



City of Louisville, CO

2016 Citizen Survey

Report of Results

June 2016



Contents

Executive Summary	1
Survey Background	4
Survey Results	6
<i>Quality of Life and Community</i>	<i>6</i>
Quality of Life	6
Community Characteristics	8
Safety in Louisville	10
<i>City Services and Departments</i>	<i>12</i>
Quality of Services	12
Government Performance	13
Public Safety Services	14
Planning and Building Safety Department	16
Parks and Recreation	18
Public Library	20
Public Works	21
<i>City Employees</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Information Sources</i>	<i>25</i>
Frequency of Use	25
Quality and Reliability	26
Social Media Use	28
<i>Resident Participation</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Planning and Policy Topics</i>	<i>30</i>
Funding Priorities	30
Changes to Trash Service	33
Priorities for Redevelopment	34
Historic Preservation Tax Extension	36
Appendix A: Complete Set of Frequencies	37
Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics	67
Appendix C: Verbatim Responses to Open-ended Survey Questions	104
Appendix D: Benchmark Comparisons	116
Appendix E: Survey Methodology	130
Appendix F: Survey Instrument	134

List of Figures

Figure 1: Overall Quality of Life in Louisville	6
Figure 2: Overall Quality of Life Compared by Year	6
Figure 3: Aspects of Quality of Life Compared by Year	7
Figure 4: Community Characteristics Compared by Year	9
Figure 5: Ratings of Safety from Crime and in Public Areas Compared by Year	11
Figure 6: Overall Quality of City Services	12
Figure 7: Overall Quality of Services Compared by Year	12
Figure 8: Government Performance Compared by Year	13
Figure 9: Ratings for the Louisville Police Department Compared by Year	15
Figure 10: Ratings for the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department Compared by Year	17
Figure 11: Ratings for the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department Compared by Year	19
Figure 12: Ratings for the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum Compared by Year	20
Figure 13: Ratings for Public Works Department Compared by Year	22
Figure 14: Ratings for the Louisville Employees Compared by Year	23
Figure 15: Department Contacted	24
Figure 16: Frequency of Use of Information Sources Compared by Year	25
Figure 17: Quality and Reliability of Information Sources Compared by Year	26
Figure 18: Other Information Sources	27
Figure 19: Likelihood of Social Media Use	28
Figure 20: Resident Participation in Louisville Activities Compared by Year	29
Figure 21: City Funding Priorities	31
Figure 22: Top Three City Funding Priorities	32
Figure 23: Level of Support for Decreasing Frequency of Trash Pick-up	33
Figure 24: Level of Support for Housing Options for Former Sam's Club Area	34
Figure 25: Level of Support for Housing Options for US36/McCaslin Area	35
Figure 26: Level of Support for Historic Preservation Tax Options	36

Executive Summary

Survey Background and Methods

The Louisville Citizen 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 fourth time National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) conducted the Louisville Citizen Survey and the seventh iteration in a series of citizen survey projects completed by the City of Louisville since 1990.

The Louisville Citizen Survey was administered by mail to 2,000 randomly selected households within the city. Of those households receiving the survey, 790 residents responded to the mailed questionnaire, giving a high response rate of 40%. The margin of error is plus or minus three 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 2016 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. These comparisons were made possible through NRC's national benchmark database. This database contains resident perspectives gathered in citizen surveys from approximately 500 jurisdictions.

Key Findings

Louisville residents continue to enjoy a high quality of life.

- Almost all respondents felt that the overall quality of life in Louisville was excellent or good (97%), which was similar to previous years. Compared to other jurisdictions across the nation and in Colorado's Front Range, Louisville's overall quality of life ratings were much higher than both benchmarks.
- Over 9 in 10 participants gave high marks to Louisville as a place to live and to raise children and three-quarters or more rated the community as a place to retire and to work as excellent or good. Evaluations of Louisville as place to retire decreased from 2012 to 2016, while all other ratings remained stable over time.
- Ratings for aspects of quality of life were much higher in Louisville than in national and Front Range comparison communities.
- Regarding community characteristics of Louisville, at least 9 in 10 respondents rated the overall image or reputation of Louisville, ease of walking, quality of overall natural environment and Louisville's overall appearance as excellent or good. Additionally, 8 in 10 highly rated opportunities to participate in special events, ease of bike travel, the sense of community, recreational opportunities, opportunities to participate in community matters and ease of car travel in the city.
- While most evaluations of characteristics of the community remained stable from 2012 to 2016, several changes were observed. Lower ratings were given in 2016 compared to 2012 to recreational opportunities, ease of car travel, openness and acceptance of the community, traffic flow on major streets, ease of bus travel, variety of housing options and availability of affordable quality housing. Opportunities to participate in community matters increased from 2012 to 2016.

- Most ratings for community characteristics were much higher when compared to the national and Front Range benchmarks. Only ratings for the variety of housing options and availability of affordable quality housing were much lower than jurisdictions elsewhere in the country and the Front Range.

Residents feel safe in their community.

- Almost all Louisville residents indicated they felt safe in and around the community during the day and a similar proportion felt safe from violent crime and in the downtown area and in their neighborhoods at night. At least 8 in 10 also reported they felt safe from property crimes and in Louisville's parks after dark.
- Compared to ratings in 2012, fewer residents felt safe in Louisville's parks after dark and from property crimes in 2016. Ratings for all other perceptions of safety were similar to 2012.
- All safety ratings were much higher those given by residents in other communities across the nation and in the Front Range.

The performance of the City of Louisville government performance is viewed favorably by residents.

- Three-quarters or more of participants felt that information about City Council, Planning Commission and other official City meetings, overall performance of the City government, the City's website, information about City plans and programs and availability of City government employees as excellent or good. About two-thirds rated the City's response to citizen complaints or concerns highly.
- Residents who had contact with a City employee gave positive reviews to their interactions, with at least 8 in 10 saying the employees' courtesy, knowledge, availability, responsiveness/promptness and their overall impression of the employee were excellent or good. Compared to 2012 evaluations, only the responsiveness/promptness of employees decreased in 2016, while all other ratings remained similar.
- Almost all evaluations of employee characteristics were higher or much higher than comparisons to both the nation and Front Range. Ratings for the courtesy of Louisville employees were similar to other jurisdictions in the Front Range.

Respondents think highly of City government services.

- About 9 in 10 Louisville residents rated the overall quality of City services as excellent or good, which was similar to ratings given in 2012 and 2008. Compared to other jurisdictions across the U.S. and compared to jurisdictions in Colorado's Front Range, Louisville's quality of services rating was much higher than both benchmarks.
- Most safety services were given favorable assessments, with the highest ratings given to 911 service, the overall performance of the police department and the visibility of patrol cars. When comparisons could be made, all ratings of police services were much higher than the national and Front Range benchmarks.
- Many services provided by the Parks and Recreation Department were given high marks by most respondents, including the adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds, maintenance of parks, maintenance of the trail system and the overall performance of the Parks and Recreation department. Current recreation programs for youth, maintenance and cleanliness of the Louisville Recreation Center and maintenance of the trail system were evaluated much higher than national comparisons.

- However, some declines in ratings of parks and recreation services were seen from 2012 to 2016, including maintenance and cleanliness of the Louisville Recreation Center, overall quality of the Senior Center, current recreation programs for adults and overall quality of the community Recreation Center.
- Of those who had an opinion about the Library and Museum, nearly all respondents gave favorable ratings to library programs, services, the building and the overall performance of the Public Library. Nine in 10 awarded high marks to Historical Museum programs and the overall performance of the museum.
- A number of services provided by the Louisville Public Works Department received favorable ratings, with about 9 in 10 respondents rating wastewater, quality of City water, storm drainage and the overall performance of the department as excellent or good.

Respondents prioritize maintaining streets and the appearance of Louisville.

- When asked to rate the importance of the City funding several projects in Louisville, about 9 in 10 indicated that maintaining, repairing and paving streets was essential or very important, while 8 in 10 prioritized maintaining the City's appearance/attractiveness. Less of a priority for residents were providing new outdoor multi-purpose turf fields or expanding the Historical Museum.
- When asked to select their top three priorities from the list of 15, maintaining, repairing and paving streets topped the list by far, with almost 6 in 10 residents selecting as one of their top three priorities. Maintaining the City's appearance/attractiveness, subsidizing affordable housing, encouraging sustainability, providing additional recreation facilities and amenities and using incentives to create business and employment opportunities were each selected as one of the three top priorities by about one-quarter of respondents.

Most Louisville residents support extending the Historical Preservation Tax, are on the fence about rezoning for housing and oppose to changing their trash service.

- Three-quarters of residents supported continuing the Historic Preservation sales tax until 2028 and over two-thirds supported extending the tax and dedicating a portion of the proceeds for operation costs for the Louisville Historical Museum.
- When asked about their level of support for rezoning the former Sam's Club for different types of residential housing. Six in 10 strongly or somewhat supported senior housing and about half supported subsidized or multifamily housing; however, about 4 in 10 were strongly opposed to subsidized or multifamily housing options.
- Respondents were also asked a similar question about different housing types in the US36/McCaslin area. While just over half supported each of the three housing options, about one-third were strongly opposed to each.
- When asked to indicate their level of support for decreasing the frequency of trash pickup from once a week to once every two weeks and increasing the frequency of compost pickup from every two weeks to once a week, over half of respondents were strongly opposed to decreasing trash service; only one-quarter of participant strongly or somewhat supported the change.

Survey Background

Survey Purpose

The Louisville Citizen 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 fourth time National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) conducted the Louisville Citizen Survey and the seventh iteration in a series of citizen survey projects completed by the City of Louisville since 1990.

Survey Methods

The Louisville Citizen Survey was administered by mail beginning in March 2016 to 2,000 randomly selected households within the City of Louisville. Each household received three mailings. Completed surveys were collected over the following seven weeks. The first mailing was a prenotification postcard announcing the upcoming survey. Over the following two weeks, two survey mailings were sent to residents; each contained a letter from the Mayor inviting the household to participate in the 2016 Louisville Citizen Survey, a five-page questionnaire and a pre-addressed, postage-paid return envelope. The survey instrument itself appears in *Appendix F: Survey Instrument*.

Of those households receiving the survey, 790 residents responded to the questionnaire either by mail or Web, giving a response rate of 40%. Survey results were weighted so that the characteristics of gender, age, tenure (rent versus own), housing unit type (attached versus detached) and Ward were represented in the proportions reflective of the entire city. (For more information see *Appendix E: Survey Methodology*.)

Understanding the Results

Precision of Estimates

It is customary to describe the precision of estimates made from surveys by a "level of confidence" (or margin of error). The 95% confidence level for this survey is generally no greater than plus or minus three percentage points around any given percent reported for all respondents (790 completed surveys).

"Don't Know" Responses and Rounding

On many of the questions in the survey, respondents gave an answer of "don't know." The proportion of respondents giving this reply is shown in the full set of responses included in *Appendix A: Complete Set of 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.

When a table for a question that permitted only a single response does not total to exactly 100%, it is due to the customary practice of rounding percentages to the nearest whole number.

Comparing to Past Years

Because this survey was the seventh in a series of citizen surveys, the 2016 results are presented along with past ratings when available. Differences between 2016 and 2012 can be considered "statistically significant" if they are greater than five percentage points. Trend data for Louisville represent important comparisons and

should be examined for improvements or declines. Deviations from stable trends over time especially represent opportunities for understanding how local policies, programs or public information may have affected residents' opinions.

In 2004, substantial changes were made to the survey instrument and implementation methodology. The surveys conducted in 2004, 2008, 2012 and 2016 used similar survey instruments and survey methodologies. Comparisons across these more recent years are more robust than comparisons to results from the surveys conducted in 1990, 1994 and 1999. In those first three survey iterations, the question wording and the response scales were often different than question wording and response scales used starting in 2004.

The report body notes any differences between the 2012 and 2016 survey instruments. These are minor changes in wording to clarify a question or note a change in a department name. Previous reports contain detailed notes on the more substantial differences between the 2008 and 2004 survey instruments compared to the 1990, 1994 and 1999 survey instruments. Most of the trend lines did not change markedly with the 2004 change in methods and question wording (about 60% of the ratings were similar, 10% went up and 30% went down). However, caution should be used in comparing the newer trend line (2004 to 2016) to the 1990, 1994 and 1999 results. The differences in ratings may be due to real change in practice or policy but also may be affected by the changes in how they were measured (the methods and question wording).

Comparing by Respondent Subgroups

Selected survey results were compared to certain demographic characteristics of survey respondents as well as by Ward. These crosstabulations are presented in *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*.

Comparing to Other Jurisdictions

NRC's database of comparative resident opinion is comprised of resident perspectives gathered in citizen surveys from approximately 500 jurisdictions whose residents evaluated local government services. Conducted with typically no fewer than 400 residents in each jurisdiction, opinions are intended to represent over 30 million Americans.

National and Front Range benchmark comparisons have been provided when similar questions on the Louisville survey are included in NRC's database and there are at least five jurisdictions in which the question was asked, though most questions are compared to more than five other cities across the country or in the Front Range. Additional information on NRC's benchmarking database as well as jurisdictions to which Louisville is compared can be found in *Appendix D: Benchmark Comparisons*.

Where comparisons for quality ratings were available, the City of Louisville's results were generally noted as being "above" the benchmark, "below" the benchmark or "similar" to the benchmark and are discussed throughout the body of the report, when applicable. 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 less" or "much above"). These labels come from a statistical comparison of Louisville's rating to the benchmark where a rating is considered "similar" if it is within the margin of error (less than two points on the 100-point scale); "above" or "below" if the difference between Louisville's rating and the benchmark is greater than the margin of error (greater than two points but less than six points); and "much above" or "much below" if the difference between Louisville's rating and the benchmark is more than twice the margin of error (four points or greater). Comparison data for a number of items on the survey is not available in the benchmark database (e.g., some of the city services or aspects of government performance). These items are excluded from the benchmark tables.

Survey Results

Quality of Life and Community

The 2016 City of Louisville Citizen Survey included a number of questions that can be used to paint a picture of how residents view their community. Answers to questions about overall quality of life, specific community characteristics and feelings of safety, are the brush strokes that contribute to a picture of a vibrant community.

Quality of Life

Residents of Louisville continue to enjoy a high quality of life. Almost all respondents felt that the overall quality of life in Louisville was excellent or good (97%), a rating that was similar to previous years. Compared to other jurisdictions across the nation and communities in the Front Range, Louisville’s overall quality of life ratings were much higher than both benchmarks (please see *Appendix D: Benchmark Comparisons* for a complete list of comparisons).

Survey results were compared by respondent demographic characteristics as well as geographic area of residence (Council Ward). Homeowners and those living in detached units were more likely to give positive ratings to the overall quality of life in the city than were renters and those living in attached units (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*). No differences were observed by ward.

Figure 1: Overall Quality of Life in Louisville





Figure 2: Overall Quality of Life Compared by Year




Regarding other aspects that contribute to a high quality of life, over 9 in 10 participants gave high marks to Louisville as a place to live and to raise children. At least three-quarters of respondents rated the community as a place to retire and to work as excellent or good. Evaluations of Louisville as place to retire decreased from 2012 to 2016, while all other ratings remained stable over time.

It should be noted that about one-third of respondents selected “don’t know” when rating Louisville as a place to work. Ratings shown in the body of the report are for those who had an opinion. (For a full set of responses, including “don’t know,” see *Appendix A: Complete Set of Frequencies*.)

Ratings for these measures were much higher in Louisville than in national and Front Range comparison communities (see *Appendix D: Benchmark Comparisons*).

When ratings of aspects of quality of life were compared by respondent demographics, homeowners were more likely to give positive evaluations to the city as a place to live and as a place to raise children than were their counterparts, while those living in Ward 1 tended to give less positive ratings to these aspects than did those living in the other wards (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics* for more details).

Figure 3: Aspects of Quality of Life Compared by Year



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 18 specific characteristics of their city.

Overall, residents gave high marks to many of the 18 characteristics of Louisville. At least 9 in 10 respondents rated the overall image or reputation of Louisville (96%), ease of walking (91%), quality of overall natural environment (90%) and Louisville's overall appearance (90%) as excellent or good (see the table on the following page.) Additionally, 8 in 10 highly rated opportunities to participate in special events, the sense of community, recreational opportunities, opportunities to participate in community matters and ease of car travel in the city. Two-thirds or more evaluated opportunities to attend cultural activities, traffic flow and openness and acceptance of the community as excellent or good and less than 6 in 10 awarded high marks to shopping opportunities (58%), variety of housing options (42%), employment opportunities (41%) and availability of affordable quality housing (17%).

About half of the ratings for community characteristics were similar to those given in 2012; however, ratings for recreational opportunities, ease of car travel, openness and acceptance of the community, traffic flow on major streets, ease of bus travel, variety of housing options and availability of affordable quality housing were lower in 2016 compared to 2012. Positive evaluations for opportunities to participate in community matters increased from 2012 to 2016.

At least one-third of respondents selected "don't know" when rating the quality of employment opportunities and ease of bus travel (see *Appendix A: Complete Set of Frequencies* for a full set of responses, including "don't know").

Most ratings for community characteristics were much higher when compared to the national and Front Range benchmarks. Evaluations of shopping opportunities were similar to communities across the nation as well as the Front Range and ratings for the variety of housing options and availability of affordable quality housing were much lower than jurisdictions elsewhere in the country and the Front Range (see *Appendix D: Benchmark Comparisons*).

Younger respondents (18-34) were more likely to give excellent or good ratings to shopping opportunities and ease of car travel than older residents. Middle-aged residents (35-54) tended to give lower quality evaluations to shopping opportunities, the variety of housing options and ease of bus travel in Louisville. Renters were more likely than homeowners to give positive assessments to ease of bus travel. Overall, those living in detached housing units tended to give higher marks to most community characteristics than did those living in attached units. Residents from Ward 2 were more likely to give excellent or good assessments to the sense of community, ease of bicycle travel and ease of walking in the city than were those from other wards (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*).

Figure 4: Community Characteristics Compared by Year

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below: (Percent excellent or good)	2016	2012	2008	2004	1999	1994	1990
Overall image or reputation of Louisville	96%	98%	95%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ease of walking in Louisville	91%	92%	90%	88%	NA	NA	NA
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	90%	92%	87%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Overall appearance of Louisville	90%	89%	89%	85%	NA	NA	NA
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	89%	88%	89%	79%	NA	NA	NA
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	87%	87%	73%	NA	NA	79%	NA
Sense of community	87%	92%	82%	76%	NA	NA	NA
Recreational opportunities	84%	90%	85%	80%	NA	NA	NA
Opportunities to participate in community matters	84%	78%	75%	NA	NA	40%	NA
Ease of car travel in Louisville	82%	88%	88%	76%	NA	NA	NA
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	70%	81%	67%	68%	NA	NA	NA
Traffic flow on major streets	69%	80%	78%	61%	NA	NA	NA
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	68%	69%	60%	49%	NA	41%	NA
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	60%	67%	67%	62%	NA	NA	NA
Shopping opportunities	58%	53%	46%	60%	NA	NA	NA
Variety of housing options	42%	68%	61%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Employment opportunities	41%	39%	33%	25%	NA	NA	NA
Availability of affordable quality housing	17%	42%	39%	30%	NA	32%	NA

Safety in Louisville


Almost all Louisville residents indicated they felt safe in the downtown area, parks and in their neighborhoods during the day and a similar proportion felt safe from violent crime, in the downtown area and in their neighborhoods at night. At least 8 in 10 also reported they felt safe from property crimes and in Louisville's parks after dark.

Compared to ratings in 2012, fewer residents felt safe in Louisville's parks after dark and from property crimes in 2016. All other ratings of perceptions of safety were similar to 2012.

All safety ratings were much higher those given by residents in other communities across the nation and in the Front Range (see *Appendix D: Benchmark Comparisons*).

Few differences in safety ratings were observed by respondent demographics. Feelings of safety in Louisville's downtown after dark tended to decrease with age and length of residency. Those living in detached units felt safer in Louisville's parks after dark than did those living in attached units. No differences were observed by ward (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*).

Figure 5: Ratings of Safety from Crime and in Public Areas Compared 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 2012 and 2008.

Compared to other jurisdictions across the U.S. and those in Colorado's Front Range, Louisville's overall quality of services rating was much higher than both benchmarks (see *Appendix D: Benchmark Comparisons*).

When looking at ratings compared by respondent demographics, younger residents (18-34), newer residents (lived in the city five years or less) and renters tended to award higher marks to the overall quality of City services than did their counterparts (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*). No differences were observed by ward.

Figure 6: Overall Quality of City Services





Figure 7: Overall Quality of Services Compared by Year



Government Performance

Three-quarters or more of participants said that information about City Council, Planning Commission and other official City meetings, overall performance of the City government, the City’s website, information about City plans and programs and availability of City employees was excellent or good. About two-thirds rated the City’s response to citizen complaints or concerns highly and over half awarded high marks to programming on Louisville cable TV.

In 2016, most ratings for government performance were similar to those given in previous years. Evaluations of overall performance, City response to citizen complaints or concerns and programming on cable TV decreased since 2012.

At least 4 in 10 respondents said “don’t know” when evaluating the city’s response to citizen complaints or concerns, the availability of city employees and programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8 (see *Appendix A: Complete Set of Frequencies*).

Of the four items that could be compared to the national and Front Range benchmarks, ratings for information about City plans and programs, the City website and overall performance of Louisville government were higher or much higher than the averages. Programming on Louisville cable TV was rated lower than other communities across the nation (a comparison to the Front Range was not available, see *Appendix D: Benchmark Comparisons*).

Females, those living in detached units and those living in the community for 11 to 15 years tended to give more positive reviews to the information provided about City plans and programs than did their counterparts. Males and younger respondents (less than 55 years old) tended to give less favorable ratings to the programming on Louisville cable TV (Channel 8) than did females and older respondents (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*). No differences were observed by ward.

Figure 8: Government Performance Compared by Year

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the performance of the following areas of the City of Louisville: (Percent excellent or good)	2016	2012	2008	2004
Information about City Council, Planning Commission and other official City meetings	80%	78%	73%	74%
Overall performance of Louisville City government	78%	84%	76%	75%
Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	78%	78%	71%	75%
Information about City plans and programs	75%	74%	67%	69%
Availability of City Employees	75%	79%	74%	66%
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	67%	74%	66%	65%
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	57%	66%	66%	60%

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 911 service, overall performance of the department and the visibility of patrol cars highly. Close to 8 in 10 awarded excellent or good ratings for enforcement of traffic regulations and two-thirds evaluated municipal code enforcement positively. While ratings for enforcement of traffic regulations decreased since 2012, all other ratings remained stable over time.


About 6 in 10 respondents said “don’t know” when rating the quality of 911 services (see *Appendix A: Complete Set of Frequencies*).

When comparisons could be made, all ratings for police were much higher than the national and Front Range benchmarks (see *Appendix D: Benchmark Comparisons* for all comparisons).

When comparing results by demographics, younger residents (18-34) gave more positive marks to the visibility of patrol cars than older residents. Those living in detached housing units were more likely to give excellent or good ratings to the enforcement of traffic regulations than were those living in attached units (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*). No differences were observed by ward.

Figure 9: Ratings for the Louisville Police Department Compared by Year

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas related to the Louisville Police Department:



Planning and Building Safety Department

Between 60% and 71% of those with an opinion rated the aspects of the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department as excellent or good. Public input on planning issues was rated most positively, while the building permit process received less favorable ratings (see the figure on the following page).

It should be noted that at least 40% of respondents selected “don’t know” when assessing the quality of each of the planning and building safety services (see *Appendix A: Complete Set of Frequencies* for a full set of responses, including “don’t know”).


Ratings for the Planning and Building Safety Department tended to decrease since the last survey iteration, including building/construction inspection process (77% excellent or good in 2012 vs %65 in 2016), planning review process for new development (from 71% to 63%) and overall performance of the department (76% to 63%). Some of the difference in opinions could be at least partially attributable to changes in question wording.

The only item that could be compared to the benchmark database was the overall performance of the Louisville Planning Department. This rating was much higher the national benchmark (see *Appendix D: Benchmark Comparisons*). A Front Range comparison was not available.

Males, those living in attached units and households without children tended to give lower quality ratings to the public input process on City planning issues than did females, those living in detached units and households with children (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*). No differences were observed by ward.

Figure 10: Ratings for the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department Compared by Year

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas related to the Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department:



In 2012, "building/construction inspection process" was worded "building inspection."

Parks and Recreation

The Parks and Recreation Department is 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 14 services provided by the Parks and Recreation Department and at least two-thirds gave positive reviews to all aspects (ranging from 67% to 91% excellent or good). About 9 in 10 scored the adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds, maintenance of parks and maintenance of the trail system as excellent or good. Eight in 10 gave high marks to the following services: overall performance of the department, current programs for seniors and youth, maintenance of open space and medians and street landscaping, the maintenance and cleanliness of the Recreation Center, the overall quality of the Senior Center and the quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course.

Four services were rated lower in 2016 than in 2012: maintenance and cleanliness of the Louisville Recreation Center, overall quality of the Senior Center, current recreation programs for adults and overall quality of the community Recreation Center. All other 2016 ratings for the Parks and Recreation Department were similar to those given in 2012.

At least 40% of respondents said “don’t know” when rating the quality of the following parks and recreation services: current recreation programs for youth, current programs and services for seniors, overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center and overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course (see *Appendix A: Complete Set of Frequencies*).

Six of the 14 Parks and Recreation Department services could be compared to national benchmarks (see *Appendix D: Benchmark Comparisons*). Current recreation programs for youth, maintenance and cleanliness of the Louisville Recreation Center and maintenance of the trail system were evaluated much higher and the overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center, Senior Center and Coal Creek Golf Course were each rated lower or much lower than communities elsewhere. Of the two comparisons that could be made to other Front Range communities, ratings for the maintenance of the trail system was similar to other jurisdictions, while the overall quality of the Recreation Center was much lower.

Ratings of parks and recreation services were compared by respondent demographics and Council Ward. Respondents age 55 years or older tended to give more positive evaluations to current recreation programs for adults and the overall quality of the recreation center, while those 18 to 34 gave more positive assessments to the maintenance of parks, maintenance of open space and maintenance of medians and street landscaping. Residents living in the city for more than 15 years, households without children and households with older adults were less likely to give excellent or good ratings to the maintenance of parks, open space, trails and street landscaping than were their counterparts (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*). No differences were observed by ward.

Figure 11: Ratings for the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department Compared by Year

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas related to the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department: (Percent excellent or good)	2016	2012	2008	2004
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	91%	94%	91%	86%
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas, etc.)	90%	NA	NA	NA
Maintenance of the trail system	90%	90%	92%	85%
Overall performance of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department	89%	91%	88%	84%
Current programs and services for seniors	87%	91%	89%	86%
Maintenance of open space	87%	87%	87%	85%
Current recreation programs for youth	85%	88%	88%	86%
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	84%	NA	NA	NA
Maintenance and cleanliness of the Louisville Recreation Center	83%	91%	88%	85%
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	81%	87%	89%	86%
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	80%	76%	75%	71%
Current recreation programs for adults	77%	87%	79%	77%
Recreation fees in Louisville	75%	73%	64%	55%
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	67%	87%	82%	82%

In 2012, “overall quality” for the Recreation Center, Senior Center and Coal Creek Golf Course was worded “overall performance.”

Public Library

Of those who had an opinion, nearly all Louisville residents gave favorable ratings to library programs, services, the building and the overall performance of the Public Library. Nine in 10 awarded high marks to library services online, Internet and computer services, Historical Museum programs and the overall performance of the museum. At least 8 in 10 also gave positive scores to the Historical Museum campus and library materials and collections. All of these ratings remained stable over time.

Most aspects of the library or museum received “don’t know” responses from between 40% and 65% of respondents (see *Appendix A: Complete Set of Frequencies* for a full set of responses, including “don’t know”).

National benchmark comparisons were available for three of the seven (services at the library, materials and collections and overall performance) and each were higher or much higher than other communities. The overall performance of the Louisville Public Library was compared to the Front Range benchmark and was evaluated much higher (see *Appendix D: Benchmark Comparisons*).

Several differences were found when looking at evaluations of the library and museum by respondent demographics. Older respondents (35 years or older), females and those living in detached housing units were more likely to give positive evaluations to the to the internet and computer services at the library than were others. Females tended to give higher marks to the library’s online services and the Louisville Historical Museum campus than did males. Residents living in Ward 2 gave more positive reviews to the services at the library than those living in Wards 1 and 3 (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*).

Figure 12: Ratings for the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum Compared by Year

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas related to the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services: (Percent excellent or good)	2016	2012	2008	2004
Louisville Public Library programs (e.g., story time, One Book program, etc.)	98%	96%	93%	83%
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk check out, etc.)	98%	97%	92%	83%
Louisville Public Library building	97%	97%	96%	NA
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	96%	96%	94%	80%
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	93%	93%	NA	NA
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	92%	93%	90%	76%
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters)	90%	NA	NA	NA
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	89%	NA	NA	NA
Louisville Historical Museum campus	88%	NA	NA	NA
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	85%	84%	77%	62%

In 2016, the word “building” was added to the item “Louisville Public Library.”

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 wastewater, quality of City water, storm drainage and the overall performance of the department as excellent or good. Most respondents also awarded positive marks for street lighting (82%), access on sidewalks/crosswalks for disabled persons (82%), bike lanes (71%), street sweeping (71%) and street maintenance in Louisville (70%). Half of participants evaluated snow removal/street sanding highly.

Most ratings for public works services remained stable from 2012 to 2016, except for street sweeping, street maintenance in Louisville, street maintenance in neighborhoods and snow removal/street sanding, which decreased since the last survey was conducted.


One-third of respondents selected “don’t know” when rating the quality of access on sidewalks/crosswalks for disabled persons (see *Appendix A: Complete Set of Frequencies* for a full set of responses, including “don’t know”).

Eight of the 11 services could be compared to the national benchmark and five could be compared to the Front Range benchmark. Most of these services received ratings much higher than the national and Front Range benchmarks, except for snow removal/sanding, which was given a rating much lower than both the benchmarks and the quality of bike lanes, which was similar to the national benchmark. Comparisons to Front Range communities for bike lanes could not be made (see *Appendix D: Benchmark Comparisons*).

In general, ratings of street maintenance (in neighborhoods and in the City), street sweeping and storm drainage decreased as length of residency increased. Younger respondents (18-34) and renters tended to give more positive marks to street sweeping than did older respondents. Residents from Ward 1 tended to give lower ratings to snow removal and street sanding than did those from other wards (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*).

Figure 13: Ratings for Public Works Department Compared by Year

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the performance of the following areas of Louisville Public Works Department:



City Employees

At least 8 in 10 Louisville residents gave favorable scores to their interactions with City employees, including the employees’ courtesy, knowledge, availability, responsiveness/promptness and their overall impression of the employee they contacted. Compared to 2012 evaluations, only the responsiveness/promptness of employees decreased in 2016, while all other ratings remained similar. However, this could be due, in part, to changes in question wording from 2012 to 2016.

About 4 in 10 respondents selected “don’t know” when asked to evaluate the characteristics of City employees (see Appendix A: Complete Set of Frequencies) for a full set of responses, including “don’t know”). However, it is likely that a large proportion of those selecting “don’t know” did not have contact with a City employee.

While ratings for the availability of City employees could not be compared to the benchmarks, almost all other evaluation of employee characteristics were higher or much higher than comparisons to both the nation and Front Range. Ratings for the courtesy of Louisville employees were similar to other jurisdictions in the Front Range (see Appendix D: Benchmark Comparisons).

A few differences were seen in ratings of employee characteristics by respondent demographics. Females and households with older adults were more likely to give positive assessments to the courtesy of the employee with whom they interacted than did males and households without older adults. Households with children and homeowners tended to give lower ratings to the availability of the employee in their most recent contact than did their counterparts. Ward 3 residents were more likely to give favorable reviews to the employee’s knowledge and courtesy than were those living in other wards (see Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics).


Figure 14: Ratings for the Louisville Employees Compared by Year

If you have had any email, in-person or phone contact with a City of Louisville employee in the last 12 months, what was your impression of the employee in your most recent contact? (Percent excellent or good.)	2016	2012	2008	2004
Courtesy	90%	92%	86%	88%
Knowledge	89%	92%	89%	88%
Overall impression	85%	89%	84%	87%
Availability	84%	NA	NA	NA
Responsiveness/promptness	83%	89%	84%	86%

In 2016, a question asking if respondents had contact with a City employee in the 12 months prior the survey preceded this question. Therefore, ratings of employee characteristics were asked only of those who had contact. The wording for this question in 2012 was “What was your impression of the employee in your most recent contact?” In 2012, the item “responsiveness/promptness” was worded “responsiveness.”

Residents who had reported they had contacted a City of Louisville employee were asked to write in their own words the department with which they had contact. Responses were grouped into themes and categorized. The most frequently contacted departments as reported by respondents were planning/zoning/building, billing, the library or recreation center and public works. About 12% had contacted the police or fire department, while less than 1 in 10 had interacted with City Hall and Council or the parks and recreation/open space department. A list of the “other” departments contacted can be found in *Appendix C: Verbatim Responses to Open-ended Survey Questions*.

Figure 15: Department Contacted



Information Sources


Frequency of Use

Survey respondents were asked how frequently they used a variety of sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. Almost 9 in 10 reported they used *Community Update*, the City newsletter, at least sometimes and 8 in 10 relied on word of mouth. At least 7 in 10 had accessed the City’s website, the *Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly* or utility inserts to gain information. One-quarter or less reported that they sometimes, frequently or always used the Louisville’s email notices or attended, watched or streamed a City Council meeting.

Fewer residents reported using City Council meetings on Channel 8 or online to get City information in 2016 than in 2012, but more residents indicated they had used the City’s website or *Community Update* to gain information in 2016 than in 2012.

Use of information sources varied by respondent subgroups. Overall, use of the various sources for information about the City was higher as age increased, among homeowners, those who lived in detached housing units, those who had lived in the city for a longer period of time and households with older adults. Respondents from Ward 2 were more likely to have used each source than were those in Wards 1 and 3 (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*).

Figure 16: Frequency of Use of Information Sources Compared by Year




In 2016, the wording “streaming through the City’s website” was added to “Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting or other program on Comcast channel 8 (government access). In 2012, “The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly” was separated into two items.

Quality and Reliability

Respondents were also asked to rate the quality and reliability of the information from each source. The City newsletter, *Community Update*, was thought to be an excellent or good source of information about the City by 87% and about 8 in 10 or more awarded high marks to the City’s email notices and website. Only about half of residents rated word of mouth as at least good in terms of quality and reliability. All ratings for these items were similar to 2012 evaluations.

When evaluating the quality of the various information sources, at least 7 in 10 residents selected “don’t know” for attending, watching or streaming a City Council meeting on Channel 8 and City email notices (see *Appendix A: Complete Set of Frequencies* for a full set of responses, including “don’t know”). However, it is likely that a large proportion of those selecting “don’t know” do not use the source to get information about the City.


Figure 17: Quality and Reliability of Information Sources Compared by Year



In 2016, the wording “streaming through the City’s website” was added to “Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting or other program on Comcast channel 8 (government access). In 2012, “The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly” was separated into two items.

When asked to write in any other sources of information they used to gain information about the City, about one-third of those providing a response reported that they used Facebook, while less than 1 in 10 utilized other sources (all responses to open-ended questions can be found in *Appendix C: Verbatim Responses to Open-ended Survey Questions*).

Figure 18: Other Information Sources




Social Media Use

On the 2016 survey, participants were asked how likely they would be to use social media to look for official City information. About half of resident indicated they would be at least somewhat likely to use Facebook, Twitter or Instagram to gain information; 4 in 10 reported being very unlikely.

The likelihood of use of social media websites to look for official City information decreased as age increased. Females, renters, residents with a shorter tenure in the city (five years or less), households with three or four members, households with children and households without older adults were more likely to say they would look for City information on social media websites (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*).

Figure 19: Likelihood of Social Media Use



Resident Participation


Survey respondents were active in their community, with at least three-quarter saying that they had attended an event downtown (such as Art Walk, Taste of Louisville or a parade), used the public library or its services and attended the Downtown Louisville Street Faire. About one-third or less had attended an event, show or activity at the Arts Center, used Memory Square Pool, visited the Historical Museum or played golf at the golf course at least once in the past 12 months prior to the survey. These rates of participation were similar to rates reported in 2012.

When comparing rates of resident participation, Louisville residents reported much higher use of the public library and the recreation center compared to residents across the nation and the Front Range.

Overall, those 35 to 54, homeowners, households with five or more members, households with children, and those who had lived in the community for 11 to 15 years participated at higher rates than did their counterparts. Residents living in Ward 2 were more likely to use the recreation center, while residents living in Ward 1 were least likely (see Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics).

Figure 20: Resident Participation in Louisville Activities Compared by Year

In the last 12 months, about how many times, if ever, have you or other household members participated in the following activities in Louisville?



Planning and Policy Topics


Funding Priorities

To help the City prioritize potential projects, in 2016, residents were asked to rate the importance of funding several projects in Louisville (see the figure on the following page). About 9 in 10 indicated that maintaining, repairing and paving streets was essential or very important, while 8 in 10 prioritized maintaining the City's appearance/attractiveness. Two-thirds of participants rated encouraging sustainability as a priority for the City. Less than 2 in 10 thought that providing new outdoor multi-purpose turf fields or expanding the Historical Museum were essential or very important priorities. About half of respondents said that expanding the Historical Museum was not at all important.

The importance of the various funding priorities varied by respondent demographic characteristics and Ward of residence. Older residents (55 or older), those who had lived in the city for more than 15 years, smaller households (1-2 members), households without children and households with older adults were more likely to indicate that additional parking Downtown was essential or very important. Middle-aged residents (35-54), females, homeowners, those living in detached units, larger households and households with children were more likely to feel that providing additional recreation facilities and amenities was a priority for the city. Ward 3 residents tended to give higher importance ratings to outdoor community gathering spaces, incentives to create businesses and employment opportunities, providing financial incentives for redevelopment of the former Sam's Club and subsidizing affordable housing than residents from other wards (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics* for more information).


Figure 21: City Funding Priorities

Beyond basic City services (police, water, sewer, etc.), the City has limited resources and must make hard decisions about funding priorities. Indicate how important to you each of the following areas are as the City considers residents' current and future needs.



In addition to rating the importance of each potential priority, respondents were asked to select their top three from the list of 15 projects provided. Of all of the potential projects for the City of Louisville to fund, maintaining, repairing and paving streets was indicated to be one of respondents' top three priorities by almost 6 in 10 residents, while about one-quarter or more chose maintaining the City's appearance/attractiveness, subsidizing affordable housing, encouraging sustainability, providing additional recreation facilities and amenities and using incentives to create business and employment opportunities.

Figure 22: Top Three City Funding Priorities




Changes to Trash Service

Residents of Louisville were also asked to indicate their level of support for decreasing the frequency of trash pickup from once a week to once every two weeks while increasing the frequency of compost pickup from every two weeks to once a week. Over half of respondents indicated they were strongly opposed to decreasing trash service and only one-quarter of participant strongly or somewhat supported the change.

Respondents who were most likely to support the changes to the City’s trash service were female, renters, those living in attached units, households with one or two members, households without children and Ward 3 residents (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*).

Figure 23: Level of Support for Decreasing Frequency of Trash Pick-up

Currently, the City’s trash service (through Western Disposal) provides once per week trash pickup and compost and recycling pickup every two weeks. To what extent would you support or oppose changing the service to once per week compost pickup and trash pickup every two weeks (leaving recycling pickup every two weeks)?




Priorities for Redevelopment

Louisville residents were asked to rate their level of support for or opposition to rezoning the former Sam’s Club for different types of residential housing. Six in 10 indicated they would strongly or somewhat support senior housing and about half would support subsidized or multifamily housing; however, about 4 in 10 were strongly opposed to subsidized or multifamily housing options.

Levels of support for the various types of housing at the former Sam’s Club site differed by respondent characteristics. Younger residents (18-34), renters, shorter-term residents, households with fewer members and those without children were more supportive of including multifamily and subsidized housing at the former Sam’s Club site than were their counterparts. Older residents (55 or older), females, those living in attached units, households with one or two members, households with children and those with older adults were more in favor of including senior housing at the former Sam’s Club. No differences were observed by ward (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*).

Figure 24: Level of Support for Housing Options for Former Sam's Club Area


Most of the land zoned for residential uses in Louisville has been built out. In the former Sam's Club shopping area residential development is currently not allowed. If this area was to redevelop with retail and offices, to what extent would you support or oppose including any of the following types of housing?



Respondents were also asked if they would support or oppose different housing types in the US36/McCaslin area. The largest amount of support was for senior housing in the US36/McCaslin area, with 58% saying they would strongly or somewhat support this type of housing, followed by multifamily housing (55%). However, about one-quarter of residents voiced strongly support senior, subsidized or multifamily housing near the transit/bus station, but about one-third were strongly opposed to each of the three housing options.

The respondent subgroups that were more supportive of including the various types of housing at the former Sam’s Club site also were supportive of the same types of development at the US 36/McCaslin transit station (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*).

Figure 25: Level of Support for Housing Options for US36/McCaslin Area




Historic Preservation Tax Extension

Survey participants were asked if they would support extending the Historic Preservation Tax for another 10 years, which is set to expire in 2018. Over one-third strongly supported continuing the sales tax until 2028 and another 37% would somewhat support the measure; less than 2 in 10 strongly opposed it. Similarly, over two-thirds of respondents would at least somewhat support extending the tax and dedicating a portion of the proceeds for operation costs for the Louisville Historical Museum; only 2 in 10 were strongly opposed to this option.

Female residents, renters and households with fewer members were more likely to support the continuation of the existing historic preservation tax and the continuing the tax while dedicating a portion of it to help operate the museum (see *Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics*).

Figure 26: Level of Support for Historic Preservation Tax Options

The City of Louisville currently has a Historic Preservation Tax, which is a dedicated sales tax (0.125 cents on every dollar spent). Revenue from this tax is used to help property owners rehabilitate and preserve historic landmarks which contribute to the character of Historic Old Town Louisville. This tax was approved by voters in 2008 and is set to expire in 2018. To what extent would you support or oppose each of the following options to continue the tax?



Appendix A: Complete Set of Frequencies

Frequencies Excluding “Don’t Know” Responses

The following pages contain a complete set of responses to each question on the survey excluding the “don’t know” responses.

Table 1: Question 1

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the quality of life in Louisville:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
How do you rate Louisville as a place to live?	69%	N=544	28%	N=222	2%	N=19	0%	N=1	100%	N=785
How do you rate Louisville as a place to raise children?	75%	N=495	22%	N=146	2%	N=15	0%	N=1	100%	N=657
How do you rate Louisville as a place to retire?	43%	N=242	36%	N=201	17%	N=96	4%	N=25	100%	N=565
How do you rate Louisville as a place to work?	36%	N=179	40%	N=200	20%	N=98	5%	N=24	100%	N=501
How do you rate the overall quality of life in Louisville?	60%	N=466	37%	N=285	3%	N=25	0%	N=1	100%	N=777

Table 2: Question 2

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sense of community	42%	N=322	45%	N=346	12%	N=89	2%	N=12	100%	N=769
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	25%	N=174	45%	N=312	24%	N=167	5%	N=36	100%	N=689
Overall appearance of Louisville	34%	N=263	56%	N=439	9%	N=71	1%	N=7	100%	N=780
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	20%	N=150	47%	N=345	26%	N=192	6%	N=46	100%	N=733
Shopping opportunities	12%	N=95	45%	N=351	35%	N=274	7%	N=55	100%	N=774
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	36%	N=269	51%	N=381	11%	N=83	2%	N=14	100%	N=747
Opportunities to participate in community matters	32%	N=227	52%	N=369	14%	N=103	2%	N=13	100%	N=712
Recreational opportunities	41%	N=313	44%	N=339	13%	N=101	2%	N=19	100%	N=772
Employment opportunities	10%	N=49	31%	N=155	45%	N=224	14%	N=71	100%	N=499
Variety of housing options	9%	N=65	33%	N=239	38%	N=277	20%	N=144	100%	N=726
Availability of affordable quality housing	4%	N=27	13%	N=89	36%	N=242	47%	N=319	100%	N=677
Ease of car travel in Louisville	30%	N=237	52%	N=404	14%	N=112	3%	N=25	100%	N=778
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	20%	N=99	40%	N=202	29%	N=147	12%	N=59	100%	N=507

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	46%	N=323	44%	N=307	9%	N=64	1%	N=10	100%	N=705
Ease of walking in Louisville	50%	N=387	41%	N=317	7%	N=57	2%	N=12	100%	N=773
Traffic flow on major streets	20%	N=156	49%	N=383	25%	N=197	6%	N=48	100%	N=784
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	35%	N=274	55%	N=425	9%	N=70	1%	N=7	100%	N=777
Overall image or reputation of Louisville	61%	N=476	35%	N=269	4%	N=31	0%	N=1	100%	N=777

Table 3: Question 3

Please rate how safe you feel:	Very safe		Somewhat safe		Neither safe nor unsafe		Somewhat unsafe		Very unsafe		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
From violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	81%	N=636	16%	N=128	2%	N=14	0%	N=4	0%	N=2	100%	N=783
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	43%	N=339	44%	N=348	8%	N=59	4%	N=29	1%	N=7	100%	N=782
In your neighborhood during the day	86%	N=671	12%	N=94	2%	N=14	0%	N=2	0%	N=2	100%	N=784
In your neighborhood after dark	63%	N=493	30%	N=237	5%	N=35	2%	N=13	0%	N=2	100%	N=780
In Louisville's downtown area during the day	89%	N=688	10%	N=80	1%	N=4	0%	N=0	0%	N=2	100%	N=774
In Louisville's downtown area after dark	65%	N=478	29%	N=214	6%	N=41	1%	N=6	0%	N=1	100%	N=740
In Louisville's parks during the day	85%	N=648	14%	N=106	1%	N=9	0%	N=0	1%	N=4	100%	N=766
In Louisville's parks after dark	42%	N=276	41%	N=271	12%	N=78	4%	N=28	1%	N=3	100%	N=657

Table 4: Question 4

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the performance of the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	20%	N=89	47%	N=210	25%	N=109	8%	N=35	100%	N=444
Information about City Council, Planning Commission and other official City meetings	24%	N=151	56%	N=356	16%	N=101	4%	N=26	100%	N=634
Information about City plans and programs	22%	N=147	53%	N=354	19%	N=126	6%	N=42	100%	N=668
Availability of City Employees	25%	N=107	50%	N=215	22%	N=93	4%	N=17	100%	N=432
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	15%	N=25	42%	N=72	32%	N=55	12%	N=20	100%	N=172
Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	17%	N=95	61%	N=340	18%	N=101	4%	N=24	100%	N=559
Overall performance of Louisville City government	14%	N=92	64%	N=425	20%	N=130	2%	N=12	100%	N=659

Table 5: Question 5

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas related to the Louisville Police Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Visibility of patrol cars	40%	N=303	49%	N=373	8%	N=60	3%	N=24	100%	N=759
911 service	56%	N=178	37%	N=117	6%	N=19	1%	N=2	100%	N=315
Enforcement of traffic regulations	29%	N=179	50%	N=306	16%	N=101	5%	N=30	100%	N=616
Municipal code enforcement issues (dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	21%	N=117	47%	N=260	23%	N=126	10%	N=55	100%	N=557
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	38%	N=268	52%	N=366	8%	N=57	1%	N=10	100%	N=701

Table 6: Question 6

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas of Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
The public input process on City planning issues	21%	N=99	50%	N=230	23%	N=108	6%	N=26	100%	N=462
Planning review process for new development	19%	N=76	44%	N=179	24%	N=99	13%	N=54	100%	N=407
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning Department	16%	N=68	47%	N=199	25%	N=108	12%	N=50	100%	N=426
Building permit process	18%	N=53	43%	N=127	28%	N=84	11%	N=34	100%	N=298
Building/construction inspection process	20%	N=58	45%	N=133	26%	N=75	10%	N=29	100%	N=295

Table 7: Question 7

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Current recreation programs for youth	31%	N=145	54%	N=251	13%	N=59	2%	N=11	100%	N=467
Current recreation programs for adults	25%	N=142	51%	N=289	20%	N=113	3%	N=19	100%	N=563
Current programs and services for seniors	36%	N=130	51%	N=183	11%	N=39	2%	N=6	100%	N=358
Recreation fees in Louisville	26%	N=163	49%	N=303	21%	N=130	4%	N=25	100%	N=621
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	19%	N=127	47%	N=308	27%	N=176	6%	N=41	100%	N=652
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	29%	N=77	51%	N=135	16%	N=43	3%	N=8	100%	N=264
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	22%	N=63	57%	N=162	17%	N=49	3%	N=8	100%	N=281
Maintenance and cleanliness of the Louisville Recreation Center	32%	N=204	51%	N=320	15%	N=91	2%	N=14	100%	N=629
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	44%	N=329	47%	N=350	8%	N=56	1%	N=7	100%	N=743
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas, etc.)	41%	N=305	49%	N=367	8%	N=60	1%	N=11	100%	N=744
Maintenance of open space	40%	N=298	47%	N=346	10%	N=77	3%	N=19	100%	N=739
Maintenance of the trail system	44%	N=319	46%	N=336	9%	N=64	1%	N=7	100%	N=725
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	29%	N=221	55%	N=413	14%	N=104	3%	N=19	100%	N=757
Overall performance of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department	33%	N=246	56%	N=422	10%	N=76	1%	N=9	100%	N=753

Table 8: Question 8

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about 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.)	59%	N=247	39%	N=164	2%	N=10	0%	N=0	100%	N=420
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk check out, etc.)	64%	N=363	34%	N=192	2%	N=13	0%	N=2	100%	N=569
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	44%	N=178	48%	N=192	8%	N=30	0%	N=1	100%	N=401
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	55%	N=251	38%	N=173	7%	N=33	0%	N=0	100%	N=457
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	33%	N=181	51%	N=278	14%	N=79	1%	N=5	100%	N=544
Louisville Public Library building	63%	N=380	35%	N=212	3%	N=16	0%	N=0	100%	N=607
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	56%	N=325	40%	N=232	3%	N=19	0%	N=1	100%	N=577
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters)	40%	N=109	49%	N=132	10%	N=26	1%	N=2	100%	N=269
Louisville Historical Museum campus	37%	N=102	51%	N=141	11%	N=29	1%	N=3	100%	N=275
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	41%	N=117	48%	N=139	11%	N=31	0%	N=1	100%	N=288

Table 9: Question 9

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the performance of the following areas of Louisville Public Works Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	17%	N=132	47%	N=354	26%	N=200	10%	N=72	100%	N=758
Street maintenance in Louisville	16%	N=120	54%	N=405	25%	N=188	6%	N=42	100%	N=754
Street sweeping	17%	N=121	53%	N=369	24%	N=164	6%	N=41	100%	N=694
Snow removal/street sanding	12%	N=90	38%	N=290	31%	N=237	18%	N=137	100%	N=754
Street lighting, signage and street markings	22%	N=162	61%	N=457	16%	N=118	2%	N=14	100%	N=752
Waste water (sewage system)	29%	N=187	63%	N=398	7%	N=42	1%	N=6	100%	N=632
Storm drainage (flooding management)	26%	N=171	63%	N=413	10%	N=67	1%	N=6	100%	N=657
Bike lanes on Louisville streets	22%	N=153	49%	N=345	25%	N=177	4%	N=26	100%	N=701
Access on sidewalks/crosswalks for disabled persons	24%	N=122	57%	N=290	15%	N=76	3%	N=17	100%	N=505
Quality of Louisville water	42%	N=312	48%	N=357	8%	N=56	2%	N=13	100%	N=738
Overall performance of Louisville Public Works Department	22%	N=162	66%	N=487	12%	N=86	1%	N=4	100%	N=738

Table 10: Question 10

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?	29%	N=213	64%	N=476	6%	N=45	1%	N=5	100%	N=739

Table 11: Question 11

If you have had any email, in-person or phone contact with a City of Louisville employee in the last 12 months, what was your impression of the employee in your most recent contact? (Rate each characteristic below.)	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Knowledge	46%	N=180	43%	N=170	6%	N=24	5%	N=21	100%	N=395
Responsiveness/promptness	47%	N=188	36%	N=142	9%	N=37	8%	N=30	100%	N=397
Availability	47%	N=187	37%	N=144	9%	N=34	7%	N=28	100%	N=394
Courtesy	57%	N=226	33%	N=133	5%	N=21	5%	N=19	100%	N=399
Overall impression	49%	N=194	36%	N=145	9%	N=35	6%	N=23	100%	N=397

Table 12: Question 11a

List the department the employee you most recently contacted works in	Percent	Number
City Hall and Council	9%	N=25
Library or Rec Center	15%	N=45
Billing	16%	N=47
Planning/Zoning/Building	16%	N=48
Parks and Rec/Open Space	8%	N=23
Police/Fire	12%	N=36
Public Works	13%	N=40
Other	10%	N=31
Total	100%	N=294

Table 13: Question 12

In the last 12 months, about how many times, if ever, have you or other household members participated in the following activities in Louisville?	Never		Once or twice		3 to 12 times		13 to 26 times		More than 26 times		Total	
Played golf at the Coal Creek Golf Course	82%	N=621	11%	N=81	5%	N=41	1%	N=8	1%	N=10	100%	N=762
Used the Louisville Public Library or its services	22%	N=166	15%	N=113	28%	N=213	18%	N=136	18%	N=136	100%	N=763
Used the Louisville Recreation Center	26%	N=197	16%	N=126	22%	N=164	13%	N=99	23%	N=177	100%	N=762
Used Memory Square Pool	67%	N=509	14%	N=107	13%	N=100	3%	N=24	2%	N=18	100%	N=760
Visited the Louisville Historical Museum	71%	N=541	23%	N=178	4%	N=31	1%	N=4	1%	N=6	100%	N=759
Attended the Downtown Louisville Street Faire (9 nights in 2015)	22%	N=171	35%	N=264	40%	N=307	1%	N=9	1%	N=10	100%	N=761
Attended an event, show or activity at the Arts Center	63%	N=482	28%	N=217	7%	N=54	0%	N=4	1%	N=6	100%	N=763
Attended another event downtown (Art Walk, Taste of Lsvl, parade, Winter Skate)	20%	N=149	37%	N=283	40%	N=303	3%	N=23	1%	N=5	100%	N=763

Table 14: Question 13

Beyond basic City services (police, water, sewer, etc.), the City has limited resources and must make hard decisions about funding priorities. Indicate how important to you each of the following areas are as the City considers residents' current and future needs.	Essential		Very important		Somewhat important		Not at all important		Total	
Maintaining, repairing, and paving streets	47%	N=349	42%	N=312	11%	N=83	1%	N=6	100%	N=750
Encouraging sustainability (in buildings, energy and water use, recycling, etc.) for both residential and commercial properties	22%	N=160	45%	N=327	28%	N=207	5%	N=39	100%	N=733
Creating an indoor community gathering space (arts center, community center, etc.)	4%	N=29	25%	N=181	52%	N=384	19%	N=140	100%	N=735
Creating an outdoor community gathering space (amphitheater, commons, etc.)	6%	N=42	31%	N=226	46%	N=338	18%	N=130	100%	N=735
Providing additional recreation facilities and amenities	18%	N=133	31%	N=230	40%	N=295	10%	N=76	100%	N=734
Expanding Internet/broadband options	17%	N=125	29%	N=211	35%	N=258	19%	N=137	100%	N=731
Using incentives to create business and employment opportunities	17%	N=124	41%	N=301	33%	N=241	9%	N=69	100%	N=735
Maintaining the City's appearance/attractiveness	28%	N=205	51%	N=373	21%	N=154	1%	N=5	100%	N=737
Providing additional parking in Downtown Louisville	18%	N=132	32%	N=238	34%	N=254	16%	N=122	100%	N=746
Providing financial incentives for the redevelopment of the vacant former Sam's Club property	15%	N=110	31%	N=232	34%	N=252	20%	N=151	100%	N=745
Increasing the amount of open space maintenance	10%	N=72	26%	N=191	47%	N=347	17%	N=126	100%	N=737
Increasing the amount of parks maintenance	6%	N=42	23%	N=169	55%	N=400	17%	N=123	100%	N=733
Providing new outdoor multi-purpose turf fields (soccer, football, etc.)	6%	N=46	15%	N=108	43%	N=316	36%	N=261	100%	N=731
Expanding the Louisville Historical Museum	3%	N=22	9%	N=63	41%	N=300	48%	N=350	100%	N=735
Subsidizing affordable housing	18%	N=137	22%	N=167	33%	N=243	27%	N=200	100%	N=746

Table 15: Question 13a

What are the top issues for the City Council to invest in today? (Please select up to three responses.)	Percent	Number
Maintaining, repairing, and paving streets	57%	N=402
Encouraging sustainability (in buildings, energy and water use, recycling, etc.) for both residential and commercial properties	27%	N=195
Creating an indoor community gathering space (arts center, community center, etc.)	7%	N=52
Creating an outdoor community gathering space (amphitheater, commons, etc.)	9%	N=65
Providing additional recreation facilities and amenities	26%	N=189
Expanding Internet/broadband options	18%	N=130
Using incentives to create business and employment opportunities	25%	N=175
Maintaining the City's appearance/attractiveness	29%	N=207
Providing additional parking in Downtown Louisville	24%	N=173
Providing financial incentives for the redevelopment of the vacant former Sam's Club property	22%	N=156
Increasing the amount of open space maintenance	9%	N=67
Increasing the amount of parks maintenance	4%	N=26
Providing new outdoor multi-purpose turf fields (soccer, football, etc.)	7%	N=48
Expanding the Louisville Historical Museum	3%	N=18
Subsidizing affordable housing	29%	N=207
Total	100%	N=712

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

Table 16: Question 14

	Strongly support		Somewhat support		Somewhat oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
Currently, the City's trash service (through Western Disposal) provides once per week trash pickup and compost and recycling pickup every two weeks. To what extent would you support or oppose changing the service to once per week compost pickup and trash p	9%	N=61	17%	N=118	19%	N=128	55%	N=373	100%	N=680

Table 17: Question 15

The City of Louisville currently has a Historic Preservation Tax, which is a dedicated sales tax (0.125 cents on every dollar spent). Revenue from this tax is used to help property owners rehabilitate and preserve historic landmarks which contribute to the character of Historic Old Town Louisville. This tax was approved by voters in 2008 and is set to expire in 2018. To what extent would you support or oppose each of the following options to continue the tax?	Strongly support		Somewhat support		Somewhat oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
Continue the existing sales tax until 2028	37%	N=262	37%	N=264	10%	N=69	16%	N=114	100%	N=710
Continue the existing sales tax until 2028 and also dedicate a portion of the tax to help operate the Louisville Historical Museum	28%	N=199	39%	N=271	15%	N=102	18%	N=129	100%	N=701

Table 18: Question 16

Most of the land zoned for residential uses in Louisville has been built out. In the former Sam’s Club shopping area residential development is currently not allowed. If this area was to redevelop with retail and offices, to what extent would you support or oppose including any of the following types of housing?	Strongly support		Somewhat support		Somewhat oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
Multifamily housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	25%	N=185	28%	N=210	10%	N=77	37%	N=280	100%	N=752
Subsidized housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	26%	N=198	20%	N=153	12%	N=87	41%	N=311	100%	N=749
Senior housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	29%	N=220	31%	N=230	12%	N=93	28%	N=208	100%	N=750

Table 19: Question 17

In the area near the US36/McCaslin transit/bus station residential development is currently not allowed. If this area was to redevelop with retail and offices, to what extent would you support or oppose including any of the following types of housing?	Strongly support		Somewhat support		Somewhat oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Multifamily housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	23%	N=166	32%	N=234	10%	N=70	35%	N=256	100%	N=727
Subsidized housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	25%	N=174	26%	N=176	10%	N=71	39%	N=265	100%	N=687
Senior housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	24%	N=178	34%	N=248	12%	N=90	29%	N=213	100%	N=728

Table 20: Question 18

Following is a list of information sources. Please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville.	Always		Frequently		Sometimes		Never		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting or other program on Comcast channel 8 (government access) or online	0%	N=2	2%	N=19	18%	N=139	79%	N=612	100%	N=772
Community Update (City Newsletter)	32%	N=246	33%	N=254	24%	N=184	11%	N=83	100%	N=767
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	21%	N=160	25%	N=193	30%	N=230	24%	N=186	100%	N=769
The City of Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	7%	N=56	19%	N=150	49%	N=379	24%	N=184	100%	N=768
City's email notices (eNotification)	6%	N=43	9%	N=71	12%	N=94	73%	N=551	100%	N=760
Utility bill inserts	23%	N=175	23%	N=175	26%	N=196	29%	N=219	100%	N=766
Word of mouth	13%	N=98	34%	N=261	39%	N=300	14%	N=106	100%	N=765

Table 21: Question 18a

Following is a list of information sources. Indicate the quality of the information from that source.	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting or other program on Comcast channel 8 (government access) or online	7%	N=13	64%	N=108	22%	N=37	7%	N=12	100%	N=169
Community Update (City Newsletter)	25%	N=156	62%	N=393	12%	N=76	1%	N=4	100%	N=630
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	11%	N=59	59%	N=315	27%	N=146	3%	N=17	100%	N=536
The City of Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	17%	N=87	64%	N=335	17%	N=90	2%	N=13	100%	N=524
City's email notices (eNotification)	23%	N=44	61%	N=116	14%	N=26	3%	N=5	100%	N=191
Utility bill inserts	21%	N=106	55%	N=277	21%	N=105	3%	N=15	100%	N=503
Word of mouth	8%	N=44	43%	N=237	42%	N=235	7%	N=39	100%	N=555

Table 22: Question 19

What sources, other than those listed above, would you or do you use to get information about the City of Louisville?	Percent	Number
Facebook	34%	N=74
Street signs	8%	N=17
Library/Rec Center	9%	N=19
Web news (Denver Post, Nextdoor.com, Google)	6%	N=13
City staff (phone or in-person)	4%	N=10
Other	17%	N=36
None/NA	22%	N=48
Total	100%	N=216

Table 23: Question 20

How likely, if at all, would you be to look for official City information on social media websites (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc.) if the City were to increase its presence or activity?	Percent	Number
Very likely	22%	N=166
Somewhat likely	23%	N=176
Somewhat unlikely	11%	N=84
Very unlikely	43%	N=324
Total	100%	N=750

Table 24: Question 21

Comments	Percent	Number
Development and affordable housing	22%	N=41
Responses to Question 20	41%	N=78
Recreation, open space, programs	14%	N=26
Positive comments	6%	N=12
Other	18%	N=35
Total	100%	N=192

Table 25: Question D1

How many years have you lived in Louisville?	Percent	Number
Less than 1 year	10%	N=78
1-5 years	25%	N=197
6-10 years	18%	N=137
11-15 years	10%	N=78
More than 15 years	37%	N=292
Total	100%	N=783

Table 26: Question D2

Which best describes the building you live in?	Percent	Number
One family house detached from any other houses	74%	N=578
House attached to one or more houses (e.g., a duplex or townhome)	7%	N=58
Building with two or more apartments or condominiums	18%	N=137
Mobile home	0%	N=3
Other	1%	N=6
Total	100%	N=782

Table 27: Question D3

Do you rent or own your home?	Percent	Number
Rent	27%	N=209
Own	73%	N=572
Total	100%	N=781

Table 28: Question D4

What is your gender	Percent	Number
Female	51%	N=396
Male	49%	N=380
Total	100%	N=776

Table 29: Question D5

In which category is your age?	Percent	Number
18-24 years	2%	N=15
25-34 years	21%	N=163
35-44 years	22%	N=173
45-54 years	24%	N=183
55-64 years	16%	N=124
65-74 years	9%	N=74
75 years or older	6%	N=47
Total	100%	N=778

Table 30: Question D6

How many people (including yourself) currently live in your household?	Percent	Number
1	18%	N=141
2	33%	N=256
3	21%	N=159
4	23%	N=173
5 or more	5%	N=40
Total	100%	N=770

Table 31: Question D7

Do any children 17 or under live in your household?	Percent	Number
No	60%	N=468
Yes	40%	N=312
Total	100%	N=781

Table 32: Question D8

Are you or any other members of your household aged 60 or older?	Percent	Number
No	75%	N=583
Yes	25%	N=198
Total	100%	N=781

Frequencies Including “Don’t Know” Response

The following pages contain a complete set of responses to each question on the survey including the number of responses and the “don’t know” responses.

Table 33: Question 1

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the quality of life in Louisville:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
How do you rate Louisville as a place to live?	69%	N=544	28%	N=222	2%	N=19	0%	N=1	0%	N=1	100%	N=786
How do you rate Louisville as a place to raise children?	64%	N=495	19%	N=146	2%	N=15	0%	N=1	15%	N=120	100%	N=777
How do you rate Louisville as a place to retire?	31%	N=242	26%	N=201	12%	N=96	3%	N=25	27%	N=212	100%	N=776
How do you rate Louisville as a place to work?	23%	N=179	26%	N=200	13%	N=98	3%	N=24	35%	N=272	100%	N=773
How do you rate the overall quality of life in Louisville?	60%	N=466	37%	N=285	3%	N=25	0%	N=1	0%	N=3	100%	N=780

Table 34: Question 2

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sense of community	41%	N=322	44%	N=346	11%	N=89	2%	N=12	2%	N=13	100%	N=781
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	22%	N=174	40%	N=312	21%	N=167	5%	N=36	12%	N=93	100%	N=782
Overall appearance of Louisville	34%	N=263	56%	N=439	9%	N=71	1%	N=7	0%	N=1	100%	N=781
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	19%	N=150	44%	N=345	25%	N=192	6%	N=46	6%	N=50	100%	N=783
Shopping opportunities	12%	N=95	45%	N=351	35%	N=274	7%	N=55	1%	N=6	100%	N=780
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	34%	N=269	49%	N=381	11%	N=83	2%	N=14	5%	N=36	100%	N=783
Opportunities to participate in community matters	29%	N=227	47%	N=369	13%	N=103	2%	N=13	9%	N=72	100%	N=784
Recreational opportunities	40%	N=313	43%	N=339	13%	N=101	2%	N=19	2%	N=13	100%	N=785
Employment opportunities	6%	N=49	20%	N=155	29%	N=224	9%	N=71	36%	N=282	100%	N=780
Variety of housing options	8%	N=65	31%	N=239	36%	N=277	18%	N=144	7%	N=55	100%	N=780
Availability of affordable quality housing	3%	N=27	11%	N=89	31%	N=242	41%	N=319	13%	N=103	100%	N=780
Ease of car travel in Louisville	30%	N=237	52%	N=404	14%	N=112	3%	N=25	0%	N=3	100%	N=781

Please rate Louisville as a community on each of the items listed below:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	13%	N=99	26%	N=202	19%	N=147	8%	N=59	35%	N=274	100%	N=780
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	41%	N=323	39%	N=307	8%	N=64	1%	N=10	10%	N=77	100%	N=782
Ease of walking in Louisville	50%	N=387	41%	N=317	7%	N=57	2%	N=12	1%	N=8	100%	N=781
Traffic flow on major streets	20%	N=156	49%	N=383	25%	N=197	6%	N=48	0%	N=1	100%	N=785
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	35%	N=274	55%	N=425	9%	N=70	1%	N=7	0%	N=3	100%	N=780
Overall image or reputation of Louisville	61%	N=476	34%	N=269	4%	N=31	0%	N=1	1%	N=8	100%	N=785

Table 35: Question 3

Please rate how safe you feel:	Very safe		Somewhat safe		Neither safe nor unsafe		Somewhat unsafe		Very unsafe		Don't know		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
From violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	81%	N=636	16%	N=128	2%	N=14	0%	N=4	0%	N=2	0%	N=2	100%	N=785
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	43%	N=339	44%	N=348	8%	N=59	4%	N=29	1%	N=7	1%	N=4	100%	N=786
In your neighborhood during the day	85%	N=671	12%	N=94	2%	N=14	0%	N=2	0%	N=2	0%	N=2	100%	N=786
In your neighborhood after dark	63%	N=493	30%	N=237	5%	N=35	2%	N=13	0%	N=2	1%	N=6	100%	N=785
In Louisville's downtown area during the day	88%	N=688	10%	N=80	1%	N=4	0%	N=0	0%	N=2	1%	N=11	100%	N=785
In Louisville's downtown area after dark	61%	N=478	27%	N=214	5%	N=41	1%	N=6	0%	N=1	5%	N=43	100%	N=783
In Louisville's parks during the day	82%	N=648	13%	N=106	1%	N=9	0%	N=0	0%	N=4	2%	N=19	100%	N=785
In Louisville's parks after dark	35%	N=276	34%	N=271	10%	N=78	4%	N=28	0%	N=3	16%	N=130	100%	N=787

Table 36: Question 4

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the performance of the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	11%	N=89	27%	N=210	14%	N=109	5%	N=35	43%	N=334	100%	N=777
Information about City Council, Planning Commission and other official City meetings	19%	N=151	46%	N=356	13%	N=101	3%	N=26	19%	N=144	100%	N=778
Information about City plans and programs	19%	N=147	46%	N=354	16%	N=126	5%	N=42	14%	N=108	100%	N=776
Availability of City Employees	14%	N=107	28%	N=215	12%	N=93	2%	N=17	44%	N=345	100%	N=776
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	3%	N=25	9%	N=72	7%	N=55	3%	N=20	78%	N=602	100%	N=774
Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	12%	N=95	44%	N=340	13%	N=101	3%	N=24	28%	N=214	100%	N=773
Overall performance of Louisville City government	12%	N=92	55%	N=425	17%	N=130	2%	N=12	15%	N=118	100%	N=777

Table 37: Question 5

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas related to the Louisville Police Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Visibility of patrol cars	39%	N=303	48%	N=373	8%	N=60	3%	N=24	3%	N=22	100%	N=781
911 service	23%	N=178	15%	N=117	2%	N=19	0%	N=2	59%	N=463	100%	N=779
Enforcement of traffic regulations	23%	N=179	39%	N=306	13%	N=101	4%	N=30	21%	N=160	100%	N=777
Municipal code enforcement issues (dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	15%	N=117	33%	N=260	16%	N=126	7%	N=55	29%	N=222	100%	N=779
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	34%	N=268	47%	N=366	7%	N=57	1%	N=10	10%	N=76	100%	N=776

Table 38: Question 6

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas of Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
The public input process on City planning issues	13%	N=99	30%	N=230	14%	N=108	3%	N=26	40%	N=315	100%	N=777
Planning review process for new development	10%	N=76	23%	N=179	13%	N=99	7%	N=54	47%	N=366	100%	N=774
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning Department	9%	N=68	26%	N=199	14%	N=108	7%	N=50	45%	N=344	100%	N=770
Building permit process	7%	N=53	16%	N=127	11%	N=84	4%	N=34	62%	N=478	100%	N=775
Building/construction inspection process	7%	N=58	17%	N=133	10%	N=75	4%	N=29	62%	N=481	100%	N=776

Table 39: Question 7

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Current recreation programs for youth	19%	N=145	32%	N=251	8%	N=59	1%	N=11	40%	N=313	100%	N=779
Current recreation programs for adults	18%	N=142	37%	N=289	15%	N=113	2%	N=19	28%	N=214	100%	N=778
Current programs and services for seniors	17%	N=130	23%	N=183	5%	N=39	1%	N=6	54%	N=420	100%	N=778
Recreation fees in Louisville	21%	N=163	39%	N=303	17%	N=130	3%	N=25	20%	N=154	100%	N=775
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	16%	N=127	40%	N=308	23%	N=176	5%	N=41	16%	N=127	100%	N=779
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	10%	N=77	17%	N=135	6%	N=43	1%	N=8	66%	N=513	100%	N=777
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	8%	N=63	21%	N=162	6%	N=49	1%	N=8	64%	N=492	100%	N=773
Maintenance and cleanliness of the Louisville Recreation Center	26%	N=204	41%	N=320	12%	N=91	2%	N=14	19%	N=149	100%	N=779
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	42%	N=329	45%	N=350	7%	N=56	1%	N=7	4%	N=33	100%	N=776
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas, etc.)	39%	N=305	47%	N=367	8%	N=60	1%	N=11	5%	N=36	100%	N=780
Maintenance of open space	38%	N=298	44%	N=346	10%	N=77	2%	N=19	5%	N=39	100%	N=778
Maintenance of the trail system	41%	N=319	43%	N=336	8%	N=64	1%	N=7	7%	N=51	100%	N=776
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	28%	N=221	53%	N=413	13%	N=104	2%	N=19	3%	N=22	100%	N=778
Overall performance of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department	32%	N=246	54%	N=422	10%	N=76	1%	N=9	3%	N=27	100%	N=780

Table 40: Question 8

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about 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.)	32%	N=247	21%	N=164	1%	N=10	0%	N=0	45%	N=342	100%	N=762
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk check out, etc.)	48%	N=363	25%	N=192	2%	N=13	0%	N=2	25%	N=194	100%	N=763
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	23%	N=178	25%	N=192	4%	N=30	0%	N=1	47%	N=360	100%	N=762
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	33%	N=251	23%	N=173	4%	N=33	0%	N=0	40%	N=305	100%	N=762
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	24%	N=181	37%	N=278	10%	N=79	1%	N=5	29%	N=219	100%	N=763
Louisville Public Library building	50%	N=380	28%	N=212	2%	N=16	0%	N=0	20%	N=155	100%	N=762
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	43%	N=325	31%	N=232	3%	N=19	0%	N=1	24%	N=178	100%	N=755
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters)	14%	N=109	17%	N=132	3%	N=26	0%	N=2	65%	N=490	100%	N=759
Louisville Historical Museum campus	13%	N=102	19%	N=141	4%	N=29	0%	N=3	64%	N=485	100%	N=760
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	15%	N=117	18%	N=139	4%	N=31	0%	N=1	62%	N=472	100%	N=760

Table 41: Question 9

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the performance of the following areas of Louisville Public Works Department:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	17%	N=132	46%	N=354	26%	N=200	9%	N=72	1%	N=9	100%	N=767
Street maintenance in Louisville	16%	N=120	53%	N=405	25%	N=188	5%	N=42	1%	N=11	100%	N=765
Street sweeping	16%	N=121	48%	N=369	22%	N=164	5%	N=41	9%	N=68	100%	N=763
Snow removal/street sanding	12%	N=90	38%	N=290	31%	N=237	18%	N=137	2%	N=12	100%	N=766
Street lighting, signage and street markings	21%	N=162	60%	N=457	16%	N=118	2%	N=14	1%	N=10	100%	N=762
Waste water (sewage system)	24%	N=187	52%	N=398	5%	N=42	1%	N=6	17%	N=133	100%	N=765
Storm drainage (flooding management)	23%	N=171	54%	N=413	9%	N=67	1%	N=6	13%	N=102	100%	N=759
Bike lanes on Louisville streets	20%	N=153	45%	N=345	23%	N=177	3%	N=26	8%	N=64	100%	N=765
Access on sidewalks/crosswalks for disabled persons	16%	N=122	38%	N=290	10%	N=76	2%	N=17	34%	N=258	100%	N=763
Quality of Louisville water	41%	N=312	47%	N=357	7%	N=56	2%	N=13	4%	N=28	100%	N=766
Overall performance of Louisville Public Works Department	21%	N=162	64%	N=487	11%	N=86	0%	N=4	3%	N=26	100%	N=764

Table 42: Question 10

Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	28%	N=213	64%	N=476	6%	N=45	1%	N=5	1%	N=11	100%	N=750

Table 43: Question 11

If you have had any email, in-person or phone contact with a City of Louisville employee in the last 12 months, what was your impression of the employee in your most recent contact? (Rate each characteristic below.)	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Knowledge	27%	N=180	26%	N=170	4%	N=24	3%	N=21	40%	N=265	100%	N=659
Responsiveness/promptness	29%	N=188	22%	N=142	6%	N=37	5%	N=30	40%	N=260	100%	N=657
Availability	29%	N=187	22%	N=144	5%	N=34	4%	N=28	40%	N=260	100%	N=654
Courtesy	35%	N=226	20%	N=133	3%	N=21	3%	N=19	39%	N=257	100%	N=656
Overall impression	30%	N=194	22%	N=145	5%	N=35	4%	N=23	39%	N=256	100%	N=653

Table 44: Question 11a

List the department the employee you most recently contacted works in	Percent	Number
City Hall and Council	7%	N=25
Library or Rec Center	13%	N=45
Billing	13%	N=47
Planning/Zoning/Building	14%	N=48
Parks and Rec/Open Space	6%	N=23
Police/Fire	10%	N=36
Public Works	11%	N=40
Other	9%	N=31
Don't know/NA	17%	N=60
Total	100%	N=354

Table 45: Question 12

In the last 12 months, about how many times, if ever, have you or other household members participated in the following activities in Louisville?	Never		Once or twice		3 to 12 times		13 to 26 times		More than 26 times		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Played golf at the Coal Creek Golf Course	82%	N=621	11%	N=81	5%	N=41	1%	N=8	1%	N=10	100%	N=762
Used the Louisville Public Library or its services	22%	N=166	15%	N=113	28%	N=213	18%	N=136	18%	N=136	100%	N=763
Used the Louisville Recreation Center	26%	N=197	16%	N=126	22%	N=164	13%	N=99	23%	N=177	100%	N=762
Used Memory Square Pool	67%	N=509	14%	N=107	13%	N=100	3%	N=24	2%	N=18	100%	N=760
Visited the Louisville Historical Museum	71%	N=541	23%	N=178	4%	N=31	1%	N=4	1%	N=6	100%	N=759
Attended the Downtown Louisville Street Faire (9 nights in 2015)	22%	N=171	35%	N=264	40%	N=307	1%	N=9	1%	N=10	100%	N=761
Attended an event, show or activity at the Arts Center	63%	N=482	28%	N=217	7%	N=54	0%	N=4	1%	N=6	100%	N=763
Attended another event downtown (Art Walk, Taste of Lsvl, parade, Winter Skate)	20%	N=149	37%	N=283	40%	N=303	3%	N=23	1%	N=5	100%	N=763

Table 46: Question 13

Beyond basic City services (police, water, sewer, etc.), the City has limited resources and must make hard decisions about funding priorities. Indicate how important to you each of the following areas are as the City considers residents' current and future needs.	Essential		Very important		Somewhat important		Not at all important		Total	
Maintaining, repairing, and paving streets	47%	N=349	42%	N=312	11%	N=83	1%	N=6	100%	N=750
Encouraging sustainability (in buildings, energy and water use, recycling, etc.) for both residential and commercial properties	22%	N=160	45%	N=327	28%	N=207	5%	N=39	100%	N=733
Creating an indoor community gathering space (arts center, community center, etc.)	4%	N=29	25%	N=181	52%	N=384	19%	N=140	100%	N=735
Creating an outdoor community gathering space (amphitheater, commons, etc.)	6%	N=42	31%	N=226	46%	N=338	18%	N=130	100%	N=735
Providing additional recreation facilities and amenities	18%	N=133	31%	N=230	40%	N=295	10%	N=76	100%	N=734
Expanding Internet/broadband options	17%	N=125	29%	N=211	35%	N=258	19%	N=137	100%	N=731
Using incentives to create business and employment opportunities	17%	N=124	41%	N=301	33%	N=241	9%	N=69	100%	N=735
Maintaining the City's appearance/attractiveness	28%	N=205	51%	N=373	21%	N=154	1%	N=5	100%	N=737
Providing additional parking in Downtown Louisville	18%	N=132	32%	N=238	34%	N=254	16%	N=122	100%	N=746
Providing financial incentives for the redevelopment of the vacant former Sam's Club property	15%	N=110	31%	N=232	34%	N=252	20%	N=151	100%	N=745
Increasing the amount of open space maintenance	10%	N=72	26%	N=191	47%	N=347	17%	N=126	100%	N=737
Increasing the amount of parks maintenance	6%	N=42	23%	N=169	55%	N=400	17%	N=123	100%	N=733
Providing new outdoor multi-purpose turf fields (soccer, football, etc.)	6%	N=46	15%	N=108	43%	N=316	36%	N=261	100%	N=731
Expanding the Louisville Historical Museum	3%	N=22	9%	N=63	41%	N=300	48%	N=350	100%	N=735
Subsidizing affordable housing	18%	N=137	22%	N=167	33%	N=243	27%	N=200	100%	N=746

Table 47: Question 13a

What are the top issues for the City Council to invest in today? (Please select up to three responses.)	Percent	Number
Maintaining, repairing, and paving streets	57%	N=402
Encouraging sustainability (in buildings, energy and water use, recycling, etc.) for both residential and commercial properties	27%	N=195
Creating an indoor community gathering space (arts center, community center, etc.)	7%	N=52
Creating an outdoor community gathering space (amphitheater, commons, etc.)	9%	N=65
Providing additional recreation facilities and amenities	26%	N=189
Expanding Internet/broadband options	18%	N=130
Using incentives to create business and employment opportunities	25%	N=175
Maintaining the City's appearance/attractiveness	29%	N=207
Providing additional parking in Downtown Louisville	24%	N=173
Providing financial incentives for the redevelopment of the vacant former Sam's Club property	22%	N=156
Increasing the amount of open space maintenance	9%	N=67
Increasing the amount of parks maintenance	4%	N=26
Providing new outdoor multi-purpose turf fields (soccer, football, etc.)	7%	N=48
Expanding the Louisville Historical Museum	3%	N=18
Subsidizing affordable housing	29%	N=207
Total	100%	N=712

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

Table 48: Question 14

	Strongly support		Somewhat support		Somewhat oppose		Strongly oppose		Don't know		Total	
Currently, the City's trash service (through Western Disposal) provides once per week trash pickup and compost and recycling pickup every two weeks. To what extent would you support or oppose changing the service to once per week compost pickup and trash p	8%	N=61	15%	N=118	16%	N=128	48%	N=373	13%	N=98	100%	N=778

Table 49: Question 15

The City of Louisville currently has a Historic Preservation Tax, which is a dedicated sales tax (0.125 cents on every dollar spent). Revenue from this tax is used to help property owners rehabilitate and preserve historic landmarks which contribute to the character of Historic Old Town Louisville. This tax was approved by voters in 2008 and is set to expire in 2018. To what extent would you support or oppose each of the following options to continue the tax?	Strongly support		Somewhat support		Somewhat oppose		Strongly oppose		Don't know		Total	
Continue the existing sales tax until 2028	35%	N=262	35%	N=264	9%	N=69	15%	N=114	5%	N=35	100%	N=745
Continue the existing sales tax until 2028 and also dedicate a portion of the tax to help operate the Louisville Historical Museum	26%	N=199	35%	N=271	13%	N=102	17%	N=129	9%	N=68	100%	N=768

Table 50: Question 16

Most of the land zoned for residential uses in Louisville has been built out. In the former Sam's Club shopping area residential development is currently not allowed. If this area was to redevelop with retail and offices, to what extent would you support or oppose including any of the following types of housing?	Strongly support		Somewhat support		Somewhat oppose		Strongly oppose		Don't know		Total	
Multifamily housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	24%	N=185	27%	N=210	10%	N=77	36%	N=280	3%	N=25	100%	N=777
Subsidized housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	26%	N=198	20%	N=153	11%	N=87	40%	N=311	3%	N=26	100%	N=775
Senior housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	28%	N=220	30%	N=230	12%	N=93	27%	N=208	4%	N=27	100%	N=778

Table 51: Question 17

In the area near the US36/McCaslin transit/bus station residential development is currently not allowed. If this area was to redevelop with retail and offices, to what extent would you support or oppose including any of the following types of housing?	Strongly support		Somewhat support		Somewhat oppose		Strongly oppose		Don't know		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Multifamily housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	21%	N=166	30%	N=234	9%	N=70	33%	N=256	6%	N=47	100%	N=774
Subsidized housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	24%	N=174	24%	N=176	10%	N=71	36%	N=265	6%	N=45	100%	N=732
Senior housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	23%	N=178	32%	N=248	12%	N=90	27%	N=213	6%	N=48	100%	N=776

Table 52: Question 18

Following is a list of information sources. Please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville.	Always		Frequently		Sometimes		Never		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting or other program on Comcast channel 8 (government access) or online	0%	N=2	2%	N=19	18%	N=139	79%	N=612	100%	N=772
Community Update (City Newsletter)	32%	N=246	33%	N=254	24%	N=184	11%	N=83	100%	N=767
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	21%	N=160	25%	N=193	30%	N=230	24%	N=186	100%	N=769
The City of Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	7%	N=56	19%	N=150	49%	N=379	24%	N=184	100%	N=768
City's email notices (eNotification)	6%	N=43	9%	N=71	12%	N=94	73%	N=551	100%	N=760
Utility bill inserts	23%	N=175	23%	N=175	26%	N=196	29%	N=219	100%	N=766
Word of mouth	13%	N=98	34%	N=261	39%	N=300	14%	N=106	100%	N=765

Table 53: Question 18a

Following is a list of information sources. Indicate the quality of the information from that source.	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting or other program on Comcast channel 8 (government access) or online	2%	N=13	17%	N=108	6%	N=37	2%	N=12	74%	N=471	100%	N=640
Community Update (City Newsletter)	22%	N=156	56%	N=393	11%	N=76	1%	N=4	11%	N=76	100%	N=706
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	9%	N=59	46%	N=315	21%	N=146	2%	N=17	21%	N=142	100%	N=678
The City of Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	13%	N=87	49%	N=335	13%	N=90	2%	N=13	23%	N=158	100%	N=683
City's email notices (eNotification)	7%	N=44	18%	N=116	4%	N=26	1%	N=5	71%	N=463	100%	N=655
Utility bill inserts	16%	N=106	40%	N=277	15%	N=105	2%	N=15	27%	N=183	100%	N=686
Word of mouth	6%	N=44	35%	N=237	34%	N=235	6%	N=39	19%	N=128	100%	N=683

Table 54: Question 19

What sources, other than those listed above, would you or do you use to get information about the City of Louisville?	Percent	Number
Facebook	34%	N=74
Street signs	8%	N=17
Library/Rec Center	9%	N=19
Web news (Denver Post, Nextdoor.com, Google)	6%	N=13
City staff (phone or in-person)	4%	N=10
Other	17%	N=36
None/NA	22%	N=48
Total	100%	N=216

Table 55: Question 20

How likely, if at all, would you be to look for official City information on social media websites (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc.) if the City were to increase its presence or activity?	Percent	Number
Very likely	21%	N=166
Somewhat likely	23%	N=176
Somewhat unlikely	11%	N=84
Very unlikely	42%	N=324
Don't know	3%	N=23
Total	100%	N=772

Table 56: Question 21

Comments	Percent	Number
Development and affordable housing	22%	N=41
Responses to Question 20	41%	N=78
Recreation, open space, programs	14%	N=26
Positive comments	6%	N=12
Other	18%	N=35
Total	100%	N=192

Table 57: Question D1

How many years have you lived in Louisville?	Percent	Number
Less than 1 year	10%	N=78
1-5 years	25%	N=197
6-10 years	18%	N=137
11-15 years	10%	N=78
More than 15 years	37%	N=292
Total	100%	N=783

Table 58: Question D2

Which best describes the building you live in?	Percent	Number
One family house detached from any other houses	74%	N=578
House attached to one or more houses (e.g., a duplex or townhome)	7%	N=58
Building with two or more apartments or condominiums	18%	N=137
Mobile home	0%	N=3
Other	1%	N=6
Total	100%	N=782

Table 59: Question D3

Do you rent or own your home?	Percent	Number
Rent	27%	N=209
Own	73%	N=572
Total	100%	N=781

Table 60: Question D4

What is your gender	Percent	Number
Female	51%	N=396
Male	49%	N=380
Total	100%	N=776

Table 61: Question D5

In which category is your age?	Percent	Number
18-24 years	2%	N=15
25-34 years	21%	N=163
35-44 years	22%	N=173
45-54 years	24%	N=183
55-64 years	16%	N=124
65-74 years	9%	N=74
75 years or older	6%	N=47
Total	100%	N=778

Table 62: Question D6

How many people (including yourself) currently live in your household?	Percent	Number
1	18%	N=141
2	33%	N=256
3	21%	N=159
4	23%	N=173
5 or more	5%	N=40
Total	100%	N=770

Table 63: Question D7

Do any children 17 or under live in your household?	Percent	Number
No	60%	N=468
Yes	40%	N=312
Total	100%	N=781

Table 64: Question D8

Are you or any other members of your household aged 60 or older?	Percent	Number
No	75%	N=583
Yes	25%	N=198
Total	100%	N=781

Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics

Responses to selected survey questions by respondent demographics are compared in this appendix. Responses that are significantly different ($p < .05$) are marked with grey shading.

Demographic Characteristics

Table 65: Aspects of Quality of Life by Respondent Characteristics

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the quality of life in Louisville: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
How do you rate Louisville as a place to live?	97%	98%	98%	98%	97%	96%	98%	98%	97%	98%
How do you rate Louisville as a place to raise children?	96%	99%	97%	97%	99%	94%	99%	98%	95%	98%
How do you rate Louisville as a place to retire?	84%	74%	82%	82%	75%	84%	77%	77%	82%	79%
How do you rate Louisville as a place to work?	81%	73%	75%	77%	73%	74%	76%	74%	78%	76%
How do you rate the overall quality of life in Louisville?	94%	97%	98%	98%	96%	93%	98%	97%	94%	97%

Table 66: Aspects of Quality of Life by Respondent Characteristics

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the quality of life in Louisville: (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	
How do you rate Louisville as a place to live?	98%	98%	100%	97%	98%	97%	100%	97%	98%	98%	97%	98%
How do you rate Louisville as a place to raise children?	97%	99%	100%	97%	98%	97%	100%	97%	98%	98%	96%	98%
How do you rate Louisville as a place to retire?	84%	77%	68%	77%	82%	74%	88%	81%	74%	77%	82%	79%
How do you rate Louisville as a place to work?	79%	66%	70%	78%	75%	76%	69%	77%	72%	76%	74%	76%
How do you rate the overall quality of life in Louisville?	96%	97%	97%	97%	97%	96%	100%	96%	97%	96%	98%	97%

Table 67: 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)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
Sense of community	84%	88%	88%	90%	84%	84%	88%	89%	80%	87%
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	67%	69%	76%	72%	68%	68%	71%	72%	65%	70%
Overall appearance of Louisville	91%	90%	89%	92%	87%	93%	89%	90%	91%	90%
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	63%	65%	75%	70%	65%	63%	69%	66%	71%	68%
Shopping opportunities	65%	52%	60%	61%	53%	66%	54%	55%	65%	58%
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	84%	90%	87%	89%	85%	84%	88%	89%	83%	87%
Opportunities to participate in community matters	79%	87%	84%	84%	84%	78%	86%	87%	74%	84%
Recreational opportunities	84%	84%	85%	85%	84%	82%	85%	86%	79%	84%
Employment opportunities	47%	36%	44%	42%	40%	39%	41%	39%	45%	41%
Variety of housing options	48%	37%	45%	40%	44%	37%	44%	44%	35%	42%
Availability of affordable quality housing	13%	15%	23%	19%	16%	11%	19%	18%	15%	17%
Ease of car travel in Louisville	88%	83%	76%	81%	83%	83%	82%	84%	77%	82%
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	67%	52%	65%	62%	56%	68%	57%	61%	56%	60%
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	93%	90%	86%	89%	90%	90%	89%	92%	83%	89%
Ease of walking in Louisville	89%	93%	89%	93%	89%	89%	91%	93%	85%	91%
Traffic flow on major streets	68%	68%	70%	68%	68%	66%	70%	71%	62%	69%
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	93%	90%	88%	91%	88%	86%	91%	91%	86%	90%
Overall image or reputation of Louisville	97%	96%	95%	97%	95%	94%	96%	97%	92%	96%

Table 68: 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				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	
Sense of community	87%	86%	87%	87%	86%	88%	87%	86%	88%	86%	89%	87%
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	69%	71%	64%	73%	67%	75%	62%	68%	74%	69%	75%	70%
Overall appearance of Louisville	91%	88%	87%	90%	90%	91%	79%	90%	90%	91%	88%	90%
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	68%	64%	56%	72%	72%	62%	69%	71%	63%	65%	74%	68%
Shopping opportunities	64%	57%	52%	53%	61%	54%	57%	58%	56%	57%	59%	58%
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	88%	91%	89%	85%	86%	90%	78%	86%	90%	88%	85%	87%
Opportunities to participate in community matters	86%	88%	81%	80%	83%	85%	91%	81%	88%	85%	82%	84%
Recreational opportunities	83%	89%	85%	83%	86%	83%	85%	84%	85%	84%	85%	84%
Employment opportunities	43%	38%	39%	41%	41%	42%	34%	40%	42%	42%	38%	41%
Variety of housing options	41%	45%	40%	42%	44%	40%	36%	45%	38%	42%	43%	42%
Availability of affordable quality housing	14%	18%	16%	20%	18%	17%	14%	18%	15%	16%	21%	17%
Ease of car travel in Louisville	86%	83%	86%	77%	81%	85%	75%	80%	86%	84%	77%	82%
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	61%	68%	49%	57%	61%	58%	68%	59%	59%	58%	63%	60%
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	93%	89%	88%	87%	88%	92%	87%	89%	91%	91%	86%	89%
Ease of walking in Louisville	94%	91%	92%	87%	89%	93%	95%	89%	95%	92%	88%	91%
Traffic flow on major streets	71%	67%	71%	66%	66%	74%	56%	65%	74%	69%	67%	69%
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	90%	92%	94%	88%	88%	92%	97%	88%	93%	91%	87%	90%
Overall image or reputation of Louisville	98%	96%	97%	93%	95%	96%	98%	95%	97%	96%	95%	96%

Table 69: Safety Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate how safe you feel: (Percent rating positively e.g., very safe/somewhat safe)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
From violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	100%	97%	97%	98%	98%	97%	97%	98%	98%	97%
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	90%	86%	90%	88%	88%	88%	87%	88%	87%	88%
In your neighborhood during the day	98%	97%	98%	98%	97%	99%	97%	97%	99%	98%
In your neighborhood after dark	94%	94%	93%	93%	94%	94%	93%	95%	91%	94%
In Louisville's downtown area during the day	100%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
In Louisville's downtown area after dark	97%	94%	90%	94%	93%	94%	93%	94%	91%	93%
In Louisville's parks during the day	100%	98%	98%	98%	99%	99%	98%	98%	99%	98%
In Louisville's parks after dark	85%	85%	79%	82%	85%	82%	83%	85%	75%	83%

Table 70: Safety Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please rate how safe you feel: (Percent rating positively e.g., very safe/somewhat safe)	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	
From violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	100%	98%	95%	96%	98%	98%	98%	97%	98%	98%	97%	97%
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	90%	84%	81%	89%	90%	86%	80%	89%	86%	87%	91%	88%
In your neighborhood during the day	100%	93%	100%	97%	98%	97%	95%	97%	98%	97%	98%	98%
In your neighborhood after dark	97%	91%	96%	91%	94%	93%	95%	93%	94%	94%	92%	94%
In Louisville's downtown area during the day	100%	99%	100%	98%	99%	99%	98%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
In Louisville's downtown area after dark	97%	96%	91%	90%	94%	94%	94%	94%	93%	95%	91%	93%
In Louisville's parks during the day	100%	98%	96%	98%	99%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%
In Louisville's parks after dark	86%	85%	80%	81%	83%	84%	87%	81%	86%	85%	80%	83%

Table 71: Government Performance Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the performance of the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	75%	63%	69%	65%	69%	69%	67%	69%	58%	67%
Information about City Council, Planning Commission and other official City meetings	83%	79%	80%	84%	76%	82%	79%	80%	78%	80%
Information about City plans and programs	68%	78%	75%	79%	71%	73%	75%	77%	67%	75%
Availability of City Employees	74%	72%	78%	77%	73%	71%	75%	77%	60%	75%
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	45%	50%	67%	66%	47%	55%	57%	55%	60%	57%
Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	77%	76%	81%	81%	74%	81%	77%	77%	79%	78%
Overall performance of Louisville City government	74%	80%	79%	81%	76%	77%	79%	79%	75%	78%

Table 72: Government Performance Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the performance of the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration: (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	
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	72%	75%	69%	61%	66%	69%	73%	67%	67%	67%	68%	67%
Information about City Council, Planning Commission and other official City meetings	81%	83%	86%	76%	82%	77%	94%	80%	80%	80%	79%	80%
Information about City plans and programs	81%	71%	86%	68%	75%	74%	86%	73%	78%	76%	71%	75%
Availability of City Employees	78%	73%	80%	72%	72%	78%	82%	73%	77%	73%	77%	75%
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	58%	53%	50%	58%	58%	54%	100%	60%	50%	52%	66%	57%
Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	81%	70%	75%	79%	78%	78%	69%	79%	76%	77%	82%	78%
Overall performance of Louisville City government	82%	76%	85%	74%	78%	80%	81%	76%	82%	78%	80%	78%

Table 73: Police Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas related to the Louisville Police Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
Visibility of patrol cars	95%	87%	89%	89%	90%	88%	89%	90%	87%	89%
911 service	91%	91%	97%	95%	92%	94%	93%	94%	92%	93%
Enforcement of traffic regulations	83%	76%	80%	78%	79%	75%	80%	81%	72%	79%
Municipal code enforcement issues (dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	72%	66%	67%	71%	64%	66%	67%	69%	63%	68%
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	94%	89%	90%	91%	90%	89%	91%	92%	87%	90%

Table 74: Police Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas related to the Louisville Police Department: (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	
Visibility of patrol cars	90%	89%	92%	87%	89%	88%	100%	89%	89%	89%	90%	89%
911 service	91%	95%	95%	93%	93%	92%	100%	94%	93%	91%	98%	93%
Enforcement of traffic regulations	82%	81%	76%	76%	77%	80%	85%	78%	80%	78%	82%	79%
Municipal code enforcement issues (dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	72%	62%	72%	66%	65%	70%	70%	66%	70%	68%	67%	68%
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	93%	92%	90%	88%	91%	90%	97%	91%	90%	90%	92%	90%

Table 75: Planning and Building Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas of Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
The public input process on City planning issues	67%	74%	69%	75%	66%	66%	72%	74%	59%	71%
Planning review process for new development	64%	64%	60%	65%	59%	63%	62%	65%	53%	63%
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning Department	67%	60%	65%	64%	61%	60%	63%	65%	54%	63%
Building permit process	62%	56%	65%	60%	60%	63%	60%	62%	52%	60%
Building/construction inspection process	65%	62%	67%	65%	64%	63%	65%	66%	53%	65%

Table 76: Planning and Building Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas of Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department: (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	
The public input process on City planning issues	75%	77%	71%	66%	68%	75%	77%	68%	76%	72%	70%	71%
Planning review process for new development	71%	66%	56%	58%	63%	64%	55%	60%	66%	63%	62%	63%
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning Department	73%	65%	55%	57%	64%	63%	51%	62%	64%	62%	66%	63%
Building permit process	54%	67%	58%	61%	66%	56%	48%	65%	55%	57%	69%	60%
Building/construction inspection process	59%	72%	63%	64%	67%	62%	59%	67%	62%	62%	71%	65%

Table 77: Parks and Recreation Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
Current recreation programs for youth	81%	84%	88%	87%	83%	85%	85%	85%	86%	85%
Current recreation programs for adults	66%	74%	86%	82%	70%	77%	76%	77%	75%	77%
Current programs and services for seniors	88%	90%	85%	90%	84%	87%	87%	88%	86%	87%
Recreation fees in Louisville	72%	75%	78%	81%	69%	70%	76%	78%	60%	75%
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	72%	57%	80%	67%	67%	74%	65%	64%	77%	67%
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	87%	75%	82%	79%	82%	84%	80%	81%	80%	81%
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	83%	77%	80%	84%	76%	91%	76%	81%	77%	80%
Maintenance and cleanliness of the Louisville Recreation Center	86%	80%	87%	81%	85%	85%	82%	83%	84%	83%
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	93%	91%	91%	93%	90%	94%	90%	91%	93%	91%
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas, etc.)	95%	91%	87%	91%	89%	93%	89%	90%	92%	90%
Maintenance of open space	92%	89%	81%	87%	87%	92%	85%	86%	89%	87%
Maintenance of the trail system	95%	92%	85%	91%	89%	94%	89%	90%	90%	90%
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	89%	84%	79%	87%	80%	90%	81%	84%	85%	84%
Overall performance of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department	92%	90%	85%	91%	86%	93%	87%	89%	87%	89%

Table 78: Parks and Recreation Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department: (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	
Current recreation programs for youth	86%	88%	79%	84%	91%	82%	78%	90%	81%	84%	87%	85%
Current recreation programs for adults	76%	76%	70%	78%	81%	73%	66%	80%	71%	74%	85%	77%
Current programs and services for seniors	90%	91%	85%	85%	88%	86%	100%	87%	89%	91%	82%	87%
Recreation fees in Louisville	75%	78%	72%	74%	77%	75%	62%	77%	73%	73%	80%	75%
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	68%	63%	56%	70%	76%	60%	48%	75%	58%	62%	80%	67%
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	88%	88%	68%	79%	81%	78%	91%	82%	78%	82%	81%	81%
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	80%	76%	77%	82%	79%	79%	89%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Maintenance and cleanliness of the Louisville Recreation Center	81%	88%	78%	84%	85%	82%	82%	84%	83%	82%	87%	83%
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	92%	92%	92%	90%	92%	92%	85%	92%	92%	92%	89%	91%
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas, etc.)	95%	89%	91%	86%	91%	90%	92%	90%	92%	92%	87%	90%
Maintenance of open space	94%	87%	89%	80%	86%	88%	93%	85%	91%	90%	79%	87%
Maintenance of the trail system	95%	93%	95%	83%	89%	91%	97%	88%	94%	93%	82%	90%
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	87%	85%	90%	79%	82%	87%	82%	81%	88%	86%	79%	84%
Overall performance of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department	91%	88%	93%	86%	87%	91%	92%	86%	93%	90%	85%	89%

Table 79: Library and Museum Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
Louisville Public Library programs (e.g., story time, One Book program, etc.)	96%	98%	98%	98%	97%	98%	97%	98%	98%	98%
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk check out, etc.)	96%	98%	97%	98%	97%	95%	98%	99%	94%	98%
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	85%	93%	95%	95%	89%	90%	93%	94%	86%	92%
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	89%	93%	94%	96%	89%	95%	92%	93%	91%	93%
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	80%	86%	84%	86%	82%	85%	84%	85%	83%	85%
Louisville Public Library building	94%	99%	97%	98%	97%	99%	97%	98%	97%	97%
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	94%	97%	97%	97%	96%	98%	96%	97%	95%	96%
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters)	86%	89%	92%	91%	88%	92%	88%	91%	85%	90%
Louisville Historical Museum campus	85%	91%	86%	92%	84%	91%	87%	89%	84%	88%
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	86%	89%	90%	92%	86%	91%	88%	90%	85%	89%

Table 8o: Library and Museum Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about 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	
Louisville Public Library programs (e.g., story time, One Book program, etc.)	97%	97%	99%	98%	98%	97%	100%	98%	97%	97%	98%	98%
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk check out, etc.)	99%	99%	96%	96%	96%	99%	100%	97%	99%	97%	98%	98%
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	93%	95%	92%	91%	91%	93%	100%	92%	93%	91%	95%	92%
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	92%	97%	88%	92%	93%	93%	92%	93%	92%	92%	94%	93%
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	84%	92%	77%	83%	82%	87%	78%	84%	85%	85%	84%	85%
Louisville Public Library building	97%	99%	98%	97%	97%	98%	100%	97%	98%	97%	97%	97%
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	95%	99%	93%	97%	97%	96%	100%	97%	96%	96%	97%	96%
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters)	93%	80%	93%	91%	92%	89%	77%	91%	88%	89%	93%	90%
Louisville Historical Museum campus	93%	83%	91%	87%	87%	89%	90%	87%	90%	89%	86%	88%
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	91%	84%	87%	90%	90%	89%	79%	90%	88%	89%	88%	89%

Table 81: Public Works Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the performance of the following areas of Louisville Public Works Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	67%	61%	68%	65%	63%	64%	64%	63%	67%	64%
Street maintenance in Louisville	69%	68%	73%	70%	69%	74%	68%	69%	72%	70%
Street sweeping	80%	66%	71%	72%	69%	82%	67%	69%	76%	71%
Snow removal/street sanding	50%	48%	54%	52%	48%	54%	49%	51%	50%	50%
Street lighting, signage and street markings	81%	83%	82%	86%	79%	85%	82%	83%	82%	82%
Waste water (sewage system)	91%	94%	91%	92%	94%	93%	92%	94%	87%	92%
Storm drainage (flooding management)	97%	88%	85%	86%	91%	89%	89%	90%	86%	89%
Bike lanes on Louisville streets	74%	70%	70%	70%	72%	74%	70%	72%	68%	71%
Access on sidewalks/crosswalks for disabled persons	80%	85%	79%	78%	85%	84%	80%	82%	81%	82%
Quality of Louisville water	93%	89%	92%	91%	91%	91%	91%	91%	89%	91%
Overall performance of Louisville Public Works Department	93%	86%	87%	91%	85%	94%	85%	87%	90%	88%

Table 82: Public Works Department Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the performance of the following areas of Louisville Public Works Department: (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	
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	70%	64%	67%	58%	68%	60%	64%	66%	61%	64%	66%	64%
Street maintenance in Louisville	75%	74%	74%	62%	71%	68%	71%	69%	70%	69%	70%	70%
Street sweeping	80%	74%	64%	63%	72%	70%	68%	71%	70%	71%	70%	71%
Snow removal/street sanding	47%	60%	55%	48%	50%	52%	46%	51%	50%	50%	52%	50%
Street lighting, signage and street markings	83%	83%	83%	81%	81%	84%	86%	82%	83%	83%	82%	82%
Waste water (sewage system)	96%	91%	96%	89%	92%	93%	94%	92%	94%	93%	93%	92%
Storm drainage (flooding management)	93%	91%	88%	85%	88%	90%	94%	88%	91%	90%	85%	89%
Bike lanes on Louisville streets	75%	64%	68%	71%	70%	74%	62%	70%	73%	72%	68%	71%
Access on sidewalks/crosswalks for disabled persons	86%	73%	81%	81%	84%	79%	82%	81%	82%	83%	77%	82%
Quality of Louisville water	89%	85%	91%	94%	89%	92%	90%	91%	91%	90%	92%	91%
Overall performance of Louisville Public Works Department	94%	81%	88%	85%	89%	87%	92%	88%	89%	89%	86%	88%

Table 83: Overall Services Rating by Respondent Characteristics

Overall, how would you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville? (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	98%	93%	91%	95%	92%	97%	92%	93%	93%	93%

Table 84: Overall Services Rating by Respondent Characteristics

Overall, how would you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville? (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	
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	97%	90%	95%	91%	92%	95%	95%	92%	95%	94%	90%	93%

Table 85: Louisville Employee Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

If you have had any email, in-person or phone contact with a City of Louisville employee in the last 12 months, what was your impression of the employee in your most recent contact? (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
Knowledge	82%	90%	89%	87%	90%	88%	89%	89%	86%	89%
Responsiveness/promptness	80%	82%	85%	84%	82%	89%	81%	83%	85%	83%
Availability	84%	84%	84%	86%	83%	92%	82%	83%	90%	84%
Courtesy	84%	91%	92%	93%	87%	90%	90%	90%	88%	90%
Overall impression	80%	85%	87%	86%	85%	89%	84%	85%	85%	85%

Table 86: Louisville Employee Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

If you have had any email, in-person or phone contact with a City of Louisville employee in the last 12 months, what was your impression of the employee in your most recent contact? (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	
Knowledge	90%	85%	89%	89%	90%	85%	100%	91%	85%	88%	91%	89%
Responsiveness/promptness	83%	81%	85%	83%	87%	80%	74%	86%	80%	81%	89%	83%
Availability	89%	77%	86%	84%	88%	81%	75%	88%	80%	83%	87%	84%
Courtesy	90%	91%	92%	89%	92%	87%	96%	91%	88%	88%	96%	90%
Overall impression	84%	87%	88%	84%	89%	81%	92%	88%	83%	83%	92%	85%

Table 87: Participation Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

In the last 12 months, about how many times, if ever, have you or other household members participated in the following activities in Louisville? (Percent rating positively e.g., at least once or twice)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
Played golf at the Coal Creek Golf Course	28%	15%	16%	16%	21%	18%	18%	18%	20%	18%
Used the Louisville Public Library or its services	63%	86%	78%	80%	76%	76%	79%	78%	78%	78%
Used the Louisville Recreation Center	63%	80%	73%	75%	73%	62%	78%	80%	57%	74%
Used Memory Square Pool	15%	50%	22%	33%	34%	15%	39%	40%	11%	33%
Visited the Louisville Historical Museum	25%	27%	35%	27%	31%	29%	29%	29%	27%	29%
Attended the Downtown Louisville Street Faire (9 nights in 2015)	77%	82%	71%	74%	81%	73%	79%	80%	69%	78%
Attended an event, show or activity at the Arts Center	29%	34%	46%	38%	35%	29%	40%	39%	29%	37%
Attended another event downtown (Art Walk, Taste of Lsvl, parade, Winter Skate)	73%	86%	77%	83%	78%	72%	83%	83%	74%	80%

Table 88: Participation Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

In the last 12 months, about how many times, if ever, have you or other household members participated in the following activities in Louisville? (Percent rating positively e.g., at least once or twice)	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	
Played golf at the Coal Creek Golf Course	18%	16%	23%	19%	19%	20%	11%	18%	19%	19%	18%	18%
Used the Louisville Public Library or its services	73%	83%	92%	77%	71%	85%	95%	70%	91%	79%	77%	78%
Used the Louisville Recreation Center	69%	74%	89%	75%	63%	85%	91%	63%	91%	74%	73%	74%
Used Memory Square Pool	23%	45%	53%	32%	13%	52%	72%	14%	60%	37%	22%	33%
Visited the Louisville Historical Museum	22%	32%	32%	32%	29%	30%	25%	29%	29%	27%	34%	29%
Attended the Downtown Louisville Street Faire (9 nights in 2015)	74%	78%	88%	77%	74%	83%	83%	74%	82%	81%	68%	78%
Attended an event, show or activity at the Arts Center	26%	29%	50%	47%	36%	38%	29%	36%	37%	33%	48%	37%
Attended another event downtown (Art Walk, Taste of Lsvl, parade, Winter Skate)	77%	80%	94%	80%	74%	88%	90%	74%	90%	82%	75%	80%

Table 89: Funding Priority Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Beyond basic City services (police, water, sewer, etc.), the City has limited resources and must make hard decisions about funding priorities. Indicate how important to you each of the following areas are as the City considers residents' current and future needs. (Percent rating positively e.g., essential/very important)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
Maintaining, repairing, and paving streets	83%	86%	95%	88%	88%	86%	89%	88%	90%	88%
Encouraging sustainability (in buildings, energy and water use, recycling, etc.) for both residential and commercial properties	63%	67%	69%	73%	60%	78%	62%	62%	79%	66%
Creating an indoor community gathering space (arts center, community center, etc.)	28%	27%	32%	28%	29%	30%	28%	28%	31%	29%
Creating an outdoor community gathering space (amphitheater, commons, etc.)	49%	34%	30%	36%	37%	49%	32%	35%	42%	36%
Providing additional recreation facilities and amenities	41%	56%	46%	54%	45%	41%	52%	53%	40%	49%
Expanding Internet/broadband options	52%	48%	39%	43%	49%	53%	44%	45%	50%	46%
Using incentives to create business and employment opportunities	58%	58%	58%	58%	57%	58%	58%	59%	55%	58%
Maintaining the City's appearance/attractiveness	73%	78%	85%	75%	81%	71%	81%	81%	71%	79%
Providing additional parking in Downtown Louisville	45%	41%	66%	50%	49%	50%	50%	48%	53%	50%
Providing financial incentives for the redevelopment of the vacant former Sam's Club property	45%	45%	49%	47%	45%	45%	46%	47%	42%	46%
Increasing the amount of open space maintenance	36%	33%	41%	35%	36%	45%	32%	35%	38%	36%
Increasing the amount of parks maintenance	23%	28%	35%	28%	29%	36%	26%	28%	30%	29%
Providing new outdoor multi-purpose turf fields (soccer, football, etc.)	20%	24%	18%	19%	23%	22%	21%	22%	19%	21%
Expanding the Louisville Historical Museum	12%	9%	16%	11%	12%	17%	9%	10%	17%	12%
Subsidizing affordable housing	53%	34%	42%	47%	35%	69%	30%	31%	68%	41%

Table 90: Funding Priority Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Beyond basic City services (police, water, sewer, etc.), the City has limited resources and must make hard decisions about funding priorities. Indicate how important to you each of the following areas are as the City considers residents' current and future needs. (Percent rating positively e.g., essential/very important)	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	
Maintaining, repairing, and paving streets	84%	94%	89%	88%	91%	85%	83%	91%	83%	86%	95%	88%
Encouraging sustainability (in buildings, energy and water use, recycling, etc.) for both residential and commercial properties	76%	67%	61%	58%	68%	65%	55%	65%	68%	67%	66%	66%
Creating an indoor community gathering space (arts center, community center, etc.)	30%	26%	34%	27%	27%	31%	28%	28%	30%	28%	30%	29%
Creating an outdoor community gathering space (amphitheater, commons, etc.)	46%	39%	35%	26%	36%	36%	46%	35%	38%	39%	30%	36%
Providing additional recreation facilities and amenities	49%	48%	55%	49%	43%	55%	67%	42%	60%	52%	43%	49%
Expanding Internet/broadband options	51%	44%	39%	43%	45%	47%	39%	45%	47%	49%	35%	46%
Using incentives to create business and employment opportunities	57%	56%	60%	59%	57%	58%	56%	57%	59%	59%	54%	58%
Maintaining the City's appearance/attractiveness	82%	75%	84%	76%	79%	79%	75%	78%	79%	78%	81%	79%
Providing additional parking in Downtown Louisville	44%	44%	37%	61%	56%	44%	40%	58%	37%	44%	67%	50%
Providing financial incentives for the redevelopment of the vacant former Sam's Club property	41%	49%	48%	49%	48%	44%	43%	47%	45%	46%	46%	46%
Increasing the amount of open space maintenance	38%	40%	26%	34%	39%	33%	25%	40%	30%	35%	39%	36%
Increasing the amount of parks maintenance	32%	27%	16%	30%	32%	24%	33%	32%	24%	28%	32%	29%
Providing new outdoor multi-purpose turf fields (soccer, football, etc.)	26%	17%	14%	21%	16%	25%	37%	16%	29%	23%	17%	21%
Expanding the Louisville Historical Museum	12%	9%	11%	13%	14%	9%	7%	13%	10%	10%	16%	12%
Subsidizing affordable housing	49%	41%	31%	35%	49%	33%	28%	47%	32%	41%	40%	41%

Table 91: Support for Changing Trash Service by Respondent Characteristics

(Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
Currently, the City's trash service (through Western Disposal) provides once per week trash pickup and compost and recycling pickup every two weeks. To what extent would you support or oppose changing the service to once per week compost pickup and trash	24%	27%	28%	31%	22%	36%	23%	25%	35%	26%

Table 92: Support for Changing Trash Service by Respondent Characteristics

(Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	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	
Currently, the City's trash service (through Western Disposal) provides once per week trash pickup and compost and recycling pickup every two weeks. To what extent would you support or oppose changing the service to once per week compost pickup and trash	23%	37%	29%	23%	34%	20%	8%	31%	20%	26%	26%	26%

Table 93: Support for Historic Preservation Tax Options by Respondent Characteristics

The City of Louisville currently has a Historic Preservation Tax, which is a dedicated sales tax (0.125 cents on every dollar spent). Revenue from this tax is used to help property owners rehabilitate and preserve historic landmarks which contribute to the character of Historic Old Town Louisville. This tax was approved by voters in 2008 and is set to expire in 2018. To what extent would you support or oppose each of the following options to continue the tax? (Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
Continue the existing sales tax until 2028	77%	76%	71%	78%	70%	82%	71%	72%	80%	74%
Continue the existing sales tax until 2028 and also dedicate a portion of the tax to help operate the Louisville Historical Museum	69%	66%	68%	71%	62%	77%	63%	64%	76%	67%

Table 94: Support for Historic Preservation Tax Options by Respondent Characteristics

The City of Louisville currently has a Historic Preservation Tax, which is a dedicated sales tax (0.125 cents on every dollar spent). Revenue from this tax is used to help property owners rehabilitate and preserve historic landmarks which contribute to the character of Historic Old Town Louisville. This tax was approved by voters in 2008 and is set to expire in 2018. To what extent would you support or oppose each of the following options to continue the tax? (Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	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	
Continue the existing sales tax until 2028	79%	78%	76%	67%	76%	75%	56%	74%	75%	76%	69%	74%
Continue the existing sales tax until 2028 and also dedicate a portion of the tax to help operate the Louisville Historical Museum	70%	70%	63%	64%	70%	67%	41%	68%	66%	67%	67%	67%

Table 95: Support for Housing Options for Former Sam's Club Area by Respondent Characteristics

Most of the land zoned for residential uses in Louisville has been built out. In the former Sam's Club shopping area residential development is currently not allowed. If this area was to redevelop with retail and offices, to what extent would you support or oppose including any of the following types of housing? (Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
Multifamily housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	71%	49%	45%	55%	51%	74%	45%	46%	72%	53%
Subsidized housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	61%	43%	43%	53%	42%	74%	37%	39%	69%	47%
Senior housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	52%	58%	69%	66%	53%	64%	58%	57%	69%	60%

Table 96: Support for Housing Options for Former Sam's Club Area by Respondent Characteristics

Most of the land zoned for residential uses in Louisville has been built out. In the former Sam's Club shopping area residential development is currently not allowed. If this area was to redevelop with retail and offices, to what extent would you support or oppose including any of the following types of housing? (Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	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	
Multifamily housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	69%	46%	47%	42%	59%	47%	38%	56%	48%	54%	47%	53%
Subsidized housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	58%	46%	41%	38%	54%	42%	26%	51%	41%	49%	42%	47%
Senior housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	68%	51%	53%	58%	66%	54%	51%	63%	55%	57%	67%	60%

Table 97: Support for Housing Options for US36/McCaslin Area by Respondent Characteristics

In the area near the US36/McCaslin transit/bus station residential development is currently not allowed. If this area was to redevelop with retail and offices, to what extent would you support or oppose including any of the following types of housing? (Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
Multifamily housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	73%	53%	45%	56%	54%	73%	49%	50%	72%	55%
Subsidized housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	68%	48%	44%	57%	46%	75%	43%	45%	69%	51%
Senior housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	51%	60%	62%	64%	53%	63%	57%	56%	65%	58%

Table 98: Support for Housing Options for US36/McCaslin Area by Respondent Characteristics

In the area near the US36/McCaslin transit/bus station residential development is currently not allowed. If this area was to redevelop with retail and offices, to what extent would you support or oppose including any of the following types of housing? (Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	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	
Multifamily housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	71%	54%	45%	44%	58%	54%	39%	56%	54%	58%	47%	55%
Subsidized housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	62%	51%	47%	42%	54%	51%	34%	53%	49%	54%	43%	51%
Senior housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	67%	53%	54%	54%	62%	56%	49%	60%	57%	58%	61%	58%

Table 99: Use of Information Sources by Respondent Characteristics

Please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. (Percent rating positively e.g., at least sometimes)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting or other program on Comcast channel 8 (government access) or online	11%	17%	34%	19%	22%	13%	24%	23%	13%	21%
Community Update (City Newsletter)	80%	92%	93%	91%	88%	78%	93%	93%	78%	89%
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	66%	78%	80%	76%	76%	69%	78%	79%	67%	76%
The City of Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	70%	86%	67%	74%	79%	59%	83%	83%	58%	76%
City's email notices (eNotification)	13%	33%	30%	31%	24%	15%	32%	33%	12%	27%
Utility bill inserts	46%	78%	79%	70%	73%	40%	83%	85%	31%	71%
Word of mouth	82%	89%	85%	89%	83%	84%	87%	89%	79%	86%

Table 100: Use of Information Sources by Respondent Characteristics

Please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. (Percent rating positively e.g., at least sometimes)	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	
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting or other program on Comcast channel 8 (government access) or online	7%	16%	29%	34%	25%	17%	14%	24%	16%	17%	33%	21%
Community Update (City Newsletter)	81%	93%	94%	94%	87%	90%	94%	88%	91%	88%	93%	89%
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	68%	84%	78%	79%	74%	77%	82%	73%	80%	75%	79%	76%
The City of Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	73%	82%	86%	74%	68%	84%	84%	70%	86%	80%	64%	76%
City's email notices (eNotification)	23%	28%	37%	28%	25%	31%	25%	25%	31%	27%	27%	27%
Utility bill inserts	51%	82%	84%	82%	62%	81%	82%	64%	82%	69%	78%	71%
Word of mouth	83%	91%	90%	86%	82%	91%	88%	82%	92%	88%	82%	86%

Table 101: Information Source Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting or other program on Comcast channel 8 (government access) or online	75%	68%	73%	71%	70%	79%	69%	68%	84%	71%
Community Update (City Newsletter)	81%	91%	87%	88%	87%	87%	87%	89%	82%	87%
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	72%	66%	74%	77%	62%	80%	67%	69%	72%	70%
The City of Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	81%	78%	85%	86%	74%	92%	77%	80%	81%	80%
City's email notices (eNotification)	81%	86%	81%	85%	82%	82%	84%	85%	77%	84%
Utility bill inserts	65%	75%	83%	81%	71%	71%	77%	79%	51%	76%
Word of mouth	59%	47%	51%	58%	42%	53%	49%	52%	46%	50%

Table 102: Information Source Ratings by Respondent Characteristics

Indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (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	
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting or other program on Comcast channel 8 (government access) or online	89%	58%	72%	70%	74%	68%	60%	72%	69%	70%	73%	71%
Community Update (City Newsletter)	88%	88%	90%	86%	88%	87%	79%	87%	87%	89%	83%	87%
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	73%	67%	71%	68%	72%	69%	54%	71%	67%	70%	68%	70%
The City of Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	83%	80%	75%	80%	82%	80%	74%	82%	78%	81%	80%	80%
City's email notices (eNotification)	88%	80%	89%	80%	84%	84%	88%	83%	85%	84%	83%	84%
Utility bill inserts	67%	80%	75%	81%	78%	76%	68%	75%	77%	75%	79%	76%
Word of mouth	53%	55%	44%	47%	51%	50%	51%	49%	52%	50%	51%	50%

Table 103: Likelihood of Social Media Use by Respondent Characteristics

(Percent rating positively e.g., very likely/somewhat likely)	Age			Gender		Rent or own		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
How likely, if at all, would you be to look for official City information on social media websites (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc.) if the City were to increase its presence or activity?	67%	48%	26%	50%	42%	52%	43%	44%	49%	46%

Table 104: Likelihood of Social Media Use by Respondent Characteristics

(Percent rating positively e.g., very likely/somewhat likely)	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	
How likely, if at all, would you be to look for official City information on social media websites (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc.) if the City were to increase its presence or activity?	59%	47%	45%	31%	39%	56%	26%	41%	52%	53%	23%	46%

Geographic Area of Residence Comparisons

Table 105: Aspects of Quality of Life by Respondent Geographic Area

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the quality of life in Louisville: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
How do you rate Louisville as a place to live?	96%	99%	99%	98%
How do you rate Louisville as a place to raise children?	96%	100%	98%	98%
How do you rate Louisville as a place to retire?	78%	81%	77%	79%
How do you rate Louisville as a place to work?	74%	77%	77%	76%
How do you rate the overall quality of life in Louisville?	96%	99%	96%	97%

Table 106: 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)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
Sense of community	84%	92%	86%	87%
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	71%	73%	68%	70%
Overall appearance of Louisville	90%	89%	91%	90%
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	67%	65%	70%	68%
Shopping opportunities	57%	56%	60%	58%
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	86%	87%	88%	87%
Opportunities to participate in community matters	82%	85%	84%	84%
Recreational opportunities	82%	86%	86%	84%
Employment opportunities	38%	41%	44%	41%
Variety of housing options	44%	42%	39%	42%
Availability of affordable quality housing	22%	13%	15%	17%
Ease of car travel in Louisville	74%	89%	88%	82%
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	62%	60%	56%	60%
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	85%	94%	92%	89%
Ease of walking in Louisville	87%	95%	92%	91%
Traffic flow on major streets	64%	73%	71%	69%
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	88%	92%	91%	90%
Overall image or reputation of Louisville	94%	97%	98%	96%

Table 107: Safety Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please rate how safe you feel: (Percent rating positively e.g., very safe/somewhat safe)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
From violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	98%	97%	97%	97%
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	86%	87%	91%	88%
In your neighborhood during the day	98%	98%	97%	98%
In your neighborhood after dark	94%	92%	95%	94%
In Louisville's downtown area during the day	99%	99%	99%	99%
In Louisville's downtown area after dark	93%	91%	95%	93%
In Louisville's parks during the day	98%	98%	98%	98%
In Louisville's parks after dark	82%	82%	87%	83%

Table 108: Government Performance Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the performance of the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	63%	69%	72%	67%
Information about City Council, Planning Commission and other official City meetings	81%	75%	84%	80%
Information about City plans and programs	73%	74%	78%	75%
Availability of City Employees	74%	74%	76%	75%
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	56%	64%	51%	57%
Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	79%	77%	77%	78%
Overall performance of Louisville City government	77%	78%	81%	78%

Table 109: Police Department Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas related to the Louisville Police Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
Visibility of patrol cars	88%	92%	88%	89%
911 service	94%	93%	92%	93%
Enforcement of traffic regulations	78%	83%	75%	79%
Municipal code enforcement issues (dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	68%	69%	66%	68%
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	88%	92%	92%	90%

Table 110: Planning and Building Department Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas of Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
The public input process on City planning issues	67%	74%	74%	71%
Planning review process for new development	56%	67%	67%	63%
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning Department	58%	67%	66%	63%
Building permit process	61%	57%	63%	60%
Building/construction inspection process	69%	58%	65%	65%

Table 111: Parks and Recreation Department Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
Current recreation programs for youth	85%	83%	88%	85%
Current recreation programs for adults	75%	80%	75%	77%
Current programs and services for seniors	87%	91%	85%	87%
Recreation fees in Louisville	70%	77%	79%	75%
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	68%	67%	65%	67%
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	76%	82%	84%	81%
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	79%	76%	83%	80%
Maintenance and cleanliness of the Louisville Recreation Center	82%	86%	82%	83%
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	90%	93%	92%	91%
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas, etc.)	89%	91%	91%	90%
Maintenance of open space	84%	88%	90%	87%
Maintenance of the trail system	90%	90%	91%	90%
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	85%	82%	84%	84%
Overall performance of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department	88%	90%	88%	89%

Table 112: Library and Museum Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
Louisville Public Library programs (e.g., story time, One Book program, etc.)	96%	98%	99%	98%
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk check out, etc.)	96%	100%	98%	98%
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	92%	92%	94%	92%
Louisville Public Library services online at www.louisville-library.org accessed from home or elsewhere (e.g., book holds, access databases, research, etc.)	92%	92%	95%	93%
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	85%	82%	86%	85%
Louisville Public Library building	97%	97%	99%	97%
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	96%	96%	97%	96%
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters)	86%	89%	95%	90%
Louisville Historical Museum campus	85%	90%	92%	88%
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum	87%	88%	92%	89%

Table 113: Public Works Department Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the performance of the following areas of Louisville Public Works Department: (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	63%	64%	66%	64%
Street maintenance in Louisville	71%	68%	69%	70%
Street sweeping	73%	66%	72%	71%
Snow removal/street sanding	44%	51%	58%	50%
Street lighting, signage and street markings	85%	82%	80%	82%
Waste water (sewage system)	94%	90%	93%	92%
Storm drainage (flooding management)	90%	89%	88%	89%
Bike lanes on Louisville streets	69%	76%	69%	71%
Access on sidewalks/crosswalks for disabled persons	78%	87%	81%	82%
Quality of Louisville water	92%	92%	88%	91%
Overall performance of Louisville Public Works Department	88%	84%	91%	88%

Table 114: Overall Services Rating by Respondent Geographic Area

Overall, how would you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville? (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	93%	93%	94%	93%

Table 115: Louisville Employee Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

If you have had any email, in-person or phone contact with a City of Louisville employee in the last 12 months, what was your impression of the employee in your most recent contact? (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
Knowledge	86%	85%	95%	89%
Responsiveness/promptness	81%	83%	86%	83%
Availability	81%	82%	90%	84%
Courtesy	85%	92%	95%	90%
Overall impression	82%	85%	90%	85%

Table 116: Participation Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

In the last 12 months, about how many times, if ever, have you or other household members participated in the following activities in Louisville? (Percent rating positively e.g., at least once or twice)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
Played golf at the Coal Creek Golf Course	15%	19%	23%	18%
Used the Louisville Public Library or its services	79%	78%	78%	78%
Used the Louisville Recreation Center	69%	84%	73%	74%
Used Memory Square Pool	29%	39%	32%	33%
Visited the Louisville Historical Museum	29%	24%	32%	29%
Attended the Downtown Louisville Street Faire (9 nights in 2015)	74%	79%	81%	78%
Attended an event, show or activity at the Arts Center	38%	35%	37%	37%
Attended another event downtown (Art Walk, Taste of Lsvl, parade, Winter Skate)	79%	79%	83%	80%

Table 117: Funding Priority Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Beyond basic City services (police, water, sewer, etc.), the City has limited resources and must make hard decisions about funding priorities. Indicate how important to you each of the following areas are as the City considers residents' current and future needs. (Percent rating positively e.g., essential/very important)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
Maintaining, repairing, and paving streets	88%	87%	90%	88%
Encouraging sustainability (in buildings, energy and water use, recycling, etc.) for both residential and commercial properties	69%	61%	68%	66%
Creating an indoor community gathering space (arts center, community center, etc.)	25%	29%	33%	29%
Creating an outdoor community gathering space (amphitheater, commons, etc.)	31%	38%	42%	36%
Providing additional recreation facilities and amenities	45%	54%	52%	49%
Expanding Internet/broadband options	44%	42%	52%	46%
Using incentives to create business and employment opportunities	52%	58%	65%	58%
Maintaining the City's appearance/attractiveness	75%	86%	76%	79%
Providing additional parking in Downtown Louisville	50%	46%	53%	50%
Providing financial incentives for the redevelopment of the vacant former Sam's Club property	39%	48%	53%	46%
Increasing the amount of open space maintenance	38%	32%	36%	36%
Increasing the amount of parks maintenance	31%	26%	28%	29%
Providing new outdoor multi-purpose turf fields (soccer, football, etc.)	18%	21%	25%	21%
Expanding the Louisville Historical Museum	13%	8%	13%	12%
Subsidizing affordable housing	42%	31%	48%	41%

Table 118: Support for Changing Trash Service by Respondent Geographic Area

Currently, the City's trash service (through Western Disposal) provides once per week trash pickup and compost and recycling pickup every two weeks. To what extent would you support or oppose changing the service to once per week compost pickup and trash pickup every two weeks (leaving recycling pickup every two weeks)? (Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
Currently, the City's trash service (through Western Disposal) provides once per week trash pickup and compost and recycling pickup every two weeks. To what extent would you support or oppose changing the service to once per week compost pickup and trash	27%	19%	32%	26%

Table 119: Support for Historic Preservation Tax Options by Respondent Geographic Area

The City of Louisville currently has a Historic Preservation Tax, which is a dedicated sales tax (0.125 cents on every dollar spent). Revenue from this tax is used to help property owners rehabilitate and preserve historic landmarks which contribute to the character of Historic Old Town Louisville. This tax was approved by voters in 2008 and is set to expire in 2018. To what extent would you support or oppose each of the following options to continue the tax? (Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
Continue the existing sales tax until 2028	70%	74%	79%	74%
Continue the existing sales tax until 2028 and also dedicate a portion of the tax to help operate the Louisville Historical Museum	63%	69%	71%	67%

Table 120: Support for Housing Options for Former Sam's Club Area by Respondent Geographic Area

Most of the land zoned for residential uses in Louisville has been built out. In the former Sam's Club shopping area residential development is currently not allowed. If this area was to redevelop with retail and offices, to what extent would you support or oppose including any of the following types of housing? (Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
Multifamily housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	49%	53%	57%	53%
Subsidized housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	46%	44%	50%	47%
Senior housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	58%	62%	60%	60%

Table 121: Support for Housing Options for US36/McCaslin Area by Respondent Geographic Area

In the area near the US36/McCaslin transit/bus station residential development is currently not allowed. If this area was to redevelop with retail and offices, to what extent would you support or oppose including any of the following types of housing? (Percent rating positively e.g., strongly support/somewhat support)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
Multifamily housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	52%	55%	59%	55%
Subsidized housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	46%	52%	57%	51%
Senior housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	58%	62%	56%	58%

Table 122: Use of Information Sources by Respondent Geographic Area

Please select how often you use each of the following sources to gain information about the City of Louisville. (Percent rating positively e.g., at least sometimes)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting or other program on Comcast channel 8 (government access) or online	19%	21%	23%	21%
Community Update (City Newsletter)	85%	96%	89%	89%
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	72%	79%	78%	76%
The City of Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	68%	87%	76%	76%
City's email notices (eNotification)	23%	30%	32%	27%
Utility bill inserts	62%	84%	73%	71%
Word of mouth	84%	88%	88%	86%

Table 123: Information Source Ratings by Respondent Geographic Area

Indicate the quality and reliability of the information from that source. (Percent rating positively e.g., excellent/good)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
Attend, watch or stream a City Council meeting or other program on Comcast channel 8 (government access) or online	69%	74%	71%	71%
Community Update (City Newsletter)	87%	88%	87%	87%
The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly	69%	66%	75%	70%
The City of Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	82%	81%	78%	80%
City's email notices (eNotification)	79%	91%	82%	84%
Utility bill inserts	75%	77%	77%	76%
Word of mouth	50%	49%	53%	50%

Table 124: Likelihood of Social Media Use by Respondent Geographic Area

(Percent rating positively e.g., very likely/somewhat likely)	Area			Overall
	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	
How likely, if at all, would you be to look for official City information on social media websites (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc.) if the City were to increase its presence or activity?	45%	48%	44%	46%

Appendix C: Verbatim Responses to Open-ended Survey Questions

All write-in responses are presented below verbatim, meaning spelling and grammar has not been corrected.

Question 11a: List the department the employee you most recently contacted works in:

- 911
- 1st Responders/police.
- Administration.
- Administration.
- animal control I think also a judge in the court.
- Arborist questions (dying big trees).
- Arborist.
- Ardor specialist.
- Bill pay.
- Billing (water/trash).
- Billing for Water & material disposal.
- Billing for Water etc.
- Billing, Rec Center.
- Billing.
- Billing.
- Billing.
- Billing/Water & sewer bill.
- Bldg.
- Building and zoning.
- Building Code dept.
- Building new heater insp.
- Building Permit & Planning.
- Building permit.
- Building permit.
- Building permits.
- Building permits/inspections.
- Building Planning.
- Building safety.
- Building.
- Building.
- Building.
- Building.
- Building/permits.
- Called about Water/sewer bill.
- Can't recall!
- Can't recall.
- city clerk - dog licensing.
- city clerk XXXX.
- city council.
- city council.
- city Forrester.
- City hall Re: birth certification female (XXXX?).
- city Hall reception.
- city Hall.
- city manager.
- city manager.
- city manager.
- city manager.
- city manager/arts admin.
- City manager's office- no follow up was received.
- city of Louisville utilities.
- city to Pay Utility bill.
- Code enforcement- does not enforce dog off leash law.
- Code enforcement Louisville police.
- Code enforcement non-emergency dogs-barking.
- Code enforcement, animal control.
- Code enforcement.
- Code enforcement.
- Code enforcement.
- Code enforcement.
- Code enforcement/Fire dept.
- County clerk- very lazy!
- County courthouse.
- courthouse.
- Dept of Planning & bldg safety.
- Deputy city manager.
- dog catcher.

- No one contacted.
- None lately.
- None.
- None.
- not sure.
- Oh dear- someone on the council I wrote to!
- open space.
- open space.
- open space.
- open space/Parks.
- park & Rec / XXXX.
- park & Recreation dept.
- park reservations.
- Park.
- Parks - open space.
- Parks & open space on Davidson Mesa.
- Parks & open space.
- Parks & Rec dept.
- Parks & Rec.
- Parks & recreation.
- Parks & recreation.
- Parks & recreation.
- Parks about pesticides & herbicides.
- Parks and recreation.
- Parks.
- Parks.
- Parks.
- Parks/open space.
- Parks/open space.
- Parks/Rec.
- Parks/works with trees.
- Pay Water bill.
- Permit Residential remodel.
- Permit, police.
- permit.
- Permit/inspection.
- permits for Building decks.
- permits.
- permits.
- permits.
- permits-for fence.
- Permitting (construction).
- Pet License renewal- not sure depart.
- Photo contest & catalog production.
- Planning & Building safe.
- Planning & Building safety division.
- Planning & Building safety.
- Planning & Building.
- Planning & zoning (Permit).
- Planning dot shed non-compliant for city works.
- Planning office.
- Planning.
- Planning/Building.
- Police - Library - Rec Museum.
- Police dept.
- Police officer.
- police.
- Police/court house.
- Police/Fire.
- Police/senior Center.
- Public Library.
- Public Library.

- Water/Public works.
- Water-accounting.
- XXXX, open space.
- XXXX (Forester).
- XXXX @ Rec Center.
- XXXX in Reception area when paying H2O/trash bill.

Question 19: What sources, other than those listed above, would you or do you use to get information about the City of Louisville?

- "0027" FB : Quality is poor.
- "Oh Oh two seven" Louisville FB page, open space FB page.
- ? unknown.
- 0027 Facebook page.
- 0027 Facebook page.
- 0027 Facebook.
- 80027 Facebook page.
- 80027 feed - Facebook.
- 9 News.
- Auto phone message about parades & arts events.
- Billboards in coffee shops, etc.
- Boulder weekly, yellow scene, Denver post.
- Bulletin Board Louisville library.
- Bulletin Boards in cafes and stores.
- Call city hall.
- Call city.
- Call the department I need.
- Calling on phone.
- Certainly not the daily comers.
- Channel 9 news.
- Cheilitis magazines, Sr. services.
- Citizens Action Committee.
- City employees.
- City offices.
- Colorado public radio.
- Come to city offices and converse with staff.
- Council members.
- County & Cdot websites.
- Crime updates.
- Denver post.
- Denver post.
- Denver post.
- Don't know of any.
- Don't know.
- Driving around/neighbors.
- Email notification thru Nextdoor Neighbor.com.
- Email to HOA's & let them distribute to homeowners. Better communications with fire department- street closures, etc..
- Emails would be good.
- Facebook - Oh Oh group.
- Facebook - Oh Oh two seven.
- Facebook "80027" group.
- Facebook -"Oh Oh 27 site".
- Facebook "Oh Oh 27" Group.
- Facebook (80027).
- Facebook 0027 group.
- Facebook 80027 page.
- Facebook 80027 page.
- Facebook group "80027" fair quality & reliability.
- Facebook group- The Oh Oh.
- Facebook groups, Denver post, street signage for events.
- Facebook groups.
- Facebook Oh Oh 27 group.
- Facebook- Oh Oh 27.
- Facebook pages.
- Facebook- The 0027.
- Facebook- the Oh Oh 27.
- Facebook Twitter.
- Facebook-"0027".
- Facebook-"Oh-Oh-two-seven."
- Facebook, Instagram.
- Facebook, Next Door.
- Facebook.
- Facebook/0027 website.
- Facebook/social media.
- FB - 80027 page.

- Oh on two seven Facebook group.
- On the Oh Oh 27 facebook group.
- Other business owners.
- Outdoor signage.
- Phone call to City Hall.
- Phone call.
- Phone, paper & newsletters & word of mouth.
- Posters around town.
- Postings at Rec Center.
- Postings downtown along Main St. & in the library.
- Postings in the library.
- Rec Center Boards.
- Rec center catalog.
- Rec Center catalogue.
- Rec Center, library.
- Recreation Center brochure & Facebook.
- Recreation Center.
- RSS feed - Advertised on website.
- Sandwich board notices along the streets.
- Schools, local businesses.
- Search web.
- Shop owners.
- Signs and the monitors at the Rec Center.
- Signs around town (e.g. farmers mkt, summer concerts, etc).
- Signs on streets/corners.
- Signs on the street.
- Signs posted along open space/trails.
- Signs posted at rec center.
- Signs posted on properties (notices, etc).
- Signs posted on the roadside about community meetings.
- Social media (Oh-Oh Two-Seven FB page; Twitter).
- Social media i.e. Facebook.
- Social media, postings downtown.
- Social media.
- Social media.
- Some business owners.
- Staff.
- Street notices.
- Street signs/flags; library.
- Television.
- Text message, facebook.
- Texts.
- That's plenty any more would be overwhelming.
- The 0027 Facebook page.
- The community weekly & Denver post.
- The corner signs promoting city meetings- well done! Notices E library effective, too.
- The Denver post (sometimes) prints/delivers info about Louisville.
- The Facebook group "Oh Oh two seven".
- The library is the primary place I go. And also the playgrounds. Due to family circumstances I don't follow info mailed out. Was disappointed when my mom moved here no affordable housing for seniors available.
- The mail.
- The planning meeting signs postal on corners.
- The Recreation Center catalog.
- TV & Radio news.
- TV or newsletter.
- Twitter, Facebook, website.
- Twitter.
- Unknown.
- Vic's.
- Visits to downtown M.
- Walking around town.
- Website 80027, Linkedin (for professionals), digital billboard that blends into the landscape (not obnoxious)- can be programmed remotely to change info often.
- Would use social media.
- Yellow pages or community guide & business directory.
- Zhexs[?].

Question 21: Comments:

- "Blast" type info on city services e.g.
- #1 source today.
- (1) A parking solution that actually allows residents to park at their own homes is

essential in the downtown business area. Some do not have alley access parking or driveways that can be parked in without blocking the sidewalk. i.e. Permit parking.(2) Trash pickup every other week in nonsense. Some don't compost everything.

- (1) Need extra room for seniors. (a)Rec center. (2) Need to relocate prairie dogs/rabbits north of wells range. (3) Need stop light. (a)Pine and via Rapid.
- 0027 Facebook is great!
- 1. Re: Rec Center overcrowding- Superior residents should pay non-resident fees. 2. Re: Sam's Club development - Commercial use for youth activity center.
- 3-4 yrs ago, I would have listed everything as excellent, instead of small charming town, with additional housing projects it is becoming overcrowded & city not prepared for what they created, roads are congested, not enough schools or water [?] hospital downtown too busy.
- Add more time to the left arrow at South Boulder Road and McCaslin Blvd.
- Already do.
- Always go to website! Social media doesn't seem as reliable & current.
- Am 91, crippled, very hard of hearing. Use the Lafayette library regularly.
- Any future construction should only be allowed on previously built up land. Leave the fields, farms, and open spaces as they are.
- As long as it is accurate!
- Bumping the sidewalks out was a bad idea. Tearing out the wild sweet peas was appalling.
- Can you post on snap chat and there are too many loose dogs.
- Charging for 911 service (fire/rescue) is outrageous!! No snow removal on side streets is embarrassing.
- City Council makes bad decisions on spending, expenses, property purchase.
- City starting to get too crowded/ no more apartments or multi-family housing-

concerned about impact on school class size.

- Code enforcement needs to enforce dog off leash law between 7am-8am & 6pm-7pm & weekends.
- Concerned about the residential development increases which I do not support.
- Development of residential (especially Hi-Density) is ruining Louisville. It is losing its unique character and becoming like all other generic towns.
- Do not have a computer.
- Do not subsidize a Sam's Club redev. Require upgrade of Albertsons to 2010, or do not renew their exclusive license.
- Do not use social media websites.
- Do you/we want that information made public to everyone? Will you be inundated with non-residents?
- Don't ever use social media.
- Don't expose my privacy to social media!
- Don't have cable or a web-site.
- Don't have computer.
- Don't use a blog or allow comments!
- Don't use social media.
- Don't use social media.
- Don't use those social media sites.
- Don't.
- Email (or paper) is best. It reaches a wider audience. I do not support social media.
- Emergency information- i.e. blizzard, flooding, crime.
- Enforce your dog off leash law!
- Enough with building homes & apartments! There is going to be so much traffic & congestion at S. Boulder Rd & 95th in the very near future!
- Facebook (preferred).
- Facebook- already use street fair posts.
- Facebook especially.
- Facebook might be useful, but not the others particularly. E.g. etc. Whatever that might mean.
- Facebook- not twitter or instagram.
- Facebook or Instagram only.
- Facebook would be most useful for me.

- Facebook!
- FB is becoming a news source.
- FB.
- Following on Facebook would give me info and updates.
- For community events like movie night in park, etc. A community calendar would be great.
- For multi family living, - I would want a safe place for children to play-
- Forget Sam's Club site. Focus on crap along S. Boulder Rd: Parco & Crummy Apartments; Rundown vacant stores @ Hwy 42!!
- General. When contractors are hired by the city please supervise their work- there has been damage done to private property by them. No response from contractors.
- Have only lived here a couple of months.
- I am disabled so can't take part of a lot that Louisville has to offer. Too much multifamily housing.
- I do not currently use social media. Facebook might be a good idea, though, since that would be available to the public.
- I don't do social media.
- I don't like to have to go to multiple sites to find information using social media has to be well thought out so those that don't use it can still find the same info elsewhere.
- I don't participate with social media, but I am not opposed.
- I don't use any of those social media sites.
- I don't use social media in this way. I like traditional media.
- I don't use social media.
- I don't use these social media outlets, by choice.
- I don't use these websites.
- I don't use-or want to have to use-social media.
- I grew up in Louisville until I went to college, then moved back last September. In total, have lived 19 years in Louisville .
- I have none of the above and never want to get them.
- I live in Balfour Retirement Community so somewhat isolated from "real" world.
- I loathe social media. Just keep the website up to date!
- I look living in Louisville & would like to stay as I age, but it's hard to downsize my house & stay in Louisville. Need smaller, net zero housing.
- I love living in Louisville! It's better than Boulder!
- I really wish the city would stop building high density housing and ruining what make Louisville a great place!
- I use a water filter so unsure of water quality. I get lost on bike/walk paths & so request street signs when paths (inter section 00) cross a magic street.
- I use Twitter & Instagram & Facebook everyday.
- I used to live in Louisville in my house from 2003-2009 when my children were young & just recently moved back to a townhome town.
- I want more bike trails. The police should ticket people for off leash dogs.
- I would encourage the city to invest in a better outdoor recreational swimming pool.
- I would like to see light reduction policies in neighborhoods- give us back the evening sky & get neighbors to use motion detectors not garage lights.
- I would love to see a small dog area at a dog park!
- I would love to see the weight room at the Rec Center gym set a face lift/expansion.
- I would recommend Facebook.
- I wouldn't look for info on SM. But if it pops up u would notice it.
- If I'm wondering about an issue I will check the city's website but I suppose news alerts/announcements would be good. Twitter.
- If Louisville's demographic becomes "younger", then social media makes sense, it's likely we'll be getting some google employees living in Louisville, so we should be using social media.
- If something big is happening.
- I'm not sure where the police officer/cars hang out... McCaslin and South Boulder

- road have a lot of speeders... seems like a good way to make money!
- Jay Keany has been very helpful with postings on the local Facebook pages.
 - Keep city business professional. Social media is not professional. Police & fire services are top notch in our town, keep it up!!
 - Lafayette is a model to follow on this. I've found their updates to be useful.
 - Less money on trails and parks, more on open space -we passed box primarily for open space. Limit scrapes through ordinance.
 - Louisville is a great place to live. Lack of ranch style single family housing (Not patio homes) is a problem.
 - Louisville is becoming too crowded. Stop allowing development. Louisville is losing in character stop allowing scrape offs.
 - Louisville is close to a perfect town. Now if I could afford to buy a house here.
 - Louisville is not very diverse bk it is too expensive to live here. Downfall- the cost to live here.
 - Louisville is quickly becoming homogenized and is losing it's soul with all the building and the type of people it attracts.
 - Louisville is very wonderful city to live and everything is close by. I enjoy rec center the most.
 - Louisville leaders need to know: Don't block the mountains, don't overcrowd the city, give us open spaces!
 - Louisville, co. Great place to live years ago but a circus now.
 - Love the senior center.
 - Love to see the Rec Center have better hours (later access).
 - Managing issues related to Louisville's growth/demographic shift are important to keeping Louisville a high desirable place to love.
 - Might bring our community even closer.
 - More adult recreation options for team sports would be nice (soccer, basketball, ultimate frisbee).
 - More info in my Facebook feed please.
 - More summer camp at Rec Center-availability!!! Expand swim area-lazy river-children's are (Lafayette much better).
 - Most likely Facebook.
 - Moved to Louisville in 1993 from Boulder. We love it here!
 - Mr. Muckle needs to keep the sidewalks in front of his personal property cleared of unsightly overgrowth of weeds etc.
 - Need a youth center for teenagers. Too many lawns out of control, or filled w/ junk.
 - Never use social media.
 - Never.
 - New website is a big disappointment. Especially Planning Dept.
 - No computer! And no interest in getting one.
 - No more residential building. Traffics in S. Bldr is terrible. Many shops & have to go to Bldr or Lafay. for goods & services gently better biz in Lville.
 - Non-compostable trash could get very stinky over 2 wks ex(baby diapers) and we do have babies that use disposable.
 - None- To much social media. We did not choose website for social media.
 - None.
 - Not big into social media in general (caveat).
 - Not on social media due to privacy concerns.
 - On facebook especially.
 - Once or twice a year.
 - Other family members may use Facebook. Not twitter or instagram.
 - Overall this city is awesome, but I have concern about how the influx of new families to Louisville, Boulder, Lafayette & Erie will impact our quality of life, traffic etc. Lets work together to make smart decisions for the future.
 - Please add a small dog park/enclosure for safety of small dogs. Please enforce leash law especially on bike paths and parks. Leash law on bike paths, in parks & every

where need to be enforced. It is dangerous to have all the loose dogs. TY

- Please consider demolishing the old Sam's Club property and putting in park space, etc. or a public outdoor pool!!
- Please do not bring King Soopers to McCaslin. Please find a developer that will do high density mixed use. I would love a brewery there too.
- Please fix the potholes on McCaslin Blvd. in front of HR block. They are terrible on my car.
- Please no more new housing developments.
- Please provide more info on FB.
- Please think about providing more affordable housing options. We need the diversity in this town.
- Probably would be a good idea as many residents have these. I just don't use social media so I wouldn't pay attention this way.
- Questions 16 & 17 are poor questions because it all depends on what is proposed (density quantity etc.)
- Recreation for young children is sorely lacking in winter, as you can see during overcrowded library story hour. Please find space for indoor playroom or family center-as Westminster and Broomfield have done!
- Right now, I get updates via the Oh Oh 27 Facebook page- If it's happening in Louisville, someone posts about it (including when that guy was smashing into cars in old town).
- Sadly, Louisville is turning into a mini-Boulder so its losing some of its charm & the values are changing negatively.
- See attached new homes. Stop building!! The roads are already much busier than 5 yrs ago. Leave the church it brings so much to the community & 100's of people who go. It is a community center. It was vacant for at least a yr before the church!!
- Slow down growth- this growth in ridiculous!
- Snow removal in Louisville is terrible. That is the worst part of this city. Also very little

affordable housing-esp for seniors. And most other pools in the area are better for little kids so we don't use the Rec Center.

- Social media is helpful.
- Social media is what is wrong w/ America and the world. It is sad but our country is close to doomed... I feel sorry for the youth.
- Some of us don't do social media.
- Spending \$25 million+ for a new Rec Center for a community of 20,000 people is irresponsible.
- Thanks for wanting input.
- The city currently lacks sufficient housing for young professionals or entry-level workers. Not against senior housing, but young workers & families should get housing priority.
- The city has been severely overdeveloped in a short period of time. All these condos/town homes will ruin Louisville's unique advantages and community character. For shame!
- The city of Louisville is great!
- The city website is not that easy to navigate, would be nice to be able to store info for paying utility bills (address, credit card) Library- store library card numbers.
- The city would have to do it so it's accurate. There's a Facebook group with our zip code, but i don't follow because I hear its more gossip than news.
- The government which governs least, governs best!!!
- The Lsvl Rec Center could much better serve seniors (50+) users in improving cleanliness of pool, steam room, hot tub, locker rooms, etc by limiting/isolating services/location/sections to adults only- No young children day. No potty issues! Noise issues! crowding issues.
- The main road are maintained well, but residential roads have lots of cracks/pot holes. The Rec Center needs an expansion/update.
- The more you build, the more you want to raise rent on prices greed IS SO strong.

- The peace and quiet that made Louisville a comfortable place to live is pretty much gone. Sad to see the place crowded and frenetic.
- The quality of life in Louisville has gone down in the last 4 yrs. due to traffic restricted access to services and businesses in downtown. Louisville; high density houses & huge loss of open areas in the city.
- The question says "look for". That sounds like the way a website to pull data. Works-searchable to answer specific questions. Social media pushes data.
- The Rec Center needs more programs for tweens (10-12 years) and younger teens. These ages are left out (except for sports).
- The urns for hot chocolate at winter skate need replacing to ones with thermostates. My son leg was burned and scarred this last winter.
- This city's civil servants do an excellent job. This has been a great place to live!
- Too much residential development! Getting too much traffic. We have become too successful.
- Twitter & Facebook are a great way to keep us informed.
- Twitter waw be good.
- Use Facebook "0027" to post announcements.
- Very happy living & retiring in Louisville.
- We are new residents to Louisville although we have lived in the area for years. After moving to North-end I have become dismayed/disappointed in the level of high density housing at NE, Balfour, Kestrel & Steel Ranch that Louisville has approved. I do not feel there is adequate street infrastructure for services to support this level of growth!
- We could use more teen activities.
- We have enough multifamily housing. It detracts from Louisville anxieties. Please no more.
- We like oh oh 27.
- We love Louisville! What a wonderful place to live!
- We need more of a hometown feel and not a media or marketing strategy.
- We need to figure out a way to stop train from blowing horn... It is impacting value of properties near tracks.
- We would also support weekly recycling but overall every other week trash is strongly supported.
- What is up with the black hole storage tech?
- Where are we suppose to worship? At a Rec Center? On Friday downtown?
- Why have stop signs in residential areas police do no care. Why use/have valid plates, most out of state & new cars have expired plates rich folks do not care.
- Would ask relatives eg, Mayor.
- Would be nice.
- Would like more senior housing that is more affordable for low income seniors.
- Would like to see funding allocated to beautifying the fencing on the Appia and the trailer homes park at S Boulder Rd.
- Would like to see Louisville bring back the Louisville triathlon.
- Would love to see senior housing- single-level patio homes & condos.
- You do not have any Hispanic police supervisors. Why?
- You should replace the entire building department. They are rude and thankless.

Appendix D: Benchmark Comparisons

Comparing Louisville's Results to the Benchmarking Database

Jurisdictions use the comparative information provided by benchmarks to help interpret their own citizen survey results, to create or revise community plans, to evaluate the success of policy or budget decisions and to measure local government performance. Taking the pulse of the community has little meaning without knowing what pulse rate is too high and what is too low. When surveys of service satisfaction turn up “good” citizen evaluations, it is necessary to know how others rate their services to understand if “good” is good enough or if most other communities are “excellent.” Furthermore, in the absence of national or peer community comparisons, a jurisdiction is left with comparing its police protection rating to its street maintenance rating. That comparison is unfair as street maintenance always gets lower ratings than police protection. More illuminating is how residents’ ratings of police service compare to opinions about police service in other communities and to resident ratings over time.

A police department that provides the fastest and most efficient service – one that closes most of its cases, solves most of its crimes, and keeps the crime rate low – still has a problem to fix if the residents in the city rate police services lower than ratings given by residents in other cities with objectively “worse” departments. Benchmark data can help that police department – or any city department – to understand how well citizens think it is doing.

NRC has innovated a method for quantitatively integrating the results of surveys that we have conducted with those that others have conducted. These integration methods have been described thoroughly in *Public Administration Review*, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, and in NRC’s first book on conducting and using citizen surveys, *Citizen Surveys: how to do them, how to use them, what they mean*, published by the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). Scholars who specialize in the analysis of citizen surveys regularly have relied on NRC’s work¹. The method described in those publications is refined regularly and statistically tested on a growing number of citizen surveys in NRC’s proprietary databases.

Jurisdictions in NRC’s benchmark database are distributed geographically across the country and range from small to large in population size. Comparisons may be made to all jurisdictions in the database or to a subset of jurisdictions (within a given region or population category such as Front Range jurisdictions), as in this report. Despite the differences in jurisdiction characteristics, all are in the business of providing local government services to residents. Though individual jurisdiction circumstances, resources, and practices vary, the objective in every community is to provide services that are so timely, tailored, and effective that residents conclude the services are of the highest quality. High ratings in any jurisdiction, like SAT scores in any teen household, bring pride and a sense of accomplishment.

While benchmarks help set the basis for evaluation, citizen opinion should be used in conjunction with other sources of data about budget, population demographics, personnel, and politics to help managers know how to respond to comparative results.

Interpreting the Results

Ratings are compared when similar questions are included in NRC’s database, and there are at least five communities in which the question was asked. Where comparisons are available, three numbers are provided

¹ Kelly, J. & Swindell, D. (2002). Service quality variation across urban space: First steps towards a model of citizen satisfaction, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 24, 271-288.; Van Ryzin, G., Muzzio, D., Immerwahr, S., Gulick, L. & Martinez, E. (2004). Drivers and consequences of citizen satisfaction: An application of the American Customer Satisfaction Index Model to New York City, *Public Administration Review*, 64, 331-341.

in the table. The first column is Louisville’s “percent positive” rating (e.g., “excellent” or “good,” “very safe” or “somewhat safe”). 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 fourth column shows the comparison of Louisville’s rating to the benchmark.

Where comparisons for quality ratings were available, the City of 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 statistical comparison of Louisville’s rating to the benchmark where a rating is considered “similar” if it is within the margin of error; “higher” or “lower” if the difference between Louisville’s rating and the benchmark is greater than, but less than twice, the margin of error; and “much higher” or “much lower” if the difference between Louisville’s rating and the benchmark is more than twice the margin of error.

National Benchmark Tables

Table 125: Aspects of Quality of Life Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
How do you rate Louisville as a place to live?	98%	15	357	Much higher
How do you rate Louisville as a place to raise children?	98%	3	349	Much higher
How do you rate Louisville as a place to retire?	79%	49	331	Much higher
How do you rate Louisville as a place to work?	76%	66	323	Much higher
How do you rate the overall quality of life in Louisville?	97%	10	413	Much higher

Table 126: Community Characteristics Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Sense of community	87%	7	278	Much higher
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	70%	40	261	Much higher
Overall appearance of Louisville	90%	57	326	Much higher
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	68%	86	267	Much higher
Shopping opportunities	58%	133	267	Similar
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	87%	9	232	Much higher
Opportunities to participate in community matters	84%	6	244	Much higher
Recreational opportunities	84%	25	274	Much higher
Employment opportunities	41%	92	282	Much higher
Variety of housing options	42%	206	250	Much lower
Availability of affordable quality housing	17%	252	272	Much lower
Ease of car travel in Louisville	82%	24	271	Much higher
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	60%	18	92	Much higher
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	89%	1	267	Much higher
Ease of walking in Louisville	91%	10	263	Much higher
Traffic flow on major streets	69%	34	316	Much higher
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	90%	61	250	Much higher
Overall image or reputation of Louisville	96%	5	313	Much higher

Table 127: Safety from Crime and in Public Areas Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
From violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	97%	1	124	Much higher
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	88%	2	124	Much higher
In your neighborhood during the day	98%	28	320	Much higher
In your neighborhood after dark	94%	1	171	Much higher
In Louisville's downtown area during the day	99%	7	272	Much higher
In Louisville's downtown area after dark	93%	2	140	Much higher
In Louisville's parks during the day	98%	1	12	Much higher
In Louisville's parks after dark	83%	1	11	Much higher

Table 128: Quality of City Administration Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Information about City plans and programs	75%	91	264	Much higher
City response to citizen complaints or concerns	67%	NA	NA	NA
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8	57%	10	13	Lower
Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	78%	10	43	Higher
Overall performance of Louisville City government	78%	4	10	Much higher

Table 129: Quality of Louisville Public Safety Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Visibility of patrol cars	89%	1	27	Much higher
Enforcement of traffic regulations	79%	23	343	Much higher
Municipal code enforcement issues (dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	68%	53	331	Much higher
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	90%	90	404	Much higher

Table 130: Quality of Louisville Planning and Building Safety Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning Department	63%	4	12	Much higher

Table 131: Quality of Louisville Parks and Recreation Department Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Current recreation programs for youth	85%	4	12	Much higher
Current programs and services for seniors	87%	NA	NA	NA
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	67%	156	258	Lower
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center	81%	6	9	Much lower
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	80%	5	8	Lower
Maintenance and cleanliness of the Louisville Recreation Center	83%	3	7	Much higher
Maintenance of open space	87%	NA	NA	NA
Maintenance of the trail system	90%	6	22	Much higher
Overall performance of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department	89%	NA	NA	NA

Table 132: Quality of Louisville Public Library Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Services at the Louisville Public Library (e.g., reference desk check out, etc.)	98%	1	6	Much higher
Internet and computer services at the Louisville Public Library	92%	NA	NA	NA
Louisville Public Library materials and collections	85%	2	9	Higher
Louisville Public Library building	97%	NA	NA	NA
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	96%	17	314	Much higher

Table 133: Quality of Louisville Public Works Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Street maintenance in Louisville	70%	56	387	Much higher
Street sweeping	71%	108	291	Much higher
Snow removal/street sanding	50%	212	266	Much lower
Street lighting, signage and street markings	82%	2	7	Much higher
Waste water (sewage system)	92%	1	8	Much higher
Storm drainage (flooding management)	89%	7	330	Much higher
Access on sidewalks/crosswalks for disabled persons	91%	2	17	Much higher
Bike lanes on Louisville streets	71%	5	7	Similar

Table 134: Overall Quality of City Services Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	93%	33	401	Much higher

Table 135: Quality of City Employees Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Knowledge	89%	41	141	Higher
Responsiveness/promptness	83%	43	142	Higher
Courtesy	90%	8	35	Much higher
Overall impression	85%	32	336	Much higher

Table 136: Participation in Activities in Louisville Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Used the Louisville Public Library or its services	78%	23	216	Much higher
Used the Louisville Recreation Center	74%	12	216	Much higher

Jurisdictions Included in the National Benchmark Comparisons

Listed below are the jurisdictions included in the national benchmark comparisons provided for the City of Louisville followed by its 2010 population according to the U.S. Census.

Adams County, CO..... 441,603	Albert Lea city, MN18,016	Altoona city, IA 14,541
Airway Heights city, WA..... 6,114	Alexandria city, VA139,966	American Canyon city, CA 19,454
Albany city, OR 50,158	Algonquin village, IL 30,046	Ames city, IA 58,965
Albemarle County, VA..... 98,970	Aliso Viejo city, CA..... 47,823	Andover CDP, MA 8,762

Ankeny city, IA	45,582	Bryan city, TX	76,201	Coronado city, CA	18,912
Ann Arbor city, MI	113,934	Burien city, WA	33,313	Corvallis city, OR	54,462
Annapolis city, MD	38,394	Burleson city, TX.....	36,690	Creve Coeur city, MO	17,833
Junction city	35,840	Cabarrus County, NC	178,011	Cross Roads town, TX.....	1,563
Apple Valley town, CA.....	69,135	Cambridge city, MA	105,162	Crystal Lake city, IL	40,743
Arapahoe County, CO.....	572,003	Cannon Beach city, OR	1,690	Dacono city, CO	4,152
Arkansas City city, AR.....	366	Canton city, SD.....	3,057	Dade City city, FL	6,437
Arlington city, TX	365,438	Cape Coral city, FL	154,305	Dakota County, MN	398,552
Arlington County, VA	207,627	Cape Girardeau city, MO...	37,941	Dallas city, OR.....	14,583
Arvada city, CO	106,433	Carlisle borough, PA	18,682	Dallas city, TX	1,197,816
Asheville city, NC	83,393	Carlsbad city, CA.....	105,328	Danville city, KY	16,218
Ashland city, OR.....	20,078	Carroll city, IA	10,103	Dardenne Prairie city, MO	11,494
Ashland town, VA.....	7,225	Cartersville city, GA	19,731	Davenport city, IA	99,685
Aspen city, CO.....	6,658	Cary town, NC	135,234	Davidson town, NC	10,944
Athens-Clarke County unified government,	115,452	Casa Grande city, AZ	48,571	Dayton city, OH	141,527
Auburn city, AL	53,380	Casper city, WY	55,316	Decatur city, GA.....	19,335
Auburn city, WA	70,180	Castine town, ME.....	1,366	Del Mar city, CA	4,161
Augusta CCD, GA	134,777	Castle Pines North city, CO	10,360	Delray Beach city, FL.....	60,522
Aurora city, CO.....	325,078	Castle Rock town, CO	48,231	Denison city, TX	22,682
Austin city, TX	790,390	Cedar Rapids city, IA	126,326	Denton city, TX	113,383
Bainbridge Island city, WA	23,025	Centennial city, CO	100,377	Denver city, CO	600,158
Baltimore city, MD	620,961	Centralia city, IL.....	13,032	Derby city, KS	22,158
Bartonville town, TX.....	1,469	Chambersburg borough, PA	20,268	Des Peres city, MO	8,373
Battle Creek city, MI	52,347	Chandler city, AZ	236,123	Destin city, FL	12,305
Bay City city, MI	34,932	Chanhassen city, MN	22,952	Dorchester County, MD....	32,618
Baytown city, TX	71,802	Chapel Hill town, NC.....	57,233	Dothan city, AL	65,496
Bedford city, TX	46,979	Charlotte city, NC	731,424	Douglas County, CO.....	285,465
Bedford town, MA	13,320	Charlotte County, FL.....	159,978	Dover city, NH.....	29,987
Bellevue city, WA	122,363	Charlottesville city, VA.....	43,475	Dublin city, CA	46,036
Bellingham city, WA	80,885	Chattanooga city, TN.....	167,674	Duluth city, MN.....	86,265
Beltrami County, MN.....	44,442	Chesterfield County, VA..	316,236	Duncanville city, TX.....	38,524
Benbrook city, TX.....	21,234	Chippewa Falls city, WI	13,661	Durham city, NC.....	228,330
Bend city, OR	76,639	Citrus Heights city, CA	83,301	Eagle town, CO	6,508
Benicia city, CA	26,997	Clackamas County, OR ...	375,992	East Baton Rouge Parish, LA	440,171
Bettendorf city, IA	33,217	Clarendon Hills village, IL	8,427	East Grand Forks city, MN ..	8,601
Billings city, MT	104,170	Clayton city, MO	15,939	East Lansing city, MI	48,579
Blaine city, MN	57,186	Clearwater city, FL.....	107,685	Eau Claire city, WI	65,883
Bloomfield Hills city, MI	3,869	Cleveland Heights city, OH	46,121	Eden Prairie city, MN.....	60,797
Bloomington city, MN	82,893	Clinton city, SC	8,490	Edgerton city, KS	1,671
Blue Springs city, MO	52,575	Clive city, IA	15,447	Edgewater city, CO	5,170
Boise City city, ID	205,671	Clovis city, CA.....	95,631	Edina city, MN.....	47,941
Boone County, KY	118,811	College Park city, MD.....	30,413	Edmond city, OK	81,405
Boulder city, CO	97,385	College Station city, TX....	93,857	Edmonds city, WA.....	39,709
Bowling Green city, KY	58,067	Colleyville city, TX.....	22,807	El Cerrito city, CA	23,549
Bozeman city, MT	37,280	Collinsville city, IL	25,579	El Dorado County, CA	181,058
Brentwood city, MO	8,055	Columbia city, MO	108,500	El Paso city, TX.....	649,121
Brentwood city, TN	37,060	Columbia city, SC.....	129,272	Elk Grove city, CA.....	153,015
Brighton city, CO.....	33,352	Columbia Falls city, MT.....	4,688	Elk River city, MN	22,974
Bristol city, TN.....	26,702	Columbus city, WI.....	4,991	Elko New Market city, MN..	4,110
Broken Arrow city, OK.....	98,850	Commerce City city, CO....	45,913	Elmhurst city, IL	44,121
Brookfield city, WI.....	37,920	Concord city, CA	122,067	Encinitas city, CA	59,518
Brookline CDP, MA.....	58,732	Concord town, MA.....	17,668	Englewood city, CO.....	30,255
Broomfield city, CO	55,889	Cookeville city, TN.....	30,435	Erie town, CO.....	18,135
Brownsburg town, IN.....	21,285	Coon Rapids city, MN.....	61,476	Escambia County, FL.....	297,619
		Copperas Cove city, TX	32,032	Estes Park town, CO.....	5,858

Fairview town, TX.....	7,248	Hillsborough town, NC.....	6,087	Lakeville city, MN.....	55,954
Farmington Hills city, MI...	79,740	Holland city, MI.....	33,051	Lakewood city, CO.....	142,980
Fayetteville city, NC.....	200,564	Honolulu County, HI.....	953,207	Lakewood city, WA.....	58,163
Fishers town, IN.....	76,794	Hooksett town, NH.....	13,451	Lane County, OR.....	351,715
Flower Mound town, TX..	64,669	Hopkins city, MN.....	17,591	Larimer County, CO.....	299,630
Forest Grove city, OR.....	21,083	Hopkinton town, MA.....	14,925	Las Cruces city, NM.....	97,618
Fort Collins city, CO.....	143,986	Hoquiam city, WA.....	8,726	Las Vegas city, NV.....	583,756
Fort Smith city, AR.....	86,209	Horry County, SC.....	269,291	Lawrence city, KS.....	87,643
Fort Worth city, TX.....	741,206	Hudson city, OH.....	22,262	League City city, TX.....	83,560
Fountain Hills town, AZ....	22,489	Hudson town, CO.....	2,356	Lee's Summit city, MO.....	91,364
Franklin city, TN.....	62,487	Hudsonville city, MI.....	7,116	Lehi city, UT.....	47,407
Fredericksburg city, VA....	24,286	Huntersville town, NC.....	46,773	Lenexa city, KS.....	48,190
Fremont city, CA.....	214,089	Hurst city, TX.....	37,337	Lewis County, NY.....	27,087
Friendswood city, TX.....	35,805	Hutchinson city, MN.....	14,178	Lewisville city, TX.....	95,290
Fruita city, CO.....	12,646	Hutto city, TX.....	14,698	Libertyville village, IL.....	20,315
Gahanna city, OH.....	33,248	Hyattsville city, MD.....	17,557	Lincoln city, NE.....	258,379
Gaithersburg city, MD.....	59,933	Independence city, MO...	116,830	Lindsborg city, KS.....	3,458
Galveston city, TX.....	47,743	Indian Trail town, NC.....	33,518	Littleton city, CO.....	41,737
Gardner city, KS.....	19,123	Indianola city, IA.....	14,782	Livermore city, CA.....	80,968
Geneva city, NY.....	13,261	Iowa City city, IA.....	67,862	Lombard village, IL.....	43,165
Georgetown city, TX.....	47,400	Issaquah city, WA.....	30,434	Lone Tree city, CO.....	10,218
Gilbert town, AZ.....	208,453	Jackson County, MI.....	160,248	Long Grove village, IL.....	8,043
Gillette city, WY.....	29,087	James City County, VA.....	67,009	Longmont city, CO.....	86,270
Glendora city, CA.....	50,073	Jefferson City city, MO.....	43,079	Longview city, TX.....	80,455
Glenview village, IL.....	44,692	Jefferson County, CO.....	534,543	Los Alamos County, NM...	17,950
Globe city, AZ.....	7,532	Jefferson County, NY.....	116,229	Louisville city, CO.....	18,376
Golden city, CO.....	18,867	Jerome city, ID.....	10,890	Lynchburg city, VA.....	75,568
Golden Valley city, MN.....	20,371	Johnson City city, TN.....	63,152	Lynnwood city, WA.....	35,836
Goodyear city, AZ.....	65,275	Johnston city, IA.....	17,278	Macomb County, MI.....	840,978
Grafton village, WI.....	11,459	Jupiter town, FL.....	55,156	Madison city, WI.....	233,209
Grand Blanc city, MI.....	8,276	Kalamazoo city, MI.....	74,262	Manhattan Beach city, CA.	35,135
Grand Island city, NE.....	48,520	Kansas City city, KS.....	145,786	Mankato city, MN.....	39,309
Grass Valley city, CA.....	12,860	Kansas City city, MO.....	459,787	Maple Grove city, MN.....	61,567
Greeley city, CO.....	92,889	Keizer city, OR.....	36,478	Maple Valley city, WA.....	22,684
Green Valley CDP, AZ.....	21,391	Kenmore city, WA.....	20,460	Maricopa County, AZ....	3,817,117
Greenville city, NC.....	84,554	Kennedale city, TX.....	6,763	Martinez city, CA.....	35,824
Greenwich town, CT.....	61,171	Kennett Square borough, PA	6,072	Maryland Heights city, MO	27,472
Greenwood Village city, CO	13,925	Kettering city, OH.....	56,163	Matthews town, NC.....	27,198
Greer city, SC.....	25,515	Key West city, FL.....	24,649	McAllen city, TX.....	129,877
Guilford County, NC.....	488,406	King County, WA.....	1,931,249	McDonough city, GA.....	22,084
Gunnison County, CO.....	15,324	Kirkland city, WA.....	48,787	McKinney city, TX.....	131,117
Gurnee village, IL.....	31,295	Kirkwood city, MO.....	27,540	McMinnville city, OR.....	32,187
Hailey city, ID.....	7,960	Knoxville city, IA.....	7,313	Medford city, OR.....	74,907
Haines Borough, AK.....	2,508	La Mesa city, CA.....	57,065	Menlo Park city, CA.....	32,026
Hallandale Beach city, FL...	37,113	La Plata town, MD.....	8,753	Mercer Island city, WA....	22,699
Hamilton city, OH.....	62,477	La Porte city, TX.....	33,800	Meridian charter township, MI	39,688
Hanover County, VA.....	99,863	La Vista city, NE.....	15,758	Meridian city, ID.....	75,092
Harrisonburg city, VA.....	48,914	Lafayette city, CO.....	24,453	Merriam city, KS.....	11,003
Harrisonville city, MO.....	10,019	Laguna Beach city, CA.....	22,723	Mesa County, CO.....	146,723
Hayward city, CA.....	144,186	Laguna Hills city, CA.....	30,344	Miami Beach city, FL.....	87,779
Henderson city, NV.....	257,729	Laguna Niguel city, CA....	62,979	Miami city, FL.....	399,457
Herndon town, VA.....	23,292	Lake Oswego city, OR.....	36,619	Middleton city, WI.....	17,442
High Point city, NC.....	104,371	Lake Stevens city, WA.....	28,069	Midland city, MI.....	41,863
Highland Park city, IL.....	29,763	Lake Worth city, FL.....	34,910	Milford city, DE.....	9,559
Highlands Ranch CDP, CO	96,713	Lake Zurich village, IL.....	19,631	Milton city, GA.....	32,661

Minneapolis city, MN.....	382,578	Park City city, UT	7,558	Roselle village, IL.....	22,763
Mission Viejo city, CA	93,305	Parker town, CO	45,297	Rosemount city, MN	21,874
Modesto city, CA.....	201,165	Parkland city, FL	23,962	Rosenberg city, TX	30,618
Monterey city, CA.....	27,810	Pasadena city, CA.....	137,122	Roseville city, MN.....	33,660
Montgomery County, VA..	94,392	Pasco city, WA.....	59,781	Roswell city, GA	88,346
Monticello city, UT	1,972	Pasco County, FL.....	464,697	Round Rock city, TX	99,887
Monument town, CO.....	5,530	Pearland city, TX.....	91,252	Royal Oak city, MI	57,236
Mooreville town, NC	32,711	Peoria city, AZ	154,065	Saco city, ME	18,482
Morristown city, TN.....	29,137	Peoria city, IL	115,007	Sahuarita town, AZ	25,259
Morrisville town, NC	18,576	Peoria County, IL	186,494	Sammamish city, WA.....	45,780
Moscow city, ID	23,800	Petoskey city, MI	5,670	San Anselmo town, CA.....	12,336
Mountain Village town, CO.	1,320	Pflugerville city, TX.....	46,936	San Antonio city, TX.....	1,327,407
Mountlake Terrace city, WA	19,909	Phoenix city, AZ.....	1,445,632	San Carlos city, CA	28,406
Muscatine city, IA	22,886	Pinal County, AZ	375,770	San Diego city, CA.....	1,307,402
Naperville city, IL.....	141,853	Pinehurst village, NC.....	13,124	San Francisco city, CA ...	805,235
Needham CDP, MA	28,886	Piqua city, OH.....	20,522	San Jose city, CA	945,942
New Braunfels city, TX	57,740	Pitkin County, CO	17,148	San Juan County, NM	130,044
New Brighton city, MN	21,456	Plano city, TX.....	259,841	San Marcos city, CA	83,781
New Hanover County, NC	202,667	Platte City city, MO.....	4,691	San Marcos city, TX.....	44,894
New Orleans city, LA	343,829	Plymouth city, MN.....	70,576	San Rafael city, CA	57,713
New Smyrna Beach city, FL	22,464	Pocatello city, ID.....	54,255	Sandy Springs city, GA	93,853
Newberg city, OR	22,068	Polk County, IA.....	430,640	Sanford city, FL	53,570
Newport Beach city, CA....	85,186	Pompano Beach city, FL ..	99,845	Sangamon County, IL.....	197,465
Newport News city, VA ..	180,719	Port Huron city, MI.....	30,184	Santa Clarita city, CA	176,320
Newton city, IA.....	15,254	Port Orange city, FL.....	56,048	Santa Fe County, NM	144,170
Noblesville city, IN.....	11,969	Portland city, OR	583,776	Santa Monica city, CA	89,736
Nogales city, AZ	20,837	Post Falls city, ID.....	27,574	Sarasota County, FL.....	379,448
Norfolk city, VA.....	242,803	Prince William County, VA	402,002	Savage city, MN	26,911
North Port city, FL	57,357	Prior Lake city, MN	22,796	Scarborough CDP, ME.....	4,403
North Richland Hills city, TX	63,343	Provo city, UT	112,488	Schaumburg village, IL.....	74,227
Northglenn city, CO	35,789	Pueblo city, CO.....	106,595	Scott County, MN	129,928
Novato city, CA	51,904	Purcellville town, VA.....	7,727	Scottsdale city, AZ	217,385
Novi city, MI	55,224	Queen Creek town, AZ.....	26,361	Seaside city, CA	33,025
O'Fallon city, IL.....	28,281	Radnor township, PA	31,531	SeaTac city, WA.....	26,909
O'Fallon city, MO.....	79,329	Ramsey city, MN.....	23,668	Sevierville city, TN	14,807
Oak Park village, IL.....	51,878	Rapid City city, SD	67,956	Shawnee city, KS	62,209
Oakland city, CA.....	390,724	Raymore city, MO.....	19,206	Sheboygan city, WI	49,288
Oakland Park city, FL	41,363	Redmond city, WA.....	54,144	Shoreview city, MN	25,043
Oakley city, CA.....	35,432	Rehoboth Beach city, DE	1,327	Shorewood city, MN	7,307
Ogdensburg city, NY	11,128	Reno city, NV.....	225,221	Shorewood village, IL.....	15,615
Oklahoma City city, OK ..	579,999	Reston CDP, VA.....	58,404	Shorewood village, WI	13,162
Olathe city, KS	125,872	Richmond city, CA	103,701	Sierra Vista city, AZ.....	43,888
Old Town city, ME	7,840	Richmond Heights city, MO	8,603	Sioux Center city, IA.....	7,048
Olmsted County, MN.....	144,248	Rifle city, CO.....	9,172	Sioux Falls city, SD	153,888
Olympia city, WA	46,478	Rio Rancho city, NM	87,521	Skokie village, IL	64,784
Orland Park village, IL	56,767	River Falls city, WI.....	15,000	Snellville city, GA	18,242
Oshkosh city, WI	66,083	Riverdale city, UT.....	8,426	Snowmass Village town, CO	2,826
Oshtemo charter township, MI	21,705	Riverside city, CA.....	303,871	South Kingstown town, RI	30,639
Otsego County, MI	24,164	Riverside city, MO.....	2,937	South Lake Tahoe city, CA	21,403
Overland Park city, KS.....	173,372	Rochester Hills city, MI.....	70,995	South Portland city, ME ...	25,002
Oviedo city, FL	33,342	Rock Hill city, SC.....	66,154	Southborough town, MA....	9,767
Paducah city, KY	25,024	Rockford city, IL.....	152,871	Southlake city, TX	26,575
Palm Coast city, FL.....	75,180	Rockville city, MD	61,209	Sparks city, NV.....	90,264
Palo Alto city, CA.....	64,403	Rogers city, MN	8,597	Spokane Valley city, WA ..	89,755
Papillion city, NE	18,894	Rolla city, MO	19,559	Spring Hill city, KS.....	5,437

Springboro city, OH.....	17,409	Thornton city, CO	118,772	West Des Moines city, IA ..	56,609
Springfield city, MO	159,498	Thousand Oaks city, CA ..	126,683	West Richland city, WA	11,811
Springfield city, OR	59,403	Tigard city, OR.....	48,035	Western Springs village, IL	12,975
Springville city, UT	29,466	Tracy city, CA	82,922	Westerville city, OH	36,120
St. Augustine city, FL.....	12,975	Tualatin city, OR	26,054	Westlake town, TX	992
St. Charles city, IL.....	32,974	Tulsa city, OK	391,906	Westminster city, CO	106,114
St. Cloud city, FL	35,183	Twin Falls city, ID	44,125	Weston town, MA	11,261
St. Cloud city, MN	65,842	Tyler city, TX.....	96,900	Wheat Ridge city, CO	30,166
St. Joseph city, MO.....	76,780	Umatilla city, OR	6,906	White House city, TN	10,255
St. Louis County, MN.....	200,226	Upper Arlington city, OH ...	33,771	Wichita city, KS	382,368
St. Louis Park city, MN	45,250	Urbandale city, IA	39,463	Williamsburg city, VA.....	14,068
Stallings town, NC.....	13,831	Vail town, CO.....	5,305	Wilmington city, NC.....	106,476
State College borough, PA	42,034	Vancouver city, WA	161,791	Wilsonville city, OR	19,509
Steamboat Springs city, CO	12,088	Vernon Hills village, IL.....	25,113	Winchester city, VA.....	26,203
Sterling Heights city, MI .	129,699	Vestavia Hills city, AL.....	34,033	Windsor town, CO	18,644
Sugar Grove village, IL.....	8,997	Victoria city, MN	7,345	Windsor town, CT	29,044
Sugar Land city, TX	78,817	Virginia Beach city, VA....	437,994	Winnetka village, IL.....	12,187
Summit city, NJ.....	21,457	Wake Forest town, NC	30,117	Winston-Salem city, NC .	229,617
Summit County, UT.....	36,324	Walnut Creek city, CA	64,173	Winter Garden city, FL	34,568
Sunnyvale city, CA.....	140,081	Washington County, MN.	238,136	Woodbury city, MN	61,961
Surprise city, AZ	117,517	Washington town, NH	1,123	Woodland city, CA	55,468
Suwanee city, GA	15,355	Washoe County, NV.....	421,407	Woodland city, WA	5,509
Tacoma city, WA	198,397	Watauga city, TX	23,497	Wrentham town, MA.....	10,955
Takoma Park city, MD	16,715	Wauwatosa city, WI	46,396	Yakima city, WA.....	91,067
Tamarac city, FL.....	60,427	Waverly city, IA.....	9,874	York County, VA	65,464
Temecula city, CA	100,097	Weddington town, NC	9,459	Yorktown town, IN	9,405
Tempe city, AZ.....	161,719	Wentzville city, MO	29,070	Yountville city, CA.....	2,933
Temple city, TX	66,102	West Carrollton city, OH ...	13,143		
The Woodlands CDP, TX ..	93,847	West Chester borough, PA	18,461		

Front Range Benchmark Tables

Table 137: Aspects of Quality of Life Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
How do you rate Louisville as a place to live?	98%	2	27	Much higher
How do you rate Louisville as a place to raise children?	98%	1	28	Much higher
How do you rate Louisville as a place to retire?	79%	6	29	Much higher
How do you rate Louisville as a place to work?	76%	7	29	Much higher
How do you rate the overall quality of life in Louisville?	97%	3	33	Much higher

Table 138: Community Characteristics Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Sense of community	87%	1	23	Much higher
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	70%	4	20	Much higher
Overall appearance of Louisville	90%	5	22	Much higher
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	68%	9	18	Much higher
Shopping opportunities	58%	13	22	Similar
Opportunities to participate in special events and community activities	87%	1	14	Much higher
Opportunities to participate in community matters	84%	1	16	Much higher
Recreational opportunities	84%	5	22	Much higher
Employment opportunities	41%	9	25	Much higher
Variety of housing options	42%	13	16	Much lower
Availability of affordable quality housing	17%	17	18	Much lower
Ease of car travel in Louisville	82%	3	23	Much higher
Ease of bus travel in Louisville	60%	3	9	Much higher
Ease of bicycle travel in Louisville	89%	1	23	Much higher
Ease of walking in Louisville	91%	1	22	Much higher
Traffic flow on major streets	69%	3	21	Much higher
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	90%	7	18	Much higher
Overall image or reputation of Louisville	96%	1	23	Much higher

Table 139: Safety from Crime and in Public Areas Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
From violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	97%	1	11	Much higher
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	88%	1	11	Much higher
In your neighborhood during the day	98%	3	22	Much higher
In your neighborhood after dark	94%	1	14	Much higher
In Louisville's downtown area during the day	99%	2	18	Much higher
In Louisville's downtown area after dark	93%	1	11	Much higher

Table 140: Quality of City Administration Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Information about City plans and programs	75%	4	14	Much higher
Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	78%	1	6	Much higher

Table 141: Quality of Louisville Public Safety Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Enforcement of traffic regulations	79%	3	24	Much higher
Municipal code enforcement issues (dogs, noise, weeds, etc.)	68%	3	23	Much higher
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department	90%	4	26	Much higher

Table 142: Quality of Louisville Parks and Recreation Department Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	67%	15	19	Much lower
Maintenance of the trail system	90%	3	5	Similar

Table 143: Quality of Louisville Public Library Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall performance of the Louisville Public Library	96%	1	22	Much higher

Table 144: Quality of Louisville Public Works Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Street maintenance in Louisville	70%	2	28	Much higher
Street sweeping	71%	5	21	Much higher
Snow removal/street sanding	50%	19	27	Much lower
Storm drainage (flooding management)	89%	4	20	Much higher
Access on sidewalks/crosswalks for disabled persons	91%	1	5	Much higher

Table 145: Overall Quality of City Services Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Overall, how do you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Louisville?	93%	4	28	Much higher

Table 146: Quality of City Employees Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Knowledge	89%	6	17	Much higher
Responsiveness/promptness	83%	5	14	Higher
Courtesy	90%	5	6	Similar
Overall impression	85%	5	28	Much higher

Table 147: Participation in Activities in Louisville Benchmarks

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Used the Louisville Public Library or its services	78%	3	14	Much higher
Used the Louisville Recreation Center	74%	4	13	Much higher

Jurisdictions Included in the Front Range Benchmark Comparisons

Listed below are the jurisdictions included in the Front Range benchmark comparisons provided for the City of Louisville followed by its 2010 population according to the U.S. Census.

Arapahoe County, CO.....	572,003	Greenwood Village city, CO	13,925
Arvada city, CO	106,433	Highlands Ranch CDP, CO	96,713
Aurora city, CO.....	325,078	Jefferson County, CO.....	534,543
Boulder city, CO	97,385	Lafayette city, CO.....	24,453
Brighton city, CO.....	33,352	Lakewood city, CO.....	142,980
Broomfield city, CO	55,889	Larimer County, CO	299,630
Castle Pines North city, CO.....	10,360	Littleton city, CO	41,737
Castle Rock town, CO	48,231	Lone Tree city, CO	10,218
Centennial city, CO.....	100,377	Longmont city, CO	86,270
Commerce City city, CO	45,913	Louisville city, CO	18,376
Dacono city, CO	4,152	Monument town, CO	5,530
Denver city, CO	600,158	Northglenn city, CO.....	35,789
Douglas County, CO	285,465	Parker town, CO	45,297
Edgewater city, CO	5,170	Pueblo city, CO	106,595
Englewood city, CO.....	30,255	Thornton city, CO	118,772
Erie town, CO	18,135	Westminster city, CO.....	106,114
Fort Collins city, CO.....	143,986	Windsor town, CO	18,644
Golden city, CO	18,867		
Greeley city, CO	92,889		

Appendix E: Survey Methodology

Survey Instrument Development

General citizen surveys, such as this one, ask recipients their perspectives about the quality of life in the city, their use of city amenities, their opinion on policy issues facing the city and their assessment of city service delivery. The 2016 citizen survey instrument for Louisville was developed by starting with the version from the previous implementation in 2012. A list of topics was generated for new questions; topics and questions were modified to find those that were the best fit for the 2016 questionnaire. In an iterative process between City staff, elected officials appointed to the survey committee and NRC staff, a final five-page questionnaire was created.

Selecting Survey Recipients

Approximately 2,000 Louisville households were selected to participate in the survey. To ensure households selected to participate in the survey were within the City of Louisville boundaries, the latitude and longitude of each address was plotted to determine its location within the city. Addresses that fell outside of the city boundaries were removed from the list. Additionally, the voter ward for each address was tracked to enable further breakdowns of survey results. Attached units within the city were oversampled to compensate for detached unit residents' tendency to return surveys at a higher rate.

An individual within each household was selected 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 regardless of year of birth. The underlying assumption in this method is that day of birth has no relationship to the way people respond to surveys.)

Survey Administration and Response

Households received three mailings each, beginning in March 2016. Completed surveys were collected over the following seven weeks. The first mailing was a prenotification postcard announcing the upcoming survey. A week after the prenotification postcard was sent, the first wave of the survey was sent. The second wave was sent one week after the first. The survey mailings contained a letter from the mayor inviting the household to participate in the 2016 Citizen Survey, a questionnaire and postage-paid envelope. The cover letters included a web address for the survey in case respondents preferred to complete the survey online. About 2% of the surveys were returned because the housing unit was vacant or the postal service was unable to deliver the survey as addressed. Of the 1,965 households that received a survey, 790 completed the survey (including 66 completed online), providing a response rate of 40%. The response rates by voter ward ranged from 38% to 45% (details appear in the following table).

Table 14.8: 2016 Survey Response Rates

	Number of surveys mailed	Number of completed surveys	Number of households receiving a survey (minus undeliverables)	Response rate
Ward 1	939	350	924	38%
Ward 2	481	213	473	45%
Ward 3	580	227	568	40%
Overall	2000	790	1965	40%

95% Confidence Intervals

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 number of respondents, and indicates that in 95 of 100 surveys conducted like this one, for a particular item, a result would be found that is within plus or minus five 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 (potentially introducing non-response error) and some eligible households may be unintentionally excluded from the listed sources for the mailing list (referred to as coverage error).

While the 95 percent confidence level for the survey is generally no greater than plus or minus three percentage points around any given percent reported for all respondents (790), results for subgroups will have wider confidence intervals. Where estimates are given for subgroups, they are less precise. For each subgroup from the survey, the margin of error is higher: as much as plus or minus 18% for a sample size of 30 to plus or minus 7% for 200 completed surveys.

Survey Processing (Data Entry)

Mailed surveys were submitted via postage-paid business reply envelopes. Once received, staff assigned a unique identification number to each questionnaire. 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; staff would choose randomly two of the three selected items to be coded in the dataset.

Once cleaned and numbered, all surveys were entered into an electronic dataset. This dataset was subject to a data entry protocol of “key and verify,” in which survey data were entered twice into an electronic dataset and then compared. Discrepancies were evaluated against the original survey form and corrected. Range checks as well as other forms of quality control were also performed.

Data from the web surveys were automatically entered into an electronic dataset and, therefore, generally require little cleaning. The web data were downloaded, cleaned as necessary and then merged with the data from the mail survey to create one complete dataset.

Weighting the Data

The demographic characteristics of the survey respondents were compared to those found in the 2010 U.S. Census estimates for adults in the city. Survey results were weighted using the population norms to reflect the appropriate percent of those residents in the city. Other discrepancies between the whole population and the survey respondents were also aided by the weighting due to the intercorrelation of many socioeconomic characteristics.

The variables used for weighting were respondent gender, age, tenure (rent versus own), housing unit type and Ward. 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

The primary objective of weighting survey data is to make the survey respondents reflective of the larger population of the community. This is done by: 1) reviewing the respondent demographics and comparing them

to the population norms from the most recent Census or other sources and 2) comparing the responses to different questions for demographic subgroups. The demographic characteristics that are least similar to the Census and yield the most different results are the best candidates for data weighting. A third criterion sometimes used is the importance that the community places on a specific variable. For example, if a jurisdiction feels that accurate race representation is key to staff and public acceptance of the study results, additional consideration will be given in the weighting process to adjusting the race variable. Several different weighting “schemes” are tested to ensure the best fit for the data.

The process actually begins at the point of sampling. Knowing that residents in single-family dwellings are more likely to respond to a mail survey, NRC oversamples residents of multi-family dwellings to ensure they are accurately represented in the sample data. Rather than giving all residents an equal chance of receiving the survey, this is systematic, stratified sampling, which gives each resident of the jurisdiction a known chance of receiving the survey (and apartment dwellers, for example, a greater chance than single family home dwellers). As a consequence, results must be weighted to recapture the proper representation of apartment dwellers.

The results of the weighting scheme are presented in the figure below.

Table 149: City of Louisville Weighting Table 2016

Characteristic	2010 Census	Unweighted Data	Weighted Data
Housing			
Rent	27%	18%	27%
Own	73%	82%	73%
Detached*	74%	76%	74%
Attached*	26%	24%	26%
Gender and Age			
Female	51%	59%	51%
Male	49%	41%	49%
Age 18-34	23%	8%	23%
Age 35-54	46%	38%	46%
Age 55 and over	31%	54%	31%
Female 18-34	11%	5%	11%
Female 35-54	24%	23%	24%
Female 55 and over	16%	31%	16%
Male 18-34	12%	3%	12%
Male 35-54	22%	15%	22%
Male 55 and over	15%	23%	15%
Ward			
Ward 1	42%	44%	42%
Ward 2	28%	27%	28%
Ward 3	30%	29%	30%

* ACS 2005-2010

Analyzing the Data

The surveys were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Frequency distributions are presented in the body of the report. Chi-square and ANOVA tests of significance were applied to breakdowns of selected survey questions by respondent and geographic characteristics. 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 our sample represent “real” differences among those populations. Where differences between subgroups are statistically significant, they are marked with grey shading in the appendices (see Appendix B: Comparison of Responses by Respondent Demographics).

Appendix F: Survey Instrument

The following is a copy of the survey instrument.

2016 Louisville Citizen 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 anonymous and will be reported in group form only.

1. Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the quality of life in Louisville:

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
How do you rate Louisville as a place to live?	1	2	3	4	5
How do you rate Louisville as a place to raise children?	1	2	3	4	5
How do you rate Louisville as a place to retire?	1	2	3	4	5
How do you rate Louisville as a place to work?	1	2	3	4	5
How do you rate 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:

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
Sense of community	1	2	3	4	5
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
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
Quality of overall natural environment in Louisville	1	2	3	4	5
Overall image or reputation of Louisville	1	2	3	4	5

3. Please rate how safe you feel:

	<u>Very safe</u>	<u>Somewhat safe</u>	<u>Neither safe nor unsafe</u>	<u>Somewhat unsafe</u>	<u>Very unsafe</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
From violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	1	2	3	4	5	6
From property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	1	2	3	4	5	6
In your neighborhood during the day	1	2	3	4	5	6
In your neighborhood after dark	1	2	3	4	5	6
In Louisville's downtown area during the day	1	2	3	4	5	6
In Louisville's downtown area after dark	1	2	3	4	5	6
In Louisville's parks during the day	1	2	3	4	5	6
In Louisville's parks after dark	1	2	3	4	5	6

4. Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the performance of the following areas of the City of Louisville Administration:

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
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 plans and programs	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of City Employees	1	2	3	4	5
Programming on Louisville cable TV, municipal channel 8.....	1	2	3	4	5
Louisville Web site (www.louisvilleco.gov)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of Louisville City government.....	1	2	3	4	5

5. Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas related to the Louisville Police Department:

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
Visibility of patrol cars.....	1	2	3	4	5
911 service.....	1	2	3	4	5
Enforcement of traffic regulations.....	1	2	3	4	5
Municipal code enforcement issues (dogs, noise, weeds, etc.).....	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of the Louisville Police Department.....	1	2	3	4	5

6. Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas of Louisville Planning and Building Safety Department:

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
The public input process on City planning issues	1	2	3	4	5
Planning review process for new development	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of the Louisville Planning Department.....	1	2	3	4	5
Building permit process.....	1	2	3	4	5
Building/construction inspection process	1	2	3	4	5

7. Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the following areas of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department:

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
Current recreation programs for youth	1	2	3	4	5
Current recreation programs for adults.....	1	2	3	4	5
Current programs and services for seniors	1	2	3	4	5
Recreation fees in Louisville	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of the Louisville Recreation Center	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of the Louisville Senior Center.....	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of the Coal Creek Golf Course	1	2	3	4	5
Maintenance and cleanliness of the Louisville Recreation Center	1	2	3	4	5
Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Maintenance of parks (e.g., landscaping, turf areas, playgrounds, picnic areas, etc.).....	1	2	3	4	5
Maintenance of open space.....	1	2	3	4	5
Maintenance of the trail system.....	1	2	3	4	5
Maintenance of medians and street landscaping	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department	1	2	3	4	5

8. Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the Louisville Public Library and Historical Museum and their services:

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
Louisville Public Library programs (e.g., story time, One Book program, 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 performance of the Louisville Public Library.....	1	2	3	4	5
Louisville Historical Museum programs (e.g., lectures, walking tours, newsletters).....	1	2	3	4	5
Louisville Historical Museum campus	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of the Louisville Historical Museum.....	1	2	3	4	5

9. Please circle the number that comes closest to your opinion about the performance of the following areas of Louisville Public Works Department:

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
Street maintenance in your neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5
Street maintenance in Louisville	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 (sewage system).....	1	2	3	4	5
Storm drainage (flooding management)	1	2	3	4	5
Bike lanes on Louisville streets	1	2	3	4	5
Access on sidewalks/crosswalks for disabled persons	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of Louisville water.....	1	2	3	4	5
Overall performance of Louisville Public Works Department	1	2	3	4	5

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

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
.....	1	2	3	4	5

11. If you have had any email, in-person or phone contact with a City of Louisville employee in the last 12 months, what was your impression of the employee in your most recent contact? (Rate each characteristic below.)

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
Knowledge.....	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness/promptness	1	2	3	4	5
Availability	1	2	3	4	5
Courtesy.....	1	2	3	4	5
Overall impression.....	1	2	3	4	5

11a. List the department the employee you most recently contacted works in: _____

12. In the last 12 months, about how many times, if ever, have you or other household members participated in the following activities in Louisville?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once or twice</u>	<u>3 to 12 times</u>	<u>13 to 26 times</u>	<u>More than 26 times</u>
Played golf at the Coal Creek Golf Course	1	2	3	4	5
Used the Louisville Public Library or its services.....	1	2	3	4	5
Used the Louisville Recreation Center	1	2	3	4	5
Used Memory Square Pool.....	1	2	3	4	5
Visited the Louisville Historical Museum.....	1	2	3	4	5
Attended the Downtown Louisville Street Faire (9 nights in 2015).....	1	2	3	4	5
Attended an event, show or activity at the Arts Center	1	2	3	4	5
Attended another event downtown (Art Walk, Taste of Lsvl, parade, Winter Skate) ...	1	2	3	4	5

13. Beyond basic City services (police, water, sewer, etc.), the City has limited resources and must make hard decisions about funding priorities. First, indicate how important to you each of the following areas are as the City considers residents' current and future needs. Then please select up to three (3) issues the City Council should invest in today.

	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not at all important	Please select 3 top issues
Maintaining, repairing, and paving streets	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Encouraging sustainability (in buildings, energy and water use, recycling, etc.) for both residential and commercial properties	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Creating an <u>indoor</u> community gathering space (arts center, community center, etc.)	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Creating an <u>outdoor</u> community gathering space (amphitheater, commons, etc.)	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing additional recreation facilities and amenities	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Expanding Internet/broadband options	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Using incentives to create business and employment opportunities	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maintaining the City's appearance/attractiveness	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing additional parking in Downtown Louisville	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing financial incentives for the redevelopment of the vacant former Sam's Club property	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increasing the amount of open space maintenance	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increasing the amount of parks maintenance	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing new outdoor multi-purpose turf fields (soccer, football, etc.) ...	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Expanding the Louisville Historical Museum	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Subsidizing affordable housing	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>

14. Currently, the City's trash service (through Western Disposal) provides once per week trash pickup and compost and recycling pickup every two weeks. To what extent would you support or oppose changing the service to once per week compost pickup and trash pickup every two weeks (leaving recycling pickup every two weeks)?

- Strongly support Somewhat support Somewhat oppose Strongly oppose Don't know

15. The City of Louisville currently has a Historic Preservation Tax, which is a dedicated sales tax (0.125 cents on every dollar spent). Revenue from this tax is used to help property owners rehabilitate and preserve historic landmarks which contribute to the character of Historic Old Town Louisville. This tax was approved by voters in 2008 and is set to expire in 2018. To what extent would you support or oppose each of the following options to continue the tax?

	Strongly support	Somewhat support	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	Don't know
Continue the existing sales tax until 2028	1	2	3	4	5
Continue the existing sales tax until 2028 and also dedicate a portion of the tax to help operate the Louisville Historical Museum	1	2	3	4	5

16. Most of the land zoned for residential uses in Louisville has been built out. In the former Sam's Club shopping area residential development is currently not allowed. If this area was to redevelop with retail and offices, to what extent would you support or oppose including any of the following types of housing?

	Strongly support	Somewhat support	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	Don't know
Multifamily housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	1	2	3	4	5
Subsidized housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	1	2	3	4	5
Senior housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	1	2	3	4	5

17. In the area near the US36/McCaslin transit/bus station residential development is currently not allowed. If this area was to redevelop with retail and offices, to what extent would you support or oppose including any of the following types of housing?

	Strongly support	Somewhat support	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	Don't know
Multifamily housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	1	2	3	4	5
Subsidized housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	1	2	3	4	5
Senior housing (apartments, condos, townhomes)	1	2	3	4	5

18. 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 or other program on Comcast channel 8 (government access) or streaming through the City's website	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Community Update</i> (City Newsletter)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5
<i>The Daily Camera/Hometown Weekly</i>	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 email notices (eNotification)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5
Utility bill inserts	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5
Word of mouth	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5

19. What sources, other than those listed above, would you or do you use to get information about the City of Louisville?

20. How likely, if at all, would you be to look for official City information on social media websites (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc.) if the City were to increase its presence or activity?

- Very likely
 Somewhat likely
 Somewhat unlikely
 Very unlikely
 Don't know

21. Comments: _____

Our last questions are about you and your household. Again, all of your responses to this survey are completely anonymous and will be reported in group form only.

D1. How many years have you lived in Louisville?

- Less than 1 year 11-15 years
 1-5 years More than 15 years
 6-10 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. What is your gender?

- Female
 Male

D5. In which category is your age?

- 18-24 years 55-64 years
 25-34 years 65-74 years
 35-44 years 75 years or older
 45-54 years

D6. How many people (including yourself) currently live in your household? _____ people

D7. Do any children 17 or under live in your household?

- No
 Yes

D8. Are you or any other members of your household aged 60 or older?

- No
 Yes

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