provided shall not alter the property and services taxed in Section 3.20.305 of the Louisville Municipal Code for construction and building materials, and as such will not constitute a new tax, tax increase, or tax policy change directly causing a net tax revenue gain as those terms are used in Article X, Section 20 of the Colorado Constitution (the "Taxpayer's Bill of Rights" or "TABOR") when the conditions for the exemption no longer exist; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that an emergency exists because the preservation of public property, health, safety, and welfare requires the City to take immediate action to provide the relief set forth herein to those whose homes were damaged or destroyed due to the Marshall Fire.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO:

Section 1. Requirements for Exemption. In addition to those exemptions from the City's use tax set forth in Section 3.20.310 of the Louisville Municipal Code, construction and building materials shall be exempt, or partially exempt, from the imposition of the tax levied by Section 3.20.300 of the Louisville Municipal Code when all of the following requirements are met:

A. The building permit application is for major structural repair

---

Prairie Mountain Media, LLC

PUBLISHER'S AFFIDAVIT

County of Boulder
State of Colorado

The undersigned, Agent, being first duly sworn under oath, states and affirms as follows:

1. He/she is the legal Advertising Reviewer of Prairie Mountain Media LLC, publisher of the *Daily Camera*.
2. The *Daily Camera* is a newspaper of general circulation that has been published continuously and without interruption for at least fifty-two weeks in Boulder County and meets the legal requisites for a legal newspaper under Colo. Rev. Stat. 24-70-103.
3. The notice that is attached hereto is a true copy, published in the *Daily Camera* in Boulder County on the following date(s):

Oct 9, 2022

Signature

Subscribed and sworn to me before me this 10th day of October, 2022.

Notary Public

(SEAL)

MELISSA L NAJERA
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE OF COLORADO
NOTARY ID 20064049936
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES DECEMBER 11, 2022

Account: 1048836
Ad Number: 1925945
Fee: $333.52

1.4

B. The building permit application has been filed by a person who, on December 30, 2021, was the owner of record of property in any jurisdiction on which a residence was damaged or destroyed by the Marshall Fire.

C. The building permit application is filed with the City of Louisville on or before December 31, 2024.

D. The building permit applicant attests on the building permit application they are requesting a use tax exemption due to financial hardship caused by inadequate insurance coverage.

Section 2. Amount of Exemption. The amount of the use tax exemption provided by this ordinance shall be determined as follows:

A. For permits issued pursuant to the 2021 IECC as adopted by the City, with or without Appendix RC, the use tax exemption shall equal the full amount of the City use tax due for the construction and building materials regardless of any increase in the size of the home.

B. For permits issued pursuant to the 2018 IECC as adopted by the City, the use tax exemption shall be a percentage of the City use tax due, based on the size of the home to be rebuilt as compared to the previous home that was located on the lot for which the building permit is issued. The home to be rebuilt will be considered the same size if it is not more than ten percent (10%) larger than the home that was previously located on the lot. For example, if the home that was previously located on the lot for which the building permit is issued was 2,000 square feet, and the home to be rebuilt is 2,200 square feet or smaller, the use tax exemption shall equal the full amount of the City use tax. If the home to be rebuilt on such lot is 3,000 square feet, two-thirds (2/3) of the City use tax due for construction and building materials shall be exempt.

Section 3. Refunds of City Use Taxes. City staff is authorized and directed to issue refunds of City use taxes paid in connection with building permits issued prior to the effective date of this ordinance, and which permits meet the requirements for exemption set forth in Section 1 of this ordinance. The amount of such refunds shall be determined as set forth in Section 2 of this ordinance.

Section 4. If any portion of this ordinance is held to be invalid for any reason, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each part hereof irrespective of the fact that any one part be declared invalid.

Section 5. The repeal or modification of any provision of the Municipal Code of the City of Louisville by this ordinance shall not release, extinguish, alter, modify, or change in whole or in part any penalty, forfeiture, or liability, either civil or criminal, which shall have been incurred under such provision, and each provision shall be treated and held as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any and all proper actions, suits, proceedings, and prosecutions for the enforcement of the penalty, forfeiture, or liability, as well as for the purpose of sustaining any judgment, decree, or order which can or may be rendered, entered, or made in such actions, suits, proceedings, or prosecutions.

Section 6. All other ordinances or portions thereof inconsistent or conflicting with this ordinance or any portion hereof are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency or conflict.

Section 7. The City Council herewith finds, determines and declares that this ordinance is genuinely and urgently necessary for the immediate preservation of the public health, safety, and welfare due to the impacts of the Marshall Fire set forth herein.

INTRODUCED, READ, PASSED AND ADOPTED AS AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE BY TWO-THIRDS OF THE ENTIRE CITY COUNCIL, AND ORDERED PUBLISHED this 3rd day of October, 2022.

Dennis Maloney, Mayor Pro Tem

ATTEST:
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

Published: Boulder Daily Camera October 9, 2022-1925945

Second Reading Amendments

Ordinance No. 1867, Series 2023, is revised to read as follows (amendments on second reading are shown in track changes format):

ORDINANCE NO. 1867
SERIES 2023

AN ORDINANCE EXEMPTING CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS FROM THE CITY'S USE TAX FOR BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED FOR REPAIR AND RECONSTRUCTION OF HOMES THAT SUSTAINED SMOKE, HEAT, WATER, ASH OR OTHER DAMAGE AS A RESULT OF THE MARSHALL FIRE

WHEREAS, on December 30, 2021, the Marshall Fire ignited and quickly spread to the City of Louisville, resulting in severe damage or total loss of almost six hundred (600) structures within the City of Louisville, most of them residential homes; and

WHEREAS, also on December 30, 2021, the Mayor of the City of Louisville, pursuant to Chapter 2.32 of the Louisville Municipal Code and C.R.S. § 24-33.5-709, executed a Declaration of Local Disaster Emergency in and for the City of Louisville, which Declaration was thereafter continued in effect by resolution of the City Council, and the Governor of the State of Colorado issued a Declaration of Statewide Emergency in response to the Marshall Fire; and

WHEREAS, on January 1, 2022, President Joseph R. Biden approved a Major Disaster Declaration for the Event (DR-4634-CO) beginning on December 30, 2021 and continuing thereafter; and

WHEREAS, the structures damaged and destroyed by the Marshall Fire comprise significant portions of several residential subdivisions within the City; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Sections 3.20.300 and 3.20.305 of the Louisville Municipal Code, the City imposes a use tax on construction and building materials; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 3.20.330 of the Louisville Municipal Code, the use tax for construction and building materials is determined based on fifty percent (50%) of the estimated general contract costs and fifty percent (50%) of the estimated mechanical contract costs, which is deemed to be the purchase price of such construction and building materials; and

WHEREAS, also pursuant to Section 3.20.330 of the Louisville Municipal Code, the full amount of the use tax is collected prior to issuance of a building permit; and

WHEREAS, many of the City's residents affected by the Marshall Fire have learned they may be significantly underinsured and will thus face financial hardships rebuilding their fire-damaged homes; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that repairing and rebuilding of homes lost to the Marshall Fire is essential to maintaining the fabric of the community, and that providing a use tax exemption for homeowners affected by the Marshall Fire who are underinsured will help those residents return to the City; and

WHEREAS, the exemption of construction and building materials from the City's use tax may only be made based upon satisfaction of those criteria set forth herein, to ensure the exemption is provided only to the extent reasonably necessary to facilitate the repair and rebuilding of fire-damaged homes within the community; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that restoring a vibrant and robust community requires rebuilding to occur within a reasonable amount of time, and that the relief set forth herein afforded those who lost their homes in the Marshall Fire who are experiencing financial hardship is rationally related to the important government function of fostering and maintaining a vibrant and robust community; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds those persons who lost their homes or ability to live in their homes due to the Marshall Fire have experienced and been impacted by a natural disaster of epic proportions, and thus are differently situated from those within the City who choose to repair or remodel an existing residence, or build a new residence; and

WHEREAS, by this ordinance, the City Council furthers its established policy of facilitating rebuilding of structures damaged or destroyed by the Marshall Fire as set forth in previous actions of the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council recognizes those residents whose homes were damaged or destroyed by the Marshall Fire have suffered great losses and it is the policy of the City to assist and encourage these residents to return to the community; and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the City Council that adoption of this ordinance shall provide only the limited relief under the specific circumstances set forth herein, and the short-term exemption provided shall not alter the property and services taxed in Section 3.20.305 of the Louisville Municipal Code for construction and building materials, and as such will not constitute a new tax, tax increase, or tax policy change directly causing a net tax revenue gain as those terms are used in Article X, Section 20 of the Colorado Constitution (the "Taxpayer's Bill of Rights" or "TABOR") when the conditions for the exemption no longer exist; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO:

Section 1. Requirements for Exemption. In addition to those exemptions from the City's use tax set forth in Section 3.20.310 of the Louisville Municipal Code, and those exemptions approved by Ordinance 1841, Series 2022 for the repair and rebuilding of a residence that sustained fire damage, construction and building materials shall be exempt, or partially exempt, from the imposition of the tax levied by Section 3.20.300 of the Louisville Municipal Code when all of the following requirements are met:

A. The building permit application is for repair or rebuilding of a primary residential structure that sustained smoke, heat, water, ash or other damage from the Marshall Fire, not including direct fire damage.

B. The building permit application has been filed by a person who, on December 30, 2021, was the owner of record of property in any jurisdiction on which a residence was damaged or destroyed by the Marshall Fire.

C. The building permit application is filed with the City of Louisville on or before December 31, ~~2024~~ 2025.

D. The building permit applicant attests on the building permit application that they are requesting a use tax exemption due to financial hardship caused by inadequate insurance or a gap in insurance coverage when compared to the cost of repairs.

Section 2. Amount of Exemption. The amount of the use tax exemption provided by this ordinance shall equal the full amount of the City use tax due for the construction and building materials.

Section 3. Refunds of City Use Taxes. City staff is authorized and directed to issue refunds of City use taxes paid in connection with building permits issued prior to the effective date of this ordinance, and which permits meet the requirements for exemption set forth in Section 1 of this ordinance. The amount of such refunds shall be determined as set forth in Section 2 of this ordinance.

Section 4. If any portion of this ordinance is held to be invalid for any reason, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each part hereof irrespective of the fact that any one part be declared invalid.

Section 5. The repeal or modification of any provision of the Municipal Code of the City of Louisville by this ordinance shall not release, extinguish, alter, modify, or change in whole or in part any penalty, forfeiture, or liability, either civil or criminal, which shall have been incurred under such provision, and each provision shall be treated and held as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any and all proper actions, suits,

proceedings, and prosecutions for the enforcement of the penalty, forfeiture, or liability, as well as for the purpose of sustaining any judgment, decree, or order which can or may be rendered, entered, or made in such actions, suits, proceedings, or prosecutions.

Section 6. All other ordinances or portions thereof inconsistent or conflicting with this ordinance or any portion hereof are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency or conflict.

Section 7. The City Council herewith finds, determines and declares that this ordinance is genuinely and urgently necessary for the immediate preservation of the public health, safety, and welfare due to the impacts of the Marshall Fire set forth herein.

INTRODUCED, READ, PASSED ON FIRST READING AND ORDERED PUBLISHED this 28th day of November, 2023.

Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

ATTEST:

Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

CITY OF LOUISVILLE SEAL COLORADO

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Kelly PC, City Attorney

PASSED AND ADOPTED ON SECOND AND FINAL READING, this 19th day of December, 2023.

Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

ATTEST:

Meredyth Muth, City Clerk


CITY OF LOUISVILLE SEAL COLORADO

SUBJECT: **ORDINANCE NO. 1879, SERIES 2024 – AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE VACATION OF AN EXISTING DRAINAGE EASEMENT ON LOTS 3 AND 4, BLOCK 1 OF THE ENCLAVE REPLAT – 1ST READING – SET PUBLIC HEARING 8/6/24**

DATE: **JULY 16, 2024**

PRESENTED BY: **AMELIA BRACKETT, SENIOR PLANNER**

VICINITY MAP:



SUMMARY:
Attached for consideration on first reading, and to set the public hearing for August 6, 2024, is a draft ordinance to vacate a drainage easement across Lots 3 and 4, Block 1 of the Enclave Replat. New easements will be dedicated by the Third Replat of the

Enclave, which will be reviewed concurrent with the second reading of this Easement Vacation.

REQUEST:
The applicants, Thomas and Kathryn Greany, request approval of a Minor Subdivision and Easement Vacation to adjust the lot line and associated easements between 1147 and 1149 W Enclave. As part of this proposal, the applicants are requesting to vacate the existing side lot line easement so it can be moved to align with the proposed lot line in the Third Replat of the Enclave.

A full staff report on the application will be provided to City Council ahead of the August 6, 2024 hearing, which will include an analysis of the concurrent application for a Minor Subdivision that accompanies this Easement Vacation.




Figure 1. Exhibits showing easement to be vacated.

ANALYSIS:
Louisville Public Works and utility providers have reviewed the proposed easement vacations and have no objections as part of the development application. New easements are proposed as part of the replat running in tandem with the easement vacation.

FISCAL IMPACT:
There is no anticipated fiscal impact to the City resulting from the requested easement vacation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval of Ordinance No. 1879, Series 2024 on first reading, and setting second reading and the public hearing for August 6, 2024.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Ordinance No. 1879, Series 2024

ORDINANCE NO. 1879
SERIES 2024

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE VACATION OF AN EXISTING DRAINAGE EASEMENT LOCATED ON LOTS 3 AND 4, BLOCK 1 OF THE ENCLAVE REPLAT

WHEREAS, by the Enclave Replat, recorded in the Office of the Boulder County Clerk and Recorder on January 14, 1988 at Reception No. 00898171, there was a drainage easement across Lots 2 and 3, Block 1 ("the easement"); and

WHEREAS, a replat application has been approved by the City dedicating new easements under the name the Third Replat of the Enclave; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds and determines that the easement for which vacation is requested is not and will not be needed for any public, governmental, or utility purposes; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to approve the application and vacate the City's interests in the easement for which vacation is requested;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO:

Section 1. The City hereby approves the vacation of the easement across Lots 2 and 3, Block 1 which easement herein vacated is in the location further described in Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference ("the easement").

Section 2. All other ordinances or portions thereof inconsistent or in conflict with this ordinance or any portion hereof are repealed to the extent of such inconsistency or conflict.

Section 3. The Mayor and City Manager, or either of them, is authorized to execute such additional documents as may be necessary to evidence the vacation of the easement herein vacated, including but not execution of quit claim deeds.

INTRODUCED, READ, PASSED ON FIRST READING, AND ORDERED PUBLISHED this 16TH day of July, 2024.

_____
Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
Kelly PC
City Attorney

PASSED AND ADOPTED ON SECOND AND FINAL READING, this 6th day of July, 2024.

_____
Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

EXHIBIT "A"

SHEET 1 OF 2

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 12 AND THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 7, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO

VACATION OF A FIVE FOOT (5') WIDE EASEMENT FOR DRAINAGE PURPOSES UPON, OVER AND ACROSS LOTS 2 AND 3, BLOCK 1, AS SHOWN ON THE PLAT OF A REPLAT OF THE ENCLAVE AS DESCRIBED IN THE RECORDS OF BOULDER COUNTY AT REC. NO. 00898171, DATED JANUARY 14, 1988 BEING A PORTION OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 12 AND THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 7, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 70 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO, LYING TWO AND ONE HALF FEET (2.5') ON BOTH SIDES OF THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED CENTERLINE:

THE COMMON LINE OF LOTS 2 & 3, AS DESCRIBED ON SAID PLAT.

SAID SIDELINES BEING SHORTENED AND LENGTHENED SO AS TO PREVENT GAPS OR OVERLAPS WITH THE PERIMETER BOUNDARY LINES OF SAID LOTS.

THE TOTAL AREA OF VACATED EASEMENT CONTAINS 1,057 SQUARE FEET, MORE OR LESS.

James Z. Gowan

Digitally signed by James Z. Gowan
DN: cn=James Z. Gowan, o=Flatirons, Inc., ou, email=zgowan@flatironsinc.com, c=US
Date: 2024.03.28 10:18:11 -06'00'

I, JAMES Z. GOWAN, A LAND SURVEYOR LICENSED IN THE STATE OF COLORADO, DO HEREBY STATE FOR AND ON BEHALF OF FLATIRONS, INC., THAT THIS PARCEL DESCRIPTION AND ATTACHED EXHIBIT, BEING MADE A PART THEREOF, WERE PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY RESPONSIBLE CHARGE, ARE ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, INFORMATION AND BELIEF, ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPLICABLE STANDARDS OF PRACTICE AND ARE NOT A GUARANTY OR WARRANTY, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED. SAID PARCEL DESCRIPTION AND EXHIBIT WERE PREPARED AT THE REQUEST OF THE CLIENT AND ARE NOT INTENDED TO REPRESENT A MONUMENTED LAND SURVEY OR SUBDIVIDE LAND IN VIOLATION OF STATE STATUTE.

COLORADO LICENSED JAMES Z. GOWAN 29038 PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR
3/28/24


JAMES Z. GOWAN
COLORADO P.L.S. #29038
VICE PRESIDENT, FLATIRONS, INC.

JOB NUMBER: 24-80548
DRAWN BY: W. BECKETT
DATE: MARCH 28, 2024

THIS IS NOT A "LAND SURVEY PLAT" OR "IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT" AND THIS EXHIBIT IS NOT INTENDED FOR PURPOSES OF TRANSFER OF TITLE OR SUBDIVISIONS OF LAND. RECORD INFORMATION SHOWN HEREON IS BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CLIENT.

Flatirons, Inc.
Land Surveying Services
3825 IRIS AVE,
SUITE 395
BOULDER, CO 80301
(303) 443-7001
www.FlatironsInc.com

BY:BBECKETT FILE:80548-EASEMENT VACATE.DWG DATE:3/28/2024 8:50 AM


SHEET 2 OF 2
EXHIBIT "A"
LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 12 AND THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 7, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COUNTY OF BOUNDER, STATE OF COLORADO
N85°07'00"E 179.67'
0 15 30
1 inch = 30 ft.
W. ENCLAVE CIRCLE (50' R.O.W.)
N04°53'00"W 56.48'
L=28.14'
R=150.00'
Δ=10°44'55"
CH=N0°29'28"E
28.10'
LOT 2
A REPLAT OF THE ENCLAVE
EASEMENT TO BE VACATED
AREA: 1,057 SQ.FT.
S84°08'05"E 211.33'
2.5' (TYP.)
2.5' (TYP.)
L=126.51'
R=2060.00'
Δ=3°31'18"
CH=S16°26'10"E
126.43'
LOT 3
A REPLAT OF THE ENCLAVE
COLORADO
JAMES A. COWAN
29038
3/28/24
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR
JOB NUMBER: 24-80548
DRAWN BY: W. BECKETT
DATE: MARCH 28, 2024
THIS IS NOT A "LAND SURVEY PLAT" OR "IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT" AND THIS EXHIBIT IS NOT INTENDED FOR PURPOSES OF TRANSFER OF TITLE OR SUBDIVISIONS OF LAND. RECORD INFORMATION SHOWN HEREON IS BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CLIENT.
Flatirons, Inc.
Land Surveying Services
3825 IRIS AVE, SUITE 395
BOULDER, CO 80301
(303) 443-7001
www.FlatironsInc.com
BY:BBECKETT FILE:80548-EASEMENT VACATE.DWG DATE:3/28/2024 10:08 AM

SUBJECT: **ORDINANCE NO. 1880, SERIES 2024 – AN ORDINANCE REPEALING SECTION 13.12.105 TO ELIMINATE A WATER USE REBATE PROGRAM**

DATE: **JULY 16, 2024**

PRESENTED BY: **RYDER BAILEY, CPA, FINANCE DIRECTOR**

SUMMARY:
Staff is requesting City Council approval of consolidating two existing City utility assistance programs by expanding Sister Carmen's, a well-respected local Non-Profit since 1978, existing Utility Assistance program, and by eliminating the City Administered Annual Senior Water Rebate Program.

These programmatic updates were presented and supported by Finance Committee at their June 20th meeting.

BACKGROUND:
In 2007, City Council, by Resolution 1515, adopted the Annual Senior Water Rebate Program for Louisville residents over the age of 65 and a household income of less than $25,000. The Annual Rebate amount ($100) and the maximum household income have not been modified since 2007. City Staff administering the program has seen recent participation at an all-time low.

An update to the City's Water Utility Assistance program was initially presented at the May 16 Finance Committee meeting. At that meeting, City Staff who administer the Annual Senior Water Rebate Program proposed adjusting the annual rebate amount and maximum household income to adjust for inflation since 2007. Calculated using a Regional CPI from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), this would increase the annual rebate amount from $100 to $150, and also increase the maximum household income from $25,000 to $40,000. This level is approximately 30-35% of Boulder County Area Medium Income per Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Staff also proposed lowering the age eligibility criteria from 65 to 60, to better align with our City Senior offerings.

Based upon feedback from the Finance Committee at their May 16th meeting, the Committee requested options to assist Louisville households in need, regardless of age. Staff returned and presented the recommended option at the June 20 Finance Committee meeting. The Committee recommended option would consolidate the two existing utility assistance programs by expanding Sister Carmen's, a well-respected local Non-Profit since 1978, existing Utility Assistance program, and by eliminating the City Administered Annual Senior Water Rebate Program.

The City of Louisville currently partners with Sister Carmen for Utility Assistance through the City's Non-Profit Grant Program. A portion of the City's annual funding awarded to Sister Carmen (roughly a third) at $5,000, is earmarked for the Utility Assistance Program. These funds are distributed to Louisville residents based on need, there are no age or income requirements. Sister Carmen staff have mentioned to the fill the gap in need it would require approximately an additional $5,000 - $10,000 in funding support.

Staff met with Sister Carmen staff on May 22nd to discuss the Sister Carmen administered Utility Assistance Program. Discussion around potentially expanding the program was well received, especially with recent utility rate increases. Sister Carmen administers their Utility Assistance program year-round, provides assistance based on need, not age. During the meeting, Sister Carmen staff noted the following;

- 73% of Louisville Heads of Households who received Utility Assistance the past two years were under 60 years of age.
- 91% of All Households assisted by Sister Carmen were at or below 30% of Area Medium Income.
- The amount of water utility assistance ranged between $200 and $400 per instance.

By expanding Sister Carmen's current no age restriction, need based, Utility Assistance Program, the following would be accomplished;

- The Assistance Program would be based on need, not age or household income.
- The Assistance Program would be available year-round.
- Sister Carmen would be able to connect persons in need to other available resources.
- Sister Carmen would be able to assist persons currently enrolled in the City's program.

FISCAL IMPACTS:
Staff is requesting an additional $5,000 in funding for a total of $10,000 in Sister Carmen Administered Utility Assistance Program funding available under Account 101121-538420- Contributions and Grants.

The net fiscal impact of consolidating the two existing programs and expanding Sister Carmen's existing no age restriction, need based Utility Assistance Program by providing additional assistance would result in an estimated cost increase of $3,800 to the City.

Additionally, there would be an immaterial amount of City administration savings, as Sister Carmen would administer this program as part of the City's current Non-Profit Grant assistance.

RECOMMENDATION:
Approve the ordinance on first reading and set the public hearing for August 6, 2024.

ATTACHMENT:
1. Ordinance

ORDINANCE NO. 1880
SERIES 2024

AN ORDINANCE REPEALING SECTION 13.12.105 TO ELIMINATE A WATER USE REBATE PROGRAM

WHEREAS, by Ordinance No 1515, Series 2007, the City Council recodified a "water rebate program" in Chapter 13.12 of the Louisville Municipal Code, known as the Annual Senior Water Rebate Program, and which Program has seen dwindling use over the years; and

WHEREAS, the City's Finance Committee has recommended that such Program be eliminated as a City rebate, to be replaced with donations from the City to a local non-profit that will administer assistance to those in need on a broader scale; and

WHEREAS, by this ordinance, the City Council desires to repeal Section 13.12.105 of the Louisville Municipal Code, making such funds available for such purpose.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO:

Section 1. Section 13.12.105 of the Louisville Municipal Code is hereby repealed.

Section 2. If any portion of this ordinance is held to be invalid for any reason, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each part hereof irrespective of the fact that any one part be declared invalid.

Section 3. The repeal or modification of any provision of the Municipal Code of the City of Louisville by this ordinance shall not release, extinguish, alter, modify, or change in whole or in part any penalty, forfeiture, or liability, either civil or criminal, which shall have been incurred under such provision, and each provision shall be treated and held as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any and all proper actions, suits, proceedings, and prosecutions for the enforcement of the penalty, forfeiture, or liability, as well as for the purpose of sustaining any judgment, decree, or order which can or may be rendered, entered, or made in such actions, suits, proceedings, or prosecutions.

Section 4. All other ordinances or portions thereof inconsistent or conflicting with this ordinance or any portion hereof are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency or conflict.

INTRODUCED, READ, PASSED ON FIRST READING, AND ORDERED PUBLISHED this _____ day of _____, 2024.

_____
Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
Kelly PC, City Attorney

PASSED AND ADOPTED ON SECOND AND FINAL READING, this _____ day of _____, 2024.

_____
Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

ATTEST:


_____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

SUBJECT: **RESOLUTION NO. 30, SERIES 2023 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING A PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION GRANT FOR THE COLACCI HOUSE AT 1209 MAIN STREET**

DATE: **JULY 16, 2024**

PRESENTED BY: **AMELIA BRACKETT, SENIOR PLANNER**
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

LOCATION:



SUMMARY
The applicant is requesting:

- A Preservation and Restoration Grant in the amount of **$40,000.**

Staff recommends:

- Approval of a Preservation and Restoration Grant in the amount of **$40,000**.

The applicant is requesting approval of a Preservation and Restoration Grant for preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration work. The total grant request is $40,000, which is equal to the maximum grant allowance of $40,000. This grant would be in addition to the $5,000 signing

bonus for landmarking the structure and the $4,000 grant for the Historic Structure Assessment previously approved for the property.

Under Resolution No. 17, Series 2019, owners of landmarked properties are eligible to apply for Preservation and Restoration Grants. Approved work must fall under the categories of preservation, rehabilitation, and/or restoration.

Resolution 17 includes a requirement that grant requests be received within 36 months of the date a property is declared a landmark, per Section 12.a on page 8. City Council landmarked 1209 Main Street on June 6, 2023, making the deadline for grant requests June 6, 2026.

Staff finds that:

- All of the proposed work falls under either preservation, restoration, or rehabilitation as noted in the table below.
- All of the work is recommended in the Historic Structure Assessment (HSA).

GRANT TABLE

1	2	3
Title of Line Item	**Total Cost of Line Item**	**Check box if work will be completed prior to hearing.**
Preservation- Redesign front porch to prevent water infiltration to the building.	$8,500	☐
Preservation- Foundation Waterproofing, install drainage at rear sides of the home and redirect downspouts away from building	$13,000	☐
Rehabilitation- Evaluate existing electrical and electrical repairs	$11,000	☐
Preservation- install drainage management (correct grading) at sides and rear of home	$2,500	☐
Preservation- Reinforce floor, ceiling & roof framing	$16,000	☐
Restoration- Remove aluminum siding and repair historic stucco siding on walls, repairs soffits and fascia	$31,250	☐
Rehabilitation- Hazardous Materials Abatement	$12,000	☐
		☐
		☐
		☐
Total Project Cost:	$94,250	
Half of total:	$40,000 (max)	**← Total Grant Request**

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ACTION:
The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) held a public hearing on the application on June 17, 2024. The HPC voted to recommend approval of the request(s). The HPC determined the preservation work did not affect the architectural integrity and qualified for matching grant funds.

PROGRAM/SUB-PROGRAM IMPACT:
The application meets the Community Design program goals and sub-program objectives by providing incentives to preserve the historic character of Old Town and to encourage the promotion and preservation of Louisville's history and cultural heritage.

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval of a preservation and restoration grant in the amount of $40,000.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Resolution No. 30, Series 2024
2. Historic Preservation Approval Resolutions
3. Application Materials
4. Historic Structure Assessment

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPACT:

☐	**Financial Stewardship & Asset Management**	☐	**Reliable Core Services**
☐	**Vibrant Economic Climate**	☒	**Quality Programs & Amenities**
☒	**Engaged Community**	☐	**Healthy Workforce**
☐	**Supportive Technology**	☐	**Collaborative Regional Partner**

RESOLUTION NO. 30
SERIES 2024

A RESOLUTION APPROVING A PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION GRANT FOR THE COLACCI HOUSE AT 1209 MAIN STREET

WHEREAS, there has been submitted to the Louisville Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) an application requesting a Preservation and Restoration Grant for the historical residential property located at 1209 Main Street, on property legally described as Lot 2, Nicola Di Giacomo Addition Replat B, City of Louisville, State of Colorado;

WHEREAS, City staff and the HPC have reviewed the application and found it to be in compliance with Chapter 15.36.120 of the Louisville Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, the HPC held a properly noticed public hearing on the proposed grant application and has forwarded to the City Council a recommendation of approval; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has duly considered the proposed grant application and the Commission's recommendation and report, and has held a properly noticed public hearing on the application; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the proposed improvements will assist in the preservation of the Colacci House, a local historic landmark.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO:

Section 1. The City Council hereby approves the Preservation and Restoration Grant for work at the Colacci House, subject to the following:

1. There is approved a total grant amount of $40,000 for the work described in the attached Exhibit A.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 16TH day of July, 2024.

By: _____
Christopher M. Leh, Mayor

Attest: _____
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

Exhibit A

GRANT TABLE

1	2	3
Title of Line Item	**Total Cost of Line Item**	**Check box if work will be completed prior to hearing.**
Preservation- Redesign front porch to prevent water infiltration to the building.	$8,500	☐
Preservation- Foundation Waterproofing, install drainage at rear sides of the home and redirect downspouts away from building	$13,000	☐
Rehabilitation- Evaluate existing electrical and electrical repairs	$11,000	☐
Preservation- install drainage management (correct grading) at sides and rear of home	$2,500	☐
Preservation- Reinforce floor, ceiling & roof framing	$16,000	☐
Restoration- Remove aluminum siding and repair historic stucco siding on walls, repairs soffits and fascia	$31,250	☐
Rehabilitation- Hazardous Materials Abatement	$12,000	☐
		☐
		☐
		☐
Total Project Cost:	$94,250	
Half of total:	$40,000 (max)	**← Total Grant Request**

RESOLUTION NO. 3
SERIES 2024

A RESOLUTION MAKING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING A PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION GRANT FOR COLLACI HOUSE LOCATED AT 1209 MAIN STREET.

WHEREAS, there has been submitted to the Louisville Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) an application requesting a preservation and restoration grant for Colacci House, a historic residential structure located at 1209 Main Street, on property legally described as Lot 2, Nicola Di Giacomo Addition Replat B, Town of Louisville, City of Louisville, State of Colorado; and

WHEREAS, the City Staff and the HPC have reviewed the application and found it to be in compliance with Section 3.20.605.D and Section 15.36.120 of the Louisville Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, the HPC has held a properly noticed public hearing on the preservation and restoration grant; and

WHEREAS, the preservation and restoration work being requested includes making repairs to the existing structure; and

WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission finds these proposed improvements will assist in the preservation of Colacci House, which is to be landmarked by the City;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO:

1. The Historic Preservation Commission recommends the City Council approve the proposed Preservation and Restoration Grant application for the Colacci House, in the amount of **$40,000** for work as described in the attached Exhibit A.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 17th day of June, 2024.

Lynda Haley, Chairperson

City of Louisville **Historic Preservation Program**

PRESERVATION & RESTORATION GRANT APPLICATION

APPLICATION MATERIALS REQUIRED (submit final docs to abrackett@louisvilleco.gov)

- [x] Application form (3 pages)
- [x] Separate list with detailed descriptions of proposed work
- [ ] Alteration Certificate Application, if relevant (for work that alters the exterior of a property)
- [ ] Optional: Cover letter describing the proposal
- [ ] Optional: Invoices, estimates, and other cost-related materials to support request

GENERAL INFORMATION

Site Address: 1209 Main Street

Owner Name: Defend Colorado LLC

Owner Phone: _____

Owner Email: vincent@colsonbuilders.com

Owner Representative Name: Peter Stewart

Owner Rep. Phone: 303-665-6668

Owner Rep. Email: peter@stewart-architecture.com

FILLING OUT THE GRANT TABLE ON PAGE 2

Column 1: Give a title to each line item. Include the same title in your list of descriptions of the work so that it is clear which description corresponds to which estimate.

Column 2: Provide the total cost of the line item.

Column 3: Check if relevant. Work completed within the past 5 years prior to landmarking is eligible for grants.

Total Project Cost: Fill in the total cost of all of the line items.

Half of Total: Divide the total project cost in half. This becomes your Total Grant Request. Preservation & Restoration Grants are 50/50 matching grants.

Grant requests greater than maximum allowed: If the Total Grant Request is greater than the maximum allowed, you must submit a letter describing your request. Applications for grants above the maximum must begin with a specific meeting with staff to discuss the request above maximum.

GRANT TABLE

1	2	3
Title of Line Item	**Total Cost of Line Item**	**Check box if work will be completed prior to hearing.**
Preservation- Redesign front porch to prevent water infiltration to the building.	$8,500	☐
Preservation- Foundation Waterproofing, install drainage at rear sides of the home and redirect downspouts away from building	$13,000	☐
Rehabilitation- Evaluate existing electrical and electrical repairs	$11,000	☐
Preservation- install drainage management (correct grading) at sides and rear of home	$2,500	☐
Preservation- Reinforce floor, ceiling & roof framing	$16,000	☐
Restoration- Remove aluminum siding and repair historic stucco siding on walls, repairs soffits and fascia	$31,250	☐
Rehabilitation- Hazardous Materials Abatement	$12,000	☐
		☐
		☐
		☐
Total Project Cost:	$94,250	
Half of total:	$40,000 (max)	**← Total Grant Request**
If Total Grant Request is greater than the maximum allowed, you must first meet with staff as part of the application process.		

The Property Owner (or Grantee) hereby agrees and acknowledges that:

A. Funds received as a result of this application will be expended as reimbursements of up to half of actual expenses and must be completed within established timelines.

B. Awards from the Historic Preservation Fund may differ in type and amount from those requested on an application.

C. Recipients must submit their project for any required design review by the Historic Preservation Commission and acquire any required building permits before work has started.

D. All projects are subject to zoning and building code review and approval of a grant does not constitute building permit approval.

E. All work approved for grant funding must be completed even if only partially funded through this incentives program.

F. Unless the conditions of approval provide otherwise, disbursement of grant or rebate funds will occur after completion of the project and shall be accompanied by proof of payment. Reimbursements are processed as payments to the Property Owner or Grantee.

G. The incentive funds may be considered taxable income and Applicant should consult a tax professional if they have questions.

H. The grant application will be reviewed in accordance with all relevant City policy, including but not limited to the categories of eligible expenses described below.

Eligible expenses fall into one or more of the categories below. Interior improvements for protection, stabilization, or code-required work are eligible for grants. Other interior improvements are not.

- **Preservation** applies methods to sustain existing form, integrity, and materials. Approved work focuses on repairing exterior historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction.
- **Rehabilitation** facilitates new uses and standards for a building through repair, alterations, and additions that preserve those portions or features that convey its historical, cultural, or architectural significance. Rehabilitation acknowledges the need to alter or add to a historic property while retaining the property's historic character. Upgrading mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-related work may be considered rehabilitation.
- **Restoration** accurately depicts the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time. Approved work focuses on exterior work and includes the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period.

SIGNATURES AND DATES

4/8/4024

Owner (or Grantee) Signature Date

If Grantee is not Property Owner, describe relationship to property:

CITY USE ONLY – INTAKE VERIFICATION

- ☐ Table is filled out completely
- ☐ List of Line Item Descriptions is attached
- ☐ Title of Line Items matches Line Item Description Addendum
- ☐ Accompanied by Alteration Certificate, if needed
- ☐ Line items correspond to one of the 3 eligible categories (preservation, restoration, rehabilitation)
- ☐ Applicant has met with staff if grant request is above maximum allowed

1209 Main Street

Revised: 4/1/24

Preservation & Restoration grant requests highlighted

High Priority

Task	*Quantity*	*Unit*		*Unit Cost*		*Total*
3.2 Structural Systems						
Determine source of leak by sprinkler control box, and repair	1	EA	$	1,000.00	$	1,000
3.4 Envelope - Roofing and Waterproofing						
Redirect Downspouts away from building	1	EA	$	2,500.00	$	2,500
Foundation waterproofing	1	EA	$	10,500.00	$	10,500
3.8 Electrical Systems						
Evaluate electrical system	1	EA	$	1,000.00	$	1,000
Electrical system repairs	1	EA	$	10,000.00	$	10,000
Subtotal High Priority Costs					**$**	**25,000**
Other						
Permits, Contractor O&P, Professional fees	15%				$	3,750
Subtotal					$	28,750
Contingency	10%				$	2,875
Total High Priority Costs					**$**	**31,625**

Low to medium Priority

Task	*Quantity*	*Unit*		*Unit Cost*		*Total*
3.1 Site						
Fencing repair	1	EA	$	1,500.00	$	1,500
Install drainage at rear and sides of home	1	EA	$	2,500.00	$	2,500
3.2 Structural System						
Redesign front porch floor to prevent water infiltration into the basement	1	EA	$	8,500.00	$	8,500
Reinforce floor, ceiling and roof framing	1	EA	$	16,000.00	$	16,000
3.3 Envelope - Exterior Walls						

Remove alumn siding and repair historic stucco siding on walls, repair soffits, and fascia	2500	SF	$	12.50	$	31,250
3.7 Mechanical Systems						
Evaluate the furnace to determine if systems are functioning properly with adequate air intake and exhaust	1	EA	$	800.00	$	800
Subtotal Construction Costs					**$**	**60,550**
**** Hazardous Material Abatement**						
Budget estimate	1	EA	$	12,000.00	$	12,000
Subtotal Hard Construction Costs					**$**	**72,550**
Other						
Permits, Contractor O&P, Professional fees	15%				$	10,883
Subtotal					$	83,433
Contingency	10%				$	8,343
Total Low Priority Costs					**$**	**91,776**

1209 Main Street

Historic Structure Assessment



Prepared for:
Vincent Colson, Colson Builders

Prepared by:
Stewart Architecture & Planning
1132 Jefferson Avenue
Louisville, CO 80027
(303) 665-6668

stewart
ARCHITECTURE

November 2022

CREDITS

FUNDING:
This project was partially paid for by the Louisville Historic Preservation Fund.

PARTICIPANTS:

Stewart Architecture
Peter J. Stewart
Adam Lagacey

Barlow Cultural Resource Consulting LLC (BCRC)
Phillip Barlow

JVA Consulting Engineers
Matthew Dinsmore, PE
Ian Glaser, PE
JVA Consulting Engineers
1319 Spruce Street, Boulder, CO 80302

PHOTO AND MAP CREDITS:
Stewart Architecture
BCRC LLC
Louisville Historical Museum, Department of Library & Museum Services

Contents

1.0 Introduction 4
1.1 Research Background/Participants 4
1.2 Building Location 4

2.0 History and Use 6
2.0 Building History 6
2.1 Architectural Significance and Construction History 13
2.2 Floor Plans 16
2.3 Proposed Use 19

3.0 Structure Condition Assessment 20
3.0 Condition Assessment 20
3.1 Site 21
3.2 Structural Systems 25
3.3 Envelope- Exterior Walls 31
3.4 Envelope - Roofing and Waterproofing 34
3.5 Windows & Doors 38
3.6 Interior Finishes 42
3.7 Mechanical Systems 45
3.8 Electrical Systems 48
4.1 Hazardous Materials 51
4.2 Building Code Compliance 52
4.3 Zoning Code Compliance 52

5.0 Preservation Plan 53
5.1 Prioritized Work 53
5.2 Estimate of Probable Costs of Construction 55

6.0 Bibliography 58
Bibliography 58
Online Sources 58

7.0 Appendix 59
Structural Engineer report
Survey (ILC)

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Research Background/Participants

This report was researched and prepared by Stewart Architecture and Planning and BCRC for Colson Builders. The primary focus of this report is the house and not the accessory garage building.

Information was provided by Stewart Architecture and Planning consultants, BCRC, and the City of Louisville. The project was partially funded by a Louisville Historic Preservation Fund grant.

1.2 Building Location


Building Address: 1209 Main Street, Louisville, Colorado.

Legal Description: LOTS 3-4-5-6 BLK 1 NICOLAS DIGIACOMO ADDITION

Boundary: This legally defined parcel encompasses but does not exceed the land historically associated with this property.



Site Plan



Portion of ILC (see appendix)

2.0 History and Use

2.0 Building History

Information from Bridget Bacon, City of Louisville Museum Coordinator

Date of Construction: circa 1909

Summary: This was the first Louisville home of Mike Colacci, who with his wife Mary founded Louisville's _lue Parrot Restaurant while they lived at 1209 Main; Mike _olacci's brother, Jim, who co-owned it from the start, became the sole owner of the house in 1922 and lived there. The property was the site of Jim Colacci's poultry business as well as the house being the likely site of Colacci's bootlegging activities during Prohibition.

Development of the Nicola Di Giacomo Addition

This area of Louisville was named the Nicola Di Giacomo Addition, having been platted by Nicola Di Giacomo in 1907. Nicola Di Giacomo farmed this area before filing the plat for a subdivision. This addition consists of 4 ½ blocks that stretch across the north end of Old Town of Louisville. (On the 1909 Drumm's Wall Map of Louisville, Nicola Di Giacomo is also shown as the owner of the additional property where Louisville Middle School is now located, and of the residential area that now extends behind the school and north of it up to South Boulder Road.) DiGiacomo was born in Italy in 1852 and immigrated to the US in about 1882.

Colacci Family Ownership, 1908-1959; Discussion of Date of Construction

Arcangelo Michele "Mike" _olacci (1886-1970) and Vincenzo James "Jim" _olacci (1884-1964) were brothers who had emigrated from Bojano, Campobasso, Italy (Mike reportedly in 19051907, and Jim reportedly in 1908). The two purchased the property at 1209 Main in 1908 and built the house soon after. This house at 1209 Main was the first Louisville home of Mike Colacci, the founder of the Blue Parrot Restaurant that he and his wife, Mary, started in 1919 and that put Louisville on the map as being a restaurant town with Italian food that drew diners from all over the Denver area and beyond.

The house is shown in the 1909 Drumm's Wall Map of Louisville. At the time of the 1910 census, both brothers were living in the house. Both were listed as being coal miners.

Boulder County gives the date of construction of the original part of this house as being 1910. This date appears on both the 1948 County Assessor card for 1209 Main and on the current Boulder County website. Since Boulder County records are sometimes in error with respect to the construction dates of historic buildings in Louisville, other evidence must also be looked to. In this case, Mike Colacci and Jim Colacci purchased the lots in 1908 and the house is shown as already being in existence on the Drumm's Wall Map of Louisville dated 1909, which was a year before the date given by the County. Therefore, the construction date is assumed to be circa 1909.

According to an article the August 1994 issue of the *Louisville Historian*, which was based on information from the Colacci family, Mike Colacci returned to Italy when the 1910 mine strike started in the Louisville area and was immediately drafted into the Italian Army. He ended up serving for three years, including time served in Ethiopia, before returning to Louisville. It is not known whether Jim Colacci went through the same experience, but both brothers are listed in the Louisville directory for 1916 as being back at the house at 1209 Main by that year. According to the same article, Mike and Jim Colacci tried starting a dairy business together, but it failed during the agricultural depression of 1919.

In 1916, Mike Colacci married Mary Iarussi (1899-1949). She had come with her family from Italy in 1907 and they lived on the 1200 block of La Farge Ave., the block behind 1209 Main. At the time of their marriage, she was 16 and he was 29. They had two sons, Joe and Anthony, who themselves became important figures in Louisville's "spaghetti economy" of the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s in particular, with Joe operating the Blue Parrot Restaurant and Anthony operating Colacci's Restaurant;


The 1920 census shows Mike and Mary Colacci, and their young sons Joe and Anthony, living at 1209 Main. Mike was listed as being a coal miner, but the couple by then had already started the business that would become the Blue Parrot. Jim Colacci could not be located in the 1920 census.

In the 1920s, Mike and Mary Colacci and their sons had moved down Main Street to live by the Blue Parrot, where they could tend to their growing restaurant business. In 1922, Mike Colacci's brother, Jim, who was still the co-owner and who had lived in the house earlier, purchased Mike's half-ownership interest. He became the full owner and made it his residence.

Both Colacci brothers were active bootleggers during Colorado's Prohibition, which lasted from 1916 until 1933. During that period, Colorado KKK members were active participants in the enforcement of Prohibition laws as a way to control immigrants, particularly Catholic immigrants, of whom there were many in Louisville. The lead article of the Fall 2022 issue of the *Louisville Historian* describes this context and details Mike Colacci's bootlegging activities and how it was his ability to pay off a loan with proceeds from illegal sales of alcohol that made it possible for the Blue Parrot Restaurant to survive and succeed. Bootlegging was risky, but could be lucrative. The *Lafayette Leader* newspaper on Sept. 26, 1924 featured the following article on its front page, describing a raid on what in all likelihood was 1209 Main (given the lack of evidence that Jim

Colacci had any other homes in Louisville and given that 1209 Main is documented as having a basement):

"One of the most productive raids ever made on a moonshine plant in Boulder county was staged on Jim Colacci's place in Louisville last Friday just before noon by Sheriff Robert Blum, Deputy Sheriff Roy Reed and Federal prohibition officer J. R. Calloway.


SHERIFF BLUM GETS LOUISVILLE STILL

Collacci's Place Raided, Still And Large Quantities Of Hooch Seized

"Collacci is an unmarried, unnaturalized Italian and he and his place have been under surveillance by the authorities for some time past. Friday Sheriff Blum was tipped off that the time was ripe for a raid. Accordingly Blum and his posse descended upon Collacci's residence, which is located in a prominent place in Louisville. Entering the house the officers discovered a trap-door in the dining room. They lifted this door and descended down a ladder about ten feet into the basement. Here they found what they were looking for. There was confiscated a 15-gallon copper still, 30 gallons of whisky, 3 gallons of rare old wine, 400 gallons of corn sugar mash, several gallons of coloring fluid, 20 five-gallon jars, a number of glass containers, a few kegs, ten or twelve gallons of gasoline and 2 sacks of sugar.

"It may be said in favor of Collacci that everything was spotlessly clean. The still and other articles were loaded into trucks and taken back to Boulder by Blum and his men. The still had a capacity of 50 gallons daily. One of the most interesting things found was the distiller's ledger; In this ledger were written the names of 165 customers who are indebted to Collacci for "merchandise rendered " Among the 165 names on the list are those of Boulder County lawyers, farmers, truck drivers, merchants, doctors, idle rich and others of various and sundry callings. It will make an interesting and instructive document if made public when Collacci's case is brought up for trial.

> "Collacci is an old offender in the moonshine industry and it will probably go pretty hard with him when the court gets busy with him. He will in all probability be sent down to Canon City to board with Tom Tynan [The warden of the State Penitentiary in Canon City], while others are making a move to have him deported. His is the second big still put out of business in Louisville within the last thirty days by Sheriff Blum."

Unfortunately, more information could not be located about the raid, any trial, or the ledger. However, it is possible that Jim Colacci served time in the State Penitentiary as a result of the raid, as was suggested in the article as being a possibility.

Apparently related to the raid and his legal problems, Jim Colacci quickly took action to get himself access to a large amount of money -$1500 (worth about $26,000 in today's dollars). On Oct. 2, 1924, which was less than two weeks after the raid, he deeded a half interest in his property at 1209 Main over to Rome Perrella. (Rome was the son of his neighbors, Joseph and Flora Perrella, who were the longtime residents of 1201 Main and who had come from a village in Italy not far from the village of the Colaccis.) The sale amount shown on the deed was $1500. Four years later, in 1928, Rome Perrella deeded the half-interest in the property back to him for the same amount of money, according to Boulder County records. These transactions suggest that Jim Colacci may have needed funds to pay a large fine, but this is not known for certain. It is also possible that Jim Colacci did serve time and that Rome Perrella looked after the house during this period. (Jim Colacci did not appear in the 1926 Louisville directory.)

Besides working as a coal miner, trying a dairy business with his brother, and making and selling alcohol during Prohibition, Jim Colacci also engaged in other activities to bring in income. This photo from the collection of the Louisville Historical Museum came with handwriting that indicated that he was a business partner of Rome Perrella at the latter's auto business at the southwest corner of Main and Walnut, likely been in the 1920s or early 1930s. Jim is indicated as being the man on the left.

By 1930, if not earlier, Jim Colacci also started a poultry business on his property at 1209 Main that he would have for many years.

He also began to rent out part of his property to renters – a longtime practice in Louisville that benefitted both the property owner and the tenants, particularly during years when levels of housing stock were low. (see related Louisville Historian article). In the first documented instance of this, the 1930 census shows Guy Comozzi (also spelled Camozzi) (1869-1948), a widower, lodging with Jim Colacci at 1209 Main; Guy worked as a miner; Jim Colacci's occupation in 1930 was listed as raising chickens. Guy Comozzi continued to reside at 1209 Main until 1935, according to Louisville directory listings.

Next, from around 1939 to at least 1946 (according to Louisville directories), James Vincenzo Colacci rented out the house at 1209 Main to Harry and Paulin e Wade and their children, Willard, Grace, and Pearl. Harry Wade was an electrician who worked in the coal mines in the area. The 1940 federal census shows them to be living at 1209 Main at the same time as Jim Colacci. He is listed as being the owner of the property and living there, and the Wade family is shown as renting for $20 per month.

In 1948, the Boulder County Assessor had photos taken of houses in Louisville and information was filled out on a card for each house. Here are the photo of the house and a sketch of the layout from that card. The card indicates that the house had an alteration in 1933 or 1935 (the handwriting is not clear). The card makes a reference to the "poultry houses" being itemized on a separate card, but no such card has survived.




Image 1: Assessor Card Photo




Image 2: Assessor Card Plan Sketch

The next known set of tenants at 1209 Main were Robert Hall (1921-2012) and his family. He came to Louisville in 1948 to be the principal and science teacher at the nearby Louisville High School at 1341 Main that had opened in 1940. He and his wife, Viola, and sons Russell, Tyler, and Wesley are shown on the 1950 census as living at 1209 Main, with Jim Colacci also residing on the property at the same time and working as a "poultryman;" The Halls left Louisville in 1951 for Robert to take a position elsewhere.

Starting in 1951, Joe Stelmack (1904-1989) and Agnes Pankoski Stelmack (1910-1995) began to rent the house. They were both born in Superior. Jim Colacci continued to live on the premises at this time as well; According to the 1956 Louisville directory, Jim was living in the "rear;" This rental situation turned into the Stelmacks actually purchasing the property.

Ownership of Property by Stelmack Family (1959-1996)

In 1959, Agnes and Joe Stelmack bought 1209 Main and continued to live there. (The 1960 directory lists Jim Colacci as still living at 1209 Main as well, although this may have been a carryover from their situation in 1959.) The house was sold after Agnes's 1995 death.

Jim Colacci died in 1964. His August 7, 1964 obituary in the *Louisville Times* stated that his death followed a long illness.

Aerial Photos

This excerpt of a 1962 aerial photo of Louisville, looking east, shows a back view of the property at 1209 Main, including outbuildings that are now gone:



This excerpt of a 1978 aerial photo is a front view of 1209 Main:

Later owners

Erich and Deborah Walls purchased 1209 Main from the Stelmack family in 1996. They, in turn, sold it to Jeffrey Smith and Stacey Brangenberg in 2001. In 2021, Stacey Brangenberg became the sole owner, and in 2022, she sold it to Defend Colorado, LLC, which is the current owner of record.



Records of the work that owners have had done on the house since the 1990s can be found on the City website here: Main 1209 -Laserfiche WebLink (louisvilleco.gov) . These records show that in the 1990s, some outbuildings were demolished. They appear on a 1996 survey that was filed later with a notation that the buildings were by then gone; They include a “chicken coop” and a “very old barn” at the southwest corner of the property. It is possible that other structures, including additional structures for raising chickens, had already been removed.

According to the report “Stories in Places: Putting Louisville’s Residential Development in Context” (at Microsoft Word -Final Louisville Residential Context 111918 (louisvilleco.gov) written by PaleoWest Archaeology for the City of Louisville, the architectural style of the house at 1209 Main is “bungalow” style;

The preceding research is based on a review of relevant and available online County property records, census records, oral history interviews, Louisville directories, and Louisville Historical Museum maps, files, obituary records, and historical photographs from the collection of the Louisville Historical Museum.

End of Bridget Bacon's Report

2.1 Architectural Significance and Construction History

Architectural Description:

1209 Main Street is a one-story wood-framed Bungalow form residential property on a large 100' x 250' lot on the west side of Main Street, north of downtown Louisville, Colorado.

The property is primarily rectangular in form, oriented gable-front towards Main Street. The primary footprint of the building is covered with a Jerkinhead, or clipped gable, roof with a brick chimney centrally located on the ridge line. There is a three-quarter-width centered front porch featuring a roof that mimics the style of the primary roof, heavy tapered columns that are coated with stucco, and a half-height solid-wall railing. Fascia and soffit on the property are wrapped with non-historic sheet metal, obscuring any remaining original details. The walls of the property are covered with a non-historic vinyl and sheet metal siding product. There are two protrusions from the primary rectangular block, a shed roof partial-depth protrusion on the south elevation, and a shed roof half-width protrusion on the rear, west elevation. The windows are predominately wood, three-over-one double-hung windows with spring-pin stays with wood casing.

Construction History:

Building was constructed ca.1909. The building retains its original construction site.

The footprint of the building matches the 1948 Assessor card, indicating that no major structural modifications were made after that time. There is some evidence that there were modifications prior to 1948, those being:

- An exterior basement window obstructed by the current stairs to the basement. The stairs to the basement are within the south side shed roof protruding portion of the building



Image 3: Basement window is bisected by the main level landing to the basement stairs


- Exterior stairs on the rear of the building that are now covered over by the rear addition. While this addition is shown on the Assessor card footprint, it may have been a covered entry to the basement that has been modified. This addition currently houses a bathroom and laundry room which appears to have been recently updated.



Image 4: Exterior stairs covered with rear addition

Non-structural changes to the property include the addition of siding over the older stucco siding, which likely occurred in 1975 per the Building Permit files. Windows appear to be original.

Building History Plan:




Significance:
The property retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

Under the National Register of Historic Places criteria for eligibility, the property would qualify as historic under:

Criteria A "*Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history*" (development of Louisville's history, coal mining, bootlegging, and restaurant culture)

Potentially **Criteria B** "*Associated with the lives of significant persons in our past*" (The Colacci family).

2.2 Floor Plans




BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN


1/4"=1'-0"

N

0 4 8 FT



MAIN FLOOR PLAN


ATTIC
BED RM. 2
LIVING RM.
OFFICE
STORAGE
STORAGE
1ST FLOOR
100'-0"
BSMT SLAB
CROSS SECTION

2.3 Proposed Use

The historic use as a residence is anticipated to continue.

3.0 Structure Condition Assessment

3.0 Condition Assessment

This site and building assessment represents the first critical phase to the historic preservation project. The report is based on comprehensive field inspections and research conducted by a number of professionals, including a preservation specialist, an archaeologist, architect and engineer. The assessment recommends, where necessary, appropriate treatments consistent to the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

The users of this assessment will find a description of each feature, element, or space followed by a condition evaluation and finally recommendations for the appropriate treatment of each.

The following condition evaluation rating system is used in this section to evaluate the condition of each feature, element, or space:

GOOD CONDITION: An element, feature, or space is evaluated in good condition when it meets the following criteria:

- It is intact, structurally sound, and performing its intended purpose.
- There are few or no cosmetic imperfections.
- It needs no repair and only minor or routine maintenance.

FAIR CONDITION: An element, feature, or space is evaluated in fair condition when one or more the following are evident:

- There are early signs of wear, failure, or deterioration, although the feature or element is generally structurally sound and performing its intended purpose.
- There is failure of a sub-component of the feature or element.
- Replacement of up to 25% of the feature or element is required.
- Replacement of a defective sub-component of the feature or element is required.

POOR CONDITION: An element, feature, or space is evaluated in poor condition when the following is evident:

- It is no longer performing its intended purpose.
- It is missing.
- It shows signs of imminent failure or breakdown.
- Deterioration/damage affects more than 25% of the feature/element and cannot be adjusted or repaired.
- It requires major repair or replacement.

3.1 Site

Element	*Description & Condition*	*Evaluation*	*Recommendation*
Associated Landscape Features	Detached two car garage located in the northwest portion of the property. Some cracks around openings. Built prior to 1962.	Fair	Determine if movement has stopped. Patch cracks
Grading	The lot slopes from the rear of the property to the street. Concrete curbs have been built along the rear to prevent water infiltration. Multiple cracks in the concrete. Some minor efflorescence was noted on the rear basement wall.	Fair	Recommend installation of a French drain along the rear of the home to guide drainage along the sides to the street. Repair cracked concrete and curbs
Parking	There is a wide concrete driveway on the north side of the home leading to the detached garage. Driveway is heavily cracked. An animal has made a home underneath the western portion	Poor	Replace driveway, ensuring that the drainage slope is away from the home
Fencing	The rear yard of the home is fenced with 6' cedar. There is one panel that has been dislodged by a neighbors tree	Fair	Gain permission to trim back adjacent tree. Reattached dislodged panel
Irrigation	Irrigation control box on the north side of the house may be leaking	Good	There is an exterior hose connection and an irrigation control box adjacent to the moisture damage on the interior. These systems should be excavated and inspected for leaks to prevent further damage



Image 5: Associated Landscape Feature_Detached Garage



Image 6: Associated Landscape Feature Detached Garage Crack by door



Image 7: Grading_ Lot slopes from rear of the home to the street. View facing towards Main Street



Image 8: Grading Lot slopes from rear of the home to the street. Curb around basement window



Image 9: Parking Concrete driveway



Image 10: Fencing Panel dislodged at west end

3.2 Structural Systems

Element	*Description & Condition*	*Evaluation*	*Recommendation*
General Structural System Description	Wood framed structure on concrete foundation. (See engineer's report in Appendix for detailed description and condition)	Good	See engineer's report for detailed recommendations
Foundation Systems	The foundation is concrete basement walls that extend approximately 12" above grade with several internal concrete walls. The north foundation wall exhibits signs of excessive moisture penetration which has caused failure of the plaster coating on the interior. While this has not damaged the foundation structurally, the moisture should be addressed	Good	Patch and repair cracks in foundation walls and address moisture issues with waterproofing on north wall per engineer's report Correct irrigation system and downspout drainage issues. Addressed in 3.1 & 3.4
Floor & Ceiling Systems	Basement floor are concrete slab on grade. Main level floor joists are 2"x6" wood joists set 16" on-center resting on sill plates on exterior and internal concrete walls.	Good	Sister main floor joists to increase floor load capacity per engineers report
Roof Framing System	The roof framing system consists of 2"x6" wood rafters butt jointed to a ridge beam. There are no collar ties. Purlins have been added to the structure at some point throughout the roof structure except in the northeast quarter of the roof. The reason for the lack of bracing in that area was not able to be determined. The added purlins are bolted to the existing rafters. In addition, metal tie rods were added at the purlin-rafter connection point vertically to the attic joists. The insulation prevented a clear view of how they were connected at the joists	Good	Reinforce framing system per engineers report

Entry Porch	The entry porch is wood framed with a wood floor. There are steps on the south side from a concrete sidewalk. The ceiling, solid wall railing, and tapered columns are all coated in stucco. This stucco appears to be a more recent skim coat, and a pale yellow stucco can be seen underneath where the top coat has been damaged. The basement extends to underneath the porch, and there is a concrete wall supporting the outer edge of the porch and another wall at the house wall, creating a vault underneath. The floor of the porch creates the roof of the basement vault, and water infiltration and mold are evident.	Good	The porch floor needs to be sealed with managed drainage to prevent water infiltration into the basement.



Image 11: Foundation Systems_ Poured concrete on grade with concrete walls. Stepped poured concrete foundation walls common throughout the basement



Image 12: Foundation Systems_ Sprinkler control box and hose bib are immediately adjacent on the exterior



Image 13: Floor & Ceiling Systems_ 2x6 wood joists with sill plates resting on concrete foundation walls



Image 14: Roof Framing Systems_ 2x6, 24"OC. View facing towards Main Street. Note the lack of purlins on the NE quarter



Image 15: Roof Framing Systems_ Note the vertical metal tie rods. As they are attached with L-brackets, it is assumed that they are not designed to carry much weight



Image 16: Entry Porch



Image 17: Entry Porch_ Basement room directly under porch



Image 18: Entry Porch_ Underside of porch floor

3.3 Envelope- Exterior Walls

Element	Description & Condition	Evaluation	Recommendation
Exterior Wall Construction	Wood framed stud wall with exterior stucco. Walls are generally straight and plumb. Stucco is covered by metal siding and cannot be fully evaluated	Good	Remove non-historic siding to evaluate stucco
Exterior Finishes	Metal siding covers the original wall, soffit, and fascia finishes. The siding is coming loose in multiple locations. The stucco cannot be evaluated. It is not known if the stucco is the original finish, but it has been extant since at least 1948 when the Assessor card photo was taken	Fair	As the siding is already in need of repairs, recommend its removal to evaluate the stucco finish underneath. Patch and repair stucco siding. Remove aluminum covering soffits and fascia. Repair wood soffit an fascia.
Exterior Masonry	The above grade portion of the poured foundation is in good condition. The brick chimney is in good condition.	Good	Inspect the chimney annually for mortar and flashing deterioration
Exterior Appendages—Porch, Stoop, Portico, etc.	The porch has been addressed in section 3.2	N/A	N/A



Image 19: Exterior Finishes_ A section where the siding has slipped shows the stucco underneath



Image 20: Exterior Finishes_ Loose siding



Image 21: Exterior Masonry_ Brick Chimney

3.4 Envelope - Roofing and Waterproofing

Element	Description & Condition	Evaluation	Recommendation
Roofing Systems	Roofing is asphalt shingles. The shingles appear to be in good order and no leaks were noted in the attic	Good	No action needed
Sheet Metal Flashing	Flashing around the chimney and swamp cooler appear to be in good order and no leaks were noted on the interior	Good	No action needed
Perimeter Foundation Drainage	No in-ground drainage systems were noted. There is concrete sidewalks and curbs along the rear of the house where the slope meets the building. Concrete is cracked its effectiveness at diverting water is reduced.	Fair	Install a perimeter drain system at the rear of the home to move water away from the foundation. Repair concrete curbs and sidewalks
Foundations	Moisture intrusion through north basement wall.	Poor	Apply waterproofing material to the backside of the wall. Alternatively, improve site grading and install a perimeter drain system along the north side of the house.
Drainage System, Gutters & Downspouts	Gutters are in good condition. Downspouts discharge water too close to the foundation of the building, causing water to infiltrate the basement.	Fair	Extend the downspouts so that water is discharged at least six feet from the foundation and on a grade flowing away from the home.
Skylights / Cupolas	There is a skylight in the rear bathroom addition.	Good	No action needed



Image 22: Sheet Metal Flashing_ Swamp cooler flashing



Image 23: Perimeter Foundation Drainage_ Concrete poured up against the rear of the home is cracked and allowing surface water in penetrate



Image 24: Drainage System, Gutters & Downspouts_ Discharge is too close to the foundation



Image 25: Drainage System, Gutters & Downspouts_ Active water infiltration in basement directly adjacent to previous photo of downspout

3.5 Windows & Doors

Element	Description & Condition	Evaluation	Recommendation
Doors (including Hardware, Casing/Trim, and Finishes)	Front door matches windows and is likely original. Door is stained and varnished wood and features three vertical lites above with three horizontal panels below. Bedroom doors are two-panel stained and varnished wood. They appear to be original Interior door to the south side shed roof protrusion is 15-lite, stained and varnished wood. Exterior door on the south elevation is four-panel with large single-pane lite, painted wood. Doors are all two-hinge design, with only one set of knob hardware appearing to be original Interior casing appears to be original, and consists of stained and varnished wood, 4 1/8" wide side and top boards with a 1/2" cap at the door head	Good	Perform general maintenance. Inspect and repair weatherstripping on the exterior doors. Monitor crack in bottom panel of south-side exterior door.
Windows (including Hardware, Casing/Trim, and Finishes)	Window casing matches the doors. Windows on the main level are three-over-one, wood, double-hung windows with spring-pin stays. The windows are stained and varnished except for the kitchen and dinette windows, which are painted. The kitchen windows have been modified with tape balances. The windows are all in good condition, with no repairs needed that would be outside of a general maintenance scope. There are storm windows on the exterior Basement windows are a variety of types, including replacement windows. The oldest surviving style is the three-lite wood awning-style windows in fair condition	Good-Main level Fair-Basement	Main level: Perform general maintenance. Paint and glazing putty touchups. Lubricate spring pins. Basement: Clear debris from exterior. Ensure positive drainage away from building. Windows would require a level 2 restoration per the National Park Service Preservation Brief 9.



Image 26: Doors_Front door



Image 27: Doors Bedroom door



Image 28: Windows_ Representative windows



Image 29: Windows_ Typical level of deterioration



Image 30: Windows_ Representative historic basement window

3.6 Interior Finishes

Element	Description & Condition	Evaluation	Recommendation
Wall Finish Materials	Plaster, various textures Drywall around kitchen	Good	Patch some small holes and divots
Ceiling Finish Materials	Plaster, various textures Drywall around kitchen Cracking is noted on the bedroom ceilings	Good	Assess cracking in bedrooms. If no more movement is anticipated, patch and paint cracks
Floor Finish Materials	Finished hardwood throughout the main level except for tile in the bathrooms. Wood floors feature 5 1/2" painted baseboard with shoe moulding.	Good	No work needed
Trim and Built-Ins (not previously addressed in Section 3.5	Stained and varnished wood closet in front bedroom	Good	No work needed



Image 31: Wall Finish Materials_ Drywall/plaster seam at the kitchen



Image 32: Ceiling Finish Materials_ Ceiling cracks in bedroom



Image 33: Floor Finish Materials_ Representative wood floor and moulding



Image 34: Trim and Built-ins_ Closet in bedroom

3.7 Mechanical Systems

Element	Description & Condition	Evaluation	Recommendation
Heating & Air-Conditioning	Swamp cooler is in use as air conditioning. Unit appears to be functional. It was not tested as the temperature was at or near freezing Heating is provided via a Round Oak "Moistair" Blended Iron furnace that has a potential production date up to the 1950s, so it is at least 60-70 years old. It appears to have been designed as a coal burning furnace that was converted to gas at some point. There is still coal in the adjacent coal bin. The furnace is functional, and providing heat throughout the property. The supply air is provided through a duct in the coal room that connects to an exterior grate. This duct is constructed of paperboard over the joist space, and has become disconnected	Fair	The furnace should be inspected by an HVAC specialist who has some knowledge of older systems. The supply air duct should be evaluated to determine if it is sufficient for the furnace, and repaired. Fire alarms were noted in the bedrooms, but not in the basement. Carbon monoxide detectors should be installed close to the furnace
Ventilation	Windows and swamp cooler Radon mitigation system is present and working	Good	Inspect swamp cooler for leaks and function
Water Service, Plumbing, & Sewer Utilities	Plumbing supply and drain lines appear to have been worked on in recent years. Fixtures are relatively new. Water heater was manufactured in 2014. Water softener is a current model. All appears in good order	Good	No work needed
Fire Suppression—Sprinklers	None	N/A	N/A



Image 35: Heating & Air-Conditioning_ Round Oak Furnace



Image 36: Heating & Air-Conditioning_ Supply air duct for furnace has failed



Image 37: Heating & Air-Conditioning_ Furnace ducting, return air at the bottom and distribution ducting at the top




Image 38: Ventilation_ Radon system is functional

3.8 Electrical Systems

Element	Description & Condition	Evaluation	Recommendation
Electrical Service & Panels	Overhead service lines feed a modern meter and panel which is located on the rear of the home on the west elevation. There is a Federal "NoArk" panel on the landing by the basement stairs that is screwed shut. There are some Federal panels that are considered a safety risk that should be replaced immediately. It is unknown what type of panel this is, or if it is indeed still in use. An adjacent junction box contains a mix of modern and fiber-wrapped wires	Fair	An electrician should conduct a full survey of the property to determine if the Federal panel is still active, and if so, to evaluate its safety
Electrical Distribution System	There is a mix of modern and older wiring in the property. Many runs of Romex in the basement are surface stapled to the exposed edges of joists, potentially exposing them to damage	Fair	An electrician should evaluate the current distribution system and re-run wires in a code-compliant manner
Lighting	The lighting appears to have been updated in recent years	Good	No work needed
Fire Detection System	There are smoke alarms in each bedroom. No smoke or carbon monoxide alarms were noted in the basement	Fair	Add fire alarm and carbon monoxide alarms in the basement
Security Systems	None noted	N/A	N/A



Image 39: Electrical Service & Panels_ Connection at rear of home



Image 40: Electrical Service & Panels_ Federal "NoArk" panel and unknown associated electrical devices



Image 41: Electrical Distribution System_ Wiring improperly attached to exposed edge of joists



Image 42: Electrical Distribution System_ Wiring improperly attached to exposed edge of joists

4.0 Analysis & Compliance

4.1 Hazardous Materials

Considering the age of the building, lead paint is likely to found on any original painted surface. A lead paint test should be conducted before starting any activity that is likely to disturb paint

There are floor tiles in the basement that may contain asbestos, or their mastic may contain asbestos. These materials should be tested before they are disturbed.



Image 43: Basement floor tiles

4.2 Building Code Compliance

As an existing residence the building code allows continued use of the building, even though all elements may not meet current building codes. Except in cases where dangerous or hazardous structural issues are identified.

The following are some items that do not meet current code but may be used as a continued use:

- Electrical Panels (If the Federal Panel is still in use)
- Electrical Distribution System (Improper attachments in basement)
- Fire/Carbon Monoxide Alarms (Missing in basement)

Any new construction (additions or alterations) will be required to meet current building codes at the time of construction.

4.3 Zoning Code Compliance

The property is zoned RM, residential medium density, and is within the Old Town Overlay. The lot meets the minimum lot size. The building is zoned residential and is being used as a residence. No zoning code violations are noted.

5.0 Preservation Plan

5.1 Prioritized Work

The following identifies two categories of prioritized work:

High Priority is work necessary to stabilize the structure and assure it is weather tight. This work may also include other Items which fall within the Critical or Serious Deficiency categories (see definitions below)

- Evaluate electrical system by qualified electrician to determine if obsolete equipment is still in use and if it is safe
- Redirect downspouts away from the building to halt ongoing water infiltration
- Determine source of leak on north elevation by the sprinkler control box to halt ongoing water infiltration

Medium to Low Priority work includes Minor Deficiencies and preservation work, and reconstruction work for interpretive purposes.

- Improve drainage along the rear and sides of the building
- Repair or replace concrete walkways and driveway
- Redesign the entry porch floor so that it is a weatherproof surface to prevent additional water infiltration into the basement
- Repair or replace the siding material on the walls, soffit, and fascia
- Contract a skilled HVAC technician to evaluate the furnace to determine if all systems are functioning properly with adequate air intake and exhaust
- Trim tree along rear property line and reconnect fence panel

DEFINITIONS

CRITICAL DEFICIENCY: One or more of the following indicate a critical deficiency:
1. Advanced deterioration has resulted in failure of the building element, feature, or space, or will result in its failure if not corrected within two years.
2. Accelerated deterioration of adjacent or related building materials has occurred as a result of the feature or element's deficiency.
3. The feature or element poses a threat to the health and/or safety of the user.
4. The feature or element fails to meet a code/compliance requirement.

SERIOUS DEFICIENCY: One or more of the following indicate a serious deficiency:
1. Deterioration, if not corrected within two to five years, will result in failure of the feature or element.
2. Deterioration of a feature or element, if not corrected within two to five years, may pose a threat to the health and/or safety of the user.
3. Deterioration of adjacent or related building materials and/or systems will occur as a result of the deficiency of the feature or element.

MINOR DEFICIENCY: One or more of the following indicate a minor deficiency:
1. Standard preventive maintenance practices and building conservation methods have not been followed.
2. A reduced life expectancy of affected or related building materials and/or systems will result.
3. A condition exists with long-term impact beyond five years

5.2 Estimate of Probable Costs of Construction

Since the Architect has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, the contractor's method of determining prices, or market conditions, opinions of probable costs, as provided herein, are made on the basis of our experience with similar project types and represent our best judgment as design professionals familiar with the rehabilitation/ construction industry. The Architect cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids or the construction costs will not vary from our opinions of probable costs.

Notes:
The allowance for general conditions provides for the General Contractor's mobilization, temporary facilities, builders risk insurance, and contingencies.

General Contractor overhead includes indirect costs such as permits, Workers' Compensation, insurances and supervision.

Contingency (for construction) provides for uncovered existing conditions, weather delays and other unforeseen conditions.

Abbreviations

ea	lump sum
sf	square feet
lf	lineal feet
sq	square

Estimate of Probable Costs Worksheet

High Priority Work

Task	*Quantity*	*Unit*		*Unit Cost*		*Total*
3.2 Structural Systems						
Determine source of leak by sprinkler control box, and repair	1	EA	$	1,000.00	$	1,000
3.4 Envelope - Roofing and Waterproofing						
Redirect Downspouts away from building	1	EA	$	2,500.00	$	2,500
Foundation waterproofing	1	EA	$	5,500.00	$	5,500
3.8 Electrical Systems						
Evaluate electrical system	1	EA	$	1,000.00	$	1,000
Subtotal High Priority Costs					**$**	**10,000**
Other						
Permits, Contractor O&P, Professional fees	15%				$	1,500
Subtotal					$	11,500
Contingency	10%				$	1,150
Total High Priority Costs					**$**	**12,650**

Low Priority Work

Task	*Quantity*	*Unit*	*Unit Cost*	*Total*
3.1 Site				
Fencing repair	1	EA	$ 1,500.00	$ 1,500
Replace concrete driveway	2050	SF	$ 12.00	$ 24,600
Install drainage at rear and sides of home	1	EA	$ 2,500.00	$ 2,500
3.2 Structural System				
Redesign front porch floor to prevent water infiltration into the basement	1	EA	$ 8,500.00	$ 8,500
Renforce floor, ceiling and roof framing	1	EA	$ 16,000.00	$ 16,000
3.3 Envelope - Exterior Walls				
Remove alumn siding and repair historic stucco siding on walls, repair soffits, and fascia	2500	SF	$ 12.50	$ 31,250
3.7 Mechanical Systems				
Evaluate the furnace to determine if systems are functioning properly with adequate air intake and exhaust	1	EA	$ 800.00	$ 800
Subtotal Construction Costs				**$ 85,150**
**** Hazardous Material Abatement**				
Budget estimate	1	EA	$ 12,000.00	$ 12,000
Subtotal Hard Construction Costs				**$ 97,150**
Other				
Permits, Contractor O&P, Professional fees	15%			$ 14,573
Subtotal				$ 111,723
Contingency	10%			$ 11,172
Total Low Priority Costs				**$ 122,895**

6.0 Bibliography

Bibliography

Bacon, Bridget. *1209 Main St. History.* Louisville Historical Museum Department of Library & Museum Services, City of Louisville, Colorado. September 2022

Weeks, Kay D. and Anne E. Grimmer. *Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.* Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication, 1995.

Online Sources

Myers, John H. *Preservation Briefs: 9 The Repair of Historic Wooden Windows.* U.S. Department of the Interior. National Park Service.
https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-09-wood-windows.pdf

City of Louisville. Louisville Historical Museum. *Boulder County Assessor Cord for 1209 Main St., Louisville, CO.*
https://louisvilleco.catalogaccess.com/archives/11448

7.0 Appendix

A Structural Engineer report
B Survey (ILC)

JVA, Incorporated
1319 Spruce Street
Boulder, CO 80302
303.444.1951
info@jvajva.com

www.jvajva.com

January 13, 2023

Peter Stewart
Stewart Architecture
1132 Jefferson Avenue
Louisville, CO 80027

RE: 1209 Main Street – Structural Condition Observations and Recommendations
JVA Job Number 21726

Dear Mr. Stewart:

PURPOSE
The homeowners of 1209 Main Street in Louisville, CO are working with Stewart Architecture to prepare a Historic Structures Assessment (HSA) of their house in advance of a planned remodeling project. JVA was contacted by Stewart Architecture to provide structural input. JVA visited the site on December 5, 2022 to perform a visual condition assessment and limited review of accessible framing and foundation elements.

No material testing or invasive probes were performed. The information contained in this report is intended to describe our observations of the structural systems and their conditions, as well as recommend repair concepts. No structural design has been completed at this stage; recommendations have been made based on our experience and our preliminary analysis.

This report is intended to supplement the architectural HSA with high level structural findings. This report references room numbers that are identified on the architectural floor plans.

DESCRIPTION
The house at 1209 Main Street was constructed circa 1909. Based on our observations, the house was originally constructed over a full height basement area and partial crawl space areas. At unknown dates, the basement was expanded. Crawlspace areas were dug out and retaining walls were added to support the original foundations and soil. The spaces adjacent to the primary gable form on the south and west are believed to be additions. Generally, the building was built with wood floor, wall, ceiling, and roof framing. The wood framing is founded on concrete foundations. In a few locations in the basement, there are brick masonry walls and wood-framed interior bearing walls.

There is also a detached garage (not in scope) to the northwest of the house that was constructed at an unknown date.

Foundation
The house is founded primarily on concrete basement foundation walls. The walls form the perimeter of the structure's footprint and there are also interior concrete walls. Along the south side of the house, there is an area that has clay brick masonry foundation walls. Beyond what appears to be the original basement footprint, crawl space areas were dug out and concrete

retaining walls were added to support the original stem walls and footings as well as the retained earth. There are no longer any crawlspace areas, the entire area below the first floor is full height.

Condition:
In general, the foundations are in good physical condition and seem to be performing adequately.

A settlement crack in the foundation wall exists under a window on the west side of the building. In that same foundation wall, the added concrete retaining wall appears to have moved slightly inward, resulting in the top of the wall separating from the concrete cap that forms the bench. The crack at the interface between the top of the retaining wall and the concrete cap was parged at an unknown time.

On the east side of the building, there is a shrinkage crack in the foundation wall at a window under the porch. There is a shrinkage crack/cold joint on the north side of the building where the former crawlspace area interfaces with the original full height basement area. Other foundation wall cracks were observed around the perimeter of the building that appear to be the result of shrinkage. These cracks were observed most commonly at wall T-intersections.

There is a crack in the concrete wall at the unused concrete basement stair on the west side of the building. The cause of the crack was not determined and requires further investigation, but it is likely the result of settlement.

Floor Framing
The basement floor is a concrete slab on grade.

The first floor of the residence is framed with dimensional lumber. The floor framing is predominantly 2x6 joists at 16-inch spacing spanning in the north-south direction between bearing walls. In some locations, joists are spanning in the east-west direction and in two locations, the framing was observed to be 2x8 joists spaced at 24 inches. In most locations (except where repairs/modifications were made), the joists did not appear to have traditional subfloor sheathing. 1x tongue-and-groove hardwood flooring is laid perpendicular to and is attached directly to the joists. Another layer of flooring is installed over the original tongue-and-groove flooring.

At the front/east entrance to the house, a porch provides access to the building. The porch floor framing is comprised of 2x6 joists spaced at 16 inches over a dug out basement area.

Condition:
Overall, the floor framing is in good physical condition.

The basement slabs show no signs of distress where the slabs are visible.

Preliminary analyses indicate that the first-floor framing does not have the calculated capacity to support the Code required loading for residential use (40 pounds per square foot) in the following locations (see the architectural drawings for room numbers):

- First floor framing above basement Room-1

- First floor framing above basement Room-2
- Porch framing above basement Room-5
- Porch framing above basement Room-6
- First floor framing above basement Room-7
- First floor framing above basement Room-8
- First floor framing above basement Room-9

Meanwhile, the floor joists were observed to be in good physical condition with no signs of distress such as cracking that would indicate a deficiency.

In several locations, water staining was observed on the floor framing, particularly under the porch and under the main bathroom. However, no rot was observed in the framing, and it appears to remain in good condition. On the exterior, rot was observed at the southeast corner of the front porch.

In Room-9, under the bathtub, a 4x6 dropped beam over two jack posts is providing additional support to several floor joists. However, the beam and jack posts are not properly secured to the structure.

Cracking was observed in the ceiling at the basement entrance. The cause was not determined but, likely results from marginal framing conditions that are concealed by finishes.

Roof Framing
The primary, original gable roof of the house is framed with dimensional lumber. The roof structure is comprised of 2x6 rafters at 24 inch spacing and 2x4 ceiling joists at 24 inch spacing. The roof is sheathed with a layer of 1x horizontal skip sheathing overlayed with a layer of panel sheathing. Along the south aspect of the gable roof, the rafters have been braced down to the central bearing wall with 2x6 struts. In concert with this retrofit, ½" diameter vertical tie rods were added to provide additional support to the ceiling joists on the south side of the house. Four such struts and rods are also in place on the west end of the north side of the house. These interventions appear to be relatively recent.

The porch roof is framed similarly to the primary gable form. The rafters are supported at the peak with 1x vertical members that bear on the ceiling joists.

The south shed addition is comprised of 2x6 rafters that bear directly atop the original 2x6 rafters. The west shed roof framing is not visible.

The chimney is battered through the attic space to exit at the peak. Horizontal support for the battered chimney is provided by a 1x6 that is nailed to the underside of the rafters.

Condition:
The roof framing of the house is in good physical condition with no signs of water damage, deteriorating members, or distressed members. However, preliminary analyses indicate that the rafters are overstressed when compared to Code prescribed live loads and snow loads.

The original roof framing assembly falls outside limits for prescriptively designed wood-framed residential roof structures (RE: International Residential Code).

The retrofits that were introduced are well intentioned and improve the capacity of the rafters and ceiling joists on the south half of the roof. But the modifications do not appear to have been engineered and they are not repeated on the north side of the roof for symmetry.

Wall Framing

The perimeter walls of the original basement footprint, as well as some interior basement walls are constructed of concrete. A non-loadbearing wall, separating basement Room-7 and Room-8 is constructed of single-wythe brick with a plaster finish on one side. There are several loadbearing and non-loadbearing walls in the basement that are framed with dimensional lumber. The walls of the house above grade are stud framed.

Condition:

The interior concrete walls and brick walls appear to be in good physical condition.

A large opening was introduced into the concrete basement wall separating Room-1 and Room-2. Because the opening was added without providing an adequate header, the unsheathed stud wall in Room-2 is currently supporting the 2x8 floor joists that span east-west.

The plaster on the inside face of the north wall is delaminating and there is minor efflorescence that signal moisture intrusion.

The concrete basement wall head above the opening into basement Room-4 does not appear to have adequate support on the west side of the opening.

However, the dimensional lumber framed walls in the basement are either missing the bottom plate or the bottom plate is embedded in the concrete slab. In some locations the bottom ends of the studs were observed to be rotted.

The base of the perimeter stud walls bounding the west shed addition are proximate to grade and are susceptible to moisture-borne deterioration.

Discontinuous studs were observed in the east and west gable end walls in the attic space.

STRUCTURAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall:
The residential building is overall in fair to good structural condition. There are however several minor deficiencies (noted above), and it should be expected that more exist that are concealed behind finishes as the building has been modified in several campaigns over its lifespan. Most of the structural framing systems do not comply with current-day Code requirements. However, where framing systems are performing adequately, and will not be experiencing an increase in load as part of a future remodeling project, they are not required to be upgraded to current Code requirements.

A menu of recommended structural strengthening measures is presented below that correspond to the deficiencies identified above. Some of the recommendations are discretionary rather than triggered by the Code. It is suggested that the future remodeling project incorporate the structural treatments correspondingly. For example, where ceiling finishes are being removed to run new wiring and lighting, the floor joists are available to be easily strengthened with little extra cost to the project.

Foundation:
Settlement crack under a window on the west side of the building.

> *Recommendation:* Fill crack with epoxy adhesive. Monitor crack for further movement. If crack widens, underpin settling wall section and stitch crack.

On the west side of the building, the added concrete retaining wall appears to have moved inward, resulting in the top of the wall separating from the concrete cap.

> *Recommendation:* Anchor the top of the added retaining wall to the original stem wall and/or the concrete cap to arrest further movement.

Vertical shrinkage cracks and cold joints.

> *Recommendation:* Fill cracks with epoxy adhesive so that avenues for moisture, soil, and critter intrusion are blocked.

There is a crack in the concrete wall at the unused concrete basement stair on the west side of the building. The cause of the crack was not determined but could be the result of settlement.

> *Recommendation:* Monitor for further movement. Epoxy or stitching repair may be warranted.

Floor Framing:
The existing floor framing is undersized compared to Code required loads for a residential floor loading in several locations.

> *Recommendation:* Strategically sister the floor joists with additional 2x framing to improve the floor's performance.

Water staining was observed on the underside of the porch floor framing.

Recommendation: Install/repair waterproofing and flashing.

The newer 4x6 dropped beam and two jack posts are not connected to the structure.

Recommendation: Provide connection of the 4x6 dropped beam to the floor joists and provide connection at the top and bottom of the jack posts.

Cracking in the ceiling at the basement entrance.

Recommendation: Remove ceiling finishes, verify framing arrangement & condition, and repair as necessary.

Roof Framing:

The existing roof framing of the original structure is undersized compared to the Code required loads for a residential roof with snow loading. Per the 2018 International Residential Code prescriptive requirements, the rafters and ceiling joists are over-spanned by several feet. The diagonal braces and tie rods are well intentioned and help the condition, but they do not provide adequate support to meet code requirements.

Recommendations: Because the roof framing of the house is in good physical condition with no signs of deteriorating or distressed members, structural upgrades are not triggered by the Code and are therefore discretionary. However, from a structural perspective, it is recommended that diagonal braces be added to all the rafters. The rafter braces should be at a 45° slope and bear on the central, first floor bearing wall. Collar ties should also be added in the upper third of the attic height and installed at every other rafter. Sistering of the ceiling joists is also recommended to minimize the risk of future ceiling cracking.

The connection between the added shed roof rafters and main roof rafters appears to be inadequate.

Recommendations: Connect the shed roof rafters to the main roof rafters with a Simpson LPT4 metal tie or equivalent at each connection.

The chimney is leaning on a single 1x cleat that is nailed to two rafters.

Recommendation: Bolster this restraint system with additional lumber and fasteners.

Wall Framing:

A large opening was added in the concrete wall separating basement Room-1 and Room-2.

Recommendation: Assuming the temporary stud wall will be removed in the remodel project, add jamb posts and a dropped header to support the floor framing.

Moisture intrusion through north basement wall.

Recommendation: Apply waterproofing material to the backside of the wall by either excavating to expose it or by blindside urethane injection. Alternatively, improve site grading and install a perimeter drain system along the north side of the house. It is suggested that the effectiveness of a drain system be monitored before the north wall is furred.

The concrete basement wall head above the opening into basement Room-4 does not appear to have adequate support on the west side of the opening.

Recommendations: Verify header condition over the three openings in the south wall of basement Room-2. Assume that an adjustable steel column will need to be installed on the west side of the door into Room 4.

The dimensional lumber framed walls in the basement are either missing a bottom plate or the bottom plate is embedded in the concrete slab. In some locations the bottom of the studs were observed to be rotted.

Recommendations: Replace deteriorated structural members and provide wall framing bottom plate where missing. Use pressure treated lumber where wood is to be in contact with soil, concrete, or masonry.

Discontinuous studs were observed in the east and west gable end walls.

Recommendations: Discontinuous gable end wall studs should be sistered with continuous members.

Please reach out if there are any questions and if you would like us to move forward with any of the recommendations by preparing construction documents. We look forward to working with you on this project.

Sincerely,
JVA, INCORPORATED

By: _____
Matthew Dinsmore, PE
Project Engineer

Reviewed By: _____
Ian Glaser, PE
Principal

Enclosure: Report Figures

JVA, Incorporated
1319 Spruce Street
Boulder, CO 80302
303.444.1951
info@jvajva.com

www.jvajva.com

Photographs:



Figure 1: 1209 Main viewed from the northeast



Figure 2: 1209 Main viewed from the south



Figure 3: 1209 Main viewed from the west



Figure 4: 1209 Main viewed from the north



Figure 5: Settlement (or shrinkage) crack under window in west basement wall



Figure 6: Repaired separation crack between top of retaining wall and concrete cap at west basement wall



Figure 7: Repaired separation crack between top of retaining wall and concrete cap at west basement wall



Figure 8: Shrinkage crack in east basement wall under porch



Figure 9: Presumed settlement crack at unused basement stair west side



Figure 10: Water staining at porch framing



Figure 11: Deterioration at southeast corner of porch



Figure 12: 4x6 dropped beam on jack posts in basement Room-9. Note that posts are not anchored, just friction-fit



Figure 13: Roof framing with diagonal bracing and tie rod retrofit



Figure 14: Typical shed rafter to main roof rafter connection. No connectors visible.



Figure 15: Stud wall at basement Room-2 supporting 2x8 floor joists with opening in concrete wall beyond



Figure 16: Deteriorated studs in basement Room-4



Figure 17: Discontinuous studs in east gable end wall



Figure 18: Discontinuous studs in west gable end wall





Figure 19: Little to no support for basement wall head at west side of opening into basement Room-4

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
(provided by Security Title)

Lots 3, 4, 5 and 6, Block 1,
NICOLA DI GIACOMO ADDITION,
County of Boulder,
State of Colorado.

FLATIRONS SURVEYING, INC.
5717 Arapahoe Road
Boulder, Colorado 80303
(303) 443-7001



RECEIVED
JUN 01 2001
BUILDING DIVISION

BUILDING DEPT. COPY

NOTES:

1-This Certificate does not constitute a Title Search by Flatirons Surveying, Inc. to determine ownership, rights of way, easements or encumbrances not shown by the plat that may affect this tract of land. There may be easements or rights of way that may affect this tract of land that are not shown on this Certificate.

2-This Certificate is based upon platted rights of way and occupation lines in the area.

3-An Improvement Survey Plat is recommended to depict more precisely the locations of the improvements shown hereon.

4-Overhead Utility Lines cross the airspace of the subject property as shown hereon.

COLORADO REGISTERED JOHN B. GUYTON 16406 LAND SURVEYOR

John B. Guyton, Colorado L.S. #16406

IMPROVEMENT LOCATION CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this improvement location certificate was prepared for CHERRY CREEK MORTGAGE CO., INC. and SECURITY TITLE GUARANTY CO., that it is not a land survey plat or improvement survey plat, and that it is not to be relied upon for the establishment of fence, building or other future improvement lines. I further certify that the improvements on the above described parcel on this date, March 19, 2001, except utility connections, are entirely within the boundaries of the parcel, except as shown, that there are no encroachments upon the described premises by improvements on any adjoining premises, except as indicated, and that there is no apparent evidence or sign of any easement crossing or burdening any part of said parcel, except as noted.

NOTICE: This Improvement Location Certificate is prepared for the sole purpose of use by the parties stated hereon. It is not a Land Survey Plat as defined by C.R.S 38-51-102(12) or an Improvement Survey Plat as defined by C.R.S 38-51-102(9). It does not establish property corners. A more precise relationship of the improvements to the boundary lines can be determined by a Land Survey or Improvement Survey. The improvements are generally situated as shown and only apparent (visible at the time of fieldwork) improvements and encroachments are noted. Flatirons Surveying, Inc. and John B. Guyton will not be liable for more than the cost of this Improvement Location Certificate, and then only to the parties specifically shown hereon. Acceptance and/or use of this Improvement Location Certificate for any purpose constitutes acknowledgement and agreement to all terms stated hereon.

Title Co. No. T025127A01
Flatirons No. 01-38.215
Borrower Smith & Brangenberg

City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

CITY COUNCIL COMMUNICATION
AGENDA ITEM 8E

SUBJECT: **COMMUNITY SURVEY PRESENTATION OF RESULTS**

DATE: **JULY 16, 2024**

PRESENTED BY: **SAMMA FOX, ACTING CITY MANAGER**

SUMMARY:
The City conducted the Louisville Community Survey in May and June. The Community Survey gives residents the opportunity to rate their satisfaction with the quality of life in the city, the community's amenities, and local government. The survey gathers community-wide feedback on what is working well and what is not and helps map out residents' priorities for community planning and resource allocation. This is the sixth time that Polco/National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) has conducted the Louisville Community Survey.

Polco/NRC will present key findings and results of the 2024 Community Survey. The full survey results are attached.

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. 2024 Community Survey Report of Results
2. 2024 Community Survey Open Participation Survey Report of Results
3. Presentation of Key Findings

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPACT:

☒	**Financial Stewardship & Asset Management**	☐	**Reliable Core Services**
☐	**Vibrant Economic Climate**	☐	**Quality Programs & Amenities**
☒	**Engaged Community**	☐	**Healthy Workforce**
☐	**Supportive Technology**	☐	**Collaborative Regional Partner**

City of Louisville, CO

2024 Community Survey

Report of Results

July 2024

1241 John Q. Hammons Dr, Suite #203
Madison, WI 53717
info.polco.us • 608-709-8683

Contents

Figures 4

Executive Summary 5

Summary of Survey Methods 5
Key Findings 5

Survey Background 7

Survey Purpose 7
Survey Administration 7
How the Results Are Reported 7
Precision of Estimates 8
Comparison of Results Over Time and By Subgroups 8
Comparing Survey Results to Other Communities 8

Quality of Life and Community 10

Quality of Life 10
Community Characteristics 12
Safety in Louisville 14
City Services and Departments 15
Quality of Services 15
Government Performance 16
Public Safety Services 16
Planning and Building Safety Department 18
Public Library and Historical Museum 20
Recreation and Senior Center and the Coal Creek Golf Course 21
Parks and Open Space 22
Public Works 23
Transportation System 24
Information Sources 26
Frequency of Use 26
Quality and Reliability 28
Planning and Policy Topics 30
City Priorities 30
Vibrant Economic Climate Priorities 32
Sustainability Vision Priorities 34
Support for Mixed-Use Development 35
Support for Affordable Housing Incentives 36

Appendix A: Respondent Characteristics 37

Appendix B: Complete Survey Frequencies 40

Appendix C: Verbatim Responses to Open-Ended Questions 72

Gender Identity 72
Marshall Fire Impact 72

Appendix D: Responses to Selected Survey Questions by Respondent Characteristics 74

Comparisons by Length of Residency, Age, Gender, Presence of Children, Housing Unit Type, Housing Tenure, and Household Income 75
Comparisons by Geographical Area 153

Appendix E: Detailed Benchmark Comparisons 168

Comparison Data 168
Interpreting the Results 168
Front Range Regional Benchmark Comparisons 172
Regional Benchmark Communities 177

Appendix F: Survey Methodology 179

About the Survey 179
Developing the Questionnaire 179
Selecting Survey Recipients 179
Survey Administration and Response Rate 180
Margin of Error 181
Survey Processing (Data Entry) 181
Weighting the Data 182
Analyzing the Data 184
Comparing Survey Results 184

Appendix G: Survey Materials 185

2024 Louisville Community Survey 185

Figures

Figure 1: Overall Quality of Life in Louisville, 2024 10
Figure 2: Overall Quality of Life Compared by Year 10
Figure 3: Aspects of Quality of Life Compared by Year 11
Figure 4: Ratings of Safety from Crime and in Public Areas by Year 14
Figure 5: Overall Quality of City Services, 2024 15
Figure 6: Overall Quality of City Services by Year 15
Figure 7: Government Performance by Year 16
Figure 8: Louisville Police Department and Public Safety by Year 17
Figure 9: Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department and Community Design by Year 19
Figure 10: Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum by Year 20
Figure 11: Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course by Year 21
Figure 12: Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions by Year 22
Figure 13: Louisville Public Works Department by Year 23
Figure 14: Transportation System by Year 25
Figure 15: Frequency of Use of Information Sources by Year 27
Figure 16: Quality of Information Sources by Year 29
Figure 17: City Priorities, 2024 30
Figure 18: Top Three City Funding Priorities, 2024 31
Figure 19: Vibrant Economic Climate Priorities, 2024 32
Figure 20: Top Two Vibrant Economic Climate Priorities, 2024 33
Figure 21: Sustainability Vision Priorities, 2024 34
Figure 22: Level of Support for Transportation Master Plan Tax, 2024 35
Figure 23: Level of Support for Affordable Housing Initiative, 2024 36

Executive Summary

Summary of Survey Methods

The Louisville Community Survey gives residents the opportunity to rate their satisfaction with the quality of life in the city, the community's amenities, and satisfaction with local government. The survey gathers community-wide feedback on what is working well and what is not and helps map out residents' priorities for community planning and resource allocation. It serves as a consumer report card for Louisville; providing a check-in with residents to make sure City policies and services are on course. This is the sixth time Polco/National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) has conducted the Louisville Community Survey and the nineth iteration in a series of citizen survey projects completed by the City of Louisville since 1990.

The Louisville Community Survey was administered by mail to 3,500 randomly selected households within the city. Of those households receiving the survey, 570 residents responded to the mailed questionnaire, giving a high response rate of 17%. The margin of error is plus or minus four percentage points around any given percentage for all survey respondents. Survey results were weighted so that the characteristics of gender, age, tenure (rent versus own), housing unit type (attached versus detached) and Council Ward are represented in proportions reflective of the entire city.

Comparisons are made between 2024 responses and those from prior years, when possible. Louisville's results also are compared to those of other jurisdictions around the nation as well as to those of other Front Range jurisdictions. Comparisons are made possible through a national benchmark database created and maintained by Polco/National Research Center (NRC). This database contains resident perspectives gathered in resident surveys from over 500 jurisdictions over the past five years.

Key Findings

Highest-performing areas:

- Louisville residents continue to enjoy a high quality of life, with ratings for the City as a place to live, raise children, work, and retire all achieving marks higher than the national benchmark.
- The Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum are almost universally appreciated, with all related survey items receiving positive ratings by more than 90% of the community.
- The community's recreational centers are highly valued:
    - Overall performance of the Louisville Recreation Center (94% excellent or good)
    - Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center (94%)
    - Overall customer service at the Louisville Recreation Center (92%)
    - Overall performance of the Louisville Senior Center (92%)
    - Overall customer service at the Louisville Senior Center (91%)
    - Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center (91%)

Lowest-performing areas:

- Every survey item regarding government performance saw decreases in the scores provided by residents, with the largest drop of 19% for the City response to citizen complains or concerns.
- Public Safety scores saw declines in all ratings but the overall performance of the Louisville Police Department, though all scores met or exceeded national benchmarks.
- All scores for Planning and Building Safety Department experienced declines from 2020:
    - Building permit process overall (16% decline)
    - Planning review process for new development (12% decline)
    - Overall customer service (10% decline)
    - The public input process on City planning issues (10% decline)
    - Overall performance of the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department (9% decline)
    - Building/construction inspection process (8% decline)

Other notable results:

- Overall, Louisville residents rate their community higher than other residents across the country, even though several survey items have seen declines since the last iteration. Economic and political uncertainty post-COVID could play a role in shaping resident sentiment.
- The Louisville community's top sources for information about the city continue to be the quarterly community update newsletter, word of mouth, and the Louisville website. Notable increases were seen in the number of residents attending, watching, or streaming a City Council meeting and in the use of the City's engagement site.
- When asked to list their top priorities for the City to focus on in the next four years, respondents named economic prosperity, utilities, and public safety as their top three priorities.
- Residents similarly provided their top priorities for creating a vibrant economic climate. Half of residents wanted the City to meet the retail and services needs of local residents, attract businesses to locate or expand in Louisville, and pursue redevelopment of vacant or underused commercial sites.

Survey Background

Survey Purpose

The Louisville Community Survey gives residents the opportunity to rate their satisfaction with the quality of life in the city, the community's amenities and satisfaction with local government. The survey gathers community-wide feedback on what is working well and what is not and helps map out residents' priorities for community planning and resource allocation. It serves as a consumer report card for Louisville; providing a check-in with residents to make sure the City policies and services are on course.

This is the sixth time Polco/National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) conducted the Louisville Community Survey and the ninth iteration in a series of citizen survey projects completed by the City of Louisville since 1990.

Survey Administration

A postcard was mailed to 3,500 Louisville households, selected at random, notifying residents that they had been chosen to participate in the survey. A paper copy of the survey followed in the mail after one week. Both postcard and paper survey mailings included a web link so that residents could take the survey online, if desired. There were 294 respondents to the mailed questionnaire (with 135 undeliverable addresses), yielding a response rate of 17%. In addition to the scientific, random sample, a link to an online "opt-in" survey was publicized through various channels including the Louisville website and social media. This opt-in survey was identical to the scientific survey and open to all Louisville residents. A total of 246 online surveys were completed, yielding a total count of 570 survey responses. The margin of error is plus or minus four percentage points around any given percentage for all respondents.

Survey results were weighted so that respondent gender, age, housing unit type (attached or detached), and housing tenure (rent or own) were represented in the proportions reflective of the entire city. More information about the survey methodology can be found in *Appendix F: Survey Methodology.*

How the Results Are Reported

For the most part, the full set of frequencies or the "percent positive" are presented in the body and narrative of the report. The percent positive is the combination of the top two most positive response options (i.e., "excellent" and "good," "very safe" and "somewhat safe," "strongly support" and "somewhat support," etc.).

On many of the questions in the survey, respondents could give an answer of "don't know." The proportion of respondents giving this reply is shown in the full set of responses included in *Appendix B: Complete Survey Frequencies* and is discussed in the body of this report if it is 30% or greater. However, these responses have been removed from the analyses presented in the body of the report,

unless otherwise indicated. In other words, the majority of the tables and graphs in the body of the report display the responses from respondents who had an opinion about a specific item.

For some questions, respondents were permitted to select multiple responses. When the total exceeds 100% in a table for a multiple response question, it is because some respondents are counted in multiple categories. When a table for a question that only permitted, a single response does not total to exactly 100%, it is due to the customary practice rounding values to the nearest whole number.

Precision of Estimates

It is customary to describe the precision of estimates made from surveys by a "level of confidence" and accompanying "confidence interval" (or margin of error). The margin of error for this survey is generally no greater than plus or minus four percentage points around any given percent reported for the entire sample (N=570).

Comparison of Results Over Time and By Subgroups

Results from the 2008, 2012, 2016, and 2020 surveys are presented when comparisons to 2024 were available. Where differences in ratings from 2020 to 2024 are five percentage points or greater, they can be considered significantly higher or lower.

When reviewing comparisons to data prior to 2014, differences that surfaced may or may not be meaningful, as wording changes between survey versions and the switch in methodology to a self-administered survey from a telephone survey may account, at least in part, for any shift in ratings. NRC adjusted the findings from 2012 and prior in order to maximize the comparability of results over time. This way the reported trend line data are not influenced by the decline that is attributable to the change in data collection mode from phone to mail. For more information on comparing results over time, see *Appendix F: Survey Methodology.*

Selected survey results were compared by geographic location of a respondent's home, length of residency, age, gender, housing unit type (attached or detached), and housing unit tenure (rent or own). These crosstabulations are summarized and presented in tabular form in *Appendix D: Responses to Selected Survey Questions by Respondent Characteristics.*

Comparing Survey Results to Other Communities

NRC's database of comparative resident opinion comprises resident perspectives gathered in citizen surveys from approximately 500 communities whose residents evaluated their services. Communities to which Louisville was compared can be found in *Appendix E: Detailed Benchmark Comparisons*. National and Front Range benchmark comparisons have been provided when similar questions on the Louisville survey are included in NRC's database, and there were at least five communities in which the question was asked.

Where comparisons for quality ratings were available, Louisville's results were generally noted as being "higher" than the benchmark, "lower" than the benchmark or "similar" to the benchmark. In

instances where ratings are considerably higher or lower than the benchmark, these ratings have been further demarcated by the attribute of "much," (for example, "much lower" or "much higher"). These labels come from a comparison of Louisville's rating to the benchmark where a rating is considered "similar" if it is within the standard margin of error (10 points or less on the 100-point scale); "higher" or "lower" if the difference between Louisville's rating and the benchmark is greater than 10 points but 20 points or less; and "much higher" or "much lower" if the difference between Louisville's rating and the benchmark is more than twice the standard margin of error (greater than 20 points). Comparisons for a number of items on the survey are not available in the benchmark database. These items are excluded from the benchmark tables.

Quality of Life and Community

The 2024 City of Louisville Community Survey included a number of questions that can be used to create a portrait of how residents view their community. Answers to questions about the overall quality of life, specific community characteristics, and feelings of safety are the brushstrokes that contribute to a picture of a vibrant community.

Quality of Life

Louisville residents continue to rate the quality of life highly, with 92% awarding excellent or good marks in 2024. Only 1% of respondents felt the quality of life was poor. This rating was higher than national and regional peer benchmarks (see *Appendix E: Detailed Benchmark Comparisons* for detailed information on the benchmark comparisons). This rating is on par with previous years.

Survey results were compared by geographic location of residency and select respondent demographic characteristics. Survey participants who lived in Louisville for fewer than five years gave higher evaluations to the overall quality of life in Louisville than those residents living in the City for more than fifteen years (see *Appendix D: Responses to Selected Survey Questions by Respondent Characteristics*).

Figure 1: Overall Quality of Life in Louisville, 2024





Figure 2: Overall Quality of Life Compared by Year




Regarding other aspects that contribute to a high quality of life, about 9 in 10 participants gave high marks to Louisville as a place to live (93% excellent or good) and as a place to raise children (93%). At least 7 in 10 of respondents rated the community as a place to retire and to work as excellent or good, the latter of which experienced notable declines in scores from 2020 to 2024.

Ratings for these measures were higher in Louisville than in national and Front Range comparison communities. Notably, the ratings for Louisville as a place to raise children and the overall quality of life brought the City above other Front Range communities (see *Appendix E: Detailed Benchmark Comparisons*

Figure 3: Aspects of Quality of Life Compared by Year

Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Louisville.



Percent excellent or good

The full set of responses, including "don't know", can be found in Appendix B: Complete Survey Frequencies.

Community Characteristics

A wide variety of characteristics contribute to how residents view and experience their community. In the Louisville survey, respondents were asked to evaluate the quality of 13 specific characteristics of their city.

Overall, residents gave high marks to many of the 13 characteristics of Louisville. About 9 in 10 respondents rated recreational opportunities (89%) and quality of overall natural environment (87%). Additionally, about 8 in 10 respondents favorably rated the overall appearance of Louisville and opportunities to participate in special events and community activities. Three-quarters of respondents felt opportunities to participate in community matters and the preservation of the historic character of the old town were excellent or good.

Out of the 13 community characteristics listed, ratings for ten items declined from 2020 to 2024. Louisville's openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds, the availability of affordable quality housing, and the preservations of the historical character of the old town remained stable; all others in the table below experienced a statistically significant decline.

Despite the decline in ratings, some marks for community characteristics were higher when compared to the national and Front Range benchmarks. Evaluations of the openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds, opportunities to participate in special events and community activities shopping opportunities and variety of housing options were similar to communities across the nation as well as the Front Range, and ratings for the availability of affordable quality housing were lower or much lower than jurisdictions elsewhere in the country and the Front Range (see *Appendix E: Detailed Benchmark Comparisons*).

Table 1: Community Characteristics Compared by Year

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below: (Percent rating as "excellent" or "good")	Year of survey					
	2024	2020	2016	2012	2008	2004
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	78%	79%	70%	81%	67%	80%
Overall appearance of Louisville	83%	91%	90%	89%	89%	NA
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	66%	72%	68%	69%	60%	85%
Shopping opportunities	39%	55%	58%	53%	46%	NA
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	85%	90%	87%	87%	73%	NA
Opportunities to participate in community matters	74%	86%	84%	78%	75%	NA
Recreational opportunities	89%	95%	84%	90%	85%	NA
Employment opportunities	42%	47%	41%	39%	33%	68%


Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below: (Percent rating as "excellent" or "good")	Year of survey					
	2024	2020	2016	2012	2008	2004
Variety of housing options	31%	44%	42%	68%	61%	49%
Availability of affordable quality housing	16%	16%	17%	42%	39%	60%
Preservation of the historic character of old town	76%	79%	NA	NA	NA	25%
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	87%	93%	90%	92%	87%	NA
Overall economic health of Louisville	65%	84%	NA	NA	NA	30%

Safety in Louisville

Almost 9 in 10 Louisville residents indicated they felt safe from violent crime and felt safe in Louisville's downtown area, in their neighborhood, and in City parks. Nearly 8 in 10 also reported they felt safe from property crimes.

Almost all safety ratings for which benchmark comparisons were available were similar those given by residents in other communities across the nation and in the Front Range, except for feeling safe in from violent crime, which was higher.

Figure 4: Ratings of Safety from Crime and in Public Areas by Year



City Services and Departments

Gauging residents' perceptions about the quality of City services and the job City departments are doing can be invaluable for local governments to set budget priorities and determine which, if any, specific services and departments offer opportunities for improvement.

Quality of Services

About 9 in 10 Louisville residents rated the overall quality of City services as excellent or good, which was similar to ratings awarded in previous years.

Compared to other jurisdictions across the U.S. and those in Colorado's Front Range, Louisville's overall quality of services rating was higher than both benchmarks (see *Appendix D: Responses to Selected Survey Questions by Respondent Characteristics*).

Figure 5: Overall Quality of City Services, 2024

Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?





Figure 6: Overall Quality of City Services by Year



Government Performance

Approximately 7 in 10 survey participants rated the overall customer service of City Administration, overall performance of Louisville City government, information about City meetings (Council, Planning Commission and other official meetings), and the Louisville website as excellent or good. About 6 in 10 rated the City's response to citizen complaints or concerns and information about City's strategic plan and budget highly, while half awarded high marks to programming on Louisville cable TV.

Ratings in 2024 for government performance experienced notable declines in all areas. The largest decline occurred for the score given to the City's response to citizen complaints or concerns, which declined 19% from 75% to 56%.

Two items could be compared to the national benchmarks (the overall customer service and overall performance of the Louisville City government). Ratings for the former were higher than both national and Front Range benchmarks whereas the former was similar to both comparison groups (see *Appendix E: Detailed Benchmark Comparisons*).

Figure 7: Government Performance by Year

Please rate the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration: (Percent excellent or good)	2024	2020	2016	2012	2008
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	76%	85%	NA	NA	NA
Overall performance of Louisville City government	67%	83%	78%	84%	76%
Information about City Council, Planning Commission and other official City meetings	68%	81%	80%	78%	73%
Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	72%	80%	78%	78%	71%
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	56%	75%	67%	74%	66%
Information about City's strategic plan and budget	59%	74%	NA	NA	NA
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	46%	61%	57%	66%	66%


Public Safety Services

Survey participants were also asked to evaluate the Louisville Police Department (see the figure on the following page). About 9 in 10 rated overall performance of the Louisville Police Department highly, while three-quarters said the same about the overall customer service of the police and the visibility of patrol cars. About 6 in 10 of residents named other aspects of public safety excellent or good. The overall performance of the Police Department remained stable; all other public safety items experienced a decline since the 2020 iteration.

When comparisons could be made, all but one rating for police were similar to the national and Front Range benchmarks; the feeling of safety was higher than other communities. (see *Appendix D: Responses to Selected Survey Questions by Respondent Characteristics* for all comparisons).

Figure 8: Louisville Police Department and Public Safety by Year

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Police Department and public safety:




Planning and Building Safety Department

About two-thirds of those with an opinion rated the services provided by the overall customer service and overall performance of the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department as excellent or good. Around 6 in 10 participants provided favorable marks to the building/construction inspection process and the public input process. Half positively rated the building permit process overall, and planning review process for new development. All survey items below experienced a decline in score since 2020.

Figure 9: Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department and Community Design by Year

Please rate the following areas of community design and the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department:



Prior to 2020, there was one item labelled building permit process; this was split into two items on the 2020 survey: building permit process overall and building permit process related to 2018 hail damage. Prior to 2020, Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department was Louisville Planning Department.

Public Library and Historical Museum

Of those who had an opinion, virtually all Louisville residents gave favorable ratings to all survey items relating to the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum. All of these ratings remained stable from 2020 to 2024.

Figure 10: Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum by Year

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services: (Percent excellent or good)	2024	2020	2016	2012	2008
Louisville Public Library programs (e.g., story time, One Book program, etc.)	96%	98%	98%	96%	93%
Louisville Public Library building	97%	98%	97%	97%	96%
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk, check out, etc.)	96%	97%	98%	97%	92%
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	95%	97%	93%	93%	NA
Overall customer service at the Library (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	98%	97%	NA	NA	NA
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	97%	97%	96%	96%	94%
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	96%	95%	92%	93%	90%
Overall customer service at the Historical Museum (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	98%	95%	NA	NA	NA
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	97%	95%	89%	NA	NA
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters, expanded/new programming)	96%	93%	90%	NA	NA
Archival materials (e.g., historic photographs, newspapers, etc.)	96%	92%	NA	NA	NA
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	91%	91%	85%	84%	77%
Louisville Historical Museum campus	93%	90%	88%	NA	NA

Prior to 2020, "Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters, expanded/new programming)" did not include expanded/new programming in the parenthetical.

Recreation and Senior Center and the Coal Creek Golf Course

Almost all residents were pleased with various aspects of and services provided by the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center. Approximately 9 in 10 respondents awarded excellent or good ratings to the overall performance of, overall quality of, and overall customer service at the Louisville Recreation Center; overall quality of and overall customer service at the Louisville Senior Center; current recreation programs for youth; and current programs and services for seniors. Coal Creek Golf Course also earned high marks with at least 8 in 10 responses being positive for the overall quality of, performance of, and customer service at the golf course. Three-quarters of respondents provided positive scores for the Recreation Center fees in Louisville.

Five survey items related to recreation experienced declines in scores from 2020: overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center, current programs and services for seniors, overall performance of the Coal Creek Golf Course, overall customer service at the Coal Creek Golf Course (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous), and Recreation Center fees in Louisville

Benchmark comparisons were available for just one of the 13 services: overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center. Louisville's score for the Recreation Center was #2 out of 504 municipalities in the national benchmark database that asked a similar question and #1 out of 25 Front Range communities that have asked a similar question (see *Appendix E: Detailed Benchmark Comparisons*).

Figure 11: Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course by Year

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course: (Percent excellent or good)	2024	2020	2016	2012	2008
Overall performance of the Louisville Recreation Center	94%	97%	NA	NA	NA
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	94%	96%	67%	87%	82%
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	91%	96%	81%	87%	89%
Overall customer service at the Louisville Senior Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	92%	96%	NA	NA	NA
Current recreation programs for youth (e.g., swim lessons, sports, preschool, camps)	91%	95%	85%	88%	88%
Overall customer service at the Louisville Recreation Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	92%	95%	NA	NA	NA
Current programs and services for seniors	89%	95%	87%	91%	89%
Overall performance of the Louisville Senior Center	92%	95%	NA	NA	NA
Current recreation programs for adults (e.g., fitness classes, sports, general interests)	91%	92%	77%	87%	79%
Overall performance of the Coal Creek Golf Course	83%	89%	NA	NA	NA

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course: (Percent excellent or good)	2024	2020	2016	2012	2008
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	86%	88%	80%	76%	75%
Overall customer service at the Coal Creek Golf Course (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	81%	88%	NA	NA	NA
Recreation Center fees in Louisville	77%	83%	75%	73%	64%

Prior to 2020, current recreation programs for youth and for adults did not include any items in parenthesis and Recreation Center fees was recreation fees.

Parks and Open Space

The Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions are responsible for a variety of programs and amenities that contribute to the overall health and wellbeing of the community. Their services provide opportunities for things such as exercise, alternatives to using automobiles for commuting, connections to nature and to other community members.

Survey respondents were asked to rate the quality of 10 services provided by the Parks and Open Space Divisions and at least 8 in 10 gave positive reviews to all aspects (ranging from 78% excellent or good for maintenance of medians and street landscaping to 94% for maintenance of parks, e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, and picnic areas).

When compared to 2020 results, three experienced declines while the rest remained stable (maintenance of parks, overall customer service of the Parks Division, and maintenance of medians and street landscaping.

Figure 12: Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions by Year

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions: (Percent rating as excellent or good)	2024	2020	2016	2012	2008
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas)	85%	95%	90%	NA	NA
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	94%	94%	91%	94%	91%
Maintenance of the trail system	92%	94%	90%	90%	92%
Maintenance of open space (e.g., trash bins, trailheads, habitat, etc.)	89%	93%	87%	87%	87%
Overall performance of the Open Space Division	91%	93%	NA	NA	NA
Overall customer service of the Parks Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	87%	92%	NA	NA	NA

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions: (Percent rating as excellent or good)	2024	2020	2016	2012	2008
Overall performance of the Parks Division	89%	92%	NA	NA	NA
Overall customer service of the Open Space Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	90%	90%	NA	NA	NA
Maintenance of the Louisville Cemetery	91%	87%	NA	NA	NA
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	78%	86%	84%	NA	NA

Prior to 2020, "maintenance of open space" did not include any items in parenthesis and a single question was asked about the "overall performance of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department" whereas the 2024 survey listed each division of the department separately, therefore a comparison over time is not available for those items.

Public Works

Most services offered by the Louisville Public Works Department received favorable ratings from a majority of residents. About 9 in 10 residents rated waste water, quality of City water, storm drainage, and the Louisville Public Works Department as excellent or good. At least 8 in 10 respondents also awarded positive marks for overall performance of the overall customer service, solid waste/trash service, and street lighting, signage and street markings. Seven in 10 gave favorable marks to street sweeping while two-thirds awarded high scores to street maintenance in Louisville and in their neighborhood. About 6 in 10 positively rated fees for water, sewer, and trash; half of participants evaluated snow removal/street sanding highly.

Most ratings for public works services remained stable from 2020 to 2024, except for street maintenance in your neighborhood, which increased by six percent, and fees for water, sewer and trash, which decreased seven percentage points since the 2020 iteration of the survey.

Six of the 12 services could be compared to the national and Front Range benchmarks. All of these services received ratings similar to or higher than both peer groups (see *Appendix E: Detailed Benchmark Comparisons*).

Figure 13: Louisville Public Works Department by Year

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department: (Percent rating as excellent or good)	2024	2020	2016	2012	2008
Waste water (e.g., sewage system)	93%	91%	92%	90%	NA
Storm drainage (e.g., flooding management)	87%	88%	89%	88%	NA
Quality of Louisville water	88%	88%	91%	89%	89%
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Works Department	87%	85%	88%	89%	84%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department: (Percent rating as excellent or good)	2024	2020	2016	2012	2008
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	82%	83%	NA	NA	NA
Street lighting, signage and street markings	80%	81%	82%	86%	82%
Solid waste/trash service (e.g., trash, recycle, compost)	80%	81%	NA	NA	NA
Street sweeping	72%	72%	71%	78%	74%
Fees for water, sewer and trash	63%	70%	NA	NA	NA
Street maintenance in Louisville (e.g., paving and concrete replacement)	67%	64%	70%	80%	78%
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	67%	61%	64%	71%	69%
Snow removal/street sanding	56%	52%	50%	60%	55%


Prior to 2020, "street maintenance in Louisville" did not include any items in parentheses.

Transportation System

About 8 in 10 residents gave excellent or good scores to ease of walking, car travel, bicycle travel in Louisville, the overall safety of Louisville's Transportation System (see the figure on the following page). The overall quality of the transportation system garnered excellent or good marks from three-quarters of residents. About 7 in 10 survey respondents gave excellent or good ratings to traffic flow on major streets and 6 in 10 gave favorable marks to the ease of bus travel in the City.

Where trends over time were available, ratings for Louisville's transportation system tended to decline from 2020 to 2024; only the ease of travel by bicycle remained stable. Compared to other jurisdictions across the nation and in the Front Range, Louisville's transportation scores were typically higher than those observed in other communities (*see Appendix E: Detailed Benchmark Comparisons*).

Figure 14: Transportation System by Year



Prior to 2020, ease of various forms of travel and traffic flow were included with other characteristics of the community (i.e., shopping opportunities, overall appearance of Louisville, etc.) instead of grouped with transportation-only items.

Information Sources


Frequency of Use

As in past years, survey respondents were asked how frequently they used a variety of sources to gain information about the City of Louisville, with three new digital information sources added to the list in 2020 (see Figure 15 on the following page). About 9 in 10 reported they used *Community Update*, the quarterly City newsletter, and a similar proportion relied on word of mouth and the City's website. Roughly 7 in 10 relied on communications from utility bill inserts and the monthly *Community Update* e-newsletter. About two-third utilized *the Daily Camera* or City's email notices. Half of respondents used social media as a source of City information. About one-quarter reporting attending, watching or streaming a City Council meeting, 16% had used the City's online engagement site, engagelouisvilleco.org, and 10% watched Channel 8.

Where comparisons to previous years were possible, residents were more likely in 2024 than in 2020 to have used the City email notices, have attended, watched or streamed a City Council meeting, or used the city's engagement website. Survey participants were less likely to have read the *Daily Camera*.

Figure 15: Frequency of Use of Information Sources by Year

First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville.



Prior to 2020, "attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting" also included "other programs on Comcast channel 8 (government access) or online" and "Quarterly Community Update eNewsletter" was "Community Update (City Newsletter)".


Quality and Reliability

Respondents were also asked to rate the quality and reliability of the information from each source (see Figure 16 on the following page). The quarterly City newsletter, *Community Update*, as well as the monthly e-version of the City newsletter, were thought to be excellent or good sources of information about the City by about 9 in 10 residents. About three-quarters awarded favorable marks to the City's email notices, utility bill inserts, and the Louisville website. Of those who used the source, roughly two-thirds of respondents gave high scores to the *Daily Camera* , the City's online engagement site, and City Council meetings. Only about half of residents rated word of mouth, social media, or Channel 8 as good or better in terms or quality and reliability.

Where trends over time were available, most ratings in 2024 tended to be similar to those given in 2016 with the exception of email notices, utility bill inserts, City Council meetings, and the city's online engagement site, which all declined; use of social media increased by five percentage points.

Figure 16: Quality of Information Sources by Year

Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source.



Prior to 2020, "attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting" also included "other programs on Comcast channel 8 (government access) or online" and "Quarterly Community Update eNewsletter" was "Community Update (City Newsletter)".


Planning and Policy Topics

City Priorities

To help the City prioritize potential projects/initiatives in 2024, residents were asked to rate how much of a priority, if any, they felt the City should place on 11 different aspects of Louisville. About 9 in 10 or more residents rated most service areas as a high or medium priority. Those deemed the highest priorities, by at 6 in 10 respondents, were Utilities, Economic Prosperity, and Open Space and Trails.


Figure 17: City Priorities, 2024

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of the community.



In addition to rating the level of priority of each aspect, respondents were asked to select their top three from the same list of 11 community aspects. Of all of the potential aspects for the City of Louisville to focus on, about half of residents selected Economic Prosperity as one of their top three priorities, while about 4 in 10 chose Open Space and Trails and Public Safety. Other items were selected as a top choice by fewer than one-third of respondents.

Figure 18: Top Three City Funding Priorities, 2024




Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Vibrant Economic Climate Priorities

Residents also prioritized different aspects of the City's strategy for a vibrant economic climate. Overall, about 8 in 10 or more felt each aspect was a high or medium priority; creating and enhancing unique identities for each business district was named a priority by about half of residents. About 7 in 10 residents thought that pursuing redevelopment of vacant or underused commercial sites was a high priority and about 6 in 10 said the same about meeting the retail and services needs Just over half said that attracting businesses to locate or expand in Louisville should be a high priority.

Figure 19: Vibrant Economic Climate Priorities, 2024


First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate. Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in



Respondents also selected, from the same list of seven aspects of a vibrant economic climate, their top two priorities for the City to focus on in the next four years. Of all of the potential aspects for the City of Louisville to focus on, about half selected meeting the retail and services needs of local residents or attracting businesses to locate or expand in Louisville among their top two priorities for the City to focus on in the next four years. A similar proportion named pursuing redevelopment of vacant or underused commercial sites as one of their top two priorities.

Figure 20: Top Two Vibrant Economic Climate Priorities, 2024

Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.




Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Sustainability Vision Priorities

Residents evaluated a list of aspects related to Louisville's vision for sustainability and indicated whether they thought each was a high, medium or low/not a priority. Generally, about 9 in 10 felt that each of the five aspects of the City's sustainability vision were a high or medium priority. More than two-thirds of residents placed high priority on encouraging water efficiency and water quality efforts, while half wanted to reduce energy consumption and increase use of clean energy. About 5 in 10 survey participants indicated that they thought ensuring a sustainable, safe and healthy food supply that is accessible and promoting fuel-efficient transportation and multi-modal infrastructure should be high priorities for the City to achieve its sustainability vision. Increasing community waste diversion was felt to be less of a priority for the City (39% selected it as a high priority).

Figure 21: Sustainability Vision Priorities, 2024

How much of a priority, if at all, should the City place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to achieve Louisville's sustainability vision?




Support for Mixed-Use Development

Residents of Louisville rated their level of support for or opposition to the hypothetical development of empty/underused storefronts into mixed-use housing and businesses in Louisville. Residents overwhelmingly support this initiative, with about 8 in 10 respondents offering their support for such a development.

Figure 22: Level of Support for Transportation Master Plan Tax, 2024

Imagine a commercial area with several vacant storefronts and empty parking lots. How much would you support, if at all, the development of mixed-use housing and businesses in this area?




Support for Affordable Housing Incentives

The City also asked residents their support for various affordable housing initiatives. The greatest support was offered to providing financial incentive for developers with 18% in support of the effort. Seven and six percent stated that most support increased building height limitations and reduce parking requirements, respectively. Additionally, 17% of respondents offered support for all initiatives while 19% were opposed to them all.

Figure 23: Level of Support for Affordable Housing Initiative, 2024

The City is working on a housing plan that aims to increase the availability of affordable housing options while maintaining Louisville character. To achieve this, the plan explores offering incentives to developers who create affordable housing units. Which of the following incentive types would you MOST SUPPORT to encourage the development of more affordable housing?



Appendix A: Respondent Characteristics

The following tables summarize the demographic characteristics of Louisville's survey respondents in 2024.

Table 2: Question D1

How many years have you lived in Louisville?	Percent	Number
Less than 1 year	8%	N=42
1-5 years	23%	N=129
6-10 years	18%	N=100
11-15 years	10%	N=57
More than 15 years	41%	N=233
Total	100%	N=562

Table 3: Question D2

Which best describes the building you live in?	Percent	Number
One family house detached from any other houses	70%	N=394
House attached to one or more houses (e.g., a duplex or townhome)	8%	N=47
Building with two or more apartments or condominiums	21%	N=122
Mobile home	0%	N=1
Other	1%	N=4
Total	100%	N=567

Table 4: Question D3

Do you rent or own your home?	Percent	Number
Rent	27%	N=155
Own	73%	N=409
Total	100%	N=564

Table 5: Question D4

How many people (including yourself) currently live in your household?	Percent	Number
1	18%	N=98
2	42%	N=225
3	16%	N=86
4	17%	N=89
5 or more	6%	N=34
Total	100%	N=531

Table 6: Question D5

Do any children 17 or under live in your household?	Percent	Number
No	68%	N=384
Yes	32%	N=179
Total	100%	N=563

Table 7: Question D6

Are you or any other members of your household aged 60 or older?	Percent	Number
No	61%	N=344
Yes	39%	N=218
Total	100%	N=562

Table 8: Question D7

In which category is your age?	Percent	Number
18-24 years	2%	N=11
25-34 years	20%	N=114
35-44 years	17%	N=96
45-54 years	20%	N=111
55-64 years	13%	N=73
65-74 years	18%	N=100
75 years or older	10%	N=54
Total	100%	N=559

Table 9: Question D8

How do you describe your gender identity?	Percent	Number
Female	52%	N=286
Male	48%	N=265
Identify another way (specify if you wish):	0%	N=2
Total	100%	N=552

Appendix B: Complete Survey Frequencies

The following pages contain a complete set of responses to each question on the survey. For questions that included a "don't know" or "no opinion" response option, two tables for that question are provided: the first excludes the "don't know" or "no opinion" responses and the second includes those response options.

Table 10: Question 1 (excluding don't know)

Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Louisville:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Louisville as a place to live	57%	N=322	36%	N=204	6%	N=34	1%	N=6	100%	N=566
Louisville as a place to raise children	62%	N=276	31%	N=139	4%	N=20	3%	N=12	100%	N=447
Louisville as a place to retire	36%	N=142	38%	N=152	17%	N=68	9%	N=36	100%	N=397
Louisville as a place to work	27%	N=92	44%	N=152	23%	N=79	6%	N=21	100%	N=343
The overall quality of life in Louisville	52%	N=293	40%	N=224	7%	N=39	1%	N=7	100%	N=563

Table 11: Question 1 (including don't know)

Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Louisville:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Louisville as a place to live	57%	N=322	36%	N=204	6%	N=34	1%	N=6	0%	N=1	100%	N=567
Louisville as a place to raise children	49%	N=276	25%	N=139	4%	N=20	2%	N=12	21%	N=116	100%	N=563
Louisville as a place to retire	25%	N=142	27%	N=152	12%	N=68	6%	N=36	29%	N=166	100%	N=563
Louisville as a place to work	17%	N=92	27%	N=152	14%	N=79	4%	N=21	38%	N=213	100%	N=556
The overall quality of life in Louisville	52%	N=293	40%	N=224	7%	N=39	1%	N=7	0%	N=1	100%	N=564

Table 12: Question 2 (excluding don't know)

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	27%	N=128	50%	N=235	17%	N=80	5%	N=25	100%	N=468
Overall appearance of Louisville	34%	N=193	49%	N=276	15%	N=88	2%	N=11	100%	N=568
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	18%	N=94	48%	N=249	27%	N=141	6%	N=33	100%	N=517
Shopping opportunities	7%	N=36	33%	N=184	42%	N=234	19%	N=105	100%	N=560
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	38%	N=205	47%	N=252	13%	N=71	2%	N=11	100%	N=538
Opportunities to participate in community matters	26%	N=126	48%	N=229	22%	N=104	4%	N=20	100%	N=479
Recreational opportunities	54%	N=301	35%	N=196	9%	N=48	2%	N=12	100%	N=558
Employment opportunities	9%	N=28	33%	N=104	43%	N=132	15%	N=47	100%	N=311
Variety of housing options	8%	N=42	23%	N=118	38%	N=197	31%	N=160	100%	N=517
Availability of affordable quality housing	6%	N=30	10%	N=45	23%	N=108	61%	N=285	100%	N=468
Preservation of the historic character of old town	31%	N=171	45%	N=250	17%	N=93	7%	N=36	100%	N=550
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	44%	N=243	44%	N=245	10%	N=55	3%	N=15	100%	N=558
Overall economic health of Louisville	14%	N=66	51%	N=242	24%	N=113	11%	N=54	100%	N=475

Table 13: Question 2 (including don't know)

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	23%	N=128	42%	N=235	14%	N=80	4%	N=25	17%	N=97	100%	N=565
Overall appearance of Louisville	34%	N=193	49%	N=276	15%	N=88	2%	N=11	0%	N=1	100%	N=569
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	16%	N=94	44%	N=249	25%	N=141	6%	N=33	9%	N=50	100%	N=567
Shopping opportunities	6%	N=36	32%	N=184	41%	N=234	18%	N=105	1%	N=8	100%	N=569
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	36%	N=205	44%	N=252	12%	N=71	2%	N=11	5%	N=28	100%	N=566
Opportunities to participate in community matters	22%	N=126	41%	N=229	18%	N=104	4%	N=20	15%	N=83	100%	N=562
Recreational opportunities	53%	N=301	35%	N=196	9%	N=48	2%	N=12	1%	N=6	100%	N=564
Employment opportunities	5%	N=28	18%	N=104	24%	N=132	8%	N=47	45%	N=252	100%	N=563
Variety of housing options	7%	N=42	21%	N=118	35%	N=197	28%	N=160	9%	N=49	100%	N=566
Availability of affordable quality housing	5%	N=30	8%	N=45	19%	N=108	50%	N=285	17%	N=99	100%	N=567
Preservation of the historic character of old town	30%	N=171	44%	N=250	16%	N=93	6%	N=36	3%	N=17	100%	N=568
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	43%	N=243	44%	N=245	10%	N=55	3%	N=15	1%	N=4	100%	N=562
Overall economic health of Louisville	12%	N=66	43%	N=242	20%	N=113	10%	N=54	16%	N=92	100%	N=567

Table 14: Question 3 (excluding don't know)

Please rate how safe you feel:	Very safe		Somewhat safe		Neither safe nor unsafe		Somewhat unsafe		Very unsafe		Total	
From violent crime (e.g., personal assault, sexual assault, robbery, hate crimes)	75%	N=426	17%	N=96	4%	N=21	3%	N=17	1%	N=6	100%	N=567
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft, vandalism, arson)	42%	N=234	41%	N=228	7%	N=39	7%	N=39	3%	N=18	100%	N=559
In your neighborhood	65%	N=367	26%	N=146	5%	N=29	3%	N=16	1%	N=5	100%	N=563
In Louisville's downtown area	69%	N=375	25%	N=135	4%	N=21	1%	N=7	1%	N=4	100%	N=543
In Louisville's parks	62%	N=335	31%	N=168	6%	N=31	1%	N=5	1%	N=4	100%	N=543

Table 15: Question 3 (including don't know)

Please rate how safe you feel:	Very safe		Somewhat safe		Neither safe nor unsafe		Somewhat unsafe		Very unsafe		Don't know		Total	
From violent crime (e.g., personal assault, sexual assault, robbery, hate crimes)	75%	N=426	17%	N=96	4%	N=21	3%	N=17	1%	N=6	0%	N=0	100%	N=567
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft, vandalism, arson)	41%	N=234	40%	N=228	7%	N=39	7%	N=39	3%	N=18	1%	N=7	100%	N=565
In your neighborhood	65%	N=367	26%	N=146	5%	N=29	3%	N=16	1%	N=5	0%	N=3	100%	N=566
In Louisville's downtown area	66%	N=375	24%	N=135	4%	N=21	1%	N=7	1%	N=4	4%	N=24	100%	N=566

Please rate how safe you feel:	Very safe		Somewhat safe		Neither safe nor unsafe		Somewhat unsafe		Very unsafe		Don't know		Total	
In Louisville's parks	59%	N=335	30%	N=168	5%	N=31	1%	N=5	1%	N=4	4%	N=25	100%	N=568

Table 16: Question 4 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the job you feel the Louisville community does at each of the following.	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Making all residents feel welcome	31%	N=149	54%	N=260	11%	N=52	4%	N=19	100%	N=480
Attracting people from diverse backgrounds	12%	N=51	29%	N=128	37%	N=159	22%	N=96	100%	N=434
Valuing/respecting residents from diverse backgrounds	26%	N=110	46%	N=195	19%	N=82	8%	N=35	100%	N=422
Taking care of vulnerable residents (elderly, disabled, homeless, etc.)	21%	N=73	38%	N=131	30%	N=105	11%	N=39	100%	N=348

Table 17: Question 4 (including don't know)

Please rate the job you feel the Louisville community does at each of the following.	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Making all residents feel welcome	26%	N=149	46%	N=260	9%	N=52	3%	N=19	16%	N=88	100%	N=568
Attracting people from diverse backgrounds	9%	N=51	22%	N=128	28%	N=159	17%	N=96	24%	N=134	100%	N=568
Valuing/respecting residents from diverse backgrounds	19%	N=110	34%	N=195	14%	N=82	6%	N=35	26%	N=145	100%	N=568
Taking care of vulnerable residents (elderly, disabled, homeless, etc.)	13%	N=73	23%	N=131	18%	N=105	7%	N=39	38%	N=217	100%	N=566

Table 18: Question 5 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	11%	N=43	44%	N=165	27%	N=101	17%	N=64	100%	N=373
Information about City Council, Planning Commission & other official City meetings	18%	N=84	50%	N=235	21%	N=99	11%	N=53	100%	N=472
Information about City's strategic plan and budget	14%	N=62	45%	N=203	26%	N=118	14%	N=65	100%	N=448
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	11%	N=10	36%	N=35	32%	N=32	22%	N=22	100%	N=99
Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	15%	N=71	56%	N=260	25%	N=115	3%	N=14	100%	N=460
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	27%	N=108	49%	N=198	18%	N=73	5%	N=21	100%	N=401
Overall performance of the Louisville City government	14%	N=71	53%	N=262	24%	N=121	8%	N=41	100%	N=495

Table 19: Question 5 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	7%	N=43	29%	N=165	18%	N=101	11%	N=64	34%	N=195	100%	N=568
Information about City Council, Planning Commission & other official City meetings	15%	N=84	42%	N=235	18%	N=99	9%	N=53	16%	N=92	100%	N=564
Information about City's strategic plan and budget	11%	N=62	36%	N=203	21%	N=118	11%	N=65	21%	N=118	100%	N=566

Please rate the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	2%	N=10	6%	N=35	6%	N=32	4%	N=22	82%	N=465	100%	N=565
Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	13%	N=71	46%	N=260	21%	N=115	3%	N=14	18%	N=101	100%	N=561
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	19%	N=108	35%	N=198	13%	N=73	4%	N=21	29%	N=164	100%	N=564
Overall performance of the Louisville City government	12%	N=71	46%	N=262	21%	N=121	7%	N=41	12%	N=70	100%	N=565

Table 20: Question 6 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Police Department and public safety:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Visibility of patrol cars	26%	N=142	51%	N=280	15%	N=83	8%	N=41	100%	N=546
Enforcement of traffic regulations	15%	N=71	47%	N=219	24%	N=112	13%	N=61	100%	N=464
Municipal code enforcement issues (e.g., dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	20%	N=80	45%	N=177	24%	N=94	10%	N=41	100%	N=393
Communicating regularly with community members (e.g., website, meetings, etc.)	16%	N=58	43%	N=154	31%	N=110	10%	N=34	100%	N=356
Response to emerging community issues (e.g., opioids, mental health, etc.)	21%	N=50	41%	N=100	24%	N=59	15%	N=36	100%	N=245
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	28%	N=108	51%	N=193	16%	N=60	5%	N=18	100%	N=378

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Police Department and public safety:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	27%	N=129	60%	N=288	10%	N=50	2%	N=12	100%	N=479

Table 21: Question 6 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Police Department and public safety:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Visibility of patrol cars	25%	N=142	49%	N=280	15%	N=83	7%	N=41	4%	N=21	100%	N=568
Enforcement of traffic regulations	13%	N=71	39%	N=219	20%	N=112	11%	N=61	18%	N=102	100%	N=566
Municipal code enforcement issues (e.g., dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	14%	N=80	31%	N=177	17%	N=94	7%	N=41	31%	N=176	100%	N=568
Communicating regularly with community members (e.g., website, meetings, etc.)	10%	N=58	27%	N=154	20%	N=110	6%	N=34	36%	N=203	100%	N=559
Response to emerging community issues (e.g., opioids, mental health, etc.)	9%	N=50	18%	N=100	10%	N=59	6%	N=36	56%	N=316	100%	N=561
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	19%	N=108	34%	N=193	11%	N=60	3%	N=18	33%	N=183	100%	N=561
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	23%	N=129	51%	N=288	9%	N=50	2%	N=12	15%	N=88	100%	N=567

Table 22: Question 7 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of community design and the Louisville Community Development Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
The public input process on City planning issues	15%	N=61	41%	N=162	27%	N=107	17%	N=67	100%	N=397
Planning review process for new development	10%	N=35	38%	N=129	30%	N=102	21%	N=72	100%	N=338
Building permit process related to the Marshall Fire	13%	N=23	27%	N=48	31%	N=55	30%	N=53	100%	N=179
Building permit process overall	9%	N=24	40%	N=101	30%	N=77	21%	N=53	100%	N=255
Building/construction inspection process	13%	N=30	46%	N=109	26%	N=61	15%	N=36	100%	N=237
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	20%	N=57	46%	N=130	24%	N=69	9%	N=27	100%	N=283
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department	15%	N=44	48%	N=144	23%	N=67	14%	N=42	100%	N=297

Table 23: Question 7 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of community design and the Louisville Community Development Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
The public input process on City planning issues	11%	N=61	29%	N=162	19%	N=107	12%	N=67	30%	N=169	100%	N=566
Planning review process for new development	6%	N=35	23%	N=129	18%	N=102	13%	N=72	40%	N=223	100%	N=561
Building permit process related to the Marshall Fire	4%	N=23	8%	N=48	10%	N=55	9%	N=53	68%	N=385	100%	N=564
Building permit process overall	4%	N=24	18%	N=101	14%	N=77	9%	N=53	55%	N=308	100%	N=563

Please rate the following areas of community design and the Louisville Community Development Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Building/construction inspection process	5%	N=30	19%	N=109	11%	N=61	6%	N=36	58%	N=327	100%	N=564
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	10%	N=57	23%	N=130	13%	N=69	5%	N=27	49%	N=272	100%	N=555
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department	8%	N=44	26%	N=144	12%	N=67	8%	N=42	46%	N=258	100%	N=555

Table 24: Question 8 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Louisville Public Library programs (e.g., story time, One Book program, etc.)	64%	N=277	34%	N=147	2%	N=9	0%	N=1	100%	N=435
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk, check out, etc.)	73%	N=354	23%	N=113	3%	N=16	0%	N=1	100%	N=484
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	63%	N=225	33%	N=116	3%	N=11	1%	N=2	100%	N=354
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	68%	N=271	27%	N=108	5%	N=21	0%	N=1	100%	N=402
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	47%	N=221	44%	N=206	8%	N=38	1%	N=5	100%	N=471

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Louisville Public Library building	73%	N=366	24%	N=122	3%	N=13	0%	N=1	100%	N=502
Overall customer service at the Library (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	77%	N=372	21%	N=99	2%	N=11	0%	N=1	100%	N=483
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	72%	N=349	25%	N=121	3%	N=14	0%	N=1	100%	N=485
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters, programs)	50%	N=143	46%	N=130	4%	N=11	0%	N=1	100%	N=285
Louisville Historical Museum campus	48%	N=137	45%	N=128	6%	N=16	1%	N=2	100%	N=284
Archival materials (e.g., historic photographs, newspapers, etc.)	49%	N=119	47%	N=113	3%	N=7	1%	N=3	100%	N=242
Overall customer service at the Historical Museum (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	63%	N=155	35%	N=87	1%	N=3	1%	N=2	100%	N=248
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	53%	N=150	43%	N=121	3%	N=9	0%	N=1	100%	N=280

Table 25: Question 8 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Louisville Public Library programs (e.g., story time, One Book program, etc.)	49%	N=277	26%	N=147	2%	N=9	0%	N=1	23%	N=126	100%	N=561
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk, check out, etc.)	63%	N=354	20%	N=113	3%	N=16	0%	N=1	14%	N=80	100%	N=563
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	40%	N=225	21%	N=116	2%	N=11	0%	N=2	36%	N=201	100%	N=555

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	49%	N=271	19%	N=108	4%	N=21	0%	N=1	28%	N=157	100%	N=559
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	40%	N=221	37%	N=206	7%	N=38	1%	N=5	16%	N=89	100%	N=560
Louisville Public Library building	65%	N=366	22%	N=122	2%	N=13	0%	N=1	11%	N=60	100%	N=562
Overall customer service at the Library (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	66%	N=372	18%	N=99	2%	N=11	0%	N=1	14%	N=77	100%	N=560
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	63%	N=349	22%	N=121	2%	N=14	0%	N=1	13%	N=72	100%	N=558
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters, programs)	26%	N=143	23%	N=130	2%	N=11	0%	N=1	49%	N=276	100%	N=561
Louisville Historical Museum campus	25%	N=137	23%	N=128	3%	N=16	0%	N=2	49%	N=275	100%	N=559
Archival materials (e.g., historic photographs, newspapers, etc.)	21%	N=119	20%	N=113	1%	N=7	1%	N=3	57%	N=318	100%	N=560
Overall customer service at the Historical Museum (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	28%	N=155	16%	N=87	1%	N=3	0%	N=2	56%	N=310	100%	N=558
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	27%	N=150	22%	N=121	2%	N=9	0%	N=1	50%	N=279	100%	N=559

Table 26: Question 9 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Current recreation programs for youth (e.g., swim lessons, sports, preschool, camps)	54%	N=176	37%	N=121	8%	N=26	1%	N=2	100%	N=325
Current recreation programs for adults (e.g., fitness classes, sports, general interests)	45%	N=185	46%	N=188	8%	N=31	2%	N=8	100%	N=412
Recreation Center fees in Louisville	34%	N=163	43%	N=205	17%	N=83	6%	N=29	100%	N=480
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	65%	N=319	29%	N=142	6%	N=28	0%	N=1	100%	N=490
Overall customer service at the Louisville Recreation Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	64%	N=302	27%	N=127	8%	N=39	0%	N=0	100%	N=469
Overall performance of the Louisville Recreation Center	60%	N=290	33%	N=159	6%	N=30	0%	N=1	100%	N=480
Current programs and services for seniors	53%	N=116	36%	N=78	8%	N=18	3%	N=6	100%	N=218
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	60%	N=133	31%	N=68	9%	N=20	0%	N=1	100%	N=222
Overall customer service at the Louisville Senior Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	57%	N=120	34%	N=72	9%	N=18	0%	N=1	100%	N=211
Overall performance of the Louisville Senior Center	60%	N=119	31%	N=62	7%	N=14	1%	N=2	100%	N=196
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	35%	N=63	51%	N=93	10%	N=18	4%	N=7	100%	N=181
Overall customer service at the Coal Creek Golf Course (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	34%	N=55	47%	N=77	16%	N=25	3%	N=5	100%	N=162
Overall performance of the Coal Creek Golf Course	34%	N=58	49%	N=83	13%	N=22	4%	N=6	100%	N=170

Table 27: Question 9 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Current recreation programs for youth (e.g., swim lessons, sports, preschool, camps)	31%	N=176	22%	N=121	5%	N=26	0%	N=2	42%	N=235	100%	N=560
Current recreation programs for adults (e.g., fitness classes, sports, general interests)	33%	N=185	34%	N=188	6%	N=31	1%	N=8	26%	N=148	100%	N=560
Recreation Center fees in Louisville	29%	N=163	37%	N=205	15%	N=83	5%	N=29	14%	N=79	100%	N=559
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	57%	N=319	25%	N=142	5%	N=28	0%	N=1	12%	N=68	100%	N=558
Overall customer service at the Louisville Recreation Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	54%	N=302	23%	N=127	7%	N=39	0%	N=0	16%	N=90	100%	N=559
Overall performance of the Louisville Recreation Center	52%	N=290	29%	N=159	5%	N=30	0%	N=1	14%	N=77	100%	N=556
Current programs and services for seniors	21%	N=116	14%	N=78	3%	N=18	1%	N=6	61%	N=339	100%	N=557
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	24%	N=133	12%	N=68	4%	N=20	0%	N=1	60%	N=335	100%	N=557

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Overall customer service at the Louisville Senior Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	22%	N=120	13%	N=72	3%	N=18	0%	N=1	62%	N=339	100%	N=549
Overall performance of the Louisville Senior Center	22%	N=119	11%	N=62	3%	N=14	0%	N=2	64%	N=354	100%	N=551
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	11%	N=63	17%	N=93	3%	N=18	1%	N=7	67%	N=374	100%	N=555
Overall customer service at the Coal Creek Golf Course (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	10%	N=55	14%	N=77	5%	N=25	1%	N=5	71%	N=394	100%	N=556
Overall performance of the Coal Creek Golf Course	10%	N=58	15%	N=83	4%	N=22	1%	N=6	70%	N=387	100%	N=557

Table 28: Question 10 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	61%	N=329	33%	N=180	4%	N=24	1%	N=8	100%	N=541
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas)	50%	N=274	35%	N=192	12%	N=68	2%	N=13	100%	N=546
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	38%	N=211	40%	N=219	14%	N=78	8%	N=44	100%	N=552
Maintenance of the Louisville Cemetery	46%	N=80	45%	N=78	6%	N=10	3%	N=5	100%	N=173

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Overall customer service of the Parks Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	46%	N=150	41%	N=132	10%	N=33	3%	N=8	100%	N=322
Overall performance of the Parks Division	46%	N=210	43%	N=198	9%	N=41	2%	N=9	100%	N=459
Maintenance of open space (e.g., trash bins, trailheads, habitat, etc.)	44%	N=237	44%	N=238	9%	N=46	3%	N=14	100%	N=536
Maintenance of the trail system	49%	N=258	42%	N=222	7%	N=38	1%	N=5	100%	N=523
Overall customer service of the Open Space Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	52%	N=171	38%	N=124	8%	N=26	2%	N=7	100%	N=327
Overall performance of the Open Space Division	51%	N=240	40%	N=191	8%	N=38	1%	N=6	100%	N=475

Table 29: Question 10 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	59%	N=329	32%	N=180	4%	N=24	1%	N=8	3%	N=19	100%	N=561
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas)	49%	N=274	34%	N=192	12%	N=68	2%	N=13	2%	N=14	100%	N=560
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	38%	N=211	39%	N=219	14%	N=78	8%	N=44	2%	N=9	100%	N=561
Maintenance of the Louisville Cemetery	14%	N=80	14%	N=78	2%	N=10	1%	N=5	69%	N=386	100%	N=559
Overall customer service of the Parks Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	27%	N=150	24%	N=132	6%	N=33	2%	N=8	42%	N=230	100%	N=552

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Overall performance of the Parks Division	38%	N=210	36%	N=198	7%	N=41	2%	N=9	17%	N=96	100%	N=555
Maintenance of open space (e.g., trash bins, trailheads, habitat, etc.)	42%	N=237	43%	N=238	8%	N=46	3%	N=14	4%	N=23	100%	N=559
Maintenance of the trail system	46%	N=258	40%	N=222	7%	N=38	1%	N=5	7%	N=37	100%	N=559
Overall customer service of the Open Space Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	31%	N=171	22%	N=124	5%	N=26	1%	N=7	42%	N=232	100%	N=559
Overall performance of the Open Space Division	43%	N=240	34%	N=191	7%	N=38	1%	N=6	15%	N=82	100%	N=557

Table 30: Question 11 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Street maintenance in Louisville (e.g., paving and concrete replacement)	21%	N=114	46%	N=256	25%	N=139	8%	N=43	100%	N=552
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	23%	N=128	44%	N=245	22%	N=124	10%	N=58	100%	N=555
Street sweeping	22%	N=108	50%	N=244	22%	N=108	5%	N=26	100%	N=487
Snow removal/street sanding	18%	N=101	38%	N=207	27%	N=149	16%	N=88	100%	N=545
Street lighting, signage and street markings	31%	N=171	49%	N=273	13%	N=75	6%	N=35	100%	N=554
Waste water (e.g., sewage system)	43%	N=203	50%	N=234	5%	N=23	2%	N=9	100%	N=470
Storm drainage (e.g., flooding management)	39%	N=193	48%	N=239	8%	N=39	5%	N=24	100%	N=495

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Quality of Louisville water	44%	N=237	45%	N=241	9%	N=46	3%	N=16	100%	N=541
Solid waste/trash service (e.g., trash, recycle, compost)	33%	N=181	47%	N=253	14%	N=76	6%	N=30	100%	N=541
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	30%	N=115	52%	N=198	14%	N=53	4%	N=14	100%	N=380
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Works Department	32%	N=164	55%	N=278	10%	N=50	3%	N=15	100%	N=507

Table 31: Question 11 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Street maintenance in Louisville (e.g., paving and concrete replacement)	20%	N=114	46%	N=256	25%	N=139	8%	N=43	1%	N=7	100%	N=559
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	23%	N=128	44%	N=245	22%	N=124	10%	N=58	1%	N=4	100%	N=559
Street sweeping	19%	N=108	44%	N=244	19%	N=108	5%	N=26	13%	N=71	100%	N=558
Snow removal/street sanding	18%	N=101	37%	N=207	27%	N=149	16%	N=88	2%	N=14	100%	N=558
Street lighting, signage and street markings	31%	N=171	49%	N=273	13%	N=75	6%	N=35	1%	N=5	100%	N=558
Waste water (e.g., sewage system)	36%	N=203	42%	N=234	4%	N=23	2%	N=9	16%	N=90	100%	N=559
Storm drainage (e.g., flooding management)	35%	N=193	43%	N=239	7%	N=39	4%	N=24	11%	N=58	100%	N=554

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Quality of Louisville water	43%	N=237	43%	N=241	8%	N=46	3%	N=16	3%	N=17	100%	N=558
Solid waste/trash service (e.g., trash, recycle, compost)	32%	N=181	45%	N=253	14%	N=76	5%	N=30	3%	N=18	100%	N=559
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	21%	N=115	36%	N=198	9%	N=53	3%	N=14	32%	N=177	100%	N=558
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Works Department	30%	N=164	50%	N=278	9%	N=50	3%	N=15	9%	N=49	100%	N=557

Table 32: Question 12 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of Louisville's Transportation System:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Ease of car travel in Louisville	44%	N=244	40%	N=223	11%	N=62	5%	N=28	100%	N=557
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	20%	N=68	40%	N=136	24%	N=84	16%	N=54	100%	N=342
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	41%	N=199	45%	N=220	10%	N=51	3%	N=16	100%	N=486
Ease of walking in Louisville	47%	N=265	36%	N=203	14%	N=79	2%	N=11	100%	N=559
Traffic flow on major streets	22%	N=124	48%	N=264	21%	N=119	8%	N=47	100%	N=554
Overall quality of Louisville's Transportation System	26%	N=136	49%	N=257	21%	N=110	5%	N=24	100%	N=526
Overall safety of Louisville's Transportation System	32%	N=162	50%	N=253	15%	N=75	4%	N=20	100%	N=510

Table 33: Question 12 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of Louisville's Transportation System:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Ease of car travel in Louisville	43%	N=244	40%	N=223	11%	N=62	5%	N=28	1%	N=5	100%	N=562
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	12%	N=68	24%	N=136	15%	N=84	10%	N=54	39%	N=219	100%	N=561
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	36%	N=199	39%	N=220	9%	N=51	3%	N=16	13%	N=73	100%	N=559
Ease of walking in Louisville	47%	N=265	36%	N=203	14%	N=79	2%	N=11	1%	N=4	100%	N=563
Traffic flow on major streets	22%	N=124	47%	N=264	21%	N=119	8%	N=47	1%	N=4	100%	N=558
Overall quality of Louisville's Transportation System	24%	N=136	46%	N=257	20%	N=110	4%	N=24	6%	N=36	100%	N=563
Overall safety of Louisville's Transportation System	29%	N=162	45%	N=253	13%	N=75	4%	N=20	9%	N=50	100%	N=560

Table 34: Question 13 (excluding don't know)

Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	36%	N=196	52%	N=286	10%	N=57	2%	N=9	100%	N=549

Table 35: Question 13 (including don't know)

Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	35%	N=196	51%	N=286	10%	N=57	2%	N=9	1%	N=8	100%	N=556

Table 36: Question 14 (excluding don't know)

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of the community. Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	High priority		Medium priority		Low/not a priority		Total	
Transportation (e.g., safe/well-maintained multi-modal transportation system)	44%	N=238	43%	N=232	13%	N=69	100%	N=539
Utilities (e.g., safe/reliable water, treated wastewater)	71%	N=388	26%	N=143	3%	N=16	100%	N=547
Public Safety (e.g., community safety and compliance with Municipal Code/State Law)	56%	N=302	37%	N=201	7%	N=39	100%	N=542
Parks (e.g., well-maintained parks/landscapes areas, sports facilities, cemetery)	49%	N=269	46%	N=250	5%	N=27	100%	N=546
Open Space & Trails (e.g., preserving native plants, wildlife and scenic vistas)	59%	N=322	35%	N=192	6%	N=33	100%	N=548
Recreation (e.g., high quality, reasonably priced recreation/leisure activities)	46%	N=254	45%	N=244	9%	N=48	100%	N=547
Library (e.g., informing/involving the community)	45%	N=246	42%	N=226	13%	N=72	100%	N=544
Museum Services (e.g., preserving heritage, informing community)	11%	N=57	45%	N=235	44%	N=234	100%	N=526
Economic Prosperity (e.g., promoting a thriving business climate)	60%	N=325	35%	N=189	5%	N=29	100%	N=543
Administration & Support Services (e.g., effective and efficient governance)	43%	N=231	49%	N=264	7%	N=40	100%	N=535
Environmental Sustainability (e.g., promoting efficiency, reducing environmental impacts)	50%	N=271	35%	N=187	15%	N=82	100%	N=540

Table 37: Question 14 (including don't know)

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of the community. Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	High priority		Medium priority		Low/not a priority		Don't know		Total	
Transportation (e.g., safe/well-maintained multi-modal transportation system)	43%	N=238	42%	N=232	12%	N=69	2%	N=9	100%	N=548
Utilities (e.g., safe/reliable water, treated wastewater)	71%	N=388	26%	N=143	3%	N=16	1%	N=4	100%	N=551
Public Safety (e.g., community safety and compliance with Municipal Code/State Law)	55%	N=302	37%	N=201	7%	N=39	1%	N=5	100%	N=547
Parks (e.g., well-maintained parks/landscapes areas, sports facilities, cemetery)	49%	N=269	46%	N=250	5%	N=27	0%	N=3	100%	N=549
Open Space & Trails (e.g., preserving native plants, wildlife and scenic vistas)	58%	N=322	35%	N=192	6%	N=33	1%	N=6	100%	N=553
Recreation (e.g., high quality, reasonably priced recreation/leisure activities)	46%	N=254	44%	N=244	9%	N=48	1%	N=3	100%	N=550
Library (e.g., informing/involving the community)	45%	N=246	41%	N=226	13%	N=72	1%	N=8	100%	N=553
Museum Services (e.g., preserving heritage, informing community)	10%	N=57	43%	N=235	42%	N=234	5%	N=25	100%	N=551
Economic Prosperity (e.g., promoting a thriving business climate)	59%	N=325	34%	N=189	5%	N=29	2%	N=10	100%	N=553
Administration & Support Services (e.g., effective and efficient governance)	42%	N=231	48%	N=264	7%	N=40	2%	N=13	100%	N=548
Environmental Sustainability (e.g., promoting efficiency, reducing environmental impacts)	49%	N=271	34%	N=187	15%	N=82	2%	N=10	100%	N=551

Table 38: Question 14 Top Three Priorities

Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.		Percent	Number
Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	Transportation (e.g., safe/well-maintained multi-modal transportation system)	21%	N=48
	Utilities (e.g., safe/reliable water, treated wastewater)	46%	N=106
	Public Safety (e.g., community safety and compliance with Municipal Code/State Law)	39%	N=89
	Parks (e.g., well-maintained parks/landscapes areas, sports facilities, cemetery)	18%	N=41
	Open Space & Trails (e.g., preserving native plants, wildlife and scenic vistas)	33%	N=77
	Recreation (e.g., high quality, reasonably priced recreation/leisure activities)	24%	N=55
	Library (e.g., informing/involving the community)	16%	N=37
	Museum Services (e.g., preserving heritage, informing community)	3%	N=7
	Economic Prosperity (e.g., promoting a thriving business climate)	54%	N=124
	Administration & Support Services (e.g., effective and efficient governance)	14%	N=33
	Environmental Sustainability (e.g., promoting efficiency, reducing environmental impacts)	30%	N=69

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select up to three responses.

Table 39: Question 15 (excluding don't know)

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate. Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	High priority		Medium priority		Low/not a priority		Total	
Meet the retail and services needs of local residents	62%	N=344	31%	N=173	6%	N=33	100%	N=550
Attract visitors to shop in Louisville	29%	N=159	51%	N=276	20%	N=109	100%	N=545
Attract businesses to locate or expand in Louisville	56%	N=310	34%	N=190	10%	N=53	100%	N=552
Pursue redevelopment of vacant or underused commercial sites	69%	N=379	23%	N=129	8%	N=43	100%	N=551
Preserve the historic character of existing buildings	38%	N=211	41%	N=228	20%	N=112	100%	N=551
Provide gathering spaces for the community (e.g., parks, facilities, etc.)	44%	N=240	42%	N=229	15%	N=80	100%	N=550
Create and enhance unique identities for each of Louisville's business districts	20%	N=106	36%	N=196	44%	N=236	100%	N=538

Table 40: Question 15 (including don't know)

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate. Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	High priority		Medium priority		Low/not a priority		Don't know		Total	
Meet the retail and services needs of local residents	62%	N=344	31%	N=173	6%	N=33	1%	N=4	100%	N=555
Attract visitors to shop in Louisville	29%	N=159	50%	N=276	20%	N=109	1%	N=6	100%	N=551
Attract businesses to locate or expand in Louisville	56%	N=310	34%	N=190	9%	N=53	1%	N=4	100%	N=556

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate. Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	High priority		Medium priority		Low/not a priority		Don't know		Total	
Pursue redevelopment of vacant or underused commercial sites	68%	N=379	23%	N=129	8%	N=43	1%	N=8	100%	N=559
Preserve the historic character of existing buildings	38%	N=211	41%	N=228	20%	N=112	0%	N=1	100%	N=552
Provide gathering spaces for the community (e.g., parks, facilities, etc.)	43%	N=240	41%	N=229	15%	N=80	1%	N=4	100%	N=554
Create and enhance unique identities for each of Louisville's business districts	19%	N=106	35%	N=196	43%	N=236	3%	N=17	100%	N=555

Table 41: Question 15 Top Two Priorities

Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.		Percent	Number
Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	Meet the retail and services needs of local residents	54%	N=123
	Attract visitors to shop in Louisville	10%	N=23
	Attract businesses to locate or expand in Louisville	46%	N=105
	Pursue redevelopment of vacant or underused commercial sites	45%	N=103
	Preserve the historic character of existing buildings	20%	N=47
	Provide gathering spaces for the community (e.g., parks, facilities, etc.)	20%	N=47

Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.		Percent	Number
	Create and enhance unique identities for each of Louisville's business districts	4%	N=10

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select up to two responses.

Table 42: Question 16 (excluding don't know)

How much of a priority, if at all, should the City place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to achieve Louisville's sustainability vision?	High priority		Medium priority		Low/not a priority		Total	
Reduce energy consumption and increase use of clean energy	53%	N=295	33%	N=184	13%	N=73	100%	N=552
Encourage water efficiency and water quality efforts	69%	N=379	25%	N=137	6%	N=33	100%	N=549
Promote fuel-efficient transportation and multi-modal infrastructure	49%	N=269	31%	N=171	19%	N=104	100%	N=544
Increase community waste diversion	39%	N=203	45%	N=233	16%	N=80	100%	N=516
Ensure a sustainable, safe and healthy food supply that is accessible	53%	N=285	33%	N=177	14%	N=75	100%	N=537

Table 43: Question 16 (including don't know)

How much of a priority, if at all, should the City place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to achieve Louisville's sustainability vision?	High priority		Medium priority		Low/not a priority		Don't know		Total	
Reduce energy consumption and increase use of clean energy	53%	N=295	33%	N=184	13%	N=73	1%	N=7	100%	N=558
Encourage water efficiency and water quality efforts	68%	N=379	25%	N=137	6%	N=33	2%	N=10	100%	N=559

How much of a priority, if at all, should the City place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to achieve Louisville's sustainability vision?	High priority		Medium priority		Low/not a priority		Don't know		Total	
Promote fuel-efficient transportation and multi-modal infrastructure	48%	N=269	31%	N=171	19%	N=104	3%	N=14	100%	N=559
Increase community waste diversion	36%	N=203	42%	N=233	14%	N=80	8%	N=43	100%	N=558
Ensure a sustainable, safe and healthy food supply that is accessible	51%	N=285	32%	N=177	14%	N=75	4%	N=21	100%	N=559

Table 44: Question 17 (excluding don't know)

	Strongly support		Somewhat support		Somewhat oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
Imagine a commercial area with several vacant storefronts and empty parking lots. How much would you support, if at all, the development of mixed-use housing and businesses in this area?	55%	N=303	27%	N=149	10%	N=54	9%	N=47	100%	N=553

Table 45: Question 17 (including don't know)

	Strongly support		Somewhat support		Somewhat oppose		Strongly oppose		Don't know		Total	
Imagine a commercial area with several vacant storefronts and empty parking lots. How much would you support, if at all, the development of mixed-use housing and businesses in this area?	54%	N=303	26%	N=149	9%	N=54	8%	N=47	2%	N=12	100%	N=565

Table 46: Question 18 (including don't know)

The City is working on a housing plan that aims to increase the availability of affordable housing options while xxx		Percent	Number
The City is working on a housing plan that aims to increase the availability of affordable housing options while xxx	Increased building density (allowing for more units on a single lot)	30%	N=168
	Increased building height limitations (allowing taller buildings in specific areas)	6%	N=34
	Reduced parking requirements	5%	N=31
	Financial incentives for developers (tax breaks, grants, etc.)	17%	N=95
	All of the above	16%	N=87
	None of the above	18%	N=100
	Don't know	9%	N=48
	Total	100%	N=563

Table 47: Question 18 (excluding don't know)

The City is working on a housing plan that aims to increase the availability of affordable housing options while maintaining Louisville character. To achieve this, the plan explores offering incentives to developers who create affordable housing units. Which of the following incentive types would you MOST SUPPORT to encourage the development of more affordable housing?		Percent	Number
The City is working on a housing plan that aims to increase the availability of affordable housing options while maintaining Louisville character. To achieve this, the plan explores offering incentives to developers who create affordable	Increased building density (allowing for more units on a single lot)	33%	N=168

The City is working on a housing plan that aims to increase the availability of affordable housing options while maintaining Louisville character. To achieve this, the plan explores offering incentives to developers who create affordable housing units. Which of the following incentive types would you MOST SUPPORT to encourage the development of more affordable housing?		Percent	Number
housing units. Which of the following incentive types would you MOST SUPPORT to encourage the development of more affordable housing?	Increased building height limitations (allowing taller buildings in specific areas)	7%	N=34
	Reduced parking requirements	6%	N=31
	Financial incentives for developers (tax breaks, grants, etc.)	18%	N=95
	All of the above	17%	N=87
	None of the above	19%	N=100
	Total	100%	N=515

Table 48: Question 19 - Frequency

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source.	Always		Frequently		Sometimes		Never		Total	
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting	0%	N=2	4%	N=20	29%	N=161	67%	N=379	100%	N=563
Quarterly Community Update Newsletter (direct mail)	46%	N=261	26%	N=148	19%	N=106	8%	N=47	100%	N=562
Monthly Community Update eNewsletter (emailed)	24%	N=132	21%	N=118	21%	N=116	34%	N=192	100%	N=557

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source.	Always		Frequently		Sometimes		Never		Total	
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	11%	N=59	14%	N=77	34%	N=190	41%	N=225	100%	N=551
The City of Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	6%	N=34	28%	N=154	52%	N=289	14%	N=80	100%	N=557
City's online engagement site (www.engagelouisville.org)	2%	N=10	4%	N=20	21%	N=117	73%	N=404	100%	N=551
City's email notices (eNotification)	16%	N=86	17%	N=95	30%	N=164	37%	N=203	100%	N=547
Utility bill inserts	26%	N=143	21%	N=119	22%	N=125	30%	N=170	100%	N=557
Social media (Facebook, Instragram, NextDoor)	7%	N=41	15%	N=81	29%	N=158	49%	N=267	100%	N=548
Word of mouth	13%	N=73	32%	N=178	44%	N=248	11%	N=61	100%	N=559
Channel 8	1%	N=4	2%	N=10	8%	N=43	90%	N=493	100%	N=550

Table 49: Question 19 - Quality (excluding don't know)

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source.	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting	22%	N=36	46%	N=77	25%	N=41	8%	N=13	100%	N=167
Quarterly Community Update Newsletter (direct mail)	38%	N=169	51%	N=230	9%	N=41	2%	N=9	100%	N=450
Monthly Community Update eNewsletter (emailed)	30%	N=100	57%	N=195	11%	N=36	2%	N=7	100%	N=339
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	13%	N=36	49%	N=136	31%	N=85	8%	N=21	100%	N=278

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source.	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
The City of Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	20%	N=84	57%	N=236	19%	N=80	4%	N=17	100%	N=418
City's online engagement site (www.engagelouisville.org)	19%	N=24	42%	N=53	34%	N=43	4%	N=5	100%	N=125
City's email notices (eNotification)	21%	N=57	53%	N=141	21%	N=56	4%	N=12	100%	N=267
Utility bill inserts	26%	N=89	50%	N=174	19%	N=65	5%	N=18	100%	N=347
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor)	19%	N=46	36%	N=88	37%	N=90	9%	N=22	100%	N=247
Word of mouth	14%	N=53	39%	N=150	42%	N=165	5%	N=20	100%	N=388
Channel 8	17%	N=10	37%	N=22	28%	N=17	17%	N=10	100%	N=58

Table 50: Question 19 - Quality (including don't know)

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source.	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting	7%	N=36	16%	N=77	8%	N=41	3%	N=13	66%	N=321	100%	N=487
Quarterly Community Update Newsletter (direct mail)	33%	N=169	45%	N=230	8%	N=41	2%	N=9	12%	N=62	100%	N=512

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source.	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Monthly Community Update eNewsletter (emailed)	20%	N=100	39%	N=195	7%	N=36	1%	N=7	32%	N=156	100%	N=495
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	7%	N=36	28%	N=136	17%	N=85	4%	N=21	43%	N=212	100%	N=490
The City of Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	17%	N=84	47%	N=236	16%	N=80	3%	N=17	16%	N=80	100%	N=498
City's online engagement site (www.engagelouisville.org)	5%	N=24	11%	N=53	9%	N=43	1%	N=5	74%	N=357	100%	N=482
City's email notices (eNotification)	12%	N=57	30%	N=141	12%	N=56	2%	N=12	44%	N=213	100%	N=479
Utility bill inserts	18%	N=89	35%	N=174	13%	N=65	4%	N=18	31%	N=153	100%	N=500
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor)	9%	N=46	18%	N=88	18%	N=90	4%	N=22	50%	N=247	100%	N=494
Word of mouth	11%	N=53	31%	N=150	34%	N=165	4%	N=20	21%	N=100	100%	N=488

Appendix C: Verbatim Responses to Open-Ended Questions

Following are verbatim responses to the open-ended question on the survey. Because these responses were written by survey participants, they are presented here in verbatim form, including any typographical, grammar or other mistakes.

Question d8. How do you describe your gender identity?

Gender Identity

- THERE ARE ONLY TWO LOOK IN YOUR SHORTS FOR THE ANSWER.
- BULLSHIT CATAGORY.
- Correctly.
- NYOB

Question d9: How has the Marshall Fire impacted you?

Marshall Fire Impact

- Directly, I had to evacuate my home and clean it afterwards for ash/smoke. ("Damaged" feels like overkill)
- raised prices/insurance, destroyed businesses, exposed government overreach/incompetence slowing the rebuild
- had to go through remediation
- We need cell towers! It is unsafe for our families and people not have access to call someone while in the town.
- Smoke damage.
- Smoke damage.
- Some smoke dam.
- Directly - our neighborhood lost 1/3 of the total homes. We help re-build.
- New friends at Balfour.
- Extensive Interior smoke dust cleaning on & in every room/surface.
- Poor water quality polouted.
- Friends affected.
- Evacuated 2 nights.
- I was evacuated from or could not access senior at my home for multiple days.
- Horse had ash but able to clean.
- I own a business in Louisville had no income in Q1 2022-all fund raising.
- Possible smoke damage-wasn't mitigated though.
- TAXES HIGHER, INSURANCE HIGHER UTILITIES PERIODICALLY CUT & COST OF BATTARIES CANDLES & FOOD LOSS OF MONEY DUE TO UTILITY INTERUPTION FOR TOO LONG TO PROTECT REFRIGERATION.

- Other family members lost their home.
- Questionable (green) regulations slowing rebuild.
- * IN SUPERIOR, MOVED HERE.
- Minor damag.
- Friends/support systems moved.

Appendix D: Responses to Selected Survey Questions by Respondent Characteristics

The subgroup comparison tables contain the cross tabulations of selected survey questions by respondent characteristics. Chi-square or ANOVA tests of significance were applied to these breakdowns of survey questions. A "p-value" of 0.05 or less indicates that there is less than a 5% probability that differences observed between groups are due to chance; or in other words, a greater than 95% probability that the differences observed in the selected categories of the sample represent "real" differences among those populations.

For each pair of subgroups that has a statistically significant difference, an upper-case letter denoting significance is shown in the category with the larger column proportion. The letter denotes the category with the smaller column proportion from which it is statistically different. Differences were marked as statistically significant if the probability that the differences were due to chance alone were less than 5%. Categories were not used in comparisons when a column proportion was equal to zero or one.

Items that have no upper-case letter denotation in their column and that are also not referred to in any other column were not statistically different.

For example, in Table 51: Aspects of Quality of Life by Respondent Characteristics on page 76, 95% of residents aged 35-54 gave excellent or good ratings to their neighborhood as a place to live. This proportion of residents (B) was statistically higher than residents aged 18-34 (A).

Comparisons by Length of Residency, Age, Gender, Presence of Children, Housing Unit Type, Housing Tenure, and Household Income

Table 51: Aspects of Quality of Life by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Louisville: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Louisville as a place to live	96%	92%	92%	94%	92%	93%	93%	92%	94%	93%
Louisville as a place to raise children	85%	95% A	94% A	93%	93%	92%	93%	93%	92%	93%
Louisville as a place to retire	66%	73%	78%	77%	72%	75%	74%	72%	78%	74%
Louisville as a place to work	76%	67%	73%	77% B	66%	78%	69%	67%	84% A	71%
The overall quality of life in Louisville	94%	92%	91%	92%	92%	92%	92%	91%	93%	92%

Table 52: Aspects of Quality of Life by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Louisville: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Louisville as a place to live	92%	97%	.	94%	91%	94%	91%	93%

Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Louisville: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Louisville as a place to raise children	93%	100%	.	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%
Louisville as a place to retire	73%	77%	.	75%	72%	72%	77%	74%
Louisville as a place to work	70%	85%	.	72%	70%	71%	72%	71%
The overall quality of life in Louisville	92%	92%	.	92%	93%	93%	90%	92%

Table 53: Aspects of Quality of Life by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Louisville: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Louisville as a place to live	96%	92%	92%	94%	92%	93%	93%	92%	94%	93%
Louisville as a place to raise children	85%	95% A	94% A	93%	93%	92%	93%	93%	92%	93%
Louisville as a place to retire	66%	73%	78%	77%	72%	75%	74%	72%	78%	74%
Louisville as a place to work	76%	67%	73%	77% B	66%	78%	69%	67%	84% A	71%
The overall quality of life in Louisville	94%	92%	91%	92%	92%	92%	92%	91%	93%	92%

Table 54: Aspects of Quality of Life by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Louisville: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Louisville as a place to live	92%	97%	.	94%	91%	94%	91%	93%
Louisville as a place to raise children	93%	100%	.	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%
Louisville as a place to retire	73%	77%	.	75%	72%	72%	77%	74%
Louisville as a place to work	70%	85%	.	72%	70%	71%	72%	71%
The overall quality of life in Louisville	92%	92%	.	92%	93%	93%	90%	92%

Table 55: Aspects of Quality of Life by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Louisville: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Louisville as a place to live	97% C D	94%	88%	90%	93%	93%	94%	93%
Louisville as a place to raise children	94%	92%	96%	92%	98% B	91%	93%	93%

Louisville as a place to retire	87% B D	73%	80%	67%	65%	78% A	73%	74%
Louisville as a place to work	78% D	76%	78%	65%	67%	71%	83% A	71%
The overall quality of life in Louisville	95% D	93%	92%	89%	93%	91%	94%	92%

Table 56: Select Community Characteristics by Respondent Characteristics

	Age			**Gender**		**Housing tenure**		**Housing unit type**		**Overall**
Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	**18-34**	**35-54**	**55+**	**Female**	**Male**	**Rent**	**Own**	**Detached**	**Attached**	
	(A)	**(B)**	**(C)**	**(A)**	**(B)**	**(A)**	**(B)**	**(A)**	**(B)**	**(A)**
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	76%	77%	80%	75%	82%	78%	78%	80%	73%	78%
Overall appearance of Louisville	88% C	84%	79%	85%	80%	89% B	81%	80%	89% A	83%
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	56%	65%	74% A	64%	70%	58%	69% A	68%	61%	66%

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Shopping opportunities	52% B C	35%	37%	36%	44% A	54% B	34%	34%	51% A	39%
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	93% B C	83%	81%	90% B	80%	87%	84%	84%	87%	85%
Opportunities to participate in community matters	66%	81% A C	72%	77%	71%	67%	76%	73%	77%	74%
Recreational opportunities	88%	91%	89%	89%	89%	82%	93% A	93% B	80%	89%
Employment opportunities	52%	40%	38%	45%	43%	46%	41%	41%	45%	42%
Variety of housing options	27%	30%	33%	29%	32%	27%	33%	33%	27%	31%
Availability of affordable quality housing	13%	17%	16%	11%	21% A	13%	18%	18%	11%	16%
Preservation of the historic character of old town	86% C	77%	72%	75%	80%	80%	75%	74%	83% A	76%

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	97% B C	89% C	81%	88%	87%	90%	87%	87%	89%	87%
Overall economic health of Louisville	73% C	65%	60%	64%	68%	80% B	60%	58%	82% A	65%

Table 57: Select Community Characteristics by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	78%	80%	.	77%	81%	77%	81%	78%
Overall appearance of Louisville	83%	81%	.	83%	82%	85%	79%	83%
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	66%	79%	.	65%	69%	61%	74% A	66%

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Shopping opportunities	39%	30%	.	42% B	32%	41%	37%	39%
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	84%	92%	.	83%	88%	87%	82%	85%
Opportunities to participate in community matters	72%	81%	.	72%	80% A	77%	70%	74%
Recreational opportunities	88%	100% A	.	88%	93%	90%	88%	89%
Employment opportunities	42%	65%	.	40%	48%	44%	39%	42%
Variety of housing options	29%	34%	.	31%	30%	28%	35%	31%
Availability of affordable quality housing	15%	34% A	.	14%	20%	13%	21% A	16%
Preservation of the historic character of old town	75%	89%	.	76%	77%	81% B	71%	76%

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	87%	100% A	.	87%	90%	92% B	80%	87%
Overall economic health of Louisville	65%	56%	.	66%	63%	68%	61%	65%

Table 58: Select Community Characteristics by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	70%	81%	83%	79%	82% C	78%	69%	78%
Overall appearance of Louisville	92% C D	85%	76%	76%	85%	80%	89% B	83%
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	56%	62%	81% A B	70% A	76% C	67% C	54%	66%

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Shopping opportunities	50% B D	32%	35%	34%	35%	37%	53% A B	39%
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	90% D	81%	93% B D	80%	85%	84%	88%	85%
Opportunities to participate in community matters	78%	68%	83% B	73%	74%	73%	79%	74%
Recreational opportunities	85%	89%	91%	91%	93%	89%	85%	89%
Employment opportunities	49%	33%	64% B D	37%	50%	37%	51%	42%
Variety of housing options	34%	26%	43% B D	29%	31%	30%	34%	31%
Availability of affordable quality housing	13%	17%	21%	17%	16%	19% C	7%	16%

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Preservation of the historic character of old town	85% B D	74%	81%	69%	76%	74%	83%	76%
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	94% D	89%	89%	81%	85%	87%	92%	87%
Overall economic health of Louisville	83% B C D	62%	61%	57%	68%	60%	81% B	65%

Table 59: Safety Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate how safe you feel: (Percent rating positively e.g., very safe/somewhat safe)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
From violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	95% C	96% C	88%	92%	93%	89%	94%	94% B	89%	92%
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	84%	86%	80%	83%	84%	88%	81%	82%	85%	83%

Please rate how safe you feel: (Percent rating positively e.g., very safe/somewhat safe)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
In your neighborhood	94% C	95% C	87%	90%	93%	88%	92%	92%	88%	91%
In Louisville's downtown area	98% C	99% C	88%	94%	95%	94%	94%	94%	93%	94%
In Louisville's parks and open spaces	97% C	94%	90%	92%	95%	89%	94% A	93%	92%	93%

Table 60: Safety Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate how safe you feel: (Percent rating positively e.g., very safe/somewhat safe)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
From violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	92%	100%	.	91%	96% A	95% B	89%	92%

Please rate how safe you feel: (Percent rating positively e.g., very safe/somewhat safe)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	84% B	63%	.	83%	83%	85%	80%	83%
In your neighborhood	91%	92%	.	89%	96% A	94% B	88%	91%
In Louisville's downtown area	94%	100%	.	92%	99% A	98% B	88%	94%
In Louisville's parks and open spaces	92%	100%	.	92%	95%	95% B	89%	93%

Table 61: Safety Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate how safe you feel: (Percent rating positively e.g., very safe/somewhat safe)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
From violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	92%	94%	98% D	90%	93%	93%	92%	92%
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	88% D	83%	80%	79%	79%	83%	90% A	83%
In your neighborhood	93%	92%	96%	88%	93%	90%	93%	91%
In Louisville's downtown area	96% D	98% D	97% D	90%	96%	94%	94%	94%
In Louisville's parks and open spaces	92%	93%	98%	91%	94%	94% C	87%	93%

Table 62: Louisville Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the job you feel the Louisville community does at each of the following: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Making all residents feel welcome	96% B C	85%	80%	86%	86%	88%	85%	85%	87%	85%
Attracting people from diverse backgrounds	38%	41%	43%	36%	48% A	51% B	38%	39%	47%	41%
Valuing/respecting residents from diverse backgrounds	76%	73%	69%	70%	75%	72%	73%	73%	70%	72%
Taking care of vulnerable residents (elderly, disabled, homeless, etc.)	47%	62%	61%	55%	63%	52%	61%	59%	59%	59%

Table 63: Louisville Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the job you feel the Louisville community does at each of the following: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Making all residents feel welcome	86%	83%	.	84%	88%	89% B	80%	85%

Please rate the job you feel the Louisville community does at each of the following: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Attracting people from diverse backgrounds	41%	34%	.	40%	43%	37%	49% A	41%
Valuing/respecting residents from diverse backgrounds	72%	78%	.	68%	81% A	73%	71%	72%
Taking care of vulnerable residents (elderly, disabled, homeless, etc.)	57%	74%	.	54%	69% A	56%	61%	59%

Table 64: Louisville Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the job you feel the Louisville community does at each of the following: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Making all residents feel welcome	91% D	85%	88%	80%	85%	84%	91%	85%
Attracting people from diverse backgrounds	36%	35%	37%	48%	47%	39%	39%	41%

Please rate the job you feel the Louisville community does at each of the following: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Valuing/respecting residents from diverse backgrounds	78% B	65%	80%	69%	80% B	68%	74%	72%
Taking care of vulnerable residents (elderly, disabled, homeless, etc.)	61%	50%	66%	61%	65%	55%	67%	59%

Table 65: Government Performance Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	74% B C	54%	52%	58%	53%	66% B	53%	53%	65% A	56%
Information about City Council, Planning Commission & other official City meetings	68%	69%	66%	71%	65%	67%	68%	66%	72%	68%
Information about City's strategic plan and budget	53%	66% A	56%	61%	59%	48%	62% A	60%	58%	59%

Please rate the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	0%	57%	45%	48%	47%	33%	50%	50%	37%	46%
Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	82% B C	69%	70%	75%	70%	80% B	70%	69%	79% A	72%
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	86% C	79%	72%	77%	76%	84%	75%	75%	80%	76%
Overall performance of the Louisville City government	83% B C	65%	61%	69%	66%	80% B	64%	64%	76% A	67%

Table 66: Government Performance Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	55%	64%	.	53%	61%	63% B	48%	56%

Please rate the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Information about City Council, Planning Commission & other official City meetings	67%	78%	.	64%	76% A	69%	65%	68%
Information about City's strategic plan and budget	57%	79% A	.	53%	72% A	62%	55%	59%
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	44%	100% A	.	42%	57%	55%	43%	46%
Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	71%	73%	.	72%	72%	74%	67%	72%
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	76%	81%	.	75%	80%	84% B	68%	76%
Overall performance of the Louisville City government	67%	66%	.	67%	68%	73% B	59%	67%

Table 67: Government Performance Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	81% B C D	45%	62% D	46%	49%	54%	79% A B	56%
Information about City Council, Planning Commission & other official City meetings	82% B D	62%	78% B D	61%	67%	66%	78%	68%
Information about City's strategic plan and budget	69% D	58%	65%	54%	59%	60%	57%	59%
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	52%	48%	50%	45%	54%	48%	35%	46%
Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	81% B D	68%	73%	66%	64%	72%	86% A B	72%
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	95% B D	73%	80%	67%	74%	73%	96% A B	76%
Overall performance of the Louisville City government	88% B C D	60%	67%	58%	65%	63%	89% A B	67%

Table 68: Police Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Police Department and public safety: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Visibility of patrol cars	80%	83% C	72%	74%	81%	72%	79%	77%	78%	77%
Enforcement of traffic regulations	61%	66%	60%	62%	63%	53%	66% A	65%	56%	63%
Municipal code enforcement issues (e.g., dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	76% C	69%	59%	64%	67%	71%	65%	66%	65%	65%
Communicating regularly with community members (e.g., website, meetings, etc.)	64%	61%	56%	61%	60%	66%	58%	58%	64%	60%
Response to emerging community issues (e.g., opioids, mental health, etc.)	66%	69% C	54%	62%	63%	75% B	58%	56%	74% A	61%
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	89% C	83% C	74%	81%	79%	85%	78%	78%	84%	80%
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	94% C	88%	83%	87%	89%	92%	86%	86%	92%	87%

Table 69: Police Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Police Department and public safety: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2 (A)	3-4 (B)	5 or more (C)	No (A)	Yes (B)	No (A)	Yes (B)	(A)
Visibility of patrol cars	77%	82%	.	75%	84% A	81% B	72%	77%
Enforcement of traffic regulations	62%	72%	.	61%	65%	64%	61%	63%
Municipal code enforcement issues (e.g., dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	65%	80%	.	65%	69%	71% B	58%	65%
Communicating regularly with community members (e.g., website, meetings, etc.)	58%	75%	.	54%	72% A	63%	55%	60%
Response to emerging community issues (e.g., opioids, mental health, etc.)	62%	46%	.	56%	76% A	65%	58%	61%
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	79%	85%	.	77%	84%	83%	75%	80%
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	87%	87%	.	87%	89%	91% B	83%	87%

Table 70: Police Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Police Department and public safety: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Visibility of patrol cars	76%	84% D	88% D	72%	81%	78%	72%	77%
Enforcement of traffic regulations	58%	66%	75% A D	60%	65% C	66% C	50%	63%
Municipal code enforcement issues (e.g., dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	69%	67%	68%	62%	65%	64%	76%	65%
Communicating regularly with community members (e.g., website, meetings, etc.)	70% D	64% D	59%	49%	57%	56%	82% A B	60%
Response to emerging community issues (e.g., opioids, mental health, etc.)	73% C	64%	43%	59%	62%	58%	82% B	61%
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	82%	86%	82%	75%	85%	76%	86%	80%
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	94% D	89%	92%	82%	93% B	84%	94% B	87%

Table 71: Planning and Building Safety Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of community design and the Louisville Community Development Department:	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34 (A)	35-54 (B)	55+ (C)	Female (A)	Male (B)	Rent (A)	Own (B)	Detached (A)	Attached (B)	(A)
The public input process on City planning issues	64%	57%	52%	59%	56%	57%	57%	55%	61%	56%
Planning review process for new development	48%	52%	47%	51%	48%	56%	48%	46%	57%	48%
Building permit process related to the Marshall Fire	45%	38%	41%	36%	43%	53%	38%	37%	51%	40%
Building permit process overall	76% B C	52%	40%	44%	55%	45%	50%	49%	49%	49%
Building/construction inspection process	81% C	67% C	47%	55%	64%	80% B	58%	57%	74%	59%
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	85% B C	67%	61%	65%	68%	76%	65%	64%	74%	66%
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department	87% B C	67% C	54%	62%	67%	82% B	60%	60%	75% A	63%

Table 72: Planning and Building Safety Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of community design and the Louisville Community Development Department:	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
The public input process on City planning issues	55%	74%	.	55%	61%	62% B	48%	56%
Planning review process for new development	46%	65%	.	45%	55%	54% B	43%	48%
Building permit process related to the Marshall Fire	38%	76% A	.	36%	48%	47%	34%	40%
Building permit process overall	50%	50%	.	46%	55%	56% B	42%	49%
Building/construction inspection process	60%	64%	.	56%	66%	68% B	49%	59%
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	65%	65%	.	66%	66%	73% B	60%	66%
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department	62%	66%	.	61%	67%	73% B	53%	63%

Table 73: Planning and Building Safety Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of community design and the Louisville Community Development Department:	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
The public input process on City planning issues	71% B D	50%	61%	50%	56%	52%	81% A B	56%
Planning review process for new development	62% B D	41%	69% B D	41%	44%	47%	69% A B	48%
Building permit process related to the Marshall Fire	66% B D	27%	41%	36%	40%	34%	77% A B	40%
Building permit process overall	72% B D	38%	68% B D	42%	53%	46%	65%	49%
Building/construction inspection process	85% B D	47%	77% B D	50%	61%	56%	80% B	59%
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	93% B C D	50%	71%	60%	66%	62%	87% A B	66%

Please rate the following areas of community design and the Louisville Community Development Department:	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department	87% B D	56%	77% B D	52%	64%	58%	85% A B	63%

Table 74: Public Library and Historical Museum Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Louisville Public Library programs (e.g., story time, One Book program, etc.)	100%	96%	97%	99%	96%	99%	97%	97%	99%	98%
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk, check out, etc.)	97%	96%	96%	98%	95%	98%	97%	96%	97%	96%
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	100% B	94%	95%	99% B	94%	100% B	95%	95%	99%	96%
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	98% B	92%	95%	98% B	92%	99% B	94%	93%	98% A	95%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	94%	92%	88%	93%	90%	95%	90%	91%	92%	91%
Louisville Public Library building	100%	97%	97%	99%	96%	100% B	97%	97%	99%	97%
Overall customer service at the Library (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	100%	97%	97%	100% B	96%	100%	97%	97%	99%	98%
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	100% C	97%	95%	99%	96%	100% B	96%	96%	99%	97%
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters, expanded/new programming)	100% C	97%	92%	98%	94%	97%	95%	95%	97%	96%
Louisville Historical Museum campus	100% C	94%	91%	97%	91%	97%	93%	92%	97%	93%
Archival materials (e.g., historic photographs, newspapers, etc.)	100% C	97%	93%	99% B	93%	98%	96%	95%	98%	96%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Overall customer service at the Historical Museum (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	100%	98%	97%	100%	96%	100%	97%	98%	99%	98%
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	100%	97%	96%	99% B	95%	98%	97%	96%	99%	97%

Table 75: Public Library and Historical Museum Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Louisville Public Library programs (e.g., story time, One Book program, etc.)	99%	100% D	98%	95%	97%	100%	.	97%	98%	98%	97%	98%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk, check out, etc.)	97%	97%	98%	95%	96%	100%	.	95%	99% A	96%	97%	96%
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	99% D	98%	97%	93%	97%	94%	.	97%	95%	96%	95%	96%
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	99% D	98% D	92%	91%	94%	100%	.	95%	93%	94%	95%	95%
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	97% B D	90%	91%	87%	90%	100%	.	89%	95% A	94% B	86%	91%
Louisville Public Library building	99% D	99%	98%	95%	97%	100%	.	97%	98%	98%	96%	97%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Overall customer service at the Library (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	99%	98%	98%	96%	97%	100%	.	97%	99%	98%	98%	98%
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	99% D	98%	98%	95%	96%	100%	.	96%	99%	98%	95%	97%
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters, expanded/new programming)	96%	97%	96%	95%	96%	100%	.	94%	99% A	98%	93%	96%
Louisville Historical Museum campus	94%	95%	91%	94%	94%	94%	.	92%	96%	96% B	90%	93%
Archival materials (e.g., historic photographs, newspapers, etc.)	100%	92%	96%	96%	96%	100%	.	95%	98%	98%	94%	96%
Overall customer service at the Historical Museum (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	100%	99%	100%	96%	98%	100%	.	97%	100%	99%	97%	98%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	96%	100%	96%	96%	97%	100%	.	95%	100% A	98%	95%	97%

Table 76: Public Library and Historical Museum Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Louisville Public Library programs (e.g., story time, One Book program, etc.)	99%	100% D	98%	95%	99%	97%	98%	98%
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk, check out, etc.)	97%	97%	98%	95%	98%	96%	98%	96%
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	99% D	98%	97%	93%	97%	96%	97%	96%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	99% D	98% D	92%	91%	95%	93%	100% B	95%
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	97% B D	90%	91%	87%	86%	91%	96% A	91%
Louisville Public Library building	99% D	99%	98%	95%	99%	97%	98%	97%
Overall customer service at the Library (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	99%	98%	98%	96%	99%	98%	98%	98%
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	99% D	98%	98%	95%	98%	96%	98%	97%
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters, expanded/new programming)	96%	97%	96%	95%	93%	97%	94%	96%
Louisville Historical Museum campus	94%	95%	91%	94%	95%	94%	89%	93%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Archival materials (e.g., historic photographs, newspapers, etc.)	100%	92%	96%	96%	94%	96%	100%	96%
Overall customer service at the Historical Museum (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	100%	99%	100%	96%	99%	97%	100%	98%
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	96%	100%	96%	96%	97%	97%	94%	97%

Table 77: Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Current recreation programs for youth (e.g., swim lessons, sports, preschool, camps)	96%	88%	93%	92%	91%	98% B	90%	90%	96%	91%
Current recreation programs for adults (e.g., fitness classes, sports, general interests)	82%	91%	93% A	89%	92%	85%	92% A	90%	90%	91%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Recreation Center fees in Louisville	63%	80% A	80% A	76%	77%	65%	80% A	80% B	68%	77%
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	96%	92%	95%	94%	95%	92%	95%	95%	92%	94%
Overall customer service at the Louisville Recreation Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	90%	88%	95% B	89%	94% A	92%	92%	92%	91%	92%
Overall performance of the Louisville Recreation Center	96%	90%	96% B	93%	94%	89%	95% A	95%	91%	94%
Current programs and services for seniors	100%	87%	88%	90%	89%	83%	91%	89%	90%	89%
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	100%	89%	91%	91%	90%	88%	91%	90%	92%	91%
Overall customer service at the Louisville Senior Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	75%	91%	93% A	89%	94%	84%	93% A	92%	89%	91%
Overall performance of the Louisville Senior Center	100%	93%	91%	92%	93%	89%	93%	92%	93%	92%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	94% C	89%	79%	83%	87%	93%	84%	84%	91%	86%
Overall customer service at the Coal Creek Golf Course (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	93%	77%	77%	80%	82%	92% B	78%	78%	89%	81%
Overall performance of the Coal Creek Golf Course	93%	82%	79%	80%	86%	92%	81%	81%	91%	83%

Table 78: Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Current recreation programs for youth (e.g., swim lessons, sports, preschool, camps)	92%	96%	87%	90%	92%	86%	.	95% B	87%	91%	91%	91%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Current recreation programs for adults (e.g., fitness classes, sports, general interests)	90%	89%	94%	91%	90%	85%	.	90%	92%	90%	91%	91%
Recreation Center fees in Louisville	71%	78%	88% A	76%	76%	87%	.	74%	81%	76%	77%	77%
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	94%	95%	98%	92%	93%	100%	.	94%	95%	93%	95%	94%
Overall customer service at the Louisville Recreation Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	93%	87%	98% B	91%	91%	95%	.	93%	89%	91%	93%	92%
Overall performance of the Louisville Recreation Center	95%	92%	96%	93%	93%	100%	.	94%	93%	92%	95%	94%
Current programs and services for seniors	94%	93%	80%	87%	88%	100%	.	89%	90%	95%	86%	89%
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	95%	87%	100%	89%	90%	100%	.	90%	93%	94%	89%	91%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Overall customer service at the Louisville Senior Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	90%	93%	91%	92%	91%	100%	.	91%	93%	89%	92%	91%
Overall performance of the Louisville Senior Center	97%	95%	87%	90%	91%	100%	.	91%	95%	95%	91%	92%
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	99% D	88%	91%	78%	85%	100%	.	87%	85%	90% B	79%	86%
Overall customer service at the Coal Creek Golf Course (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	99% B D	78%	80%	74%	79%	100%	.	85%	76%	82%	80%	81%
Overall performance of the Coal Creek Golf Course	99% D	83%	95% D	73%	82%	100%	.	86%	80%	86%	79%	83%

Table 79: Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Current recreation programs for youth (e.g., swim lessons, sports, preschool, camps)	92%	96%	87%	90%	94%	89%	99% B	91%
Current recreation programs for adults (e.g., fitness classes, sports, general interests)	90%	89%	94%	91%	94%	90%	88%	91%
Recreation Center fees in Louisville	71%	78%	88% A	76%	85% B	73%	77%	77%
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	94%	95%	98%	92%	97%	93%	96%	94%
Overall customer service at the Louisville Recreation Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	93%	87%	98% B	91%	93%	91%	93%	92%
Overall performance of the Louisville Recreation Center	95%	92%	96%	93%	96%	93%	94%	94%
Current programs and services for seniors	94%	93%	80%	87%	91%	88%	93%	89%
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	95%	87%	100%	89%	94%	90%	93%	91%
Overall customer service at the Louisville Senior Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	90%	93%	91%	92%	95% C	93% C	79%	91%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Overall performance of the Louisville Senior Center	97%	95%	87%	90%	96%	91%	91%	92%
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	99% D	88%	91%	78%	83%	84%	96%	86%
Overall customer service at the Coal Creek Golf Course (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	99% B D	78%	80%	74%	77%	78%	98% A B	81%
Overall performance of the Coal Creek Golf Course	99% D	83%	95% D	73%	82%	81%	92%	83%

Table 80: Parks and Open Space Divisions Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	94%	95%	94%	95%	94%	94%	94%	94%	94%	94%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas)	90%	84%	86%	86%	85%	89%	84%	84%	88%	85%
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	88% B C	79% C	71%	79%	77%	85% B	76%	75%	84% A	78%
Maintenance of the Louisville Cemetery	100% C	96% C	87%	91%	95%	96%	90%	91%	95%	91%
Overall customer service of the Parks Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	97% B C	86%	84%	87%	88%	88%	87%	86%	89%	87%
Overall performance of the Parks Division	96% B C	88%	87%	88%	91%	95% B	87%	87%	94%	89%
Maintenance of open space (e.g., trash bins, trailheads, habitat, etc.)	95% C	92% C	83%	87%	91%	94% B	87%	87%	94% A	89%
Maintenance of the trail system	94%	94% C	89%	92%	93%	95%	91%	91%	94%	92%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Overall customer service of the Open Space Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	97% C	93% C	85%	90%	91%	96%	89%	89%	94%	90%
Overall performance of the Open Space Division	97% C	92% C	86%	90%	92%	93%	91%	90%	93%	91%

Table 81: Parks and Open Space Divisions Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	94%	95%	.	94%	95%	95%	94%	94%
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas)	85%	91%	.	85%	87%	88%	82%	85%
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	77%	87%	.	78%	79%	82% B	72%	78%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Maintenance of the Louisville Cemetery	92%	100%	.	91%	96%	98% B	87%	91%
Overall customer service of the Parks Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	86%	92%	.	86%	90%	89%	85%	87%
Overall performance of the Parks Division	89%	97%	.	88%	92%	92% B	86%	89%
Maintenance of open space (e.g., trash bins, trailheads, habitat, etc.)	89%	88%	.	88%	92%	93% B	82%	89%
Maintenance of the trail system	91%	100%	.	90%	95%	94% B	88%	92%
Overall customer service of the Open Space Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	89%	100%	.	87%	97% A	94% B	85%	90%
Overall performance of the Open Space Division	91%	95%	.	89%	95% A	94% B	85%	91%

Table 82: Parks and Open Space Divisions Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	98% B D	90%	96%	93%	95%	92%	100% B	94%
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas)	95% B D	77%	90% B	80%	83%	83%	97% A B	85%
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	94% B C D	76%	76%	67%	76%	74%	96% A B	78%
Maintenance of the Louisville Cemetery	100% D	94%	93%	88%	91%	91%	100%	91%
Overall customer service of the Parks Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	95% B D	84%	95%	83%	93% B	84%	96% B	87%
Overall performance of the Parks Division	96% D	91%	86%	84%	89%	87%	99% A B	89%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Maintenance of open space (e.g., trash bins, trailheads, habitat, etc.)	97% B C D	85%	85%	85%	90%	87%	97% B	89%
Maintenance of the trail system	98% B D	86%	94%	89%	92%	91%	97%	92%
Overall customer service of the Open Space Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	96% D	91%	95%	85%	93%	89%	97%	90%
Overall performance of the Open Space Division	97% D	90%	95% D	86%	93%	89%	97% B	91%

Table 83: Public Works Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Street maintenance in Louisville (e.g., paving and concrete replacement)	73% C	69%	61%	63%	71% A	76% B	65%	62%	78% A	67%
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	84% B C	63%	62%	67%	69%	76% B	65%	64%	76% A	67%
Street sweeping	79%	71%	72%	72%	74%	81% B	70%	71%	76%	72%
Snow removal/street sanding	73% B C	52%	51%	56%	57%	66% B	53%	52%	67% A	56%
Street lighting, signage and street markings	86%	80%	78%	77%	83%	84%	79%	78%	85%	80%
Waste water (e.g., sewage system)	99% C	93%	90%	90%	96% A	97% B	92%	92%	96%	93%
Storm drainage (e.g., flooding management)	94% C	86%	84%	83%	91% A	88%	87%	88%	85%	87%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Quality of Louisville water	91%	89%	87%	85%	93% A	84%	90%	89%	86%	88%
Solid waste/trash service (e.g., trash, recycle, compost)	83%	81%	78%	79%	82%	87% B	78%	78%	85%	80%
Fees for water, sewer and trash	62%	67%	59%	62%	65%	63%	63%	62%	66%	63%
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	92% B C	80%	79%	79%	86%	90% B	80%	78%	94% A	82%
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Works Department	96% B C	88%	83%	85%	91% A	91%	86%	85%	92% A	87%

Table 84: Public Works Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2 (A)	3-4 (B)	5 or more (C)	No (A)	Yes (B)	No (A)	Yes (B)	(A)
Street maintenance in Louisville (e.g., paving and concrete replacement)	65%	87% A	.	66%	68%	70%	63%	67%
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	67%	76%	.	69%	65%	70%	63%	67%
Street sweeping	72%	85%	.	73%	72%	74%	71%	72%
Snow removal/street sanding	55%	61%	.	58%	53%	57%	55%	56%
Street lighting, signage and street markings	81%	72%	.	79%	83%	82%	77%	80%
Waste water (e.g., sewage system)	93%	96%	.	93%	94%	96% B	89%	93%
Storm drainage (e.g., flooding management)	87%	92%	.	85%	92% A	90% B	83%	87%
Quality of Louisville water	89%	91%	.	87%	93% A	91%	86%	88%
Solid waste/trash service (e.g., trash, recycle, compost)	80%	82%	.	80%	81%	81%	79%	80%
Fees for water, sewer and trash	63%	70%	.	61%	69%	67% B	57%	63%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	83%	79%	.	82%	83%	86%	78%	82%
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Works Department	87%	94%	.	87%	89%	91% B	82%	87%

Table 85: Public Works Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Street maintenance in Louisville (e.g., paving and concrete replacement)	78% B D	63%	70%	59%	65%	65%	77% B	67%
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	78% C D	71%	64%	60%	63%	65%	82% A B	67%
Street sweeping	77%	70%	75%	70%	69%	73%	77%	72%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Snow removal/street sanding	61%	65% D	53%	51%	51%	56%	65% A	56%
Street lighting, signage and street markings	84%	82%	79%	77%	77%	79%	89% A B	80%
Waste water (e.g., sewage system)	99% D	92%	92%	90%	93%	92%	99% B	93%
Storm drainage (e.g., flooding management)	92% D	84%	92%	84%	89%	84%	96% B	87%
Quality of Louisville water	89%	84%	88%	90%	90%	88%	90%	88%
Solid waste/trash service (e.g., trash, recycle, compost)	89% B C D	73%	77%	77%	80%	78%	90% B	80%
Fees for water, sewer and trash	73% D	63%	69%	55%	67%	59%	74% B	63%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	93% B D	77%	82%	76%	83%	78%	97% A B	82%
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Works Department	94% D	90% D	89%	81%	86%	86%	96% A B	87%

Table 86: Transportation System Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of Louisville's Transportation System: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Ease of car travel in Louisville	96% B C	85% C	77%	86%	82%	91% B	82%	81%	90% A	84%
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	57%	63%	58%	58%	62%	63%	58%	60%	59%	60%
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	88%	85%	87%	86%	86%	83%	87%	87%	84%	86%
Ease of walking in Louisville	71%	85% A	89% A	84%	84%	71%	89% A	89% B	71%	84%

Please rate the following areas of Louisville's Transportation System: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Traffic flow on major streets	67%	73%	70%	71%	70%	69%	71%	68%	75%	70%
Overall quality of Louisville's Transportation System	76%	77%	73%	76%	75%	79%	73%	74%	76%	75%
Overall safety of Louisville's Transportation System	81%	83%	81%	80%	83%	79%	83%	83%	76%	81%

Table 87: Transportation System Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of Louisville's Transportation System: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Ease of car travel in Louisville	84%	88%	.	82%	88%	90% B	74%	84%
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	60%	57%	.	55%	70% A	59%	61%	60%
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	87%	97%	.	85%	88%	86%	87%	86%

Please rate the following areas of Louisville's Transportation System: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Ease of walking in Louisville	82%	96% A	.	83%	86%	81%	88% A	84%
Traffic flow on major streets	70%	72%	.	68%	74%	72%	66%	70%
Overall quality of Louisville's Transportation System	75%	82%	.	71%	84% A	77%	72%	75%
Overall safety of Louisville's Transportation System	80%	90%	.	79%	86%	83%	79%	81%

Table 88: Transportation System Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate the following areas of Louisville's Transportation System: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Ease of car travel in Louisville	92% D	91% D	88% D	73%	79%	84%	92% A	84%
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	57%	60%	67%	58%	59%	62%	56%	60%
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	86%	81%	88%	88%	87%	87%	85%	86%

Please rate the following areas of Louisville's Transportation System: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Ease of walking in Louisville	75%	81%	92% A	89% A	92% B C	84% C	74%	84%
Traffic flow on major streets	78% D	72%	72%	65%	75%	67%	76%	70%
Overall quality of Louisville's Transportation System	78% D	78%	82% D	69%	76%	74%	76%	75%
Overall safety of Louisville's Transportation System	80%	86%	86%	78%	84%	81%	78%	81%

Table 89: Overall Services Rating by Respondent Characteristics

Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville? (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	94% C	88%	85%	89%	87%	91%	87%	87%	90%	88%

Table 90: Overall Services Rating by Respondent Characteristics

Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville? (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	88%	90%	.	88%	89%	92% B	82%	88%

Table 91: Overall Services Rating by Respondent Characteristics

Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville? (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	96% B D	87%	92% D	81%	86%	87%	94% B	88%

Table 92: City Priorities by Respondent Characteristics

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of the community. Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years. (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Transportation (e.g., safe/well-maintained multi-modal transportation system)	81%	90% A	89% A	89%	86%	88%	87%	87%	87%	87%
Utilities (e.g., safe/reliable water, treated wastewater)	91%	99% A	99% A	97%	97%	93%	99% A	99% B	93%	97%
Public Safety (e.g., community safety and compliance with Municipal Code/State Law)	83%	95% A	97% A	92%	93%	82%	97% A	96% B	84%	93%
Parks (e.g., well-maintained parks/landscapes areas, sports facilities, cemetery)	93%	96%	95%	94%	96%	91%	97% A	97% B	91%	95%
Open Space & Trails (e.g., preserving native plants, wildlife and scenic vistas)	95%	93%	94%	95%	93%	93%	94%	95%	92%	94%
Recreation (e.g., high quality, reasonably priced recreation/leisure activities)	87%	92%	93%	90%	92%	87%	93% A	93% B	87%	91%

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of the community. Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years. (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Library (e.g., informing/involving the community)	83%	89%	87%	89%	84%	81%	89% A	89% B	82%	87%
Museum Services (e.g., preserving heritage, informing community)	60% B	49%	59% B	59%	51%	54%	56%	55%	57%	56%
Economic Prosperity (e.g., promoting a thriving business climate)	96%	96%	93%	95%	95%	94%	95%	96% B	92%	95%
Administration & Support Services (e.g., effective and efficient governance)	94%	91%	94%	91%	94%	90%	93%	93%	91%	93%
Environmental Sustainability (e.g., promoting efficiency, reducing environmental impacts)	93% C	87% C	78%	89% B	81%	89%	84%	84%	87%	85%

Table 93: City Priorities by Respondent Characteristics

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of the community. Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years. (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2 (A)	3-4 (B)	5 or more (C)	No (A)	Yes (B)	No (A)	Yes (B)	(A)
Transportation (e.g., safe/well-maintained multi-modal transportation system)	87%	95%	.	87%	88%	90%	84%	87%
Utilities (e.g., safe/reliable water, treated wastewater)	97%	100%	.	97%	98%	96%	99%	97%
Public Safety (e.g., community safety and compliance with Municipal Code/State Law)	93%	100%	.	93%	93%	90%	97% A	93%
Parks (e.g., well-maintained parks/landscapes areas, sports facilities, cemetery)	95%	100%	.	94%	96%	96%	93%	95%
Open Space & Trails (e.g., preserving native plants, wildlife and scenic vistas)	93%	100%	.	94%	92%	95%	93%	94%
Recreation (e.g., high quality, reasonably priced recreation/leisure activities)	92%	100%	.	89%	95% A	91%	91%	91%
Library (e.g., informing/involving the community)	88%	88%	.	85%	89%	86%	89%	87%
Museum Services (e.g., preserving heritage, informing community)	57%	55%	.	58% B	49%	51%	63% A	56%
Economic Prosperity (e.g., promoting a thriving business climate)	95%	100%	.	94%	96%	95%	94%	95%
Administration & Support Services (e.g., effective and efficient governance)	92%	95%	.	92%	93%	93%	92%	93%

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of the community. Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years. (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Environmental Sustainability (e.g., promoting efficiency, reducing environmental impacts)	85%	90%	.	86%	83%	89% B	78%	85%

Table 94: City Priorities by Respondent Characteristics

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of the community. Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years. (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Transportation (e.g., safe/well-maintained multi-modal transportation system)	85%	96% A D	88%	85%	80%	93% A C	78%	87%
Utilities (e.g., safe/reliable water, treated wastewater)	93%	98% A	100% A	99% A	99% C	99% C	88%	97%
Public Safety (e.g., community safety and compliance with Municipal Code/State Law)	86%	92% A	96% A	98% A	96% C	96% C	78%	93%

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of the community. Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years. (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less (A)	6 to 10 years (B)	11 to 15 years (C)	More than 15 years (D)	Direct Impact (A)	Indirect Impact (B)	No Impact (C)	(A)
Parks (e.g., well-maintained parks/landscapes areas, sports facilities, cemetery)	94%	93%	97%	96%	97%	96%	91%	95%
Open Space & Trails (e.g., preserving native plants, wildlife and scenic vistas)	95%	96%	94%	92%	97%	93%	93%	94%
Recreation (e.g., high quality, reasonably priced recreation/leisure activities)	90%	91%	93%	92%	95%	90%	88%	91%
Library (e.g., informing/involving the community)	85%	88%	90%	86%	88% C	89% C	77%	87%
Museum Services (e.g., preserving heritage, informing community)	57% C	60% C	42%	55%	55%	55%	58%	56%
Economic Prosperity (e.g., promoting a thriving business climate)	96%	93%	92%	96%	95%	95%	94%	95%
Administration & Support Services (e.g., effective and efficient governance)	90%	93%	91%	94%	94%	93%	90%	93%
Environmental Sustainability (e.g., promoting efficiency, reducing environmental impacts)	94% B C D	84%	79%	80%	83%	83%	92% B	85%

Table 95: Vibrant Economic Climate Priorities by Respondent Characteristics

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate. Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years. (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Meet the retail and services needs of local residents	94%	92%	96%	93%	95%	94%	94%	94%	95%	94%
Attract visitors to shop in Louisville	85%	79%	78%	81%	79%	86% B	78%	80%	80%	80%
Attract businesses to locate or expand in Louisville	90%	93%	89%	88%	93% A	88%	92%	93% B	86%	90%
Pursue redevelopment of vacant or underused commercial sites	95% C	96% C	88%	94%	90%	96%	91%	93%	90%	92%
Preserve the historic character of existing buildings	89% B C	76%	77%	81%	79%	90% B	76%	78%	84%	80%
Provide gathering spaces for the community (e.g., parks, facilities, etc.)	91%	85%	84%	88%	84%	91%	84%	84%	90% A	85%

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate. Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years. (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Create and enhance unique identities for each of Louisville's business districts	52%	57%	58%	58%	55%	66% B	53%	53%	64% A	56%

Table 96: Vibrant Economic Climate Priorities by Respondent Characteristics

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate. Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years. (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Meet the retail and services needs of local residents	94%	95%	.	94%	95%	93%	95%	94%
Attract visitors to shop in Louisville	79%	91%	.	81%	77%	83% B	75%	80%
Attract businesses to locate or expand in Louisville	91%	96%	.	92%	88%	92%	89%	90%

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate. Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years. (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Pursue redevelopment of vacant or underused commercial sites	93%	95%	.	93%	93%	95% B	88%	92%
Preserve the historic character of existing buildings	79%	79%	.	82%	76%	81%	78%	80%
Provide gathering spaces for the community (e.g., parks, facilities, etc.)	86%	84%	.	84%	88%	88%	82%	85%
Create and enhance unique identities for each of Louisville's business districts	55%	44%	.	58%	53%	56%	57%	56%

Table 97: Vibrant Economic Climate Priorities by Respondent Characteristics

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate. Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years. (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Meet the retail and services needs of local residents	91%	94%	97%	96% A	95% C	96% C	85%	94%

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate. Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years. (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less (A)	6 to 10 years (B)	11 to 15 years (C)	More than 15 years (D)	Direct Impact (A)	Indirect Impact (B)	No Impact (C)	(A)
Attract visitors to shop in Louisville	81%	81%	86%	78%	78%	82%	79%	80%
Attract businesses to locate or expand in Louisville	89%	91%	91%	91%	92%	92% C	84%	90%
Pursue redevelopment of vacant or underused commercial sites	94%	90%	94%	92%	93%	93%	90%	92%
Preserve the historic character of existing buildings	87% B D	75%	76%	77%	87% B	75%	87% B	80%
Provide gathering spaces for the community (e.g., parks, facilities, etc.)	92% D	83%	88%	81%	91% B	83%	88%	85%
Create and enhance unique identities for each of Louisville's business districts	65% C D	60%	49%	49%	59%	52%	68% B	56%

Table 98: Sustainability Vision Priorities by Respondent Characteristics

How much of a priority, if at all, should the City place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to achieve Louisville's sustainability vision? (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34 (A)	35-54 (B)	55+ (C)	Female (A)	Male (B)	Rent (A)	Own (B)	Detached (A)	Attached (B)	(A)
Reduce energy consumption and increase use of clean energy	92%	88%	85%	89%	85%	92% B	85%	85%	91%	87%
Encourage water efficiency and water quality efforts	99% B	92%	94%	97% B	91%	99% B	93%	92%	99% A	94%
Promote fuel-efficient transportation and multi-modal infrastructure	86% C	84%	77%	86% B	77%	91% B	77%	79%	86%	81%
Increase community waste diversion	87%	88%	81%	89% B	81%	88%	83%	84%	86%	84%
Ensure a sustainable, safe and healthy food supply that is accessible	98% B C	82%	84%	93% B	79%	94% B	83%	83%	94% A	86%

Table 99: Sustainability Vision Priorities by Respondent Characteristics

How much of a priority, if at all, should the City place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to achieve Louisville's sustainability vision? (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Reduce energy consumption and increase use of clean energy	87%	85%	.	86%	89%	92% B	80%	87%
Encourage water efficiency and water quality efforts	95%	90%	.	95%	93%	95%	92%	94%
Promote fuel-efficient transportation and multi-modal infrastructure	81%	86%	.	82%	80%	87% B	73%	81%
Increase community waste diversion	84%	85%	.	83%	88%	89% B	78%	84%
Ensure a sustainable, safe and healthy food supply that is accessible	86%	92%	.	87%	84%	87%	85%	86%

Table 100: Sustainability Vision Priorities by Respondent Characteristics

How much of a priority, if at all, should the City place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to achieve Louisville's sustainability vision? (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less (A)	6 to 10 years (B)	11 to 15 years (C)	More than 15 years (D)	Direct Impact (A)	Indirect Impact (B)	No Impact (C)	(A)
Reduce energy consumption and increase use of clean energy	96% B D	84%	91% D	80%	83%	87%	94% A B	87%
Encourage water efficiency and water quality efforts	99% D	94%	92%	91%	92%	94%	98% A	94%
Promote fuel-efficient transportation and multi-modal infrastructure	87% D	88% D	80%	73%	77%	82%	83%	81%
Increase community waste diversion	92% C D	85%	79%	80%	80%	86%	87%	84%
Ensure a sustainable, safe and healthy food supply that is accessible	92% D	90% D	82%	81%	82%	86%	93% A	86%

Table 101: Support for mixed-use housing and businesses by Respondent Characteristics

Imagine a commercial area with several vacant storefronts and empty parking lots. How much would you support, ifat all, the development of mixed-use housing and businesses in this area? (Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Imagine a commercial area with several vacant storefronts and empty parking lots. How much would you support, if at all, the development of mixed-use housing and businesses in this area?	89% C	83%	77%	85%	79%	88% B	79%	78%	89% A	82%

Table 102: Support for mixed-use housing and businesses by Respondent Characteristics

Imagine a commercial area with several vacant storefronts and empty parking lots. How much would you support, ifat all, the development of mixed-use housing and businesses in this area? (Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Imagine a commercial area with several vacant storefronts and empty parking lots. How much would you support, if at all, the development of mixed-use housing and businesses in this area?	81%	82%	.	82%	81%	86% B	75%	82%

Table 103: Support for mixed-use housing and businesses by Respondent Characteristics

Imagine a commercial area with several vacant storefronts and empty parking lots. How much would you support, ifat all, the development of mixed-use housing and businesses in this area? (Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Imagine a commercial area with several vacant storefronts and empty parking lots. How much would you support, if at all, the development of mixed-use housing and businesses in this area?	94% D	85% D	86% D	69%	74%	82% A	89% A	82%

Table 104: Use of Information Sources by Respondent Characteristics

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gaininformation about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., at least sometimes)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting	15%	35% A	41% A	31%	34%	15%	39% A	38% B	20%	33%
Quarterly Community Update Newsletter	83%	95% A	93% A	89%	95% A	79%	96% A	96% B	82%	92%

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gaininformation about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., at least sometimes)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Monthly Community Update eNewsletter	34%	77% A	72% A	63%	68%	34%	78% A	76% B	42%	66%
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	48%	61% A	63% A	60%	58%	48%	63% A	62% B	52%	59%
The City of Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	89% C	94% C	77%	83%	87%	79%	88% A	90% B	76%	86%
City's online engagement site (www.engagelouisville.org)	26%	30%	25%	29%	25%	25%	27%	29%	22%	27%
City's email notices (eNotification)	47%	68% A	68% A	62%	64%	35%	73% A	73% B	40%	63%
Utility bill inserts	50%	75% A	75% A	69%	69%	36%	81% A	84% B	35%	70%

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gaininformation about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., at least sometimes)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor)	64% C	55% C	43%	59% B	45%	51%	52%	54%	46%	51%
Word of mouth	90%	91%	87%	90%	88%	80%	93% A	94% B	79%	89%
Channel 8	7%	8%	14%	9%	12%	12%	10%	10%	10%	10%

Table 105: Use of Information Sources by Respondent Characteristics

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gaininformation about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., at least sometimes)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting	31%	55% A	.	33%	32%	27%	42% A	33%

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gaininformation about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., at least sometimes)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Quarterly Community Update Newsletter	91%	97%	.	91%	93%	91%	93%	92%
Monthly Community Update eNewsletter	62%	93% A	.	61%	77% A	62%	71% A	66%
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	58%	68%	.	61%	55%	57%	63%	59%
The City of Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	85%	93%	.	82%	93% A	91% B	76%	86%
City's online engagement site (www.engagelouisville.org)	28%	19%	.	23%	34% A	29%	24%	27%
City's email notices (eNotification)	61%	77%	.	59%	71% A	60%	68%	63%
Utility bill inserts	69%	83%	.	66%	78% A	65%	77% A	70%
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor)	52%	56%	.	47%	60% A	57% B	43%	51%

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gaininformation about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., at least sometimes)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Word of mouth	88%	94%	.	88%	92%	91%	87%	89%
Channel 8	11%	5%	.	12% B	6%	7%	15% A	10%

Table 106: Use of Information Sources by Respondent Characteristics

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gaininformation about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., at least sometimes)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting	13%	28% A	30% A	50% A B C	47% B C	35% C	10%	33%
Quarterly Community Update Newsletter	80%	95% A	98% A	97% A	94% C	95% C	78%	92%

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gaininformation about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., at least sometimes)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Monthly Community Update eNewsletter	50%	61%	83% A B	77% A B	82% B C	67% C	45%	66%
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	54%	57%	61%	62%	68% C	60% C	49%	59%
The City of Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	82%	88%	91%	86%	91% C	86% C	78%	86%
City's online engagement site (www.engagelouisville.org)	28%	28%	29%	26%	26%	28%	25%	27%
City's email notices (eNotification)	50%	67% A	70% A	68% A	77% B C	64% C	43%	63%
Utility bill inserts	55%	51%	76% A B	86% A B	85% B C	68% C	52%	70%
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor)	49%	60%	57%	48%	54%	52%	48%	51%

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gaininformation about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., at least sometimes)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	More than 15 years	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	No Impact	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Word of mouth	84%	85%	92%	94% A B	94% C	89% C	82%	89%
Channel 8	4%	11%	4%	14% A C	12%	11%	6%	10%

Table 107: Information Source Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting	83%	72%	61%	72%	65%	65%	68%	67%	73%	68%
Quarterly Community Update Newsletter	90%	91%	87%	92%	86%	92%	88%	88%	90%	89%
Monthly Community Update eNewsletter	93%	88%	84%	90%	84%	89%	87%	87%	88%	87%

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	71%	58%	62%	69% B	53%	64%	62%	59%	72% A	62%
The City of Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	84%	74%	76%	81%	74%	82%	75%	75%	83%	77%
City's online engagement site (www.engagelouisville.org)	80% C	58%	54%	66%	57%	63%	63%	61%	63%	62%
City's email notices (eNotification)	49%	77% A	78% A	76%	72%	49%	79% A	77% B	64%	74%
Utility bill inserts	68%	82% A	74%	79%	74%	66%	78% A	80% B	56%	76%
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor)	58%	57%	48%	62% B	46%	65% B	51%	53%	60%	55%
Word of mouth	56%	56%	47%	54%	50%	60%	50%	54%	48%	52%
Channel 8	82%	53%	47%	47%	58%	56%	56%	56%	49%	54%

Table 108: Information Source Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Number of household members			Presence of children		Presence of older adults		Overall
	1-2	3-4	5 or more	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting	68%	73%	.	69%	68%	76% B	59%	68%
Quarterly Community Update Newsletter	89%	89%	.	87%	92%	92% B	85%	89%
Monthly Community Update eNewsletter	87%	88%	.	86%	89%	90% B	82%	87%
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	61%	55%	.	65%	54%	60%	64%	62%
The City of Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	76%	86%	.	78%	75%	77%	76%	77%
City's online engagement site (www.engagelouisville.org)	61%	100%	.	61%	62%	65%	55%	62%
City's email notices (eNotification)	74%	88%	.	72%	78%	73%	76%	74%
Utility bill inserts	74%	89%	.	77%	73%	76%	75%	76%
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor)	53%	58%	.	57%	50%	57%	50%	55%
Word of mouth	53%	63%	.	50%	58%	54%	50%	52%
Channel 8	54%	68%	.	61%	39%	61%	47%	54%

Table 109: Information Source Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less (A)	6 to 10 years (B)	11 to 15 years (C)	More than 15 years (D)	Direct Impact (A)	Indirect Impact (B)	No Impact (C)	(A)
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting	88% B D	62%	86%	61%	74%	64%	87%	68%
Quarterly Community Update Newsletter	95% D	92%	87%	84%	84%	91% A	89%	89%
Monthly Community Update eNewsletter	94% D	91%	91%	81%	86%	89%	84%	87%
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	68%	66%	56%	57%	69%	59%	62%	62%
The City of Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	85% B D	65%	84% B	74%	78%	75%	84%	77%
City's online engagement site (www.engagelouisville.org)	80% B D	52%	48%	55%	62%	55%	88% B	62%
City's email notices (eNotification)	75%	72%	77%	75%	75%	78% C	58%	74%

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Length of residency				Marshall fire impact			Overall
	Five years or less (A)	6 to 10 years (B)	11 to 15 years (C)	More than 15 years (D)	Direct Impact (A)	Indirect Impact (B)	No Impact (C)	(A)
Utility bill inserts	64%	75%	78%	81% A	81% C	78% C	62%	76%
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor)	57%	54%	48%	52%	60%	53%	53%	55%
Word of mouth	56%	54%	51%	48%	48%	56%	44%	52%
Channel 8	63%	59%	0%	44%	51%	53%	76%	54%

Comparisons by Geographical Area

Table 110: Aspects of Quality of Life by Respondent Geographic Area

Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Louisville: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Louisville as a place to live	90%	92%	97% A B	93%
Louisville as a place to raise children	89%	94%	96% A	93%
Louisville as a place to retire	74%	68%	79%	74%
Louisville as a place to work	68%	74%	72%	71%
The overall quality of life in Louisville	88%	90%	97% A B	92%

Table 111: Select Community Characteristics by Respondent Geographic Area

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1 (A)	Ward 2 (B)	Ward 3 (C)	(A)
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	69%	78%	86% A	78%
Overall appearance of Louisville	80%	81%	87%	83%
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	63%	66%	71%	66%
Shopping opportunities	41%	37%	40%	39%
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	84%	85%	86%	85%
Opportunities to participate in community matters	70%	74%	79%	74%
Recreational opportunities	84%	93% A	92% A	89%
Employment opportunities	35%	49%	47%	42%
Variety of housing options	31%	29%	33%	31%
Availability of affordable quality housing	16%	19%	14%	16%
Preservation of the historic character of old town	76%	76%	77%	76%
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	85%	87%	90%	87%
Overall economic health of Louisville	61%	66%	68%	65%

Table 112: Safety Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please rate how safe you feel: (Percent rating positively e.g., very safe/somewhat safe)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1 (A)	Ward 2 (B)	Ward 3 (C)	(A)
From violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	90%	92%	95% A	92%
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	81%	82%	86%	83%
In your neighborhood	88%	93%	93%	91%
In Louisville's downtown area	93%	95%	95%	94%
In Louisville's parks and open spaces	93%	92%	93%	93%

Table 113: Louisville Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please rate the job you feel the Louisville community does at each of the following: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1 (A)	Ward 2 (B)	Ward 3 (C)	(A)
Making all residents feel welcome	84%	84%	88%	85%
Attracting people from diverse backgrounds	39%	40%	45%	41%
Valuing/respecting residents from diverse backgrounds	63%	76% A	79% A	72%
Taking care of vulnerable residents (elderly, disabled, homeless, etc.)	55%	63%	60%	59%

Table 114: Government Performance Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please rate the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	56%	49%	61%	56%
Information about City Council, Planning Commission & other official City meetings	64%	70%	70%	68%
Information about City's strategic plan and budget	59%	58%	61%	59%
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	42%	30%	62% B	46%
Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	70%	69%	75%	72%
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	73%	75%	81%	76%
Overall performance of the Louisville City government	67%	68%	67%	67%

Table 115: Police Department Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Police Department and public safety: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Visibility of patrol cars	77%	74%	80%	77%
Enforcement of traffic regulations	60%	61%	67%	63%
Municipal code enforcement issues (e.g., dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	62%	67%	68%	65%
Communicating regularly with community members (e.g., website, meetings, etc.)	61%	55%	61%	60%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Police Department and public safety: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Response to emerging community issues (e.g., opioids, mental health, etc.)	59%	63%	63%	61%
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	76%	81%	82%	80%
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	84%	89%	90%	87%

Table 116: Planning and Building Safety Department Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please rate the following areas of community design and the Louisville Community Development Department:	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
The public input process on City planning issues	58%	59%	52%	56%
Planning review process for new development	55%	43%	46%	48%
Building permit process related to the Marshall Fire	40%	34%	44%	40%
Building permit process overall	45%	52%	51%	49%
Building/construction inspection process	59%	59%	59%	59%
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	67%	67%	64%	66%
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department	63%	64%	63%	63%

Table 117: Public Library and Historical Museum Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1 (A)	Ward 2 (B)	Ward 3 (C)	(A)
Louisville Public Library programs (e.g., story time, One Book program, etc.)	97%	97%	99%	98%
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk, check out, etc.)	95%	98%	97%	96%
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	96%	95%	98%	96%
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	94%	92%	97%	95%
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	91%	88%	94%	91%
Louisville Public Library building	96%	99%	97%	97%
Overall customer service at the Library (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	97%	98%	97%	98%
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	96%	97%	97%	97%
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters, expanded/new programming)	95%	95%	97%	96%
Louisville Historical Museum campus	92%	94%	95%	93%
Archival materials (e.g., historic photographs, newspapers, etc.)	98%	93%	96%	96%
Overall customer service at the Historical Museum (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	97%	97%	99%	98%
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	96%	97%	98%	97%

Table 118: Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1 (A)	Ward 2 (B)	Ward 3 (C)	(A)
Current recreation programs for youth (e.g., swim lessons, sports, preschool, camps)	91%	94%	90%	91%
Current recreation programs for adults (e.g., fitness classes, sports, general interests)	89%	90%	93%	91%
Recreation Center fees in Louisville	75%	73%	82%	77%
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	91%	96% A	96% A	94%
Overall customer service at the Louisville Recreation Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	88%	94% A	93%	92%
Overall performance of the Louisville Recreation Center	90%	94%	97% A	94%
Current programs and services for seniors	88%	88%	92%	89%
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	90%	88%	93%	91%
Overall customer service at the Louisville Senior Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	86%	93%	95%	91%
Overall performance of the Louisville Senior Center	88%	90%	97%	92%
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	86%	82%	88%	86%
Overall customer service at the Coal Creek Golf Course (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	86%	78%	80%	81%

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Overall performance of the Coal Creek Golf Course	86%	78%	84%	83%

Table 119: Parks and Open Space Divisions Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	93%	96%	94%	94%
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas)	84%	85%	87%	85%
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	78%	74%	81%	78%
Maintenance of the Louisville Cemetery	92%	94%	89%	91%
Overall customer service of the Parks Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	83%	89%	91%	87%
Overall performance of the Parks Division	90%	89%	89%	89%
Maintenance of open space (e.g., trash bins, trailheads, habitat, etc.)	88%	91%	87%	89%
Maintenance of the trail system	92%	93%	90%	92%
Overall customer service of the Open Space Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	87%	91%	93%	90%
Overall performance of the Open Space Division	90%	91%	92%	91%

Table 120: Public Works Department Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Street maintenance in Louisville (e.g., paving and concrete replacement)	70%	63%	67%	67%
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	68%	62%	71%	67%
Street sweeping	71%	75%	71%	72%
Snow removal/street sanding	59%	58%	52%	56%
Street lighting, signage and street markings	80%	84%	77%	80%
Waste water (e.g., sewage system)	92%	95%	93%	93%
Storm drainage (e.g., flooding management)	88%	89%	86%	87%
Quality of Louisville water	86%	90%	89%	88%
Solid waste/trash service (e.g., trash, recycle, compost)	83%	82%	75%	80%
Fees for water, sewer and trash	65%	58%	65%	63%
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	81%	82%	84%	82%
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Works Department	88%	87%	86%	87%

Table 121: Transportation System Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please rate the following areas of Louisville's Transportation System: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Ease of car travel in Louisville	84%	82%	85%	84%

Please rate the following areas of Louisville's Transportation System: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	62% C	70% C	47%	60%
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	82%	90% A	88%	86%
Ease of walking in Louisville	79%	87% A	87% A	84%
Traffic flow on major streets	63%	69%	79% A	70%
Overall quality of Louisville's Transportation System	73%	78%	74%	75%
Overall safety of Louisville's Transportation System	77%	82%	86% A	81%

Table 122: Overall Services Rating by Respondent Geographic Area

Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville? (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	85%	88%	91%	88%

Table 123: City Priorities by Respondent Geographic Area

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of the community. Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years. (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Transportation (e.g., safe/well-maintained multi-modal transportation system)	92% B C	84%	85%	87%
Utilities (e.g., safe/reliable water, treated wastewater)	98%	96%	97%	97%
Public Safety (e.g., community safety and compliance with Municipal Code/State Law)	94%	95%	90%	93%
Parks (e.g., well-maintained parks/landscapes areas, sports facilities, cemetery)	95%	95%	96%	95%
Open Space & Trails (e.g., preserving native plants, wildlife and scenic vistas)	92%	96%	95%	94%
Recreation (e.g., high quality, reasonably priced recreation/leisure activities)	90%	93%	91%	91%
Library (e.g., informing/involving the community)	88%	83%	89%	87%
Museum Services (e.g., preserving heritage, informing community)	59% B	49%	57%	56%
Economic Prosperity (e.g., promoting a thriving business climate)	96%	96%	93%	95%

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of the community. Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years. (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Administration & Support Services (e.g., effective and efficient governance)	92%	94%	92%	93%
Environmental Sustainability (e.g., promoting efficiency, reducing environmental impacts)	83%	83%	89%	85%

Table 124: Vibrant Economic Climate Priorities by Respondent Geographic Area

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate. Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years. (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Meet the retail and services needs of local residents	95%	94%	93%	94%
Attract visitors to shop in Louisville	76%	81%	83%	80%
Attract businesses to locate or expand in Louisville	91%	93%	88%	90%
Pursue redevelopment of vacant or underused commercial sites	91%	92%	94%	92%
Preserve the historic character of existing buildings	79%	82%	79%	80%
Provide gathering spaces for the community (e.g., parks, facilities, etc.)	86%	85%	85%	85%
Create and enhance unique identities for each of Louisville's business districts	62% B	50%	55%	56%

Table 125: Sustainability Vision Priorities by Respondent Geographic Area

How much of a priority, if at all, should the City place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to achieve Louisville's sustainability vision? (Percent rating positively e.g., high priority/medium priority)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Reduce energy consumption and increase use of clean energy	86%	84%	90%	87%
Encourage water efficiency and water quality efforts	92%	92%	98% A B	94%
Promote fuel-efficient transportation and multi-modal infrastructure	80%	81%	82%	81%
Increase community waste diversion	85%	80%	87%	84%
Ensure a sustainable, safe and healthy food supply that is accessible	86%	85%	87%	86%

Table 126: Support for mixed-use housing and businesses by Respondent Geographic Area

Imagine a commercial area with several vacant storefronts and empty parking lots. How much would you support, ifat all, the development of mixed-use housing and businesses in this area? (Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Imagine a commercial area with several vacant storefronts and empty parking lots. How much would you support, if at all, the development of mixed-use housing and businesses in this area?	82%	79%	84%	82%

Table 127: Use of Information Sources by Respondent Geographic Area

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gaininformation about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., at least sometimes)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting	31%	35%	33%	33%
Quarterly Community Update Newsletter	93%	95% C	88%	92%
Monthly Community Update eNewsletter	60%	69%	70% A	66%
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	61%	57%	58%	59%
The City of Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	85%	86%	86%	86%
City's online engagement site (www.engagelouisville.org)	26%	28%	26%	27%
City's email notices (eNotification)	60%	71% A C	59%	63%
Utility bill inserts	57%	82% A	73% A	70%
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor)	55%	45%	53%	51%
Word of mouth	90%	91%	86%	89%
Channel 8	11%	9%	10%	10%

Table 128: Information Source Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gaininformation about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Council Ward			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting	60%	71%	73%	68%
Quarterly Community Update Newsletter	90%	90%	87%	89%
Monthly Community Update eNewsletter	87%	86%	88%	87%
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	60%	55%	70% B	62%
The City of Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	77%	77%	77%	77%
City's online engagement site (www.engagelouisville.org)	54%	53%	80% A B	62%
City's email notices (eNotification)	59%	83% A	81% A	74%
Utility bill inserts	65%	80% A	82% A	76%
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor)	52%	60%	54%	55%
Word of mouth	53%	55%	49%	52%
Channel 8	59%	44%	56%	54%

Appendix E: Detailed Benchmark Comparisons

Comparison Data

Polco/National Research Center (NRC)'s database of comparative resident opinion comprises resident perspectives gathered in surveys from over 500 communities whose residents evaluated the same kinds of topics on the Louisville Quality of Life Survey. The comparison evaluations are from the most recent survey completed in each community; most communities conduct surveys every year or in alternating years. NRC adds the latest results quickly upon survey completion, keeping the benchmark data fresh and relevant. The communities in the database represent a wide geographic and population range. National benchmark comparisons, Minnesota communities' comparisons and comparisons to the north central region with populations over 15,000 have been provided when similar questions on the Louisville Community Survey are included in NRC's database.

Interpreting the Results

Ratings are compared when there are at least five communities in which a similar question was asked. Where comparisons are available, four columns are provided in the table. The first column is Louisville's "percent positive." The percent positive is the combination of the top two most positive response options (i.e., "excellent" and "good," "very safe" and "somewhat safe," "essential" and "very important," etc.), or, in the case of resident behaviors/participation, the percent positive represents the proportion of respondents indicating "yes" or participating in an activity at least once a month. The second column is the rank assigned to Louisville's rating among communities where a similar question was asked. The third column is the number of communities that asked a similar question. The final column shows the comparison of Louisville's rating to the benchmark.

In that final column, Louisville's results are noted as being "higher" than the benchmark, "lower" than the benchmark or "similar" to the benchmark, meaning that the average rating given by residents is statistically similar to or different (greater or lesser) than the benchmark. Being rated as "higher" or "lower" than the benchmark means that Louisville's average rating for a particular item was more than 10 points different than the benchmark. If a rating was "much higher" or "much lower," then Louisville's average rating was more than 20 points different when compared to the benchmark.

Table 129: Quality of Life

Quality of Life Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
The overall quality of life in Louisville	92%	62	586	Higher
Louisville as a place to live	93%	99	560	Similar

Table 130: Governance

Governance Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	76%	338	554	Similar
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	88%	37	558	Higher

Table 131: Economy

Economy Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall economic health of Louisville	65%	283	512	Similar
Shopping opportunities	39%	367	520	Similar
Louisville as a place to work	71%	194	559	Similar
Employment opportunities	42%	286	533	Similar

Table 132: Mobility

Mobility Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall quality of Louisville's Transportation System	75%	29	416	Higher
Traffic flow on major streets	70%	50	534	Higher
Ease of car travel in Louisville	84%	47	526	Higher
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	86%	6	522	Much Higher
Ease of walking in Louisville	84%	28	528	Higher
Enforcement of traffic regulations	63%	257	543	Similar
Street maintenance in Louisville (e.g., paving and concrete replacement)	67%	46	565	Higher
Street sweeping	72%	174	513	Similar
Snow removal/street sanding	56%	272	395	Similar

Table 133: Community Design

Community Design Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall appearance of Louisville	83%	115	524	Similar
Variety of housing options	31%	407	512	Similar
Availability of affordable quality housing	16%	448	539	Lower
Municipal code enforcement issues (e.g., dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	65%	56	539	Higher

Table 134: Utilities

Utilities Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Solid waste/trash service (e.g., trash, recycle, compost)	80%	298	522	Similar
Quality of Louisville water	88%	51	506	Higher
Storm drainage (e.g., flooding management)	87%	23	528	Higher

Table 135: Safety

Safety Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	87%	274	572	Similar
In your neighborhood	91%	372	525	Similar
In Louisville's downtown area	94%	177	523	Similar
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	83%	135	420	Similar
From violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	92%	48	418	Higher

Table 136: Natural Environment

Natural Environment Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	87%	113	524	Similar

Table 137: Parks and Recreation

Parks and Recreation Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Recreational opportunities	89%	19	528	Higher
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	94%	2	504	Much Higher

Table 138: Education, Arts, and Culture

Education, Arts, and Culture Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	66%	162	524	Similar
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	97%	4	505	Higher

Table 139: Inclusivity and Engagement

Louisville as a place to raise children	93%	70	568	Higher
Louisville as a place to retire	74%	135	565	Similar
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	78%	28	529	Higher
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	85%	6	504	Higher
Opportunities to participate in community matters	74%	47	507	Similar

Front Range Regional Benchmark Comparisons

Table 140: Quality of Life

Quality of Life Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
The overall quality of life in Louisville	92%	1	32	Higher
Louisville as a place to live	93%	3	31	Higher

Table 141: Governance

Governance Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	76%	17	29	Similar
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	88%	1	31	Higher

Table 142: Economy

Economy Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall economic health of Louisville	65%	11	23	Similar
Shopping opportunities	39%	15	28	Similar
Louisville as a place to work	71%	8	32	Higher
Employment opportunities	42%	9	28	Similar

Table 143: Mobility

Mobility Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall quality of Louisville's Transportation System	75%	3	22	Much Higher
Traffic flow on major streets	70%	2	27	Higher
Ease of car travel in Louisville	84%	2	29	Higher

Mobility Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	86%	1	28	Much Higher
Ease of walking in Louisville	84%	1	29	Higher
Enforcement of traffic regulations	63%	9	29	Similar
Street maintenance in Louisville (e.g., paving and concrete replacement)	67%	1	30	Much Higher
Street sweeping	72%	4	27	Higher
Snow removal/street sanding	56%	11	30	Similar

Table 144: Community Design

Community Design Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall appearance of Louisville	83%	5	25	Higher
Variety of housing options	31%	19	25	Similar
Availability of affordable quality housing	16%	19	26	Similar
Municipal code enforcement issues (e.g., dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	65%	2	29	Higher

Table 145: Utilities

Utilities Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Solid waste/trash service (e.g., trash, recycle, compost)	80%	7	22	Similar
Quality of Louisville water	88%	5	24	Higher
Storm drainage (e.g., flooding management)	87%	1	26	Higher

Table 146: Safety

Safety Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	87%	6	30	Similar
In your neighborhood	91%	18	25	Similar
In Louisville's downtown area	94%	12	25	Similar
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	83%	4	22	Higher
From violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	92%	2	22	Higher

Table 147: Natural Environment

Natural Environment Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	87%	7	25	Higher

Table 148: Parks and Recreation

Parks and Recreation Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Recreational opportunities	89%	3	27	Higher

Parks and Recreation Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	94%	1	25	Much Higher

Table 149: Education, Arts, and Culture

Education, Arts, and Culture Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	66%	7	26	Higher
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	97%	1	24	Higher

Table 150: Inclusivity and Engagement

Inclusivity and Engagement Items	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Louisville as a place to raise children	93%	1	32	Higher
Louisville as a place to retire	74%	4	32	Higher
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	78%	1	27	Higher
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	85%	1	24	Higher
Opportunities to participate in community matters	74%	2	26	Higher

Regional Benchmark Communities

The communities included in the Colorado Front Range are listed on the following pages along with their population according to the 2021 American Community Survey.

Table 151: Jurisdictions Included in the Front Range Regional Comparison

	Total Population (ACS 2021)
Adams County, CO	520,149
Berthoud, CO	10,892
Boulder, CO	106,598
Brighton, CO	40,569
Broomfield, CO	73,946
Centennial, CO	107,702
Commerce City, CO	63,050
Denver, CO	710,800
Elbert County, CO	26,457
Englewood, CO	33,634
Erie, CO	30,447
Estes Park, CO	5,906
Firestone, CO	16,704
Fort Collins, CO	168,758
Fort Lupton, CO	8,164
Frederick, CO	15,037
Golden, CO	20,461
Greeley, CO	107,949
Highlands Ranch, CO	101,514
Johnstown, CO	17,327
Lakewood, CO	156,149
Littleton, CO	45,531
Loveland, CO	76,500
Northglenn, CO	37,948
Parker, CO	58,733
Superior, CO	13,146
Wellington, CO	11,163
Westminster, CO	115,502

	Total Population (ACS 2021)
Wheat Ridge, CO	32,263
Windsor, CO	33,905
Woodland Park, CO	7,911

Appendix F: Survey Methodology

About the Survey

The Louisville Community Survey serves as a consumer report card for the City by providing residents the opportunity to rate City services, local government, community amenities and the quality of life in the City. The survey also gives residents a chance to provide feedback to government on what is working well and what is not, and to communicate their priorities for community planning and resource allocation. The City of Louisville funded this research. Please contact Grace Johnson of the City of Louisville at gjohnson@louisvilleco.gov if you have any questions about the survey.

Developing the Questionnaire

The 2024 survey instrument was developed by starting with the version from the previous implementation in 2020. Few changes were made to the survey in order to maximize comparisons over time. In an iterative process between City staff and Polco/NRC staff, a final five-page questionnaire was created.

Selecting Survey Recipients

"Sampling" refers to the method by which survey recipients are chosen. The "sample" refers to all those who were given a chance to participate in the survey. A list of all households within the zip codes serving Louisville was purchased from Go-Dog Direct based on updated listings from the United States Postal Service, updated every three months, providing the best representation of all households in a specific geographic location. NRC used the USPS data to select the survey recipients.

A larger list than needed was pulled so that a process referred to as "geocoding" could be used to eliminate addresses from the list that were outside Louisville's boundaries. Geocoding is a computerized process in which addresses are compared to electronically mapped boundaries and coded as inside or outside desired boundaries; in this case, within Louisville. All addresses determined to be outside the study boundaries were eliminated from the list of potential households. Each address identified as being within city boundaries was further identified as being within one of three wards. A random selection was made of the remaining addresses to create a mailing list of 3,500 addresses.

To choose the 3,500 survey recipients, a systematic sampling method was applied to the list of households previously screened for geographic location. Systematic sampling is a procedure whereby a complete list of all possible households is culled, selecting every Nth one, giving each eligible household a known probability of selection, until the appropriate number of households is selected. Multi-family housing units were selected at a higher rate as residents of this type of housing typically respond at lower rates to surveys than do those in single-family housing units. In general, because of the random sampling techniques used, the displayed sampling density will closely mirror the overall housing unit density (which may be different from the population density). While the theory of probability assumes no bias in selection, there may be some minor variations in practice (meaning, an area with only 15% of the housing units might be selected at an actual rate that is slightly above or below that).

An individual within each household was randomly selected to complete the survey using the birthday method. The birthday method selects a person within the household by asking the "person whose birthday has most recently passed" to complete the questionnaire. The underlying assumption in this method is that

day of birth has no relationship to the way people respond to surveys. This instruction was contained in the cover letter accompanying the questionnaire.

In addition to the scientific, random sample, a link to an online "opt-in" survey was publicized through various channels including the Louisville website and social media. This opt-in survey was identical to the scientific survey and open to all City residents.

Survey Administration and Response Rate

Each selected household was contacted two times. First, a prenotification announcement was sent on April 22, 2024, informing the household members that they had been selected to participate in the City of Louisville Community Survey. Approximately one week after mailing the prenotification, each household was mailed a survey containing a cover letter signed by Mayor Chris Leh enlisting participation. The packet also contained a postage-paid return envelope in which the survey recipients could return the completed questionnaire directly to NRC. Each wave of the cover letter accompanying the mailed survey included a web link for residents to visit if they preferred to take the survey online. Data collection was open through June 10, 2024. The online "opt-in" survey became available to all Louisville residents on May 20, 2024 and remained open for the final three weeks of data collection.

About 4% of the 3,500 surveys mailed were returned because the housing unit was vacant, or the postal service was unable to deliver the survey as addressed. Of the 3,365 households presumed to have received a survey, 570 completed the survey (276 of which were completed online), providing a response rate of 17%. The response rates were calculated using AAPOR's response rate #2[1] for mailed surveys of unnamed persons. Additionally, 246 residents completed the online "opt-in" online survey, providing a grand total of 816 completed surveys.

Response Rate by Area for Mailed Survey

	Number of surveys mailed	Number of completed surveys	Number of households receiving a survey (minus undeliverables)	Response rate
Ward 1	1,516	180	1,178	13%
Ward 2	923	181	592	20%
Ward 3	1,061	209	660	20%
Overall	**3,500**	**570**	**3,365**	**17%**

[1] *See AAPOR's Standard Definitions here: http://www.aapor.org/Standards-Ethics/Standard-Definitions-(1).aspx for more information*

Margin of Error

The 95% confidence interval (or "margin of error") quantifies the "sampling error" or precision of the estimates made from the survey results. A 95% confidence interval can be calculated for any sample size and indicates that in 95 of 100 surveys conducted like this one, for a particular item, a result would be found that is within three percentage points of the result that would be found if everyone in the population of interest was surveyed. The practical difficulties of conducting any resident survey may introduce other sources of error in addition to sampling error. Despite best efforts to boost participation and ensure potential inclusion of all households, some selected households will decline participation in the survey (referred to as non-response error) and some eligible households may be unintentionally excluded from the listed sources for the sample (referred to as coverage error).

While the margin of error for the survey is generally no greater than plus or minus four[2] percentage points around any given percent reported for the entire sample, results for subgroups will have wider confidence intervals. Where estimates are given for subgroups, they are less precise.

Survey Processing (Data Entry)

Upon receipt, completed surveys were assigned a unique identification number. Additionally, each survey was reviewed and "cleaned" as necessary. For example, a question may have asked a respondent to pick two items out of a list of five, but the respondent checked three; in this case, NRC would use protocols to randomly choose two of the three selected items for inclusion in the dataset.

All surveys then were entered twice into an electronic dataset; any discrepancies were resolved in comparison to the original survey form. Range checks as well as other forms of quality control were also performed.

NRC uses Polco, an online public engagement tool designed primarily for local governments, to collect online survey data. The Polco platform includes many features of online survey tools, but also includes elements tailored to the civic environment. For example, like NRC's mailed surveys, surveys on Polco are presented with the city name, logo (or other image) and a description, so residents understand who is asking for input and why. Optionally, Polco can also verify respondents with local public data to ensure respondents are residents or voters. More generally, an advantage of online programming and data gathering is that it allows for more rigid control of the data format, making extensive data cleaning unnecessary.

A series of quality control checks were also performed in order to ensure the integrity of the web data. Steps may include and not be limited to reviewing the data for clusters of repeat IP addresses and time stamps (indicating duplicate responses) and removing empty submissions (questionnaires submitted with no questions answered).

[2] Although this has become the traditional way to describe survey research precision, when opt-in results are blended with scientific results, assumptions about randomness of responses are not the same as when results come only from the random sample. Consequently, other terms sometimes are used in place of "confidence interval" or "margin of error," such as "credibility intervals." We hew to the traditional way of describing sample-driven uncertainty while we work with the industry to sort out the best ways to describe these new approaches.

Weighting the Data

Upon completion of data collection for both the scientific (probability) and online "opt-in" (non-probability) samples, data were compared in order to determine whether it was appropriate to combine, or blend, both samples together. In the case of Louisville, the non-probability sample's characteristics were similar to the probability sample, in both respondent trait and opinion, indicating that the samples could be blended. This decision reflects a growing trend in survey research toward integration of traditional scientific probability samples and non-probability samples (opt-in).

The demographic characteristics of the survey sample were compared to those found in the 2020 Census and the 2021 American Community Survey estimates for adults in the City of Louisville. The primary objective of weighting survey data is to make the survey sample reflective of the larger population of the community. Both samples were weighted independently and then combined into one final dataset.

The characteristics used for weighting were respondent gender, age, housing unit type (attached or detached), and housing tenure (rent or own). This decision was based on:

- The disparity between the survey respondent characteristics and the population norms for these variables
- The saliency of these variables in differences of opinion among subgroups
- The historical profile created and the desirability of consistently representing different groups over the years

A special software program using mathematical algorithms is used to calculate the appropriate weights. Several different weighting "schemes" are tested to ensure the best fit for the data.

The results of the weighting scheme are presented in the table on the following page.

2024 Louisville Community Survey Weighting Table

Characteristic	Population Norm	Unweighted Data	Weighted Data
Housing			
Rent home	30%	14%	27%
Own home	70%	86%	73%
Detached unit	68%	79%	70%
Attached unit	32%	21%	30%
Sex and Age			
Female	50%	59%	52%
Male	50%	41%	48%
18-34 years of age	24%	7%	22%
35-54 years of age	36%	28%	37%
55+ years of age	39%	65%	41%
Females 18-34	11%	5%	11%
Females 35-54	18%	15%	18%
Females 55+	21%	38%	22%
Males 18-34	14%	2%	11%
Males 35-54	18%	12%	19%
Males 55+	18%	27%	18%
Ward			
Ward 1	39%	32%	39%
Ward 2	29%	32%	28%
Ward 3	32%	37%	33%

** 2020 U.S. Census Bureau, 2021 American Community Survey Population Estimates*

Analyzing the Data

The electronic dataset was analyzed by NRC staff using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). For the most part, frequency distributions and mean ratings are presented in the body of the report. A complete set of frequencies for each survey question is presented in *Appendix B: Complete Survey Frequencies.* Also included are results by respondent characteristics). Chi-square or ANOVA tests of significance were applied to these breakdowns of selected survey questions. A "p-value" of 0.05 or less indicates that there is less than a 5% probability that differences observed between groups are due to chance; or in other words, a greater than 95% probability that the differences observed in the selected categories of the sample represent "real" differences among those populations. Where differences between subgroups are statistically significant, they have been denoted with capital letters.

Comparing Survey Results

For reporting comparability, the "don't know" responses from years prior to 2016 were removed in order to match the reporting of the 2016 and 2020 data, which shows the percentages without "don't know" to focus on the results from those who had an opinion about a particular service or activity. Ratings between 2024 and 2020 can be considered statistically significant if there are differences of four percentage points or more.

Appendix G: Survey Materials

The following pages contain copies of the survey materials sent to randomly selected households within the City of Louisville.

2024 Louisville Community Survey

Please complete this questionnaire if you are the adult (age 18 or older) in the household who most recently had a birthday. The adult's year of birth does not matter. Please circle the response that most closely represents your opinion for each question. Your responses are confidential and will be reported in group form only.

1. Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Louisville:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Louisville as a place to live	1	2	3	4	5
Louisville as a place to raise children	1	2	3	4	5
Louisville as a place to retire	1	2	3	4	5
Louisville as a place to work	1	2	3	4	5
The overall quality of life in Louisville	1	2	3	4	5

2. Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Overall appearance of Louisville	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	1	2	3	4	5
Shopping opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunities to participate in community matters	1	2	3	4	5
Recreational opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
Employment opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
Variety of housing options	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of affordable quality housing	1	2	3	4	5
Preservation of the historic character of old town	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	1	2	3	4	5
Overall economic health of Louisville	1	2	3	4	5

3. Please rate how safe you feel:

	Very safe	Somewhat safe	Neither safe nor unsafe	Somewhat unsafe	Very unsafe	Don't know
From violent crime (e.g., personal assault, sexual assault, robbery, hate crimes)	1	2	3	4	5	6
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft, vandalism, arson)	1	2	3	4	5	6
In your neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5	6
In Louisville's downtown area	1	2	3	4	5	6
In Louisville's parks and open spaces	1	2	3	4	5	6

4. Please rate the job you feel the Louisville community does at each of the following.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Making all residents feel welcome	1	2	3	4	5
Attracting people from diverse backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Valuing/respecting residents from diverse backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Taking care of vulnerable residents (elderly, disabled, homeless, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5

5. Please rate the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	1	2	3	4	5
Information about City Council, Planning Commission & other official City meetings	1	2	3	4	5
Information about City's strategic plan and budget	1	2	3	4	5
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	1	2	3	4	5
Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of the Louisville City government	1	2	3	4	5

6. Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Police Department and public safety:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Visibility of patrol cars	1	2	3	4	5
Enforcement of traffic regulations	1	2	3	4	5
Municipal code enforcement issues (e.g., dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Communicating regularly with community members (e.g., website, meetings, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Response to emerging community issues (e.g., opioids, mental health, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	1	2	3	4	5

7. Please rate the following areas of community design and the Louisville Community Development Department:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
The public input process on City planning issues	1	2	3	4	5
Planning review process for new development	1	2	3	4	5
Building permit process related to the Marshall Fire	1	2	3	4	5
Building permit process overall	1	2	3	4	5
Building/construction inspection process	1	2	3	4	5
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department	1	2	3	4	5

8. Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Louisville Public Library programs (e.g., story time, author events, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk, check out, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	1	2	3	4	5
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	1	2	3	4	5
Louisville Public Library building	1	2	3	4	5
Overall customer service at the Library (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	1	2	3	4	5

Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters, programs)	1	2	3	4	5
Louisville Historical Museum campus	1	2	3	4	5
Archival materials (e.g., historic photographs, newspapers, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall customer service at the Historical Museum (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	1	2	3	4	5

9. Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Current recreation programs for youth (e.g., swim lessons, sports, preschool, camps)	1	2	3	4	5
Current recreation programs for adults (e.g., fitness classes, sports, general interests)	1	2	3	4	5
Recreation Center fees in Louisville	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	1	2	3	4	5
Overall customer service at the Louisville Recreation Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of the Louisville Recreation Center	1	2	3	4	5
Current programs and services for seniors	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	1	2	3	4	5
Overall customer service at the Louisville Senior Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of the Louisville Senior Center	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	1	2	3	4	5
Overall customer service at the Coal Creek Golf Course (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of the Coal Creek Golf Course	1	2	3	4	5

10. Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, trees, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas)	1	2	3	4	5
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	1	2	3	4	5
Maintenance of the Louisville Cemetery	1	2	3	4	5
Overall customer service of the Parks Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of the Parks Division	1	2	3	4	5
Maintenance of open space (e.g., trash bins, trailheads, habitat, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Maintenance of the trail system	1	2	3	4	5
Overall customer service of the Open Space Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of the Open Space Division	1	2	3	4	5

11. Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Street maintenance in Louisville (e.g., paving and concrete replacement)	1	2	3	4	5
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5
Street sweeping	1	2	3	4	5
Snow removal/street sanding	1	2	3	4	5
Street lighting, signage and street markings	1	2	3	4	5
Waste water (e.g., sewage system)	1	2	3	4	5

Storm drainage (e.g., flooding management)	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of Louisville water	1	2	3	4	5
Solid waste/trash service (e.g., trash, recycle, compost)	1	2	3	4	5
Fees for water, sewer and trash	1	2	3	4	5
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Works Department	1	2	3	4	5

12. Please rate the following areas of Louisville's Transportation System:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Ease of car travel in Louisville	1	2	3	4	5
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	1	2	3	4	5
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	1	2	3	4	5
Ease of walking in Louisville	1	2	3	4	5
Traffic flow on major streets	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of Louisville's Transportation System	1	2	3	4	5
Overall safety of Louisville's Transportation System	1	2	3	4	5

13. Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?

❍ Excellent ❍ Good ❍ Fair ❍ Poor ❍ Don't know

14. First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of the community. Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.

	High priority	Medium priority	Low/not a priority	Don't know	Top 3 priorities
Transportation (e.g., safe/well-maintained multi-modal transportation system)	1	2	3	4	❑
Utilities (e.g., safe/reliable water, treated wastewater)	1	2	3	4	❑
Public Safety (e.g., community safety and compliance with Municipal Code/State Law)	1	2	3	4	❑
Parks (e.g., well-maintained parks/landscapes areas, sports facilities, cemetery)	1	2	3	4	❑
Open Space & Trails (e.g., preserving native plants, wildlife and scenic vistas)	1	2	3	4	❑
Recreation (e.g., high quality, reasonably priced recreation/leisure activities)	1	2	3	4	❑
Library (e.g., informing/involving the community)	1	2	3	4	❑
Museum Services (e.g., preserving heritage, informing community)	1	2	3	4	❑
Economic Prosperity (e.g., promoting a thriving business climate)	1	2	3	4	❑
Administration & Support Services (e.g., effective and efficient governance)	1	2	3	4	❑
Environmental Sustainability (e.g., promoting efficiency, reducing environmental impacts)	1	2	3	4	❑

15. First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate. Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.

	High priority	Medium priority	Low/not a priority	Don't know	Top 2 priorities
Meet the retail and services needs of local residents	1	2	3	4	❑
Attract visitors to shop in Louisville	1	2	3	4	❑
Attract businesses to locate or expand in Louisville	1	2	3	4	❑
Pursue redevelopment of vacant or underused commercial sites	1	2	3	4	❑
Preserve the historic character of existing buildings	1	2	3	4	❑
Provide gathering spaces for the community (e.g., parks, facilities, etc.)	1	2	3	4	❑
Create and enhance unique identities for each of Louisville's business districts	1	2	3	4	❑

16. How much of a priority, if at all, should the City place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to achieve Louisville's sustainability vision?

	High priority	Medium priority	Low/not a priority	Don't know
Reduce energy consumption and increase use of clean energy	1	2	3	4
Encourage water efficiency and water quality efforts	1	2	3	4
Promote fuel-efficient transportation and multi-modal infrastructure	1	2	3	4
Increase community waste diversion	1	2	3	4
Ensure a sustainable, safe and healthy food supply that is accessible	1	2	3	4

17. Imagine a commercial area with several vacant storefronts and empty parking lots. How much would you support, if at all, the development of mixed-use housing and businesses in this area?

❍ Strongly support ❍ Somewhat support ❍ Somewhat oppose ❍ Strongly oppose ❍ Don't know

18. The City is working on a housing plan that aims to increase the availability of affordable housing options while maintaining Louisville character. To achieve this, the plan explores offering incentives to developers who create affordable housing units. Which of the following incentive types would you MOST SUPPORT to encourage the development of more affordable housing?

❍ Increased building density (allowing for more units on a single lot)
❍ Increased building height limitations (allowing taller buildings in specific areas)
❍ Reduced parking requirements
❍ Financial incentives for developers (tax breaks, grants, etc.)
❍ All of the above
❍ None of the above
❍ Don't know

19. Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source.

	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Never	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5
Quarterly Community Update Newsletter (**direct mail**)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5
Monthly Community Update eNewsletter (**emailed**)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5
The City of Louisville website (www.LouisvilleCO.gov)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5
City's online engagement site (www.EngageLouisville.org)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5
City's email notices (eNotification)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5
Utility bill inserts	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5
Social media (Facebook, Instagram, Nextdoor)	1	2	3	4	4	1	2	3	4 5
Word of mouth	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5
Channel 8	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5

Our last questions are about you and your household. Again, all of your responses to this survey are confidential and will be reported in group form only.

D1. How many years have you lived in Louisville?

- ❍ Less than 1 year
- ❍ 1-5 years
- ❍ 6-10 years
- ❍ 11-15 years
- ❍ More than 15 years

D2. Which best describes the building you live in?

- ❍ One family house detached from any other houses
- ❍ House attached to one or more houses (e.g., a duplex or townhome)
- ❍ Building with two or more apartments or condominiums
- ❍ Mobile home
- ❍ Other

D3. Do you rent or own your home?

- ❍ Rent
- ❍ Own

D4. How many people (including yourself) currently live in your household? _____ people

D5. Do any children 17 or under live in your household?

- ❍ No
- ❍ Yes

D6. Are you or any other members of your household aged 60 or older?

- ❍ No
- ❍ Yes

D7. In which category is your age?

- ❍ 18-24 years
- ❍ 25-34 years
- ❍ 35-44 years
- ❍ 45-54 years
- ❍ 55-64 years
- ❍ 65-74 years
- ❍ 75 years or older

D8. How do you describe your gender identity?

- ❍ Female
- ❍ Male
- ❍ Identify another way (specify if you wish):

  _____

D9. How has the Marshall Fire impacted you?

- ❍ Directly, my home was lost.
- ❍ Directly, my home was damaged.
- ❍ Indirectly, my home was not lost or damaged, but it affected me as a community member.
- ❍ I have not been affected by the Marshall Fire / I moved here after the fire.
- ❍ Other: _____

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return the completed survey in the postage-paid envelope to: National Research Center, Inc., PO Box 549, Belle Mead, NJ 08502

Dear Louisville Resident:

How do you think we're doing? We want to know how the City is serving you, and where we can improve! You've been randomly selected to participate in the 2024 Louisville Community Survey. If you've already completed the survey online, thank you. Please do not respond twice.

If you have not yet participated, please fill out the enclosed survey. Your feedback is crucial since your household is among a select number invited to participate. Survey results will impact decisions that affect Louisville.

Important things to keep in mind:

- Please do not share your survey link. This survey is for randomly selected households only.
- Your responses are confidential and no identifying information will be shared.
- Complete the survey if you're 18 or older. If there are multiple adults in your household, have the one who most recently had a birthday fill it out. This way, the person within your household is also randomized.
- Please return the survey by mail in the enclosed postage-paid envelope, or you can complete the survey online at:

polco.us/Louisville2024xx



If you have questions about the survey, call 720-693-1735.

We appreciate your time and insights!

Thank you,

Chris Leh
Mayor

City of Louisville, CO

2024 Community Survey

Open-Participation Survey

Report of Results

July 2024

Polco NRC

1241 John Q. Hammons Dr, Suite #203
Madison, WI 53717
info.polco.us • 608-709-8683

Contents

About the Open Participation Online Survey I

Complete Set of Frequencies 3

Verbatim Responses to Open-Ended Questions 28

Gender Identity 28

Marshall Fire Impact 28

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

About the Open Participation Online Survey

As part the 2024 Louisville Community Survey, the City of Louisville conducted a mailed survey of 3,500 residents. Surveys were mailed to randomly selected households on April 22, 2024 and data were collected through June 10, 2024 (see the report, *2024 Louisville Community Survey Report of Results*). The results from this main survey effort represent the most robust estimate of your residents' opinions.

After the data collection period was underway, the City made available a web-based survey to its residents through a link on the City's website. Visitors to the site were able to complete the survey beginning May 20, 2024 and 247 surveys were received. This report contains the results of this opt-in web-based survey. These data were not collected through a random sample and it is unknown who in the community was aware of link on the City's website; therefore, a level of confidence in the representativeness of the sample cannot be estimated. However, to reduce bias where possible, these data were weighted to match the demographic characteristics of the 2020 Census and 2021 American Community Survey estimates for adults in the City of Louisville.

The results of the weighting scheme for the opt-in survey are presented in the following table.

Table 1: Louisville, CO 2024 Weighting Table

Characteristic	Population Norm[1]	Unweighted Data	Weighted Data
Housing			
Rent	30%	7%	22%
Own	70%	93%	78%
Detached[2]	68%	92%	75%
Attached[2]	32%	8%	25%
Gender and Age			
Female	50%	64%	51%
Male	50%	36%	49%
Age 18-34	24%	5%	19%
Age 35-54	36%	39%	39%
Age 55 and over	39%	55%	43%
Female 18-34	11%	3%	9%
Female 35-54	18%	24%	19%
Female 55 and over	21%	36%	23%
Male 18-34	14%	2%	10%
Male 35-54	18%	14%	20%
Male 55 and over	18%	20%	20%
Council Ward[3]			
Ward 1	39%	26%	38%
Ward 2	29%	38%	28%
Ward 3	32%	35%	33%

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

[1] *2020 Census*
[2] *American Community Survey 2021 5-year estimates*
[3] *Proportion of addresses in USPS list*

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Complete Set of Frequencies

The following pages contain a complete set of responses to each question on the survey. For questions that included a "don't know" response option, two tables for that question are provided: the first that excludes the "don't know" responses, and the second that includes those responses. The percent of respondents giving a particular response is shown followed by the number of respondents (denoted with "N=").

Table 2: Question 1 (excluding don't know)

Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Louisville:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Louisville as a place to live	51%	N=115	42%	N=95	6%	N=13	1%	N=2	100%	N=225
Louisville as a place to raise children	64%	N=120	31%	N=59	4%	N=8	1%	N=2	100%	N=189
Louisville as a place to retire	36%	N=59	41%	N=67	11%	N=18	12%	N=19	100%	N=163
Louisville as a place to work	20%	N=28	46%	N=65	18%	N=26	16%	N=22	100%	N=142
The overall quality of life in Louisville	44%	N=98	47%	N=105	7%	N=15	2%	N=4	100%	N=222

Table 3: Question 1 (including don't know)

Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Louisville:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Louisville as a place to live	51%	N=115	42%	N=95	6%	N=13	1%	N=2	0%	N=0	100%	N=225
Louisville as a place to raise children	54%	N=120	26%	N=59	3%	N=8	1%	N=2	15%	N=34	100%	N=222
Louisville as a place to retire	27%	N=59	30%	N=67	8%	N=18	9%	N=19	26%	N=57	100%	N=220
Louisville as a place to work	13%	N=28	29%	N=65	12%	N=26	10%	N=22	36%	N=80	100%	N=222
The overall quality of life in Louisville	44%	N=98	47%	N=105	7%	N=15	2%	N=4	0%	N=0	100%	N=222

Table 4: Question 2 (excluding don't know)

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	31%	N=60	44%	N=87	19%	N=38	6%	N=11	100%	N=196
Overall appearance of Louisville	33%	N=72	47%	N=104	17%	N=37	3%	N=7	100%	N=220

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	26%	N=54	46%	N=96	21%	N=45	7%	N=15	100%	N=209
Shopping opportunities	6%	N=14	26%	N=56	46%	N=99	22%	N=47	100%	N=215
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	33%	N=71	49%	N=106	18%	N=39	0%	N=0	100%	N=216
Opportunities to participate in community matters	27%	N=56	51%	N=106	16%	N=33	7%	N=14	100%	N=209
Recreational opportunities	48%	N=104	46%	N=100	5%	N=11	1%	N=3	100%	N=217
Employment opportunities	8%	N=12	27%	N=37	38%	N=52	27%	N=37	100%	N=138
Variety of housing options	8%	N=16	24%	N=49	36%	N=73	32%	N=65	100%	N=202
Availability of affordable quality housing	4%	N=7	14%	N=26	24%	N=45	59%	N=110	100%	N=187
Preservation of the historic character of old town	28%	N=61	51%	N=112	16%	N=36	5%	N=10	100%	N=219
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	43%	N=95	47%	N=103	7%	N=15	3%	N=7	100%	N=220
Overall economic health of Louisville	16%	N=33	38%	N=76	34%	N=69	11%	N=23	100%	N=201

Table 5: Question 2 (including don't know)

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	27%	N=60	39%	N=87	17%	N=38	5%	N=11	12%	N=28	100%	N=224
Overall appearance of Louisville	33%	N=72	47%	N=104	17%	N=37	3%	N=7	0%	N=0	100%	N=220
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	24%	N=54	43%	N=96	20%	N=45	7%	N=15	6%	N=13	100%	N=222
Shopping opportunities	6%	N=14	25%	N=56	45%	N=99	21%	N=47	3%	N=6	100%	N=221
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	33%	N=71	48%	N=106	18%	N=39	0%	N=0	1%	N=3	100%	N=219
Opportunities to participate in community matters	25%	N=56	48%	N=106	15%	N=33	6%	N=14	5%	N=11	100%	N=220
Recreational opportunities	48%	N=104	46%	N=100	5%	N=11	1%	N=3	0%	N=1	100%	N=218
Employment opportunities	5%	N=12	17%	N=37	24%	N=52	17%	N=37	38%	N=83	100%	N=221
Variety of housing options	7%	N=16	22%	N=49	33%	N=73	30%	N=65	8%	N=17	100%	N=219

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Availability of affordable quality housing	3%	N=7	12%	N=26	20%	N=45	50%	N=110	16%	N=35	100%	N=221
Preservation of the historic character of old town	28%	N=61	51%	N=112	16%	N=36	4%	N=10	1%	N=2	100%	N=222
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	43%	N=95	47%	N=103	7%	N=15	3%	N=7	0%	N=0	100%	N=220
Overall economic health of Louisville	15%	N=33	34%	N=76	31%	N=69	10%	N=23	10%	N=21	100%	N=222

Table 6: Question 3 (excluding don't know)

Please rate how safe you feel:	Very safe		Somewhat safe		Neither safe nor unsafe		Somewhat unsafe		Very unsafe		Total	
From violent crime (e.g., personal assault, sexual assault, robbery, hate crimes)	75%	N=166	21%	N=46	3%	N=6	1%	N=3	0%	N=1	100%	N=221
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft, vandalism, arson)	37%	N=83	44%	N=100	11%	N=25	6%	N=14	1%	N=3	100%	N=225
In your neighborhood	66%	N=147	25%	N=56	6%	N=12	2%	N=6	1%	N=2	100%	N=224
In Louisville's downtown area	68%	N=148	24%	N=52	5%	N=10	4%	N=9	0%	N=0	100%	N=218
In Louisville's parks and open spaces	62%	N=135	31%	N=69	6%	N=13	1%	N=2	0%	N=1	100%	N=219

Table 7: Question 3 (including don't know)

Please rate how safe you feel:	Very safe		Somewhat safe		Neither safe nor unsafe		Somewhat unsafe		Very unsafe		Don't know		Total	
From violent crime (e.g., personal assault, sexual assault, robbery, hate crimes)	75%	N=166	21%	N=46	3%	N=6	1%	N=3	0%	N=1	0%	N=0	100%	N=221
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft, vandalism, arson)	37%	N=83	44%	N=100	11%	N=25	6%	N=14	1%	N=3	0%	N=0	100%	N=225
In your neighborhood	66%	N=147	25%	N=56	6%	N=12	2%	N=6	1%	N=2	0%	N=0	100%	N=224
In Louisville's downtown area	66%	N=148	23%	N=52	4%	N=10	4%	N=9	0%	N=0	2%	N=5	100%	N=223
In Louisville's parks and open spaces	61%	N=135	31%	N=69	6%	N=13	1%	N=2	0%	N=1	2%	N=4	100%	N=223

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Table 8: Question 4 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the job you feel the Louisville community does at each of the following.	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Making all residents feel welcome	32%	N=66	47%	N=95	14%	N=29	7%	N=14	100%	N=204
Attracting people from diverse backgrounds	20%	N=35	24%	N=42	32%	N=56	24%	N=41	100%	N=175
Valuing/respecting residents from diverse backgrounds	26%	N=46	43%	N=75	18%	N=32	13%	N=22	100%	N=174
Taking care of vulnerable residents (elderly, disabled, homeless, etc.)	18%	N=30	37%	N=61	25%	N=41	20%	N=33	100%	N=165

Table 9: Question 4 (including don't know)

Please rate the job you feel the Louisville community does at each of the following.	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Making all residents feel welcome	29%	N=66	43%	N=95	13%	N=29	6%	N=14	9%	N=19	100%	N=224
Attracting people from diverse backgrounds	16%	N=35	19%	N=42	25%	N=56	19%	N=41	22%	N=48	100%	N=223
Valuing/respecting residents from diverse backgrounds	21%	N=46	34%	N=75	14%	N=32	10%	N=22	20%	N=45	100%	N=219
Taking care of vulnerable residents (elderly, disabled, homeless, etc.)	14%	N=30	27%	N=61	19%	N=41	15%	N=33	26%	N=57	100%	N=222

Table 10: Question 5 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	15%	N=25	34%	N=57	28%	N=46	24%	N=40	100%	N=168
Information about City Council, Planning Commission & other official City meetings	22%	N=46	47%	N=101	20%	N=42	12%	N=25	100%	N=215
Information about City's strategic plan and budget	19%	N=37	43%	N=86	22%	N=44	16%	N=32	100%	N=200
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	25%	N=13	31%	N=16	28%	N=14	15%	N=8	100%	N=51
Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	17%	N=36	57%	N=119	19%	N=40	6%	N=13	100%	N=209
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	27%	N=49	50%	N=92	11%	N=20	12%	N=22	100%	N=183

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Please rate the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Overall performance of the Louisville City government	19%	N=39	44%	N=91	24%	N=49	13%	N=27	100%	N=206

Table 11: Question 5 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	11%	N=25	26%	N=57	21%	N=46	18%	N=40	24%	N=54	100%	N=222
Information about City Council, Planning Commission & other official City meetings	21%	N=46	45%	N=101	19%	N=42	11%	N=25	4%	N=8	100%	N=223
Information about City's strategic plan and budget	17%	N=37	39%	N=86	20%	N=44	15%	N=32	10%	N=22	100%	N=222
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	6%	N=13	7%	N=16	6%	N=14	3%	N=8	77%	N=172	100%	N=222
Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	16%	N=36	54%	N=119	18%	N=40	6%	N=13	6%	N=13	100%	N=222
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	22%	N=49	41%	N=92	9%	N=20	10%	N=22	17%	N=39	100%	N=221
Overall performance of the Louisville City government	18%	N=39	41%	N=91	22%	N=49	12%	N=27	7%	N=15	100%	N=221

Table 12: Question 6 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Police Department and public safety:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Visibility of patrol cars	24%	N=51	49%	N=104	21%	N=44	7%	N=15	100%	N=213
Enforcement of traffic regulations	22%	N=42	39%	N=74	21%	N=40	18%	N=33	100%	N=189
Municipal code enforcement issues (e.g., dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	23%	N=40	42%	N=72	24%	N=42	11%	N=18	100%	N=171
Communicating regularly with community members (e.g., website, meetings, etc.)	19%	N=33	44%	N=76	29%	N=50	8%	N=13	100%	N=173
Response to emerging community issues (e.g., opioids, mental health, etc.)	23%	N=28	45%	N=55	24%	N=28	8%	N=9	100%	N=121

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Police Department and public safety:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	35%	N=61	49%	N=86	10%	N=17	6%	N=11	100%	N=175
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	29%	N=60	56%	N=115	11%	N=23	4%	N=8	100%	N=206

Table 13: Question 6 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Police Department and public safety:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Visibility of patrol cars	23%	N=51	47%	N=104	20%	N=44	7%	N=15	4%	N=10	100%	N=223
Enforcement of traffic regulations	19%	N=42	33%	N=74	18%	N=40	15%	N=33	16%	N=35	100%	N=224
Municipal code enforcement issues (e.g., dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	18%	N=40	32%	N=72	19%	N=42	8%	N=18	23%	N=51	100%	N=222
Communicating regularly with community members (e.g., website, meetings, etc.)	15%	N=33	34%	N=76	23%	N=50	6%	N=13	22%	N=48	100%	N=221
Response to emerging community issues (e.g., opioids, mental health, etc.)	13%	N=28	25%	N=55	13%	N=28	4%	N=9	45%	N=101	100%	N=222
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	28%	N=61	39%	N=86	8%	N=17	5%	N=11	21%	N=46	100%	N=221
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	27%	N=60	52%	N=115	10%	N=23	4%	N=8	8%	N=17	100%	N=223

Table 14: Question 7 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of community design and the Louisville Community Development Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
The public input process on City planning issues	15%	N=28	36%	N=66	26%	N=48	24%	N=44	100%	N=185
Planning review process for new development	16%	N=25	33%	N=53	28%	N=45	24%	N=39	100%	N=162
Building permit process related to the Marshall Fire	16%	N=15	31%	N=29	28%	N=26	24%	N=23	100%	N=94
Building permit process overall	7%	N=8	43%	N=51	26%	N=32	24%	N=29	100%	N=120
Building/construction inspection process	12%	N=15	47%	N=59	21%	N=26	21%	N=26	100%	N=126

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Please rate the following areas of community design and the Louisville Community Development Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	18%	N=27	55%	N=80	13%	N=19	13%	N=19	100%	N=145
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department	10%	N=14	55%	N=80	18%	N=26	17%	N=24	100%	N=145

Table 15: Question 7 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of community design and the Louisville Community Development Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
The public input process on City planning issues	12%	N=28	30%	N=66	21%	N=48	20%	N=44	17%	N=37	100%	N=222
Planning review process for new development	12%	N=25	24%	N=53	21%	N=45	18%	N=39	26%	N=57	100%	N=219
Building permit process related to the Marshall Fire	7%	N=15	13%	N=29	12%	N=26	10%	N=23	58%	N=131	100%	N=225
Building permit process overall	4%	N=8	23%	N=51	14%	N=32	13%	N=29	46%	N=102	100%	N=222
Building/construction inspection process	7%	N=15	27%	N=59	12%	N=26	12%	N=26	43%	N=97	100%	N=223
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	12%	N=27	36%	N=80	9%	N=19	9%	N=19	34%	N=75	100%	N=220
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department	6%	N=14	36%	N=80	12%	N=26	11%	N=24	35%	N=78	100%	N=223

Table 16: Question 8 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Louisville Public Library programs (e.g., story time, One Book program, etc.)	63%	N=104	34%	N=57	2%	N=3	1%	N=1	100%	N=167
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk, check out, etc.)	70%	N=131	27%	N=51	1%	N=1	1%	N=2	100%	N=186
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	60%	N=87	39%	N=57	0%	N=0	0%	N=0	100%	N=144
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	68%	N=101	30%	N=46	2%	N=2	0%	N=0	100%	N=150

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	49%	N=82	48%	N=81	2%	N=4	1%	N=2	100%	N=168
Louisville Public Library building	68%	N=135	29%	N=58	2%	N=4	0%	N=0	100%	N=198
Overall customer service at the Library (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	69%	N=128	29%	N=54	1%	N=1	1%	N=2	100%	N=185
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	71%	N=135	27%	N=50	2%	N=3	1%	N=2	100%	N=190
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters, programs)	53%	N=67	42%	N=53	5%	N=6	1%	N=1	100%	N=127
Louisville Historical Museum campus	50%	N=64	47%	N=61	2%	N=3	1%	N=1	100%	N=128
Archival materials (e.g., historic photographs, newspapers, etc.)	53%	N=57	45%	N=48	1%	N=1	1%	N=1	100%	N=107
Overall customer service at the Historical Museum (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	62%	N=71	36%	N=41	1%	N=1	1%	N=2	100%	N=115
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	55%	N=67	43%	N=52	0%	N=0	1%	N=1	100%	N=120

Table 17: Question 8 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Louisville Public Library programs (e.g., story time, One Book program, etc.)	47%	N=104	26%	N=57	2%	N=3	1%	N=1	25%	N=56	100%	N=222
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk, check out, etc.)	59%	N=131	23%	N=51	1%	N=1	1%	N=2	16%	N=36	100%	N=222
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	39%	N=87	26%	N=57	0%	N=0	0%	N=0	35%	N=77	100%	N=221
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	46%	N=101	21%	N=46	1%	N=2	0%	N=0	31%	N=68	100%	N=218
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	37%	N=82	37%	N=81	2%	N=4	1%	N=2	23%	N=51	100%	N=220
Louisville Public Library building	61%	N=135	26%	N=58	2%	N=4	0%	N=0	10%	N=22	100%	N=220

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Overall customer service at the Library (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	58%	N=128	25%	N=54	1%	N=1	1%	N=2	16%	N=35	100%	N=219
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	61%	N=135	23%	N=50	1%	N=3	1%	N=2	14%	N=30	100%	N=220
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters, programs)	31%	N=67	24%	N=53	3%	N=6	0%	N=1	42%	N=91	100%	N=219
Louisville Historical Museum campus	29%	N=64	28%	N=61	1%	N=3	0%	N=1	41%	N=91	100%	N=219
Archival materials (e.g., historic photographs, newspapers, etc.)	26%	N=57	22%	N=48	1%	N=1	0%	N=1	51%	N=111	100%	N=218
Overall customer service at the Historical Museum (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	32%	N=71	19%	N=41	1%	N=1	1%	N=2	47%	N=103	100%	N=218
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	31%	N=67	24%	N=52	0%	N=0	1%	N=1	44%	N=94	100%	N=214

Table 18: Question 9 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Current recreation programs for youth (e.g., swim lessons, sports, preschool, camps)	53%	N=69	41%	N=53	6%	N=8	0%	N=1	100%	N=130
Current recreation programs for adults (e.g., fitness classes, sports, general interests)	46%	N=81	34%	N=60	18%	N=32	1%	N=2	100%	N=175
Recreation Center fees in Louisville	40%	N=76	39%	N=74	15%	N=29	6%	N=12	100%	N=191
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	62%	N=128	34%	N=71	3%	N=6	1%	N=2	100%	N=207
Overall customer service at the Louisville Recreation Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	64%	N=114	29%	N=52	4%	N=8	3%	N=5	100%	N=179
Overall performance of the Louisville Recreation Center	63%	N=120	32%	N=61	5%	N=9	1%	N=2	100%	N=192
Current programs and services for seniors	60%	N=51	32%	N=27	4%	N=3	4%	N=4	100%	N=85
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	60%	N=53	33%	N=29	5%	N=4	2%	N=2	100%	N=88

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Overall customer service at the Louisville Senior Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	66%	N=56	29%	N=25	2%	N=2	4%	N=3	100%	N=86
Overall performance of the Louisville Senior Center	63%	N=54	32%	N=27	2%	N=2	4%	N=3	100%	N=87
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	46%	N=29	39%	N=24	7%	N=4	7%	N=5	100%	N=62
Overall customer service at the Coal Creek Golf Course (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	53%	N=28	33%	N=17	5%	N=3	9%	N=5	100%	N=52
Overall performance of the Coal Creek Golf Course	50%	N=27	34%	N=18	7%	N=4	9%	N=5	100%	N=54

Table 19: Question 9 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Current recreation programs for youth (e.g., swim lessons, sports, preschool, camps)	31%	N=69	24%	N=53	4%	N=8	0%	N=1	41%	N=89	100%	N=219
Current recreation programs for adults (e.g., fitness classes, sports, general interests)	37%	N=81	28%	N=60	15%	N=32	1%	N=2	20%	N=44	100%	N=219
Recreation Center fees in Louisville	35%	N=76	34%	N=74	13%	N=29	5%	N=12	13%	N=28	100%	N=219
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	58%	N=128	32%	N=71	3%	N=6	1%	N=2	6%	N=13	100%	N=220
Overall customer service at the Louisville Recreation Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	52%	N=114	24%	N=52	3%	N=8	2%	N=5	19%	N=42	100%	N=221
Overall performance of the Louisville Recreation Center	55%	N=120	28%	N=61	4%	N=9	1%	N=2	13%	N=28	100%	N=220
Current programs and services for seniors	23%	N=51	12%	N=27	1%	N=3	2%	N=4	61%	N=134	100%	N=220
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	25%	N=53	14%	N=29	2%	N=4	1%	N=2	59%	N=125	100%	N=213
Overall customer service at the Louisville Senior Center (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	26%	N=56	11%	N=25	1%	N=2	2%	N=3	60%	N=130	100%	N=216
Overall performance of the Louisville Senior Center	25%	N=54	13%	N=27	1%	N=2	2%	N=3	60%	N=127	100%	N=214
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	13%	N=29	11%	N=24	2%	N=4	2%	N=5	71%	N=153	100%	N=216

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Overall customer service at the Coal Creek Golf Course (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	13%	N=28	8%	N=17	1%	N=3	2%	N=5	76%	N=165	100%	N=217
Overall performance of the Coal Creek Golf Course	12%	N=27	8%	N=18	2%	N=4	2%	N=5	75%	N=162	100%	N=215

Table 20: Question 10 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	51%	N=110	41%	N=90	6%	N=14	2%	N=4	100%	N=218
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas)	41%	N=91	47%	N=104	8%	N=18	3%	N=6	100%	N=220
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	29%	N=65	42%	N=94	18%	N=39	11%	N=24	100%	N=222
Maintenance of the Louisville Cemetery	50%	N=35	43%	N=30	6%	N=4	2%	N=1	100%	N=70
Overall customer service of the Parks Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	47%	N=65	39%	N=53	7%	N=10	6%	N=9	100%	N=136
Overall performance of the Parks Division	39%	N=72	51%	N=94	7%	N=12	4%	N=7	100%	N=185
Maintenance of open space (e.g., trash bins, trailheads, habitat, etc.)	42%	N=88	47%	N=97	8%	N=16	3%	N=7	100%	N=208
Maintenance of the trail system	44%	N=90	48%	N=98	6%	N=13	1%	N=3	100%	N=204
Overall customer service of the Open Space Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	50%	N=71	40%	N=57	5%	N=8	5%	N=7	100%	N=143
Overall performance of the Open Space Division	44%	N=86	46%	N=91	7%	N=13	3%	N=6	100%	N=196

Table 21: Question 10 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	50%	N=110	41%	N=90	6%	N=14	2%	N=4	2%	N=4	100%	N=222

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Open Space Divisions:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas)	41%	N=91	47%	N=104	8%	N=18	3%	N=6	1%	N=2	100%	N=222
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	29%	N=65	42%	N=94	17%	N=39	11%	N=24	1%	N=2	100%	N=223
Maintenance of the Louisville Cemetery	16%	N=35	13%	N=30	2%	N=4	0%	N=1	69%	N=153	100%	N=224
Overall customer service of the Parks Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	30%	N=65	24%	N=53	4%	N=10	4%	N=9	38%	N=82	100%	N=218
Overall performance of the Parks Division	33%	N=72	43%	N=94	6%	N=12	3%	N=7	15%	N=33	100%	N=218
Maintenance of open space (e.g., trash bins, trailheads, habitat, etc.)	40%	N=88	44%	N=97	7%	N=16	3%	N=7	5%	N=11	100%	N=219
Maintenance of the trail system	41%	N=90	44%	N=98	6%	N=13	1%	N=3	7%	N=16	100%	N=220
Overall customer service of the Open Space Division (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	32%	N=71	26%	N=57	3%	N=8	3%	N=7	35%	N=77	100%	N=220
Overall performance of the Open Space Division	40%	N=86	42%	N=91	6%	N=13	3%	N=6	10%	N=21	100%	N=217

Table 22: Question 11 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Street maintenance in Louisville (e.g., paving and concrete replacement)	21%	N=47	50%	N=110	18%	N=40	10%	N=23	100%	N=220
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	25%	N=54	47%	N=105	17%	N=39	11%	N=24	100%	N=222
Street sweeping	24%	N=51	48%	N=101	20%	N=42	8%	N=16	100%	N=210
Snow removal/street sanding	19%	N=42	32%	N=69	32%	N=71	17%	N=37	100%	N=219
Street lighting, signage and street markings	28%	N=62	38%	N=83	22%	N=48	12%	N=28	100%	N=221
Waste water (e.g., sewage system)	43%	N=79	50%	N=92	6%	N=11	2%	N=3	100%	N=184
Storm drainage (e.g., flooding management)	41%	N=83	47%	N=95	7%	N=14	5%	N=9	100%	N=201
Quality of Louisville water	46%	N=98	40%	N=84	12%	N=26	2%	N=4	100%	N=211
Solid waste/trash service (e.g., trash, recycle, compost)	37%	N=77	46%	N=96	13%	N=28	4%	N=9	100%	N=211

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	36%	N=60	45%	N=75	11%	N=19	7%	N=12	100%	N=165
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Works Department	39%	N=78	43%	N=88	13%	N=27	5%	N=9	100%	N=203

Table 23: Question 11 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Works Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Street maintenance in Louisville (e.g., paving and concrete replacement)	21%	N=47	50%	N=110	18%	N=40	10%	N=23	1%	N=2	100%	N=222
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	25%	N=54	47%	N=105	17%	N=39	11%	N=24	0%	N=0	100%	N=222
Street sweeping	23%	N=51	46%	N=101	19%	N=42	7%	N=16	5%	N=12	100%	N=222
Snow removal/street sanding	19%	N=42	31%	N=69	32%	N=71	17%	N=37	1%	N=1	100%	N=220
Street lighting, signage and street markings	28%	N=62	38%	N=83	22%	N=48	12%	N=28	0%	N=0	100%	N=221
Waste water (e.g., sewage system)	36%	N=79	42%	N=92	5%	N=11	1%	N=3	15%	N=33	100%	N=218
Storm drainage (e.g., flooding management)	38%	N=83	44%	N=95	6%	N=14	4%	N=9	8%	N=16	100%	N=217
Quality of Louisville water	44%	N=98	38%	N=84	11%	N=26	2%	N=4	5%	N=11	100%	N=222
Solid waste/trash service (e.g., trash, recycle, compost)	35%	N=77	44%	N=96	13%	N=28	4%	N=9	4%	N=10	100%	N=220
Overall customer service (knowledgeable, available, responsive, courteous)	27%	N=60	34%	N=75	8%	N=19	5%	N=12	25%	N=55	100%	N=220
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Works Department	36%	N=78	40%	N=88	12%	N=27	4%	N=9	8%	N=18	100%	N=221

Table 24: Question 12 (excluding don't know)

Please rate the following areas of Louisville's Transportation System:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Ease of car travel in Louisville	42%	N=93	37%	N=81	12%	N=27	9%	N=19	100%	N=221
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	22%	N=31	35%	N=49	25%	N=34	18%	N=25	100%	N=140

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Please rate the following areas of Louisville's Transportation System:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	39%	N=77	44%	N=86	16%	N=32	2%	N=3	100%	N=198
Ease of walking in Louisville	46%	N=101	37%	N=81	16%	N=35	1%	N=2	100%	N=220
Traffic flow on major streets	30%	N=65	40%	N=86	20%	N=43	10%	N=21	100%	N=216
Overall quality of Louisville's Transportation System	26%	N=56	48%	N=102	21%	N=45	5%	N=10	100%	N=213
Overall safety of Louisville's Transportation System	29%	N=60	48%	N=100	18%	N=37	4%	N=8	100%	N=205

Table 25: Question 12 (including don't know)

Please rate the following areas of Louisville's Transportation System:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Ease of car travel in Louisville	42%	N=93	37%	N=81	12%	N=27	9%	N=19	0%	N=1	100%	N=222
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	14%	N=31	23%	N=49	16%	N=34	12%	N=25	36%	N=79	100%	N=219
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	35%	N=77	40%	N=86	15%	N=32	1%	N=3	9%	N=21	100%	N=218
Ease of walking in Louisville	46%	N=101	37%	N=81	16%	N=35	1%	N=2	0%	N=0	100%	N=220
Traffic flow on major streets	30%	N=65	40%	N=86	20%	N=43	10%	N=21	0%	N=0	100%	N=216
Overall quality of Louisville's Transportation System	25%	N=56	46%	N=102	21%	N=45	5%	N=10	4%	N=8	100%	N=221
Overall safety of Louisville's Transportation System	27%	N=60	45%	N=100	17%	N=37	4%	N=8	7%	N=16	100%	N=221

Table 26: Question 13 (excluding don't know)

Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	31%	N=68	56%	N=123	10%	N=21	3%	N=7	100%	N=219

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Table 27: Question 13 (including don't know)

Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	31%	N=68	55%	N=123	9%	N=21	3%	N=7	2%	N=4	100%	N=224

Table 28: Question 14 (excluding don't know)

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of the community. Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	High priority		Medium priority		Low/not a priority		Total	
Transportation (e.g., safe/well-maintained multi-modal transportation system)	45%	N=96	36%	N=78	19%	N=41	100%	N=216
Utilities (e.g., safe/reliable water, treated wastewater)	80%	N=173	17%	N=37	3%	N=7	100%	N=217
Public Safety (e.g., community safety and compliance with Municipal Code/State Law)	61%	N=134	30%	N=67	9%	N=19	100%	N=220
Parks (e.g., well-maintained parks/landscapes areas, sports facilities, cemetery)	46%	N=99	49%	N=106	5%	N=12	100%	N=217
Open Space & Trails (e.g., preserving native plants, wildlife and scenic vistas)	50%	N=107	40%	N=86	9%	N=20	100%	N=213
Recreation (e.g., high quality, reasonably priced recreation/leisure activities)	47%	N=102	39%	N=87	14%	N=31	100%	N=220
Library (e.g., informing/involving the community)	51%	N=109	35%	N=75	14%	N=30	100%	N=214
Museum Services (e.g., preserving heritage, informing community)	14%	N=30	54%	N=114	31%	N=66	100%	N=210
Economic Prosperity (e.g., promoting a thriving business climate)	62%	N=137	29%	N=64	8%	N=18	100%	N=219
Administration & Support Services (e.g., effective and efficient governance)	51%	N=109	39%	N=85	10%	N=22	100%	N=215
Environmental Sustainability (e.g., promoting efficiency, reducing environmental impacts)	46%	N=101	31%	N=67	24%	N=52	100%	N=220

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Table 29: Question 14 (including don't know)

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of the community. Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	High priority		Medium priority		Low/not a priority		Don't know		Total	
Transportation (e.g., safe/well-maintained multi-modal transportation system)	44%	N=96	36%	N=78	19%	N=41	1%	N=2	100%	N=218
Utilities (e.g., safe/reliable water, treated wastewater)	79%	N=173	17%	N=37	3%	N=7	1%	N=2	100%	N=219
Public Safety (e.g., community safety and compliance with Municipal Code/State Law)	61%	N=134	30%	N=67	8%	N=19	0%	N=1	100%	N=221
Parks (e.g., well-maintained parks/landscapes areas, sports facilities, cemetery)	45%	N=99	49%	N=106	5%	N=12	1%	N=2	100%	N=219
Open Space & Trails (e.g., preserving native plants, wildlife and scenic vistas)	50%	N=107	40%	N=86	9%	N=20	0%	N=1	100%	N=214
Recreation (e.g., high quality, reasonably priced recreation/leisure activities)	46%	N=102	39%	N=87	14%	N=31	0%	N=1	100%	N=221
Library (e.g., informing/involving the community)	51%	N=109	35%	N=75	14%	N=30	1%	N=2	100%	N=216
Museum Services (e.g., preserving heritage, informing community)	14%	N=30	53%	N=114	31%	N=66	2%	N=4	100%	N=214
Economic Prosperity (e.g., promoting a thriving business climate)	62%	N=137	29%	N=64	8%	N=18	1%	N=2	100%	N=221
Administration & Support Services (e.g., effective and efficient governance)	50%	N=109	39%	N=85	10%	N=22	1%	N=3	100%	N=218
Environmental Sustainability (e.g., promoting efficiency, reducing environmental impacts)	46%	N=101	30%	N=67	24%	N=52	0%	N=1	100%	N=221

Table 30: Question 14 Top Three Priorities

Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.		Percent	Number
Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	Transportation (e.g., safe/well-maintained multi-modal transportation system)	30%	N=67
	Utilities (e.g., safe/reliable water, treated wastewater)	46%	N=103

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	Percent	Number
Public Safety (e.g., community safety and compliance with Municipal Code/State Law)	32%	N=72
Parks (e.g., well-maintained parks/landscapes areas, sports facilities, cemetery)	18%	N=40
Open Space & Trails (e.g., preserving native plants, wildlife and scenic vistas)	38%	N=84
Recreation (e.g., high quality, reasonably priced recreation/leisure activities)	29%	N=64
Library (e.g., informing/involving the community)	12%	N=26
Museum Services (e.g., preserving heritage, informing community)	1%	N=2
Economic Prosperity (e.g., promoting a thriving business climate)	50%	N=111
Administration & Support Services (e.g., effective and efficient governance)	14%	N=31
Environmental Sustainability (e.g., promoting efficiency, reducing environmental impacts)	24%	N=53

Table 31: Question 15 (excluding don't know)

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate. Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	High priority		Medium priority		Low/not a priority		Total	
Meet the retail and services needs of local residents	57%	N=122	38%	N=81	5%	N=11	100%	N=213
Attract visitors to shop in Louisville	33%	N=73	50%	N=109	17%	N=36	100%	N=218
Attract businesses to locate or expand in Louisville	61%	N=131	29%	N=62	10%	N=21	100%	N=214
Pursue redevelopment of vacant or underused commercial sites	68%	N=144	18%	N=38	14%	N=29	100%	N=211
Preserve the historic character of existing buildings	36%	N=80	37%	N=82	26%	N=58	100%	N=220
Provide gathering spaces for the community (e.g., parks, facilities, etc.)	37%	N=78	45%	N=96	19%	N=40	100%	N=215

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate. Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	High priority		Medium priority		Low/not a priority		Total	
Create and enhance unique identities for each of Louisville's business districts	20%	N=42	37%	N=77	43%	N=91	100%	N=210

Table 32: Question 15 (including don't know)

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate. Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	High priority		Medium priority		Low/not a priority		Don't know		Total	
Meet the retail and services needs of local residents	57%	N=122	38%	N=81	5%	N=11	0%	N=1	100%	N=214
Attract visitors to shop in Louisville	33%	N=73	50%	N=109	16%	N=36	0%	N=1	100%	N=218
Attract businesses to locate or expand in Louisville	60%	N=131	29%	N=62	10%	N=21	1%	N=2	100%	N=217
Pursue redevelopment of vacant or underused commercial sites	66%	N=144	18%	N=38	13%	N=29	3%	N=6	100%	N=218
Preserve the historic character of existing buildings	36%	N=80	37%	N=82	26%	N=58	0%	N=0	100%	N=220
Provide gathering spaces for the community (e.g., parks, facilities, etc.)	36%	N=78	44%	N=96	18%	N=40	2%	N=3	100%	N=218
Create and enhance unique identities for each of Louisville's business districts	19%	N=42	36%	N=77	42%	N=91	3%	N=7	100%	N=216

Table 33: Question 15 Top Two Priorities

Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.		Percent	Number
Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	Meet the retail and services needs of local residents	34%	N=75
	Attract visitors to shop in Louisville	8%	N=18
	Attract businesses to locate or expand in Louisville	48%	N=107
	Pursue redevelopment of vacant or underused commercial sites	60%	N=132
	Preserve the historic character of existing buildings	18%	N=40

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.	Percent	Number
Provide gathering spaces for the community (e.g., parks, facilities, etc.)	20%	N=45
Create and enhance unique identities for each of Louisville's business districts	6%	N=13

Table 34: Question 16 (excluding don't know)

How much of a priority, if at all, should the City place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to achieve Louisville's sustainability vision?	High priority		Medium priority		Low/not a priority		Total	
Reduce energy consumption and increase use of clean energy	44%	N=95	32%	N=70	24%	N=52	100%	N=217
Encourage water efficiency and water quality efforts	61%	N=132	32%	N=70	7%	N=15	100%	N=217
Promote fuel-efficient transportation and multi-modal infrastructure	41%	N=88	27%	N=58	32%	N=70	100%	N=216
Increase community waste diversion	36%	N=71	41%	N=81	22%	N=44	100%	N=196
Ensure a sustainable, safe and healthy food supply that is accessible	40%	N=84	41%	N=87	19%	N=40	100%	N=211

Table 35: Question 16 (including don't know)

How much of a priority, if at all, should the City place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to achieve Louisville's sustainability vision?	High priority		Medium priority		Low/not a priority		Don't know		Total	
Reduce energy consumption and increase use of clean energy	44%	N=95	32%	N=70	24%	N=52	0%	N=0	100%	N=217
Encourage water efficiency and water quality efforts	61%	N=132	32%	N=70	7%	N=15	0%	N=0	100%	N=217
Promote fuel-efficient transportation and multi-modal infrastructure	41%	N=88	27%	N=58	32%	N=70	0%	N=1	100%	N=217
Increase community waste diversion	33%	N=71	38%	N=81	21%	N=44	8%	N=18	100%	N=214
Ensure a sustainable, safe and healthy food supply that is accessible	39%	N=84	40%	N=87	19%	N=40	2%	N=4	100%	N=215

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Table 36: Question 17 (excluding don't know)

	Strongly support		Somewhat support		Somewhat oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
Imagine a commercial area with several vacant storefronts and empty parking lots. How much would you support, if at all, the development of mixed-use housing and businesses in this area?	50%	N=108	29%	N=63	13%	N=28	8%	N=17	100%	N=216

Table 37: Question 17 (including don't know)

	Strongly support		Somewhat support		Somewhat oppose		Strongly oppose		Don't know		Total	
Imagine a commercial area with several vacant storefronts and empty parking lots. How much would you support, if at all, the development of mixed-use housing and businesses in this area?	49%	N=108	29%	N=63	13%	N=28	8%	N=17	1%	N=2	100%	N=218

Table 38: Question 18 (including don't know)

The City is working on a housing plan that aims to increase the availability of affordable housing options while xxx		Percent	Number
The City is working on a housing plan that aims to increase the availability of affordable housing options while xxx	Increased building density (allowing for more units on a single lot)	17%	N=38
	Increased building height limitations (allowing taller buildings in specific areas)	13%	N=28
	Reduced parking requirements	9%	N=21
	Financial incentives for developers (tax breaks, grants, etc.)	12%	N=26
	All of the above	19%	N=43
	None of the above	18%	N=40
	Don't know	11%	N=25
	Total	100%	N=220

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Table 39: Question 18 (excluding don't know)

The City is working on a housing plan that aims to increase the availability of affordable housing options while xxx		Percent	Number
The City is working on a housing plan that aims to increase the availability of affordable housing options while xxx	Increased building density (allowing for more units on a single lot)	19%	N=38
	Increased building height limitations (allowing taller buildings in specific areas)	14%	N=28
	Reduced parking requirements	11%	N=21
	Financial incentives for developers (tax breaks, grants, etc.)	13%	N=26
	All of the above	22%	N=43
	None of the above	20%	N=40
	Total	100%	N=196

Table 40: Question 19 - Frequency

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source.	Always		Frequently		Sometimes		Never		Total	
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting	2%	N=5	10%	N=22	47%	N=104	40%	N=89	100%	N=220
Quarterly Community Update Newsletter (direct mail)	49%	N=107	24%	N=52	20%	N=44	7%	N=15	100%	N=219
Monthly Community Update eNewsletter (emailed)	40%	N=87	23%	N=49	19%	N=41	19%	N=41	100%	N=217
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	17%	N=36	17%	N=37	38%	N=80	28%	N=59	100%	N=213
The City of Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	11%	N=24	38%	N=82	46%	N=100	5%	N=11	100%	N=217
City's online engagement site (www.engagelouisville.org)	1%	N=2	8%	N=17	20%	N=44	71%	N=156	100%	N=219
City's email notices (eNotification)	20%	N=44	26%	N=58	26%	N=56	28%	N=60	100%	N=219
Utility bill inserts	25%	N=55	24%	N=53	22%	N=48	28%	N=62	100%	N=218
Social media (Facebook, Instragram, NextDoor)	7%	N=16	26%	N=57	27%	N=60	39%	N=85	100%	N=218
Word of mouth	6%	N=14	41%	N=89	38%	N=83	15%	N=33	100%	N=219

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source.	Always		Frequently		Sometimes		Never		Total	
Channel 8	1%	N=2	1%	N=3	8%	N=18	90%	N=196	100%	N=218

Table 41: Question 19 - Quality (excluding don't know)

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source.	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting	32%	N=39	42%	N=51	21%	N=25	4%	N=5	100%	N=120
Quarterly Community Update Newsletter (direct mail)	33%	N=62	50%	N=94	13%	N=24	3%	N=6	100%	N=187
Monthly Community Update eNewsletter (emailed)	33%	N=56	52%	N=88	12%	N=21	3%	N=5	100%	N=169
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	7%	N=10	49%	N=70	34%	N=49	10%	N=14	100%	N=144
The City of Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	19%	N=35	60%	N=114	17%	N=32	4%	N=7	100%	N=188
City's online engagement site (www.engagelouisville.org)	18%	N=11	42%	N=26	35%	N=22	5%	N=3	100%	N=62
City's email notices (eNotification)	23%	N=33	56%	N=80	18%	N=26	3%	N=5	100%	N=144
Utility bill inserts	23%	N=32	50%	N=68	23%	N=31	5%	N=6	100%	N=137
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor)	20%	N=24	54%	N=63	17%	N=19	9%	N=11	100%	N=117
Word of mouth	10%	N=16	35%	N=56	43%	N=68	12%	N=18	100%	N=159
Channel 8	14%	N=4	47%	N=13	18%	N=5	21%	N=6	100%	N=27

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Table 42: Question 19 - Quality (including don't know)

Following is a list of information sources. First, please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Then, indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source.	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting	18%	N=39	24%	N=51	11%	N=25	2%	N=5	44%	N=96	100%	N=216
Quarterly Community Update Newsletter (direct mail)	29%	N=62	44%	N=94	11%	N=24	3%	N=6	13%	N=27	100%	N=214
Monthly Community Update eNewsletter (emailed)	26%	N=56	41%	N=88	10%	N=21	2%	N=5	20%	N=44	100%	N=213
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	5%	N=10	33%	N=70	23%	N=49	7%	N=14	32%	N=69	100%	N=213
The City of Louisville website (www.louisvilleco.gov)	17%	N=35	53%	N=114	15%	N=32	3%	N=7	11%	N=24	100%	N=213
City's online engagement site (www.engagelouisville.org)	5%	N=11	12%	N=26	10%	N=22	1%	N=3	70%	N=148	100%	N=210
City's email notices (eNotification)	16%	N=33	38%	N=80	12%	N=26	2%	N=5	32%	N=67	100%	N=211
Utility bill inserts	16%	N=32	34%	N=68	15%	N=31	3%	N=6	32%	N=65	100%	N=202
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor)	11%	N=24	30%	N=63	9%	N=19	5%	N=11	44%	N=92	100%	N=209
Word of mouth	8%	N=16	26%	N=56	32%	N=68	9%	N=18	25%	N=54	100%	N=213

Table 43: Question D1

How many years have you lived in Louisville?	Percent	Number
Less than 1 year	4%	N=8
1-5 years	27%	N=60
6-10 years	15%	N=33
11-15 years	15%	N=33
More than 15 years	40%	N=89
Total	100%	N=223

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Table 44: Question D2

Which best describes the building you live in?	Percent	Number
One family house detached from any other houses	75%	N=168
House attached to one or more houses (e.g., a duplex or townhome)	11%	N=25
Building with two or more apartments or condominiums	11%	N=25
Mobile home	0%	N=0
Other	2%	N=4
Total	100%	N=223

Table 45: Question D3

Do you rent or own your home?	Percent	Number
Rent	22%	N=50
Own	78%	N=172
Total	100%	N=222

Table 46: Question D8

How do you describe your gender identity?	Percent	Number
Female	51%	N=106
Male	48%	N=101
Identify another way (specify if you wish):	1%	N=2
Total	100%	N=210

Table 47: Question D7

In which category is your age?	Percent	Number
18-24 years	0%	N=0
25-34 years	19%	N=41
35-44 years	16%	N=36

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

In which category is your age?	Percent	Number
45-54 years	22%	N=49
55-64 years	16%	N=36
65-74 years	16%	N=35
75 years or older	10%	N=22
Total	100%	N=218

Table 48: Question D4

How many people (including yourself) currently live in your household?	Percent	Number
1	18%	N=37
2	38%	N=79
3	16%	N=34
4	21%	N=43
5 or more	6%	N=13
Total	100%	N=206

Table 49: Question D5

Do any children 17 or under live in your household?	Percent	Number
No	65%	N=143
Yes	35%	N=75
Total	100%	N=218

Table 50: Question D6

Are you or any other members of your household aged 60 or older?	Percent	Number
No	57%	N=125
Yes	43%	N=95
Total	100%	N=220

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Verbatim Responses to Open-Ended Questions

Following are verbatim responses to the open-ended question on the survey. Because these responses were written by survey participants, they are presented here in verbatim form, including any typographical, grammar or other mistakes.

Question d8. How do you describe your gender identity?

Gender Identity

- N/A

Question d9: How has the Marshall Fire impacted you?

Marshall Fire Impact

- My parents lost their home and I was majorly involved in supporting them to rebuild.
- Becoming aware of fire danger

Prepared by National Research Center, Inc.

Polco

City of Louisville

2024 Louisville Community Survey

Presentation of Results

Polco

Civic Communication & Analytics Platform

Smarter, better-connected communities. A civic surveying, policy polling, and constituent communication tech platform.

Visit us online at

polco.us

National Research Center

Advanced Survey Science & Performance Analytics

Data insights to help communities move forward. The premiere provider of professional civic surveys and performance benchmarking analyses.


Exclusive Partners

ICMA

NLC NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

CITIES STRONG TOGETHER

The Louisville Community Survey



The Louisville Community Survey

- Nineth time conducting a community survey since 1990, sixth with Polco/NRC (2020, 2016, 2012, 2008, 2004, 1999)
- Survey conducted from April 22, 2024–Jun 10, 2024
- Mailing approach employed:
  - Probability-based sample of 3,500 randomly selected households
  - 570 total responses received
  - 17% overall response rate
  - Non-probability, open-participation survey: 247 responses
- Results statistically weighted to reflect Louisville overall
- 95% confidence interval with a +/- 4% margin of error



Key Findings




Louisville residents continue to enjoy a high quality of life.




Overall Community Quality

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services:



The Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum are almost universally appreciated.



Public Library and Historical Museum

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services:



The community's Recreation and Senior Center is highly valued.



Louisville Recreation and Senior Center

Please rate the following areas of the Louisville Recreation and Senior Center, and the Coal Creek Golf Course:




Additional Special Topics




Louisville Recreation and Senior Center

Please rate the job you feel the Louisville community does at each of the following..




Support for Mixed-Use Development

Imagine a commercial area with several vacant storefronts and empty parking lots. How much would you support, if at all, the development of mixed-use housing and businesses in this area?




Affordable Housing Initiative

The City is working on a housing plan that aims to increase the availability of affordable housing options while maintaining Louisville character. To achieve this, the plan explores offering incentives to developers who create affordable housing units. Which of the following incentive types would you MOST SUPPORT to encourage the development of more affordable housing?




Priorities of the Community

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of the community.




Top Priorities of the Community

Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.




*Arrows indicate comparison to 2020

Measuring High Priority vs Top Priority




Priorities for a Vibrant Economic Climate

First tell us how much of a priority, if at all, the City should place on each of the following aspects of its strategy to ensure a vibrant economic climate.



Top Priorities for a Vibrant Economic Climate

Then, select which two (2) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.




Measuring High Priority vs Top Priority



Top Sources of Information About the City

Please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville.



Percent always, frequently, or sometimes

*Arrows indicate comparison to 2020

Impact of the Marshall Fire

D9. How has the Marshall Fire impacted you?


- ❍ Directly, my home was lost.
- ❍ Directly, my home was damaged.
- ❍ Indirectly, my home was not lost or damaged, but it affected me as a community member.
- ❍ I have not been affected by the Marshall Fire / I moved here after the fire.
- ❍ Other: _____

Impact of the Marshall Fire




Priorities of the Community (Marshall Impact)

Then, select which three (3) should be the top priorities for the City to focus on in the next 4 years.




Sources of Information Quality and Reliability

Please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville.



*Arrows indicate comparison to 2020

Sources of Information Quality vs Frequency of Use



Questions?

Thank you!

Brandon Barnett
Senior Survey Associate
Polco/National Research Center
brandon@polco.us