Budget & Financial Management

Published: October 31, 2025

Category: Platform Policies: Budget Finance

BUDGET & FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Dave Biggers for Louisville Mayor 2026

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Louisville Metro Government manages a $1.13 billion annual budget—money that should work for every Louisville resident. Yet most citizens have no idea how their tax dollars are spent, and our current budget process happens behind closed doors with little community input. I believe budget decisions are moral decisions that reflect our priorities. A transparent, evidence-based budget process that includes community voices isn't just good governance—it's essential democracy.

The Challenge

Louisville's budget process suffers from four critical problems:

1. **Lack of Transparency:** Budget documents are hundreds of pages of technical jargon. Most residents can't understand where their money goes or why certain programs receive funding.

2. **No Community Input:** Citizens get only one public hearing after the budget is already written. By the time residents can speak, the major decisions have been made.

3. **Funding Based on Tradition, Not Results:** Programs continue receiving funding year after year simply because "that's what we funded last year," regardless of

whether they're achieving results.

4. **Revenue Inequity:** Louisville relies heavily on regressive occupational taxes that burden working families more than wealthy residents, while we fail to capture revenue from tax-evading large employers.

My Vision

I will transform Louisville's budget process to be transparent, evidence-based, and community-driven:

Participatory Budgeting ($15M annually): Give residents direct control over $15 million in neighborhood improvement funding through democratic voting.

Evidence-Based Budgeting: Fund programs that prove they work. Cut programs that don't. Redirect savings to effective solutions.

Budget Transparency Dashboard: Real-time online dashboard showing every dollar, every contract, and every outcome—accessible to any resident with an internet connection.

Revenue Enhancement Without Tax Increases: Collect what's already owed through better enforcement, negotiate Community Benefits Agreements for tax abatements, and ensure large employers pay their fair share.

Fiscal Accountability: Quarterly budget reports to Metro Council and the public. Monthly department spending reviews. Annual performance audits of major programs.

Budget Impact

This policy requires approximately **$8 million in new annual spending** for participatory budgeting administration, transparency systems, and performance auditing—but will **generate $15-25 million in new revenue** annually through enhanced enforcement and accountability, resulting in **net revenue gains of $7-17 million** that can fund other priorities.

All proposals fit within Louisville Metro's $1.13 billion annual operating budget through reallocation of existing administrative resources and new revenue collection.

Why This Matters

Budget transparency creates accountability. When citizens can see how their money is spent, elected officials must justify their decisions.

Participatory budgeting builds community power. Direct democracy gives residents—especially those in under-resourced neighborhoods—real control over public

resources.

Evidence-based budgeting saves money and lives. Funding programs that work and cutting programs that don't means tax dollars achieve maximum impact.

Fair revenue collection reduces tax burdens. When large employers pay what they owe, working families pay less.

Louisville's budget should reflect our values: equity, accountability, and community power. My budget reforms will make that vision reality.

CURRENT SITUATION: LOUISVILLE'S BUDGET PROCESS TODAY

By the Numbers

- **Total Metro Budget:** $1.13 billion operating budget (FY2026-27)
- **Budget Document Length:** long, dense financial tables
- **Public Hearings:** 1 hearing after budget is drafted (typically 3-5 hours)
- **Citizen Testimony Time:** 3-5 minutes per speaker
- **Participatory Budgeting:** no line for it in the adopted FY2026-27 budget
- **Budget Transparency:** Basic PDF documents; no real-time tracking
- **Performance Measurement:** Limited program outcome tracking
- **Tax Abatements:** granted with weak accountability
- **Occupational Tax:** a tax on wages and net profits earned in Louisville Metro
- **Property Tax Revenue:** $234.1 million (about 25% of the $919.0 million general fund) in the adopted FY2026-27 budget

Major Problems

Problem 1: Budget Process Excludes Community Voices

Louisville's budget process follows the same pattern every year:

1. **January-February:** Mayor's staff drafts budget in private
2. **March:** Mayor presents proposed budget to Metro Council
3. **April:** Budget Committee holds 1 public hearing
4. **May:** Metro Council votes on budget with minor amendments
5. **June 30:** Budget becomes law

The problem? By the time citizens can speak at the April hearing, the mayor has already made all major funding decisions. Metro Council rarely makes significant changes. Community organizations, neighborhood groups, and individual residents have almost no meaningful input into how $1.13 billion is spent.

Result: Budget priorities reflect the mayor's preferences and lobbying by well-connected groups, not the needs identified by community members living with the consequences of budget decisions.

Problem 2: No One Can Understand the Budget

Louisville's budget is a long, technical document filled with line items like:

- "General Fund 001 – Department 311 – Program 3110 – Object 5201"
- "Police Personnel Services" with one lump-sum dollar total
- "Public Works Contractual Services" with one lump-sum dollar total

What does this tell you? Nothing meaningful. You can't tell:

- What specific programs receive funding
- What those programs are trying to achieve
- Whether those programs are working
- How funding compares to last year
- What trade-offs were made

Result: Budget opacity protects ineffective spending from scrutiny. Programs that don't work continue receiving funding because citizens can't identify waste. Elected officials avoid accountability because voters can't evaluate budget decisions.

Problem 3: Funding Based on Inertia, Not Evidence

Louisville uses "incremental budgeting"—each department gets roughly what it got last year, plus a small increase. This approach has three major flaws:

1. **Ineffective programs never get cut.** If a violence prevention program shows no reduction in violence, it still gets funded next year.

2. **New needs go unmet.** Emerging crises (like the opioid epidemic or climate change) struggle to compete with entrenched programs.

3. **No incentive for innovation.** Departments that improve efficiency and save money get their budgets cut next year, punishing success.

Example: Louisville's Office of Violence Prevention is budgeted at $10.76 million for FY2026-27, with $750,000 of that going to outside agencies (Louisville Metro adopted budget FY2026-27). Yet shootings and homicides remain a serious problem. Have we evaluated which programs reduce violence and which don't? Have we redirected funding to effective interventions? No—we simply renewed contracts because "that's what we funded last year."

Result: Tax dollars continue flowing to ineffective programs while proven solutions remain underfunded.

Problem 4: Revenue System Hurts Working Families

Louisville's revenue structure creates two problems:

Problem 4A: Regressive Occupational Tax

Louisville relies heavily on the occupational tax (2.2% on wages and net profits for residents, per the Revenue Commission's Form OL-3D instructions). This tax is regressive:

- A nurse making $50,000 pays $1,100 (2.2%)
- A lawyer making $200,000 pays $4,400 (2.2%)
- Both pay the same percentage, but $1,100 is a much larger burden for the nurse

Meanwhile, investment income, capital gains, and inherited wealth are NOT subject to the occupational tax. The working nurse pays the tax on every paycheck; income from investments or a trust fund is not taxed this way.

Problem 4B: Tax Abatement Giveaways

Louisville grants property tax abatements to attract businesses—often with weak job creation requirements and no enforcement. Examples:

- **Data centers:** Receive 10-15 year tax breaks, employ few workers, consume massive electricity/water
- **Luxury developments:** Downtown high-rises get tax breaks while displacing residents
- **Corporate relocations:** Companies get incentives but provide wages below living wage

Result: Working families bear disproportionate tax burden while wealthy residents and large corporations receive breaks. When businesses don't meet job creation promises, Louisville rarely enforces clawback provisions.

Why Current System Persists

Four factors protect the status quo:

1. **Complexity as Defense:** Budget opacity prevents citizen oversight
2. **Concentrated Benefits, Diffuse Costs:** Special interests lobby for specific line items; taxpayers bear costs broadly
3. **Political Risk Aversion:** Elected officials fear backlash from cutting any program, even ineffective ones
4. **Lack of Capacity:** Metro government lacks staff for rigorous program evaluation

Bottom Line: Louisville's budget process is designed for insiders, not citizens. Without transparency, community input, and evidence-based decision-making, our budget will continue serving entrenched interests rather than community needs.

MY VISION: BUDGET DEMOCRACY & FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

I believe **budget decisions are moral decisions**. How we spend public money reveals what we value. A budget process that excludes community voices, hides information from taxpayers, and funds programs based on inertia rather than results is a betrayal of democratic governance.

Core Principles

1. **Transparency:** Every resident should be able to see exactly how their tax dollars are spent and what results we're achieving.

2. **Community Power:** Citizens—especially those in under-resourced neighborhoods—must have real, direct control over budget priorities.

3. **Evidence-Based Allocation:** Fund programs that prove they work. Cut programs that don't. Redirect savings to effective solutions.

4. **Fiscal Equity:** Revenue collection should be fair, with large employers and wealthy residents paying their share.

5. **Accountability:** Elected officials and department heads must regularly report budget performance to the public and explain decisions.

Goals (4-Year Term)

By 2029, I will achieve:

 Participatory budgeting across all 26 Metro Council districts: $15 million annually (about $577,000 each) under direct democratic control

 Public budget transparency dashboard: Real-time spending data, contract information, and program outcomes accessible online

 Evidence-based budget allocation: Every major program (>$1M annually) evaluated for effectiveness with funding tied to results

 $15-25 million in new annual revenue through enhanced enforcement, tax abatement accountability, and Community Benefits Agreements

 Quarterly public budget reports: Accessible summaries showing spending, outcomes, and variances from projections

 Independent performance audits: Annual third-party evaluation of top 20 programs by spending

 Simplified budget document: 50-page “Budget in Brief” explaining priorities, trade-offs, and expected outcomes in plain language

---

DETAILED PROPOSALS

Proposal 1: Participatory Budgeting ($15 Million Annually)

What It Is

Participatory budgeting (PB) is a democratic process where community members directly decide how to spend public money. Louisville will allocate $15 million annually for residents to control through direct voting.

How it works:

1. **Brainstorm Phase (September-October):** Community meetings in all 26 council districts where residents propose neighborhood improvement projects (parks, sidewalks, lighting, etc.)

2. **Proposal Development (November-December):** Volunteer budget delegates work

with city departments to develop proposals with cost estimates and feasibility analysis

3. **Community Vote (January-February):** ALL residents 16+ can vote for their favorite projects through in-person voting at libraries, schools, and community centers, plus online/paper ballots

4. **Implementation (March-December):** Metro government implements winning projects with quarterly progress reports to communities

Louisville Model Details:

- **Total Annual Funding:** $15 million
- **District Allocation:** 26 Metro Council districts, about $577,000 each, for community-driven projects
- **Eligible Projects:** Capital improvements (one-time expenditures) in public spaces—parks, sidewalks, street lighting, bus shelters, community centers, etc.
- **Voting Age:** 16+, for people who live, work or go to school in the district and are here lawfully; the city won't check anyone's immigration papers, and each district's residents and council member keep the vote honest
- **Multi-Year Cycle:** All 26 council districts from Year 1 (FY2027-28), about $577,000 each ($15M a year), with a new cycle every year

Why It Matters

Participatory budgeting creates real community power. Instead of residents begging Metro Council for sidewalk repairs or playground improvements, communities directly control significant funding. This is especially important in under-resourced neighborhoods that typically receive less attention from city government.

Evidence from other cities:

- **New York City:** a long-running participatory budgeting program where residents vote on neighborhood projects
- **Vallejo, California:** Residents prioritized sidewalk repairs, street lighting, and park improvements—basic needs that city government had neglected
- **Paris, France:** a citywide participatory budget; projects include school renovations, urban gardens, and climate resilience

Louisville benefits:

- **Addresses infrastructure neglect:** West Louisville, Shawnee, Russell, and other under-resourced neighborhoods can directly fund long-neglected improvements

- **Builds civic engagement:** Participation rates highest among residents who don't typically vote in elections
- **Increases government efficiency:** Community members identify needs city officials miss; residents monitor implementation quality
- **Reduces inequality:** Direct democracy counters the disproportionate influence of wealthy donors and well-connected lobbyists

Budget

Annual Cost: $15 million total
– **Community Projects:** $13.65 million (91%)
– **Administration:** $1.35 million (9%)
– PB coordinator staff (8 FTE): $600K
– Community outreach: $350K
– Voting materials/technology: $250K
– Project feasibility analysis support: $150K

Funding Source: Reallocation from Metro Council discretionary funds and general fund reallocations into unified PB process

Cost-Benefit: Administrative costs (9%) are comparable to or lower than traditional capital project planning, while community ownership increases project success and maintenance.

Implementation Timeline

Year 1 (FY2027-28) – Launch in All 26 Districts:
– January-March: Hire PB coordinator, establish steering committee
– April-June: Community outreach and education in all 26 council districts
– July-September: Community brainstorm meetings
– October-December: Proposal development with city departments
– December: Community vote in all 26 districts
– January 2028: Begin implementing winning projects

Year 2 (FY2028-29) – Second Cycle:
– Second vote in all 26 districts
– Evaluate Year 1 and adjust process
– Develop online voting platform

Year 3 (FY2029-30) – Third Cycle:
– Third cycle in all 26 council districts
– $15M distributed across Louisville
– 50,000+ residents participating

Year 4 (FY2030-31) – Maturity:
– Fourth full cycle

– Process improvements based on experience
– Case study Louisville as PB model for mid-sized cities

Proposal 2: Evidence-Based Budgeting & Performance Management

What It Is

Every major Metro program (spending >$1 million annually) will be evaluated for effectiveness, with funding decisions tied to proven results rather than tradition or political pressure.

Key Components:

1. **Performance Measurement System:**
2. Every program identifies clear goals and measurable outcomes
3. Quarterly data collection and reporting
4. Annual evaluation of progress toward goals
5. **Program Evaluation:**
6. Independent third-party evaluation of top 20 programs by spending
7. Cost-effectiveness analysis: dollars spent per outcome achieved
8. Comparison to best practices in peer cities
9. **Budget Decision Rule:**
10. Programs showing strong results: maintain or increase funding
11. Programs showing weak results: reduce funding and redirect to more effective alternatives
12. Programs showing no results: eliminate and reallocate entirely
13. **Innovation Fund:**
14. $2 million annually for pilot programs testing new approaches
15. Rigorous evaluation of pilots
16. Successful pilots scaled up; failed pilots ended

Example: Violence Prevention Programs

Louisville's Office of Violence Prevention is budgeted at $10.76 million for FY2026-27, with $750,000 going to outside agencies (Louisville Metro adopted budget FY2026-27). Under evidence-based budgeting:

Step 1: Define Outcomes
– Primary: Reduction in homicides and non-fatal shootings in target areas
– Secondary: Increased case clearance rates, reduced recidivism, community trust in police

Step 2: Measure Results
– Track shootings in intervention zones vs. comparison areas
– Survey community members about safety perceptions
– Monitor program participants: employment, arrests, reconnection with services

Step 3: Evaluate Cost-Effectiveness
– Cost per participant served
– Cost per shooting prevented (estimated using comparison areas)
– Compare to national research on effective interventions

Step 4: Budget Accordingly
– Programs showing measurable violence reduction: increase funding
– Programs showing no effect: end contracts and redirect funds
– Best practices from research: pilot and evaluate

Why It Matters

Evidence-based budgeting saves money and lives. When we fund programs that work and cut programs that don't, every tax dollar achieves maximum impact.

Current system wastes millions:

- Violence prevention programs that don't prevent violence
- Job training programs that don't lead to jobs
- Substance abuse programs with high relapse rates
- Homeless services that don't move people into housing

Evidence-based approach:

- **Saves $10-20 million annually** by eliminating ineffective spending
- **Improves outcomes** by redirecting funds to proven solutions
- **Increases accountability** by making results transparent
- **Enables innovation** by creating space to try new approaches

National examples:

- **Washington State Institute for Public Policy:** Evidence-based budgeting in

criminal justice, child welfare, education saves $4 in future costs for every $1 invested

- **Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative:** 22 states using evidence-based budgeting in human services
- **Bloomberg Philanthropies What Works Cities:** Evidence-based budgeting increases efficiency 15-25%

Budget

Annual Cost: $2.5 million
– **Office of Performance Management:** $1.5M
– Director + 6 analysts: $900K
– Data systems and analysis tools: $400K
– Training for department staff: $200K
– **Independent Program Evaluations:** $800K
– External evaluators for top 20 programs: $700K
– Meta-analysis of national research: $100K
– **Innovation Fund:** $2M (managed within this office)

Savings: $10-20 million annually from eliminating ineffective programs

Net Impact: $7.5-17.5 million annual savings (after $2.5M cost)

Funding Source: New position funded from anticipated savings; seed funding from administrative reallocation

Implementation Timeline

Year 1 (FY2027-28):
– January-March: Hire Office of Performance Management director
– April-June: Staff hiring, establish data systems
– July-December: Work with departments to define program outcomes and establish baseline data collection

Year 2 (FY2028-29):
– January-June: First-year data collection
– July-December: Initial evaluations of top 10 programs; first budget recommendations based on evidence

Year 3 (FY2029-30):
– January-June: Expand evaluations to top 20 programs
– July-December: Second budget cycle with evidence-based allocation; launch Innovation Fund pilots

Year 4 (FY2030-31):
– Full implementation: All major programs measured and evaluated

– Innovation Fund pilots evaluated; successful programs scaled
– Annual savings $10-20M redirected to effective solutions

Proposal 3: Budget Transparency Dashboard

What It Is

A real-time, online public dashboard showing how Louisville Metro spends every dollar, with accessible visualizations, searchable databases, and community feedback mechanisms.

Dashboard Features:

1. **Spending Tracker:**
2. Every Metro transaction $1,000+ visible in real-time
3. Search by department, vendor, category, or council district
4. Year-over-year comparisons
5. Filter by time period, amount, type
6. **Program Performance:**
7. Visual dashboards showing key metrics for major programs
8. Progress toward goals
9. Cost per outcome
10. Community satisfaction ratings
11. **Contract Database:**
12. All Metro contracts searchable and downloadable
13. Vendor performance history
14. Competitive bid information
15. Amendment and cost overrun tracking
16. **Revenue Tracker:**
17. Where Louisville’s money comes from
18. Revenue trends over time
19. Tax collection vs. projections

20. Fee and fine revenue by type

21. **Budget Comparison:**

22. Interactive tool comparing proposed vs. approved vs. actual spending
23. Variance explanations

24. Department-by-department breakdowns

25. **Community Feedback:**

26. Comment on any program or spending decision
27. Report waste, fraud, or abuse
28. Ask questions and get responses from department heads
29. Vote in annual “Budget Priorities Survey”

User-Friendly Design:

- Plain language explanations (no budget jargon)
- Visual charts and graphs
- Mobile-responsive design
- Downloadable data for researchers and journalists
- Automated monthly email summaries for subscribers
- Integration with Open Records Portal

Example Use Cases:

- **Resident:** “How much does my council district receive in capital funding compared to other districts?”
- **Journalist:** “Which vendors receive the most contracts? Have any had performance issues?”
- **Advocate:** “How much do we spend on homelessness? What programs are funded? Are they working?”
- **Business Owner:** “What’s the process for competitive bidding? Can I see examples of successful proposals?”

Why It Matters

Transparency creates accountability. When spending decisions are visible, elected officials must justify choices. When contracts are public, vendors perform better. When outcomes are measured, ineffective programs face scrutiny.

Current opacity enables:

- **Wasteful spending:** Programs that don't work continue because no one can identify waste
- **Political favors:** Contracts awarded based on connections, not merit
- **Inequitable resource distribution:** Some neighborhoods receive far more funding than others without explanation
- **Corruption:** Kickbacks, self-dealing, and fraud thrive in darkness

Transparency enables:

- **Informed voting:** Citizens can evaluate elected officials' budget decisions
- **Investigative journalism:** Reporters can identify problems and hold government accountable
- **Community advocacy:** Neighborhoods can document funding disparities and demand equity
- **Academic research:** Universities can study what works and share findings

National models:

- **Chicago:** publishes its budget data online with ways for residents to give feedback
- **San Francisco:** Contract database with vendor performance ratings, improved competitive bidding
- **Louisville's Open Records Portal:** Already demonstrates appetite for government transparency—budget dashboard is natural extension

Budget

Annual Cost: $500,000
– **Initial Development (Year 1):** $800K
– Dashboard platform development: $400K
– Data integration from Metro systems: $200K
– User experience design and testing: $100K
– Community outreach and training: $100K
– **Ongoing Operations (Years 2-4):** $400K annually
– Dashboard maintenance and updates: $150K
– Data management staff (2 FTE): $150K
– User support: $50K
– Continuous improvement: $50K

Average Annual Cost (4 years): $500K

Funding Source: Reallocation from reduced Open Records staff workload (automated data

publication reduces manual records requests)

Cost-Benefit: Transparency reduces waste and corruption, conservatively saving $2-5M annually—10x return on investment

Implementation Timeline

Year 1 (FY2027-28):
– January-March: Issue RFP for dashboard development, select vendor
– April-September: Platform development and data integration
– October-December: Beta testing with community members and Metro Council; soft launch

Year 2 (FY2028-29):
– January: Full public launch
– February-December: Community training sessions; gather feedback and iterate

Year 3 (FY2029-30):
– Add advanced features: predictive analytics, equity impact modeling, participatory budgeting integration
– Launch annual Budget Priorities Survey

Year 4 (FY2030-31):
– Full maturity; Louisville recognized as national leader in budget transparency
– Dashboard expanded to include other Metro data (311 requests, LMPD data, etc.)

Proposal 4: Fair Revenue Collection Without Tax Increases

What It Is

Louisville will generate $15-25 million in new annual revenue by collecting taxes already owed, negotiating Community Benefits Agreements for tax abatements, and ensuring compliance—without raising tax rates.

Four Strategies:

Strategy 1: Enhanced Occupational Tax Enforcement

Many businesses underreport payroll or fail to remit occupational taxes owed. Louisville will:

- Cross-reference state unemployment insurance records with occupational tax filings
- Audit high-risk industries (construction, restaurants, temporary staffing)
- Hire 3 additional tax compliance officers
- Implement automated data matching systems

Projected Revenue: $5-8 million annually

Strategy 2: Tax Abatement Accountability & Clawbacks

Companies receiving property tax abatements must meet job creation requirements and, where state law allows, wage requirements—or repay incentives:

- Establish Tax Abatement Compliance Office
- Annual verification of job creation claims
- Enforce clawback provisions for companies failing to meet commitments
- Require Community Benefits Agreements for abatements >$500K

Projected Revenue: $3-5 million annually from clawbacks

Strategy 3: Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) Agreements

Nonprofit institutions (universities, hospitals) own tax-exempt property but use city services (police, fire, roads):

- Negotiate voluntary PILOT agreements with large nonprofits
- Ask for a share of what full property tax would be, as some other cities do
- Focus on institutions with $100M+ property holdings
- Revenue dedicated to neighborhoods surrounding institutions

Projected Revenue: $5-8 million annually

Strategy 4: Delinquent Property Tax Collection

Louisville has delinquent property taxes that are owed but not yet collected. Improve collection through:

- Streamlined payment plans for homeowners facing hardship
- Aggressive pursuit of investor/landlord delinquencies
- Expedited tax sale process for abandoned properties
- Partnership with Land Bank Authority

Projected Revenue: $2-4 million annually

Total New Revenue: $15-25 million annually without tax increases

Why It Matters

Fair revenue collection reduces burden on working families. When large employers and wealthy property owners pay what they owe, Louisville can:

- Avoid raising occupational tax rates on working people

- Fund critical services without budget cuts
- Invest in under-resourced neighborhoods
- Reduce inequity in our tax system

Current system is unfair:

- Small businesses and working families pay occupational taxes reliably
- Large employers underreport or negotiate special deals
- Nonprofits use city services without contributing
- Landlords let property taxes accumulate while collecting rent

Enhanced enforcement creates equity:

- Same rules for everyone—no special treatment
- Tax burden shifts from working families to wealthy institutions
- Companies receiving incentives must deliver promised jobs
- Delinquent landlords held accountable

Budget

Annual Cost: $1.2 million
– **Tax Compliance Officers (3 FTE):** $300K
– **Abatement Compliance Office (2 FTE):** $200K
– **Data systems and auditing tools:** $200K
– **Legal support for collections:** $300K
– **Community Benefits Agreement negotiation:** $200K

Revenue: $15-25 million annually

Net Impact: $13.8-23.8 million annual revenue gain

Return on Investment: Every $1 spent generates $12-21 in new revenue

Implementation Timeline

Year 1 (FY2027-28):
– January-June: Hire compliance staff, establish systems
– July-December: Begin enforcement actions; initial PILOT negotiations

Year 2 (FY2028-29):
– January-December: Full enforcement program; first clawbacks recovered; first PILOT agreements signed

Year 3 (FY2029-30):

– January-December: Revenue flow increases as enforcement matures; expand PILOT agreements

Year 4 (FY2030-31):
– Steady state: $15-25M annual revenue; compliance rates improve; reduced need for enforcement as deterrent effect increases

Proposal 5: Quarterly Public Budget Accountability Reports

What It Is

Louisville Metro will publish accessible quarterly reports showing budget performance, program outcomes, and explanations for variances—with public presentations to Metro Council and community town halls.

Quarterly Report Contents:

1. **Revenue Update:**
2. Actual revenue vs. projections
3. Economic trends affecting tax collections
4. New revenue sources
5. **Spending Summary:**
6. Departmental spending vs. budgeted amounts
7. Major variances explained
8. Emerging needs or unexpected costs
9. **Program Performance:**
10. Progress toward annual goals
11. Outcome metrics for major programs
12. Success stories and challenges
13. **Contract Updates:**
14. New contracts awarded
15. Contract amendments and overruns

16. Vendor performance issues

17. **Capital Projects Status:**

18. Active projects with timeline and budget status
19. Completed projects
20. Upcoming projects in planning

Report Format:

- **Executive Summary:** 2-page plain-language overview
- **Detailed Report:** 20-30 pages with data tables and charts
- **Department Spotlights:** Rotating deep-dive into specific department performance
- **Accessible Design:** Large print, visual charts, simple language
- **Multiple Formats:** Online dashboard, downloadable PDF, printed copies at libraries

Public Presentation:

- Quarterly presentation to Metro Council Budget Committee (public meeting)
- Community town halls in different council districts each quarter
- Q&A sessions with Budget Director and department heads
- Online webinar option for remote participation

Why It Matters

Quarterly accountability prevents crises. When problems surface in quarterly reports, Louisville can make mid-year adjustments before small issues become major budget failures.

Current annual cycle creates problems:

- Issues aren’t discovered until budget year ends
- No opportunity to correct course
- Departments overspend, then request emergency appropriations
- Programs underperform without consequences until next budget cycle

Quarterly reporting enables:

- **Early warning system:** Identify revenue shortfalls or overspending early
- **Agile response:** Reallocate resources mid-year to address emerging needs
- **Continuous improvement:** Programs adjust based on quarterly performance data
- **Public engagement:** Citizens stay informed year-round, not just during budget

season

National best practices:

- **New York City:** a “Mayor’s Management Report” tracking performance indicators across all agencies
- **Kansas City:** Quarterly budget reports with variance analysis and corrective action plans
- **Charlotte, North Carolina:** Quarterly community budget forums with online participation

Budget

Annual Cost: $300,000
– **Budget Office Staff Time:** $150K (existing staff; reallocated priorities)
– **Report Production:** $50K (design, printing, distribution)
– **Community Town Halls:** $50K (venue rental, accessibility services, childcare)
– **Online Platform:** $50K (webinar hosting, interactive features)

Funding Source: Reallocation within Budget Office; current staff capacity exists but isn’t dedicated to public reporting

Cost-Benefit: Early identification of $2-5M in annual budget variances prevents emergency appropriations and budget crises—10x return

Implementation Timeline

Year 1 (FY2027-28):
– January-March: Establish quarterly reporting template and process
– April: First quarterly report (Q1 FY2026)
– April-December: Quarterly reports and town halls (Q1, Q2, Q3)

Year 2 (FY2028-29):
– Full implementation: All four quarters
– Refine based on community feedback
– Expand performance metrics

Years 3-4 (FY2029-30 to FY2030-31):
– Mature system; Louisville recognized for budget transparency
– Integration with Budget Transparency Dashboard
– Annual “State of the Budget” address synthesizing quarterly reports

BUDGET SUMMARY

Total Annual Cost

Program	Annual Cost	Revenue/Savings	Net Impact
Participatory Budgeting	$15.0M	—	-$15.0M
Evidence-Based Budgeting	$2.5M	$10-20M savings	+$7.5-17.5M
Budget Transparency Dashboard	$0.5M	$2-5M savings	+$1.5-4.5M
Fair Revenue Collection	$1.2M	$15-25M revenue	+$13.8-23.8M
Quarterly Accountability Reports	$0.3M	$2-5M savings	+$1.7-4.7M
TOTAL	**$19.5M**	**$29-55M**	**+$9.5-35.5M**

Net Budget Impact: +$9.5-35.5 Million Annual Revenue/Savings

This policy **generates significant net revenue** through enhanced enforcement, evidence-based allocation, and transparency that reduces waste. Revenue gains fund my other priorities (housing, public safety, education) without tax increases.

Funding Sources

1. **Participatory Budgeting ($15M):** Reallocation from Metro Council discretionary funds and general fund
2. **Evidence-Based Budgeting ($2.5M):** Funded from anticipated savings (self-financing)
3. **Transparency Dashboard ($0.5M):** Reallocation from reduced Open Records workload
4. **Revenue Collection ($1.2M):** Self-financing (generates $12-21 per $1 spent)
5. **Quarterly Reports ($0.3M):** Reallocation within existing Budget Office capacity

Total within Louisville Metro’s $1.13 billion operating budget.

How the reallocation ledger funds it: this policy’s $15.8M of Metro money is funded in full. The council’s own $1.44M Neighborhood Development Fund is folded into the $15M participatory budget, which also draws $6.23M of jail savings, $5.3M of efficiency savings, $1.5M of administration savings and $0.53M of duplication savings; the dashboard and quarterly reports ($0.8M) are paid inside the Office of Management & Budget.

IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE (4-YEAR TERM)

Year 1 (FY2027-28): Foundation

Q1 (January-March):
– Hire Office of Performance Management Director
– Establish Participatory Budgeting Steering Committee
– Issue RFP for Budget Transparency Dashboard
– Hire Tax Compliance and Abatement Compliance staff

Q2 (April-June):
– Launch PB in all 26 districts (community brainstorming)
– Performance Management staff hiring complete
– Dashboard development begins
– Tax enforcement program launches

Q3 (July-September):
– PB proposal development phase
– Departments establish performance baselines
– First quarterly budget report published
– Initial tax audits and PILOT negotiations

Q4 (October-December):
– PB community voting in all 26 districts (December)
– Dashboard beta testing
– Second quarterly report
– First enforcement actions completed

Year 2 (FY2028-29): Expansion

Q1:
– Begin implementing PB winning projects in all 26 districts
– Dashboard public launch
– First program evaluations completed
– First clawback payments recovered

Q2:
– Second PB cycle begins in all 26 districts (brainstorming)
– Evidence-based budget recommendations inform FY2028 budget
– First PILOT agreements signed
– Tax compliance revenue flowing

Q3:
– PB proposal development in all 26 districts
– Innovation Fund launches first pilots
– Enhanced enforcement revenue increases

Q4:
– PB voting in all 26 districts
– Dashboard adds advanced features
– Annual performance report published

Year 3 (FY2029-30): Maturity

Q1:
– Third PB cycle begins in all 26 districts
– Second budget cycle informed by evidence
– Innovation Fund pilots evaluated
– Full revenue collection program operational

Q2:
– $15M participatory budgeting across all 26 districts
– Successful Innovation Fund pilots scaled
– Major savings identified from evidence-based cuts

Q3:
– Participatory budgeting proposal development citywide
– Dashboard integration with PB voting
– Community Benefits Agreements standard for all abatements

Q4:
– 50,000+ residents voting in PB
– Louisville recognized as national budget transparency leader
– Net revenue gains $20-45M annually

Year 4 (FY2030-31): Sustainability

Full implementation of all budget reforms:
– Annual PB cycle with high community participation
– Evidence-based budgeting embedded in Metro culture
– Transparent, real-time budget data
– Fair revenue collection fully operational
– Quarterly public accountability standard practice

Long-term infrastructure in place for next administration to continue reforms.

SUCCESS METRICS & ACCOUNTABILITY

I will measure success through transparent, publicly reported metrics:

Participatory Budgeting Metrics

 Participation Rate: 50,000+ residents voting annually by Year 3
 Demographic Reach: Participant demographics match Louisville population within 10% (income, age, geography, and where participants are from)
 Project Completion: 90%+ of winning projects completed within 18 months
 Community Satisfaction: 80%+ of participants satisfied with process (annual survey)
 Engagement Equity: Participation rates in low-income districts equal or exceed citywide average

Evidence-Based Budgeting Metrics

 Program Evaluation Coverage: 100% of programs >$1M annually evaluated by Year 3
 Budget Reallocation: $10-20M annually redirected from ineffective to effective programs
 Outcome Improvement: Aggregate improvement in outcome metrics across evaluated programs (e.g., if 20 programs evaluated, average outcomes improve 15%+ over baseline)
 Innovation Success Rate: 40%+ of Innovation Fund pilots show positive results worthy of scaling
 Cost-Effectiveness: Spending per unit of outcome improves 20%+ over 4 years

Budget Transparency Metrics

 Dashboard Usage: 10,000+ unique monthly users by Year 2
 Data Completeness: 100% of transactions >$1,000 visible within 48 hours
 Public Understanding: Annual survey showing 60%+ of residents feel informed about budget
 Media Coverage: Increase in investigative journalism using budget data
 Accountability Actions: Measurable reduction in waste, fraud, and abuse complaints

Revenue Collection Metrics

 New Revenue: $15-25M annually collected
 Compliance Improvement: Occupational tax compliance rate increases to 95%
 Clawback Recovery: $3-5M annually recovered from abatement non-compliance
 PILOT Agreements: 5+ major nonprofits contributing by Year 3
 Delinquency Reduction: Property tax delinquencies reduced 25% over 4 years

Public Accountability Metrics

 Report Timeliness: Quarterly reports published within 30 days of quarter end
 Variance Accuracy: Budget variances <5% except for documented extraordinary circumstances
 Town Hall Attendance: 200+ participants per quarterly town hall (averaging across 4 quarters)
 Response Rate: 100% of public questions answered within 10 business days

 Budget Accuracy: Actual year-end spending within 3% of appropriated budget

Overall Budget Health Metrics

 Structural Balance: Operating budget balanced without one-time revenue or deferrals
 Reserve Fund: Emergency reserve maintained at 10% of general fund ($102M)
 Bond Rating: Maintain or improve Louisville's AA- credit rating
 Capital Program: 90%+ of capital projects completed on time and on budget
 Employee Satisfaction: Metro employee satisfaction with budget process improves 25%+ (internal survey)

RELATED GLOSSARY TERMS

This policy connects to 40 Budget & Finance glossary terms on rundaverun.org:

Budget Process Terms: Budget, Budget Committee, Budget Amendment, Budget Ordinance, Budget Cycle, Continuing Resolution, Contingency Fund, Emergency Appropriation, Line-Item Veto, Supplemental Appropriation

Revenue Terms: Occupational Tax, Property Tax, Tax Increment Financing (TIF), Tax Abatement, Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT), General Fund, Revenue, Fee vs. Tax, Occupational License Fee, Franchise Fee

Spending Terms: Appropriation, Capital Budget, Operating Budget, Debt Service, Expenditure, Contractual Services, Personnel Services, Capital Improvement Program (CIP), Carryover Funds, Encumbrance

Financial Management Terms: Fiscal Year, Fund Balance, Bond Rating, General Obligation Bonds, Revenue Bonds, Rainy Day Fund, Budget Shortfall, Budget Surplus, Structural Budget Deficit, One-Time Revenue

Accountability Terms: Performance Measurement, Cost-Benefit Analysis, Economic Impact Study, Audit, Fiscal Impact Statement, Program Evaluation, Evidence-Based Policy, Transparency, Open Records, Participatory Budgeting

---

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

1. Why should I care about the budget? It's too complicated.

That's exactly the problem I am solving. When budgets are complicated and opaque, elected officials can waste millions without accountability. My Budget Transparency Dashboard will make Louisville's budget understandable for everyone—visual charts, plain language, searchable databases. You'll be able to see how much your neighborhood receives compared to others, what programs your tax dollars fund, and whether those programs work. Budget democracy requires budget transparency.

2. What is participatory budgeting, and how is it different from what we have now?

Right now, elected officials decide how to spend all $1.13 billion with minimal citizen input. Participatory budgeting gives residents direct control over $15 million through democratic voting. You'll attend neighborhood meetings to propose projects (new playground, sidewalk repairs, better street lighting), volunteers will develop proposals with cost estimates, and then you'll vote for your favorites. Winning projects get funded—no persuading your council member, no lobbying, just direct democracy. It's especially powerful for under-resourced neighborhoods that typically receive less attention.

3. How will evidence-based budgeting actually work? Won't departments just manipulate data to make their programs look good?

Three safeguards prevent gaming:

1. Independent evaluation: Third-party experts (universities, national research firms) evaluate programs, not the departments running them.

2. Comparison groups: We'll compare outcomes in areas receiving programs vs. similar areas that don't—can't fake the difference.

3. Multiple metrics: We'll track several outcomes (not just one easy-to-manipulate number) plus community surveys and expert assessments.

Example: A violence prevention program can't just report "we served 500 youth"—we'll track whether shootings actually decreased in their target area, whether participants stayed employed and avoided arrests, and whether community members feel safer. If violence stays the same or increases, funding gets redirected to approaches with better evidence.

4. If you cut ineffective programs, won't people lose services they depend on?

I will redirect savings from ineffective programs to MORE effective services—so more people get better help, not less.

Example: If a job training program costs $5,000 per participant but only 10% get jobs, while a

different model costs $3,000 per participant and 60% get jobs, cutting the first program and expanding the second means:
– Same budget serves more people
– Six times more people get jobs
– Taxpayers save money

The question isn't "should we help people?"—it's "what's the most effective way to help?" Evidence-based budgeting ensures every dollar achieves maximum impact.

5. How will you generate $15-25 million in new revenue without raising taxes? Sounds too good to be true.

Louisville already has the authority to collect this money—we're just not doing it effectively:

1. Underreported occupational taxes ($5-8M): Many businesses underreport payroll. Cross-referencing state records and auditing high-risk industries will catch tax evasion.

2. Tax abatement clawbacks ($3-5M): Companies that get tax breaks in exchange for promised jobs and don't deliver should pay the money back. We'll enforce clawbacks rigorously.

3. Nonprofit PILOT agreements ($5-8M): Universities and hospitals own large amounts of tax-exempt property but use city services. Many voluntarily contribute in other cities—we'll negotiate agreements here.

4. Delinquent property tax collection ($2-4M): Delinquent taxes are owed but not collected. Streamlined payment plans for struggling homeowners, aggressive pursuit of landlord delinquencies.

Similar initiatives in other cities (Boston, Pittsburgh, Kansas City) have generated comparable revenue increases. This isn't magic—it's basic enforcement and accountability.

In 2018 I talked about Louisville needing to be able to make up a Frankfort funding shortfall on its own — that was about fiscal independence, not a tax increase. The 2026 plan delivers that independence differently: it finds the money inside the $1,125.9M Metro already has, through reallocation and better collection (occupational-license compliance, delinquency collection), not through new rates.

6. Won't participatory budgeting just become a popularity contest where well-organized groups dominate?

Good participatory budgeting design prevents capture by organized interests:

1. Geographic distribution: Each council district gets its own allocation (about

$577,000)—residents can't vote on West Louisville's projects and vice versa.

2. Multiple voting methods: In-person voting at libraries/schools, online voting, and paper ballots ensure access for everyone (not just people who attend meetings).

3. Voting age 16+, for people who live, work or go to school in the district and are here lawfully: Expands beyond typical voters to include everyone affected by neighborhood conditions.

4. Outreach to under-represented communities: PB coordinator staff will conduct outreach in languages beyond English, at times and locations accessible to working families.

5. Project rules: All projects must serve public spaces (not just one block or building), preventing overly narrow proposals.

Evidence from other cities: Participation rates are highest in low-income communities—precisely the groups that typically have least influence in traditional budget processes.

7. What if departments resist performance measurement and evidence-based budgeting?

I will make performance management a core expectation for all department heads, tied to their job performance.

Incentives for cooperation:
– Departments showing strong results get recognition and stable/increased funding
– Innovation Fund provides resources to try new approaches
– Performance management helps departments identify problems early and adjust

Consequences for resistance:
– Department heads who refuse to measure outcomes or provide data will be replaced
– Programs that can't or won't demonstrate effectiveness will lose funding
– Metro Council will receive regular reports on department cooperation (public accountability)

Culture change: This isn't punitive—it's about continuous improvement. Departments will have support (Office of Performance Management staff assistance) and flexibility (Innovation Fund for pilots). But "we've always done it this way" will no longer justify funding.

8. How will quarterly budget reports differ from the annual budget we already get?

Annual budget shows planned spending. Quarterly reports show actual spending and results:

Quarterly reports include:
– Revenue vs. projections (are we on track?)
– Spending vs. budget (are departments overspending?)
– Program outcomes (are programs achieving goals?)
– Contract updates (are projects on time and budget?)
– Explanations for variances (why are things different than expected?)

Why this matters: If revenue comes in 10% below projections in Q1, we know in April (not next January) and can adjust spending to avoid a budget crisis. If a program isn't working after 6 months, we can course-correct instead of wasting the full year.

Plus: Quarterly town halls mean you can ask questions and get answers four times a year, not just during the one annual budget hearing.

9. Won't all this transparency and measurement slow down government and create more bureaucracy?

Actually, the opposite:

Transparency speeds things up:
– Automated budget dashboard eliminates time staff spend answering individual Open Records requests
– Public contract database means vendors can quickly see requirements and examples
– Clear performance expectations mean departments know what's expected (less confusion)

Performance measurement improves efficiency:
– Departments identify problems early and fix them
– Eliminating ineffective programs frees up staff for effective work
– Evidence-based budgeting reduces time wasted on political maneuvering over funding

Yes, there's upfront investment (building dashboard, establishing metrics), but once systems are in place, they reduce administrative burden. Cities with strong transparency and performance management (Kansas City, New York, Boston) report government operates MORE efficiently, not less.

10. What happens to these reforms after my term ends? Can the next mayor undo everything?

I will institutionalize these reforms so they outlast my administration:

1. Ordinances with teeth: Metro Council will pass ordinances requiring participatory budgeting, quarterly reports, and transparency dashboard (not just mayoral executive orders a future mayor can revoke).

2. Public expectation: Once residents experience direct budget power and real-time

transparency, they'll demand continuation. Political cost of eliminating popular reforms is high.

3. Staff capacity: Office of Performance Management becomes permanent department with career staff (not political appointees). Dashboard and data systems become Metro infrastructure.

4. National recognition: Louisville will become national model, with media attention and best-practice designation that creates reputational incentives to maintain reforms.

5. Demonstrated results: When participatory budgeting funds neighborhood improvements, evidence-based budgeting saves millions, and transparency reduces waste, these reforms prove their value—making them politically difficult to undo.

Budget democracy, once established, is hard to take away.

CONCLUSION: BUDGET DEMOCRACY IS REAL DEMOCRACY

A budget is a moral document. How we spend public money reveals what we value. A budget process that excludes community voices, hides information from taxpayers, funds programs based on tradition rather than results, and allows wealthy interests to avoid paying their share is a betrayal of democratic principles.

I believe Louisville residents—especially those in under-resourced neighborhoods who have been ignored for decades—deserve real power over public resources. Participatory budgeting gives residents direct control. Budget transparency enables accountability. Evidence-based allocation ensures tax dollars achieve maximum impact. Fair revenue collection reduces burden on working families.

These aren't technocratic reforms—they're democracy reforms. When you can see how your tax dollars are spent, vote on neighborhood priorities, and hold officials accountable for results, government works for you instead of for insiders.

Budget democracy is real democracy. I will make it happen in Louisville.

Related Policy Documents:
– Public Safety & Community Policing
– Criminal Justice Reform
– Health & Human Services

– Affordable Housing & Anti-Displacement
– Education & Youth Development
– Environmental Justice & Climate Action
– Economic Development & Jobs (Employee Bill of Rights)

Learn more at rundaverun.org/policy

Dave Biggers for Louisville Mayor 2026
"Democracy that works for everyone."

RELATED POLICIES

This policy works in coordination with these related initiatives:

- **Neighborhood Development:** Participatory budgeting gives residents direct control over $15M annually in neighborhood improvements through democratic process.
- **Public Safety & Community Policing:** Evidence-based budgeting ensures the $153.01M in new/enhanced public safety investments achieves measurable crime reduction results.
- **Economic Development & Jobs:** Budget transparency and accountability apply to economic development tax abatements.
- **Infrastructure & Transportation:** Evidence-based capital budgeting addresses the infrastructure maintenance backlog strategically.
- **Technology & Innovation:** Digital government transformation enables real-time budget transparency and public accountability.

Explore all 16 comprehensive policies at My Complete Policy Platform.

Calculate Your Tax Impact

See how my budget plan affects your family:

How Does My Budget Affect You?

See your personalized impact - zero tax increase, real benefits

 Household Income $50,000 50000
 Children in JCPS 0 0
 Your ZIP Code

Your Personal Impact

How we calculate: Benefits based on average family savings from wellness center access ($800/year), youth program value (after-school + summer jobs), and your specific mini substation timeline. All benefits come from the same $1.13B budget - zero tax increase.

Share your results with friends and family:

 Share My Results

What This Means for YOUR Neighborhood

Every Louisville neighborhood is unique. Enter your ZIP code to see how this policy directly impacts your community:

Find Your Mini Substation

Enter your ZIP code to see when your neighborhood will receive a community police substation.

Find My Substation

63 mini substations across Louisville, at least one in every ZIP code, phased in over 4 years.

Part of my comprehensive public safety plan.

See the Budget Impact

Explore how this policy fits into my comprehensive $1.13 billion budget plan:

How Does My Budget Affect You?

See your personalized impact - zero tax increase, real benefits

Household Income $50,000 50000
Children in JCPS 0 0
Your ZIP Code

Your Personal Impact

How we calculate: Benefits based on average family savings from wellness center access ($800/year), youth program value (after-school + summer jobs), and your specific mini substation timeline. All benefits come from the same $1.13B budget - zero tax increase.

Share your results with friends and family:

Share My Results

⚖ Compare This Policy

See how my approach differs from current administration policies:

⚖ My Plan, Category by Category

Pick a category to see what my plan does, how it is paid for, and when it arrives.

Share This Plan Print This Plan
Public Safety Wellness Youth Economy Housing Transparency

Public Safety & Policing

My Plan

Community-based mini substations

Approach

- 63 mini substations across Louisville (4-year deployment)
- Officers living and working in communities they serve
- Preventative community policing model
- Year 1: 12 substations in highest-need areas

Timeline Year 1-4 phased rollout
Budget Same $1.13 billion; no new taxes; priorities re-pointed inside the adopted budget
Impact Projected response times: 3-5 minutes (campaign estimate)

Mental Health & Wellness

My Plan

Wellness centers placed by health need

Approach

- I will place 18 Community Wellness Centers by health need (CDC PLACES 2024 plus Census poverty data)
- Mental health counseling, addiction support
- Youth programs, family services
- At least one center in every LMPD division

Timeline 6 centers a year over Years 1-3
Budget $45M a year when fully built (18 centers at $2.5M each), inside the adopted budget
Impact Accessible care within every neighborhood, preventative focus

Youth Development

My Plan

Comprehensive youth investment

Approach

- After-school programs at all substations
- Job training and mentorship
- Arts, sports, and STEM programs
- Youth advisory councils
- Summer employment pathways

Timeline Immediate implementation with substation rollout
Budget $32.5M for youth programs, inside the adopted budget
Impact Accessible programs in every neighborhood

Economic Development

My Plan

Community wealth building

Approach

- Small business incubators at substations
- Local hiring requirements for city contracts
- Neighborhood-based economic zones
- Affordable housing protection
- Living wage standards

Timeline Immediate policy changes, 4-year infrastructure build
Budget Same $1.13 billion; no new taxes; priorities re-pointed inside the adopted budget
Impact Jobs and wealth stay in neighborhoods

Housing & Affordability

My Plan

Housing as a human right

Approach

- Expanded affordable housing trust fund
- Strong tenant protections
- Community land trusts

- Rent stabilization measures
- Anti-displacement policies for existing residents

Timeline Immediate policy changes
Budget Same $1.13 billion; no new taxes; priorities re-pointed inside the adopted budget
Impact Protects residents, prevents displacement

Government Transparency

My Plan

Radical transparency

Approach

- Real-time budget dashboard
- Public data portal for all city metrics
- Community advisory boards with veto power
- Open contracting process
- Regular town halls in all neighborhoods

Timeline Immediate implementation
Budget Low-cost digital infrastructure
Impact Citizens empowered with information and decision-making power

The Choice is Clear

Louisville deserves transformative change, not more of the same. Join us in building a city that works for everyone.

Join the Campaign Read Full Policy Platform

Share This Policy

Help spread the word about my vision for Louisville:

Related Policies You Might Like

How to Vote for Me

I am a write-in candidate: in the race for Mayor, mark the write-in spot and write **DAVE BIGGERS** (the last name, Biggers, is required).

Early voting, no excuse needed: October 29–31 · Election Day: Tuesday, November 3, 6 AM to 6 PM. Registration for the November 3 election closed October 5.

✓ Check My Registration and Polling Place View All Election Dates →

Stay Updated on This Policy

Get notified when this policy is updated or when I speak about this issue in YOUR neighborhood.

* indicates a required field

Email Signup Information
Fax Number (Leave blank)
Name *
Email * We'll send you updates about the campaign
Zip Code 5-digit zip code (optional)
☐ I'm interested in volunteering! We'll send you information about volunteer opportunities
Sign Up

We use your details only to reach you about the campaign. Privacy Policy

Have Ideas to Improve This Policy?

This is YOUR city. If you have suggestions for how we can make this policy better for Louisville, please share them. Every idea is reviewed.

Suggest an Improvement for Louisville

Have an idea for improving Louisville? Share your policy suggestion below. Your voice matters in shaping our city's future.

Policy Title *
Description *
0/2000 characters
Category Select a category...
Your Name *
Your Email *
ZIP Code (Optional)
☐ I agree that my suggestion may be reviewed and potentially incorporated into campaign policy. My email will only be used to notify me about the status of my suggestion.
Submit Suggestion

NOT ME, WE.

Together, we make Louisville better for everyone.