Research Bibliography & Citations

Published: October 13, 2025

Category: Implementation Guides

DAVE BIGGERS FOR MAYOR

Version: 2.1.0 | **Last Updated:** February 2026

Research Bibliography & Citations

Evidence Base for Budget Policy Proposals

Date: October 2025
Purpose: Provide complete sourcing for all data, statistics, and evidence-based claims

—

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document provides the research foundation for every major claim, statistic, and evidence-based policy in my budget proposal.

Key Principle: Every statistical claim is backed by peer-reviewed research, government data, or credible academic sources.

Coverage:

- □ Violence reduction programs (Boston, LA, Oakland)
- □ Community policing effectiveness
- □ Participatory budgeting outcomes
- □ Healthcare ROI and preventive care
- □ Youth employment and crime prevention
- □ Fire prevention programs
- □ School zone safety interventions

—

SECTION 1: VIOLENCE REDUCTION & PUBLIC SAFETY

1.1 Boston Operation Ceasefire – 63% Fewer Young Homicide Victims

Primary Source:
Kennedy, D. M., Braga, A. A., Piehl, A. M., & Waring, E. J. (2001). *Reducing Gun Violence: The Boston Gun Project's Operation Ceasefire*. NIJ Research Report NCJ 188741. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Key Finding:
"The time series shows a 63-percent reduction in the mean monthly number of youth homicide victims from a pretest mean of 3.5 youth homicides per month to a posttest mean of 1.3 youth homicides per month." (p. 57; in the report, "youth" means ages 24 and under.)

Additional Context:

- Time period: June 1996 to May 1998, compared with 1991 to May 1996
- Method: Focused deterrence strategy combining law enforcement with community outreach
- Measured: the monthly number of homicide victims ages 24 and under, citywide; the report describes the drop as "associated with" Ceasefire

Secondary Sources:
1. Braga, A. A., & Weisburd, D. L. (2012). The effects of focused deterrence strategies on crime: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 49(3), 323-358.

2. Braga, A. A., Kennedy, D. M., Waring, E. J., & Piehl, A. M. (2001). Problem-oriented policing, deterrence, and youth violence: An evaluation of Boston's Operation Ceasefire. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 38(3), 195-225.

Applicability to Louisville:
Boston's demographics (2000 census: ~590,000) similar to Louisville Metro (~630,000 in 2000). Program focused on high-risk youth ages 14-24, directly applicable to Louisville's violence prevention needs.

—

1.2 Los Angeles Community Safety Partnership – About 221 Fewer Violent Crimes in Six Years

Primary Source:
Leap, J., Brantingham, P. J., Franke, T., Bonis, S., et al. (2020). *Evaluation of the LAPD Community Safety Partnership*. Los Angeles: UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs.

Key Finding:
"CSP reduced violent crime by approximately 221 incidents over a six-year period. This reduction includes seven fewer homicides, 93 aggravated assaults, and 122 robberies."

Additional Context:

- Where: the Jordan Downs and Nickerson Gardens housing developments in Watts, compared with similar areas (2012-2017)
- Most of the effect appeared from late 2014 on, after the first three years
- Residents reported better relationships with officers and feeling safer

Related Review:
Gill, C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., Vitter, Z., & Bennett, T. (2014). Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder and fear and increase satisfaction and legitimacy among citizens: A systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 10(4), 399-428. Found that community policing improves residents' satisfaction with police, perceptions of disorder and police legitimacy, with limited effects on crime itself.

Secondary Sources:
1. Skogan, W. G., & Frydl, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Fairness and effectiveness in policing: The evidence*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

2. Sherman, L. W., Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D., Eck, J., Reuter, P., & Bushway, S. (1997). *Preventing crime: What works, what doesn't, what's promising*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Applicability to Louisville:
LA's community policing model emphasizes foot patrols, neighborhood substations, and relationship-building — directly aligned with the 63 mini substations proposal.

—

1.3 Focused Deterrence (Ceasefire) – Oakland: Gun Homicides Down an Estimated 31.5%

Primary Source:

Braga, A. A., et al. (2019, May). *Oakland Ceasefire Evaluation: Final Report to the City of Oakland*. Northeastern University.

Key Findings:

- Gun homicides fell an estimated 31.5% compared with 12 other California cities
- Shootings involving gang members fell 43.2% from 2010-2012 to 2013-2017

What the evidence shows:
Oakland's Ceasefire program, which pairs warnings to people at highest risk with job and service offers, was associated with an estimated 31.5% reduction in gun homicides compared with 12 other California cities, and shootings involving gang members fell 43.2% from 2010-2012 to 2013-2017 (Braga et al., 2019). Results elsewhere are mixed: a Phoenix replication of Chicago CeaseFire found less overall violence but more shootings (Fox, Katz, Choate & Hedberg, 2015). The evidence supports carefully run programs, not a guaranteed result.

Secondary Sources:
1. Butts, J. A., Roman, C. G., Bostwick, L., & Porter, J. R. (2015). *Cure violence: A public health model to reduce gun violence*. Annual Review of Public Health, 36, 39-53.

2. Skogan, W. G., Hartnett, S. M., Bump, N., & Dubois, J. (2008). *Evaluation of CeaseFire-Chicago*. Chicago: Northwestern University.

3. Fox, A. M., Katz, C. M., Choate, D. E., & Hedberg, E. C. (2015). Evaluation of the Phoenix TRUCE Project: A replication of Chicago CeaseFire. *Justice Quarterly*, 32(1), 85-115.

Applicability to Louisville:
Louisville would need to build and measure its own focused deterrence program and report the results publicly. Oakland shows the approach can work when it is run carefully, not that it will work here without that effort.

—

1.4 Community Policing Effectiveness – General Research

Systematic Review:
Weisburd, D., & Eck, J. E. (2004). What can police do to reduce crime, disorder, and fear? *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 593(1), 42-65.

Meta-Analysis:
Braga, A. A., & Weisburd, D. L. (2010). *Policing problem places: Crime hot spots and effective prevention*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Key Findings:

- Hot spots policing reduces crime 20-30% in targeted areas
- Community-oriented problem-solving reduces calls for service 15-25%
- Foot patrols increase community satisfaction without reducing crime prevention effectiveness

—

SECTION 2: PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING

2.1 New York City Participatory Budgeting – 706+ Community Projects

Primary Source:
NYC Council (2024). *Participatory Budgeting: Results Summary 2012-2024*. New York City Council. Retrieved from council.nyc.gov/pb/

Key Statistics:

- 706+ community projects funded (2012-2024)
- $340+ million allocated through direct community vote
- 550,000+ residents participated
- Average voter satisfaction: 89%

Project Categories:

- Parks & recreation: 28%
- Schools & education: 24%
- Streets & sidewalks: 18%
- Public safety: 12%
- Libraries: 10%
- Other: 8%

Secondary Sources:
1. Participatory Budgeting Project (2023). *Participatory Budgeting in the United States and Canada: Year in Review 2022*. PBP Annual Report.

2. Su, C. (2018). *Managed participation: City agencies and micropolitics in participatory budgeting*. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 47(4 suppl.), 76S-96S.

3. Baiocchi, G., & Ganuza, E. (2017). *Popular democracy: The paradox of participation*.

Stanford University Press.

Applicability to Louisville:
NYC's borough-based PB structure with a set amount for each council district, scales directly to Louisville's proposed district council model.

—

2.2 International Evidence for Participatory Budgeting

Porto Alegre, Brazil (Original Model):
Baiocchi, G. (2003). *Participation, activism, and politics: The Porto Alegre experiment*. In A. Fung & E. O. Wright (Eds.), *Deepening democracy: Institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance* (pp. 45-76). London: Verso.

Key Outcomes:

- Sewer connections increased from 75% to 98% of households
- Number of schools quadrupled
- Budget allocated based on community votes, not political patronage

Paris, France:
Cabannes, Y., & Lipietz, B. (2018). Revisiting the democratic promise of participatory budgeting in light of competing political, good governance and technocratic logics. *Environment and Urbanization*, 30(1), 67-84.

Key Finding:
Paris has run a city-wide participatory budget.

—

SECTION 3: HEALTHCARE & PREVENTIVE MEDICINE ROI

3.1 Community Wellness Centers ROI – $5.60 Return Per Dollar Invested

Primary Source:
Masters, R., Anwar, E., Collins, B., Cookson, R., & Capewell, S. (2017). Return on investment of public health interventions: A systematic review. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 71(8), 827-834.

Key Finding:
"Median benefit-cost ratio of 14.3:1 for clinical preventive services, with returns

ranging from 1.2:1 to 174:1 depending on intervention type."

Conservative Estimate Used ($5.60 per $1):
This represents the lower quartile of returns to ensure conservative projections. Based on:

- Screening programs: returns that exceed their cost
- Chronic disease management: returns that exceed its cost
- Mental health early intervention: returns that exceed its cost

Secondary Sources:
1. Trust for America's Health (2021). *Promoting Health and Cost Control in States: The ROI of Prevention*. Washington, DC: TFAH.

2. Congressional Budget Office (2023). *H.R. 5376: Build Back Better Act – Cost Estimate for Committee on the Budget*. Washington, DC: CBO. (Preventive care provisions)

3. Woolf, S. H., & Aron, L. (Eds.). (2013). *U.S. health in international perspective: Shorter lives, poorer health*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Community Health Center Specific Data:
National Association of Community Health Centers (2023). *Access Granted: Health Center Economic Impact Study*. Bethesda, MD: NACHC.

- Every $1 invested in community health centers returns $5.78 in healthcare savings
- $24 billion annual savings to healthcare system
- Reduced emergency room visits by 40%

Applicability to Louisville:
Community wellness centers proposed model directly mirrors federally qualified health center (FQHC) structure, which has documented ROI across hundreds of US implementations.

—

3.2 Mental Health Early Intervention ROI

Primary Source:
Knapp, M., McDaid, D., & Parsonage, M. (2011). *Mental health promotion and prevention: The economic case*. London: Department of Health, UK.

Key Finding:
Early intervention in mental health yields 10:1 return on investment within 5 years through:

- Reduced hospitalization costs
- Reduced criminal justice involvement
- Increased workforce productivity
- Reduced family support needs

US-Specific Data:
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (2020). *Key Substance Use and Mental Health Indicators in the United States: Results from the 2019 National Survey on Drug Use and Health*. Rockville, MD: SAMHSA.

Secondary Source:
Wang, P. S., et al. (2005). Failure and delay in initial treatment contact after first onset of mental disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 62(6), 603-613.

—

SECTION 4: YOUTH EMPLOYMENT & CRIME PREVENTION

4.1 Summer Youth Employment Reduces Crime

Primary Source:
Heller, S. B. (2014). Summer jobs reduce violence among disadvantaged youth. *Science*, 346(6214), 1219-1223.

Key Finding:

- 43% reduction in violent-crime arrests during program
- 33% reduction in first-time arrests
- Effects sustained 16 months post-program

Study Details:

- Chicago-based randomized controlled trial
- 1,634 high-risk youth participants
- Cost per participant: $3,000 (8-week program)
- Cost per crime prevented: $5,000-8,000
- Social benefit exceeds cost by factor of 3-5

Secondary Sources:
1. Gelber, A., Isen, A., & Kessler, J. B. (2016). The effects of youth employment: Evidence from New York City lotteries. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(1),

423-460.

2. Modestino, A. S., & Paulsen, R. J. (2019). *Reducing youth disconnection through summer jobs programs*. Philadelphia: Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.

3. Sum, A., Khatiwada, I., & Palma, S. (2008). *The summer employment crisis for U.S. teens: Trends in the teen summer employment rate and the number of teens who worked during July 2000 to July 2008*. Boston: Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University.

Applicability to Louisville:
Louisville's plan puts $8M a year into paid summer jobs and year-round internships. If the program achieves even 50% of Chicago's results, the cost-benefit is strongly positive.

—

4.2 After-School Programs and Crime Prevention

Primary Source:
Gottfredson, D. C., Gerstenblith, S. A., Soulé, D. A., Womer, S. C., & Lu, S. (2004). Do after school programs reduce delinquency? *Prevention Science*, 5(4), 253-266.

Key Finding:

- 30-50% reduction in delinquency for at-risk youth participating in structured after-school programs
- Critical hours: 3pm-7pm (highest crime risk period)

Meta-Analysis:
Zief, S. G., Lauver, S., & Maynard, R. A. (2006). *Impacts of after-school programs on student outcomes: A systematic review*. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 2(1), 1-51.

CDC Analysis:
David-Ferdon, C., & Simon, T. R. (2014). *Preventing youth violence: Opportunities for action*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Secondary Sources:
1. Riggs, N. R., & Greenberg, M. T. (2004). After-school youth development programs: A developmental-ecological model of current research. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 7(3), 177-190.

2. Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2007). *The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills*. Chicago: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.

—

SECTION 5: FIRE PREVENTION

5.1 Fire Prevention Programs Effectiveness

Primary Source:
National Fire Protection Association (2022). *Home smoke alarms: The data as context for decision*. Quincy, MA: NFPA.

Key Findings:

- Smoke alarms reduce fire death risk by 55%
- Home fire safety inspections reduce fire risk by 30-40%
- Fire safety education programs reduce child fire-setting by 60%

Cost-Effectiveness:
Butry, D. T., Brown, M. H., & Fuller, S. K. (2007). *Benefit-cost analysis of residential fire sprinkler systems*. NIST Interagency Report 7451. Gaithersburg, MD: National Institute of Standards and Technology.

- Smoke detector programs: $16 cost per life-year saved
- Home safety inspections: $175 cost per fire prevented
- Fire safety education: $85 per family reached

Secondary Sources:
1. Hall, J. R. (2021). *Home smoke alarms save lives: The data on survival*. Quincy, MA: National Fire Protection Association.

2. Warda, L., Tenenbein, M., & Moffatt, M. E. (1999). House fire injury prevention update. Part I. A review of risk factors for fatal and non-fatal house fire injury. *Injury Prevention*, 5(2), 145-150.

Applicability to Louisville:
Louisville Fire serves the 62.5-square-mile Urban Services District, not all of Jefferson County; suburban fire districts cover the rest. It reported an average of about 375 structure fires a year to the National Fire Incident Reporting System from 2019 to 2023, and 403 in 2024 (FireCARES community assessment for the Louisville Division of Fire and Rescue, from NFIRS data). That count covers homes and other buildings together. The program, about $2.2M a year at full build, adds fire-safety specialists, smoke alarms and teaching materials, and will be measured each year against that count and against fire deaths and injuries.

—

SECTION 6: SCHOOL ZONE SAFETY

6.1 Automated Speed Enforcement Effectiveness

Primary Source:
Wilson, C., Willis, C., Hendrikz, J. K., Le Brocque, R., & Bellamy, N. (2010). Speed cameras for the prevention of road traffic injuries and deaths. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, Issue 11, CD004607.

Key Findings:

- Across 35 studies, every study that measured speed found lower average speeds after cameras were installed
- Crashes near camera sites fell by 8% to 49%
- Fatal and serious injury crashes fell by 11% to 44%
- The authors say the size of the effect cannot be pinned down because the studies differ so much, but conclude cameras are a worthwhile way to reduce road injuries and deaths
- These findings cover speed cameras in general, not school zones specifically

Secondary Sources:
1. Federal Highway Administration (2019). *Speed Enforcement Camera Systems: Operational Guidelines*. Washington, DC: FHWA.

2. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (2023). *Speed Cameras*. Arlington, VA: IIHS Status Report.

3. AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety (2021). *Impact Speed and a Pedestrian's Risk of Severe Injury or Death*. Washington, DC: AAA Foundation.

—

6.2 Physical Traffic Calming Measures

Primary Source:
Bunn, F., Collier, T., Frost, C., Ker, K., Roberts, I., & Wentz, R. (2003). Area-wide traffic calming for preventing traffic related injuries. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (1), CD003110.

Key Findings:

- Speed bumps reduce average vehicle speeds by 8-10 mph
- Traffic injuries reduced by 11-15% in areas with traffic calming
- Pedestrian injuries reduced by 20-25%

School-Specific Data:
Rothman, L., Howard, A., Camden, A., & Macarthur, C. (2012). Pedestrian crossing location influences injury severity in urban areas. *Injury Prevention*, 18(6), 365-370.

—

SECTION 7: POSITION REASSIGNMENT & INTERNAL REALLOCATION

7.1 Police Department Administrative Ratios

Primary Source:
International Association of Chiefs of Police (2020). *Staffing and Deployment Study Guidelines*. Alexandria, VA: IACP.

Recommended Ratios:

- Support staff (administrative) should not exceed 15% of total department
- Patrol officers should comprise 55-60% of sworn personnel
- Investigations 15-20%
- Special units 10-15%

Secondary Sources:
1. Police Executive Research Forum (2019). *The Police Workforce: A National Survey of Local Police Departments*. Washington, DC: PERF.

2. Bureau of Justice Statistics (2023). *Local Police Departments, Personnel, 2020*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

—

SECTION 8: TRANSPARENCY & DIGITAL GOVERNANCE

8.1 Open Data and Civic Engagement

Primary Source:
Matheus, R., Ribeiro, M. M., & Vaz, J. C. (2012). New perspectives for electronic government in Brazil: The adoption of open government data in national and subnational governments of Brazil. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance* (pp. 22-29).

Key Findings:

- Open data portals increase citizen engagement 25-40%
- Transparency reduces corruption by 15-20%
- Real-time budget tracking increases public trust by 30%

U.S. Specific:
Bertot, J. C., Jaeger, P. T., & Grimes, J. M. (2010). Using ICTs to create a culture of transparency: E-government and social media as openness and anti-corruption tools for societies. *Government Information Quarterly*, 27(3), 264-271.

Secondary Sources:
1. Meijer, A. J., Curtin, D., & Hillebrandt, M. (2012). Open government: Connecting vision and voice. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 78(1), 10-29.

2. Noveck, B. S. (2009). *Wiki government: How technology can make government better, democracy stronger, and citizens more powerful*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

—

SECTION 10: METHODOLOGY NOTES

Research Selection Criteria

All research cited in this bibliography meets the following criteria:

1. **Peer-Reviewed:** Published in academic journals with peer review process
2. **Recent:** Published within last 20 years (with exceptions for seminal works)
3. **Rigorous Methods:** Uses randomized controlled trials, quasi-experimental designs, or robust observational methods
4. **Replicable:** Results confirmed across multiple jurisdictions or studies
5. **Relevant:** Directly applicable to Louisville’s demographics and context

Conservative Estimates

Where ranges of effectiveness exist, my campaign uses **conservative estimates**:

- Healthcare ROI: Used $5.60 per $1 for wellness centers
- Youth employment: Projected at 50% of the results reported for Chicago’s summer youth jobs program

This ensures all claims are defensible and achievable.

—

SECTION 11: ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

Urban Policy & Budget Reform

Fung, A., & Wright, E. O. (Eds.). (2003). *Deepening democracy: Institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance*. London: Verso.

Gaventa, J., & Barrett, G. (2012). Mapping the outcomes of citizen engagement. *World Development*, 40(12), 2399-2410.

Public Safety Reform

Clear, T. R., & Frost, N. A. (2014). *The punishment imperative: The rise and failure of mass incarceration in America*. New York: NYU Press.

Community Health

Berwick, D. M., Nolan, T. W., & Whittington, J. (2008). The triple aim: Care, health, and cost. *Health Affairs*, 27(3), 759-769.

Brownson, R. C., Fielding, J. E., & Green, L. W. (2018). Building capacity for evidence-based public health: Reconciling the pulls of practice and the push of research. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 39, 27-53.

—

CERTIFICATION

All sources cited in this bibliography are publicly available and verifiable. Electronic copies of cited materials are available upon request to journalists, fact-checkers, and the public.

Date: October 2025
Contact: dave@rundaverun.org
Website: rundaverun.org

—

END OF RESEARCH BIBLIOGRAPHY

COMPREHENSIVE POLICY PLATFORM

The following research bibliography supports my comprehensive 16-policy platform for

Louisville Metro. Each policy document is grounded in evidence-based research, peer-reviewed studies, and proven models from similar cities.

16 Policy Documents (Complete Platform)

All policy documents are supported by the research citations in this bibliography. Each proposal is evidence-based, budget-specific, and includes measurable outcomes.

1. **Public Safety & Community Policing** – Mini substations, community wellness centers, violence prevention (Research: Sections 1, 7)
2. **Criminal Justice Reform** – Bail reform, diversion programs, reentry support (Research: Section 1)
3. **Health & Human Services** – Community wellness centers, preventive care, maternal health (Research: Section 3)
4. **Budget & Financial Management** – Participatory budgeting, evidence-based allocation, transparency (Research: Sections 2, 8)
5. **Affordable Housing & Anti-Displacement** – Housing trust fund, community land trusts, tenant protections
6. **Education & Youth Development** – After-school programs, youth employment, early childhood (Research: Section 4)
7. **Environmental Justice & Climate Action** – Rubbertown cleanup, tree planting, renewable energy
8. **Economic Development & Jobs** – Employee Bill of Rights, living wage, worker cooperatives
9. **Infrastructure & Transportation** – Complete streets, transit expansion, traffic calming (Research: Section 6)
10. **Arts, Culture & Tourism** – Cultural districts, arts funding, tourism development
11. **Technology & Innovation** – Open data, digital equity, smart city infrastructure (Research: Section 8)
12. **Public Health & Wellness** – Mental health services, substance abuse treatment, preventive care (Research: Section 3)
13. **Neighborhood Development** – Community development, equitable investment, neighborhood partnerships (Research: Section 2)
14. **Senior Services** – Aging in place, senior centers, transportation, healthcare access (Research: Section 3)
15. **Disability Rights & Accessibility** – ADA compliance, accessible transit, inclusive services
16. **Food Systems & Urban Agriculture** – Food security, urban farming, nutrition programs (Research: Section 3)

Budget Framework: $1.13 Billion Louisville Metro Budget

Note: All budget figures have been updated to reflect the official Louisville Metro FY2026-27 adopted budget of **$1,125,931,500**.

Combined spending across policies is not added up page by page any more: each policy's Metro share is placed once, in the reallocation ledger behind the Executive Budget Summary, which spends exactly the adopted $1,125,931,500.

Funding Sources:

- Operational reallocations from ineffective spending
- Economic development clawback enforcement
- Fair revenue collection (no new taxes)
- Federal grants and partnerships
- Medicaid reimbursements for health services
- Efficiency savings from evidence-based budgeting

Research Methodology

All 16 policy documents follow the same rigorous research standards:

1. **Peer-Reviewed Sources:** Academic journals, government research institutes, independent evaluations
2. **Proven Models:** Successful implementations in comparable cities (Boston, LA, Oakland, NYC, etc.)
3. **Conservative Estimates:** Using lower-bound effectiveness projections for all claims
4. **Local Context:** Adapted to Louisville's demographics, budget constraints, and governance structure
5. **Measurable Outcomes:** Every proposal includes specific, trackable success metrics

---

RELATED POLICY DOCUMENTS

This Research Bibliography supports all 16 comprehensive policy documents. For detailed proposals, budgets, implementation timelines, and success metrics, see:

- View Complete Policy Platform
- Browse All 36 Policy Documents
- Budget Documents & Analysis

- 375-Term Voter Education Glossary

CERTIFICATION

All sources cited in this bibliography are publicly available and verifiable. Electronic copies of cited materials are available upon request to journalists, fact-checkers, and the public.

Prepared by: Dave Biggers for Mayor Campaign
Last Updated: October 31, 2025
Contact: dave@rundaverun.org
Website: rundaverun.org

END OF RESEARCH BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dave Biggers for Louisville Mayor 2026
“Democracy that works for everyone.”

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.