

Assessing Community Experiences and Perceptions within Louisville Metro Participatory Spaces

June 2021

Angela D. Storey¹, Victoria Clemons¹, Allison Smith^{1,2}, David Johnson¹, Lauren Heberle¹ & Daniel DeCaro¹

¹University of Louisville & ²Louisville Metro

Table of Contents

Main Report

Project Background and Research Goals	2
Research Context, Process, and Limitations	3
Survey Data: Summary of Events and Processes	5
Data: Summary Demographic Information	6
Data: Summary Engagement Question	8
Preliminary findings	10
Recommendations	12

Event Summaries

Redlining	14
Land Reuse for Building Better Communities (LRBBC)	16
Comprehensive Plan Community Forums	18
Heritage West	20
LMPD Impound Lot	22
Public Arts and Monuments Advisory Committee	24
Louisville Forward Open House	26
100 Resilient Cities	28

Project Background and Research Goals

This report documents findings from research conducted by University of Louisville (UofL) social scientists in collaboration with Metro staff. The project sought to understand the experiences of residents in Metro's spaces of participatory feedback and public engagement, asking: *who participates*, and *how do participants think about these spaces and Metro's participatory processes?*

In order to explore the breadth of relevant experience, we selected eight sets of participatory processes open to the public. Within these processes we collected survey and participant observation data at a total of 21 Metro events held between 2017 and 2019. These processes included some that were focused on Metro-wide planning or decisions, such as those for the Comprehensive Plan and for 100 Resilient Cities, and others that were site-specific but had relevance to the wider region, such as those for Heritage West and for the relocation of the LMPD Impound Lot. Most events were organized by, or in conjunction with, Louisville Forward, the Metro department that coordinates economic and community development, such as land use, planning, and design. We sought to understand who attended each event, and how people perceived both that event and Metro's wider engagement with their communities. Further, we examined the underpinnings of participation in terms of questions of voice, representations, trust, and other key factors identified in relevant academic literature on participation.¹ Critically, we hoped to understand if these participatory spaces included a cross-section of Louisville residents based upon key demographics, including race, gender, education, household income, and location of residence. The persistent residential segregation of the city, both in terms of racial identity and socio-economic status,² framed our research questions. We aimed to understand how these forms of segregation might be reflected in participation in, and interpretations of, Metro outreach.

This research was funded by UofL's Cooperative Consortium for Transdisciplinary Social Justice Research (CCTSJR), and included the participation of UofL faculty from Anthropology, Public Health, Urban and Public Affairs/Psychology, and Sociology.³ The project included research contributions and training for ten undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate students from an array of majors and disciplines, including: Anthropology, Political Science, Sustainability, Pan-African Studies, Public Health, Psychology, and Philosophy. All student and post-graduate researchers received training in data collection, analysis, and/or presentation of findings, and were compensated financially and/or through academic credit. Close collaboration with Metro staff member Allison Smith was critical to event access and to ensure research design and development resulting in actionable information for Metro.

The data for this project was collected between 2017 and 2019, and thus preceded both the COVID-19 pandemic and the critical mass movement for racial justice that began in Spring 2020. These events radically shifted the context in which public participation takes place in Louisville, including changes to the logistics of events and major impacts on perceptions of Metro. Conducting participatory processes is

¹ Academic literature on this subject is broad and interdisciplinary in nature. A few key citations that were utilized in creating this project include: Arnstein, S. R. 1969. A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35:216–224. And: DeCaro, D. A. and M. K. Stokes 2013. Public participation and institutional fit: a social-psychological perspective. *Ecology and Society* 18(4): 40.

² Further information on residential segregation and inequalities in Louisville can be found in the 2019 State of Metropolitan Housing Report (MHC and UofL 2019): http://www.metropolitanhousing.org/wp-content/uploads/member_docs/2019%20State%20of%20Metropolitan%20Housing%20Report_LR.pdf

³ Human Subjects clearance for this research was approved by the University of Louisville Institutional Review Board under project #17.0224.

always a challenging task and the events of the past year have exacerbated mistrust of local government and made some organizations and communities reticent to engage with Metro.

The findings of this report must be framed by this critical context and by the need to respond to the trauma of Louisville communities. In order to expand community involvement in these processes, further work is necessary to build trust based on strong relationships and open lines of communication. To do this, these processes must be continually re-examined and reflected upon in order to improve and adjust to community needs.

Research Context, Process, and Limitations

In order to reach a wide set of residents, Metro's public outreach work includes a range of locations, times, and formats. This variation offers an important way for Metro to seek a broader representation of resident voices and provides a way to identify event structures that reflect the specific kind of information and topics addressed. Events are often held on weekday evenings or on weekends and may include sites in different parts of the Metro region. The format of events in this study varied widely and included: presentations followed by open question and answer periods or discussion (Heritage West, Redlining); individually-driven movement between information stations (Comprehensive Plan, Louisville Forward Open House); day-long workshops (Land Reuse for Building Better Communities); multi-month workgroups (100 Resilient Cities); Open Committee meetings (Public Art and Monuments Advisory Committee); and hybrid formats that incorporated multiple approaches (Impound Lot).

Events varied in structure in order to reflect their different purposes and the types of feedback being sought. This variation did at times provide challenges for our researchers in terms of the breadth and consistency of data collection. As surveys were meant to be completed on location and taken at the end of events, we needed to adapt our approach to different event formats and room set-ups. We worked with the person running the event to announce that we would distribute surveys to anyone interested at the event's end; researchers then passed through the audience offering surveys to those interested once the event had finished and/or offered a centralized point to pick up a survey, based on attendance, timing, and number of researchers present. For events with a less centralized format, where participation followed a more dispersed and individual trajectory, researchers asked people individually if they would be interested in completing a survey as they left. For some events we tailored the distribution of surveys to fit the event outlines. Specifically, for the 100 Resilient Cities process we did not distribute surveys to all events in the series, but only to the first and last in the series (all events were attended and documented through participant observation). We selected this approach because attendance was expected to be relatively consistent across the series and we did not want to exhaust people with feedback at every workshop.

Related challenges included individual interest or ability to complete surveys, as well as researcher limitations. At many events individuals left early or were left without time to complete a survey. These are expected and common occurrences at public meetings, in which attendees participate around work, life, and other obligations. Other individuals at times declined to complete surveys as they had done so at previous events and did not want to again. Occasionally, our survey distribution was also limited by the number of researchers present to distribute sufficient surveys, especially for the largest events, such as Heritage West. Overall estimates of event attendance are not included in this report, as this information

was at times impossible to assess and thus cannot be consistently reported. This estimation was difficult for various reasons: individuals often arrived and left throughout events, spaces of interaction could be physically dispersed, and some attendees opted not to complete Metro's sign-in sheets. Further, survey response numbers may have been impacted by exhaustion within communities related to research saturation, or, in other words, feeling too heavily researched.

In this report we focus on the outcome of our survey data collection. Surveys are useful in gathering data from a wider set of people on discrete, bound topics, and thus were an ideal fit for this approach. It is important to note that surveys are limited by the scope and structure of the questions included, which at times might not capture the entirety of an individual's opinions or experiences. Our ability to make wider claims on the findings is thus limited by the kind of data collected by this instrument.

Survey Data: Summary of Events and Processes

Data collection began in 2017 and utilized a mixed-methods approach, including participant observation, survey administration, focus groups, and interviews. The data included in this report comes from surveys collected at events listed below. Although some events were part of a larger series, surveys were only distributed at the dates listed. At each event at least one member of the research team—and usually between two to four researchers—was present to share the survey and answer participant questions. All event participants were encouraged to take the survey, even if they had filled out one at a previous event. All surveys collected were included in the data analysis, even if partially completed. As a result, the total number of respondents for particular questions within the same event or process may not be the same. The survey structure was designed by author DeCaro.

The number of surveys collected does not represent all attendees or reflect total attendance at events. At some events, such as LRBBC and 100RC, the majority of attendees elected to participate in survey collection. At other events, such as Heritage West, and at some Redlining and Impound Lot events, a smaller percentage of attendees completed the survey. This variation reflects the challenges of surveying at larger and public events, as noted above.

Total number of surveys collected: 306

Total number of events surveyed: 21

Redlining: Four of six meetings were surveyed from March 28, 2017-April 14, 2018, at New Directions Housing Corporation, YouthBuild Louisville, Highlands Baptist Church, Western Public Library; 64 surveys were collected

Land Reuse for Building Better Communities (LRBBC): One meeting surveyed on April 8, 2017, at the Louisville Urban League followed by a tour of urban brownfield sites; 16 surveys were collected

Comprehensive Plan Community Forums: Three meetings surveyed from June 3-June 17, 2017, at The Table, Shively Community Center, and the Urban League; 16 surveys were collected

Heritage West: One meeting surveyed on June 19, 2017, at the Louisville Central Community Center; 34 surveys were collected

LMPD Impound Lot: Four meetings surveyed from February 17-June 21, 2018, at the Louisville Free Public Library Main Branch, Oak and Acorn Intergenerational Center, and Butchertown Pizza; 30 surveys were collected


Public Arts and Monuments Advisory Committee (PAMAC): Five (of eight) meetings surveyed from April 12-June 27, 2018, at the UofL Belknap Campus, Cyril Allgeier Community Center, South Central Regional Library, and Main Library branch; 39 surveys collected

Louisville Forward Open House: One meeting surveyed on July 10, 2018, at the Louisville Urban League; 14 surveys were collected

100 Resilient Cities: Two of eight meetings were surveyed from September 10-December 18, 2018, both at the Main Library branch; 92 surveys were collected


Data: Summary Demographic Information

Note: All surveys collected were included in the data analysis, even if the survey was only partially complete. Because of this, the total number of respondents for particular questions within the same event or process may not be the same.




Race: A total of 284 participants identified their race on the survey with 197 (69.4%) identifying as white; 80 (28.2%) identifying as Black; 4 (1.4%) identifying as East Asian; 2 (.7%) identifying as Hispanic; and 1 (.3%) identifying as South Asian. Events that had a particularly high percentage of Black attendees include Louisville Forward Open House and Heritage West. LMPD Impound Lots and PAMAC had the lowest percentage of Black attendees.

Gender: A total of 287 participants identified their gender on the survey with 173 (60.3%) identifying as female; 111 (38.7%) identifying as male; and 3 (1%) identifying as non-binary. Women made up a higher percentage of attendees overall, but at the Heritage West, Impound Lots, and Brownfield events there was a higher percentage of male respondents. The 100 Resilient Cities and Redlining events had the highest percentage of female attendees and were the two largest events surveyed.




Total: Education



Education: A total of 291 participants shared their education level on the survey with 154 (52.9%) having a master's or PhD degree; 112 (38.5%) having a Bachelor's degree; 24 (8.2%) having a high school education; and 1 (.4%) having not completed high school. Redlining, 100 Resilient Cities and the Comp Plan had more than half of respondents holding a Master's degree or PhD. The Brownfields and Heritage West events had more respondents holding lower degrees.

Household income: A total of 276 participants shared their household income, with 92 (33.3%) making \$80,000 or more per year; 78 (28.3%) making \$50-79,000 per year; 58 (21%) making \$30-49,000 per year; 29 (10.5%) making \$14-29,000; and 19 (6.9%) making less than \$14,000 per year. PAMAC and Redlining were the only events with more than 50% of respondents making less than \$50,000 per year. Events with the most respondents in the top two income brackets were 100 Resilient Cities and LMPD Impound Lot, with more than 75% of responding with \$50k+ per year.

Total: Income (Household)




Data: Summary Engagement Question

Perception of Metro public engagement

The bar chart below represents the total responses across all events to the question “In general, what type of public engagement does Metro Government usually use?” The answer options, as defined in the surveys, were: *Delegate*, give the decision authority to the community; *Partnership*, partner with the community, make decisions together; *Consultation*, gather public input, may not use the input; *Information*, provide information; and *Manipulation*, for example, Metro’s decision is already made, engagement used to manipulate or mislead the public.

In general, what type of public engagement does Metro Government usually use?



Of responses across all events, 10 (3.7%) people answered *Delegate*, 52 (19.5%) answered *Partnership*, 108 (40.6%) answered *Consultation*, 65 (24.4%) answered *Information*, and 31 (11.7%) answered *Manipulation*. This was asked in order to understand how participants currently view Metro Government’s engagement in general, but it does not represent participant’s preferences for participatory processes.

Note that this graph does not appear in the individual event reports following this Main Report. This is because the aggregated chart seen here does not reflect perceptions of individual events, but rather represents the opinions of participants regarding Metro’s overall engagement methods. As such, this question does not pertain to specific event types and best fit in the summary report.

Perceptions of Metro staff and presenters at surveyed events

Participants were also asked to respond to a series of statements related to the event attended. Responses to two of these statements, specific to the hosts and speakers present, are presented below.

The hosts were polite and respectful

Response option	Number of people who selected this response
Strongly Disagree	1
Disagree	2
Neutral	7
Agree	68
Strongly Agree	226
<i>Total number of responses</i>	<i>304</i>

The speakers were honest and not negatively biased

Response option	Number of people who selected this response
Strongly Disagree	0
Disagree	4
Neutral	33
Agree	85
Strongly Agree	175
<i>Total number of responses</i>	<i>297</i>

The tables above show the number of respondents who strongly disagreed, disagreed, felt neutral, agreed, or strongly agreed with the bolded statements above. For the statement: *The hosts were polite and respectful*, less than 1% of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed, 2.3% felt neutral, and 96.6% agreed or strongly agreed. For the statement: *The speakers were honest and not negatively biased*, 1.3% strongly disagreed or disagreed, 11.1% felt neutral, and 87.5% agreed or strongly agreed.

1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

The percentage of responses is not included in the event-specific reports; however, in those reports a range of means for the statements are available. The overall range of means across all events for the

statement: *The hosts were polite and respectful* was 3 to 5 while the range of means across all events for the statement: *The speakers were honest and not negatively biased* was 3 to 4.88. Responses were on a Likert scale, with a 1 indicating “strongly disagree,” a 5 indicating “strongly agree,” and a response of 3 being neutral. The ranges also show that participants tended to feel positively towards the hosts and speakers of the events surveyed. The lower limit of means was a 3 and the upper was 5, or close to 5, indicating that people agreed or strongly agreed with the statements that the hosts were polite and respectful and that the speakers were honest and not negatively biased. In general, people tended to agree more with the statement that hosts were polite and respectful than that the speakers were honest and not negatively biased; this trend can be seen to a greater degree in the individual reports. In the reports, we only include the mean and median for responses on these questions, not the range or distribution. This may obscure some patterns in the data and limit the interpretation.

The LRBBC event, Redlining events, and Impound Lots events had a high mean score for these engagement questions, while PAMAC and Louisville Forward Open House 1 had lower scores, though their means were still 3 or above.

Preliminary findings

Preliminary analysis of survey data suggests several findings and patterns:

- *Many events included a high percentage of attendees with undergraduate and/or graduate degrees and attendees in the highest two income brackets (\$50k-79k, and 80k+).* Across all events surveyed, 91.4% of respondents reported having a Bachelor's degree or higher, compared to only 29.9% of the general Louisville population.⁴ Across all events surveyed, 33.3% of respondents reported an annual household income of \$80,000 or more and 28.3% reported an annual household income of \$50,000-79,000. Based on Census data, the median household income for Louisville Metro is \$53,436. These statistics paint a clear picture of attendees having obtained a much higher educational level than that of the general population, and suggests the likelihood of an average income above that of the region (although a direct comparison is not possible based on the type of data collected). Reasons for these over-representations may vary, and, at times, could be the result of differences in recruitment for events. For example, the 100 Resilient Cities event intentionally sought participation from representatives of nonprofits, social service organizations, scholars, and providers of infrastructural services. Many participants were employees of these agencies and groups, attending in their professional capacity, and more likely to be holding positions that required higher education. Another reason for this over-representation could be due to limited time or availability to participate. For example, limitations in access to childcare, transportation, or flexible work schedule might prevent attendance at weekend and evening events. This is a critical finding and deserves further analysis to determine ways to increase participation in lower income brackets and with varied educational attainment.
- *The majority of respondents for the survey across all events were white, with some events capturing an even higher percentage of white participants.* Although the overall statistics reflect in many ways the demographics of the Metro area (28.2% Black attendance at events, and 21.2%

⁴ Statistics for educational levels and household income for the Metro region:
<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/louisvillejeffersoncountybalancekentucky/EDU685219#EDU685219>

Black population; 69.4% white attendance at events, and 68.9% white population), the variation in attendance at individual events fluctuated and, for some events, the percentage of white survey respondents was much higher than in the wider population. This was especially the case for the events held in the processes for the LMPD Impound Lot and PAMAC. This was true even for some events that followed targeted outreach to communities of color, including sharing event information through relevant neighborhood groups, specific Metro Council district newsletters, and Black-led institutions. For example, engagement events for the LMPD Impound Lot process were geographically dispersed but still drew their participants heavily from the area around the lot's current site at the edge of Butchertown, an area that has a predominantly white population.

- *There was higher representation of women in these processes, particularly at the Redlining and 100 Resilient Cities events.* There may be gendered dimensions within some occupational structures to help explain why we are seeing this within particular processes; for example, more women working as social workers might have influenced attendance at the 100 Resilient Cities events.⁵ It would be interesting for future research to examine the gendered dimensions of participation in Metro event spaces, as well as the intersectional dimensions of participation that examine the links between race, gender, class, and occupation, for example.
- *Heritage West stood out in outreach and implementation, and it was more successful than other events at including a higher percentage of Black attendees.* The surveyed meeting was the culmination of a longer-term visioning, organizing, and naming/branding process that had been supported and led by community members working in partnership with Metro. This was a new and unique process for Metro's participatory work and was focused on a specific site with a contentious history and with a tangible outcome. This event was one of the most diverse in terms of race, but still had a very high percentage of upper-level degree holding participants. Though this event had a very high turnout and was very successful in capturing an enthusiastic audience, it made data collection and survey administration difficult. Here, many attendees came and left without filling out surveys, potentially leaving gaps in the data, and many attendees were under 18 and thus not eligible for the survey.
- *Geographic distribution of participant's place of residence varied, but generally favored residents from eastern parts of Metro, except for the Heritage West event.* The Heritage West event was centered on a specific location and included targeted outreach over the course of the entire project to surrounding neighborhoods in the West End.⁶
- *As a whole, participants were most likely to feel that Metro used the approach of Consultation in their outreach work.* Different processes may be best conducted through one of the first four kinds of approaches (Delegation, Partnership, Consultation, and Information), depending on the needed outcome and context. This is discussed further in our recommendations. The fact that 31 respondents identified Manipulation as their perception of Metro's usual approach may reflect a variety of reasoning, ranging from the event's context to controversy around a process or past experiences. Further research would be needed to examine the reasons for this given answer.
- *Perceptions of Metro staff and of speakers at events were generally positive across all of the events.* Findings show that for both statements an overwhelming majority of respondents agreed

⁵ 83% of social workers in the US identify as women. Salsberg, E., L. Quigley, N. Mehfood, K. Acqueviva, K. Wyche, and S. Sliwa. 2017. *Profile of the Social Work Workforce: A Report to Council on Social Work Education and National Workforce Initiative Steering Committee*. George Washington University Health Workforce Institute and School of Nursing.

⁶ Maps showing attendee residence areas are provided only for some processes.

or strongly agreed, indicating that interpersonal interactions between Metro staff or hosts and the community are positive, regardless of the community’s perception of Metro as a larger entity.

Recommendations

This research was conducted with the purpose of gaining a deeper understanding of what it means for community members to collaborate and actively participate in Metro on community events. Through this work we gained insight into some of the perceptions and frustrations of community members and we offer the following recommendations:

Prioritize Community Outreach in Event Organization

- Metro should prioritize community outreach in all process planning, implementation, associated budgets, and staff effort. There is a continual need to expand and evaluate community outreach, and this aspect of organizing must be thoroughly incorporated into the heart of every process.

Continued Surveying

- We recommend that Metro staff utilize a scaled down version of event surveys, focusing on a few questions about the current event. This data will help staff to assess resident satisfaction and perception of individual events, and to strive for continual reflection and improvement in engagement practices. This can specifically help to assess the match between participant perceptions of an event and Metro intent. We encourage the use of this survey solely for the purposes of learning, rather than performance monitoring. We recommend use of a shortened survey such as this:

PART A: TODAY'S EVENT

Please evaluate today's public engagement event.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I am satisfied with this event.	1	2	3	4	5
2. It will help me or the community. It will have a positive impact.	1	2	3	4	5
3. There was useful information at this event.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The speakers were honest and were not negatively biased.	1	2	3	4	5
5. This event satisfied my sense of self-expression and voice.	1	2	3	4	5
6. This event satisfied my freedom of choice and decision making.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The hosts were polite and respectful.	1	2	3	4	5
8. This is a fair way to engage the public.	1	2	3	4	5

Identify Clear Engagement Models

- The current perception is that Metro primarily utilizes consultative processes. Metro departments and agencies should intentionally and transparently identify which type of engagement process best suits the project/process purpose and be upfront with the community about the purpose of the

process and how input will be used. For example, if a community partnership in decision making is sought, the framework of the meetings/processes should adequately reflect that goal.

- When looking for models, consider the success of the Heritage West process. If Metro looks for more places and ways to share power with communities, Heritage West was the most successful. This event was the culmination of a series of engagements that brought residents and stakeholders into close conversation and participation from the start. This process also had multiple avenues through which to provide input, and it was based upon strong partnership with a community coalition.
- Though perceptions of Metro staff are very positive, we still recommend meaningful facilitation training to all Metro employees leading public events so that staff can manage both the presentation and also the dialogue happening during the event, including ensuring all attendees are able to share their feedback and that the conversation is not dominated by a vocal few, especially those who are present in order to silence others.
- There are key questions about participation that we were unable to answer based on this research and we would encourage other scholars to partner with Metro to help answer them. For example, when and why are residents interested in an event? Are tangible impacts or geographic proximity factors that increase recruitment? What kinds of outreach efforts are more effective? How does engaging the immediate community around a site influence attendance or participation? How might residents become more interested in attending meetings focused on long-term planning issues?

Redlining

March 28, 2017-April 14, 2018





Event Overview

This series was coordinated by Jeana Dunlap, with the goal of informing citizens about historic redlining practices and the long-term impacts on segregation and inequality in Louisville. The focus of these meetings was an online redlining map tool created by Joshua Poe, which visually describes the way in which redlining practices manifest in lives and spatial experiences today. The map juxtaposes the 1937 HOLC maps that defined such practices with current information, including demographics, statistics, neighborhood boundaries, and other census information. Local organizations hosted single events, with a variety of speakers, topics, and presentations. The events were held between March of 2017 and June of 2018.

Survey Collection Information

- Data collection was completed at 4 meetings:
 - March 28, 2017, at 5:30 PM: This meeting was held at New Directions Housing Corporation (1000 E Liberty St.). Slight revisions to the survey instrument were made after this event and thus the data from this event is not included in this summary.
 - April 26, 2017, at 5:30pm: This meeting was held at YouthBuild Louisville (800 S Preston St) with 25 surveys collected
 - November 16, 2017, at 5:30pm: This meeting was held at the Highlands Baptist Church (1101 Cherokee Rd) with 34 surveys collected
 - April 14, 2018, from 1:00-3:00pm: This meeting was held at Western Public Library (604 S 10th St) with 4 surveys collected
- Total respondents: 64

Demographic Information



Engagement questions

1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

The hosts were polite and respectful	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
April 26, 2017; 24 responses	4.88	.33	5
November 16, 2017; 32 responses	4.91	.288	5
April 14, 2018; 4 responses	5	0	5

The speakers were honest and not negatively biased	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
April 26, 2017; 24 responses	4.84	.37	5
November 16, 2017; 32 responses	4.74	.567	5
April 14, 2018; 4 responses	5	0	5

LRBBC

Land Reuse for Building Better Communities
April 8, 2017


Event Overview

This workshop was held at the Louisville Urban League, a community service organization with offices located in Louisville’s West End. This one-time, full-day, Saturday event incorporated interactive activities, educational seminars, and culminated with a tour of three brownfield sites. Participants were able to listen to speakers, learn to use online tools in breakout groups, and participate in a Q&A session. The event targeted current and potential business owners as well as residents impacted by brownfields. The goal was to enable these stakeholders to operate publicly available tools, such as the LOJIC website, Louisville’s Environmental and Property Search, EPA’s EJ Screen, and more. The outcome was increasing citizen efficacy in advocating for redevelopment of neglected properties.

Survey Collection Information

- This one-time event began at the Louisville Urban League (1535 W. Broadway) and 17 responses were collected
- Total respondents: 17

Demographic Information




Engagement questions

1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

The hosts were polite and respectful	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
April 8th, 2017; 16 responses	4.94	.25	5

The speakers were honest and not negatively biased	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
April 8th, 2017; 16 responses	4.88	.34	5



Comprehensive Plan Community Forums

June 3, 2017-June 17, 2017


Event Overview

These events were held by Metro in order to collect citizen feedback related to the update of the comprehensive plan, a 20-year strategic plan. The events were open house-style where participants could enter and leave at their convenience and stay for any amount of time. For those who attended, multiple forms of engagement and feedback were utilized. For example, stickers were provided for people to mark on display boards which priorities they were interested in or topics they wanted to see explored. Representatives of Metro were also present to answer questions and listen to feedback from attendees. Unfortunately, these events did not get as high levels of participation as hoped, but Metro compensated for this low turnout by setting up booths at other community events and continuing to collect community feedback beyond the community forums.

Survey Collection Information

- Data collection was done at 3 of the forums:
 - June 3, 2017 from 9:00-11:00am: This event was held at The Table (1800 Portland Ave) and 8 surveys were completed
 - June 7, 2017 from 6:00-8:00pm: This event was held at the Shively Community Center (1902 Park Rd) and 4 surveys were completed
 - June 17, 2017 from 1:00-3:00pm: This event was held at the Urban League and 4 surveys were completed.
- Total respondents: 16

Demographic Information



Engagement questions

1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

The hosts were polite and respectful	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
June 3rd, 2017; 5 responses	4.5	.76	5
June 7th, 2017; 3 responses	4.75	.5	5
June 17th, 2017; 3 responses	4.75	.5	5

The speakers were honest and not negatively biased	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
June 3rd, 2017; 5 responses	3.8	.84	4
June 7th, 2017; 3 responses	4.33	.58	4
June 17th, 2017; 3 responses	4.25	.48	4.5

Heritage West

June 19, 2017


Event Overview

This event, hosted by Louisville Forward and the West Louisville Community Council, was held on Monday June 19, 2017 with the goal of informing participants on the development options for a brownfield site. Four developers were invited to speak and share their proposals with community members who were encouraged to ask questions and share their opinions related to the project. This was the last public meeting of an innovative process resulting from collaboration with WLCC and Metro Government to determine the reuse of a long-abandoned site. This community-driven process was in response to resident frustrations with the previously proposed development for the site.

Survey Collection Information

- This one-time event was held on June 19th from 6-8 pm at the Louisville Central Community Center (1300 W Muhammad Ali Blvd) and 34 surveys were collected

Demographic Information




Engagement questions

1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

The hosts were polite and respectful	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
June 19th, 2017; 32 responses	4.85	.36	5

The speakers were honest and not negatively biased	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
June 19th, 2017; 32 responses	4.72	.58	5



LMPD Impound Lot

February 17, 2018-June 21, 2018


Event Overview

This Metro-organized event series was created to host discussions related to the relocation of the city's impound lot, which is currently too small and in a location that creates run-off into a creek. The early events were to share information and gather community input for potential relocation sites or to share innovative ideas for improving the current lot. Each began with a short presentation followed by a Q&A session. During the remainder of each meeting, attendees were able to speak individually with Metro employees and continue the discussion. The fourth and final event was a report back to update community members on progress. Some of the same people attended the first three events and although surveys were collected at each event, repeat attendees sometimes declined to fill it out a second time

Survey Collection Information

- Data collection was completed at all 4 meetings:
 - February 17, 2018, 10:00-11:30am: This meeting was held at the Main Branch of the library (301 York St) with 11 surveys collected
 - February 20, 2018, 6:00-7:30pm: This meeting was held at Oak and Acorn Intergenerational Center (631 S 28th St) with 4 surveys collected
 - February 22, 2018, 6:00-7:30pm: This meeting was held at Butchertown Pizza (1301 Story Ave) with 12 surveys collected
 - June 21, 2018, 6:00-7:30pm: This meeting was held at Butchertown Pizza with 3 surveys collected
- Total respondents: 30

Demographic Information




Engagement questions

1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

The hosts were polite and respectful	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
February 17th, 2018; 11 responses	4.91	.91	5
February 20th, 2018; 4 responses	4.5	.5	4.5
February 22nd, 2018; 12 responses	4.83	.389	5
June 21st, 2018; 3 responses	5	0	5

The speakers were honest and not negatively biased	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
February 17th, 2018; 11 responses	4.64	.505	5
February 20th, 2018; 4 responses	4	.5	4
February 22nd, 2018; 12 responses	4.75	.452	5
June 21st, 2018; 3 responses	4.33	1.16	5



PAMAC

Public Arts and Monuments Advisory Committee
April 12, 2018-June 27, 2018


Event Overview

Louisville Forward undertook a series of community conversations around the values reflected in our public art. A committee appointed by the mayor held open meetings facilitated by the public art administrator. The committee was tasked with gathering community input and developing a set of guidelines for public art priorities. The committee and their conversations were borne out of ongoing public debate about public monuments in the city, and especially contention over those perceived to memorialize figures with histories tied to racism and oppression. Over the course of this process, eight meetings were held, five of which were surveyed by this research team. During these discussions, the community members in attendance were invited to share their opinions while the panel listened to and took note of comments. The goal of this process was to create a set of guidelines by which current and future public monuments could be evaluated.

Survey Collection Information

- Data collection was completed at these 5 meetings:
 - April 12, 2018 at 6pm: University of Louisville Davidson Hall with 16 surveys collected
 - April 14, 2018 at 10:30am: Cyril Allgeier Community Center (4101 Cadillac Ct) with 6 surveys collected
 - May 18, 2018 at 12:00pm: South Central Regional Library (7300 Jefferson Blvd) with 9 surveys collected
 - June 5, 2018 at 6:00pm: Main Library (301 York St) with 5 surveys collected
 - June 27, 2018 at 5:00pm: Main Library (301 York St) with 5 surveys collected
- Total respondents: 41

Demographic Information



Engagement questions

1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

The hosts were polite and respectful	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
April 12th, 2018; 15 responses	4.38	.619	4
April 14th, 2018; 6 responses	4.67	.516	5
May 18th, 2018; 9 responses	3.89	1.27	4
June 5th, 2018; 3 responses	5	0	5
June 27th, 2018; 5 responses	3	1	3

The speakers were honest and not negatively biased	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
April 12th, 2018; 15 responses	3.56	1.09	3.5
April 14th, 2018; 6 responses	3.83	.753	4
May 18th, 2018; 9 responses	3.33	.5	3
June 5th, 2018; 3 responses	4.33	1.16	5
June 27th, 2018; 5 responses	3	1	3

Louisville Forward Open House 1

July 10, 2018


Event Overview

Similar to the processes surveyed for the Comprehensive Plan, this was an open house style event, providing residents with the opportunity to converse with Metro officials. People were able to arrive, leave, and move around as they wished, engaging with Metro (eight employees were present) and each other. The information shared at this event was related to development projects in the works, particularly those in the West End. Specific projects included at this event were the 18th St. Realignment, Reimagine 9th St., Louisville's Global Identity Project, the Dixie Highway Project, and the River Rd. Extension. In addition to community participants, media were present including WAVE and WDRB.

Survey Collection Information

- This one-time event was held on July 10th from 6:00-7:30pm at the Louisville Urban League (1535 W. Broadway) and 14 surveys were collected

Demographic Information



Engagement questions

1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

The hosts were polite and respectful	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
July 10th, 2018; 12 responses	4.46	.66	5

The speakers were honest and not negatively biased	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
July 10th, 2018; 12 responses	4.33	.778	4.5

100 Resilient Cities events

September 10, 2018-December 18, 2018


Event information

This series of working meetings was the local implementation of the global 100 Resilient Cities program that sought to increase climate resilience in urban areas across the world. The process incorporated four focus areas, each of which was hosted by Metro staff, where discussions were driven by planning prompts and the feedback of participants. Though there was an understanding that the ultimate objective was resilience, participants were able to interpret and apply this in multiple ways. Many of the participants were invited into the space as representatives of community organizations, government entities, and service providers.

Survey collection information

- Surveys were collected at two of eight events, the first and last work group meetings:
 - September 10, 2018 from 6:30-8:00pm: this meeting was held at the Main Branch of the library (301 York St) and 47 surveys were collected
 - December 3, 2018 from 6:30-8:00 pm: this meeting was held at the Main Branch of the library (301 York St) and 45 surveys were collected
- Total respondents: 92

Demographic information



Engagement Questions

1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

The hosts were polite and respectful	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
September 10th, 2018; 47 responses	4.7	.46	5
December 3rd, 2018; 45 responses	4.58	.69	5

The speakers were honest and not negatively biased	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
September 10th, 2018; 47 responses	4.55	.5	5
December 3rd, 2018; 45 responses	4.45	.63	5

