City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

Special Finance Committee Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, August 24, 2016
LIbrary Meeting Room
951 Spruce Street
10:00 AM

I. CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

II. REVIEW OF KEY INDICATORS

- Transportation
- Utilities
- Parks
- Open Space & Trails
- Recreation
- Public Safety and Justice
- Community Design
- Economic Prosperity
- Administrative and Support Services
- Cultural Services

III. ADJOURN

City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

CITY COUNCIL COMMUNICATION
AGENDA ITEM II

SUBJECT: **STATUS UPDATE ON PROGRAM KEY INDICATORS**

DATE: **AUGUST 19, 2016**

PRESENTED BY: **MALCOLM FLEMING, CITY MANAGER**

SUMMARY:
Staff is working with the Finance Committee to refine the Key Indicators for all Programs and Sub-Programs. To date the Finance Committee has met and discussed this issue on February 19th, March 4th, April 1st, April 15th, May 10th and July 22nd. Based on Committee Member's comments, staff is working on Key Indicators for each of the 43 Sub-Program areas with the following elements:

- Goals and Objectives that clearly reflect what is intended to be achieved through all Sub-Program related activities.
- Context Data and General Information (Population and/or Businesses Served, Staffing, Budget, Dollars spent per Resident and similar data) for comparison purposes
- Workload measures that reflect the quantity or volume of products, services or effort involved
- Efficiency measures that reflect the resources used to accomplish a measureable outcome; the level of productivity and/or cost per unit of output.
- Effectiveness measures that indicate how well a program is accomplishing the stated goals and objectives. They often measure the results, accomplishments, or quality of the products or services provided.

The Key Indicators are a work in progress. In previous meetings with the Committee, staff focused on satisfying the Committee's expectations for general approach, formatting, structure and level of detail on the Key Indicators for a few Sub-Program areas. Staff has used the Committee's comments to craft templates for all other Sub-Programs. In this meeting staff asks for the Committee's evaluation and direction on the Key Indicators for the following Sub-Programs:

Transportation
- Planning and Engineering
- Transportation Infrastructure Maintenance
- Streetscapes
- Snow and Ice removal

Utilities
- Water
- Wastewater

FINANCE COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

- Stormwater
- Solid Waste, Recycling and Composting

Parks
- Parks
- Forestry
- Horticulture
- Cemetery

Open Space and Trails
- Acquisition
- Maintenance and Management
- Education and Outreach
- Trail Maintenance
- New Trails

Recreation
- Youth Activities
- Adult Activities
- Senior Activities and Services
- Aquatics
- Golf Course

Community Design
- Community Design
- Development Review
- Historic Preservation

Economic Prosperity Program
- Business Retention and Development
- Urban Renewal

Public Safety and Justice
- Patrol and Investigations
- Code Enforcement
- Municipal Court

Cultural Services Program
- Library Services
- Museum Services
- Cultural Arts and Special Events

Administration and Support Services Program

- Governance and Administration
- Public Information and Involvement
- City Clerk/Public Records
- Legal Support
- Human Resources and Organizational Development
- Finance, Accounting and Tax Administration
- Information Technology
- Sustainability
- Facilities Maintenance
- Fleet Maintenance

RECOMMENDATION:
Discussion and direction on the draft Key Indicators developed to date.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. City of Louisville Programs, Goals, Sub-Programs and Key Indicators (2/4/16 Draft)
2. 8/16/16 DRAFT Key Indicators for all Sub-Programs listed above

Transportation Program Key Indicators
Planning and Engineering Sub-Program

Goals

A Safe, well-maintained, effective and efficient multi-modal transportation system at a reasonable cost.

Objectives

Streets, paths and all related infrastructure built and maintained to adopted City standards. Development reviews completed within a specified time period. Progress toward Council's adopted Mode Split

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Development Referrals	Applications			
Active Projects	Items			
Community Inquiries/Requests	Items			
Accident Count	Units			
Traffic Counts	Counts (varies)			
Efficiency				
Maximum Time per Development Referral	Weeks			
Project per Project Manager	Projects/FTE			
% of CIP Designed Within Scheduled Time Frames	%			
Sub-Program Budget	$			
Effectiveness				
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey [1]	% Excellent or Good	??%	??%	
Intersection Safety/Condition Index	Index			
Complete Street Index	Index			
Street and Intersection LOS	Grade			
Mode Split (Vehicle, Transit, Bike or Walk)	% Vehicle			
	% Transit			
	% Bike			
	% Walk			

[1] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.

Transportation Program Key Indicators
Transportation Infrastructure Maintenance Sub-Program

Goals

A safe, well-maintained, effective and efficient multi-modal transportation system at a reasonable cost.

Objectives

A multi-modal system of streets and hard surface paths that satisfy all applicable safety requirements and are maintained to the standards set by City Council.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Street Area Resurfaced	Square Feet			
Street Sweeping	Lane Miles			
Striping	Miles			
Signage	Units			
SF Patched	SF			
Efficiency				
$ per PCI Rating Arterial	$ per PCI			
$ per PCI Rating Collector Maintenance	$ per PCI			
$ per PCI Rating Local Maintenance	$ per PCI			
Effectiveness				
Overall PCI[1] of 75 no Streets < 35	PCI			
School Zone/Route Safety Score	Score			
Walk Score (On Street/Off Street/Park/Open Space)	Score			
Bike Score	Score			
Transit Score	Score			
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey [2]	% Excellent or Good	??%	??%	

[1] PCI is the Pavement Condition Index
[2] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results

Transportation Program Key Indicators
Streetscapes Sub-Program

Goals

A safe, well-maintained, effective and efficient multi-modal transportation system at a reasonable cost.

Objectives

Safe, visually appealing, well-lit, and inviting streets, sidewalks and publicly-owned areas adjacent to streets and sidewalks.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Turf Maintenance	SF			
Tree Maintenance	Trees			
Planting Bed Maintenance	SF			
Total SF of Streetscapes	SF			
Total SF of Irrigated Streetscapes	SF			
Total Hard Surface of Streetscapes	SF			
Street Lights	Items			
Efficiency				
Cost per 1,000 SF Turf	$/1,000 SF			
Cost per Tree	$/Tree			
Cost per 10SF Planting Bed	$/10SF			
Water Score (Irrigation Gal/SF)	Gal/SF			
Average kWh per Streetlight	kWh/Light			
Effectiveness				
Attractiveness Score[1]	1 to 4			
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey [2]	% Excellent or Good	84%	%	
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey[2] of "Street Lighting, Signage, and Street Markings"	% Excellent of Good	82%	??%	

[1] Based on annual review by the Parks and Public Landscape Advisory Board.
[2] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.

Transportation Program Key Indicators
Snow & Ice Removal Sub-Program

Goals

A safe well-maintained, effective and efficient multi-modal transportation system at a reasonable cost.

Objectives

Safe traveling conditions for pedestrians and motorists; cost effective snow and ice control services; reduce economic losses to the City and to businesses that result from employees being unable to get to work; assist Police, Fire and Emergency Medical Services in fulfilling their duties; safe, passable streets, school bus routes and hard surface trails; safe access to City facilities; and snow cleared within 24 hours from sidewalks that are the City's responsibility.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Expenditures/ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Miles of Streets Plowed	Lane Miles			
City Facilities Shoveled	Square Yards			
Miles of Sidewalks and Trails Plowed	Miles			
Deicer Used	Tons			
Category II to IV snow events[1]	Events/Yr			
Efficiency				
Average cost per Category II event	$			
Average cost per Category III event	$			
Average cost per Category IV event	$			
Ave time[2] to resolve Category II events	Nearest ½ Hr			
Ave time[2] to resolve Category III events	Nearest ½ Hr			
Ave time[2] to resolve Category IV events	Nearest ½ Hr			
Effectiveness				
Reported accidents	Filed PD Report			
Facility closures/delayed open due to snow	Closures/Delays			
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey [3] (Snow Removal/Street Sanding)	% Excellent or Good	50 %	??%	

[1] Category II=2' to 6"; Category III= 6" to 12"; Category IV= over 12"
[2] Time from first plow out to all plows back
3 Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.

Utilities Program Key Indicators
Water Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure safe, reliable, great tasting water; properly treated wastewater; effective stormwater control; successfully managed solid waste; and competitive prices for all services.

Objectives

Consistently provide safe and great tasting water, routinely testing quality for compliance with State and Federal Standards. Operate and maintain facilities efficiently, allowing for reasonable and equitable rates while maintaining optimal quality.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Surveys to detect water main leaks	Feet			
Water main flushing	Feet			
Water main valves and hydrants exercised	Units			
Potable water measured and billed	MG			
Hydrants Maintained	Units			
Potable water produced annually (MG)	HBWTP[2]			
	SCWTP[2]			
Efficiency				
Energy per MGD	E/MGD			
Potable water unaccounted	%			
Cost per MGD billed	$/MGD			
Effectiveness				
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey [1] (Quality of Louisville Water)	% Excellent or Good	91%	??%	
Compliance with all State & Federal Stds	Full Compliance	??%	??%	

1 Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[2] HBWTP is the Howard Berry Water Treatment Plant, SCWTP is the Sid Copeland Water Treatment Plant

Utilities Program Key Indicators
Wastewater Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure safe, reliable, great tasting water; properly treated wastewater; effective stormwater control; successfully managed solid waste; and competitive prices for all services.

Objectives

Protect public health and the environment by collecting and treating wastewater in compliance with Federal, State, and Local laws.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Sewer line jetting and cleaning	Linear Feet			
WWTP maintenance	Units			
WWTP testing	Units			
Collection system lift station monitoring	Units			
Industrial Pretreatment Program	Units			
Collection system maintenance	Units			
Efficiency				
Average wastewater treated (daily)	MGD			
Treatment cost per 1,000 gallons[1]	$/1,000 Gallons			
Energy Usage per MGD	Energy/MGD			
Available reclaimed wastewater used[2]	%			
	MG			
Effectiveness				
CDPHE Compliance	Full Compliance	Yes	Yes	Yes
USEPA Compliance	Full Compliance	Yes	Yes	Yes
Odor Complaints[2]	Complaints			
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey[3] (Waste Water)	% Excellent of Good	92%		

[1] The acceptable range for treatment operating cost per thousand gallon is between ?? and ??
[2] The City's water rights limit the total amount of wastewater that may be used to XX MG.
The acceptable range for odor complaints is between 0 and ??
[3] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.

Utilities Program Key Indicators
Stormwater Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure safe, reliable, great tasting water; properly treated wastewater; effective stormwater control; successfully managed solid waste; and competitive prices for all services.

Objectives

Protect the environment and waterways, enhance and improve the water quality in Coal Creek. Proactively reduce pollutants by educating the public and entering intergovernmental partnerships.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Miles of collection system to maintain	Miles			
Debris grates requiring cleaning	Grates			
Quality monitoring tests	Tests			
Public information and education items	Items			
Maintenance and repair requests	Items			
Design standards to maintain	Items			
Regulations requiring compliance	Regulations			
Efficiency				
Cost per mile of collection system	$/Mile			
Maintenance and repairs per FTE	MR/FTE			
Effectiveness				
CDPHE Compliance	Full Compliance	Yes	Yes	Yes
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey of Storm Drainage [2]	% Excellent or Good	89%		
% of Residents familiar with basic Stormwater Standards[1]	%			
Best Management Practices followed[3]	% of BMPs			
Flooding when storm does not exceed design capacity of infrastructure	Zero Incidents			

[1] Based on periodic survey.
[2] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[3] Based on identified list of BMPs and internal independent evaluation.

Utilities Program Key Indicators
Solid Waste, Recycling, and Composting Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure safe, reliable, great tasting water; properly treated wastewater; effective stormwater control; successfully managed solid waste; and competitive prices for all services.

Objectives

Provide a cost effective curbside weekly trash pickup and bi-weekly recycling and compost pickup that delivers customer satisfaction and a reasonable diversion rate.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Total Households Served	Units			
Weekly Trash Service Customers	Units			
Bi- weekly Recycling Service Customers	Units			
Bi- weekly Composting Service Customers	Units			
Service Billing Recipients	Units			
Efficiency				
Total expenditures per ton of material	$/ton			
Average monthly billing cost/account	$			
Effectiveness				
% of Waste Diverted from Landfill	%			
Solid Waste Tonnage/Resident	Tons/Capita			
Recyclables Tonnage/Resident	Tons/Capita			
Compostable Materials Tonnage/Resident	Tons/Capita			
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey [1] (Quality of Louisville Water)	% Excellent or Good			
Monthly bill for small container choice[2]	$/Mo			
Monthly bill for midsize container choice[2]	$/Mo			
Monthly bill for large container choice[2]	$/Mo			

1 Based on survey of customers. The 2016 Citizen Survey did not cover this service.
2 Small=32/32/32 for Trash, Recycling and Compost, Midsize=32/64/64, Large=96/96/32

Parks Program Key Indicators
Parks Sub-Program

Goals

Provide well-maintained parks and landscaped areas that are easy to walk to and enjoyable to visits or see; sports facilities that are fully used and properly maintained.

Objectives

Well maintained, popular parks and facilities that provide multiple outdoor opportunities for residents of and visitors to Louisville to enjoy.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$75	$91	$94
Workload				
Total Park Acreage	Acres	353	353	353
Irrigated Park Acreage	Acres	93	93	93
Non-irrigated Park Acreage	Acres	260	260	260
Park Maintenance	Hours			
Adopt a Park program	Volunteers			
Efficiency				
Park expenditures per irrigated acre	$/Acre	$4,242	$5,194	$5,346
Park expenditures per non-irrigated acre	$/Acre			
Facility (shelters & fields) utilization ratio	% of avail time			
Effectiveness				
Overall Performance Rating of the Louisville Parks and Recreation Department on Citizen Survey [1]	% Excellent or Good	89%	??%	
Respondents Who Rate Adequacy of Parks as "Essential" or "Good" [1]	% Essential or Important	91%		
Attractiveness score[2]	1 to 4			
Adopt a Park Annual Volunteer Hours	Hours			

[1] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[2] Based on annual review by the Parks and Public Landscape Advisory Board.

Parks Program Key Indicators
Forestry Sub-Program

Goals

Provide well-maintained parks and landscaped areas that are easy to walk to and enjoyable to visit of see; sports facilities that are fully used and properly maintained; and a final resting place that meets community needs.

Objectives

A healthy, diverse and sustainable forest throughout the City. Easy to access information on recommended trees and tree management practices specific to Louisville.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$5.86	$5.45	$5.68
Acres within City Limits	Acres			
Workload				
City-owned tree inventory	Trees	10,000	10,000	10,000
Branch drop-off days	Days	24	24	24
Public education programs	Participants	500	500	500
Consultations	Resident requests	129	150	150
Trees pruned	Trees	453	500	500
Contracts managed	Contracts			
Efficiency				
Ave $/branch drop-off day participant	$			
$/City-owned tree	$			
FTEs per tree	Units			
Effectiveness				
Arboretum event rentals[1]	Events			
Respondents who rate quality of Arboretum as “Excellent” or “Good”[2]	% Excellent or Good	?	80%	?
Average overall rating of forestry customer service[3]	Rating on scale of 1 to 4			

[1] Rentals available from May-September.
[2] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[3] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each consultation with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Parks Program Key Indicators
Horticulture Sub-Program

Goals

Provide well-maintained parks and landscaped areas that are easy to walk to and enjoyable to visit of see; sports facilities that are fully used and properly maintained; and a final resting place that meets community needs.

Objectives

A diverse, beautiful collection of plants and landscaped areas in City-owned property.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$4.18	$7.34	$7.71
Workload				
Garden beds maintained	Square Feet	?	?	?
Contracts managed	Contracts			
Total SF and % of total medians maintained as horticulture beds	SF			
	%			
Total SF and % of total irrigated park acreage maintained as horticulture beds	SF			
	%			
Efficiency				
$ per SF	$			
Area per FTE	Units			
Effectiveness				
Attractiveness Score[1]	1 to 4			
Number of CO Native Plants in Collection	Units			

[1] Based on annual review by the Parks and Public Landscape Advisory Board.
.

Parks Program Key Indicators
Cemetery Sub-Program

Goals

Provide well-maintained parks and landscaped areas that are easy to walk to and enjoyable to visit of see; sports facilities that are fully used and properly maintained; and a final resting place that meets community needs

Objectives

Provide a suitable final resting place that meets community needs.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$	$	$
Workload				
Total Acreage	Acres	9	9	9
Plots-Occupied	Plots	2,000	2,035	2,070
Plots-Vacant	Plots	320	320	320
Total customer inquiries	Inquiries	??%	??%	
Efficiency				
Cost to inter (adult size)	Ave $/Per			
Cost to Inter (cremation)	Ave $/Per			
Sub-Program cost per plot	Ave $/Plot			
Acreage Maintained/FTE	Acres/FTE	??%	??%	
Effectiveness				
Cemetery Fund balance vs. operating expenditures (15% minimum target)	Bal./Exp.			
Projected supply of plots relative to demand	Years of Supply			

Open Space & Trails Program Key Indicators
Acquisition Sub-Program

Goals

Acquire candidate properties as they become available and preserve, enhance and maintain native plants, wildlife, wildlife and plant habitat, cultural resources, agriculture and scenic vistas and appropriate passive recreation.

Objectives

Maintain an up to date list of high-priority candidate properties for acquisition. Contact each property owner and, based on the owner's expressed interests, determine the most effective strategy for voluntary acquisition of each candidate property. Maintain contact with each property owner consistent with their expressed interests. Voluntarily acquire candidate properties at a price that reflects the current market value for comparable property (considering all development restrictions, size, location, existing development, and other relevant factors). Maintain funding for acquisition consistent with adopted Council policy.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
OSAB ranked & Council approved Candidate Properties	Units	20	20	20
Property owners contacted	Contacts			
Efficiency				
Ratio of staff time devoted to acquisition related activities divided by # of Properties	Hrs/Properties			
Effectiveness				
Candidate list is up to date	Annual Review			
Rights of First Refusal secured	Rights			
Conservation Easements secured	Units			
Service level rating[1]	Rating on scale of 1 to 4	?	?	?

[1] Based on evaluation cards provided during each meeting with each property owner. Scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Open Space & Trails Program Key Indicators
Maintenance and Management Sub-Program

Goals

Acquire candidate properties as they become available and preserve, enhance and maintain native plants, wildlife, wildlife and plant habitat, cultural resources, agriculture and scenic vistas and appropriate passive recreation.

Objectives

Manage the City's Open Space properties in a manner consistent with good stewardship and sound ecological principles that benefits citizens of Louisville by promoting native plants, wildlife, wildlife and plant habitat, cultural resources, agriculture and scenic vistas and appropriate passive recreation.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Open Space acreage	Acres	695	695	695
Open Space expenditures	Total Exp.	$451,930	$446,010	$504,340
Weed mitigation	Total Treated			
Contracts managed annually	Contracts			
Ranger Naturalist citations	Citations			
Ranger Naturalist verbal warnings	Warnings			
Ranger Naturalist written warnings	Warnings			
Efficiency				
Open Space expenditures per acre	Exp./Acres	$650.00	$642.00	$726.00
Open Space expenditures per capita	Exp./Capita	$22.54	$22.19	$25.09
High Priority weed species treated	% of total			
Colorado "A List" species treated	% Treated			
Effectiveness				
Overall performance rating on Citizen Survey [1]	% Excellent or Good	87%	??%	
Percentage of all Open Space Designated	% of Total	77%		
Contracts Managed Annually	# of Contracts			

[1] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.

Open Space & Trails Program Key Indicators
Education and Outreach Sub-Program

Goals

Acquire candidate properties as they become available and preserve, enhance and maintain native plants, wildlife, wildlife and plant habitat, cultural resources, agriculture and scenic vistas and appropriate passive recreation

Objectives

To conserve and restore Open Space through land acquisition and management for the protection of natural and cultural resources and provide opportunities for education, volunteering and appropriate passive recreation.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Education programs	Programs	25	24	24
Participants	Participants	683	700	800
Volunteer programs	Attendance			
Volunteer hours donated	Hours			
Efficiency				
Average participants per program	Participants/ Programs	27	29	33
Average hours per volunteer program	Hours/ Program	Not Measured		
Effectiveness				
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey [1]	% Excellent or Good	??%	??%	
Average overall rating of Education Programs[2]	Rating on scale of 1 to 4	1.0	1.0	1.0
Average overall rating of Volunteer Programs[2]	Rating on scale of 1 to 4			

[1] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[2] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each program with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Open Space & Trails Program Key Indicators
Trail Maintenance Sub-Program

Goals

Acquire candidate properties as they become available and preserve, enhance and maintain native plants, wildlife, wildlife and plant habitat, cultural resources, agriculture and scenic vistas and appropriate passive recreation.

Objectives

All trails satisfy established maintenance criteria.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Trails - total miles	Miles	33.8	38.3	40.7
Trails - soft surface	Miles	14.5	14.9	15.5
Trails - hard surface	Miles	19.3	23.4	25.2
Wayfinding signage	Units			
Sq Yards Repaired	SQ Yards			
Efficiency				
Sub-Program cost per mile	$			
Time to resolve reported maintenance item	Days			
Effectiveness				
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey [1] (Maintenance of Trail System)	% Excellent or Good	90%	%	
Ave. Maintenance Rating[2] Hard Surface	OSAB Rating			
Min. Maintenance Rating[2] Hard Surface	OSAB Rating			
Maintenance Rating[2] Soft Surface	OSAB Rating			
Min Maintenance Rating[2] Soft Surface	OSAB Rating			

[1] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[2] Based on annual OSAB review of each trail segment with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Open Space & Trails Program Key Indicators
New Trails Sub-Program

Goals

Acquire candidate properties as they become available and preserve, enhance and maintain native plants, wildlife, wildlife and plant habitat, cultural resources, agriculture and scenic vistas and appropriate passive recreation.

Objectives

A trail system that enriches the experience of living in Louisville by providing opportunities for citizens to reconnect with nature and their cultural heritage while also enhancing their mental and physical well-being.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Prioritized list of trail connections/crossings to complete (Wayfinding Plan)	Y/N	Y	Y	Y
Efficiency				
Staff hours devoted to this Sub-Program	Hours			
Effectiveness				
Number of trail connections and crossings remaining to be completed	Total	25	25	14
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey [1]	% Excellent or Good	??%	??%	

[1] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results for "Adequacy of parks, bike paths, playing fields and playgrounds".
.
.

Recreation Program Key Indicators
Youth Activities Sub-Program

Goals

Promote the physical, mental and social well-being of residents and visitors through a broad range of high-quality, reasonably priced recreation and leisure activities for people of all ages, interests and ability levels.

Objectives

Provide programs which stimulate social, physical, and cognitive skills for the youth of Louisville. Encourage community responsibility through volunteer service initiatives that support the well-being of the community. Provide an individualized learning environment in which each child may grow and learn at their own pace.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Summer Adventure Day Camp attendees	Units			
Preschool program attendees	Units			
VOLoCITY teen program attendees	Units			
Youth sports attendees	Units			
Nite at the Rec attendees	Units			
Promotional items	Units			
Efficiency				
Ave. Day Camp attendance/FTE	Participants/FTE			
Preschool Teacher to Student ratio	Ratio			
Ave. # of volunteers per project	Units			
Effectiveness				
Ave. # and % of return participants per sports program	#			
	%			
Overall Performance Rating of "Current Recreation Programs for Youth" on Citizen Survey [1]	% Excellent or Good	85%	??%	
Average overall rating of programs[2]	Rating on scale of 1 to 4	?	?	?
Total Youth Activities participants	Participants			

[1] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[2] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each program with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Recreation Program Key Indicators
Adult Activities Sub-Program

Goals

Promote the physical, mental and social well-being of residents and visitors through a broad range of high-quality, reasonably priced recreation and leisure activities for people of all ages, interests and ability levels.

Objectives

Encourage physical activity, intellectual stimulation, and social well-being by offering adult sports leagues, adult educational programs, and other events.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Adult sporting events	Events			
Adult fitness classes offered	Classes			
Promotional items	Units			
FTE/PTE's	Units			
Facilities/equipment maintained	Units			
Efficiency				
Cost Recovery of Adult Programs (meets or exceeds Council policy)	%			
Effectiveness				
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey (Recreation for Adults)[1]	% Excellent or Good	76%	??%	
Adult participation in fitness classes	%			
Adult participation in sporting events	%			
Average Overall Rating of Programs[2]	Rating on scale of 1 to 4	?	?	?

[1] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[2] Based on evaluation cards submitted in periodic surveys for Adult Rec programs with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Recreation Program Key Indicators
Senior Activities and Services Sub-Program

Goals

Promote the physical, mental and social well-being of residents and visitors through a broad range of high-quality, reasonably priced recreation and leisure activities for people of all ages, interests and ability levels.

Objectives

Encourage physical activity, intellectual stimulation, and social well-being through programs and services for persons 60 and older.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Special Events	Events			
Health and Wellness Events	Items			
Fitness and Sports Events	Items			
Trips	Events			
Daily Lunch Program	Units			
Classes and Workshops	Events			
Volunteer opportunities	Events			
Efficiency				
Average cost per participant	$/Participant			
Average Participants per Day Trip	Att./Trip			
Average Participants Lunch Bunch	Att./Trip			
Average Participants Dinner Group	Att./Trip			
Average Class Size	Att./Class			
Average Silver Sneakers Participants	Att./Event			
Effectiveness				
Overall Performance Rating of Senior Center on Citizen Survey [1]	% Excellent or Good	81%	??%	
Overall Rating of "Current Programs and Services for Seniors" on Citizen Survey[1]	% Excellent or Good	87%	??%	
Average Overall Rating of Programs[2]	Rating on scale of 1 to 4	?	?	?

[1] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[2] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each program with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Recreation Program Key Indicators
Aquatics Sub-Program

Goals

Promote the physical, mental and social well-being of residents and visitors through a broad range of high-quality, reasonably priced recreation and leisure activities for people of all ages, interests and ability levels.

Objectives

Provide comprehensive aquatics programming that meets the needs of the community through highly accessible, enjoyable, and varied opportunities for learning and recreation. Offer a safe, responsive and welcoming aquatics environment that promotes the health and well-being of residents and visitors.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Water Aerobics Classes	Classes			
Rec. Center Pool Management	FTEs			
Memory Square Pool Management	FTEs			
Louisville Dolphins Swim Team	Participation			
Water Aerobics	Classes			
Swim Lesson Participation	Group			
	Private			
Efficiency				
Water Aerobics Class cost per attendee	$/Attendee			
Net Revenue of Rec Center Pool Mgt.	Net Rev			
Net Revenue of Memory Square Pool Mgt.	Net Rev			
Effectiveness				
Total attendance of swim lessons	Units			
Overall performance rating on Citizen Survey [1]	% Excellent or Good	??%	??%	
Average Rating of Programs[2]	1 to 4			
Average Participation[1] (Memory Square Pool Use)	% Reported	33%	?	?

[1] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[2] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each program with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Recreation Program Key Indicators
Golf Course Sub-Program

Goals

Promote the physical, mental and social well-being of residents and visitors through a broad range of high-quality, reasonably priced recreation and leisure activities for people of all ages, interests and ability levels.

Objectives

Provide an enjoyable, yet challenging course for residents and visitors of all skill levels. Attract and retain golfers by offering competitive rates and amenities, continuous maintenance and professional management. Operate as an Enterprise by generating sufficient revenue to cover operations, debt service and capital replacement.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Total Rounds	Rounds			
Season Passes	Units			
Cart Rentals	Units			
Green Fees	$			
Driving Range Fees	$			
Total Playable Days	Playable Days			
Guest Lessons attended	Units			
Number of golf club repairs	Units			
Course Maintenance	FTEs			
Promotional Items	Units			
Efficiency				
Net Revenue per Round	$/Round			
Cart Rental Rev./Cart Lease Debt Service	Rev/Exp.			
Net Revenue per Playable Day	Rev-Op Exp.			
Effectiveness				
Net revenue or (loss)	$			
Resident Participation[1] (Played Golf at the Coal Creek Golf Course)	% Essential or Important	18%	25%	
Average Overall Rating of Program[2]	Rating on scale of 1 to 4			

[1] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[2] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each round with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Community Design Program Key Indicators
Community Design Sub-Program

Goals

Sustain an inclusive, family-friendly community with a small-town atmosphere, effective and efficient building services and effective preservation of the City's historic structures through a voluntary system

Objectives

A well-connected and safe community that is easy for all people to walk, bike, or drive in. Neighborhoods that are rated highly by residents and thriving commercial areas. An open and inclusive long-range planning process with significant public participation.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Municipal Code Compliance/Amendments	Items			
Long-Range Plans and Implementation	Items			
Review of Area Plans	Items			
Zoning Regulations	Items			
Design Standards and Guidelines	Items			
Efficiency				
Area Plans Completed Per Year	Item/FTE			
Code Sections Updated Per Year	Item/FTE			
Effectiveness				
Overall performance of Planning Dept. on Citizen Survey[1]	% Excellent or Good	63%		
Respondents rating of "The Public Input Process on City Planning Issues "Essential" or "Important"[1]	% Excellent or Good	71%		
Alignment of staff recommendation with Final Decision (# Rec vs # Decisions safe as recommendation)	City Council			
	Planning Commission			
Walkability Score[2]	Score			
Sense of Community[1]	% Excellent or Good			
Overall image or reputation of Louisville[1]	% Excellent or Good			

[1] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
2 Rating available through Walk Score

Community Design Program Key Indicators
Development Review Sub-Program

Goals

Sustain an inclusive, family-friendly community with a small-town atmosphere, effective and efficient building services and effective preservation of the City's historic structures through a voluntary system

Objectives

A well-connected and safe community that is easy for all people to walk, bike, and drive in. Neighborhoods that are rated highly by residents and thriving commercial areas. An open and inclusive long-range planning process with significant citizen participation.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident			
Workload				
Pre-Application Conferences	Units			
Plans Review	Items			
Walk-in Plan Review[2]	Items			
Public Hearings	Units			
Zoning Compliance and Variances	Items			
Permits Issued	Units			
Efficiency				
Development Plan Review Time/FTE	Hours/FTE			
Average Walk-in Citizens/Day[2]	Items/Day			
Effectiveness				
Overall performance of Planning Dept. on Citizen Survey[1]	% Excellent or Good	63%		
Respondents rating of "The Public Input Process on City Planning Issues "Excellent" or "Good" [1]	% Excellent or Good	71%		
Customer service and program rating[3]	Rating			
Alignment of staff recommendation with Final Decision (# Rec vs # Decisions same as recommendation)	City Council			
	Planning Comm			
	Bd of Adjust			
Walkability Score[4]	Score			

1 Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
2 Walk-in plan review is available every Tuesday.
3 Based on evaluation cards submitted with each permit application with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor
4 Rating issued by Walk Score

Community Design Program Key Indicators
Historic Preservation Sub-Program

Goals

Sustain an inclusive, family-friendly community with a small-town atmosphere through the effective preservation of the City's historic structures through a voluntary system.

Objectives

Preserve Louisville's historic resources vital to maintaining its small town character. Retain a connection to the City's Heritage which recognizes, values, and encourages the promotion and preservation of Louisville's history and cultural heritage, particularly its mining and agricultural past.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Historic Preservation Grants	Grants			
Historic Preservation Loans	Loans			
Public Hearings facilitated	Hearings			
Historic Preservation Demolition Permits	Administrative			
	HPC			
Outreach Events	Events			
Landmarked Structures	Units			
Historic Preservation Assessment and Designation	Units			
Efficiency				
Application processing time per FTE	Items/FTE			
Plan reviews per FTE	Items/FTE			
Average application review time	Time/Item			
Average Plan review time	Time/Item			
Effectiveness				
Landmarked structures	Structures			
Historic Building research reports	Reports			
Alignment of staff rec with Final Decision of Historic Preservation Commission	Items			
Participants at outreach events	Participants			

[1]Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.

Economic Prosperity Program Key Indicators
Business Retention and Development Sub-Program

Goals

Promote a thriving business climate that provides job opportunities, facilitates investment, and produces reliable revenue to support city services.

Objectives

Maintain positive business relationships throughout the community and assist property owners, brokers, and companies in finding locations and/ or constructing new buildings in the City. Attract and retain a diverse mix of businesses that provide good employment opportunities for Louisville residents.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
Licensed Businesses	Units			
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
BAP Agreements Negotiated	Units			
Meetings Facilitated	Units			
Retention Visits	Units			
Downtown Off-street Parking Spaces Under City Control	Units			
Lease Management (Old City Shops, Koko Plaza)	Items			
Efficiency				
Jobs per capita	Units			
Construction Dollars per BAP Incentive	$			
BAP Incentives per Job Created	Items			
Annual Sales Tax $ per BAP Incentive $	$			
Effectiveness				
New Annual Sales and Use Tax Revenue	$			
Linear Feet of Downtown Patios utilized	Linear Feet			
Downtown Parking Space Utilization	%			
Vacancy Rates	Office			
	Retail			
	Industrial			

Economic Prosperity Program Key Indicators
Urban Renewal Sub-Program

Goals

Promote a thriving business climate that provides job opportunities, facilities investment and produces reliable revenue to support city services.

Objectives

Encourage new development in areas identified as blighted or having reached the end of their useful economic life. Incentivize developers using various funding mechanisms, primarily tax increment financing. Elicit public input through the facilitation of public hearings.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Urban Renewal Plans	Plans			
TIF Bond Issuance	Items			
TIF Reimbursements	$			
Development Agreements Negotiated	Agreements			
PAR Analysis	Results			
Public Hearings	Hearings			
Efficiency				
Projected Value/ Assessed Value	$			
Average processing time for development agreements	Days			
Effectiveness				
Vacant Lots in City	%	??%	??%	
Revenue Generated for City Services	$			

Public Safety & Justice Program Key Indicators
Patrol and Investigation Sub-Program

Goals

Police and other City staff working with the community to help ensure safety, satisfy residents' expectations that individuals observe the City's Municipal Code and State Law, and a justice system that is fair, effective, and efficient.

Objectives

Maintain community safety and a low crime rate through community engagement, effective patrol and efficient response times. Emphasize prevention-oriented police services by engaging community groups in effective partnerships.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$227.00	$232.00	$241.00
Workload				
Outreach Programs	Programs			
Unduplicated Program Participants	Participants			
Calls for Service	Calls	3,016	3,455	4,000
Watch Total[1]	Hours	31,151	33,148	40,578
Case Investigation	Hours	3,240	3,240	3,240
Total Cases	Cases			
Arrests and Holds	Items	250	250	285
Reports (Crime, Incident, and Traffic Accident)	Items	2,076	2,076	2,100
Traffic Citations	Citations	672	1,000	1,000
Efficiency				
Ave. Staff Time per Program Participant	FTE/Participants			
Ave. Response Time for Priority 1 Calls	Days			
Cases per FTE	Units			
Effectiveness				
Overall Performance of Louisville Police Dept. on Citizen Survey [2]	% Excellent or Good	90%		
Visibility of Patrol Cars on Citizen Survey[2]	% Excellent or Good	89%		
Enforcement of Traffic Regulations on Citizen Survey[2]	% Excellent or Good	79%	?	?
Cases Cleared	Cases cleared	No Data	150	150
City of Louisville Crime Rate	Crime rate			

[1] 2015 staffing reflects officers working 21 FTEs with 80% of time on patrol. 2016 staffing reflects officers working 25 FTEs (2 vacancies) and 2017 staffing reflects 27 FTEs (full staffing).
[2] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.

Public Safety Program Key Indicators
Code Enforcement Sub-Program

Goals

Police and other City staff working with the community to help ensure safety, satisfy residents' expectations that individuals observe the City's Municipal Code and State Law, and a justice system that is fair, effective, and efficient.

Objectives

Judiciously enforce the municipal code; including parking, junked vehicles, uncontrolled weeds, and stray dogs. Work with residents and the business community to achieve compliance with City ordinances. Emphasize voluntary compliance over punitive enforcement through the Courtesy Notice program.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$8.86	$8.58	$8.93
Housing Units	Units	8,666	8,666	8,666
Workload				
Code Violation Summons	# of summons	51	49	50
Code Violation Warnings	# of warnings	1,161	1,000	1,000
Patrol Hours	Hours			
Code Reports	CE Reports	419	419	500
Animals Impounded	Impounds	21	21	20
Parking Spaces w Restricted Hours	Spaces			
Parking citations issued	Citations			
Efficiency				
Parking spaces monitored per hour	Spaces/Hour			
Ave. # of Days to Achieve Voluntary Compliance or Initiate Inducement Process	Days			
Properties monitored per FTE	Properties/FTE			
Effectiveness				
Cases Brought into Voluntary Compliance/ All Cases Initiated	Voluntary/ Total	90%		
Rating of Municipal Code Enforcement Issues (dogs, noise, weeds, etc) [1]	% Excellent or Good	Not Measured	68%	
% of Time Restricted Parking Spaces exceed 80% Occupancy.	%			

[1] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.

Public Safety & Justice Program Key Indicators
Municipal Court Sub-Program

Mission Statement

Police and other City staff working with the community to help ensure safety, satisfy residents' expectations that individuals observe the City's Municipal Code and State Law, and a justice system that is fair, effective, and efficient.

. Goals

Maintain accurate permanent records of citations and payments, administer fair and competent hearings, treat all citizens fairly and equally.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$10.64	$11.36	$11.75
Workload				
Total Caseload	Total cases	1,377	1,400	1,400
Cases resolved through Mail-in Option	Mail-in Option	303	300	300
Caseload Requiring Court Hearing	Court hearings	1,074	1,100	1,100
Cases Requiring Jury Trial	Jury Trials	2	2	2
Efficiency				
Ratio of Cases to FTEs	Ratio	984	1,000	1,000
Average staff time per Case	Hours			
Average time for resolution of Cases	Days			
Number of Cases settled before hearings	Units			
Effectiveness				
Cases adjudicated annually	Total Adjudicated			
Average Overall Rating of Programs[1]	Rating on scale of 1 to 4			

[1] Based on evaluation cards provided with each summons with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Cultural Services Program Key Indicators
Library Services Sub-Program

Goals

Provide services, facilities and activities that inform, involve, engage and inspire the community and preserve the community heritage.

Objectives

Provide information and technology to all members of the community, with assistance from an approachable, knowledgeable staff. Foster lifelong learning by delivering wide-ranging, hands-on learning activities and programs to all ages. Practice and reinforce the skills needed for reading readiness with young children so that they are poised to be successful learners when they enter school.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Resident Population of Louisville and Superior	Residents	32,904	33,000	33,000
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$51.49	$53.31	$55.41
Workload				
Check-outs and Renewals	Items	494,889	490,000	485,000
Library Card Holders	Resident Library Card Holders	17,931	18,150	18,150
Programs for Adults, Teens, and Children	# of Programs	818	820	820
Programs for Adults, Teens, and Children	Attendance	21,473	22,000	22,500
Ave Number of WiFi Users	Daily	125	135	150
Visitors	Annual	249,421	230,000	230,000
Efficiency				
Check-outs per FTE[1]	Items/FTE	25,007	23,786	23,544
Program Attendance per 1,000 Served [1]	Units	665	670	680
Summer Reading Program Participation (age 11 and under)	Total registrants	1,558	1,755	1,780
Average Wireless Users	Daily	125	140	155
Ave Times Study Room Requestors Turned Away	Daily	No Data	New metric	New metric
Ave Time from Item Check-in to Back on Shelf	Hours	16	16	16
Ave dDays for Newly Acquired Items to be Ready for Checkout	Days	13	13	13
Effectiveness				
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey [2]	% Excellent or Good	No Data	96%	
Respondents Rating Library "Essential" or "Important"	% Essential or Important	No Data	86%	
Average Overall Rating of Programs [3]	Rating on scale of 1 to 4	No Data	New metric	New metric

[1] For comparison purposes, the Statewide average is 16,667. (Source: Library Research Service)
[2] Statewide average is 543. (Source: Library Research Service)
[3] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[4] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each program with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Cultural Services Program Key Indicators
Museum Services Sub-Program

Goals

Provide services, facilities and activities that inform, involve, engage and inspire the community and preserve the community heritage.

Objectives

Promote, collect, preserve, and interpret the history of Louisville, with emphasis on the coal mining period from 1877-1955. Make historical artifacts and documents accessible both physically and virtually. Educate children and adults about Louisville's past through programs, displays, and publications.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Resident Population of Louisville	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$4.27	$4.27	$4.45
Workload				
Total Collection Size [1]	Items	19,300	19,800	20,300
Total Items Cataloged	Items	9,206	9,406	9,606
Programs and Outreach Offered	Programs Offered	14	30	30
Efficiency				
Attendance to Resident Ratio	Att./ Population	1%	9.5%	9.5%
Average Attendance per Program	Att./ Program	20	63	63
Effectiveness				
Program Attendance [2]	Attendance	274	1,900	1,900
Respondents Who Consider Museum "Essential" or "Important" [3]	% Essential or Important		53%	
History Foundation Paying Members [4]	Members	1,321	1,386	1,460
Web Access Users (site visits)	Total Site Visits	12,200	12,800	13,400
Percent of Residents Who are Members	% of Total	6.59%	6.90%	7.26%
Historic Photos and Documents Catalogued and Accessible (Total) [5]	Items	2,416	2,500	2,600
Staff Time per Acquisition	Hours	New metric	New metric	New metric
Visitors	Annual	2,913	3,500	3,500

[1] Includes digitized images.
[2] New programming added including First Friday Art Walk open houses.
[3] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[4] The families represented by family memberships are assumed to consist of an average of three people.
[5] Not all photos that the Museum has in its collection and digitizes may legally be made accessible online.

Cultural Services Program Key Indicators
Cultural Arts & Special Events Sub-Program

Goals

Provide services, facilities and activities that inform, involve, engage and inspire the community and preserve the community heritage. Continue City sponsored events

Objectives

High-quality public art, cultural arts programming, and diverse, community-wide special events for residents of and visitors to Louisville. Provide facilities for community programming.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Cultural Council events managed	Events			
Marketing materials produced	Items			
Contracts managed	Items			
Fall Festival	Attendees			
4th of July Fireworks	Attendees			
Street Faire	Attendees			
LCC Grant funds administered	$			
Efficiency				
Marketing Materials $/ Attendance (per event)	Cost/ Attendance			
Staff time to volunteer hours	Hours/Hours			
Effectiveness				
Overall performance rating on Citizen Survey [1]	% Excellent or Good	??%	??%	
Average rating of programs[2]	Rating on scale of 1 to 4	?	?	?
Total revenue of tickets sold	$			
Average attendance per event	Attendance			

[1] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results for "Opportunities to attend cultural activities".
[2] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each program with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators
Governance & Administration Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective and efficient governance, administration, and support.

Objectives

Implement policies and programs approved by the City Council, as well as administration of the City as a whole, including leadership and supervision of all departments and delivery of City services.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Insurance Claims Processed	Items			
Management Team Meetings	Units			
Policy Meetings Attended	Units			
Proposed Budget Items	Items			
Number of Annual Reports	Units			
Number of City Services	Units			
Number of Capital Projects	Units			
Efficiency				
% of Budget Utilized	%			
Avg. Budget Preparation Time	Days			
Avg. Response Time to Council Requests	Days			
Effectiveness				
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey [2] (Quality of Services provided by City)	% Excellent or Good	93%		
Financial Audit Results	Rating			
Internal survey rating	Rating	?	?	?
Library Bonds Rating	S&P Rating	AA+		

[1] If possible, provide a measure that reflects comparison to the average of other jurisdictions in Colorado.
[2] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[3] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each program with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators
Public Information & Involvement Sub-Program

Goals

Facilitation of open, inclusive, and transparent government which provides the public access to proceedings through a variety of means.

Objectives

Facilitate open, inclusive, and transparent government for the public. Provide open access to proceedings and effectively communicate goals and activities of the City to the public. Provide information to the public in a variety of ways by publishing the City newsletter, managing the City website, overseeing Channel 8 broadcasting, advertising City events, and answering inquiries from residents and the media.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Newsletters Produced	Units			
Meetings Broadcast on Channel 8/ Streaming Online	Units			
Public/Media Inquiries	Items			
Website Content for Departments	%			
Efficiency				
Ave. Response Time/ Information Requests	Days			
Website Visits	Units			
City Event Attendance Rates	Units			
Effectiveness				
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey [2]	% Excellent or Good	??%	??%	
Respondents rating ??? "Essential" or "Important" [2]	% Essential or Important	??%	??%	
Average Overall Rating of Programs[3]	Rating on scale of 1 to 4	?	?	?

[1] If possible, provide a measure that reflects comparison to the average of other jurisdictions in Colorado.
[2] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[3] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each program with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Administration & Support Services Key Indicators
City Clerk/Public Records Sub-Program

Goals

Provide efficient and transparent processes for residents to access public documents and notice of public hearings/events. Transparent, consistent and responsive management of the licensing authority and special events permits.

Objectives

Handles all document management for long term and permanent record retention; Fulfills open records requests; advertises public hearings and legal notices for the City Council; issues liquor and marijuana licenses; and issues dog licenses and special events permits.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$17.10	$15.98	$???
Workload				
Public Information Requests Filled	Requests			
City Council Agenda Items Processed	Items			
Board & Commission Applications Processed	Items			
Special Event Permits Processed	Items			
Open Government Trainings Offered	Units			
Efficiency				
Open Government Training Cost per Attendee	Cost/Attendee			
Ave. Special Event Permit Processing Time/FTE	Time/FTE			
Effectiveness				
Number of Complaints	Items		??%	
Number of Agenda Items Processed/Average Time	Items/Time		??%	
Number of Board and Commission Applications Processed	Items			
Number of Special Events Permits Processed	Items			
Customer Service Survey Results[1]	Rating 1 to 4			

[1] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each program with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators
Legal Support Sub-Program

Goals

Provide effective, cost efficient and responsive legal advice to the City Council.

Objectives

Advise City Council, Management, and Staff in legal matters pertaining to their official powers and duties. Represents the City in all legal proceedings, drafts ordinances, and all other legal documents on behalf of the City.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
City Legal Work	Hours			
Water Attorney Legal Work	Hours			
Urban Renewal Legal Work	Hours			
Legal Opinions	Items			
Legislation Drafted	Items			
Education/Trainings Offered	Units			
Contract Review	Hours			
Efficiency				
Avg. Time to Process Contracts	Days			
Avg. Response Time to Council/Staff Requests	Days			
Ave. Attendance of Workshops/Trainings Offered	Att./Trainings			
Effectiveness				
Total Hours Billed	Hours	??%	??%	
Contracts Reviewed	Units	?	?	?

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators
Human Resources & Organizational Development
Sub-Program

Goals

Human Resources goal is to continue to be an employer of choice, with low employee turnover and high morale.

Objectives

Attract and retain highly qualified and dedicated employees to the City of Louisville by providing competitive compensation and benefits, effective employee training, and ongoing career and professional development opportunities. Maintain a positive work environment through continuous position classification and review, workforce planning, salary administration, and employee relations. Provide a safe workplace through employee safety training, administration of workers' and unemployment compensation, and maintaining HR related policies and procedures.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per FTE (Benefits)[3]	Dollars	$11,320.00	$11,040.00	$???
Workload				
Citywide FTEs	FTE Positions	185	185	???
Citywide Employees (Full & Part Time)	Active Employees	375	450	500
Recruiting/Hiring/Screening (Vacant Positions Filled)	Positions	209	225	250
Applications Reviewed	Applications	2621	2800	3000
Training Classes Offered to Employees	Classes	15	20	20
Efficiency				
Average Time to Fill a Vacancy[1]	Weeks	Not Measured	4-6 weeks	
HR FTE's/ Total FTE's	%	Not Measured	41% FTE	
HR Budget/General Fund Expenditures[2]	%	2.3%	2.6%	
Effectiveness				
Overall Performance Rating on Internal Survey	% Excellent or Good	??%	%	
Employee Turnover	% Turnover among FTEs	Not Measured	11.32%	
Hiring Official's Satisfaction Rating with Recruitment Process for Filling Vacant Positions	Based on Survey	Not Measured		

[1] Time to fill a vacancy varies based on the type of position being filled.
[2] Includes General Fund Expenditures less Interfund Transfers, Total=$17,011,210 (2016), $16,339,230 (2015)
[3] Reduction from 2015 to 2016 was due to a decrease in premium, not benefits.

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators
Finance, Accounting & Tax Administration Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective and efficient governance, administration, and support.

Objectives

Provide budget and accounting services for the City, including budget development and implementation, debt administration, cash and investment management, accounts payable and payroll, cash receipts, fixed asset records and controls, and financial record keeping and reporting. Provide front desk customer service. Maintain banking and investment broker relationships, and perform audits to ensure the accuracy of financial data.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Journal Entries Posted	Entries	4,651	4,660	4,675
Accounts Payable & P-Card Transactions	Transactions	9,519	9,920	9,975
Sales & Use Tax Returns Processed	Returns	10,853	11,650	12,100
Receipts Processed	Transactions	28,224	28,400	29,000
Payroll Checks & NODs Processed	Transactions	8,220	8,630	8,890
Utility Bills Processed	Bills	85,170	86,020	86,880
Combined Utility Revenue Collected	Dollars	$9.5 M	$10.6 M	$11.7 M
Ave. Cash & Investment Balance/Rate Of Return[2]	Ave. Dollars	$41.1 M	$36.8 M	$38.1 M
	Rate of Return	0.47%	0.75%	1.25%
Efficiency				
Direct Op Cost to Process one PR Trans	Cost/Trans	$8.75	$8.74	$8.91
Direct Op Cost to Process one AP Trans	Cost/Trans	$7.46	$7.65	$7.97
Direct Op Cost to Process one Utility Bill	Cost/Trans	$2.90	$3.10	$3.19
Effectiveness				
Sales/Use Tax Audit Evaluation Rating	Rating	90%	95%	95%
Revenue Forecast Accuracy[1]	Accuracy	99%	91%	95%
Sales/Use Tax Training Evaluation Rating[3]	Rating	94%	98%	98%
GFOA CAFR and Budget Awards	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Unmodified Audit Opinion	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes

[1] excludes interfund transfers for all years and wastewater/storm water bond proceeds in 2015.
[2] Excludes CSRPDA loan proceeds within escrow and URA bond proceeds.
[3] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each program.

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators
Information Technology Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective and efficient governance, administration, and support.

Objectives

Maintain a secure and connected network ensuring all users have appropriate technological resources to effectively perform their jobs. Provide outstanding internal customer service to efficiently resolve employee help desk issues.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
Expenditures per FTE	Exp./ FTE	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
System and Storage Administration	Hours			
Infrastructure Availability	%			
Help Desk	Items			
Software Management	Hours			
Equipment Management	Hours			
Devices Supported	Units			
Workshops/Training Offered	Units			
Efficiency				
Ave. Time to Close Help Desk Ticket	Hours/Ticket			
Op. Expenditures per Workstation	$/Station			
IT budget % of Total Budget	%/Budget			
Effectiveness				
Overall Performance Rating on Internal Survey	% Excellent or Good	??%	??%	
Number of Help Desk Tickets	% Essential or Important	??%	??%	
Total Network Outage Time	Rating on scale of 1 to 4	?	?	?

[1] If possible, provide a measure that reflects comparison to the average of other jurisdictions in Colorado.
[2] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[3] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each program with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators
Sustainability Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective and efficient governance, administration, and support.

Objectives

Utilize environmental, economic, and human resources to meet present and future needs without compromising the ecosystems on which we depend. Actively pursue efficiency upgrades to realize cost savings and reduce environmental impacts.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Energy Consumption/Renewables	Units			
GHG Emissions, Climate Change Management	Units			
Sustainability Programs	Units			
Waste Generation and Diversion	Items			
Sourcing Practices	Items			
Transportation	Units			
Efficiency				
BTUs/GSF	BTU/GSF			
% Vehicles Alternative Fuels	%			
Ave. Cost Savings	%			
GHG Emissions /per Capita	CHG/Capita			
Water Use per Capita	Gallons/Capita			
Energy Use per Capita	KwH/Capita			
Effectiveness				
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey [2]	% Excellent or Good	??%	??%	
Respondents rating ??? "Essential" or "Important" [2]	% Essential or Important	??%	??%	
Average overall rating of programs[3]	Rating on scale of 1 to 4	?	?	?

[1] If possible, provide a measure that reflects comparison to the average of other jurisdictions in Colorado.
[2] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[3] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each program with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators
Facilities Maintenance Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective and efficient governance, administration, and support.

Objectives

Provide safe, clean, and well maintained buildings in a cost effective manner by maintaining cleanliness, mechanical systems, completing necessary repairs, general maintenance, and utility services.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Gross SF of Buildings	Square Feet			
FTE Hours by Building/Program	Hours			
FTE Hours by Category	Hours			
Planned Maintenance Completed per FTE	Items			
Emergency Maintenance	Items			
Efficiency				
Expenditures per/Gross SF	$/GSF			
Custodial Expenditures per/GSF	$/GSF			
Work Orders per FTE	WO/FTE			
Scheduled Maintenance/Reactive Maintenance (emergencies)	Items			
GSF/FTE Maintenance Staffing	GSF/FTE			
$/Custodial GSF	$/GSF			
Building Energy Efficiency Ratings	Ratings			
Overall Facilities Condition Index	Index			
Effectiveness				
Overall Performance Rating on Citizen Survey [2]	% Excellent or Good	??%	??%	
Energy Rebates	Rating on scale of 1 to 4	?	?	?
Average Building Lifespan	Years			

[1] If possible, provide a measure that reflects comparison to the average of other jurisdictions in Colorado.
[2] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators
Facilities Maintenance Sub-Program

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
[3] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each program with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.				

Administration & Support Services Program Key Indicators
Fleet Maintenance Sub-Program

Goals

Ensure inclusive, responsive, transparent, friendly, fiscally responsible, effective and efficient governance, administration, and support.

Objectives

Provide routine, high-quality, preventative maintenance to City owned vehicles, extending their length of service. Maintain standards to replace or re-purpose City vehicles when needed.

INDICATOR	UNIT	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ESTIMATED	2017 PROJECTED
Context Data and General Information				
Population	Residents	20,047	20,100	20,100
$ Per Resident	Exp./ Resident	$???	$???	$???
Workload				
Vehicle Preventative Maintenance	$			
Vehicle Replacement Evaluations	Items			
Vehicles Replaced	Units			
Fleet Inventory	Units			
Fuel - Gasoline	Gallons			
Fuel - Diesel	Gallons			
Efficiency				
% of Vehicles Exceeding Replacement Criteria	%			
$/ per Vehicle	$/Vehicle			
Vehicles per FTE	Vehicle/FTE			
$ per Gallon Diesel	$/Gallon			
$ per Gallon Gasoline	$/Gallon			
Effectiveness				
Internal Performance Rating	Rating	??%	??%	
Average Overall Rating of Programs[3]	Rating on scale of 1 to 4	?	?	?

[1] If possible, provide a measure that reflects comparison to the average of other jurisdictions in Colorado.
[2] Based on the 2016 Citizen Survey results.
[3] Based on evaluation cards submitted at conclusion of each program with rating on a scale of 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor.