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ABSTRACT

This study examines the organizational structure of the Kentucky Main Street Program (KYMS), the Nation’s first statewide Main Street program, and its impact on Kentucky’s Main Street communities. Since its inception, KYMS has modified its program in response to changes in Kentucky’s economic situation and communities’ needs. These changes include expanding the program to smaller communities, adjusting the provision of technical services, and offering grants for manager’s salaries and projects. KYMS and National Main Street Center (NMSC) evaluations have focused on performance during one- or two-year program cycles. Changes in structure and availability of services, however, have not been compared with KYMS’s annual performance measures, which the program refers to as reinvestment statistics. Examination of the program’s reinvestment statistics revealed correlations between the total reinvestment in Main Street communities and changes in the program’s structure and funding. They also revealed minor changes in the average reinvestment per community. This illustrates that while increased funding grew the program by attracting more communities to participate, funding did not drastically affect the reinvestment of each community. A qualitative survey accompanies this quantitative assessment. The survey sought to balance information gleaned from reinvestment statistics with opinions gathered from Main Street participants. The results varied with some praise and some discontent toward the past and current programs. Despite changes in opinion and organizational structure, the KYMS program is still well established in Kentucky. Determining the impact of past changes to KYMS’s structure is important in guiding its future, justifying additional funding and determining how it will best serve its Main Street communities.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Since 1976, the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s (NTHP) Main Street program has devoted itself to preserving and reviving historic downtown business districts. Initiated by the Midwest office of the NTHP, the program has grown to include 40 states and over a thousand communities. It boasts the rehabilitation of 236,201 buildings, the creation of 109,664 net businesses and 473,439 net jobs, and a total reinvestment of $55.7 billion in its Main Street districts.\(^1\) The Main Street program refers to statistics like these as “reinvestment” statistics and uses them to promote the accomplishments of the program. The statistics can represent a snapshot of a particular year or the cumulative impact of the program. Very rarely, however, do reports emphasize comparisons from year to year.

As the first statewide Main Street program, Kentucky Main Street (KYMS) and its communities have reaped numerous benefits. They have existed long enough to experience a range of highs and lows, including rapid growth and popularity. They have also weathered economic recessions. Since its creation in 1979, KYMS has made many alterations to the way it serves Kentucky communities. These alterations brought increased funding, training and community consultations as the program expanded its scope. There have also been negative results such as decreases in funding and staff levels. Today the program serves close to fifty communities in Kentucky and operates with only one full-time staff member. At its most active, at least three KYMS staff members were devoted to the program. The current funding and staffing situation makes one wonder if the program is truly meeting the state’s needs. This study assesses the adjustments KYMS made to its program in response to fluctuations in the national and state economy and as needs of com-

munitions rose and fell. In particular, it answers two questions: first, how have changes to KYMS’s structure affected its communities, and, second, what future changes can KYMS make to better serve its communities?

To answer these questions, this study relied on reinvestment statistics gathered by KYMS and a survey of current and past KYMS participants. Unlike previous studies, this assessment used annual reinvestment statistics to measure and compare each year’s success. While the information contained in reinvestment statistics does not encompass every aspect of a Main Street community’s economic progress. They do provide a measure of investment in the district’s built environment. One drawback of the data is that it does not discriminate between positive and negative investment. Rather, it includes all development from sensitive rehabilitations to new construction unsympathetic to the district’s historic character. This acknowledgement may appear contrary to the premise of the Main Street program. However, Main Street programs are in place to promote the downtown, implement preservation strategies and formalize preservation policies such as historic designations, ordinances and review boards. When a Main Street organization actively pursues these endeavors, it ensures that development is considerate of the district’s historic buildings and minimizes insensitive designs.

Other factors that influence development in all communities include zoning ordinances, interest rates, availability of property and political climates. While Main Street managers stay abreast of these factors and use them to the advantage of the district when possible, this study does not attempt to assess their influence. Rather, the study acknowledges that the climate of each community is unique to its own time and place. Furthermore, the study focuses on KYMS’s cumulative reinvestment. While all reinvestment is made at the community level, it is only assessed in regards to its relationship to the state total.
Before delving into the programs reinvestment statistics, it is important to understand the history of the National Main Street Center (NMSC) and KYMS. Also, important is an understanding of KYMS’s past and the methods it has used to serve its communities. Chapter One provides a chronological introduction to the creation of the Main Street program. This section begins with a review of literature pertaining to community development and decline that is both specific and precursory to the Main Street program. It then transitions to the history of the Main Street program, outlining the early years of both the national and Kentucky Main Street programs. The structure of NMSC is also considered as well as an explanation of Main Street’s four-points and eight-principles. The majority of the chapter, however, focuses on the development and structure of KYMS with particular emphasis on changes the program has undergone. Most changes revolve around fluctuations in funding, support, acceptance policies and services offered by KYMS. Often, multiple changes occurred at once allowing the program to be divided into four eras this study labels as the Beginning, Expanded Program, Renaissance Kentucky and the Current Program. During each era, KYMS provided guidance and strove to be a catalyst for transformation in its Main Street communities.

The second chapter discusses reinvestment statistics and how NMSC measures success in Main Street districts. The chapter begins with an introduction of variables that comprise or otherwise relate to reinvestment including community participation, the number of buildings rehabilitated and the amount invested in public improvement projects. Last of all, the chapter analyzes total reinvestment. Throughout this study, reinvestment is regarded as the outcome or “profits” of the Main Street organization. This analogy is made in order to treat KYMS as a business with a central headquarters, the state coordinating office, and many satellite or storefront locations, the communities. By using an adaptation of two primary business ratios, sales per store and return on investment, the effectiveness of KYMS during each era can be assessed.
Following the quantitative analysis presented in Chapter Two, the third chapter presents a qualitative assessment of KYMS. Drawing from a survey conducted in 2000 by NMSC, this study distributed a new, similar survey. In order to learn about the perception of KYMS during each era, the survey asked questions pertaining to the delivery of services, level of communication, role of KYMS and satisfaction. The study then sorted the results and composed three assessments. The first provides an overview of KYMS participants’ perspectives of the program from the beginning era to the current era. The second section compares results from the original NMSC survey with results of current era participants. This comparison is significant because both sets of data were collected “at the moment” rather than retrospectively. The third portion delves further into the results of the recent survey. To do so, it eliminated responses from individuals who participated in more than one era. This method was used in order to achieve unbiased responses as opposed to responses that averaged the opinion of two eras. The assessment then compared the results from the four different eras to determine how opinions have changed over time.

Each of the assessments, quantitative and qualitative, indicated changes from era to era. Some changes, like those exhibited by the survey’s ranked questions, were minimal. The study also found that reinvestment per community did not significantly change between eras even though the number of communities participating did. Open-ended survey questions revealed discontent with changes made to the KYMS program particularly concerning funding while return on investment ratios displayed that how funding is invested in the program greatly affects the effectiveness it can have.

Drawing from KYMS’s history as well as the quantitative and qualitative assessments, the last chapter offers recommendations for the future of KYMS. Many recommendations pertain to issues discussed within the survey or the relationship between reinvestment and funding. Some categories touched upon include the delivery of services, image of the program and financial support. Overall, the recommendations intend
to strengthen KYMS and its relationship with its communities. Since 1979, the program has provided Kentucky towns with a platform for historic preservation and community revitalization. It also forged the way starting a statewide program before NMSC. In this capacity, KYMS has served as an example to all states, not just its own. As it moves into the future, it is important that KYMS continue to be a strong advocate for preservation and to use knowledge gained from its past to inform the decisions of its future.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Over the past century, many scholars have studied how cities develop, change, and cope with negative forces. While each of these forces relate to the development of the NTHP’s Main Street program, an in-depth analysis of their individual influences is unnecessary. Instead, this literature review discusses only the major authors of these movements and provides contextual history. The majority of this literature review focuses on the development of the NMSC, the Kentucky Heritage Council’s (KHC) statewide Main Street program and various studies concerning state Main Street programs and communities.

Although not grounded in historic preservation, The Garden City and City Beautiful movements can be considered precursors to the Main Street program. Like Main Street, these movements intended to create ideal cities that were aesthetically pleasing and well-functioning. The City Beautiful movement relates to the Main Street program in its objectives too revive derelict areas of cities that suffered from various social ills. While those are objectives of the Main Street program as well, a difference lies in the City Beautiful movement’s focus on new construction and creating monumental architecture to inspire people and improve their quality of life.

---

Though these movements can be linked to the changes taking place in areas of large populations (the Garden City was actually a rejection of large cities), many smaller developments were already established in less populated geographic areas and in less organized ways. Many of the towns that are now associated with the ideal of “Main Street” can be linked to early immigrants and the paths they used to travel across the United States. It is often thought that smaller communities were simply observers to larger movements. However, Kirin J. Makker, in her dissertation, Building Main Street: Village Improvement and the American Small Town Ideal, 2010, argues that rural settlements were very active in progressive reform and discusses movements including landscape gardening, sanitation, and the professionalization of city planning.3

While the above texts outline the improvements to communities, other texts thoroughly outline their decline. In many cases, especially those in the 20th century, scholars credit decline to the invention and widespread use of the automobile, as well as the expansion of the interstate system. Chester H. Liebs discusses and pictorially documents the drastic changes made to Main Street and other thoroughfares in Main Street to Miracle Mile: American Roadside Architecture (1985). Liebs discusses retrospectively the emergence of various types of roadside architecture, signage and commercial structures with an emphasis on the automobile as a catalyst for change.4

Also taking place during the mid-twentieth century was an influx of young men returning home from World War II. When Dreams Came True: The GI Bill and the Making of Modern America, written by Michael J. Bennett (1996), discusses the influence of the GI Bill after its passage in 1944.5 This bill and subsequent revisions in the next decade made it possible for veterans to purchase and build homes using GI Bill mortgages. By 1950,

3 Kirin J. Makker, Building Main Street: Village Improvement and the American Small Town Ideal (UMI Dissertation Publishing, 2010).
4 Chester H. Liebs, Main Street to Miracle Mile (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995).
Congress increased the mortgage amount to $7,500 and the maturity duration to thirty years. This change shaped the way mortgages have been structured ever since and created a financially sound reason for people to move further and further from Main Street.

The movement of such a large percentage of the population to suburbs and other non-urban areas caused a drastic decrease in the population of cities. In large cities, the decline in business and livelihood resulted in the neglect of many buildings and the creation of new federal policy in the form of the Housing Act of 1949.⁶ This act allowed developers to use federal financing for slum clearance. The intent behind the Housing Act was to replace derelict buildings and create “healthier” communities with improved housing options. The result was the removal of neglected, yet affordable, housing options and the displacement of residents. Furthermore, new construction was unable to keep pace with the housing demand created or to balance the price renters could afford. The repercussions of this policy, as well as many other changes to cities made by urban planners, are well documented in Jane Jacobs’ The Death and Life of Great American Cities which was written in 1961 in the midst of the slum clearing and urban renewal movement.⁷ Although focused on large cities, Jacob’s text makes many smaller points that can be applied to any locale, for example, cities need a building stock of diverse ages because of the suitable nature of older structures to house independent and startup business as well as provide affordable housing.⁸

---

Like Jacob’s text, those that focus on large cities can sometime be applied to smaller areas and provide great insight into the overarching issues of community decline, effects of sprawl and mindset of policy makers. It should also be noted that the majority of literature focusing on highly populated areas dwarfs similar literature on small towns like those that will be the focus of this thesis. This is especially true when it comes to finding assessments that can be applied to more than one geographic area. The lack of generality is indicative of the diversity of smaller towns and implies that, although many share similar stories of decline, they have each struggled with their own unique losses and have their own unique assets to capitalize on.

Some literature, however, does provide a regional and small-scale focus. This literature is useful in gaining an understanding of the development, decline and current situation in much of Kentucky. However, it was much more difficult to find regional sources that were not overtly specific to one region or too general of the entire state. Some sources consulted were “Bardstown, Kentucky” by Thomas W. Spalding (2000) and The 2010-2014 Kentucky State Historic Preservation Plan, written by Wendy Wheatcraft the Planning and Research Coordinator at KHC.9 Spalding’s concise history of Bardstown provides an example of decline in Kentucky. A descendant of the small central Kentucky town, Spalding outlines the community’s initial development before relaying the effects of prohibition, the inevitable closure of many Bourbon Whiskey distilleries, and the out-migration of a significant number of the county’s residents. This occurrence affected many central Kentucky communities in the 1920’s. The 2010-2014 Kentucky State Historic Preservation Plan provides a more general synopsis of the state’s development. Intended to provide a basis for Kentucky’s cultural resources, including archaeological, the plan begins with prehistoric times and highlights various timeframes through the modern era. The plan

---

pays special attention to the years after 1775 including Kentucky’s settlement and initial development, the Civil War, and the industrial movements of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century.

Later authors focus on the capitalization of each community’s unique assets and the revival of cities. Some have even discovered the many ways in which cities have not failed (even though common belief is that they have). One such author is Roberta Brandes Gratz who wrote both The Living City and Cities Back From the Edge (co-authored by Norman Mintz) (1995 and 1998, respectively).\(^\text{10}\) Gratz discusses the negative effects that urban planning and project plans had on the landscape of large cities. However, her motivation to look for the small spaces and to involve local people in the planning process can be applied to all communities whether large cities or small towns. Gratz uses the term “urban husbandry” and encourages people to recognize and reinvigorate the assets they already have. This philosophy encompasses the intent of the Main Street program. NMSC advocates that each Main Street program be an organization comprised of local citizens, business owners and groups who each have a preservation mindset and an interest in seeing their downtown thrive.\(^\text{11}\)

In The Brown Decades (1931), Lewis Mumford observed, “every generation revolts against its fathers and makes friends with its grandfathers.”\(^\text{12}\) While the Main Street program strives to preserve and revive the communities of our grandparents, a movement called New Urbanism strives to recreate them. Although both movements are indicative of a desire to return to the simplicity and functionality of past communities, a large part of the


\(^{11}\) Also pertinent to revitalization: Richard Moe and Carter Wilkie, Changing Places: Rebuilding Community in the Age of Sprawl (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1997). This book gives wonderful insight into the loss of place in many American communities and how preservation has been used to restore it; and Andrew Hurley, Beyond Preservation: Using Public History to Revitalize Inner Cities (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2010).

New Urbanism’s practice is to design neighborhoods and towns that replicate what Main Street already is. This movement, which incorporates sidewalks, a commercial core, and higher than average neighborhood density, began in the 1980’s and has since run concurrently (although conversely in ideals) with the Main Street program. These communities, such as Seaside in Florida and I’On in Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, while striving to recreate the neighborhoods and downtown districts of historic towns do not always succeed in developing a sense of place. Some, like Seaside, have capitalized on tourism but others, although often beautiful, fail to embody the close-knit character of small towns.

Authors like Gratz and Jacobs advocate many positive effects of preserving what we already have and even environmentalists can tout the benefits of working within our current building stock. Aaron Betsky, the director of the Cincinnati Art Museum, in a lecture at the University of Kentucky discussed the role of architects and how designing for the future needs to adapt to a philosophy of reuse rather than always building new.

To find literature about invigorating small, historic communities, and the positive effects this produces, one does not have to look much further than two sources. Donovan Rypkema in Economics of Historic Preservation (1994) outlines the many economic gains of preservation from employing local labor, to supporting local businesses and keeping revenue and tax dollars within the community. The other source is the NTHP, which


15 Donovan Rypkema, Economics of Historic Preservation: A Community Leader’s Guide (Washington,
keeps abreast of activities across the country and creates publications such as Preservation magazine to disseminate information.

While some of these publications, like those offered by the NMSC, are specific to the Main Street program, many offer parallel suggestions on community development and economic revitalization. Dolores Palma and Doyle Hyett in 1999 wrote one such article, “Anchors Reinvent Downtowns.” The short article provides helpful ideas for redeveloping a downtown area including providing unconventional shops and adaptively reusing spaces. While some of these publications, like those offered by the NMSC, are specific to the Main Street program, many offer parallel suggestions on community development and economic revitalization. Dolores Palma and Doyle Hyett in 1999 wrote one such article, “Anchors Reinvent Downtowns.” The short article provides helpful ideas for redeveloping a downtown area including providing unconventional shops and adaptively reusing spaces. Those that mention the Main Street program often focus on the actions taking place at the local level. Additionally, the NMSC publishes a yearly newsletter titled “State of the Main Street Report.” This newsletter highlights the successes of the Main Street program including community activities; new, unique businesses; and statistics on the positive economic benefits experienced. Other NMSC publications such as Main Street Success Stories by Suzanne G. Dane (1997) promote communities and tactics that have shown successful in the program. Occasionally the NMSC devotes literature to providing examples and insight on how to improve a Main Street program. Some of these suggestions focus on ideas for introducing new types of businesses or different types of events and fundraisers the local Main Street organization could hold. Others focus on the issues of how to create a well-functioning, diversified board and how to recruit volunteers. Material often focuses on the community level, which is in essence where the Main Street program really takes place. At the same time, however, much of its success can be attributed to assistance from the state coordinating offices and the NMSC who the local programs could not function without.


17 Suzanne G. Dane, Main Street Success Stories (Washington, DC: National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1997).
18 The exception is communities participating in states without a state coordinating office. In this case a county or other midlevel organization can in place of a state organization, but it is required that there be a level of organization between the Main Street district and the National Main Street Center.
Literature on the Main Street program is very informative in regards to how communities can organize their Main Street program and the importance of following the four-point approach. It also emphasizes that organizations should rely on and be well connected with volunteers and other forms of community support and that the main street manager is in place to assist with carrying out the plans of the board of directors. While this local organization is in many ways allowed to organize itself in the way it best sees fit (independent organization, part of community development department, etc.) the state organization has also been allowed to organize itself as it sees fit. For many states, this means the program’s coordinating office is placed in the state historic preservation office, and in some states, it resides in the state’s predominant historic preservation organization. That each level is able to determine its own preferred structure is not surprising, but what is surprising is the amount of literature devoted to assessing how these structures work. Much can be found (although many times in informal materials such as handouts) about the structure at the community level and the benefits of organizing their governing board in various ways, but little literature seems to be provided about the structure of a state coordinating program, even from the NMSC. This can in ways be attributed to funding which will vary between states and even between years within the same state, but nevertheless a study of what works best, what has and has not worked at all would be a benefit to the many states and communities involved. This type of study would aid organizations in gaining funding or justifying additional employment for the coordinators office by enabling them to compare the results of other similar programs.

One study, conducted by Jennifer Gates as a graduate student at the University of Pennsylvania, titled A Study of Inactive Main Street Communities (2005) also asks why there is so much focus on the positive community aspects, but so little on their shortcomings. Gates goes further to assess how Main Street programs can recover from and avoid shortcomings. Gates notes that little focus has been given to these communities and
determining where the approach began to fail or what other tactics could have been used to revive the town.19 A second graduate student, Helen Arnold Person, wrote in her thesis The Main Street Design: Power, Politics, and Priorities (2010) about the failure of communities in Georgia. After watching her hometown’s Main Street program falter and face drastic budget cuts, Person studied inefficiencies in the operation of Georgia’s coordinating office and conducted case studies in a select number of Georgia Main Street communities. Person concluded that the Georgia program should reevaluate its position within the state government and its relationships with affiliate organizations.20

A last dissertation discusses directly the Kentucky Main Street program and assesses variables leading to active and inactive communities. This piece, written by Christa Ann Smith in 2000, is titled “Kentucky Main Street Program: 1979-1997.”21 Smith uses seventeen variable and linear regressions to determine which factors make communities more or less likely to succeed in the program. While some of Smith’s variables are similar to those that will be examined in this thesis (primarily those collected as reinvestment statistics), here they will be viewed as a product of the structure of the state coordinating office as opposed to the cause of community participation. In addition, Smith’s dissertation only briefly mentions the Renaissance Kentucky program, which greatly affected the funding available to Main Street communities. This thesis, while also reviewing the state coordinator’s role prior to Renaissance Kentucky’s implementation, will add an assessment of that program as well which is currently lacking.22

As KYMS adapted its program over the years, it created reports in support of proposed changes and provided evaluations of new implementations. This includes literature pertaining to the expansion of the program in the 1980s, the smart growth task force in the 1990s, two reviews by the NMSC, and other annual reports. Although they have been diligent to conduct these assessments, each one provides only a snapshot of the time in which it was written. The reports have never been used to compare different phases or to assess their strengths and weaknesses and apply information to future plans.

Although efforts have been made in different states (Oklahoma and Georgia) to determine the shortcomings of the statewide Main Street program, Kentucky has been without a statewide assessment since 2000. The most recent assessment conducted by Doug Loescher and Sheri Stuart provided feedback about the state’s current structure as well as survey results collected from Main Street participants throughout the state. The report provides valuable information on how to better promote and create cohesiveness within the organization but, similar to other reports, is simply a snapshot of the current situation. This study hopes to eliminate that gap and provide a holistic review of the KYMS program. This includes an assessment of the strategies KYMS implemented in successful eras compared to those used in less successful eras and the current (2010-2013) era. Through this holistic view, the program will be better suited to create plans for the future.

---


24 Loescher and Stuart, *Kentucky Main Street Program Review*. 
with clear reasoning of the tactics that have and have not worked for Kentucky’s Main Street program.

**HISTORY OF THE NATIONAL MAIN STREET PROGRAM**

In the mid-1970s, the Midwest office of the NTHP devised an idea to revive America’s main streets. Previously the center of commerce and livelihood, many of America’s cities and towns fell victim to unfavorable economic conditions in the early twentieth century. The cores of these communities, their downtowns and business districts, became an atmosphere of high vacancy and deteriorated buildings. By the mid-twentieth century, urban renewal policies and urban flight created indelible imprints on the county’s landscape.

The movement of people away from downtowns, large and small, was facilitated by the growing popularity of the automobile and the surge in infrastructure to support easy travel from one locale to another. In addition, many American’s embraced the “American Dream” including the desire to own their own home and have their own space. Government subsidies for highway construction and home purchasing, as well as provisions in the G.I. Bill for low-cost mortgages, made this aspiration attainable. Individuals and families moved from downtown with its amenities of shopping, employment and entertainment nearby to the suburbs where they could enjoy large lawns and leisurely drives. Between 1947 and 1953 the population of suburban areas increased 43 percent while the total US population increased by only 11 percent. In the beginning, many suburban residents still used the community’s urban core for shopping and employment. However, as more people moved to the suburbs so did an increasing number of businesses and jobs. Regional shopping malls also added appeal to the suburbs and transformed them from residential communities to destination points.

Identifying this as a threat to many of our country’s historic properties, Mary Means, Director of the NTHP’s Midwest Regional Office, launched the Main Street Project. The primary objective of this effort was to counteract the movement of businesses and residents to the suburbs and promote downtown as a viable option for living, working and shopping. By accomplishing this goal, the Main Street project hoped to renewed interest in downtown and promote the preservation of its historic buildings and cultural fabric. The first step in the creation of this program was to develop a method for revitalization.

In 1977, members of the Midwest Regional Office selected three Midwest towns to be a part of a demonstration project and test ideas that combined preservation and economic revitalization. The communities chosen were Hot Springs, South Dakota; Galesburg, Illinois; and Madison, Indiana. Each town experienced the decline characteristic of so many others. It became the responsibility of their Main Street manager to devise a plan to combat further decline and revive their Main Street. According to Scott Gerloff, the manager in Hot Springs, each community was faced with different challenges, circumstances and potentials. Managers quickly discovered that every method they attempted would not be a success. Nevertheless, they endured, experimenting with new ideas, keeping the ones that worked and moving on to the next when one did not. The managers learned that while there was not a specific, one-size fits all solution, there were common aspects to each community’s success. Those common aspects became the Main Street Program’s Four Point Approach. The four points this approach relies on are Organization, Design, Promotion, and Economic Restructuring. Utilizing these four points, a community can determine in its own way how to restructure and enliven its Main Street district. By creating an approach, instead of a cut and dry, step-by-step process, the communities were given the ability to take ownership of ideas and the flexibility to cater to their community’s unique situation.
This philosophy and grassroots/bottom-up generation of activities is still a large part of what the NTHP states as integral to making a Main Street community thrive.26

After testing their theory for two years, the success of Hot Springs, Madison, and Galesburg was evident to more than just the shoppers and business owners frequenting their main streets. People from cities across the nation took notice and by 1979 the NTHP received requests for assistance from more than 4,000 towns in the United States and Canada. In the United States, this demand, plus the support of federal agencies including the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, the National Endowment for the Arts, the Economic Development Administration, and the Small Business Administration, allowed the NTHP to create the NMSC and expand the program across the country. Realizing the scope of the national program, the NMSC decided to work directly with states instead of individual communities. Mary Means explained that delegating responsibilities to the states allowed for more input and aligning of ideas from both perspectives. As much as the Main Street initiative required local enthusiasm and organization, if state policy negated local efforts it was all futile.27

As NMSC planned the Main Street program’s expansion, its leaders selected six states for inclusion in the national program. They chose Colorado, Georgia, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Pennsylvania and Texas. Each state then chose five cities with populations similar to those in the demonstration project (under 50,000) and designated a full-time state coordinator. The expanded demonstration program, like the first, was a success. Many of the states expanded beyond their initial five communities and by the end of the three-year demonstration 71 communities participated in the program. While this took place at the state level, the NMSC stayed busy as well. Changes in the administration of the Federal government necessitated that NMSC work closely with state coordinators to facilitate defi-

ciencies and pool resources. To accomplish this they provided training opportunities and encouraged state coordinators to make connections with other state agencies. In 1983, the NMSC deemed the second demonstration final and made plans to accept more states and further expand the program.²⁸

While NTHP determined their method and demonstrated their progress, KHC kept close watch on development in Madison, Indiana. Conveniently located on the Kentucky-Indiana state line, Madison’s close proximity allowed KHC staff to observe and learn about the program’s approach. David Morgan, the director of the KHC’s Site Development department in the late 1970s, used this information to draft a proposal for Kentucky’s own statewide program. The proposal outlined the structure of a state coordinating office and local organizations.²⁹ In 1979, the KHC acted on this proposal and created the first statewide Main Street program. A year later, when the NTHP chose six states to expand their network, Kentucky was not included. Those at the KHC, however, perceived the many benefits of a Main Street program and continued to pursue their own plans. The KHC’s program was designed to follow the NMSC’s approach but because it was not a part of the NTHP’s demonstration they did not receive the same network of support, trainings and site assessments available to officially participating states.³⁰ For the next seven years, the programs operated concurrently before deciding a direct link was beneficial. The first interaction between KHC and NMSC was in 1985 when KHC conducted workshops and began planning a program suited to smaller communities. In 1986, they contracted with NMSC to provide services to the new communities this plan would bring.³¹

²⁹ David L. Morgan, *Proposal for the Kentucky Main Street Program* (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council, 1979).
³⁰ Stapleton, Roger, personal conversation with author, July 2013.
Figure 1.1. Timeline of Main Street related events.
STRUCTURE OF THE NATIONAL MAIN STREET PROGRAM

When first composed, the NMSC’s staff included the three pilot communities’ managers and personnel from the Trust’s Midwest Regional Office. Its establishment also coincided with Main Street’s second demonstration program. Unlike the relationship shared by the pilot communities and the Midwest Regional Office, the new NMSC choose to disseminate control to state Main Street coordinating offices and to act as a resource for those programs as opposed to closely monitoring each community. This change was intended to promote networking within states and encourage the communities to share experiences with each other as opposed to relying on the national center for advice.32

As time passed, NMSC expanded its network of states and revamped its methods for serving participating communities. New methods included building relationships with government entities, offering videoconferences in the 1980s, creating the Main Street Network and providing Main Street News, a monthly newsletter for Main Street communities. These resources coupled with the resources and regional knowledge of the state coordinating offices provide Main Street communities with the training, information and networking necessary to achieve the goals of the Main Street program. While the NMSC is essentially the overarching organization of all Main Street coordinating offices, it allows the state offices to organize themselves within the state as they see appropriate. This resulted in coordinating offices placed within government entities such as State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) and Economic Development departments or nonprofit organizations. In each case, the state office is responsible for providing guidance to communities on how to most effectively implement Main Street’s Four-Point Approach. On its website, the NMSC defines the functions of the state Main Street coordinating programs as:
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• “translate” and tailor the Main Street approach according to the specific economic conditions and development tools and resources in its geographic region;
• competitively select local communities with traditional commercial districts for participation in the Main Street program;
• provide an appropriate scope of technical assistance and training to local Main Street organizations;
• provide networking, advocacy, and encouragement to participating local Main Street programs;
• serve as a liaison with the National Main Street Center; and identify which local programs annually meet the standards of National Main Street Program Accreditation.33

These functions provide guidance to the coordinating offices but also give leeway to how the coordinating office achieves these directives and where they house their organization. While Kentucky chose to house its Main Street program within the SHPO, the KHC, many states chose other departments or organizations. Ohio, for example, operates their program through a statewide nonprofit organization, Heritage Ohio. This organization focuses on historic preservation, revitalization of downtowns and economic development through the implementation of various programs and workshops. Their primary program, however, is Main Street.34 Unlike Kentucky, the Ohio program operates separately from Ohio’s SHPO. Georgia’s Main Street program represents a third option for structuring the state coordinating office. Its program is housed within the Office of Downtown Development at the Georgia Department of Community Affairs, a government agency that is not associated solely with historic preservation.35 The placement of Georgia’s Main Street pro-

gram contrasts with KYMS, which occasionally collaborates with economic development organizations but has no direct connection.

Other distinctions define the current 41 state coordinating offices. These differences include the number of participating communities, the number of staff devoted to the program, the amount of funding available, sources of funding and services provided. Each of these characteristics varies from state to state. The number of communities served ranges from seven in Colorado to 98 in Georgia. Funding ranges from $37,500 in Delaware to just over two million in Iowa. Kentucky falls at the lower end of this spectrum with a 2013 budget of $73,056. Sources of funding are also diverse. Depending on the coordinating office’s affiliation with state government or status as a non-profit, it may be supported by the state general fund, grants, membership dues or private donations. KYMS’s only source is the state general fund. In many ways these differences are defined by how the office is organized and the organizations with which they collaborate. Factors such as state resources and residents’ esteem for preservation also have an impact on the Main Street program’s structure.36

The Four-Points and Eight Principles

To be a Main Street program requires more than just the will and determination to revitalize your historic downtown. The NMSC places requirements on communities that desire to have a Main Street program. One requirements is that they organize themselves according to the Main Street’s four-points. Intended to be a grassroots program, each organization is run by a board of directors that consists of community stakeholders such as business owners, residents and public officials. This board and other members of the organization are divided into four committees, which focus on the four-points: Organization, Economic Restructuring, Promotion and Design.

The Organization committee is responsible for the overall functioning of the Main Street organization. They create cohesiveness in the group by overseeing volunteer recruitment and building relationships with individuals in the community. Furthermore, the organization committee acts as an advocate for the strengths of the Main Street district and encourages people to work together to achieve common goals.

The purpose of the Economic Restructuring committee is to identify and capitalize on existing assets and determine ways to diversify the district’s offerings. They accomplish these tasks by examining the current economic conditions and market forces of the district, encouraging the retention or expansion of successful businesses and determining what services, whether residential or commercial, are lacking in the Main Street district. The committee is also concerned with building the retail skills of business owners. Most of all, they strive to reach 100 percent occupancy in commercial spaces and increase the district’s economic base.

The goal of the Promotions committee is to create a positive, unified image of the downtown district. They accomplish this through a diversified mix of advertising, retail promotions, special events and marketing campaigns. Each of these components introduce the Main Street district to those inside and outside of its immediate community.

Last of all, the responsibility of the Design committee is to improve the downtowns’ physical appearance. This committee considers the district’s buildings, storefronts, signs, public spaces, parking, landscaping, window displays and way-finding indicators. They also take measures to preserve the district’s historic buildings and to ensure appropriate design guidelines and ordinances are in place to influence restorations and new construction.

The combination of these four-points, or committees, is the cornerstone of the Main Street program. The NMSC uses them as criteria to evaluate communities and reserves the
right to determine if local programs qualify for the state program. Without the effective
operation of these committees, NMSC material states they do not.37

Other Main Street requirements are set forth by the Eight Principles. While the
four-points are integral to the implementation of a Main Street program, the eight prin-
ciples are guidelines that provide direction for both daily operations and long-term goals.
In many ways, they encompass the characteristics required for a Main Street program to
succeed.

Defined by the NMSC, the principles include:

• **Comprehensive:** No single focus — lavish public improvements, name-brand business
  recruitment, or endless promotional events — can revitalize Main Street. For success-
  ful, sustainable, long-term revitalization, a comprehensive approach, including activity
  in each of Main Street’s Four Points, is essential.

• **Incremental:** Baby steps come before walking. Successful revitalization programs
  begin with basic, simple activities that demonstrate that “new things are happening
  “in the commercial district. As public confidence in the Main Street district grows
  and participants’ understanding of the revitalization process becomes more sophisti-
  cated, Main Street is able to tackle increasingly complex problems and more ambitious
  projects. This incremental change leads to much longer-lasting and dramatic positive
  change in the Main Street area.

• **Self-help:** No one else will save your Main Street. Local leaders must have the will
  and desire to mobilize local resources and talent. That means convincing residents and
  business owners of the rewards they’ll reap by investing time and money in Main Street
  — the heart of their community. Only local leadership can produce long-term success

37 National Main Street Center, “The Main Street Four-Point Approach,” National Main Street Center,
http://www.preservationnation.org/main-street/about-main-street/the-approach/ (accessed December 15,
2013).
by fostering and demonstrating community involvement and commitment to the revitalization effort.

- **Partnerships**: Both the public and private sectors have a vital interest in the district and must work together to achieve common goals of Main Street’s revitalization. Each sector has a role to play and each must understand the other’s strengths and limitations in order to forge an effective partnership.

- **Identifying and capitalizing on existing assets**: Business districts must capitalize on the assets that make them unique. Every district has unique qualities like distinctive buildings and human scale that give people a sense of belonging. These local assets must serve as the foundation for all aspects of the revitalization program.

- **Quality**: Emphasize quality in every aspect of the revitalization program. This applies to all elements of the process — from storefront designs to promotional campaigns to educational programs. Shoestring budgets and “cut and paste” efforts reinforce a negative image of the commercial district. Instead, concentrate on quality projects over quantity.

- **Change**: Skeptics turn into believers and attitudes on Main Street will turn around. At first, almost no one believes Main Street can really turn around. Changes in attitude and practice are slow but definite — public support for change will build as the Main Street program grows and consistently meets its goals. Change also means engaging in better business practices, altering ways of thinking, and improving the physical appearance of the commercial district. A carefully planned Main Street program will help shift public perceptions and practices to support and sustain the revitalization process.

- **Implementation**: To succeed, Main Street must show visible results that can only come from completing projects. Frequent, visible changes are a reminder that the revitalization effort is under way and succeeding. Small projects at the beginning of the program pave the way for larger ones as the revitalization effort matures, and that constant revi-
talization activity creates confidence in the Main Street program and ever-greater levels of participation.38

HISTORY OF THE KENTUCKY MAIN STREET PROGRAM

Kentucky’s Main Street coordinating office is housed within the KHC and like all other Main Street coordinator’s offices, KYMS strives to fulfill the functions set by the NMSC. The first point in this list is to “translate and tailor the Main Street approach according to the specific economic conditions and development tools and resources in its geographic region.”39 Since its creation in 1979, the Kentucky program has implemented new initiatives and tweaked its program offerings to better serve the economic and demographic characteristics of the state. In many cases, it has done so successfully, providing guidance, funding and expertise to ensure Kentucky’s historic business districts are preserved and used to their utmost potential.

The Beginning

Unlike the NMSC’s pilot program, which focused on one community, KYMS was designed to be statewide. In 1980, it launched with five participating communities: Bowling Green, Maysville, Frankfort, Georgetown, and Winchester.40 Although the program was initiated at the state level, the NTHP’s pilot project exhibited that communities could achieve success only with strong local support. In many cases, this support came from local governments who helped to organize, administer and fund the programs. However,

for success it was integral that community members including business owners, property owners and residents participate as well. Recognizing this, the KHC structured their coordinating offices to assist, but not operate, the local programs. However, even with KHC’s help, however, communities struggled during the first few years of establishing their Main Street organizations. One obstacle to new communities was finding adequate funding to hire a Main Street manager. To help offset this expense KHC offered 50/50 matching grants.\textsuperscript{41} These grants were available to supplement the salary of a full-time manager and were provided to local organizations on an annual basis. Early on, KYMS provided these grants as needed without guidelines to control how long a community could receive funding. KHC also responded as needed when technical issues arose but lacked a defined schedule for providing services to communities. KHC staff quickly discovered that even with the provision of funding and assistance many communities still faltered.\textsuperscript{42}

For the first few years, the staff of the KHC worked with Kentucky communities to develop the program. All the while, applications and requests for assistance from other

\textsuperscript{41} Nancy Alexander, \textit{Kentucky Small Towns Program} (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council, 1985), 3.
\textsuperscript{42} Kentucky Heritage Council, \textit{Main Street Kentucky: A Report}, 13.
communities, particularly small towns, continued to overwhelm KHC’s office. When the program began, Kentucky had a population of approximately 3.5 million people. Close to a half million of the state’s residents lived in its two largest cities, Lexington and Louisville. The majority of Kentucky’s citizens, however, resided in cities and towns with populations less than 50,000 people. The NTHP’s Main Street program targeted communities with populations between 5,000 and 50,000, but the Kentucky program choose to work with communities of 10,000 to 30,000 residents. They believed that cities of this size could better support a Main Street organization. They did, however, allow participation of some smaller cities that were able to document financial support to join the program.

From 1979 to 1985, the program assisted eleven communities but continued to receive grant applications and requests for assistance from many of the state’s smaller towns. Staff at the Heritage Council did their best to answer requests and assist each community but soon realized that without more staff and funding they could not fully assist these small, non-Main Street communities.

The KHC acknowledged that its current program was not equipped to serve the whole state and enlisted the service of the NMSC. With its experience aiding communities across the country, KYMS felt the NMSC could benefit Kentucky by sharing ideas and developing a program focused on the state’s small communities. To begin this process, they brought together local, small town representatives from three regions of the state for planning workshops. They used these meetings, as well as two involving existing Main Street programs, to determine communities’ areas of greatest need and identify services that could be provided by the state and by communities. Next, they used the information to develop a proposal for a small cities demonstration project. In December of 1985, KHC

---
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staff completed the proposal. Along with requesting the formalization of KYMS, staff requested additional funding from the state government. At this point, KHC used funds provided by the Department of the Interior to support KYMS’s budget. Both requests were granted and the additional funding obtained allowed KYMS to include more communities, hire more staff and provide more services. The result of these efforts was Main Street’s first small town demonstration program.

**The Expanded Program**

With increased funding, a newly established relationship with NMSC and state approval to extend services to smaller communities, KYMS embarked on a new era of Main Street. Their first step was to accept smaller cities. KYMS did this by adjusting the
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49 During this time the National Main Street Center was conducting their third demonstration program, but focusing on larger cities with populations over 50,000. In 1989, they followed suit with Kentucky’s program and began to work with towns under 5,000 in population. Source: National Main Street Center, “History of the National Main Street Center,” National Main Street Center, http://www.preservationnation.org/main-street/about-main-street/the-center/history.html (accessed December 15, 2013).
requirements of the current program including the employment status of the Main Street manager. Based on the NMSC’s pilot programs, KYMS previously encouraged communities to hire full-time managers. Kentucky’s demonstration project, however, experimented with the idea of paid part-time managers in cities with less than 10,000 residents. To accommodate communities with populations less than 6,000, and presumably a smaller budget, KYMS offered the option to have a volunteer manager. KYMS reasoned that because these communities were smaller their managers would be able to foster relationships, create promotions and cope with other Main Street issues with less time demands than the manager of a larger city. This practice placed fewer strains on the amount of funding the community needed to raise to operate the program and allowed programs to make use of more in-kind services. Other requirements remained in place for all participating cities. For example, an organization within the community was required to sponsor the program, managers had to attend quarterly managers’ meetings, trainings and submit monthly progress reports. In return, KYMS provided reconnaissance and resource team visits, a program assessment, and design and technical assistance.\(^{50}\)

KYMS expanded the resources they offered to all Kentucky communities through additional technical assistance, topic specific seminars and training. They also allowed any town, regardless of Main Street status, to request assistance and participate in events. Part of this expansion included a “resource center” consisting of books and periodicals that were loaned to communities for guidance on specific issues.\(^{51}\) Another addition was the creation of the Kentucky Main Street Advisory Board. The board created a network of agencies involved with community revitalization and encouraged them to collaborate and share their areas of expertise. These organizations also participated in the selection of new communities and the formation of the new program. The board consisted of representatives of these organizations:

\(^{50}\) Kentucky Heritage Council, *Main Street Kentucky: A Report*, 3.

The demonstration began with the acceptance of six smaller cities: Brandenburg, Cadiz, Harrodsburg, Prestonsburg, Princeton, and Springfield. Thirteen larger cities, half of which previously participated, continued the traditional program. For the next eighteen months, KYMS assisted and observed Main Street communities. They learned that
although different methods for minimizing and extending the budgets of local organizations appeared to be good ideas, they were not always sustainable. Programs that operated with small or as needed budgets often had to delay projects until the manager could raise the necessary funds. In addition, organizations managed by volunteers, although initially effective, were difficult to maintain. They also found that a full-time manager served communities with populations over 6,000 best.53

This experience prompted KYMS staff to restructure the KYMS program. Among other important reforms was a funding schedule. Instead of providing salary grants to communities for an undetermined number of years, the new schedule provided funding based on the number of years the community had been in the KYMS program and the employment status of its manager (see table 1.1). Another observation was that the services provided to communities, particularly in the form of on-site visits, should be extended. In 1988, the national average length of time a community participated in a state sponsored Main Street program was three years. KYMS, however, decided to provide funding for six years. KYMS dedicated the first two years of this period to shaping and strengthening the local Main Street organization. Because the state operated on a biannual budget, funding for KYMS was only certain for two years at a time. This meant KYMS could only promise grants for two-year increments, not all six. In a way this compromised the six-year funding

---

### Table 1.1. Expanded program funding schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Time Manager</th>
<th>Part-Time Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

schedule, but it also required communities to think ahead when planning budgets and allocating funds. Assuming the state government provided ample funding, KYMS continued to offer 50/50 matching grants to supplement managers’ salaries.

One reason KYMS structured their grants as matching grants was to provide a community with enough funding to assist during its incubator stage but not enough to undermine the program’s grassroots nature. By requiring local organizations to match the grant, KYMS was holding them responsible for their budget. Even more, by decreasing the amount of funding provided from year one to six, KYMS forced community organizations to seek or raise alternative funding. When the program reached its sixth year, the assistance equalled only a small portion of the program’s budget. When a community accomplished this it indicated that they were self-sufficient and more likely to operate in the future without financial assistance from KYMS (see table 1.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full-Time Manager</th>
<th>Percentage of Local Program’s Budget</th>
<th>Suggested Growth of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2. KYMS suggested budget growth vs. salary assistance funding.

During this era, KYMS’s primary focus was assisting new communities. For this reason, a program’s first few years of participation were accompanied by planned visits and training to help familiarizing new managers and board of directors with the Main Street approach. After acceptance in the program, a community received a reconnaissance visit. KYMS used this visit to meet the sponsoring organization and promote the Main Street program to community leaders and residents. Next, KYMS arranged manager and board consultations.

KYMS Services

Services Provided for First through Sixth Year:

• Grants- State grants are provided specifically for salary support of a paid local Main Street manager.

First Year Only:

• Reconnaissance Visits- A team coordinated by the Kentucky Heritage Council visits each community establishing a new program, to help in the development of a local program sponsor, discuss the program with community leaders, and publicize the initiative of the local program.

• Manager Training- The KHC offers a three-day training session every other year for new managers, including seminars and workshops covering each of the four areas of the Main Street model. Meetings for managers are also held on a quarterly basis and include roundtable discussions and seminars on specific issue areas. On-site training is also provided to help managers with individual community needs.

• Board Training- KHC staff visits each town and conducts a training session after board and committee members are appointed. The staff also helps each community set long-term goals and objectives, and will assist as needed in developing the work plan.

• Resource Team Visits- The KHC staff and others selected specifically for the community conduct interviews, tour downtown, examine current conditions and offer strategies for addressing relevant issues.

Continued on next page
Second - Sixth Year Services Provided

- **Work Plan Development** - The KHC staff will help as needed in developing the yearly work plan.
- **Special Issue Teams** - Communities may request that a specially constituted team of experts visit to study a particular issue. Generally three to four such teams are conducted each year.
- **Program Assessment Visits** - The KHC staff conducts program assessment visits at the end of each grant year, measuring progress according to the locally developed work plan.
- **Technical Assistance** - When requested, information is available on most topics relating to downtown revitalization. This assistance is provided through written materials, phone consultations, and on-site visits. The Kentucky Main Street office maintains a Resource Center containing books, periodicals and audio-visual materials on a variety of subjects relating to the Main Street approach.
- **Design Assistance** - Provided as requested on topics such as schematic facade renovations, sign design and selection of paint colors. This assistance is usually based on photographs and other information provided by the owner or manager, although a limited number of site visits may be made.
- **Quarterly Managers Meetings** - Four meetings are held each year to offer managers an opportunity for roundtable discussions and education over and above the training provided to new managers.

Once accepted, a community desiring salary assistance was required to submit a grant application, hire a manager, prepare an annual work plan and submit progress reports to the state coordinator. For first year communities, progress reports were required monthly. Thereafter they were required quarterly. KYMS gave new communities additional requirements to gauge the successful completion of their first year as well. These included:

- hiring a manager
- completing manager, board and committee training with 75 percent of board and committee members present

Figure 1.2. Resources available to KYMS communities during the expanded program. Source: Kentucky Heritage Council, *Main Street Kentucky: 1988-1989*, 5-6, 11-13.
• completing short- and long-term goals and objectives
• creating a building and business inventory
• preparing an annual work plan including activities in each of the four points

KYMS used a community’s work plan to gauge their effectiveness annually. This method allowed KYMS to judge the organization’s activities on what they planned to accomplish instead of creating a benchmark for all Kentucky communities to achieve. Once a community progressed into its second year, KYMS continued to offer services in the form of work plan development, special issue teams, yearly program assessment visits, technical and design assistance and quarterly managers’ meetings.56

At the end of year six, a community “graduated” from the state sponsored Main Street program. Although they could still participate as a Main Street community, they could no longer receive grants for salary reimbursement and were considered to have received their share of KYMS’s technical assistance for new communities. This practice enabled KYMS to accept new communities into its sponsored program but kept the number of sponsored communities at a manageable level. It also allowed KYMS to grow and serve more Kentucky towns. As a graduate community, an organization was required to sign an annual letter of agreement and continue to follow the four-point approach. Although the concentrated level of assistance was no longer available, graduate communities could receive design and technical assistance, participate in training programs and receive correspondence such as the KYMS newsletter. In the case that funding remained after the distribution of salary grants, unallocated funds could be distributed as special issue grants to graduate communities. Communities could use the grants for projects such as long-term planning, educational programs, fundraising efforts, leadership development, business recruitment and parking or zoning issues.57

Ultimately, the funding structure controlled the size of the KYMS program. The limited funding available from the state capped the number of communities that could receive grants annually at 20. Funding also limited how many new communities could join the program since a sponsored community needed to “graduate” before a new community could be added. For the next decade, 1986-1997, this cycle allowed the state program to grow at a manageable pace. The six-year structure provided communities with hands-on assistance and financial support, but it had two additional merits, it allowed the program to grow and it was self-sufficient.

Renaissance Kentucky

In 1996, Governor Paul Patton (1995-2003) visited the Kentucky Main Street community of Mount Sterling. Patton was impressed by the rehabilitation of ten downtown buildings into retail space and housing for elderly and handicapped individuals. Soon after his visit, Patton appointed the Renaissance Kentucky Committee to study the regulatory, financial, historic, cultural and social aspects of Kentucky’s downtown revitalization efforts. This group met with many of Kentucky’s local, state and federal officials as well as other community representatives and visited five Kentucky communities to view revitalization efforts first hand. Three were current Main Street participants. As a result of these studies, the committee decided to form the Renaissance Kentucky Alliance. Originally, the alliance consisted of the Kentucky Department for Local Government, KHC, Kentucky Housing Corporation, and Kentucky League of Cities. Eventually, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, and Fannie Mae joined as well. The intention of the alliance was to effectively connect Kentucky communities with fiscal

and technical resources available to revitalize and restore their downtowns, with particular emphasis on the development of housing.\textsuperscript{59}

Although, KYMS worked with other state organizations in the past, this was the first time they were linked so closely to each other. This was also the first time KYMS’s role as Kentucky’s only downtown revitalization effort was challenged. Due to Renaissance Kentucky’s emphasis on housing, the governor decided the Kentucky Housing Corporation should be the alliance’s lead agency. Staff of the Main Street program, however, maintained the position that Main Street and its method for economic development and revitalization of downtown centers was integral to a successful program. For this reason, the Renaissance Alliance choose to apply Main Street’s requirements and approach to Renaissance Kentucky communities.

Since the alliance brought together many different organizations with their own budgets and grant programs the previous need to minimize the number of communities

\textsuperscript{59} Kentucky Housing Corporation, \textit{Renaissance Kentucky, Report to the Governor} (Frankfort: KY, Kentucky Housing Corporation, 2001) 4.
receiving financial assistance from KYMS was no longer a concern. This meant graduate
towns could again seek funding and new programs could seek funding for projects in addi-
tion to managers’ salaries. The concept of funded and graduate communities gave way to
a new system that recognized communities for their efforts to maintain and restore their
downtown districts as well as to create areas that were safe, vibrant, efficient, and func-
tional. Because the criteria for selection were a direct reflection of Main Street require-
ments, current Main Street communities who applied were quickly added to the program.
Their status as a Main Street community, however, did not guarantee any particular level
within the Renaissance Program. Due to the close involvement of KHC and the Renais-
sance Alliance, these two programs essentially became one. It was, however, possible for
a community to belong to only Main Street or Renaissance depending on whether or not
they applied for both. The Renaissance program designated each community that applied
as gold, silver or bronze. According to Renaissance criteria, gold communities exhibited
a “strong downtown organization with strong committee involvement.” These communi-
ties also had a full-time manager, developed budget, local financial support and an articu-
lated vision. Silver communities had an established downtown organization with either a
part- or full-time manager and demonstrated financial support and moderate success at the
local level. Bronze communities expressed an interest in downtown revitalization and had
community leaders who demonstrated a commitment to downtown revitalization but were
in the beginning stages of their effort. Once designated, the alliance gave gold and silver
communities priority for incentives for the first five years of their designation. Bronze
communities were awarded $5,000 to be used for organizational development of the local
Renaissance/Main Street organization and given two years to reach silver or gold status.60

In 1998, the program accepted its first round of applications. Forty-one Kentucky
communities applied and of those five Main Street cities were designated as gold: Danville,

60 Renaissance Kentucky, Renaissance Kentucky, Report to the Governor, 4, 11, 25, 76.
OVERVIEW OF RENAISSANCE FISCAL AND TECHNICAL RESOURCES

FISCAL

♦ Governor Patton commits $10 million dollars of Kentucky’s TEA-21 allocation for funding downtown streetscape improvements in designated Gold/Silver cities over the next two years.

♦ Governor Patton commit $4 million dollars for utility burial and infrastructure improvements within the designated Gold/Silver cities for 1998/99.

♦ Governor Patton commits $2 million dollars for facade improvements on privately owned commercial structures in the designated Gold/Silver cities for 1998/99.

♦ Kentucky Housing Corporation establishes a $1.5 million set-aside of HOME program funds for which only designated Gold/Silver cities are eligible to compete.

♦ Kentucky Housing Corporation implements a bonus points system to reward developers competing for low income tax credits selecting housing development projects in designated Gold/Silver cities.

♦ Department for Local Government implements a bonus points system for designated Gold/Silver cities applying for Community Development Block Grant - Housing and Public Facilities category.

♦ DLG establishes a $1 million dollar Renaissance Kentucky category utilizing CDBG funds and only designated Gold/Silver cities are eligible to compete.

♦ Kentucky Heritage Council continues to provide administrative support funding for local downtown program management.

♦ Kentucky Heritage Council implements a bonus points system for designated Silver/Bronze cities applying for Federal Planning and Survey Grants.

TECHNICAL

♦ Downtown Resource Guide as developed and distributed by the Alliance to communities throughout the Commonwealth. The resource guide profiles over 80 state or national fiscal and/or technical resources.

♦ Kentucky Main Street Program continues to provide quality educational training programs on a quarterly basis at a nominal cost and geographically diverse.

♦ Kentucky Heritage Council and Kentucky Transportation Cabinet develop “Streetscape Design Guidelines”. KHC sponsored two training sessions for communities and architects, engineers and consultant firms.

♦ Joint participant among the five Alliance partners at their respective annual conferences.

Figure 1.4. Resources available to Renaissance communities. Source: “Governor Patton Awards $7.9 Million to Main Street Cities Through His Renaissance Initiative.”
Frankfort, Harrodsburg, Paducah and Shelbyville. In the spring of 1999, Governor Patton awarded $7.9 million dollars to Main Street communities to use toward streetscape and facade improvements. Compared to the $100,000 KYMS typically distributed, this level of funding was unprecedented. Figure 1.4 shows the fiscal and technical resources available to Renaissance communities during its first two years.\footnote{“Governor Patton Awards $7.9 Million to Main Street Cities Through His Renaissance Initiative,” obtained from Kitty Dougoud at the Kentucky Heritage Council.}

Renaissance Kentucky did offer funds and allow communities to finance rehabilitation and development projects that would not have been possible otherwise. It also increased the number of communities involved and placed strains on the ability of KYMS to develop new communities and assist mature ones. KYMS, however, was not the only affiliate that assisted communities. Each organization in the alliance worked with communities in their area of expertise and promoted their own objectives. Because KHC and KYMS were the only alliance members accustomed to using historic preservation to evoke economic development it was hard to ensure that preservation was the first priority of other members. Despite KHC’s efforts, the primary focus of Renaissance Kentucky was still increased housing. For the leaders involved, that did not always mean renovating historic buildings. The new procedure also weakened the existing process of accepting and managing communities. The result was a large, less hands on Main Street program.

During the late 1990s and early 2000s, the Renaissance Kentucky program grew as more communities pursued available grants. In addition to organizational development grants provided to bronze communities, gold and silver communities received grants for facade improvements, streetscape planning, riverfront development, building restorations, architectural design services and downtown master plans. Many grants were Community Development Block Grants (CDBG). The alliance allocated these federal funds community projects for affordable housing and public improvements. Renaissance often dispersed grants in amounts up to $250,000. The alliance provided other funds through
the Transportation Equity Act (TEA-21) and used them to strengthen cultural, aesthetic and environmental aspects of the downtown districts. Renaissance provided other grants through direct appropriation funds from the state government, historic rehabilitation tax credits at the state and federal level and through the continuation of salary assistance/management support funds from KYMS.\textsuperscript{62,63}

In 2003, Ernie Fletcher became Governor of Kentucky (2003-2007). Governor Fletcher moved Renaissance Kentucky’s operation to the Governor’s Office for Local Development (GOLD) as part of an overall attempt to streamline state government. This was an appropriate relocation because GOLD already administered many state and federal grant programs. Soon thereafter, the name of the program was changed to Renaissance on Main (RoM). While GOLD administered the program, the Renaissance alliance was still integral to its implementation. At this point, the alliance was renamed as the Renaissance on Main Alliance but consisted of many of the same constituents: GOLD, KYMS, the Kentucky Housing Corporation, Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, Kentucky Department of Tourism, Kentucky League of Cities and Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati.\textsuperscript{64}

Along with these changes, the application was altered to clarify that by being designated a RoM community the community also became part of the KYMS program. Although Main Street requirements were a part of the Renaissance criteria from the beginning, this represents a shift in the program that further aligns the ideals of the two programs. This created an interesting moment in KYMS’s history. Whereas Renaissance’s funding attracted many communities to Main Street, its funding was decreasing. In other words, the point when Renaissance and KYMS became the most aligned was also when the alliance was the least beneficial to Main Street communities. Nevertheless, KYMS and


\textsuperscript{63} Renaissance Kentucky, Renaissance Kentucky, Report to the Governor, 8-9.

\textsuperscript{64} Renaissance on Main Alliance, 2008 Kentucky Main Street/Renaissance on Main Guidelines (Frankfort, KY: Renaissance on Main Alliance) 3.
Renaissance were able to provide more to Kentucky communities than KYMS could have offered alone. Another example of their alignment is evident in the “2008 Kentucky Main Street/Renaissance on Main Guidelines” which states “while construction of new facilities can be an option, Renaissance on Main encourages the adaptive use of existing buildings with particular emphasis on the preservation of historic or unique facilities.” This statement emphasizes the program’s mission to RE-vitalize the historic district not just developing it.65

With RoM also came new designations. No longer were communities gold, silver or bronze, they became simply Candidate or Certified programs. Candidate programs did not meet Main Street criteria but were allowed to participate in the program for a temporary 24-month period. During this time, KYMS/RoM gave them the opportunity to achieve Certified status. If not achieved, KYMS/RoM revoked their status as a Main Street/RoM community. Until a community was certified, it was not able to apply for funding. Certified Main Street communities were those that met all basic KYMS/RoM requirements. To ensure the quality of KYMS/RoM communities did not diminish over time, KYMS required them to submit paperwork for re-certification on an annual basis. Re-certification required the community to demonstrate “reasonable improvement” in carrying out Main Street’s four-points during the last calendar year. If the community did not show improvement then KYMS/RoM designated it as Candidate for the next year and provided 24-months to regain its Certified status. If after the 24-month period the community had not achieved Certified status it was required to re-apply as a new program.66

Based on National Main Street criteria, the KYMS/RoM requirements had many similarities to the KYMS program before the creation of Renaissance Kentucky. These included having a paid full or part-time Main Street manager and attending trainings geared toward managers, board and committee members, volunteers and other Main Street/RoM

65 Renaissance on Main Alliance, 2008 Kentucky Main Street/Renaissance on Main Guidelines, 4.
66 Renaissance on Main Alliance, 2008 Kentucky Main Street/Renaissance on Main Guidelines, 5, 8.
participants. Regulations were also adapted to allow the manager position to be shared with economic development or other related positions, but at least 20 hours weekly were required to be devoted to Main Street responsibilities. Other criteria was put in place to control how long the manager position could be vacant within one calendar year before jeopardizing the community’s status.67

Overtime, the funding devoted to Renaissance declined from its first allotment of $7.9 million to $1.5 million for the 2007-2009 biennium.68 As state politicians and economic conditions changed so did the allocation of funds to Renaissance communities. The Department for Local Government’s website still lists Renaissance on Main in its “Funding Guide” but the guide states, “due to lack of funding, the program is not currently accepting applications.”69

Although Renaissance Kentucky and its funding are no longer available, some of its effects and procedures can still be observed in today’s KYMS program. One, for example, is the large number of communities participating in the program despite a period when no new communities were accepted. There is also less distinction between new and existing communities. At KYMS’s 2012 winter conference, KYMS staff gave a presentation titled “Re-organizational strategy to create stronger local Main Street programs through evaluation process and targeted services based upon collective need.” This presentation outlined the tiered system used by KYMS today to designate communities. Unlike RoM designations, there are three categories: Designated, Affiliated and Network. To be a Designated community the organization must exhibit success in the four-point approach and the ten performance standards developed by NMSC (for performance standards see fig. 1.5). Affiliate communities are very similar to Candidate communities but are either new

---

67 Renaissance on Main Alliance, 2008 Kentucky Main Street/Renaissance on Main Guidelines, 8.
68 Harry Carver, e-mail message to author, January 27, 2014.
**Ten Standards of Performance**

1. Has broad-based community support for the commercial district revitalization process, with strong support from both the public and private sectors.
2. Has developed vision and mission statements relevant to community conditions and to the local Main Street program’s organizational stage.
3. Has a comprehensive Main Street work plan.
4. Possesses an historic preservation ethic.
5. Has an active board of directors and committees.
6. Has an adequate operating budget.
7. Has a paid, professional executive director.
8. Conducts program of ongoing training for staff and volunteers.
9. Reports key statistics.
10. Current member of the National Trust National Main Street Network.

Figure 1.5. NMSC standards of performance.

or did not successfully follow the four-points or ten standards in the past year. KYMS provides these communities with two years to build their program and qualify for Designated status. Other communities and organizations recognize KYMS for its knowledge of downtown revitalization and development but do not desire to, or are not able to, maintain a Main Street program. These groups can chose to be Network communities and receive Main Street correspondence without adhering to the requirements for Main Street communities. Their organizations cannot use the Main Street trademark but KYMS allows them to participate in trainings and events. Through this designation, KYMS is able to share the Main Street philosophy with all interested Kentucky communities.\(^{70}\) In many ways, the

---

\(^{70}\) Kentucky Heritage Council, “Re-organizational strategy to create stronger local Main Street programs through evaluation process and targeted services based upon collective need” KYMS Winter Conference, January 2012.
Affiliate status for a new community is similar to the six-year process used before. During this time, the program is eligible for individual attention from the state Main Street coordinator concerning issues but not in the same structured manner that the six-year process laid out.

Other changes in how KYMS serves its communities include a reduction in the number of managers’ meetings. During the expanded program, KYMS conducted managers’ meetings on a quarterly basis. By 2010, however, KYMS conducted only two meetings per year. Today they occur in the form of a winter and summer state conference. KYMS promoted its most recent summer conference, which blended presentations on board organization and the four-points, training sessions and roundtable discussions, as a summer “retreat” instead of a conference. This new name, or branding, was used to give the event a less formal feel and encourage a relaxed, enjoyable atmosphere. While the program has also increased the measures it uses to assess communities, changes like those made to the summer conference attempt to strengthen its network and make it more welcoming to participants. Regional meetings also supplement the decreased number of managers’ meetings and provide an opportunity for managers to convene and share ideas with others in their region of the state.\(^\text{71}\)

Communities, whether new or existing, no longer receive salary assistance and although state grants are available, there is no preference given to Main Street communities. To assist with and encourage preservation projects to take place, KHC does administer the Federal and State Historic Preservation Tax Credits. Though these tax credits are not partial to Main Street communities, they do provide a financial incentive for restoring historic properties. KHC and KYMS work together to promote the tax credit within Main Street districts. Depending on the project type, the credit may save a property owner up to 30 percent of qualified rehabilitation expenses.\(^\text{72}\) While this effort is not directly related to

\(^{71}\) Kitty Dougoud, e-mail message to author, March 10, 2014.

the operation of Main Street, it is a resource available outside of KYMS. Without KYMS funding it is important that Main Street organizations consider the many other resources available for revitalization in their community. This is especially true of today’s KYMS program. Operating with a limited budget, a full-time state coordinator with limited assistance from KHC’s architect, and close to 50 communities, the current KYMS is strained to meet its communities’ needs and expectations.

CHAPTER TWO
QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF REINVESTMENT

Since its inception, KYMS has been assessed many times by its own staff members and NMSC. These assessments, however, focus on either one- or two-year time spans or individual communities and rarely compare the performance of the program from year to year. To understand how KYMS’s changes have affected Kentucky Main Street communities requires knowledge of how Main Street programs are evaluated. In some cases, the evaluating party has done this in a qualitative manner that included visiting communities and witnessing firsthand the operation of the local organization. More often, the evaluating party uses a quantitative manner involving the collection of reinvestment statistics. These statistics and the way they change from year to year serve as the basis for this thesis. To completely understand and evaluate how KYMS changed over time, the reinvestment statistics must be understood as well.

This chapter contains three subsections. The first is an explanation of reinvestment and return on investment. This explanation delineates between NMSC’s definition of reinvestment and how non-Main Street constituents commonly perceive it. It also discusses different methods of assessing return on investment. The second section introduces the variables measured by reinvestment statistics as well as other characteristics of the state program. It provides an explanation of what NMSC considers reinvestment and lays out the significance of each variable collected. It also introduces relationships between variables, most importantly their relationship with total reinvestment. The third section is an analysis of total reinvestment. This section uses both statistical analysis and business ratios to compare annual changes in total reinvestment.
The primary goal of the Main Street program is to rejuvenate historic business districts by preserving their existing historic fabric through continued use and economic vitality. Some central phrases to Main Street’s philosophy include “economic development through historic preservation” and “preservation based economic revitalization.” Both phrases emphasize the main components of the program: historic preservation and economic development. Since its beginning, Main Street communities have improved their downtown business districts by enticing new businesses to open and increase the area’s commercial offerings. Main Street managers have encouraged property owners to invest in their buildings and city officials to invest in the physical environment and infrastructure. Changes that result from these investments improve the district’s image, encourage people to shop, and, most importantly, counteract years of neglect.

Along with promoting these goals, Main Street managers collect statistics to quantify their results. These statistics range from the number of new businesses opened, and the percentage of vacant buildings, to the number of facade improvement projects completed, rent per square foot or the dollar amount invested in public improvement projects. While not every Main Street community monitors all of these factors, there are some key statistics that all collect. These include dollars invested in physical improvements (building rehabilitations, new construction and public improvements) net gain in businesses and jobs, and the number of buildings rehabilitated. Each year, NMSC collects statistics in those categories and uses them to promote the national program. The statistics serve as the most critical measure of the program’s success and are referred to by NMSC as “reinvestment” statistics. The reinvestment categories that measure dollar amounts invested in physical improvements are building rehabilitations, new construction and public improvements. These categories represent new investment in the district’s physical environment. Cumulatively they represent total reinvestment.
In addition to indicating the dollar amount invested in Main Street districts, Main Street affiliates can use reinvestment statistics to argue the benefits of supporting a Main Street program. The calculation that serves this purpose best is the reinvestment ratio. Similar to the business term “return on investment,” the reinvestment ratio provides the return in dollars for every one dollar invested in a Main Street program. More specifically, it divides the amount spent on physical fabric upgrades (reinvestment) in the district by investment in the program’s operating budget. The reinvestment ratio indicates the efficacy of the program. For 2012, the national reinvestment ratio was $18.00/$1.00. In other words, for every $1.00 invested in the operation of the local Main Street organization $18.00 was invested by business owners, loaned by banks, or provided in grants, etc. and spent on building rehabilitations, new construction, and public improvement projects in the Main Street district. While NMSC calculated the reinvestment ratio at the national level it can also be calculated at the community and state level.

Asides from the reinvestment ratio, there are other ways to conceptualize return on investment. One method that is very similar to the reinvestment ratio is to replace the community’s budget with the amount KYMS provided to communities through grants. This ratio utilizes the same conceptual model but changes scales by assessing the dollars invested in a community’s operating budget by KYMS relative to reinvestment in the community. From its beginning to 2009, KYMS and its partners provided grants to Main Street communities. By dividing total reinvestment by the total grant provision, the return

---

73 NMSC definition: The Reinvestment Ratio measures the amount of new investment that occurs, on average, for every dollar a participating community spends to support the operation of its Main Street program, based on median annual program costs reported to the National Main Street Center by its coordinating programs. Source: National Main Street Center, “Main Street Reinvestment Statistics,” National Main Street Center, Inc., http://www.preservationnation.org/main-street/about-main-street/reinvestment-statistics-1.html (accessed January 26, 2014).

on state funding to communities is calculated. One-step further is to calculate the return on KYMS’s operating budget. This calculation takes into consideration KYMS’s whole budget including the dollar amount of distributed grants, staff salaries, travel funds, etc. and compares them with the total reinvestment of all KYMS communities.

Another conceptualization of reinvestment or return on investment that helps define the effectiveness of Main Street in fiscal terms, but will not be assessed in this thesis, is the return on dollars at the local level through employment and sales tax. This measure tracks the effects of dollars spent in any economy and projects how they return (or do not return) to that economy. The classic example of this is the scenario of spending $1.00 at a local restaurant vs. a national or “big box” retailer and the impact that spending has on the immediate community. In the case of Main Street districts, many businesses are owned by a resident of the community as opposed to a national retailer. When a sole proprietor owns a business, the Small Business Administration projects that 60 cents of every dollar is retained or recirculated in the community. In contrast, only 6 cents of every dollar spent at a “big box” retailer is retained or recirculated.75

Regardless of how reinvestment is calculated, it is important that the Main Street program, whether at the community, state or national level, be profitable. This perspective is often overlooked because Main Street’s “profits,” unlike those accumulated by businesses, are not in monetary form but include increased livability and community pride. In addition, profits can be seen in Main Street districts through improvements in the physical environment and can be tallied by totaling the dollars spent on those projects.76 While the dollars spent on these projects are not physically collected by the Main Street organization,

---

76 One limitation to this analysis, from a preservation perspective, is that the outcome of each project is unknown. While we would like to believe that every project completed was sensitive to the historic nature of the building stock and community, this cannot be assumed. In other words, a large investment may result in a wonderful, well-done restoration or a complete renovation/demolition in which nothing was preserved.
they are benefits of the program. By considering investment in the Main Street district in this manner, evaluators can apply ratios and other measures of business success to annual reinvestment statistics and assess the effectiveness of the Kentucky Main Street program.

**VARIABLES**

The variables collected by KYMS are each in place to measure and convey the impact the Main Street program has on its communities. As mentioned previously, some measure monetary investment while others measure economic activity such as businesses opening and closing. Although these measurements are different, many of them are related. For example, opening a new business is often accompanied by an investment in the building it will occupy. This section aims to introduce and explain those variables. It will also discuss the variables in relation to each other and in relation to different eras of KYMS.

**Communities**

As previously mentioned, KYMS began with only five communities: Winchester, Bowling Green, Frankfort, Maysville, and Georgetown. By 1985 the program worked with a dozen communities who’s populations ranged from 4,000 to 54,450. KYMS continued, however, to receive requests from smaller Kentucky communities asking for assistance and desiring to be a part of the program. In 1986, after approval from the state legislature, KYMS began a small cities demonstration project and the number of participating communities nearly doubled.

From 1986 to 1997, the program continued to grow at a steady pace accepting a

---


78 Kentucky Heritage Council, *Kentucky Main Street Program* (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council, 1985), 1.

its inception in 1979 to 2013. By 1999, forty-three communities had joined the program. This represents a net acceptance rate of two new communities per year for the first twenty years. However, as Renaissance Kentucky grew in popularity that rate quickly changed. From 1999 to 2003, only a four-year time span, 58 communities either started or restarted their Main Street Program. Due to the changes in funding sources and the full support of Governor Patton, KYMS and Renaissance Kentucky no longer capped the number of communities it could accept. Instead, any community that applied was given a Renaissance designation. While the Renaissance Alliance still limited large amounts of funding to communities that met criteria for Gold and Silver designation, overall funding was in much greater amounts. The four years, 1999-2003, represent the second and last term of Gover-

---

80 It is important to note that, although, Renaissance adopted Main Street’s approach, it did not grandfather in all Main Street communities. Only through applying could an existing Main Street organization become a Renaissance community. In the first few years of Renaissance, there were also bronze communities that did not meet Main Street criteria. To stay in the Renaissance network, they had to meet criteria within two years. To some extent this divided the two programs but it also created a more level playing field by requiring all communities to follow the same application process.
Figure 2.2. Increases and decreases in the number of communities participating in KYMS for years 1979- 2013.

Figure 2.3. Change in the number of communities participating in KYMS as a percent of the previous year.
nor Patton and as a project initiated by his office Renaissance Kentucky was determined to make its impact a success.

In December 2003, Governor Fletcher took office and Renaissance Kentucky became RoM. Although the state still awarded transportation and CDBG, as well as a specific RoM grant, funding set aside for KYMS/RoM communities had reached its peak. During this time, the number of participating communities fluctuated but stayed high, between ninety and a hundred. In 2006, the Kentucky State budget for fiscal years 2007-09 was passed and contained $1.5 million for the RoM grant.81

This period was also characterized by a recession that lasted from December 2007 until June of 2009.82 The ensuing financial uncertainty resulted in less consumer spending and decreased the amount of state taxes collected. This impacted the ability of states to fund services they previously offered, such as the Renaissance program.83 The effects of the recession also jeopardized Federal funding allocated to states and further compromised the availability of grants. The absence of funding resulted in less interest from Kentucky communities and a hold on accepting new ones. From 2007 to 2013 the number of Main Street communities decreased from 94 to 50, an average loss of 7.3 communities per year. Since then only five first-time communities have begun local Main Street programs. In comparison to KYMS before Renaissance Kentucky began, the 50 current communities represent one of KYMS’s largest phases. Figures 2.2 and 2.3 show the change in participating communities each year. Figure 2.2 illustrates change as increases and decreases in the number of communities and Figure 2.3 illustrates change as a percent of the previous year. Due to the small number of participating communities prior to 1998 minor increases

81 Harry Carver, e-mail message to author, January 27, 2014.
"Active" Main Street Communities vs. Reporting Main Street Communities

The Beginning  Expanded Program  Renaissance Kentucky/ Renaissance on Main  Current

Number of Participating Main Street Communities  Number of Programs Reporting Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Participating</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Participating</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.4. Comparison of communities listed as “active” in KYMS materials and those that reported annual reinvestment statistics.

Table 2.1. Number of participating communities, reporting communities and the percentage of participating/active communities that reported annual reinvestment statistics.
in the number of communities participating are equivalent to large increases in the percent change.

In contrast to the number of participating communities is the number of communities that reported reinvestment statistics each year. For the first fifteen years, these figures are very similar due to the requirement that communities provide regular progress reports. Small differences that exist can be attributed to new communities in the organizing phase of their Main Street program. However, as KYMS grew some communities that were listed as “active” on the annual reinvestment spreadsheet did not always report annual statistics. Figure 2.4 shows a comparison of how many communities were listed on manager’s lists and reinvestment spreadsheets verses how many reported reinvestment statistics. The largest discrepancies occur at the end of the expanded period and beginning of Renaissance Kentucky. Once Renaissance became RoM the percentage that reported statistics rose above 90 percent. This emphasizes the merger of the two programs and the alignment of Renaissance and Main Street communities. Similarity also exists in the years from 2008-2011, for those years only the reinvestment statistics were available for determining which communities were active and reporting statistics.

**Reinvestment Statistics**

The fluctuating size of the program was also accompanied by changes in annual reinvestment. In the first five years of Kentucky’s Main Street program, communities reinvested $54 million in building rehabilitations alone.\(^\text{84}\) Lack of annual information for those years compromises our knowledge of how reinvestment was dispersed but from 1986 on KYMS maintained more detailed records of reinvestment in its communities.

As the label suggests, “total” reinvestment intends to capture all reinvestment in the Main Street district. The previously provided discussion of reinvestment defines this

\(^{84}\) Alexander, “Kentucky Small Towns Program,” 3.
amount as the dollars spent on improvements to the physical fabric of the district. These reinvestments are divided into three categories by the Main Street program: Building Rehabilitation, Public Improvement Projects, and New Construction. For the majority of years since 1986, those categories served as the basis for KYMS’s total reinvestment amount. In some years, KYMS also measured the amount of reinvestment in facade projects, business expansions and other small improvement projects. However, because smaller categories of reinvestment were not collected consistently their inclusion inflates total reinvestment for some years. Figure 2.5 shows the total reinvestment overtime including all known reinvestment. While the amounts collected for facade renovations, small improvement projects and business expansions are typically insignificant compared with the three primary categories, they do make a difference when comparing years.\footnote{The years containing additional data are 1986, 1987, 1990-1993, and 2008-2012.} Figure 2.6 depicts the total reinvestment with these removed and only building rehabilitations, private improvement projects and new construction included.

Figure 2.7 offers a third perspective of total reinvestment. From 2008-2012 KYMS continued to collect information on the three primary categories but did not add them together to obtain the total. Instead, KYMS collected two other categories of reinvestment: public and private funding. This method eliminated possible duplication of dollars spent on a public improvement project that included new construction or rehabilitations. It also acknowledged that many large projects use a combination of funding sources. For example, funding for a public improvement project does not all have to come from public sources, some may come from private businesses and individuals as well. From 1986 to 2007, figure 2.7 varies very little from figure 2.6.

While adding public and private funding achieved the most accurate total reinvestment data line, KYMS did not begin collecting data in those terms until 2008.\footnote{1996-2005 reinvestment reports specify building rehabilitation as private investment and title this category as “Private Rehab” in the excel files used to create the total. 1992-2005 reports ask for public improvement investment to be broken into “public” and “private” funding, this information, however, was not collected consistently.} For this
reason, figure 2.7, which is a hybrid of the sum of building rehabilitations, public improvement projects and new construction for 1986-2007 and the sum of private and public reinvestment for 2008-2012, will be used to represent total reinvestment for further analysis. These line segments represent the most accurate depiction of total reinvestment within their era.

This data line shows total reinvestment fluctuating in an irregular pattern from 1986 to 2002. For the most part, reinvestment stayed under $100 million rising above only in 1996, 1997, and 2001. Some changes can be attributed to how KYMS reported the data. For example, there is a slight decrease from 1986/87 to 1988 resulting from the combination of half of calendar year 1986 and all of 1987. There is also a gradual decrease in total reinvestment from 1991 to 1994 that coincides with a decrease in the number of communities reporting annual statistics (see fig. 2.9). Other factors contributing to 1994’s smaller reinvestment total include a $3 million decrease in the amount invested in public improvements, a $2 million decrease in building rehabilitations, and a $22 million decrease in new construction. By 1995, total reinvestment had risen above 1993 levels and continued to rise for the next two years.87

The first year of Renaissance Kentucky, 1998, however, saw a second significant drop. Comparing this year with the two previous years, shows that neither 1996 or 1997 shared large investments in all categories. Instead their high totals are associated with $56 million in public improvements in 1996 (half of that year’s total reinvestment) and $74 million in new construction in 1997 (over half for that year). Also, like the drop in participation in the early 1990s, four less communities reported statistics. Similarly, a large portion of 2001’s total reinvestment can be attributed to new construction. These increases and decreases continued to occur annually. Those mentioned here, as well as the ones that

---

87 Kentucky Heritage Council, Main Street Kentucky: A Report (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council, January 1988); Kentucky Heritage Council, 1994 Reinvestment Stats (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council).
Figure 2.5. All reinvestment including facade rehabilitations, signage improvements, business expansions, and other small projects which were not always included in annual reinvestment statistics.

Figure 2.6. Total reinvestment as a sum of the amount spent on public improvement projects, private rehabilitations, and new construction.
Figure 2.7. Hybrid line: Total reinvestment as the sum of the three categories for 1986-2007 and as the sum of public and private reinvestment for 2008-2012.

*For years 1986-2007 total reinvestment is the sum of building rehabilitations, public improvement projects, and new construction. For 2008-2012 total reinvestment is the sum of public and private

Figure 2.8. Comparison of “Total Reinvestment” data lines.
followed, are a factor of many variables including the subcategories of reinvestment, the number of communities reporting, changes taking place within KYMS and changes in the economic climate of the state and nation.  

\[88\]

**The Subcategories: Building Rehabilitations**

Main Street programs exist to aid in the preservation and economic revitalization of downtown business districts. This dual effort is not just about bringing businesses downtown but about working with the existing fabric, particularly the historic fabric, and encouraging property and business owners to invest in its preservation. Even more, it is about a cycle of events in which preservation of the infrastructure stimulates business in the district and successful business stimulates more preservation. For this reason, rehabilitated buildings embody the central goal of the Main Street program. Not only do these projects represent money spent in the district but, when well done, they epitomize preservation and

a commitment to the rehabilitated building. Through these rehabilitations, the district’s historic buildings are given new purposes in the form of businesses and residential spaces. They also add to the character of the downtown and create an atmosphere where people desire to live, dine and shop. While every measure collected by KYMS demonstrates interest in downtown districts, and may even amount to more interest in terms of dollars spent, this is the measure that represents Main Street’s goals the most.

The above chart (fig. 2.10) shows how reinvestment in building rehabilitations has changed since 1986. The large increase in 2007 is the result of $293.2 million reinvested in private rehabilitation in Louisville. This amount is three times the amount of other large reinvestments in KYMS districts. Without it the amount invested in building rehabilitations in 2007 would be $123 million as opposed to $416 million and close to 2006 levels. In this instance, the reinvestment of one community in one category defined total reinvestment for the year. While every year is not characterized by community reinvestments this large, this example highlights the potential for one community to drastically influ-
ence the cumulative total. Louisville’s reinvestment also highlights the tendency of larger communities to undertake larger projects. Unknown in 2007 is how many rehabilitation projects contributed Louisville’s reinvestment amount. Although KYMS’s reinvestment forms request the number of rehabilitation projects completed, Louisville did not indicate an amount. Due to this omission, it is impossible to know if one project or one hundred comprised the city’s reinvestment.89 Another facet that is not apparent through reinvestment statistics is the quality of a rehabilitation project. Although Main Street organizations encourage the use of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and strive to prevent insensitive designs, reinvestment statistics only quantify the dollar amount spent.

Although building rehabilitations are integral to the goals of Main Street, they represent only one of the three primary categories of reinvestment. Figure 2.11 shows the

Figure 2.11. The amount reinvested in building rehabilitations as a percentage of annual total reinvestment. The green line represents the average percentage over time.

89 Kentucky Heritage Council, 2007- Reinvestment Stats (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council).
amount reinvested in building rehabilitations as a percentage of annual total reinvestment. The chart shows the percentage fluctuating from year to year, and ranging from five to sixty-seven percent. On average, the amount invested in building rehabilitations represents twenty-nine percent of total reinvestment.

**The Subcategories: Public Improvement Projects**

Public improvement projects can include the construction of municipal buildings, schools, hospitals, roads, streetscape improvements, parks and other amenities shared by a community’s residents and visitors. Within Main Street districts, they often take the form of beautification projects that address parking, signage and streetscape issues as well as issues of safety such as the addition of lighting and the widening of sidewalks. They may also include the creation, whether through new construction or rehabilitation, of community centers and gathering places intended for public events and activities.
Figure 2.12 shows the amount of annual reinvestment contributed to public improvement projects. Similar to total reinvestment, it fluctuates from year to year but with less variance. The year 2010 stands out with $352 million invested in public improvements. This high number represents 275 percent of the next highest annual public improvement amount and can be attributed to the public improvement expenditures reported by Louisville. Although the specific public improvement projects completed in Louisville’s Main Street district are unknown, it is reasonable to conjecture that a majority of the city’s 2010 expenditures in this category stem from the completion of the KFC Yum! Center. While this project represents an investment in the Main Street district and a draw for residents and tourists alike, it is not as in line with Main Street’s goals as reinvestment in building rehabilitations. It does, however, represent the diversity of reinvestment in Main Street districts. Furthermore, it emphasizes that improvements must meet the area’s needs and create...
desirable spaces. If Louisville’s public improvement projects expenditure, $279 million, was removed from 2010’s data reinvestment in public improvement projects would equal just over $73 million. This amount is smaller than the two previous years, 2008 and 2009, but much comparable to the reinvestment over time.\textsuperscript{90}

Figure 2.13 is a representation of KYMS’s public improvement projects in relation to annual total reinvestment. Similar to building rehabilitations, this category is on average thirty-one percent of annual total reinvestment and ranges from five percent to sixty percent. This indicates that comparable amounts have been reinvested in building rehabilitations and public improvement projects annually since 1986 (see fig. 2.11 for the reinvestment in building rehabilitations).

\textbf{The Subcategories: New Construction}

For a group interested in historic preservation, new construction seems like an odd category to measure and promote. Nevertheless, the NMSC collects the amount of reinvestment in new construction each year. Considering the beginning of the Main Street program, you will recall that it developed after a period of decline, neglect and, in many cases, destruction. The urban renewal movement centered on the idea of tearing down the old and building new. Political leaders and city planners believed that new construction would bring life and vitality back to the cores of American cities, big and small. In many cases, however, this practice left vacant lots and an unfulfilled need for someone to recognize their potential.

The Main Street program acknowledged this and incorporated the development of underused spaces into its revitalization approach. By employing thoughtful action, local organizations can capitalize on infill development and its potential to improve the appearance of downtown. Main Street and other local constituents accomplish this by encourag-

\textsuperscript{90} Kentucky Heritage Council, \textit{2010 KYMS Totals Only Report}, (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council).
ing developers to design buildings appropriate for the historic character of the district. The annual KYMS program assessment inquires about the existence of historic preservation ordinances and architectural review boards. The presence in a Main Street district of these entities provides a basis for both new construction and changes to existing fabric. Ordinances and review boards also ensure new construction is sensitive to the district and does not detract from its overall aesthetic or character. In addition, Main Street organizations are instrumental in nominating structures and historic districts to the National Register of Historic Places. During Renaissance Kentucky, the Gold designation required a historic district designation from the National Park Service, the implementation of projects respectful of the district’s architectural integrity and the adoption of an historic district ordinance with design guidelines for historic rehabilitation and new construction. Today, many Kentucky towns have well preserved National Register districts, historic preserv-

92 Renaissance Kentucky, Renaissance Kentucky Committee Meeting Packet March 5, 1998 (Frankfort, KY: Renaissance Kentucky, 1998), 6-7.
tion ordinances and architectural review boards because Main Street managers and committee members championed their creation.

New construction also plays a large role in the economic restructuring of Main Street. A vacant lot, like a vacant building, will not bring business or increase tax revenue on Main Street. Some towns might choose to use vacant space for a garden or additional parking but it is important to consider the district’s needs and how vacant spaces can be efficiently utilized. Will a new apartment building catering to the elderly population create market vitality or will additional parking invite people from outside of downtown to come and shop, eat lunch or get coffee? By encouraging infill, and fitting the function of any new development with the district’s specific needs, Main Street is at once able to become more diversified and more holistic.

Figure 2.14 shows how reinvestment in new construction changed over time. Similar to other variables, new construction increased with some inconsistency. A difference is that new construction begins to increase earlier than building rehabilitations or public improvement projects. In each category, the expanded program and early years of Renaissance Kentucky are characterized by fluctuating reinvestment but nothing above $100 million. The first category to do so was new construction with slightly above $150 million in 2003. New construction continued to be above $50 million for the rest of the Renaissance era and into the current program. On the other hand, building rehabilitations did not exceed $100 million until 2006 and did so for only two years. Similarly, public improvement projects breached $100 million in 2008 and maintained high reinvestment levels for two more years before falling to $62 million in 2011 and $29 million in 2012.93

New construction exhibits a peak in 2010 which coincides with Louisville’s large public improvement reinvestment. This is the product of two project types overlapping.

In this case, Louisville’s new construction project(s) were also public improvements. For this reason, a large part of the city’s reinvestment in new construction is also represented in the reinvestment amount for public improvements. When KYMS changed their reporting method in 2008 to differentiate between public and private funding of projects it eliminated this duplication in the total reinvestment figure. The discrepancy, however, is still apparent when breaking reinvestment into the three subcategories.94

Figure 2.15 shows the contributions of new construction to annual total reinvestment. As a percentage of total reinvestment, this category is higher than either building rehabilitation or public improvement projects and averages 40 percent of total reinvestment since 1986. From a preservation standpoint this is surprising, however, each Main Street district must formulate its own plan and determine its own needs for rehabilitations, public improvements and new construction projects. Also of importance is that this figure compares the dollar amount reinvested in new construction, not the quantity of projects taking place. Because a new construction project begins without existing infrastructure its cost will likely exceed the cost of a rehabilitation. This is especially true if the rehabilitation does not extend to the whole building. Thus, the quantity of rehabilitation projects and attention given to preserving the Main Street district’s existing fabric may in fact be greater than the quantity of new construction projects. The next section delves further into the comparison of project types. Information on the quantity of new construction projects, however, was not available from KYMS. For this reason, it is only possible to compare building rehabilitations, public improvement projects and facade renovations.

**Project Types**

Up to this point, the discussion focused on dollars reinvested in Kentucky’s Main Street districts. Dollars, however, are the result of reinvestment in tangible projects. The

---

Figure 2.16. Comparison of the quantity of building rehabilitations, public improvement projects, and facade renovations.

next chart (see fig. 2.16) gives a comparison of project types and, although complete data sets are not available for every category, provides a clear representation of the projects taking place. For each year with a complete set of data: number of building rehabilitations, public improvement projects and facade renovations; it is clear that either building rehabilitations or facade renovations occurred most often. Though these projects do not equally contribute to the dollar amount of total reinvestment, they are a hopeful representation of activity in Kentucky’s Main Street districts, and help to quantify and compare large and small improvements. Assessing projects based on dollar amount alone, creates a situation where large investment projects overshadow small projects. It is important to remember, however, that even a small project such as restoring a store front or painting a facade can have a large impact in the appearance, appeal and preservation of a downtown district.
Net New Businesses and Net New Jobs

Also important to a Main Street organization is the business occurring in the district. While rehabilitations and public improvement projects help to make Main Street beautiful, the creation of jobs and businesses significant indicators of economic development. Main Street managers measure this facet by collecting information on the number of businesses and jobs created, lost, or expanded. Some managers keep track of the percentage of vacant retail space or its price per square foot. Metrics like these, however, can be easily skewed by retail establishments that are owner occupied, like many in small towns, and must be considered with that knowledge in mind. Regardless, the information collected on businesses and jobs provides insight into the growth of the Main Street district. Figures 2.17 and 2.18 exhibit the changes in these categories over time. Neither category, business or job creation, follows a discernible pattern. Figure 2.19, however, which compares business and job creation, does show some correlation between the two. With some exceptions, net increases in the number of businesses are accompanied by net increases in jobs as well. This is particularly evident between the years 2003 and 2008 in which both business and job growth are characterized by a slight bell curve.

Although activity in Main Street districts is influenced by its Main Street organization, activity is also a product of socioeconomic trends taking place in the community, state and country. One indicator used to assess the health of the economy at multiple scales is the unemployment rate. It is reasonable to believe that employment in Main Street districts moves similarly to the overall state employment rate, yet the information gathered from KYMS indicates that in every year since 1992 Main Street districts have gained jobs. This relationship is most apparent when comparing Kentucky’s unemployment rate with net new jobs in KYMS districts (see fig. 2.20). It is clear from this figure that when the state’s unemployment rate increased (decrease in employment) KYMS districts were still creating new jobs.
Figure 2.17. Net businesses created in KYMS districts including business expansions.

Figure 2.18. Net jobs created in KYMS districts.
Figure 2.19. Comparison of net businesses created and net jobs created in KYMS districts.

Figure 2.20. Net job creation in KYMS districts compared with Kentucky’s unemployment rate.
Total Reinvestment: The Pieces and Parts

This study observed that total reinvestment, as well as each of its categories, can be unusually large in one year and very unassuming in the next. So what is it that really causes changes from year to year? Is change caused by overall increases and decreases in reinvestment or is it associated with large changes in one category or one community? The answer is that increases (and decreases) in total reinvestment are a reflection of the projects taking place across the state. Many times one large project, or the cumulative effect of many small projects in one community, is the root of a large increase in total reinvestment. Table 2.2, although not representative of individual projects, shows the impact that one community’s reinvestment can have on a given year. In contrast, figure 2.21 exhibits the distribution of total reinvestment from individual communities for 2004 and clearly indicates that most community level reinvestment is small. The combination of these two pieces of information highlights that, although the majority of Main Street investments are small, the last ten years have included many multimillion dollar investments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Reinvestment</th>
<th>Outlier</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 $107,855,261</td>
<td>$38,750,000</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 $46,829,316</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 $220,807,510</td>
<td>$116,700,000</td>
<td>Frankfort</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 $295,090,547</td>
<td>$54,000,000</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$51,783,230</td>
<td>Pikeville</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$48,160,000</td>
<td>Paducah</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 $149,098,087</td>
<td>$31,000,000</td>
<td>Pikeville</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 $292,189,114</td>
<td>$110,600,000</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 $620,663,550</td>
<td>$293,200,000</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 $267,564,609</td>
<td>$74,225,000</td>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$89,490,000</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 $348,390,582</td>
<td>$69,696,917</td>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$119,100,000</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 $464,730,141</td>
<td>$306,300,000</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 $174,600,514</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>Pikeville</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$39,480,000</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 $126,618,921</td>
<td>$36,000,000</td>
<td>Pikeville</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2. Community reinvestment as a percentage of total annual reinvestment. This chart indicates which communities contributed the most to annual total reinvestment. Years marked with “none” exhibited consistency among all community reinvestment amounts. Total reinvestment and outlier amounts were provided by the Kentucky Heritage Council’s annual reinvestment spreadsheets.
Figure 2.21. Distribution of 2004 total reinvestment. Each tick mark on the horizontal axis represents a community. It is clear that a majority of community investments are below $10 million. Source: Kentucky Heritage Council, *REINVEST STATS-2004 spreadsheet* (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council).
Essentially it is the large investments that help Main Street “look good on paper.” However, putting this information into perspective, it is not the large projects that have the greatest effect on Main Street communities. The KYMS program is about bringing life back to Kentucky’s historic downtowns. This initiative, although central to KYMS and Main Street goals, is not only about Main Street communities but about the state as a whole and preserving Kentucky’s greatest assets. Large projects, while they may have profound impacts on one community, do not improve the whole state. A better indicator of KYMS success and preservation across the state is evidence of projects, even small ones, in every community.

Although separate from KYMS, KHC’s administration of the Federal and Kentucky Historic Preservation Tax Credits provides insight into individual projects occurring in Kentucky. Since 2005, the average Main Street commercial rehabilitation incurred $360,793 in expenditures. This includes roughly $173,000 in material costs and $187,000 in labor costs. The average expenditure of all commercial properties (not just those in Main Street districts) that applied for the state tax credit is $965,604 and the average of all properties, including residential, is $595,184. Applying the $360,000 typical of commercial rehabilitations in Main Street districts to 2012’s reinvestment in building rehabilitations suggests that 102 projects occurred that year. While this number is an estimate (not all Main Street projects applied for tax credits), it does show the potential rehabilitation projects have to influence many Kentucky communities.

The US Economy

Asides from KYMS’s influence, the state of the US economy also influenced reinvestment in Kentucky’s Main Street communities. From the program’s creation until 2013

the US experienced five recessions. The first two occurred in the early 1980s while KYMS was still in its nascent stages. They were the product of the economic unrest that defined much of the 1970s including the Iranian oil embargo and subsequent oil and energy crises of 1973 and 1979 respectively. The Iranian oil embargo decreased the supply of oil to the US and caused the commodity’s price to increase. This caused inflation, which the Federal Reserve attempted to offset by raising the interest rate. Although reinvestment statistics for individual years are unknown from 1979 to 1986, it is likely that higher interest rates decreased the willingness of business and property owners within Kentucky’s Main Street districts to invest. During this recession, the GDP was negative for six months and in November 1982 unemployment rose above ten percent for the first time since the Great Depression.96

---

A third recession occurred from July 1990 to March 1991 in response to the Savings and Loan Crisis of 1989. Less severe than the 1980’s recession, GDP dropped to a low of -3% during the fourth quarter of 1990. KYMS’s reinvestment data shows a drop in 1990 that is likely related to both the Savings and Loan Crisis and the early 1990s recession. Despite these events, however, the program’s reinvestment increased in 1991. Ten years later, in 2001, the US found itself in the midst of another recession. Like past recessions, this economic decline was caused by a combination of events. The first influence was the dot-com bubble in which the stock price of internet assets drastically rose in the late-1990s and suddenly fell. Second, was the events of 9/11. Although the recession ended by


November of 2001, its effects lingered. Unemployment reached a high of six percent in June 2003. Its effects can also be seen in KYMS’s reinvestment for 2002.97

The next few years were characterized by a booming real estate market. The positive aspects of this period likely attributed to increases in reinvestment during 2003, 2004, 2006 and 2007. The greatest drop in reinvestment, however, is evident between 2007 and 2008 and coincides with the onset of the most recent recession. Beginning in late 2007/early 2008, this recession lasted eighteen months and is referred to as the Subprime Mortgage Crisis. It is characterized by decreases in the US economy greater than any other recession since the Great Depression. A direct link between this recession and Main Street communities is the effect it had on confidence in the US banking system and tightening of lending criteria. Figure 2.22 overlays KYMS’s total reinvestment with a timeline of US recessions.98

Main Street communities, like all other communities, are not solely influenced by the climate of their local economy. Investors, property owners and entrepreneurs must all take into consideration national and global trends that may compromise (or benefit) the success of their investments. KYMS communities, although benefitted by the program’s approach, network, and occasionally funding, are still vulnerable to economic and financial pressures. Nevertheless, the Main Street program provides a platform to assist communities regardless of economic climate. Active Main Street organizations can help to make the best of these situations though influencing a community’s decisions and ensuring that decisions suitable for the worst of economic times do not negatively impact the community in the long-run.

97 ibid
98 ibid
ANALYSIS OF TOTAL REINVESTMENT

The last section introduced total reinvestment and the smaller components that contribute to or influence it. This section examines those relationships in more depth and places consideration on the differences between the three documented phases of KYMS: the Expanded Program, Renaissance Kentucky and the Current Program. First, this section utilizes statistics to determine if significant differences exist between the three eras. Second, it analyzes the total reinvestment of KYMS communities by treating KYMS as if it were a for-profit business. An early portion of this chapter discussed how Main Street’s benefits can be viewed as “profit” to the Main Street district. Just like a business strives for positive income, or profit, the Main Street program strives for positive improvements and benefits within it’s district. These benefits are most easily quantified in the program’s reinvestment statistics. This section will apply ratios similar to those used by a business to assess investments and profits made by KYMS, Renaissance Kentucky and local programs in addition to total reinvestment. To make Main Street’s nonprofit aspects more comparable to a for-profit business many of its variables need to be thought of with a different

Figure 2.24. Total Reinvestment adjusted for inflation (2012 dollars).
perspective. For this purpose, total reinvestment is considered as the business’s profits and assessed based on the number of participating communities (stores) and amount of investment (KYMS budget, grants to communities and local budgets).

**Inflation and Outliers**

As explained previously, this thesis chose to use the hybrid total reinvestment data line for analysis. This line follows KYMS’s logic for reporting total reinvestment statistics. It also provides a more accurate line than adapting the reporting method of one phase to use in another phase. After making this determination, annual total reinvestment amounts were adjusted for inflation. Each year was converted to 2012 dollars as 2012 is the last year in the data set. This was done using US government CPI data.\(^99\) Figure 2.24 shows the adjusted total reinvestment.

The adjusted total reinvestment line differs very little from the original line. It does show increased amounts for each year leading up to 2012 (see appendix E for a comparison of adjusted and unadjusted data lines and inflation rates). Overall, figure 2.24 depicts total reinvestment fluctuating from 1986 to 2002 before beginning an overall increase and decline in 2007. To better understand the line’s movement it is important to recall a few key investments on the community level. Both 2007 and 2010’s peaks are attributable to Louisville’s Main Street district. In 2007, Louisville reported $293.2 million in total reinvestment.\(^{100}\) This amount is equal to 47 percent of 2007’s total reinvestment. Without Louisville’s contribution, 2007’s total reinvestment is $327.5 million. Similarly, in 2010, Louisville contributed $306.3 million to the annual total reinvestment. The equivalent to 65.9 percent of 2010’s total reinvestment.

---


\(^{100}\) All of Louisville’s reinvestment for 2007 was in the form of building rehabilitations. $293.2 million is the amount as reported by Louisville’s Main Street organization, not adjusted for inflation.
These large investment amounts are exemplary of the distribution of KYMS communities. The Kentucky program is comprised of communities that range from under five hundred people in Guthrie to over 700,000 in Louisville. Likewise, the amount invested by participating communities varies significantly. Though individual community investment is not known for every year, almost every year that can be examined has an outlier. Reinvestment data from 2004 serves as an example of the distribution of each year’s reinvestment data (see figure 2.21). Very often the outlier is one of the larger cities in the state. On one hand, this distribution depicts the diversity of communities but, on the other, it allows one community to skew annual total reinvestment. Table 2.2 provides insight into the size of some communities’s contributions. In most years, the largest contribution was an outlier. Even if it did not equal $293 million, many large investments were 16 to 37 percent of annual total reinvestment. Preliminary investigation gave consideration to removing outliers greater than 30 percent of a given year’s total reinvestment. The resulting chart exhibited a line with less irregularity than the original hybrid total reinvestment line. This practice, however, is contrary to the purpose of this thesis which strives to consider the KYMS program as a whole. Eliminating communities that reinvested the most would diminish the perceived effectiveness of KYMS. Also, because the nature of these reinvestments, whether they are one project or one-hundred, is unknown, removing the contribution of one community could result in the elimination of many small, yet important, projects. For these reasons, the analysis will include data from every community and of every amount.

Total Reinvestment per Community: Ratio and ANOVA

This study examined total reinvestment per community for those that reported statistics. The analysis excluded communities listed as active but not contributing reinvest-

---

101 Kentucky Main Street Program, 2010 Combined reinvestment stats.
Figure 2.25. Total reinvestment per community (adjusted for inflation). No data was available for 2000, and the number of communities reporting is unknown for 1999.

Figure 2.26. Total reinvestment per community (not adjusted for inflation).
ment statistics for the given year. This study hypothesized that per community reinvestment had either increased or decreased from one phase of KYMS to another. The result, however, was reminiscent of the up and down nature of total reinvestment (see fig. 2.25 and 2.26). Comparing the results (not adjusted for inflation, fig. 2.26) shows a slight upward tendency as positive slopes rise higher and negative slopes decrease less. It is very likely that the range of differences is reflective of whether or not one community reported large reinvestments in that year. For example, both 2007 and 2010 display a high total reinvestment per community amount.

Although the highs and lows of the different eras appear to be similar, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to statistically determine variance between KYMS’s different phases. This form of analysis required entering total reinvestment per community into

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expanded Program</th>
<th>Renaissance Kentucky</th>
<th>Current Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3,587,974</td>
<td>$5,181,611</td>
<td>$7,528,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,516,811</td>
<td>$2,390,601</td>
<td>$3,182,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,355,151</td>
<td>$6,122,715</td>
<td>$2,700,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,101,206</td>
<td>$4,483,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,342,920</td>
<td>$2,038,130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,071,601</td>
<td>$3,697,358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,992,423</td>
<td>$7,991,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,663,937</td>
<td>$4,135,138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,766,168</td>
<td>$5,107,424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,467,284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,788,980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,896,080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>$3,962,545</td>
<td>$4,571,976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3. The total reinvestment per community separated according to KYMS phase. This data was analyzed using an ANOVA test to determine the variance between the means of each group.
### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Program</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47550534.4</td>
<td>3962544.533</td>
<td>2.93253E+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41147787.84</td>
<td>4571976.427</td>
<td>3.36238E+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13410899.48</td>
<td>4470299.826</td>
<td>7.0704E+12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.06969E+12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.03484E+12</td>
<td>0.296485447</td>
<td>0.746487262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>7.32977E+13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.49037E+12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.53674E+13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4. ANOVA output for total reinvestment per community.

![Total Reinvestment per Community](image)

Figure 2.27. This box and whisker plot shows the dispersion of data for each KYMS phase. The lowest whiskers indicate the minimum amount of total reinvestment per community, the highest whiskers indicate the maximum, and the shaded boxes represent the 25-50th percentile and 50-75th percentiles.

*Renissance began in July of 1998 and funding ended in June of 2009.*
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excel and using the Single Factor ANOVA feature available in the data analysis pack. The study used total reinvestment data adjusted for inflation to make each era’s reinvestment more comparable. The null hypothesis the study tested was: is the mean of total reinvestment per community for each KYMS phase equal? This is represented by the equation: $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3$. Where $\mu_1$ is the mean of the expanded program, $\mu_2$ is the mean of Renaissance Kentucky and $\mu_3$ is the mean of the current program. The alternative hypothesis is that at least one mean is different. The output of the ANOVA indicated a large p-value, 0.746. Any p-value greater than 0.05 suggests the difference between groups is not great enough to conclude they are different. Thus we fail to reject the null hypothesis. Because of our familiarity with the data we know the means do differ. The ANOVA test, however, indicates their difference is not great enough to rule out chance, rather than KYMS phase, as the cause of their difference. Had the result been a small p-value, we could conclude that the means differ more than would be expected by chance alone. It would also have indicated that the era’s did not produce equal results. However, since the p-value was high neither of these conclusions can be made. Figure 2.27 is a box plot that graphically represents the dispersion of total reinvestment per community for each phase. Each era shows two shaded boxes. These represent the 25- 50th and 50- 75th percentiles. Where they meet represents the median of the data. The diagram illustrates that the medians and overall dispersion of data for each phase are very similar. This further establishes that the data is too similar to conclude that KYMS phase is the cause of the era’s differences.

**Total Reinvestment: ANOVA**

A second ANOVA was run to compare total reinvestment based on KYMS phase. The null hypothesis for this test was: is the mean of total reinvestment for each KYMS
Single Factor Anova Data:

**Total Reinvestment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expanded Program</th>
<th>Renaissance Kentucky</th>
<th>Current Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>75,347,436</td>
<td>121,651,348</td>
<td>489,322,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>66,819,409</td>
<td>139,903,507</td>
<td>178,213,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>80,523,626</td>
<td>59,765,036</td>
<td>126,618,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>50,428,948</td>
<td>275,522,171</td>
<td>86,819,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>112,915,918</td>
<td>358,660,768</td>
<td>34,942,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>73,718,415</td>
<td>175,279,192</td>
<td>119,154,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>80,795,425</td>
<td>332,762,239</td>
<td>164,280,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>34,942,672</td>
<td>687,273,331</td>
<td>183,302,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>119,154,209</td>
<td>358,660,768</td>
<td>73,718,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>80,523,626</td>
<td>175,279,192</td>
<td>80,795,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>50,428,948</td>
<td>275,522,171</td>
<td>34,942,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>112,915,918</td>
<td>358,660,768</td>
<td>119,154,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>73,718,415</td>
<td>175,279,192</td>
<td>80,795,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>80,523,626</td>
<td>175,279,192</td>
<td>112,915,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>50,428,948</td>
<td>275,522,171</td>
<td>73,718,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>112,915,918</td>
<td>358,660,768</td>
<td>80,523,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>73,718,415</td>
<td>175,279,192</td>
<td>50,428,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>94,319,884</td>
<td>280,898,405</td>
<td>264,718,454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5. Data used for ANOVA.

Table 2.5(left): Total reinvestment was separated according to the three KYMS phases. An ANOVA test then analyzed the variance between the means of each group.

Figure 2.28(right): This box and whisker plot shows the dispersion of total reinvestment for each KYMS phase. The lowest whiskers indicate the minimum amount of total reinvestment, the highest whiskers indicate the maximum, and the shaded boxes represent the 25-50th percentile and 50-75th percentiles.

**Anova: Single Factor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expanded Program</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1131838607</td>
<td>9.432E+07</td>
<td>1.924E+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2808984051</td>
<td>2.809E+08</td>
<td>3.196E+16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>794155362</td>
<td>2.647E+08</td>
<td>3.850E+16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>F crit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.092E+17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.046E+17</td>
<td>5.9647464</td>
<td>0.0085172</td>
<td>3.4433568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3.858E+17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.754E+16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.951E+17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.6. ANOVA output for total reinvestment.
Figure 2.29. Return on investment. This chart shows the reinvestment for every dollar invested in a KYMS community Budget.

Figure 2.30. Sum of KYMS community budgets.
phase equal? This test resulted in a small p-value, 0.008. Which indicates that the means of the three phases differ more than would be expected by chance alone. By determining that the difference between the means is significant we can also infer that the eras did not produce equal results. One aspect the ANOVA does not explain is the quality of different era’s results. Those effects, however, can be assessed by studying the variables over time. Table 2.5 and 2.6 show the input and output of the total reinvestment ANOVA, while figure 2.28 shows the distribution of the data. The box plot depicts the difference between means and data distributions.

**Return on Investment: Community Budgets**

In a previous section, this report discussed the ways in which return on investment can be conceptualized. The standard method used by NMSC is to divide total reinvestment by the sum of all community budgets. The NMSC reported a reinvestment ratio of $18.00/$1.00 in 2012. In comparison, KYMS communities had a reinvestment ratio of $39.91/$1.00, more than twice the national ratio. This measure indicates that Kentucky’s Main Street communities are leveraging their budgets to produce twice the average reinvestment of communities in other states. While the national reinvestment ratio is not available for every year, it is possible to calculate Kentucky’s reinvestment ratio from 1987 to 1990 and 2008 to 2012 (see fig. 2.29). Although the data set is small it is apparent that for every dollar invested in a KYMS community’s budget over $20 was reinvested in the Main Street district. In fact, the smallest return on investment was $24.85 in 1990. The largest was $97.62 in 2010.

The four years representing the Expanded program range from $24.85 to $75.26, while the second set ranges from $39.02 to $97.62. Although the first set represents smaller

---

returns, they are not considerably different from the second set. On one hand this could be interpreted as improvement in the program between the first and second data sets. However, taking into consideration the cumulative budgets of KYMS communities makes it more surprising that the numbers are so similar (see fig. 2.30). Cumulative Main Street budgets increased from $1.1 million in 1990 to $5.4 million in 2008. This increase was caused by increases in individual community budgets and additional communities joining the program. The average budget from 1987 to 1990 was approximately $33,000. For the years 2008 to 2012, the average rose to approximately $68,000, double of the previous average. To maintain a similar return on investment, total reinvestment had to keep pace with increasing budgets. In other words, total reinvestment also had to double.

**Return on Investment: KYMS Budget**

Since information on community budgets is available for so few years, it is important to consider other forms of return. One such form is the return on KYMS’s state budget. This data set is also not complete, but does contain information for 17 of the years between 1986 and 2012. For much of this time frame the KYMS budget equalled approximately $250,000. In the 1980s, the budget was allocated for two-year time spans. For 1986-1987 biennium the budget was $460,000 and by 1990-1991 it was $535,000. Contrary information is available for 1996-1998 that indicates a budget of either $250,000 or $300,000. The sources supporting a budget of $300,000 are 1996, 1997, and 1998 reinvestment reports that list total reinvestment and a reinvestment ratio. These excel reports are only available in hardcopy as opposed to digital format hence the actual formula used to produce the reinvestment ratio is unknown. Total reinvestment was divided by the ratio listed and received an outcome of $300,000 for each year. Although NMSC uses total community budgets to

---

103 The 1987-1990 average was calculated using the number of communities that reported statistics, however, the cumulative budget amount includes budgets of new communities that had not yet accumulated statistics to report. Inclusion of those communities in the calculation would have resulted in an even lower average budget.
Figure 2.31 KHC and KYMS budgets for fiscal years 2002 through 2011. Source: KYMS, “Re-organizational strategy to create stronger local Main Street programs through evaluation process and targeted services based upon collective need.” Presentation, KYMS Winter Conference, 2012.

Figure 2.32 Kentucky General Fund expenditures, fiscal years 1997-2014. Source: Budget of the Commonwealth, Office of State Budget Director, 2012, 5.
Figure 2.33 KYMS budget vs. total reinvestment.

Figure 2.34 Return on KYMS budget.
calculate the reinvestment ratio, $300,000 is too small an amount to represent the budgets of the approximately 24 communities participating from 1996-1998. The amount allocated to grants is also known for those years. For this reason, the $300,000 must be representative of KYMS’s budget. The second source, a chart compiled by the State of Washington’s Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development in 1997, lists Kentucky’s budget as $250,000. It is reasonable to believe the budget stayed within a similar range for the next five years. In 2002, KYMS reported the budget as $230,400. Since then it has decreased to $73,056 in 2013 (see fig. 2.31).

Although multiple events have happened in the past ten years including the retirement of David Morgan, director of the KHC and SHPO for 22 years; the election of two governors; and a recession, none of these events directly coincide with decreases in KYMS funding. Renaissance Kentucky, however, was ongoing for much of this frame. As this thesis has pointed out previously, Renaissance and KYMS did not always work well together. Renaissance communities did not always report statistics and clarity was often lacking in which partnering organization was responsible for different facets of the program. It is reasonable to believe that these tensions also existed when allocating funding to the different alliance members. Another factor is the change in Kentucky’s state budget. KYMS is funded through the state’s general fund. As figure 2.32 shows, the expenditure of Kentucky’s general fund decreased from 2008 to 2010. This time frame also coincides with the largest decrease in KYMS’s budget from $135,200 in 2009 to $71,100 in 2010.

Figure 2.33 shows the KYMS budget in relation to changes in total reinvestment. It is observable, that as KYMS’s budget begins to decrease in 2002, total reinvestment begins to increase. In fact, the highest year of reinvestment coincides with the lowest KYMS
Figure 2.35. This chart attempts to show grants for each year. However, because Renaissance grants were much larger than the previous salary grants, their small amount is indiscernible on this chart. Salary grants ranged from $115,000 to 135,000.

Figure 2.36. Return on investment. This chart shows the reinvestment for every dollar invested in a KYMS community through grants. Opposite of the above chart, the return on Renaissance grants are hardly discernible.
budget. Most likely these two occurrences are not directly related. It is likely that both are products of focus on Renaissance Kentucky.

Figure 2.34 shows the return on KYMS’s budget. Unlike other returns that have been calculated by this report, the denominator (KYMS Budget) in this equation stayed relatively consistent, between $70,000 and $300,000. The resulting relationship shows low returns, under $500, prior to 2002 and higher returns thereafter. It also shows the relationship between low reinvestment amounts prior to Renaissance Kentucky and the high reinvestments in its last few years. The return per dollar invested in KYMS’s budget increased overall from 2004 to 2010. This indicates that the increase in total reinvestment was greater than the decrease in KYMS’s budget and that despite budget issues in the state coordinator’s office, Main Street communities are still investing in downtown.

**Return on Investment: Grants**

From the beginning of the Kentucky program in 1979, and into the Renaissance Kentucky era, KYMS provided salary assistance grants. With the establishment of Renaissance Kentucky many more grants were distributed to Main Street communities. Because the grants consisted of state and federal funds in the form of TEA-21 and CDBGs and were distributed by different state departments a complete list of funding is unavailable. Two lists, however, attempt to compile information on the grants given each year as well as the entity providing and the community receiving them.104, 105

Some skewing is present because state funds are distributed according to a fiscal year while reinvestment statistics are reported for the calendar year. During the expanded program, KYMS awarded management grants based on the calendar year. However, Renaissance grant records were kept according to the fiscal year. Because large project

---

104 Governor’s Office, Department of Local Government, *Renaissance Totals* (Frankfort, KY: Department of Local Government).
grants tend to be distributed in partial amounts and not immediately upon awarding, grants distributed during Renaissance were allocated to the year that corresponded with the second six months of the fiscal year. For example, a grant awarded in 1998-99 was compared with reinvestment statistics for 1999. Also, because the majority of grants contributed to building rehabilitation, new construction and public improvement projects there contribution was subtracted from total reinvestment before calculating return.106

The original salary assistance grants distributed by KYMS ranged from $115,000 to $135,000 of KYMS’s annual budget. In 1999, grant amounts increased to $7.9 million and could be used for streetscape and facade improvements (see fig. 2.35).107 For the next few years, grant amounts fluctuated but stayed within the millions. Figure 2.36 shows the relationship between grant amount and return. From the chart it is clear that the higher returns on grant amount took place when less grants were being offered and lower returns occurred when higher amounts were offered. This is not to say that dispersal of less grants, or investment, generates more reinvestment, but simply that the dollar to dollar ratio is higher for smaller initial investments.

There is also a large difference between the two types of grants the program has offered. Salary assistance grants were 50/50 matching grants. These grants helped Main Street organizations extend their budgets and offer more competitive salaries for managers. As part of the community’s budget we can consider all reinvestments, or future investments, as a result of the initial salary assistance grant. Most Renaissance grants, on the other hand, were targeted for specific uses such as streetscape improvements, facade renovations and rehabilitation projects. These grants did not normally pass through the Main Street budget but were instead allocated directly to projects. While the grants often represented a large portion of the total project cost their purpose was not to support projects but to make them

106 This method avoids grants being included in both the numerator (return) and denominator (investment) of the return on investment ratio.
107 “Governor Patton Awards $7.9 Million to Main Street Cities Through His Renaissance Initiative.”
possible by eliminating the gap between current resources and needed resources. Public and private entities who requested grants were required to detail all other sources of funding for the project. They were also allowed to combine grants. Because funding was directly used in projects they can be considered as reinvestment as well. But, unlike other reinvestment, their purpose was to encourage projects (and their associated investment, business, employment, etc.) to happen in Main Street districts. Without Renaissance Kentucky to ensure communities invested funds in Main Street/Renaissance districts communities and developers could have easily used them for development away from the historic core.

A second difference in salary assistance grants and Renaissance era grants is that the Renaissance Alliance did not place any requirement to “match” a certain percentage of the grant. Other funding sources were, however, encouraged and often necessary to complete the project. In this since, Renaissance grants were less about creating a large return and more about making a physical impact through projects. They allowed projects that would never have happened to be achieved and those that may have happened otherwise to be completed at a larger scale or with more detail. This mentality is reflected in the smaller reinvestment ratios during the Renaissance era.108

---

108 The grant amount used to calculate return on grants was based on the amount allocated through grants, some sources, however, indicate that projects did not always use their complete grant allotment. In cases where the amount dispersed is less than the allotment the actual return on grant amount will be higher than shown in figure 2.36.
A survey of current and past KYMS participants complemented the quantitative analysis of the reinvestment statistics. A survey used by NMSC to assess KYMS in 2000 influenced question types and topics. While NMSC intended their survey to gauge the partnership between KYMS and local programs, this study’s survey gauged participant’s perspectives of KYMS, particularly concerning the effectiveness of the program during different eras. For this reason, the new survey eliminated some of the original questions. Adapting the remaining questions allowed for application to all eras of KYMS, as opposed to a single period like the original survey. Additional questions determined the participant’s role in their local program and which eras they were active during. To gain the most information, the survey included open and closed-ended questions. The open-ended questions allowed respondents to elaborate on previous answers or add relevant information that was not specifically requested. The closed-ended questions were in the form of a bipolar Likert scale. This type of scale uses intervals to measure respondents opinions and is considered a “bipolar” Likert because the two ends of the scale represent opposite opinions and the middle answer is neutral.

The website Survey Monkey provided a platform for the design and distribution of the survey. In an attempt to include a participant from every role in a local Main Street program, the distribution list included current and past Main Street managers, board members, committee members and volunteers. It was also important to obtain perspectives from each era of the program. For this reason, collected material included past and current manager’s lists, reports and applications. One hindrance in this process was the
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availability of email addresses. It was often difficult to obtain addresses for early participants unless they had continued to participate in the program. This made it difficult to isolate participant’s opinions to one era. On the other hand, multi-era participants have the capability to compare and contrast the eras in which they participated. The survey was distributed to approximately ninety email addresses with an additional link included that participants could forward to other Main Street participants. This method yielded 28 responses. Though this number is small, it is only 13 less than the 41 responses received by the NMSC survey. The respondents to the survey included past and current representatives of each KYMS era and each Main Street role. The average time each respondent was affiliated with KYMS was 7.2 years. Many who responded were also affiliated with KYMS for more than one era.

Generally survey respondents provided positive results. Close-ended questions asked respondents to rank their perception of KYMS’s relationship with local managers, board members, committee members and volunteers, as well as its provision of services, understanding of issues, helpfulness, etc. Responses to these questions fell between 2.71 and 4.44 on a scale of 1 to 5, with “1” representing “not at all” and “5” representing “very
well.” Open-ended questions asked for more indepth responses concerning the role of KYMS and KHC, how this role has changed, critical issues, and services KYMS and KHC could provide. Responses to open-ended questions were more varied. Many respondents expressed praise for KYMS while others voiced discontent with its operation.

The next three portions of this thesis offer summary and interpretation of the survey results. The first section pertains to the overall feedback of the survey conducted. This provides cumulative results from participants in all eras and serves to encapsulate the perspectives of KYMS over time. The second portion compares results from NMSC’s survey with the responses of current era participant’s from the second survey. This comparison is intended to contrast the perception of KYMS in 2000 with its perception in 2013. Unlike the first portion, it is not cumulative, but uses opinions collected “at the moment” instead of retrospectively. A drawback of this comparison is that perspectives from NMSC’s survey, which belong to the Renaissance Kentucky era, are only representative of that era’s first two years. The third portion makes use of data collected by the most recent survey. The primary question of this thesis is: “how have changes to KYMS’s structure effected Kentucky Main Street communities?” This survey intended to engage participants from each era in order to learn about success, effectiveness and satisfaction within the eras and to compare eras within those categories of participant perspective. In this section, the respondent’s era of participation served to isolate it from other eras. This categorization excluded respondents who participated in more than one era. By isolating participant’s responses, the study utilized “pure” perspectives and more effectively compared the different KYMS eras. Complete survey results can be found in Appendix 3.

**Summary One: All Results**

KYMS’s Relationship with Local Programs
After determining respondents’ roles and eras of participation, a set of questions was used to gauge KYMS’s relationship with community managers, staff, board of directors, committee members, and volunteers. Within this section, KYMS’s relationship with community managers and staff ranked the highest, both above 4.00. When asked about KYMS’s relationship and provision of information to the board, committee members and volunteers, KYMS ranked slightly below 3.00, or “neutral”. This indicates a weak relationship with the majority of Main Street participants. Further questions were asked to assess KYMS’s relationship with the local programs. These revealed that while KYMS was ranked highly for responsiveness to requests for assistance. It was considered less successful in regard to its understanding of local issues, helpfulness of advice, and dissemination of pertinent and timely information. It also received a rather mediocre response relating to the delivery of services (3.37 out of 5.00).

When asked an open-ended question about how KYMS has been effective or ineffective in supporting Main Street communities the responses were varied. Some respondents voiced dissatisfaction with KYMS since the end of Renaissance funding. One stated that KYMS’s “effectiveness has diminished drastically in the last year with respect to responsiveness, delivery of services and dissemination of pertinent/timely information”. The same respondent stated that their community was more interested in KYMS when grants were available, but they are becoming disinterested now. Whereas the Main Street program was developed by NMSC to be a grassroots effort championed by the local community, this response hints at a community seeking state assistance and grants. The antithesis is the community devoted to revitalization and preservation efforts and to obtaining results through local (or otherwise available) resources. It also highlights the main difference between the current program and Renaissance Kentucky: funding. In addition, participant’s comments make it clear that while Renaissance was helpful it caused communities to lose sight of Main Street’s real emphasis: self-help. As the third Main Street
principle, self-help and self-sufficiency is integral to a successful Main Street community. On the other hand, some respondents reported that KYMS is helpful supplying information in regards to easements and design, making on-site visits, and being present at regional manager’s meetings. Observations included that KYMS does not directly communicate with board members and that many success issues are more strongly related to the ability of the local Main Street manager and the individual community.

Local Program

The intention of the next set of questions was to learn more about the success of local programs. In all the respondents reported that their local Main Street program was helpful in creating and maintaining a healthy downtown area, and that local community groups were committed to continuing a revitalization program. Most also reported that their local program will likely be in place three years from now (2016) and that they would recommend Main Street to other communities.

When asked to explain their responses further, respondents brought up many different issues. Some voiced lack of support from public officials. Others praised public officials but voiced low community support. A few respondents pointed to an imbalance in the way their community carried out the four-point approach. Funding was also brought up and while some respondents complained that the program was weakened without it others pointed out the importance of the program even without additional funds.

Satisfaction with KYMS

Question five asked respondents to rate their satisfaction with KYMS during each era. The respondents who participated in the “Beginning” reported the highest rank. Although only two respondents represent that era, they both ranked their satisfaction level as “very satisfied”. The Expanded Program received the next highest, before Renaissance
and then the Current Program. This shows that as time has passed, satisfaction with KYMS has dropped. However, while satisfaction has dropped, the Current Program received a rank slightly above “satisfied”. This indicates that while perceptions have decreased, they are still positive. Two factors could explain this decrease. One, participants may have raised their expectations of KYMS over time and/or, two, the performance level of KYMS may have decreased.

This question also allowed respondents to explain their responses. Four main reasons were provided. Three of these had negative connotations and included ineffective leadership at the local and state level, insufficient finances and staff at the state level, and confusion created by Renaissance Kentucky. A fourth response described Main Street as the beginning of revitalization in their community, and the reason for its vitality and beauty.

Role of KHC and KYMS

The next question gauged the perception of KHC and KYMS’s role over time. This question received responses from every era except the “Beginning”. The majority of responses defined the role of KHC and KYMS as providing assistance to communities through leadership, advocacy, technical and design assistance, on-site visits, the historic tax credit program, coordination of training and conferences, providing information, and answering questions. A few respondents, who are representative of both Renaissance and the current program, stated that KHC and KYMS were once resources but have become more regulatory in nature by increasing Main Street criteria and “busy work”.

Along the same lines as the last question, the next asked respondents if they had seen the role or management approach of KHC and KYMS change over time. Twenty respondents said “yes”, while seven said “no”. When asked to elaborate many responded that decreased funding and staff levels had diminished the abilities of the state coordinating office. Others emphasized that the program had become more regulatory providing less
assistance and less emphasis on the four-points. Some respondents contemplated the motivation behind KYMS. They felt KYMS has at points been government driven and at other points more private sector driven. Others were happy with changes, stating that KYMS is more involved and that changes are simply a new style from a new coordinator.

A third question prodded a little deeper to try and determine if participants perceived varying degrees of success in the local Main Street programs related to changes in KHC and KYMS. Of the twenty-three responses, eleven said yes. When asked how, respondents once again cited changes in funding. Others stated that success could be more closely linked with changes and the level of support at the community level. A third response stated that KYMS’s biggest influence on the success of local Main Street programs was its willingness to explore various solutions to projects. A fourth response cited the KYMS’s staff level and stature in the state.

Critical Issues Facing KYMS Communities

Respondents identified eight primary critical issues that affect KYMS communities. The issue listed most often was funding. Eleven respondents cited funding, financial issues and the recession as hindrances to their Main Street program. Next was state and local government. Six respondents pointed to a lack of involvement and support from government sources as well as policies that are not Main Street friendly. A third issue was community education. Responses conveyed concern for the many property owners absent from their buildings and those who were present but do not value or understand why maintenance to their properties is important for the health and vitality of their community. Respondents felt that more education to the community could convey to locals (property owners, residents, politicians) what Main Street does and does not do. Other critical issues included support, economic development, sprawl, staffing/workload and difficulty working with other, potentially beneficial, programs.
After identifying critical issues, the survey participants were asked to identify the services KYMS should provide to address these issues. A popular recommendation made by respondents was to provide more outreach and education to state and local government about the importance of revitalizing local communities. Respondents also recommended workshops or publications specifically for property owners. Some voiced dissatisfaction with KYMS for not visiting individual communities and identified visits as a way to learn more about community issues. Other respondents suggested on-line training as a way to save time and not require managers to leave their Main Street community. Suggestions also targeted funding issues. These included lobbying state government for increased funding and communicating creative funding ideas to communities. One respondent identified staffing levels at KYMS as an issue. He/she suggested hiring and devoting staff members (possibly current managers) to different Kentucky regions with a specific focus on Eastern Kentucky. Other suggestions included leading the creation of Main Street friendly policies, strengthening KYMS branding, business understanding, and more emphasis on NMSC’s basic principles.

Additional Comments

A last question allowed respondents to expand on previous questions and answers. These comments ranged from praise for KYMS and what it strives to do, to the need for further emphasis on Main Street’s basic principles and more staff, to evaluating the intentions of the current coordinator. Of the eight additional comments, six included positive remarks in regards to Main Street’s success and the effort of KYMS.

Summary Two: NMSC Survey vs. Thesis Survey

NMSC’s survey provided the initial framework for the survey, and also allowed comparison of the perspective of KYMS gathered in 2000 with the perspective gathered
in 2013. Because memory tends to adjust opinions to be more or less favorable, this second interpretation uses only the perspectives captured in the “current day” including the perception of the Renaissance Kentucky program in 2000 and the perception of the current program in 2013.

KYMS’s Relationship with Local Programs

The perception of KYMS in 2000, two years after Renaissance Kentucky began, is not much different than the perception of the current program, which began four years ago. Ranked questions inquiring about the relationship between the state coordinating office and local programs received high marks in both eras. The only question to receive less than 3 (neutral response) was KYMS’s relationship with local Main Street board of directors. This question received a 2.96 in the Renaissance era and a 2.90 for the current era. While Renaissance Kentucky received higher scores for seven of the nine questions, the scores overall very extremely similar. Many varied by less than 0.10. The greatest difference was 0.83 and concerned KYMS’s ability to deliver services as promises (4.23- Renaissance, and 3.40- Current program, scale 1-5).

Local Program

Questions inquiring about local program success and support received high responses in both eras as well. Renaissance scored higher in both commitment of local community groups to continuing a revitalization program (4.07 vs. 3.89) and likelihood that their Main Street program will be in place three years from now (4.66 vs. 3.78). The current program ranked higher for successfulness of their Main Street program to help create/maintain a healthy downtown (4.33 vs. 3.84). The last question asked participants if they would recommend a Main Street program to other communities, the average response for both eras was 4.80. These responses, which range from 3.78 to 4.80, show that both
eras thought highly of the Main Street program and its effect on their community. They also show very little discrepancy in the perception of KYMS at the beginning of Renaissance Kentucky and the perception of its current program.

Role of KHC and KYMS

The thesis survey asked participants how they had perceived the role of KHC and KYMS over time. This question was adapted from the original survey which asked: How do you perceive the role of the Kentucky Heritage Council in the Renaissance Initiative at the state level? Although slightly different, both of these questions were intended to tease apart KHC/KYMS’s role within the Main Street program. The responses provided to NMSC’s survey fell into the categories of leadership, advocacy/liaison, partnership, technical expertise, watchdog, staffing issues, communication/education, and other. Responses to the thesis survey were similar but less varied. Most emphasized KHC/KYMS’s role as a resource for information and guidance, coordination of state meetings and training, certification of communities, and a liaison traveling to communities in order to better understand local needs. While responses during the Renaissance era highlight positive aspects such as leadership and technical expertise, they also mention negative aspects specifically staffing issues. These responses emphasize the dichotomy between KYMS and Renaissance and the division of roles the two programs created.

A similar question asked only in the original survey was: How do you perceive the local Main Street Program’s role in Renaissance Kentucky, and in receiving local designation as a “Bronze,” “Silver,” or “Gold” community? While it seems this question was intended to focus on the local program, not the state, many responses emphasized Main Street’s role as a leader and partner, but also as duplication. Specific answers stated that “being a Main Street community helped us and was crucial in our Gold status”. Other responses, however, stated that “Renaissance Kentucky has swallowed the MS program”
and “MS approach was lost in quest for funds”. As mentioned previously, the Renaissance program had been in existence for only two years at the time of this survey, yet opinions were already starting to express discontent with the relationship and effect Renaissance had on KYMS.

Critical Issues Facing KYMS Communities

When asked about critical issues, survey participants provided an array of responses. Those that were similar between eras included funding, participation/support (community and local government), staffing (local), and economic development. Issues expressed by Renaissance participants only include building restoration, design issues, board training, parking, and volunteer development. Many responses from the Renaissance era focused on infrastructure and the environment of the downtown area. Current era responses, however, focused on getting people to work together, to better understand preservation, and the need for more staff and funding to accomplish these goals. Although similar, the responses from the current era show a tendency toward organizational deficiencies as opposed to issues facing the Main Street district.

To solve these issues respondents suggested increasing the availability of technical assistance, creative ideas (sharing ideas), advocacy for funding, number of state staff and programs targeting specific regions of the state. An interesting result of this question is that both eras expressed the need for additional state staff. The state of the current program with only one full-time staff member makes additional staff a given. However, during the Renaissance era KYMS had three staff members and worked with the Renaissance Alliance to meet community needs. Nevertheless, participants were still expressing the need for more state-level assistance.

Loescher and Stuart, *Kentucky Main Street Program*, 10-11.
Summary

While the NMSC survey provided a starting point for the thesis survey, not all of its questions were reused. An objective of NMSC’s survey, not addressed in the thesis survey, was to assess local issues in detail. Some examples of this objective are questions asking about successful projects and what strengths individual communities could use to mentor other communities. Although these questions were not asked in the thesis survey they still provide valuable insight in KYMS’s organization and perception during the first few years of Renaissance Kentucky. They also give insight into KYMS/KHC’s role within the Renaissance initiative. During this time respondents expressed that KYMS should have a stronger role in Renaissance, some insisted it should be the lead agency and that Renaissance responsibilities detracted from serving KYMS communities.

Today, many still praise KYMS for their work but in some instances opinions are not so positive. Many perceptions now seem to be that Renaissance Kentucky and its association with grants was the strength of the program. This is an interesting take on how perceptions can change and be influenced by changes in circumstance. It also hints that KYMS was valued more at the beginning of Renaissance Kentucky than by its end.

**Summary Three: Comparison of Eras**

For this portion, data collected from respondents who participated in only one era was assessed. Although this narrows the sample group and the amount of data available, it allows opinions and suggestions to be isolated in order to gain a “pure” perspective rather than an average of the multiple eras in which respondents participated. This method allows for better comparison of eras.
KYMS’s Relationship with Local Programs

Survey results showed that the perception of KYMS’s relationship and provision of training opportunities for managers has decreased slightly from era to era. It ranged from 5.00 in the beginning to a low of 3.80 in the current program. In contrast, the respondent’s perceptions concerning board of directors, committee members and volunteers fluctuated over time. This perception was also lower than the perception concerning managers. Results for the three questions were in the range of 1.00 to 3.40, or “not at all” to slightly above “neutral”. Concerning KYMS and Main Street board of directors, their relationship was best during Renaissance but received only a 3.00. The beginning respondent rated the relationship as a 1.00, the equivalent of “not at all”. Respondents rated the provision of training and information to board members, committee members and volunteers best during the current program.

When asked about KYMS’s understanding of issues, responsiveness, advice, delivery of services, and dissemination of information respondents provided a range of information. Differences between eras, however, were slight. The largest difference provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents Participating in only one Era: 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorized by Role</th>
<th>Community Manager</th>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Committee Member</th>
<th>Volunteer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Beginning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Expanded Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Current Program</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2. Characteristics of survey respondents excluding respondents who participated in more than one KYMS era.
by the survey results was between 4.00 and 5.00 for KYMS’s responsiveness to requests for assistance. These responses reflect an opinion of “very well” (5.00) during the Renaissance era and “well” (4.00) during the current program. Most responses reflect a positive opinion of the program despite era. The lowest collective response was 3.00 for the helpfulness of KYMS’s advice in the beginning era, which represents a neutral perspective.

The last part of question three asked for other specific ways KYMS has been effective or ineffective in supporting Main Street communities. The respondent from the beginning era did not provide further explanation and none of the respondents from the expanded program participated solely in the expanded program era. This left only Renaissance and the current program to be compared. One response from the Renaissance era voiced praise for KYMS and their willingness to assist their local program. The second response pointed to the communication and effectiveness of the local Main Street manager as the primary determining component of success at the local level. Responses from the current program also included praise for KYMS in the areas of communication and presence. Two respondents indicated they were not very familiar/had not worked with KYMS. One voiced that KYMS did not have a direct relationship with the board, but communicated through the director. Lastly, a respondent pointed out the limitations of KYMS were due to funding, not deficiencies in management.

Refining the sample group from all respondents to those that participated in only one era minimized the sample group. This decreased the ability of this thesis to conjecture that the opinions expressed by this smaller group encompass the opinions of all Main Street participants. Nevertheless, these isolated opinions vary little from the opinions expressed in the collective sample group. Concerning the last portion of question three, the opinions communicated about Renaissance and the current program do not show much difference in the two eras. Both had positive remarks about KYMS as well as comments about the manager’s responsibility to communicate with both KYMS and their board.
Local Program

This question asked participants to gauge the success of their local program, the commitment of local community groups to revitalization, and the likelihood their Main Street program would be in place in three years (2016). Renaissance Kentucky ranked the highest, with an average response of 4.25 to each question. None of the eras ranked below a 3.78, showing that survey participants responded favorably to each question. Although many negative comments were made throughout the survey concerning the lack of funding during the current era, respondents from this era expressed that they would be the most likely to recommend a Main Street program to other communities. Current program respondents gave this category a 4.80. This is interesting when comparing it to the overall response, which ranked slightly lower, 4.65. This shows that when the eight respondents who participated in the current era and another era are included in the average the likelihood to recommend the program decreases. It is possible that the difference is caused by the other eight participant’s ability to compare the current era with past eras, and indicates that in comparison it is less desirable. It also shows that new participants think highly of the program.

When asked to further explain, only participants from Renaissance and the current program responded. Respondents from both eras expressed that the success of communities was often determined by the involvement and support of the community’s government, property owners, and other stakeholders. They also expressed the importance of these individuals in understanding and caring about revitalization and how deficiencies in these areas weakened the program. Another issue that both groups mentioned was funding. A participant from the Renaissance era stressed how the Main Street program is important even without state funding. He/she emphasized that it is instead about the dedication of community members and their ability to develop and implement ideas. A member of the
current program expressed similar concerns stating that there is “never enough man power or funding”.

Satisfaction with KYMS

This portion of the survey assessed satisfaction with KYMS during each era. On a scale of 1 to 3, with one equaling not satisfied and three equaling very satisfied, the beginning era rated the highest. The beginning received a three, while Renaissance received a 2.50, and the current program received a two (satisfied). An open-ended question was offered to expand on each rating, but only negligible information was returned.

Role of KHC and KYMS

Next, questions were asked to assess the role of KHC and KYMS. The first question assessed how Main Street participants perceived the role of the two offices. Again, only participants from Renaissance and the current program responded. While respondents from both eras described KHC and KYMS’s role as to provide training, information, and guidance, only those involved with Renaissance Kentucky listed assistance with grants, and funding as a role. One current participant did point to KHC’s administration of the historic tax credit program as being helpful to Main Street communities.

Further assessing the role of KHC and KYMS, participants were asked if they had seen the role or management approach of either change. This question was included in the survey primarily to target respondents who had participated in more than one era in order to find out from them how things had changed and how those changes were perceived. Nevertheless, at least one respondent from each era answered yes to this question (excluding the expanded program). Of the ten current era respondents, five answered yes and five answered no. While change has taken place during the current era (a new state coordinator was hired, program requirements were refined, etc.) some new participants may
have joined after these implementations. Participants in the current era provided further explanations of their answers. These explanations, however, were very basic and pointed to changes in style versus changes in services or role. One participant from the beginning expressed that the role/management approach has weakened as funding decreased.

Next, a question asked participants to relate success in their Main Street community to changes in KHC and KYMS’s structure. Again, respondents from each era responded yes. The participant from the beginning era blamed changes on “not enough staff, or stature in state”. Respondents from Renaissance also agreed that success could be related to changes. They, however, expressed that the quality of the local director and their participation with KHC makes a difference in the Main Street community as well. Most respondents from the current program answered that they had not seen varying degrees of success related to changes made at the state level. Two, however, sighted improved communication and support from the KHC and KYMS as having positive effects.

Critical Issues Facing KYMS Communities

The next two questions asked participants to name critical issues facing their Main Street community. Only participants from Renaissance Kentucky and the current program provided insight in this area. The issues they listed include lack of support from local citizens and government, money, sprawl, economic development and state and local policies that were not Main Street friendly. The issues varied very little between the two eras. Concerning services KYMS should provide, respondents suggested more education directed toward residents and government officials, involvement in policy development, and communication of creative ideas. A suggestion made only in the current program was to hire more staff members who could each serve a different portion of the state.
Additional Comments

This question was a last attempt to gain information on any issues not previously addressed. Three participants from Renaissance and the current program used it to express praise for KYMS and emphasize the importance of revitalizing and preserving Kentucky communities.

Survey Findings and Relation to KYMS Eras

The primary focus of this survey was to identify differences between different KYMS eras. While some did arise, such as varying degrees of satisfaction, the overall responses were similar. In ways this helps to identify issues that KYMS has always struggled with. One of those being its communication and provision of services to board members, committee members and volunteers. In other ways it helped to identify areas where it has been consistently strong. For example, KYMS’s understanding of local program issues and responsiveness.

The survey also aided in identifying issues that arose from changes in the program. While some respondents mentioned actual changes in personnel many more mentioned the loss of Renaissance funding as a weakness to the program. This issue in particular shed light on a major misunderstanding of what state Main Street programs do. While it is expected that communities could always use more funding, the perspective conveyed by open-ended questions was that KYMS should provide funding and grants. It was stated that without grants available “KYMS has not directly benefitted” towns and communities are less interested in KYMS. These statements are worrisome in that the purpose of state Main Street programs has never been funding of local Main Street communities.

In 1991, when the NMSC assessed KYMS they described the program as “fortunate to have financial resources available” and stated that it had a “strong financial base”. At that time, only four other states provided financial assistance and three states required
communities to pay for technical services. Today the only cost to be a KYMS community is paying dues to NMSC. The services provided by KYMS are still received with no additional cost to communities. While, KYMS was able to provide for its communities for much of its existence, the purpose of KYMS and the Main Street program in general is to provide communities with an opportunity to improve their own downtown. KYMS communities have been fortunate to receive funding but they should realize that, although KYMS is there to help, it is up to the Main Street organization to garner community support, maintain appropriate budgets and be responsible for the strengths and weaknesses of their organization. Although survey responses did not mention salary assistance grants specifically, it is reasonable to believe that they as well as Renaissance grants led to local communities’ expectations of financial assistance. The perceptions of funding (and its absence) is an issue KYMS will need to address. This process will require KYMS to evaluate and promote the alternate services it offers, its responsibility to KYMS communities, and how its actions fulfill the purpose of the Main Street program.

“The Main Street Program is very important even without the available funds that the State previously distributed. The program is valuable in that persons with a dedication and commitment to the downtown can work through ideas that they have for downtown and in some instances make those ideas happen.” -Survey respondent

Another change identified was that KYMS had become more regulatory. One respondent even stated that programs felt they were “being weeded out intentionally.” The idea that KYMS is trying to be more regulatory is true. During Renaissance, KYMS’s

---

113 Kitty Dougoud, personal conversation, March 1, 2014.
emphasis was providing communities with an opportunity to begin a Main Street program
and ensuring communities were eligible for Renaissance grants. This procedure, however,
diluted Main Street’s mission and accomplishment of the four points. At the 2012 KYMS
winter conference a presentation titled “Main Street Program Restructure” was given.114
The presentation provides detailed information about the “National Accreditation Stan-
dards of Performance” developed by NMSC. The standards emphasize the importance of
an organization’s operation rather than its economic performance. They include: broad-
based community support, a comprehensive Main Street work plan, historic preservation
ethic and an adequate operating budget among other criteria. These criteria were also
emphasized at KYMS’s summer retreat in a presentation explaining the annual reevalua-
tion worksheet. In many ways this represents a return to Main Street’s true purpose and the
organizational structure promoted by NMSC. Misunderstanding of KYMS’s regulatory
responsibility is a second major concern.

Leadership and community involvement were also listed as issues in need of atten-
tion. Many respondents expressed concern with their community’s understanding of and
concern for preservation and downtown revitalization. The two groups most identified
with this concern were government officials and property owners. The concern for aware-
ness was also coupled with suggestions for more community education in the form of
workshops and publications.

Perceptions of KYMS’s responsibility to fund communities are closely related to
misunderstanding about the relationship between KYMS and the Renaissance Alliance.
Even in the report created in 2000, respondents voiced confusion about how the two pro-
grams work, what each does, and whether they were redundant. While the two programs
were more holistically combined under Renaissance on Main (the latter half of the Renais-

114 Kentucky Heritage Council, “Main Street Program Restructure,” (slide show presented at the 2012
htm (accessed March 10, 2014).
sance era), a response to the thesis survey stated “we continue to explain the difference and what the Renaissance program was.”

Despite the confusion caused by the Renaissance program, the survey indicated a high level of satisfaction with community level Main Street activities within each era. There were many open-ended responses, however, that voiced concern for the longevity of the program and the strength of community commitment, particularly from government officials and property owners. There were also mixed responses from the current era respondents who ranked community commitment and likeliness to exist in three years lower than respondents from other eras. They also ranked their satisfaction with KYMS the lowest (with and without multi-era participants included). Nevertheless, they ranked the highest in likeliness to recommend a Main Street program. The important take away here is that despite negative comments participants still believe in Main Street.

Although not a major area of concern the survey did reveal a slight decrease in the “effective working relationship” of KYMS and local program staff overtime. Understandably, this decrease parallels an increase in the number of participating communities and a decrease in the number KYMS staff members. This situation was also acknowledge in open-ended responses but to a lesser extent than funding and community issues. It should be noted that despite the decrease KHC and KYMS were still regarded as assistance to Main Street communities through education/training, information, and guidance.

Overall this survey identified many positive characteristics and perceptions of the KYMS program that remained steady during each era. It was also beneficial in identifying various negative aspects and challenges shared by participants. The next chapter of this thesis addresses those issues through recommendations. It also takes into consideration the success of the program as evidenced by reinvestment statistics and concludes with thoughts on how KYMS’s past should influence its future.
CHAPTER FOUR
CONCLUSION

The past 35 years have proven KYMS to be an ambitious and innovative Main Street program. Capitalizing on the success of Madison, Indiana, KHC developed and implemented the nation’s first statewide Main Street program. Six years later, they expanded its scope to smaller towns, an idea that was not adopted by NMSC until 1989. During their early years, KHC developed a program emulated by other states and learned from co-existing programs through their partnership with NMSC. In the 1990s, they expanded the reach of KYMS even further by collaborating with Governor Paul Patton to create the Renaissance Kentucky program. While KYMS had already been touted as financially fortunate by the NMSC, this evolution escalated its ability to financially assist Kentucky communities. The Renaissance program spread the principles of Main Street to over a hundred Kentucky communities and spurred reinvestment in many of its downtown business districts. In many ways, this was a great success for KYMS. The increase in the number of participating communities, however, coupled with financial assistance becoming a community’s primary objective moved KYMS in a direction it had not been in before. This situation lead to the KYMS program and many of the struggles it experiences today.

Although the last four years have not been KYMS’s most successful in terms of community participation or funding, they have given KYMS the opportunity reevaluate its structure and its relationship with its communities. As a result of state budget cuts, today’s program is characterized by a small staff and limited funding. Nevertheless, the program has opportunity to grow. In the past year, the KYMS coordinator made strides to return the program to its intended purpose. This includes placing more emphasis on NMSC’s

“National Accreditation Standards of Performance” and combining Main Street workshops and presentations with other KHC events. These changes, while not wholly embraced by all KYMS participants, are creating a stronger KYMS that is more closely aligned with the goals of Main Street than it has been in the past decade. To continue this momentum, KYMS needs to be persistent in its efforts to serve and retain its existing Main Street communities. Following are recommendations to improve KYMS’s current program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Although, the recommendations in this section are broken into various categories, many of them build upon one another. For this reason, recommendations should be considered in reference to each other and as complimentary pieces to a larger plan.

Relationship with Main Street Participants

NMSC’s assessment of KYMS in 2000 highlighted changes in Main Street’s emphasis nationwide. Instead of continuing to focusing only on the development of local managers, NMSC suggested that KYMS nurture relationships with Main Street’s many volunteers. When asked to rank this relationship in 2000, respondents judged the relationship as neutral. When asked the same question in 2013 current program participants provided very similar answers. Some respondents even stated that most communication did not come from the state coordinator but only through the local manager. To address this issue the state coordinator should implement the following recommendations.

Recommendation: The state coordinator should increase communication with the board of directors. He/she should include board directors when sending emails to managers, mailing newsletters, planning conferences and trainings and disseminating any other pertinent information. This practice will help the board directors more fully understand the respon-
sibilities of the local Main Street manager. It will also allow them to stay abreast of Main Street events across the state, ways in which the board can better assist the manager and ideas or solutions being implemented in other communities.

Recommendation: The state coordinator should increase communication with committee chairs. This could be done by creating contact groups or distribution lists and using them to disseminate information on Main Street’s four-points to appropriate committee chairs. This should be used to communicate successful ideas or illicit solutions to common problems. It could also help to inform committee chairs of relevant trainings/presentations across the state.

Increased communication with board directors and committee chairs will not only keep these members informed and involved in KYMS and NMSC’s network, but will strengthen the grassroots component of each Main Street program.

Mentoring Program

There are two categories of communities that could benefit from a mentoring program: communities with new managers and affiliate/struggling communities.

Recommendation: New managers should be paired with a manager from a similar, nearby community. This pairing could be an extension of the existing regional networks. Primarily the mentor should serve as a point of contact for questions and orientation to useful materials. Time could also be set aside for the new manager to “shadow” the mentoring manager for a day.
Additionally, the manager of an affiliate or struggling community could be paired with a manager who has proven success in the other community’s area of weakness. This pairing would consist of less “shadowing” and more problem solving through explanation of successful projects and idea generation.

Both applications will help to strengthen relationships in the KYMS network and to disseminate useful information.

**Assistance- Delivery of Services**

A few respondents mentioned that they could not comment on KYMS’s ability to answer questions and deliver services because they had not requested either.

**Recommendation:** KYMS should encourage every community to take advantage of technical assistance. While this would increase the workload of KYMS and KHC staff members, it would also emphasize the importance of the KYMS office and staff. Early reports quantified requests for assistance from Main Street and non-Main Street communities and used those numbers to justify the expansion of the program throughout the 1980s. By reinstating this procedure, KYMS could numerically justify the need to expand the state KYMS office. KYMS should also encourage communities to attend workshops that provide technical assistance. While workshops should not replace a relationship with KYMS staff, they are an effective way to reach multiple people/communities at once. The number of Main Street staff, board members, volunteers and other participants should be quantified at these events as well.
Training, Workshops, Events

In its past, KYMS has relied on a structure of manager and board trainings to acclimate new participants to the Main Street approach. While many of these events may have been combined with one another or with quarterly managers’ meetings and conferences, they were primarily Main Street only events. In the past year, KHC implemented a four-part conference series incorporating speakers, workshops and training relevant to Main Street participants. Another positive aspect of this series is that each of the four-parts will take place in a different area of the state. This will not only aid KHC in addressing preservation issues specific to different regions, but provides Main Street participants the opportunity to participate without extensive travel.

Recommendation: KYMS and KHC should continue to combine events. They should also continue to use these as opportunities to address and learn from issues taking place in different regions of the state.

Recommendation: KYMS should also revisit the idea of providing a schedule of services. Unlike the schedule used in the late 1980s and 1990s, which targeted new and more mature communities, this schedule could include new, mature and struggling communities. In other words, the schedule would provide a way to address communities that regressed from designated to affiliate. By developing a schedule, KYMS will not only have a defined plan of action, but will be able to better communicate to the community how its weaknesses will be resolved. This may also assist in counteracting the negative responses received from managers when assessed with a low score. (Appendix G contains a schedule of services adapted from Wisconsin’s Main Street program)
**Education/Training vs. Time Constraints**

Some survey respondents commented on the numerous responsibilities of local managers and the inability of one person to accomplish everything. Others commented on the strains of travelling to meetings and workshops, and the time those events take away from being in their community. KYMS has attempted to alleviate these strains through activities like KHC’s four-part conference series and by balancing the required number of training credits with the limited availability of a manager’s time. Some other efforts, however, could be taken. A recommendation made by survey respondents was to use publications as educational material. The next few recommendations emphasis the use of newsletters and online media to better educate managers, board members, volunteers and other Main Street stakeholders.

**Recommendation:** Create a bi-monthly or quarterly newsletter to highlight the program’s accomplishments and events. Features should include successful project, events or rehabilitations, introductions to new managers, tips on grant writing and a calendar of local Main Street events among other topics. It could also be arranged around the four-points with a page/column for successful design, promotions, organization and economic restructuring activities. Each newsletter could incorporate a project that utilized the federal or state historic preservation tax credit, certified local government grants or other sources of financial incentives. This practice would both highlight activity in Main Street districts, services provided through other KHC departments and alternative sources of funding.

The newsletter should be distributed in both hardcopy and digital forms. Hardcopy forms can be sent to managers and board chairmen and used by Main Street participants to communicate to local and state leaders (politicians, business owners, etc.) the positive impact Main Street programs have on Kentucky communities. A digital format should be provided
on KYMS’s website and e-mailed to other Main Street participants (board and committee members). The digital format would greatly increase the newsletter’s reach by making it available to anyone. It could also be integrated into other online media sources such as Facebook and Twitter.

**Recommendation:** KYMS should work with Main Street managers to develop materials targeting property and business owners. The material should emphasize how diversification, promotions and rehabilitations (even small ones) can have large impacts on business. Materials should also take into consideration property owners who do not own the business located in their building or are absent from the community. For example, non-traditional uses for vacant lots or development of upper floor housing. An interesting vacant lot project taking place in the state is “Lots of Possibility” in Louisville. This project type could be used to generate ideas on the use of a vacant lot as well as to involve community members and find out what they would like to see in their downtown.¹¹⁶

**Recommendation:** KYMS should continue to upload past presentations on their website. Currently powerpoints from KYMS’s 2012 winter conference are available online but KYMS should make efforts to update and add to this collection regularly. This will provide a way for Main Street participants to learn remotely. Managers who are unable to attend a special workshop would be able to review the material online. Also, if a participant found the presentation useful they could easily share it with board or community members.

An additional benefit of online materials is that they allow communities to be self-sufficient (Main Street Principle #3) and lessen the demands placed on KYMS. In contrast, while it is important for communities to be self-sufficient, it is also important for the KYMS network

to be strong. Mature managers and communities, while they may have the answers, should still build relationships, participate in events and seek new ideas within KYMS’s network. Online resources should not be considered as a replacement for in person trainings or workshops. They should also not count toward the annual program review’s required number of training credits.

**Additional Funding: Community Services**

This study found that funding provided to communities was beneficial in helping them to accomplish goals and complete projects. It also found that communities began to expect and rely on financial assistance from KYMS and its affiliate organizations. Furthermore, the study found that when funding was provided to communities in the nascent stages of organizational development, specifically the local community’s budget, it achieved greater returns. This indicates that when possible KYMS should supply funds to communities in small, controlled amounts. Even more beneficial is if the amount or grant is associated with a particular use. By acting in this manner, KYMS will be more fiscally responsible by both maximizing the investment’s return and controlling its outcome. A conservative take on grant distribution and use of funds will also decrease the likelihood that communities become dependent on funding.

**Recommendation:** In the case that additional funding becomes available, KYMS should consider paying the NMSC membership dues for new communities. At the time of the NMSC program review in 2000, Wisconsin provided this service to its Main Street communities during their first three years of participation.\(^{117}\) KYMS should consider offering this service for the new program’s first year as a way to invite and acclimate the community.

\(^{117}\) Loescher, 23.
to Main Street. If KYMS choose, it could offer this benefit for longer, two to three years, but should not create a situation where communities expect free membership.

Another option is to set aside funding for managers to attend NMSC’s annual conference. KYMS should choose select communities, two to four, and pay the registration fees for the conference. While this would not cover all conference expenses, it would provide an opportunity for more managers to attend the national conference. If implemented, the selection process should take into consideration whether or not a community’s manager has been to the conference before or the length of time since a community was able to send its manager. This option could also be limited to only designated communities. Further criteria should be added depending on the demand for this amenity.

Working Effectively with Local Programs

The number of communities participating in KYMS is above the national average and the number of staff members is below the national average.118 Not only does KYMS currently differ from these norms, it is in violation of NMSC requirements. Part of the NMSC Coordinating Program Membership Agreement states:

“Accept only the number of local programs that the Coordinating Program Member can realistically serve in a quality manner. This requires Coordinating Program Members to not exceed the recommended staff to local program ratio of 10 programs per 1 full-time equivalent employee.”119

118 “2013 Fall Coord Survey,” National Main Street Center.
119 “National Main Street Center, INC. Coordinating Program Membership Agreement,” National Main Street Center, 3.
Renaissance Kentucky and the additional staff available through the Renaissance Alliance made it possible for KYMS to meet NMSC requirements in the past. Today, however, the balance between communities and full-time employees is far from meeting national standards.

**Recommendation:** Hire additional staff. As funding allows, KYMS should strongly consider hiring more personnel to assist communities, make onsite visits, coordinate meetings and conferences, conduct annual reviews, maintain/update website, contribute to newsletter, etc. At its highest level, the KYMS staff consisted of a state coordinator, assistant coordinator and assistance from the staff architect. For a period of time, it was also assisted by an economic development specialist. In 2000, the NMSC suggested the KYMS staff include: State Coordinator, Assistant State Coordinator, Renaissance Kentucky Alliance Specialist, Small Business/Economic Restructuring Specialist, Marketing/Information Specialist, and an Administrative Assistant.\(^\text{120}\) Although the Renaissance Kentucky Alliance Specialist position is no longer relevant, the other positions suggested are still applicable to KYMS.

Expansion of the current KYMS staff would be extremely advantageous to the implementation of other recommendations made in this document. The first position added should be the assistant state coordinator. To obtain the most from this position, the person hired should be knowledgeable of the Main Street program, able to assist with onsite visits, and provide training and technical assistance. Depending on the employee’s skill set, it may be advantageous to combine this position with the marketing/information specialist position. This would increase their responsibilities to include the development of marketing materials, newsletters and online media.

\(^{120}\) Loescher, 20.
The NMSC report suggested the small business/economic restructuring specialist as a first priority based on KYMS community needs in 2000. KYMS should conduct further assessment of its current program to determine what specialist position would be the most beneficial today. By hiring two additional staff members, an assistant coordinator and a specialist, and continuing to rely on part-time assistance from the staff architect, the NMSC ratio of “10 programs per 1 full-time equivalent employee” would allow for approximately 35 local programs. This is still less than the current number of communities, but much more compatible than the current ratio of one and a half full-time employees to nearly 50 communities.

To even out the ratio of staff to communities, care should also be taken in accepting and evaluating new communities.

**Recommendation:** Although enthusiastic communities with documented resources and support should not be discouraged from joining KYMS, the state coordinator should take care to ensure that size of the program is not more than the staff can manage. In today’s situation efforts should not be made by KYMS to recruit new communities. Instead the program should focus on strengthening its current communities.

One way KYMS can do this is to focus on resolving current community issues through training and community education. Survey respondents voiced that community members did not always see the value of the Main Street program. For this reason, efforts should be taken to increase the value of the program.
Assistance- Technical and Financial

The 1991 assessment found that many communities valued financial assistance over technical assistance. This was also a theme in NMSC’s assessment in 2000 and the thesis survey.

**Recommendation:** KYMS should emphasize that the services they offer to Main Street communities are not always offered for free in other states. This reality can be instilled by creating a list of services and typical costs paid to state offices. The annual Main Street Coordinating Program Survey provides a list of states that do and do not charge for services. KYMS could use this information to create a comparison of costs in different states. While many participants from past eras may continue to lament the loss of funding, KYMS should emphasize the financial benefit of this free assistance to new Main Street managers, board members, etc. The longevity of this assistance should also be emphasized. Unlike grants, which are quickly exhausted, technical assistance and knowledge can be applied infinitely.

**Recommendation:** Although KYMS’s provision of no-cost services is one of its greatest benefits, they should investigate the positive and negative impacts of charging for services. As part of the investigation, KYMS could conduct an assessment of what services to charge for and reasonable price ranges. They could accomplish this through a survey of Main Street participants and by studying other state programs. This is a suggestion that KYMS should put ample thought into before implementing due to participant’s existing financial concerns.

**Marketing KYMS**

**Recommendation:** Strengthen the KYMS brand. In 2013, the KYMS state coordinator updated KYMS’s logo by changing it from brown to blue, a color more reflective of the
bluegrass state. This is a great start to improving KYMS’s image, but should be continued. One tactic that will assist in branding KYMS is to create its own webpage. The current webpage is a part of KHC’s website and primarily contains KHC’s branding. The updated logo is included in the center of the page below KHC’s banner and menu, but essentially both brands are competing for viewer’s attention. There are also options under “Main Street/Certified Local Governments” on the left side navigation bar that lead to more information but most is contained on the first page.

By creating a new webpage, accessible from KHC’s site, KYMS will be able to create a website that is more informative and relevant to KYMS’s program. Currently all information pertaining to KYMS’s history and starting a program are on the main page with digital resources located in a column to the right. Tabs to the left direct you to participating communities, the certified local government program, design assistance and a past student technology leadership program. These categories should be refined and given their own tabs on either a horizontal or vertical navigation bar. Tabs should include home, about us/history, participating communities, resources, services, upcoming events, affiliate programs/links etc. The only service currently promoted by the website is design assistance. The availability of past presentations is a plus but they should be given their own page and accompanied by a short description of their content. They should also be updated more often. Two state Main Street programs that should be used as examples are Heritage Ohio and Illinois Main Street.\textsuperscript{121} Both of their websites display a cohesive brand and are informative.

\textsuperscript{121} Heritage Ohio’s Main Street Webstie: http://www.heritageohio.org/programs/ohio-main-street-program/ and Illinois Main Street’s Website: https://www2.illinois.gov/dceo/mainsreet/Pages/default.aspx
Annual Program Evaluation Reports/Familiarity with Communities

Each state conducts its annual program evaluations in a slightly different manner. Some, for example, visit the community and interview participants in order to assess their activity. Others, like Kentucky, rely on the submission of forms and other printed material. The Wisconsin Schedule of Services outlined two-day program assessment visits every two years. While this procedure is effective in providing insight into the community’s operation and success, it is a very intangible assessment.

Recommendation: KYMS should adopt a schedule of services including visits as a way of familiarizing themselves with each community. Since being hired, the current state coordinator, Kitty Dougoud, has attempted to visit all current KYMS communities. In some cases these visits have allowed her to familiarize herself with the Main Street district, manager, board and community, but at other times it has been limited to only one or two of those aspects. A schedule should be set that allows the state coordinator to better experience each community and gain more knowledge about its particular situation or issues. While two-day visits may not be possible (especially with only one full-time staff member), the majority of one-full day should be devoted to each town.

Recommendation: Take measures to involve the board and committee members in visits. These measures could include coordinating visits with board meetings or encouraging the community to organize a breakfast/lunch for participants. This would create a social setting in which the state coordinator could meet with participants in a less formal, more friendly setting. A Main Street participant should also give the state coordinator a tour of the town. The tour could be used to discuss positive and negative aspects of the district and changes the program has implemented or wishes to pursue in the future.

Loescher, 24.
Alternative Recommendation: If time does not permit the state coordinator to visit all communities, priority should be given to those that are new or affiliate status. In the case of communities that slip from designated to affiliate, the state coordinator should find time to visit the community and meet with its staff, board, committees, city officials or other community constituents. Before the meeting, the state coordinator should review the program’s annual evaluation and highlight the areas of greatest concern. The local manager should also create a list of issues. The meetings should focus on issue resolution and clearly communicating to the manager why their community received the score they did.

Improvement of Annual Program Evaluation Scores

When submitting 2013 annual reports, many KYMS communities fell short in the area of “Active Board & Committees.” This section of the Program Evaluation Report highlights the need for Main Street boards to document activity in each of the four-points through regular meetings, completed projects and other activity as evidenced by meeting minutes. The primary reason communities did not receive points in this category was the absence of committee minutes in their re-certification documents.

Recommendation: The KYMS Annual Letter of Commitment for both certified and affiliate communities states “this board must meet on a regular basis and maintain meeting minutes.” The form also states that they “maintain and document working committees” but does not stipulate that committees keep minutes. Although minor, a clause should be added/edited requiring committee meeting minutes to be kept. For example, “maintain and document through meeting minutes working committees that meet on a regular basis...” While the requirements of certification are made known through other mediums.

123 2013 Year-End Program Evaluation Report (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Main Street Program, 2013), 5.
as well, the inclusion of this statement in the Letter of Commitment can serve to hold communities accountable.

**Further Research**

A finding of this study was that reinvestment did not change predictably from year to year but rather was influenced by increases in the reinvestment of one community or one category.

**Recommendation:** KYMS should continue to monitor reinvestment statistics and to ask themselves “what made this year’s reinvestment higher/lower than last year’s,” or “where is reinvestment coming from?” Rehabilitations, new construction, developers, individuals or local governments? Although this information will be at first reflective, it will provide direction for KYMS going forward. For example, knowledge that most reinvestment stemmed from private property owners rehabbing commercial spaces would be a good reason for KYMS and KHC to develop a workshop on working with property owners versus working with developers. Knowledge that most reinvestment stemmed from new construction would be reason to promote the importance of design guidelines in historic districts and architectural review boards.

The survey also revealed that, although participants view the absence of funding as an issue, they see the effectiveness of the local manager as a key to success. In past years, some communities have struggled with high turnover in management positions, but why? Was the job unsatisfactory, did the board fail to provide proper direction or assistance, did the manager simply desire to live closer to family?
Recommendation: KYMS should conduct a study to determine what causes management turnover. For example, did managers leave due to the discontinuation of the program, were they forcibly removed, promoted within local government or hired by another Main Street community? This study would aid in both retaining and hiring better suited managers. It would need to be an ongoing process and could be conducted by KYMS or in conjunction with NMSC.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

KYMS has proven itself as an asset to Kentucky Communities. Despite changes in funding, the availability of resources and diminishing staff levels, communities still desire to be a part of KYMS. A large contributor to this appeal is the reinvestment KYMS can document within its communities. As chapter two discussed, every year of the KYMS program is characterized by millions of dollars of reinvestment in Main Street districts. Although the NTHP founded the Main Street program to promote the preservation of our country’s historic downtowns, it also encourages new construction and public improvements to take place in these districts. This holistic perspective, which strives to improve all facets of downtown, is an integral piece of the Main Street program’s success. Along with reinvestment, Kentucky’s Main Street districts also experienced net increases in jobs and businesses. In our often unpredictable economy it is reassuring to know that jobs are still being created and projects are still taking place. Furthermore, these projects, jobs and businesses result in increased tax revenue from the purchase of materials, payment of salaries and increase in property value. Additionally, when communities make an effort to reverse decline, the result is new confidence in the downtown’s economic future. More people begin acquiring buildings and investing in those they already own.

The reinvestment statistics collected by KYMS from 1986 to 2012 are proof of preservation and improvement in Kentucky’s Main Street communities. While the data’s
increases and decreases can be associated with changes in era, they do not exhibit a strong relationship with total reinvestment per community. This distinction is important because the Renaissance era was characterized by drastic growth in the number of participating communities. To consider total reinvestment only as a whole and without taking the number of communities both participating and reporting into consideration gives the impression that Renaissance Kentucky was more successful than other eras. However, teasing the data apart and considering reinvestment per community shows that although more communities were improved the dollar amount of improvement per community was not significantly changed. The average reinvestment per community for each era was between $3,962,545 and $4,571,976, a difference of $609,431. The highest average represents Renaissance Kentucky, which bodes well for this era. An ANOVA test, however, deemed the range of data too closely related to determine era as the cause for change. This indicates that regardless of KYMS era, communities reinvest similar amounts in their Main Street district annually.

A second analysis explored the relationship between total reinvestment and the amount of grants distributed to Main Street communities. This portion found that as more grants were invested in Main Street communities the return on those investments decreased. During the Expanded program, the return on grants ranged from $196 to $1114. In contrast, most ratios of return during the Renaissance program fell below $50. Renaissance’s highest return was $232. These results indicate that as more funding was provided to Main Street districts it produced less effect per dollar. However, an aspect that this ratio negates is whether or not the reinvestment would have occurred otherwise. Although, the Renaissance era displayed the lowest return on investment, it is important to note that the program’s focus was not on generating more reinvestment but rather on making projects possible through financial assistance. On the other hand, the salary assistance grants distributed during the first two eras of the program were about strengthening local Main Street
organizations and catalyzing their effectiveness. In this sense, these eras each accomplished what they intended to do. The comparison also indicates, however, that the state can achieve a higher return on investment when it distributes modest amounts to assist the operation of Main Street organizations.

Chapter three utilized a survey to compared the different eras of the KYMS program. While many positive aspects and perspectives emerged, there were also a number of negative opinions expressed. The most vocal of these opinions focused on differences between the Renaissance and Current program and the associated decline in funding. The eight principles outline, however, that communities be self-sufficient, build community partnerships and pursue incremental, sometimes small, projects. NMSC’s ten standards of performance provide insight into the needs and suggested organization of local Main Street programs, including reasonable budgets and funding sources. Unlike the focus of Renaissance Kentucky, neither of these sources suggest local programs can or should rely on a state office for funding.

While communities welcomed KYMS’s provision of grants from the program’s beginning until 2009, it has never been an NMSC requirement that state programs offer grants. Regardless of funding level, KYMS has consistently provided other services ranging from technical assistance and site visits to an extensive network of individuals with a shared passion for downtown revitalization. The program has also shown positive results and continued reinvestment in our state’s historic communities. As KYMS evolves into the future it should continue to promote these accomplishments. It should also continue to develop new ideas, provide assistance to communities, bring resources (people, ideas and funding) together and be a catalyst for revitalization in Kentucky.
APPENDIX A

ANNUAL EVALUATION/REINVESTMENT FORMS
1988-1989 Bi-annual Report Form

CITY: ________________________________

POPULATION: ________________________

LOCAL SPONSOR: ____________________

PROGRAM BEGAN: ____________________

BOARD CHAIRMAN: ___________________

MAIN STREET MANAGER: _______________

(Following information cumulative since program began)

NUMBER OF BUILDINGS RENOVATED: _______

NUMBER OF JOBS CREATED: _____________

NUMBER OF NEW BUSINESSES: ___________

AMOUNT OF NEW INVESTMENT: ___________

(Following information since January 1988)

TOTAL NUMBER OF SITE VISITS: __________

TYPES OF VISITS/NUMBER OF EACH TYPE: ________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL AND DESIGN ASSISTANCE: __________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

FY 1989 FUNDING:

KHC ___________ City ___________ County ___________

Other (Specify) ______________________  _______________

Total: __________________________

FY 1990 FUNDING:

KHC ___________ City ___________ County ___________

Other (Specify) ______________________  _______________

Total: __________________________
ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ORGANIZATION: ____________________________


ACCOMPLISHMENTS/PROMOTION: ____________________________


ACCOMPLISHMENTS/DESIGN: ____________________________
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ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ECONOMIC RESTRUCTURING: ________________________

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
KENTUCKY MAIN STREET PROGRAM
1996 REINVESTMENT REPORT

CITY______________________________

Number of new businesses opened _____  Number of jobs created _____
Number of business expansion_____  Number of additional jobs _____
Number of businesses closed _____  Number of jobs lost _____

Amount invested in new business expansions $________
Amount invested in new business $________

Number of major building rehabilitation _____
Amount invested in major building rehabilitation (private $) $________

Number of facade renovations _____
Amount invested in facade renovations $________

Number of minor building improvement projects (signs, paint, etc) _____
Amount invested in minor building improvements $________

Number of new buildings constructed _____
Amount invested in new building construction $________

Number of public improvement project (completed in 1996) _____
Number of public improvement projects (begun in 1996, still in progress in '97) _____

Amount invested in 1996 in public improvement projects $________
Percent of total, public funds _____%  
Percent of total, private funds _____%  

Number of new housing units_____  
Number of Investment Tax Credit Projects _____
2001 Annual Reinvestment Report Form

KENTUCKY MAIN STREET PROGRAM
2001 REINVESTMENT REPORT
ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

CITY/PROGRAM NAME

YEAR PROGRAM BEGAN

PERSON SUBMITTING DATA

DATE SUBMITTED

Number of jobs created (+)  Number of new businesses opened (+)
Number of jobs lost (-)    Number of businesses closed (-)
Number of additional jobs (+)  Number of businesses expanded (+)
Job total for year (*)     Business total for year (*)

Amount invested in new business expansions Amount invested in new business
Number of major building rehabilitations
Amount invested in major building rehabilitations (private $)
Number of façade renovations Amount invested in façade renovations
Number of minor building improvement projects (sign, paint, etc.)
Number of new buildings constructed Amount invested in new building construction (+)
Number of public improvement projects (completed in 2001)
Number of public improvement projects begun previous year and carried over
Amount invested in 2001 in public improvement projects (+)
Total reinvestment (private + new + public) $ (*)
Number of new housing units Number of tax credit projects
2001 FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION/SALARY SURVEY RESPONSES

Program Name________________________________________

Section 1
Organization/Contribution Information
How long has your organization been established (3 years, etc.) ________

What is the organization's annual budget for this year? ________

Please list the annual contributions you receive from each:

City government________ County government________
Chamber of Commerce________ Economic Development________
Local Tourism Tax________ City/County government________
Dues________ Contributions________
In kind________ Other (please list)________

How many years experience has your current Executive Director have as a Main Street manager? ______

Is this person full time ____ part time____ Main Street Full time Economic Development

What are your required hours? ________ What is the typical number of overtime hours each week? ______

What is the current salary for this person? ______

Please check all benefits offered to this person:

Comp time____ Over time____
Paid vacation____ if so, please list number of weeks ______
Paid health insurance____ Paid dental____
Paid retirement____ 401K________ None____
Other, please list________
2004 Annual Reinvestment Report Form

KENTUCKY MAIN STREET PROGRAM
2004 REINVESTMENT REPORT
ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

CITY/PROGRAM NAME

YEAR PROGRAM BEGAN

PERSON SUBMITTING DATA

DATE SUBMITTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of jobs created (+)</th>
<th>Number of new businesses opened (+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs lost (-)</td>
<td>Number of businesses closed (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of additional jobs (+)</td>
<td>Number of businesses expanded (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job total for year (=)</td>
<td>Business total for year (=)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount invested in new business expansions _______ Amount invested in new business _______

Number of major building rehabilitations _______

Amount invested in major building rehabilitations (private $) _______ (+)

Number of façade renovations _______ Amount invested in façade renovations _______

Number of minor building improvement projects (sign, paint, etc.) _______

Number of new buildings constructed _______ Amount invested in new building construction _______ (+)

Number of public improvement projects (completed in 2004) _______

Number of public improvement projects begun previous year and carried over _______

Amount invested in 2004 in public improvement projects _______ (+)

Total reinvestment (private + new + public) $ _______ (=)

Number of new housing units _______ Number of tax credit projects _______

The Kentucky Main Street Program
the Kentucky Heritage Council, 300 Washington Street Frankfort, KY 40601
502.564.7005 - fax 502.564.5820
http://www.heritage.ky.gov
2004 FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION/SALARY SURVEY RESPONSES

Program Name

Section 1
Organization/ Contribution Information
How long has your organization been established (3 years, etc.)

What is the organization’s annual budget for this year?

Please list the annual contributions you receive from each:

City government
County government
Chamber of Commerce
Economic Development
Local Tourism Tax
City/County government
Dues
Contributions
In kind
Other (please list)

Section 2
Personnel Information
How many years experience has your current Executive Director have as a Main Street manager?

Is this person full time part time

What are your required hours?

What is the typical number of overtime hours each week?

What is the current salary for this person?

Please check all benefits offered to this person:

Comp time
Over time
Paid vacation
if so, please list number of weeks
Paid health insurance
Paid dental
Paid retirement
401K
None
Other, please list
## 2011 Main Street Reinvestment Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mayor - name |  |
| email address |  |
| phone number |  |
| fax number |  |
| mailing address - street address |  |
| mailing address - city, state and zip |  |

### Organization

#### Contact Information

| Main Street Manager - name |  |
| email address |  |
| phone number |  |
| fax number |  |
| mailing address - street address |  |
| mailing address - city, state and zip |  |

| Board Chair - name |  |
| email address |  |
| phone number |  |
| fax number |  |
| mailing address - street address |  |
| mailing address - city, state and zip |  |

| Organization Committee Chair - name |  |
| email address |  |
| phone number |  |
| fax number |  |
| mailing address - street address |  |
| mailing address - city, state and zip |  |

| Economic Restructuring Chair - name |  |
| email address |  |
| phone number |  |
| fax number |  |
| mailing address - street address |  |
| mailing address - city, state and zip |  |

| Design Committee Chair - name |  |
| email address |  |
| phone number |  |
| fax number |  |
| mailing address - street address |  |
| mailing address - city, state and zip |  |

| Promotion Committee Chair - name |  |
| email address |  |
| phone number |  |
| fax number |  |
| mailing address - street address |  |
| mailing address - city, state and zip |  |
### Reinvestment statistics

Submit reinvestment statistics for Main Street/Renaissance District | 2010 statistics
---|---
City Population | 
Total number of jobs in district | 
Number of jobs created | 
Number of jobs lost | 
Net change for year | 
Total number of businesses in district | 
Number of businesses opened | 
Number of businesses closed | 
Net change for year | 
Number of businesses expanded | 
Number of building rehabilitations (including façade projects) | 
Amount invested in building rehabilitations | 
Of above building rehabilitations - Number of façade projects | 
Amount invested in façade projects | 
Number of new buildings constructed | 
Amount invested in new bldg construction | 
Number of public improvement projects | 
Amount invested in public improvement projects | 
$ value of private investment spent in above projects: i.e., individuals or private sources of $ spent on bldg rehabs, public improvements, or new | 
$ value of public investment spent in above projects: i.e., city, county, state, or federal $ spent on bldg rehabs, public improvements, or new construction | 
Average $/sqft rent in commercial district (on monthly basis) | 
Total reinvestment | 
Number of new housing units in downtown | 
Number of historic rehabilitation tax credit projects | 

### Program statistics

Program's annual operating budget | 2010 statistics
---|---
Number of volunteer hours for the program |
APPENDIX B

2006 NATIONAL MAIN STREET PROGRAM ACCREDITATION AND REPORTING FORM, AND STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE
2006 NATIONAL MAIN STREET PROGRAM ACCREDITATION EVALUATION FORM
TO BE COMPLETED BY THE STATE, CITYWIDE OR COUNTYWIDE COORDINATING PROGRAM BY APRIL 14, 2006

Please complete one form for ALL of your affiliated/designated programs.

State: ___________________ City/Town Name: __________________________

Organization Name: _____________________________________________

Local Organization Status Information:
Year this organization became a designated program: ______________
Status of the organization:

X Currently active and a designated program within my system.

☐ Currently inactive but still considered a designated program within my system.

☐ No longer a designated program within my system.
Please remove from the Center’s designated list.
(Please choose one response below)
☐ However, they are still an active organization
☐ They have completely stopped functioning.

National Accreditation Evaluation:

Programs must meet all ten minimum standards of performance below for recognition. See attached
“Guidelines for National Program evaluation” for details of criteria. Must be based on performance through end of
year 2005.

1. Has broad-based community support for the commercial district revitalization process, with strong support from both the public and private sectors.

2. Has developed vision and mission statements relevant to community conditions and to the local Main Street program’s organizational stage.

3. Has a comprehensive Main Street work plan

4. Possesses an historic preservation ethic

5. Has an active board of directors and committees

6. Has an adequate operating budget

7. Has a paid professional executive director

8. Conducts a program of ongoing training for staff and volunteers

9. Reports key statistics

10. Has current membership in the National Trust’s National Main Street Network membership program

This program: ☐ meets / ☐ does not meet the criteria for certification as a
Nationally Accredited Main Street Program.

________________________________________   __________________________
Signature of evaluator                                     Date
Background on the National Main Street Accreditation Program

What is the National Main Street Accreditation program?
The National Main Street Accreditation process evaluates established commercial district revitalization programs on the basis of ten basic performance standards, and provides national recognition to those that meet these standards. The ten performance standards provide benchmarks and guidelines on how the organization should be functioning and an incentive to organizations to perform better and be more effective.

Goals
The goals of the National Main Street Accreditation program is to provide standards of performance for established Main Street organizations and recognize those that meet those standards. Overall goals are:

- to provide national and local visibility to Main Street programs which understand and fully utilize the four-point Main Street approach and eight Main Street principles and which continue to evolve organizationally to meet new challenges;
- to provide national standards for performance for Main Street programs; and
- to provide realistic goals and a tangible incentive for local Main Street programs which do not yet meet the criteria for national recognition.

A Tool for Main Street Programs
These ten performance standards are important for Main Street organizations, as they provide a benchmark and guidelines on how the organization should be functioning. They are also meant to provide an incentive to organizations to challenge them to perform better and be more effective.

Benefits of National Main Street Program Recognition
The benefits of being recognized as an Nationally Accredited Main Street Program are meant to reward organizations and provide attention within their community. Designees receive a certificate, and a special press release to be used locally to promote their designation. Those that attend National Main Streets Conference from the community receive a special ribbon for their name badge. Nationally Accredited Main Street Programs are also listed on the National Trust Main Street Center's website. However, the ultimate benefit is a much stronger and better functioning organization.

Timeframe
This designation is annual, and evaluation is based upon the organization's current activities and structure, as well as performance during the past year. Organizations must be re-evaluated each year. Those organizations that do not submit the application by the deadline will have to wait for the 2007 year application cycle. Applicants will be notified within 30 days of their status, and those attending National Main Streets Conference will receive a special ribbon in their registration packet.
NATIONAL MAIN STREET PROGRAM
STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR RECOGNITION

Guidelines for National Program Evaluation

1. Has broad-based community support for the commercial district revitalization process with strong support from both the public and private sectors:
   
   Background: At its best, a local Main Street program represents and involves a coalition of organizations, agencies, businesses, and individuals from throughout the community -- not just those who own property or businesses in the commercial district or who have a direct economic tie to it, but all members of the community who are interested in the community's overall health.
   Involvement by both the public and private sectors is critical, as well; neither sector can revitalize the commercial district without the skills and vantage points of the other.
   
   Ideally, both sectors will participate in the revitalization process by providing funding, leadership, and ideas, and by encouraging collaboration between existing programs to assist the revitalization process. By actively involving a broad range of interests and perspectives in the revitalization process, the Main Street program leverages the community's collective skills and resources to maximum advantage. The overall goal is for a broad range of constituencies from both sectors to understand and be philosophically committed to the revitalization process and, to that end, to commit the maximum resources possible to achieve the goal of revitalizing the commercial district.

   Guidelines:
   
   - The Main Street organization should have the active participation of a wide cross section of the community at the committee and board levels, including such constituents as:
     - local government
     - regional planning groups
     - realtors
     - property owners
     - business owners
     - local industries
     - financial institutions
     - transportation authorities
     - developers
     - civic groups
     - community development organizations
     - consumers
     - churches, temples, religious institutions
     - historic preservation organizations
     - school groups and students
     - architects and building contractors
     - parking authorities
     - district/neighborhood residents

   - Participants should contribute financial, in-kind, and volunteer support for the revitalization program.

   - Participants should also look for, and act on, opportunities to make connections between other programs with which they are involved and the Main Street revitalization effort so that, by doing their own work a little smarter, or in a better integrated way, other programs help further the revitalization process.

   - The program should include an ongoing process for volunteer recruitment, orientation and recognition, constantly refreshing its pool of volunteers and involving new volunteers each year.

   - The downtown revitalization program has broad-based philosophical support from the community.

   - Municipal government demonstrates a philosophical commitment to downtown revitalization.
2. Has developed vision and mission statements relevant to community conditions and to the local Main Street program's organizational stage.

**Background:** A mission statement communicates the Main Street organization's sense of purpose and overall direction. A vision statement communicates the organization's long-term hopes and intentions for the commercial district. Both should be developed with broad participation by the board, committees, program volunteers and community input.

**Guidelines:** Some revitalization programs begin with a vision statement; others develop a vision statement after several years of work. At a minimum, the Main Street organization should have a mission statement in place, reviewed annually (and updated, if appropriate). If the organization does not have a vision statement at the beginning of the revitalization process, it should develop one prior to the organization's transition from the catalyst phase to the growth phase.

- The organization has an appropriate written mission statement.
- The mission statement is reviewed on an annual basis and updated as appropriate.
- The organization has an appropriate written vision statement.

3. Has a comprehensive Main Street work plan:

**Background:** A comprehensive annual work plan provides a detailed blueprint for the Main Street program's activities, reinforces the program's accountability both within the organization and also in the broader community; and provides measurable objectives by which the program can track its progress.

**Guidelines:**

- The work plan should contain a balance of activities in each of the four broad program areas that comprise the Main Street approach -- design, organization, promotion, and economic restructuring.
- The work plan should contain measurable objectives, including time lines, budgets, desired outcomes, and specific responsibilities.
- The work plan should be reviewed, and a new work plan developed, annually.
- Ideally, the full board and committees will be involved in developing the annual work plan. At a minimum, though, the full board should adopt/approve the annual work plan.
- The work plan should distribute work activities and tasks to a broad range of volunteers and program participants.
- There has been significant progress in each of the four points based on the work plan submitted last year.

4. Possesses an historic preservation ethic:

**Background:** Historic preservation is central to the Main Street program's purpose. The historic buildings and public spaces of a traditional commercial district enrich civic life and add value -- on many levels -- to the community. Developing a historic preservation ethic is an ongoing process of education and discovery for a community and for a local Main Street program. Main Street programs
which have embraced a strong historic preservation ethic are successful in saving, rehabilitating, and finding new uses for traditional commercial buildings and in intensifying the uses of the district's buildings, through both specific building improvement projects and through policy and regulatory changes which make it easier to develop property within the commercial district.

Some Main Street programs purport to support preservation values, but do not fully understand that preservation is an ethic, not just an activity or group of activities. Historic preservation involves not only the process of rehabilitating, restoring, or renovating older commercial buildings but also the process of adopting planning and land use policies which encourage full use of existing commercial centers before new development takes place, removing the regulatory and other barriers which sometimes make it difficult to attract investment to historic commercial districts.

**Guidelines:**

The program has, or is working towards putting in place, an active and effective design management program (which may include financial incentives, design assistance, regulatory relief, design review, education, and other forms of management).

- The program has, or is working toward putting in place, an active and effective design management program (which may include financial incentives, design assistance, regulatory relief, design review, education, and other forms of management).
- The program encourages appropriate building renovation, restoration and rehabilitation projects.
- When faced with a potential demolition or substantial structural alteration of a significant, historic, or traditional building in the Main Street district, the program actively works to prevent the demolition or alteration, including working with appropriate partners at the state, local, or national level to attempt to stay or alter the proposed activity; developing alternative strategies for the property's use; and/or educating local leaders about the importance of retaining existing buildings and maintaining their architectural integrity.
- The program works to find creative adaptive use, financing, and physical rehabilitation solutions for preserving old buildings.
- The program recognizes the importance of planning and land use policies which support the revitalization of existing commercial centers and works towards putting planning and land use policies in place which make it as easy (if not easier) to develop property within the commercial district as it is outside the commercial district. Similarly, it ensures that financing, technical assistance and other incentives are available to facilitate the process of attracting investment to the historic commercial district.
- The program builds public awareness for the commercial district's historic buildings and for good design.

5. **Has an active board of directors and committees:**

**Background:** Main Street revitalization is an ongoing process of changing a community's attitudes about its traditional commercial district(s). The direct involvement of an active board of directors and committees is key to this process. The Main Street director is responsible for facilitating the work of volunteers, not for single-handedly revitalizing the commercial district. In some areas, and in communities of some sizes, local Main Street programs have been launched by or have merged with other organizations which have a broader agenda (such as a chamber of commerce or a community development corporation). A local Main Street program in one of these circumstances has a better chance of long-term success if it maintains focus on its particular purpose and if its mission statement, work plan, budget, and governing body remain distinct from that of the larger organization in which it is contained.
Guidelines:
- The board is a working, functional board that understands its roles and responsibilities and is willing to put forth the effort to make the program succeed.
- Committee members assume responsibility for the implementation of the work plan.
- The program has a dedicated governing body, its own rules of operation, its own budget, and its own bylaws, and is empowered to carry out Main Street’s mission, even if the Main Street program is a part of a larger organization.
- The board has well-managed, regular monthly meetings, with an advance agenda and regular distribution of minutes.
- Committees have regularly scheduled monthly meetings with an advance agenda that addresses the committee work plan.

6. Has an adequate operating budget:
**Background:** In order to be successful, a local Main Street program must have the financial resources necessary to carry out its annual and evolving program of work. The size of a program’s budget will change as the program matures (in its early years, it may need less money than in its growth years). Also, program budgets are likely to vary according to regional economic differences and community size.

Guidelines:
- The Main Street program’s budget should be adequate to achieve the program’s goals.
- The budget should be specifically dedicated for the purpose of revitalizing the commercial district.
- The Main Street program’s budget should contain funds adequate to cover the salary and fringe benefits of staff, office expenses; travel; professional development; and committee activities.
- The dollar amount that is “adequate” for a program budget may vary from region to region, depending on local costs of living, and may be different for small-town, mid-size, and urban Main Street programs. General guidelines for minimum operating budgets are:
  - *small town programs*: $30,000+ annually
  - *mid-size community programs*: $45,000+ annually
  - *urban neighborhood programs*: $80,000+ annually
- Revenue sources are varied and broad-based, including appropriate support from municipal government.
- There is a strategy in place to help maintain stable funding.
- There is a process in place for financial oversight and management.
- Regular monthly financial reports are made by the treasurer to the board.

7. Has a paid, professional executive director.
**Background:** Coordinating a successful Main Street program requires a trained, professional staff person. While Main Street directors come from a broad range of academic and professional backgrounds, the most successful executive directors are those who are good communicators; who
can motivate volunteers; and who have good project management skills, being able to keep the revitalization program's many activities moving forward on schedule and within budget. In most instances, the Main Street executive director's position is full-time (generally 40+ hours per week). In small towns without the resources to hire a full-time executive director, a part-time director is usually acceptable (generally 20+ hours per week).

Guidelines:
- The Main Street executive director should be paid a salary consistent with those of other community development professionals within the city, state or region in which the program operates.
- The minimum amount of time the Main Street executive director works each week should be consistent with comparable Main Street programs in the city, state or region.
- The executive director should be adequately trained -- and should continue learning about revitalization techniques and about issues affecting traditional commercial districts.
- The executive director has a written job description that correlates with the roles and responsibilities of a Main Street director.
- There is a formal system in place for evaluating the performance of the executive director on an annual basis.
- Adequate staff management policies and procedures are in place.

8. Program of ongoing training for staff and volunteers:

Background: In order to meet new challenges and ensure a strong organization, Main Street program participants need ongoing training. Participants -- both staff and volunteers -- need different skills in different phases of the revitalization process; for that reason, the skills a program's participants learn in the program's catalyst phase are rarely adequate for the growth or management phases. As staff and volunteer turnover occurs, new staff members and new volunteers will need basic Main Street training. And, all program participants should stay current on issues that affect traditional commercial districts and on new revitalization techniques and models.

Guidelines: The local Main Street program develops local leadership capacity through such mechanisms as:
- Taking advantage of citywide, state, regional and national training opportunities.
- Making reference and training materials available locally -- and using them; and
- Providing/conducting training when appropriate, including annual Main Street 101 training, annual orientation for board members, and annual committee training.

9. Reports key statistics:

Background: Tracking statistics -- reinvestment, job and business creation, and so on -- provides a tangible measurement of the local Main Street program's progress and is crucial to garnering financial and programmatic support for the revitalization effort. Statistics must be collected on a regular, ongoing basis.

Guidelines:
The program collects and tallies statistics related to the revitalization movement, using the baseline criteria listed below. It should keep this data from year to year, providing an economic record of the program's impact over the course of its history. This information is distributed regularly to constituents and in the annual report.

**Baseline Data Should Include:**

| Community Population: |  |
| Net of all gains and losses in jobs: |  |
| Net of all gains and losses in new businesses: |  |
| Number of building rehabilitation projects: |  |
| Number of public improvement projects: |  |
| Number of new construction projects: |  |
| Number of housing units created: upper floor or other |  |
| $ Value of Private investment spent in above projects:  
  i.e., individuals or private sources of $ spent on bldg. rehabs, public improvements, or new construction. |  |
| $ Value of Public investment spent in above projects:  
  i.e., city, county, state or federal $ spent on bldg. rehabs, public improvements, or new construction. |  |
| $ Value Total of all investment: add public and private investment |  |
| Ground-floor vacancy rate when your program started |  |
| Ground-floor vacancy rate now |  |
| Rental rate per square foot when program started |  |
| Rental rate per square foot now |  |
| Your program's annual operating budget |  |

10. **Current member of the National Trust's National Main Street Network membership program:**

**Background:** Participation in the National Main Street Network membership program connects local programs to their counterparts throughout the nation, providing them with valuable information resources.

**Guideline:**

- The program is a current member of the National Trust's National Main Street Network Membership program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Name</th>
<th>Year Program Began</th>
<th>The Beginning Year Program</th>
<th>Expanded Program</th>
<th>Renaissance Kentucky/Renaissance on Main</th>
<th>Current Program</th>
<th>Years of Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbourville</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardstown</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Dam</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beattyville</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellvue</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berea</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandenburg</td>
<td>1986*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadiz</td>
<td>1986*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbellsville</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrollton</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverport</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbin</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>1982*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland, Benham, and Lynch</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthiana</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson Springs</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabethtown</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkhorn City</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkton,Geithre, Trenton</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eminence</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger/Elsombere</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: For some years Managers lists/directories were used, and for other years reinvestment excel sheets were used. The Managers lists/directories provide a more holistic source for communities participating in the program. Reinvestment sheets only reflect communities that submitted reinvestment statistics and do not indicate programs that were only involved in Renaissance Kentucky, or did not submit reinvestment statistics for a given year. No managers list or excel sheet was available for 1998. Instead only the reinvestment totals were provided. To estimate the number of communities participating in that year, the communities that had programs in both 1998 and 1999 were counted. The managers list/directories provide a more holistic source for communities participating in the program. Reinvestment sheets only reflect communities that submitted reinvestment statistics and do not indicate programs that were only involved in Renaissance Kentucky, or did not submit reinvestment statistics for a given year. No managers list or excel sheet was available for 1998. Instead only the reinvestment totals were provided. To estimate the number of communities participating in that year, the communities that had programs in both 1998 and 1999 were counted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Name</th>
<th>Year Program Began</th>
<th>The Beginning</th>
<th>Expanded Program</th>
<th>Renaissance Kentucky/Renaissance on Main</th>
<th>Current Program</th>
<th># of Yrs Participating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Falmouth</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flemingsburg</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfort</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Thomas</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensburg</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenup</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthrie</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlan</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrodsburg</td>
<td>1986*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>1987*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindman</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgenville</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkinsville</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Cave</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyden</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffersontown</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffersonville</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGrange</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrenceburg</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludlow</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madisonville</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Name</td>
<td>Year Program Began</td>
<td>The Beginning</td>
<td>Expanded Program</td>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky/Renaissance on Main</td>
<td>Current Program</td>
<td># of Yrs Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maysville</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesboro</td>
<td>1987*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehead</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morganfield</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Sterling</td>
<td>Prior to 1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Vernon</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Washington</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munfordville</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholasville</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Hill</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owensboro</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owingsville</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paducah</td>
<td>Prior to 1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paintsville</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perryville</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikeville</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pineville</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestonsburg</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>1986*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russellville</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadieville</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salersville</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsville</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelbyville</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>1986*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylorsville</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Name</td>
<td>Year Program Began</td>
<td>The Beginning</td>
<td>Expanded Program</td>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky/Renaissance on Main</td>
<td>Current Program</td>
<td># of Yrs Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompkinsville</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanceburg</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versailles</td>
<td>1987*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vine Grove</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Point</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickliffe</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsburg</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamstown</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmore</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating Main Street Communities</td>
<td>5 5 5 6 8 8 16 23 22 28 28 30 29 29 27 34 40 40 40 43 44 62 63 101 95 94 94 71 73 66 63 71 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources:

- Alexander, Nancy, Kentucky Small Towns Program (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council, 1985); Kentucky Heritage Council, Kentucky Main Street Program (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council, 1985).
- Kentucky Heritage Council, Main Street Kentucky: 1992-1993 Kentucky Main Street Towns (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council, 1994).
- Kentucky Heritage Council, Kentucky Housing Corporation, Report to the Governor (Frankfort: KY, 2001).
- Kentucky Heritage Council, Kentucky Main Street Communities Program Coordinators Directory (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council).
- Kentucky Heritage Council, 1996 KY Main Street Manager Directory (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council).
- Kentucky Heritage Council, 1997 KY Main Street Manager Directory (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council).
- Kentucky Heritage Council, 1998 Kentucky Main Street Communities Program Coordinators Directory (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council).
- Kentucky Heritage Council, 1995 Kentucky Main Street Communities Program Coordinators Directory (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council).
- Kentucky Heritage Council, 1999 Kentucky Main Street Communities Program Coordinators Directory (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council).
- Kentucky Heritage Council, 2000 Kentucky Main Street Manager Directory (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council).
- Kentucky Heritage Council, 2001 Kentucky Main Street Manager Directory (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council).
- Kentucky Heritage Council, Kentucky Main Street Programs Local Reinvestment 1992-1993 (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council).
- Kentucky Heritage Council, 2002 "REINVEST STATS" excel sheet (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Heritage Council); communities that participated in both 2001 and 2003 were also added to this total.
APPENDIX D
REINVESTMENT STATISTICS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Jobs Created</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>2966</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Businesses Opened</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>607</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>2966</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Improvements</td>
<td>$ 6,015,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 6,748,589</td>
<td>$ 15,746,707</td>
<td>$ 27,138,451</td>
<td>$ 14,306,716</td>
<td>$ 11,282,772</td>
<td>$ 17,006,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldgs Rehabbed</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Public Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>607</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>2966</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ Invested in Bldg Rehabs (and façade projects for 2008 to 2012)</td>
<td>$12,380,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10,023,084.00</td>
<td>$23,387,196.00</td>
<td>$8,664,301</td>
<td>$7,873,650</td>
<td>$5,894,100</td>
<td>$37,890,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Facades Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ Invested in Façade Projects</td>
<td>$522,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$218,685.00</td>
<td>$510,265.00</td>
<td>$383,955</td>
<td>$945,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldgs Rehabs + Façade Projects (years 1994 to 2007 do not include façade projects)</td>
<td>$19,341,820</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15,884,955</td>
<td>$37,064,895</td>
<td>$19,546,082</td>
<td>$26,842,703</td>
<td>$5,894,100</td>
<td>$37,890,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Private Investment (new business, business expansion, signage, minor building improvement etc.)</td>
<td>$6,439,120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,643,186</td>
<td>$13,167,434</td>
<td>$10,497,826</td>
<td>$18,023,253</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Improvements (sum of bldg rehabs, façade projects, other private investment if specified)</td>
<td>$19,341,820</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15,884,955</td>
<td>$37,064,895</td>
<td>$19,546,082</td>
<td>$26,842,703</td>
<td>$5,894,100</td>
<td>$37,890,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Improvements (reported by KYMS)</td>
<td>no total given</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,894,100</td>
<td>$37,890,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>$18,885,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$11,935,800</td>
<td>$27,850,200</td>
<td>$9,245,000</td>
<td>$28,670,000</td>
<td>$5,378,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$44,242,220</td>
<td>$34,429,193</td>
<td>$34,489,506</td>
<td>$34,569,344</td>
<td>$80,661,802</td>
<td>$55,929,533</td>
<td>$69,819,419</td>
<td>$22,555,049</td>
<td>$79,092,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reinvestment (reported by KYMS)*</td>
<td>$44,242,220</td>
<td>$34,429,193</td>
<td>$34,489,506</td>
<td>$34,569,344</td>
<td>$80,661,802</td>
<td>$59,101,029</td>
<td>$69,846,671</td>
<td>$22,555,049</td>
<td>$79,092,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>Number of Programs Reporting Statistics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment of KHC in MS communities (Grants)</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment (Total Reinv/Grants)</td>
<td>$368.69</td>
<td>$286.91</td>
<td>$329.47</td>
<td>$256.07</td>
<td>$597.49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$196.13</td>
<td>$688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KyMS Budget</td>
<td>$460,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$267,733</td>
<td>$267,733</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment (Total Reinv/Budget)</td>
<td>$96.18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$129.12</td>
<td>$301.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative MS communities' budgets</td>
<td>$495,375</td>
<td>$645,345</td>
<td>$645,961</td>
<td>$1,155,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment (Total Reinv/Community Budgets)</td>
<td>$89.31</td>
<td>$53.35</td>
<td>$67,325,281.25</td>
<td>$29,927,5764</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td>- Statistics for 1988 &amp; 1989, and 1992 &amp; 1993 were reported only as cumulative numbers for both years. To obtain totals for each year individually, the cumulative numbers were divided based on the number of communities reporting statistics for each year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 1991's reinvestment totals were determined by subtracting 1990's total from the cumulative 1990 and 1991 total. Since 1990's reinvestment equaled 30% of the cumulative total, the subcategories were divided into 30% for 1990 and 70% for 1991.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Jobs Created (including additional jobs)</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Businesses Opened (including business expansions)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Improvement Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Public Improvements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ Public Improvements</td>
<td>$56,965,250</td>
<td>$17,202,876</td>
<td>$25,806,958</td>
<td>$51,198,279</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$31,445,267</td>
<td>$24,877,768</td>
<td>$40,440,900</td>
<td>$56,852,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Bldgs Rehabbed</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Facades Projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ Invested in Facade Projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg Rehabs + Façade Projects (years 1994 to 2007 do not include façade projects)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ Other Private Investment (new business, business expansion, signage, minor building improvement etc.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ Private Improvements (sum of bldg rehabs, façade projects, other private investment if specified)</td>
<td>$35,146,386</td>
<td>$36,566,292</td>
<td>$21,394,650</td>
<td>$13,216,433</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$28,743,234</td>
<td>$12,707,048</td>
<td>$30,295,124</td>
<td>$89,695,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ Private Improvements (reported by KYMS)</td>
<td>$35,146,386</td>
<td>$36,566,292</td>
<td>$21,394,650</td>
<td>$13,216,433</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$28,743,234</td>
<td>$12,707,048</td>
<td>$30,295,124</td>
<td>$89,695,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ New Construction</td>
<td>$20,154,239</td>
<td>$74,370,257</td>
<td>$16,416,789</td>
<td>$23,859,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$47,666,760</td>
<td>$9,244,500</td>
<td>$150,071,486</td>
<td>$148,541,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ Total Reinvestment (sum of public improvements, private improvements, new construction)</td>
<td>$112,265,875</td>
<td>$128,139,425</td>
<td>$63,618,397</td>
<td>$88,273,712</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$107,855,261</td>
<td>$46,829,316</td>
<td>$220,807,510</td>
<td>$295,090,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ Total Reinvestment (reported by KYMS)*</td>
<td>$112,265,875</td>
<td>$128,139,425</td>
<td>$62,618,397</td>
<td>$88,273,712</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$107,855,261</td>
<td>$46,829,316</td>
<td>$220,807,510</td>
<td>$295,090,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Programs Reporting Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment of KHC in MS communities (Grants)</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment (Total Reinv/Grants)</td>
<td>$976</td>
<td>$1,114</td>
<td>$545</td>
<td>$767.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$937.87</td>
<td>$407.21</td>
<td>$1,920.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KyMS Budget</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$230,400</td>
<td>$174,000</td>
<td>$125,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment (Total Reinv/Budget)</td>
<td>$374.22</td>
<td>$427.13</td>
<td>$208.73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$203.25</td>
<td>$1,269.01</td>
<td>$2,347.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative MS communities' budgets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment (Total Reinv/Community Budgets)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Jobs Created (including additional jobs)</strong></td>
<td>2186</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Businesses Opened (including business expansions)</strong></td>
<td>383</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># Public Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ Public Improvements</strong></td>
<td>$36,707,521</td>
<td>$69,383,808</td>
<td>$31,394,591</td>
<td>$128,562,493</td>
<td>$115,826,908</td>
<td>$352,354,968</td>
<td>$62,437,190</td>
<td>$29,122,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># Bldgs Rehabbed</strong></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ Invested in Bldg Rehabs (and façade projects for 2008 to 2012)</strong></td>
<td>$51,200,228</td>
<td>$127,983,338</td>
<td>$416,635,359</td>
<td>$64,361,818</td>
<td>$42,118,604</td>
<td>$40,255,456</td>
<td>$71,253,419</td>
<td>$39,913,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># Facades Projects</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ Invested in Façade Projects</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,642,993</td>
<td>$2,259,340</td>
<td>$2,119,716</td>
<td>$3,004,634</td>
<td>$2,893,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bldg Rehabs + Façade Projects (years 1994 to 2007 do not include façade projects)</strong></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ Other Private Investment (new business, business expansion, signage, minor building improvement etc.)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ Private Improvements in MS Communities</strong></td>
<td>$51,200,228</td>
<td>$127,983,338</td>
<td>$416,635,359</td>
<td>$140,148,769</td>
<td>$223,163,904</td>
<td>$71,253,419</td>
<td>$39,913,132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ Invested in Façade Projects for 2008 to 2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ Private Improvements (sum of bldg rehabs, façade projects, other private investment if specified)</strong></td>
<td>$51,200,228</td>
<td>$127,983,338</td>
<td>$416,635,359</td>
<td>$64,361,818</td>
<td>$42,118,604</td>
<td>$40,255,456</td>
<td>$71,253,419</td>
<td>$39,913,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ New Construction</strong></td>
<td>$61,190,338</td>
<td>$94,821,968</td>
<td>$172,633,600</td>
<td>$155,681,371</td>
<td>$273,220,305</td>
<td>$400,934,250</td>
<td>$64,552,327</td>
<td>$68,881,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ Total Reinvestment (sum of public improvements, private projects in MS Communities)</strong></td>
<td>$149,098,087</td>
<td>$292,189,114</td>
<td>$620,663,550</td>
<td>$348,605,682</td>
<td>$431,165,817</td>
<td>$793,544,674</td>
<td>$198,242,936</td>
<td>$137,917,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ Total Reinvestment (reported by KYMS)</strong></td>
<td>$149,098,087</td>
<td>$292,189,114</td>
<td>$620,663,550</td>
<td>$350,649,922</td>
<td>$466,849,857</td>
<td>$177,605,148</td>
<td>$129,512,869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Programs Reporting Statistics</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment of KHC in MS communities (Grants)</strong></td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Investment (Total Reinv/Grants)</strong></td>
<td>$620,663,550.00</td>
<td>$350,649,921.55</td>
<td>$466,849,857.00</td>
<td>$177,605,148.29</td>
<td>$129,512,868.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KyMS Budget</strong></td>
<td>$131,800.00</td>
<td>$138,900.00</td>
<td>$133,400.00</td>
<td>$135,200.00</td>
<td>$71,100.00</td>
<td>$71,300.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Investment (Total Reinv/Budget)</strong></td>
<td>$1,131.24</td>
<td>$2,103.59</td>
<td>$4,652.65</td>
<td>$2,048.03</td>
<td>$2,593.56</td>
<td>$6,566.10</td>
<td>$2,490.96</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative MS communities’ budgets</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,416,020</td>
<td>$4,706,215</td>
<td>$4,760,443</td>
<td>$3,204,281</td>
<td>$3,244,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Reinvestment Ratios**

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Investment (Total Reinv/Community Budgets)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50.44</td>
<td>$74.51</td>
<td>$98.07</td>
<td>$55.43</td>
<td>$39.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX E

TOTAL REINVESTMENT AND OUTLIERS
As the largest city in Kentucky, Louisville does not represent the typical Main Street community. Among other differences, this urban municipality reinvested higher amounts in its Main Street district. In some years, this amount greatly overshadowed other reinvestment in the state. This chart shows a comparison of total reinvestment with and without Louisville’s contribution in 2007 and 2010. In these two years, Louisville contributed 47.2 percent and 65.9 percent, respectively, to KYMS’s total reinvestment. The line displaying reinvestment without Louisville’s large contributions is indicative of the KYMS program without Louisville’s participation.
Similar to the last chart, this chart shows total reinvestment with and without the outliers identified in table 2.2. In some years, such as 2004, more than one community contributed a large percentage of total reinvestment. Those years display the range of activity taking place in Main Street districts. Although many communities have not experienced large reinvestment totals, table 2.2 displays that they occur in more than one community. This also highlights the urbanization of KYMS, which allowed any Kentucky community to join as well as the urbanization and growth of the state.
APPENDIX F
TOTAL REINVESTMENT ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION
Total Reinvestment Adjusted for Inflation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Reinvestment</th>
<th>Total Reinvestment with Inflation</th>
<th>Inflation Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986/87</td>
<td>$37,280,900</td>
<td>$75,347,456</td>
<td>102.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>$34,429,193</td>
<td>$66,819,409</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>$43,489,506</td>
<td>$80,523,626</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$28,707,473</td>
<td>$50,428,948</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$66,984,103</td>
<td>$112,915,918</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$45,047,752</td>
<td>$73,718,415</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$50,850,366</td>
<td>$80,795,425</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$22,555,049</td>
<td>$34,942,672</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$79,092,230</td>
<td>$119,154,209</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$112,265,875</td>
<td>$164,280,251</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$128,139,425</td>
<td>$183,302,449</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$63,618,397</td>
<td>$89,609,830</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$88,273,712</td>
<td>$121,651,348</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Reinvestment adjusted for inflation (2012 dollars) and total reinvestment unadjusted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Reinvestment</th>
<th>Total Reinvestment with Inflation</th>
<th>Inflation Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$107,855,261</td>
<td>$139,903,507</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$46,829,316</td>
<td>$59,765,036</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$220,807,510</td>
<td>$275,522,171</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$295,090,547</td>
<td>$358,660,768</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$149,098,087</td>
<td>$175,279,192</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$292,189,114</td>
<td>$332,762,239</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$620,663,550</td>
<td>$687,273,331</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$267,564,609</td>
<td>$285,324,537</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$348,390,582</td>
<td>$372,841,921</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$464,730,141</td>
<td>$489,322,657</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$174,600,514</td>
<td>$178,213,785</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$126,618,921</td>
<td>$126,618,921</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inflation percentage for each year (1987-2012) with adjusted and unadjusted total reinvestment.
APPENDIX G
SURVEY RESULTS
APPENDIX F: PART 1

Survey Results- All Responses

Notes:

• Questions with numerical answers (year, 1-5, etc.) are quantified as an average.

• After each question the number of respondents is noted in parentheses.

• After each qualitative response the respondent’s era of participation is indicated in parentheses. B = Beginning, EP = Expanded Program, RK = Renaissance Kentucky, CP = Current Program.

• A comparison of the NMSC survey conducted in 2000 and the survey conducted for this thesis is provided in the columns titled “2000” and “2013” respectively.

Question One:

How many years were you involved with the Kentucky Main Street Program? (28) 7.2

Question Two:

In which of the following time periods were you involved? In what capacity? (28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants Characterized by Era and Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Expanded Program**                      | **Current Program**      |
| Community Manager                         | Community Manager        |
| Board Member                              | Board Member             |
| Committee Member                          | Committee Member         |
| Volunteer                                 | Volunteer                |
| Total                                     | Total                    |
| 4                                        | 25                       |
Question Three:

As you answer the next few questions, please take into consideration the entire time you were or have been affiliated with KYMS. (Respondents were given the options not at all, some, neutral, well, and very well. For analysis, responses were given numerical values with 1 being “not at all” and 5 being “very well”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.  How well has KYMS established an effective working relationship with your local Main Street staff? (28)</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.  How well has KYMS provided training opportunities for local staff? (28)</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.  How well has KYMS established an effective working relationship with your local Main Street board of directors? (28)</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.  How well has KYMS provided training for board and committee members? (27)</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.  How well has KYMS provided information to board and committee members about services, training, and meetings open to volunteers? (28)</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.  How well has KYMS understood local program issues? (28)</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.  How responsive has KYMS been to your requests for assistance? (27)</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.  How helpful has the KYMS’s advice to the local Main Street program been? (27)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.  How well has KYMS delivered services to your community as promised? (27)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.  How well has KYMS disseminated pertinent and timely information? (27)</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.  Are there any other specific ways KYMS has been effective or ineffective in supporting your Main Street community? (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- During the “Renaissance KY” years, our town received several grants that were applied for by the local MS program. There has been no grant money available
for several years so the KYMS has not directly benefitted our town much in recent years. (RK, CP)

- Good communication (CP)

- These questions are really relative to the Main Street Director. The Director when I was in office did not communicate very well. A good Main Street Director is pertinent to this being a successful program. (RK)

- More analysis of each “individual” community not as a whole. (B, EP, RK, CP)

- Not extremely familiar with KYMS. (CP)

- KYMS has had a visible presence in our community, thanks to repeated visits by Kitty. The statewide program is limited, however, by the lack of funding to deliver grants-in-aid and technical assistance to local programs like ours. We also tend to get left out and overlooked across the Board by all state agencies because we are in the extreme corner of the state. Thankfully, Kitty has been the most responsive and helpful partner we’ve had in state.gov. thus far. (CP)

- The effectiveness has diminished drastically in the last year with respect to responsiveness, delivery of services and dissemination of pertinent/timely information. Additionally, when grant funding was available there was more interest on the part of our community for actively participating in the KYMS Program. We’re becoming very disinterested at this point, which is very unfortunate because we’ve seen more more revitalization success in recent years. (RK, CP)

- On site visits for design assistance, attended regional meetings with managers. (RK, CP)

- Community visit to support funding program when threatened. (EP, RK, CP)

- We are different from most Main Street Communities in that we’re a business association/mini-Chamber of Commerce in Kentucky’s largest city, Louisville, so we don’t get, nor have we asked for much in the way of assistance; other than
a grant for our oral history project coordinator, which is now being made into podcasts by students in UL’s Digital History Class. (RK, CP)

- Design assistance has been a big help. (RK, CP)
- The way KYMS communicates with our board is through the director. They have been willing to assist with facilitating a board retreat but do not have communication directly with our board or community officials. (CP)
- I haven’t really requested much support from KYMS so I can’t say much about how effectively they would respond. (CP)
- KYMS has been very helpful to our program’s success in obtaining and applying historic easements to 11 properties in our town. (RK, CP)
- As the director of the [redacted], KY program with the KYMS office located here, help was two blocks away from the office. KYMS was always there to assist in all areas when asked. (RK)

Question Four:

As you answer the next few questions, please take into consideration the entire time you were or have been affiliated with KYMS. Please answer the following questions using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being “not at all” and 5 being “very well”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. How successful has your local Main Street program been in helping to</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>create/maintain a healthy downtown area? (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. How committed are local community groups (public and private) to</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuing a revitalization program? (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. What is the likelihood that your local Main Street program will be in</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place three years from now? (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Would you recommend a Main Street program to other communities? (27)</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. If you would like to explain any of your responses please share here. (10)

• Main Street programs that follow the comprehensive four-point approach recommended by the National Trust can be very effective in keeping Main Streets vital. The current approach locally is now focused only on Historic Preservation. Locally, the four-point approach is no longer actually followed, but just given lip service. (RK, CP)

• The Main Street Program is very important even without the available funds that the State previously distributed. The program is valuable in that persons with a dedication and commitment to the downtown can work through ideas that they have for downtown and in some instances make those ideas happen. Therefore, you always have a group of people working to maintain a vital downtown. (RK)

• New director has no clue! (CP)

• Our community will continue with our local Main Street program, but our affiliation with the KYMS Program is not of much significance to us anymore. (RK, CP)

• I was fortunate to be part of the beginning of RENKY. It was a wonderful and dynamic time for Main Street. We were able to do a lot. It appears that support has waned over the years. (RK)

• Never enough man power or funding. Sigh... (CP)

• I’m not 100% sure the community understands or maybe doesn’t care about revitalization of our downtown. Those in public office or private stakeholders certainly understand revitalization! (CP)

• I think that the Main Street program works well in some communities but may not in all. At 40,000 population + it may require more resources and staff than in smaller communities, in my opinion. (CP)

• We are a “tiny” town, but MS is helping to bring business, tourism and a com-
munity spirit to our town. (RK, CP)

• has a long-time mayor that is not favorable toward downtown revitalization unless his vision is accepted as the only vision (RK)

Question Five:

How satisfied are or were you with KYMS during the following periods? (Respondents were given the choices very satisfied, satisfied, not satisfied, and NA. For analysis the responses were given numerical values, with 1 being “not satisfied” and 3 being “very satisfied”. “NA” responses were excluded.)

Note: Some respondents answered this question in regards to all eras, as opposed to only answering for the era they were involved in. Responses that did not correspond with a participant’s eras of involvement were removed.

The Beginning (2) 3.00
The Expanded Program (4) 2.50
Renaissance Kentucky (15) 2.47
Current Program (19) 2.10

If you would like to explain any of your responses, please share here.

• Ineffective leadership currently at both the local and state level. (RK and CP)

• I was not involved in the beginning, but my husband and co-owner of the business was very involved. This was the beginning of a revitalized downtown. Now we still have one of the more vital and more beautiful downtowns in KY. (RK)

• Again, more needs to be done to build up the finances and staff of the state program so it can be a stronger partner with local programs like ours. (CP)

• Renaissance provided funding for communities, but also created confusion among community leaders and others for Main Street. We continue to explain
the differences and what the Renaissance program was. (RK and CP)

• I was not involved with the Main Street program until currently. (CP)

Question Six:
Over time, what have you perceived as the role of the Kentucky Heritage Council and KYMS coordinating office?

• The KYMS should be a resource for Main Street communities. Presently KYMS seems to be dictating to the local communities how the local programs are run without regard to the needs of each individual community. The most recent criteria established for certification of KY Main Street programs announced in the fall seems to be aimed at reducing the number of certified programs rather than encouraging more communities to jump on board. Many communities will lose their certifications due to the more stringent current criteria. It is becoming too expensive to maintain certification and the benefit of doing so does not merit the expense or effort. Our local MS Director does not believe that our MS program will maintain its current certification due to the new criteria. (RK, CP)

• To help main street programs stay true to the historic make up of the town and to help the communities find grants in order to maintain and begin revitalization of their downtown. (RK)

• KHC has been a strong and consistent advocate for preservation. We’ve been fortunate to host senior staff with the KHC on one occasion in the past year. We hope to develop deeper programmatic relationships in the years ahead. The facade improvement technical assistance and tax credit program support has been especially helpful. (CP)

• We’ve viewed the Kentucky Heritage Council and KYMS Coordinator as resources for information, funding, guidance and support of our downtown revi-
talization efforts. We currently view them as a hindrance to our revitalization efforts with an emphasis on busy work. (RK, CP)

- Supporting local Main Street programs with information, training, collaborative opportunities, $$ when available, education on state level as well, what small Main Street communities mean to the fabric of the commonwealth of KY. (RK)
- To assist programs in achieving a strong program and providing training that allows communities, managers, and boards, to become successful programs that lead to the renewed interest in the town and encourages strong economic development opportunities. (RK, CP)
- Training and support for historic preservation and downtown revitalization. (RK, CP)
- To provide leadership and training to both new and seasoned managers. (RK, CP)
- A resource to Main Street Manager, and guidance when information is needed. (CP)
- During my time, KYMS was best at convening the network of program managers, and providing training to program managers. It’s been 13 years since I was last involved so I’m not sure what the current role is. (EP, RK)
- Design help seems #1, ideas related to economic development on down the list. Of course the expertise offered by the office is related mainly toward architecture and landscape design. (RK, CP)
- From what I’ve perceived from the coordinating office is they assist in answering questions from the main street offices, coordinate state meetings, work on policies for Main Street, work with other members of the KY Heritage Council on projects and when budget allows, travel to the communities to better understand them and therefore provide the best info when asked. (CP)
• We were without a SHPO for a number of months and it was a significant problem. It is much better now. (RK, CP)
• Training and certification (CP)
• Leaders in Preservation, Training and Support. (RK, CP)
• advisory, educational, supportive (RK)

Question Seven:
Have you seen the role or management approach of the Kentucky Heritage Council and KYMS coordinating office change over time? (27)

Yes (20)
No (7)

If yes, how has it changed?

• Locally and at the state level there is no longer a true emphasis on the four-point approach recommended by the National Trust’s Main Street Center. Following the four-point approach and the eight principals recommended by the National Trust should result in preservation of historic buildings by improving the vitality of downtowns by, in part, recruiting and supporting a healthy mix of retail businesses, restaurants and services like banking and insurance. Currently the emphasis locally is on historic preservation first rather than on the four-point approach and the eight principals. There is no longer a comprehensive approach. The emphasis locally is now only on historic preservation without a strategy to accomplish this very important goal. That said, I am unaware of any significant historic preservation occurring in our downtown community over the past 6 or 7 years. Having a vital downtown will result in property owners wanting to preserve and maintain historic buildings. (RK, CP)
• at time more government driven vs private sector driven (B, EP, RK, CP)
• No real knowledge of the situation (CP)
• More involved (CP)
• Mostly because I’m new to the scene. I’ve heard about the old days, but can’t speak with authority about them. (CP)
• In previous years, dating back to 1998, the Kentucky Heritage Council and the KYMS Coordinator were viewed by our community as very valuable resources with an understanding, almost empathetic, approach to the Main Street Program. They seemed to be very interested in providing financial resources to communities struggling with downtown revitalization efforts. Their current approach seems more regulatory, or directive, in nature. (RK, CP)
• New leadership has created a level of excellence and excitement in Main Street along with a bit of dread as certification standards are strengthened. Much better communication and in a timely manner than before. (RK, CP)
• Lack of funding has caused a diminished staff. (RK, CP)
• Budget constraints have curtailed much of the statewide training. We have gone from 4 to 2 statewide training meetings. (RK, CP)
• Less involvement - due to funding and lack of staff. (EP, RK, CP)
• It’s been 13 years since I was last involved so I’m not sure what the current role is. (EP, RK)
• The office is short staffed now, as are many offices in the US right now. (RK, CP)
• Management role has changed but not to the assistance to programs. (CP)
• Our tireless 25 year SHPO retired. It was difficult to find a replacement. (RK, CP)
• New staff, different style (CP)
• They are willing to work with us to achieve our goals for preservation. (RK,
• it has weakened as funding has dropped (B)

Question Eight:
Have you seen varying degrees of success in your Main Street program that could be related to shifts in the organization/management of the program by the Kentucky Heritage Council and KYMS coordinating office? (23)

Yes (11)
No (12)
If yes, how so?

• The KYMS program does not provide effective leadership in following the proven four-point approach and eight principals of the National Trust’s approach to keeping Main Streets vital. (RK, CP)
• improved communication (CP)
• I have not had a direct relationship with the KHC. However, I do feel that the local director (and their participation with KHC) is very important, and the quality of the local director certainly makes a difference. (RK)
• The earliest efforts to start a Main Street program in was the 1990’s. Then there was a period of neglect where very little happened. Discover Downtown was formed in 2006 and for several years struggled to get a critical mass of support. In the past 15 months since I’ve been here we’ve gotten increasing regional, statewide, and national attention for our work. This time has largely coincided with new management of the KYMS program. We have enjoyed and appreciated the very cordial and supportive role that the statewide program has provided to our local efforts. (CP)
• I would answer yes, only to the extent that when funding was available there
were increased opportunities for physical improvements as part of our downtown revitalization efforts. We’ve been fortunate enough to secure local funding to assist with those efforts on a relatively on-going basis. Otherwise, I would say our local Main Street Program has weathered many storms and is a stable force in our community for carrying forward with continued downtown revitalization efforts. (RK, CP)

- Not sure but perhaps yes. (RK)
- Communication, or the lack of, has sometimes been a problem. (RK, CP)
- The shift of priorities in the local community away from support of Main Street had more to do with local politics than anything the KHC/KYMS office did. (EP, RK)
- I’ve seen shifts that are more related to state funding, but not so much related to a particular person. (RK, CP)
- There may have been several however, I’ve not been involved at the state level to see how things are handled there. (CP)
- Can’t say that the State program really influences the success of the local program. (CP)
- Willingness to explore various solutions to different projects we have. (RK, CP)
- not enough staff, or stature in state (B)
Question Nine:

Main Street programs face an array of issues, what are some critical issues that your Main Street program has faced?

- Lack of visionary leadership at both the local and state level and lack of funding for the local program. The current Board of Directors of the local MS program are divided and dysfunctional. The local program is paralyzed by in-fighting and a lack of vision or mission. (RK, CP)
- Financial issues, working with other groups (CP)
- Government Support Money Expansion of outlying areas rather than ideas to revitalize what you have. (RK)
- Business development (B, EP, RK, CP)
- Money (CP)
- Funding; involvement from local government (CP)
- We have about $50 million in unmet need for various projects from restoring buildings, to constructing a trail system, and improving our local environment. The economic realities we face are dire too with over 15% unemployment and median household income less than half of the national average. The lack of a coordinated approach from state government - bringing together downtown revitalization, transportation, arts, adventure tourism/trails, ABC, economic development, and others - limits what we are able to accomplish. (CP)
- Absentee ownership and a lack of willingness on the part of some property owners to adequately maintain their properties has been an issue for our Main Street Program. Additionally, many of the property owners have failed to understand how important they and their properties are to the over health and vitality of our entire community. (RK, CP)
- Community education, local government and state government policies that are
not Main Street friendly. (RK)

• funding is always the biggest issue and community education of what the program is and what it does along with what it doesn’t do. (RK, CP)

• The recession of the past 5-8 years. (RK, CP)

• MONEY (RK, CP)

• Politics. No way for one person to fill the manager job, regardless of how strong a board they have. (CP)

• in the areas of economic development and getting people on board with historic preservation. (CP)

• Funding, finding new businesses (EP, RK, CP)

• Our program was an urban site, unlike most of the small towns/rural towns that formed the majority of Kentucky Main Street communities. How the Main Street model can be effective in urban environments is a challenge. (EP, RK)

• Ongoing sprawl. (RK, CP)

• Mainly the community doesn’t know who we are or what we do and we’re a 26 yr old organization. Since I’ve been involved with the program, we haven’t had major issues. (CP)

• Right now, we are having issues with the number of training hours needed to stay in the program. (RK, CP)

• Large area, could use another staff person. Also, could always use more resources. If there were programs that we could access without major administrative work, since we’re already certified, that would be really helpful. (CP)

• Funding (RK, CP)

• lack of support from local citizens and government (RK)
Question Ten:

What services do you think KYMS should provide to address those issues?

- Get back to the basic principals of the National Trust’s Main Street recommended strategies. (RK, CP)
- Communicate creative ideas that help with funding (CP)
- Convincing local and state leaders the importance of maintaining and revitalizing the HEART of local communities. (RK)
- Business understanding (B, EP, RK, CP)
- Outreach to local government (CP)
- More staff members dedicated to working in different areas of the state, perhaps remotely from Frankfort might help. There might even be managers in different areas willing to step up and help to mentor programs in their area. Advocacy for a $1m+ grant program to support building renovation and innovative economic development and creative placemaking activities would help. Lastly, with all the attention paid on Eastern Kentucky presently, having targeted initiatives in this area to use downtown revitalization to create new businesses and jobs would be a smart move. (CP)
- I don’t believe anyone representing the KYMS Program has even visited our community in more than 10 years, so I believe it would be beneficial for them to actually see our community and see first hand what those issues are. Perhaps then, they would understand some of the physical constraints under which we operate and be in a position to conduct regional workshops specifically designed for property owners falling in those categories. If workshops could not be arranged, or if the property owners refused to attend, any publications that could be developed to portray that information would be extremely beneficial. I think those publications would need to be regionally-based, as opposed to
statewide or national in nature. (RK, CP)

• More education, leading policy development, lobbying state government, for Main Street friendly strategies and programs. (RK)
• Continued education and state branding, helping make the name recognized as a sign of excellence. (RK, CP)
• in-service in each of these areas. (CP)
• Not sure (EP, RK, CP)
• Not sure. (EP, RK, CP)
• Time and patience. :) (RK, CP)
• They have helped. (CP)
• Have on-line training opportunities and other programs that do not take us out of our cities. (RK, CP)
• See above. (CP)
• Lobby lawmakers for funding. Which they already do. (RK, CP)

Question Eleven:
If there is any other information you would like to share, comments you would like to make, or suggestions you may have for the management of KYMS going forward feel free to add them below.

• Main Street is a very important component of our community that should be preserved as much as possible. Maintaining the charm and character of historic downtown buildings is important for our community’s image and is an attraction to bring in out of town visitors. A comprehensive approach, as outlined in the National Trust’s four point approach and the eight principals, is an excellent strategy to follow to preserve historic buildings. Focusing only on “historic preservation” is missing the point. Following a comprehensive strategy will
lead to historic preservation. (RK, CP)

- In final analysis, for anyone in community and economic development today, and especially in historic preservation, it is an uphill battle though one worth fighting. As John F. Kennedy said over 50 years ago, “I am certain that after the dust of centuries has passed over our cities, we, too, will be remembered not for victories or defeats in battle or in politics, but for our contribution to the human spirit.” That is as true a statement the time he made it as it is today and will hopefully give courage to those seeking to make stronger downtown areas in the great Commonwealth of Kentucky. (CP)

- I think serious consideration needs to be given to looking at the practices of the current KYMS Program Coordinator. I believe several communities share in this thought and feel as though they’re being weeded out intentionally. (RK, CP)

- As a Main Street Manager for nearly 5 years between 1998 and 2003 it was the MOST FUN job I ever had despite the low pay, crazy hours, and community opposition. It was a very exciting time to be involved with Main Street. Money was flowing and opportunities abounded. And the staff was KY Heritage Council staff was hustling their butts off despite their own wacky brand of dysfunction. They put the FUN in dysfunction! (RK)

- n/a (EP, RK)

- Keep up the good work. (RK, CP)

- For the limited budget the KYMS works with they are doing a great job! They keep us informed on the current events and trends! (CP)

- All in all, Kentucky has a very successful Main Street program with many cities involved. Hope this continues. (RK, CP)

- Main Street is a great program whether you are a small or large community. It
brings a feeling of community and purpose to your town. (RK, CP)
APPENDIX F: PART 2

Survey Results: NMSC Survey vs. Thesis Survey- Current Program

The majority of responses gathered by the thesis survey were reflective of past eras. Those, however, that originated from participants in the current program are not reflective of past eras but of KYMS’s current structure. Responses gathered by NMSC’s survey were also not reflective and offer opinions collected in the early years of Renaissance Kentucky. This section uses responses from non-reflective data sets to compare the Renaissance Kentucky era with the current program. Only questions asked in both surveys will be compared. This excludes questions one, five, seven, eight and eleven of the thesis survey.

Question Two:

NMSC Survey- Renaissance Kentucky

Total Responses: 41

Community Manager: 23  Board Chair: 6
City Manager/Mayor: 9  N/A: 3

Thesis Survey- Current Program

Total Responses: 10*

Community Manager: 6  Board Member: 3
Committee Member: 2  Volunteer: 0

*one respondent served both as a board and committee member.

(Original question/answers can be found in the appendix of “Kentucky Main Street Program Review.”)
Question Three:

As you answer the next few questions, please take into consideration the entire time you were or have been affiliated with KYMS. (Respondents were given the options not at all, some, neutral, well, and very well. For analysis, responses were given numerical values with 1 being “not at all” and 5 being “very well”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Ren.</th>
<th>Current Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. How well has KYMS established an effective working relationship with your local Main Street staff?</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. How well has KYMS provided training opportunities for local staff?</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. How well has KYMS established an effective working relationship with your local Main Street board of directors?</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. How well has KYMS provided training for board and committee members?</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. How well has KYMS provided information to board and committee members about services, training, and meetings open to volunteers?</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. How well has KYMS understood local program issues?</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. How responsive has KYMS been to your requests for assistance?</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. How helpful has the KYMS’s advice to the local Main Street program been?</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. How well has KYMS delivered services to your community as promised?</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions J and K were not a part of the original survey.

(Based on questions 1- 9 of part II “The State Program” of the NMSC survey.)

Question Four:

As you answer the next few questions, please take into consideration the entire time you were or have been affiliated with KYMS. Please answer the following questions using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being “not at all” and 5 being “very well”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Ren. KY</th>
<th>Current Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. How successful has your local Main Street program been in helping to create/maintain a healthy downtown area?</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. How committed are local community groups (public and private) to continuing a revitalization program?</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. What is the likelihood that your local Main Street program will be in place three years from now?</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Would you recommend a Main Street program to other communities?</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question E was not a part of the original survey.

(Based on questions 1- 4 of part I “Local Downtown/Main Street Program” of the NMSC survey.)
Question Six:
Over time, what have you perceived as the role of the Kentucky Heritage Council and KYMS coordinating office?

NMSC Survey- Renaissance Kentucky (summary)
The original question asked by NMSC was: How do you perceive the role of the Kentucky Heritage Council in the Renaissance Initiative at the state level? The responses provided fell into the categories of leadership, advocacy/liaison, partnership, technical expertise, watchdog, staffing issues, communication/education, and other.

A similar question asked only in the original survey was: How do you perceive the local Main Street Program’s role in Renaissance Kentucky, and in receiving local designation as a “Bronze,” “Silver,” or “Gold” community? Responses emphasized Main Street’s role as a leader and partner, but also as duplication. Specific answers stated that “being a Main Street community helped us and was crucial in our Gold status”. Other responses, however, stated that “Renaissance Kentucky has swallowed the MS program” and “MS approach was lost in quest for funds”.

Thesis Survey- Current Program
- na
- a resource to Main Street Manager, and guidance when information is needed.
- From what I’ve perceived from the coordinating office is they assist in answering questions from the main street offices, coordinate state meetings, work on policies for Main Street, work with other members of the KY Heritage Council

1 Doug Loescher; Sheri Stuart, Kentucky Main Street Program Review (Washington, D.C.: National Main Street Center of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2000), 10-11.
on projects and when budget allows, travel to the communities to better understand them and therefore provide the best info when asked.

- Training and certification
- n/a
- KHC has been a strong and consistent advocate for preservation. We’ve been fortunate to host senior staff with the KHC on one occasion in the past year. We hope to develop deeper programmatic relationships in the years ahead. The facade improvement technical assistance and tax credit program support has been especially helpful.

(Based on question 11 of part I “Local Downtown/Main Street Program” of the NMSC survey.)

Question Nine:
Main Street programs face an array of issues, what are some critical issues that your Main Street program has faced?

NMSC Survey- Renaissance Kentucky (summary)
Issues reported by NMSC’s survey include: funding, participation, building restoration, business retention/recruitment, staffing (local), volunteer development, organizational momentum, economic development.

Thesis Survey- Current Program
- financial issues, working with other groups
- Politics. No way for one person to fill the manager job, regardless of how strong a board they have.
- in the areas of economic development and getting people on board with historic
Mainly the community doesn’t know who we are or what we do and we’re a 26 yr old organization. Since I’ve been involved with the program, we haven’t had major issues.

Large area, could use another staff person. Also, could always use more resources. If there were programs that we could access without major administrative work, since we’re already certified, that would be really helpful.

Money

funding; involvement from local government

We have about $50 million in unmet need for various projects from restoring buildings, to constructing a trail system, and improving our local environment. The economic realities we face are dire too with over 15% unemployment and median household income less than half of the national average. The lack of a coordinated approach from state government - bringing together downtown revitalization, transportation, arts, adventure tourism/trails, ABC, economic development, and others - limits what we are able to accomplish.

(Based on question 5 of part I “Local Downtown/Main Street Program” of the NMSC survey.)

Question Ten:
What services do you think KYMS should provide to address those issues?

NMSC Survey- Renaissance Kentucky (summary)

Suggested services reported by NMSC’s survey include: technical assistance, information from other communities (share ideas, case studies), state outreach/networking, funding,
and additional staff (state), training and education, communication, and guidance.

Thesis Survey- Current Program

• communicate creative ideas that help with funding
• in-service in each of these areas.
• They have helped.
• See above.
• outreach to local government
• More staff members dedicated to working in different areas of the state, perhaps remotely from Frankfort might help. There might even be managers in different areas willing to step up and help to mentor programs in their area. Advocacy for a $1m+ grant program to support building renovation and innovative economic development and creative placemaking activities would help. Lastly, with all the attention paid on Eastern Kentucky presently, having targeted initiatives in this area to use downtown revitalization to create new businesses and jobs would be a smart move.

(Based on question 6 of part I “Local Downtown/Main Street Program” of the NMSC survey.)
APPENDIX F: PART 3

Survey Results- Comparison of Eras

For this portion, only data collected from respondents who participated in only one era will be assessed. Although this narrows the amount of data available, it allows me to isolate opinions that are based on one KYMS era. This isolation allows me to better compare the different eras.

Question One:

How many years were you involved with the Kentucky Main Street Program? (15)

- Beginning (1) 3
- Expanded Program (0) 0
- Renaissance Kentucky (4) 5.25
- Current Programs (10) 3.35

Question Two:

In which of the following time periods were you involved? In what capacity? (16)

- Beginning (1)
  - Community Manager (1) Board Member (0)
  - Committee Member (0) Volunteer (0)
- Expanded Program (0)
  - Community Manager (0) Board Member (0)
  - Committee Member (0) Volunteer (0)
- Renaissance Kentucky (4)
  - Community Manager (2) Board Member (2)
  - Committee Member (0) Volunteer (0)
Question Three:
As you answer the next few questions, please take into consideration the entire time you were or have been affiliated with KYMS. (Respondents were given the options not at all, some, neutral, well, and very well. For analysis the responses were given numerical values, with 1 being “not at all” and 5 being “very well”.

A. How well has KYMS established an effective working relationship with your local Main Street staff? (15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Program (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky (4)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Programs (10)</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. How well has KYMS provided training opportunities for local staff? (15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Program (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky (4)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Programs (10)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. How well has KYMS established an effective working relationship with your local Main Street board of directors? (15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Program (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky (4)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Programs (10)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. How well has KYMS provided training for board and committee members? (14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Program (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky (4)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Programs (9)</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. How well has KYMS provided information to board and committee members about services, training, and meetings open to volunteers? (15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Program (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky (4)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Programs (10)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. How well has KYMS understood local program issues? (15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Program (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky (4)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Programs (10)</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. How responsive has KYMS been to your requests for assistance? (14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Program (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky (3)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Programs (10)</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. How helpful has the KYMS’s advice to the local Main Street program been? (14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Program (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky (3)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Programs (10)</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. How well has KYMS delivered services to your community as promised? (14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Program (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky (4)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Programs (10)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. How well has KYMS disseminated pertinent and timely information? (14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Program (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky (3)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Programs (10)</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K. Are there any other specific ways KYMS has been effective or ineffective in supporting your Main Street community? (7)

Beginning (0)

Expanded Program (0)

Renaissance Kentucky (2)

- As the director of the **KY program** with the KYMS office located here, help was two blocks away from the office. KYMS was always there to assist in all areas when asked.

- These questions are really relative to the Main Street Director. The Director when I was in office did not communicate very well. A good Main Street Director is pertinent to this being a successful program.
Current Program (5)

- Good communication
- The way KYMS communicates with our board is through the director. They have been willing to assist with facilitating a board retreat but do not have communication directly with our board or community officials.
- I haven’t really requested much support from KYMS so I can’t say much about how effectively they would respond.
- Not extremely familiar with KYMS
- KYMS has had a visible presence in our community, thanks to repeated visits by Kitty. The statewide program is limited, however, by the lack of funding to deliver grants-in-aid and technical assistance to local programs like ours. We also tend to get left out and overlooked across the Board by all state agencies because we are in the extreme corner of the state. Thankfully, Kitty has been the most responsive and helpful partner we’ve had in state government thus far.

Question Four:

As you answer the next few questions, please take into consideration the entire time you were or have been affiliated with KYMS. Please answer the following questions using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being “not at all” and 5 being “very well”.

A. How successful has your local Main Street program been in helping to create/maintain a healthy downtown area? (14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Program (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky (4)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Programs (9)</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. How committed are local community groups (public and private) to continuing a revitalization program? (14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Program (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky (4)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Programs (9)</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. What is the likelihood that your local Main Street program will be in place three years from now? (14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Program (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky (4)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Programs (9)</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Would you recommend a Main Street program to other communities? (14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Program (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky (4)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Programs (9)</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. If you would like to explain any of your responses please share here. (7)

Beginning (0)

Expanded Program (0)

Renaissance Kentucky (3)

- [Redacted] has a long-time mayor that is not favorable toward downtown revitalization unless his vision is accepted as the only vision.

- The Main Street Program is very important even without the available funds that the State previously distributed. The program is valuable in that persons with a dedication and commitment to the downtown can work through ideas that they have for downtown and in some instances make those ideas happen. Therefore, you always have a group of people working to maintain a vital downtown.

- I was fortunate to be part of the beginning of RENKY. It was a wonderful and dynamic time for Main Street. We were able to do a lot. It appears that support has waned over the years.

Current Program (4)

- Never enough man power or funding. Sigh...

- I’m not 100% sure the community understands or maybe doesn’t care about revitalization of our downtown. Those in public office or private stakeholders certainly understand revitalization!

- I think that the Main Street program works well in some communities but may not in all. At 40,000 population + it may require more resources and staff than in smaller communities, in my opinion.

- New director has no clue!
Question Five:
How satisfied are or were you with KYMS during the following periods? (Respondents were given the choices very satisfied, satisfied, not satisfied, and NA. For analysis the responses were given numerical values, with 1 being “not satisfied” and 3 being “very satisfied”. “NA” responses were excluded.) (15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Beginning (1)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Expanded Program (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Kentucky (4)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Program (10)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you would like to explain any of your responses, please share here. (4)

Beginning (0)
Expanded Program (0)
Renaissance Kentucky (1)

• I was not involved in the beginning, but my husband and co-owner of the business was very involved. This was the beginning of a revitalized downtown. Now we still have one of the more vital and more beautiful downtowns in KY.

Current Program (3)

• na
• I was not involved with the Main Street program until currently.
• Again, more needs to be done to build up the finances and staff of the state program so it can be a stronger partner with local programs like ours.
Question Six:

Over time, what have you perceived as the role of the Kentucky Heritage Council and KYMS coordinating office? (9)

- Beginning (0)
- Expanded Program (0)
- Renaissance Kentucky (3)
  - advisory, educational, supportive
  - To help main street programs stay true to the historic make up of the town and to help the communities find grants in order to maintain and begin revitalization of their downtown.
  - Supporting local Main Street programs with information, training, collaborative opportunities, $$ when available, education on state level as well, what small Main Street communities mean to the fabric of the commonwealth of KY.
- Current Program (6)
  - na
  - a resource to Main Street Manager, and guidance when information is needed.
  - From what I’ve perceived from the coordinating office is they assist in answering questions from the main street offices, coordinate state meetings, work on policies for Main Street, work with other members of the KY Heritage Council on projects and when budget allows, travel to the communities to better understand them and therefore provide the best info when asked.
  - Training and certification
  - n/a
  - KHC has been a strong and consistent advocate for preservation. We’ve been fortunate to host senior staff with the KHC on one occasion in the past year. We hope to develop deeper programmatic relationships in the years ahead. The
facade improvement technical assistance and tax credit program support has been especially helpful.

Question Seven:
Have you seen the role or management approach of the Kentucky Heritage Council and KYMS coordinating office change over time? (14) If yes, how has it changed? (7)

Beginning (1)
Yes (1) No (0)
• it has weakened as funding has dropped

Expanded Program (0)
Yes (0) No (0)

Renaissance Kentucky (3)
Yes (2) No (1)
• Not applicable to me.

Current Program (10)
Yes (5) No (5)
• Management role has changed but not to the assistance to programs. (CP)
• New staff, different style (CP)
• No real knowledge of the situation (CP)
• More involved (CP)
• Mostly because I’m new to the scene. I’ve heard about the old days, but can’t speak with authority about them. (CP)
Question Eight:

Have you seen varying degrees of success in your Main Street program that could be related to shifts in the organization/management of the program by the Kentucky Heritage Council and KYMS coordinating office? (11) If yes, how so? (8)

Beginning (1)

Yes (1) No (0)

• not enough staff, or stature in state

Expanded Program (0)

Yes (0) No (0)

Renaissance Kentucky (2)

Yes (2) No (0)

• I have not had a direct relationship with the KHC. However, I do feel that the local director (and their participation with KHC) is very important, and the quality of the local director certainly makes a difference.

• Not sure but perhaps yes.

Current Program (8)

Yes (2) No (6)

• improved communication

• There may have been several however, I’ve not been involved at the state level to see how things are handled there.

• Can’t say that the State program really influences the success of the local program.

• Again, no opinion

• The earliest efforts to start a Main Street program in was the 1990’s. Then there was a period of neglect where very little happened. Discover Downtown was formed in 2006 and for several years struggled to
get a critical mass of support. In the past 15 months since I’ve been here we’ve
gotten increasing regional, statewide, and national attention for our work. This
time has largely coincided with new management of the KYMS program. We
have enjoyed and appreciated the very cordial and supportive role that the state-
wide program has provided to our local efforts.

Question Nine:
Main Street programs face an array of issues, what are some critical issues that your Main
Street program has faced? (11)

Beginning (0)
Expanded Program (0)
Renaissance Kentucky (3)
• lack of support from local citizens and governmen
t
• Government Support Money Expansion of outlying areas rather than ideas to
revitalize what you have.
• Community education, local government and state government policies that are
not Main Street friendly.
Current Program (8)
• financial issues, working with other groups
• Politics. No way for one person to fill the manager job, regardless of how strong
a board they have.
• in the areas of economic deveopment and getting people on board with historic
preservation.
• Mainly the community doesn’t know who we are or what we do and we’re a 26 yr old organization. Since I’ve been involved with the program, we haven’t had major issues.
• Large area, could use another staff person. Also, could always use more resources. If there were programs that we could access without major administrative work, since we’re already certified, that would be really helpful.

• Money

• funding; involvement from local government

• We have about $50 million in unmet need for various projects from restoring buildings, to constructing a trail system, and improving our local environment. The economic realities we face are dire too with over 15% unemployment and median household income less than half of the national average. The lack of a coordinated approach from state government - bringing together downtown revitalization, transportation, arts, adventure tourism/trails, ABC, economic development, and others - limits what we are able to accomplish.

Question Ten:

What services do you think KYMS should provide to address those issues? (8)

Beginning (0)

Expanded Program (0)

Renaissance Kentucky (2)

• Convincing local and state leaders the importance of maintaining and revitalizing the HEART of local communities.

• More education, leading policy development, lobbying state government, for Main Street friendly strategies and programs.

Current Program (6)

• communicate creative ideas that help with funding

• in-service in each of these areas.

• They have helped.
• See above.
• outreach to local government
• More staff members dedicated to working in different areas of the state, perhaps remotely from Frankfort might help. There might even be managers in different areas willing to step up and help to mentor programs in their area. Advocacy for a $1m+ grant program to support building renovation and innovative economic development and creative placemaking activities would help. Lastly, with all the attention paid on Eastern Kentucky presently, having targeted initiatives in this area to use downtown revitalization to create new businesses and jobs would be a smart move.

Question Eleven:
If there is any other information you would like to share, comments you would like to make, or suggestions you may have for the management of KYMS going forward feel free to add them below. (3)

Beginning (0)
Expanded Program (0)
Renaissance Kentucky (1)
• As a Main Street Manager for nearly 5 years between 1998 and 2003 it was the MOST FUN job I ever had despite the low pay, crazy hours, and community opposition. It was a very exciting time to be involved with Main Street. Money was flowing and opportunities abounded. And the staff was KY Heritage Council staff was hustling their butts off despite their own wacky brand of dysfunction. They put the FUN in dysfunction!

Current Program (2)
• For the limited budget the KYMS works with they are doing a great job! They
keep us informed on the current events and trends!

• In final analysis, for anyone in community and economic development today, and especially in historic preservation, it is an uphill battle though one worth fighting. As John F. Kennedy said over 50 years ago, “I am certain that after the dust of centuries has passed over our cities, we, too, will be remembered not for victories or defeats in battle or in politics, but for our contribution to the human spirit.” That is as true a statement the time he made it as it is today and will hopefully give courage to those seeking to make stronger downtown areas in the great Commonwealth of Kentucky.
Schedule of Services (adapted from Wisconsin Main Street Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshops for all Communities:</th>
<th>Services for all Communities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>Joint Marketing Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Training</td>
<td>Reconnaissance Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplan Development</td>
<td>Program Manager Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Analysis</td>
<td>Summer/Winter Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation</td>
<td>New Manager Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year One**
- Reconnaissance Visit
- Summer/Winter Conference
- New Manager Training (combined with other events)
- Board Training
- Workshops (combined with other events)
- Phone/E-mail Assistance
- Membership in National Main Street Center
- National Main Streets Conference Registration
- Design Assistance
- Economic Restructuring Assistance
- Historic Preservation Workshop (Secretary of the Interior Standards, Historic Preservation Tax Credits, economic value of vacant buildings, etc.)
- Business Recruitment Workshop

Also, included in the original schedule was a 3-day resource team visits. Resource team visits would be beneficial to new communities and should be included in the schedule if possible. If so, they could take place for a 2-3 days depending on the availability of KYMS staff and budget.

**Year Two**
- Business Retention Workshop
- Summer/Winter Conference
- Phone/E-mail Assistance
- Membership in National Main Street Center
- National Main Streets Conference Registration
- Design Assistance
- Economic Restructuring Assistance
- Technical Assistance Visit- one per year
Services Past Year Three
Program Assessment Visit (combine with annual review, bi-annual basis)
Technical Assistance Visit- one per year
Summer/Winter Conference
Phone/E-mail Assistance
Design Assistance (limited, communities should be encouraged to seek local sources)
Economic Restructuring Assistance

Note: A schedule similar to year’s one and two could be used for struggling communities with particular emphasis on their areas of weakness.
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