

Minutes of the Eighteenth Meeting of the
REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: May 23, 2012
TIME: 1:30 p.m.
PLACE: Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center, Banquet Room 2
State Fair Park
640 S. 84th Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Members Present

William R. Drew Executive Director, Milwaukee County Research Park,
Chairman Commissioner, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Julie A. Anderson..... Director of Public Works and Development Services, Racine County
David Cappon Executive Director, Housing Authorities of the City and County of Waukesha
Michael P. Cotter Director, Walworth County
Land Use and Resource Management Department
Rob Henken President, Public Policy Forum, Milwaukee
Douglas J. Koehler..... Planner, City of Waukesha
Jeffrey B. Labahn..... Director of Community Development and Inspections, City of Kenosha
J. Scott Mathie Senior Director, Government Affairs,
Metropolitan Builders Association of Greater Milwaukee
George E. MelcherDirector of Planning and Development, Kenosha County
Michael J. Murphy Alderman, City of Milwaukee
Linda Olson.....Director, Aging and Disability Resource Center of Washington County
Antonio M. PérezExecutive Director, City of Milwaukee Housing Authority
Brian Peters Housing Policy Advocate, IndependenceFirst
Maria PriolettaRedevelopment and Special Projects Manager,
Milwaukee Department of City Development
Robin Reese Vanguard Group, LLC (representing Kalan R. Haywood, Sr.)
Mary Kay SchleiterAssociate Professor, Department of Sociology-Anthropology,
University of Wisconsin-Parkside
Kori Schneider-PeragineSenior Administrator, Inclusive Communities Program,
Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council
Dale R. Shaver Director, Waukesha County Department of Parks and Land Use
Michael J. Soika..... Vice President, Urban Strategy and Social Responsibility
YMCA of Metropolitan Milwaukee
Andrew T. Struck.....Director, Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department
Marne J. Stück Government Affairs Director, Greater Milwaukee Association of Realtors
John F. Weishan, Jr. Supervisor, Milwaukee County
Commissioner, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Guests and Staff Present

Stephen P. Adams Public Involvement and Outreach Manager, SEWRPC
Nancy M. Anderson Chief Community Assistance Planner, SEWRPC
Kim Dunisch Manager Career Transition, Milwaukee Job Corps Center
Azizi Lilourd Career Development Specialist, Milwaukee Job Corps Center
Travis Kuch Career Development Specialist, Milwaukee Job Corps Center
Gary K. Korb Regional Planning Educator, UW-Extension/SEWRPC
Benjamin R. McKay Principal Planner, SEWRPC
Christopher D. Parisey Planner, SEWRPC
Karyn L. Rotker Senior Staff Attorney, ACLU of Wisconsin
Kenneth R. Yunker Executive Director, SEWRPC

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Drew called the meeting of the Regional Housing Plan Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 p.m., welcoming those in attendance.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 18, 2012

Mr. Drew asked if there were any questions or comments on the April 18, 2012, meeting minutes. There were none. Hearing no comments, Mr. Drew asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Mr. Soika made a motion to approve the minutes from the April 18, 2012, meeting. Ms. Olson seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the minutes were approved unanimously by the Committee.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF THE REVISED REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Drew asked Ms. N. Anderson of the Commission staff to review the revised regional housing plan recommendations. Ms. N. Anderson asked the Committee members to turn their attention to the document titled “Revised Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, May 23, 2012” (see Attachment 1). She noted that revisions to the preliminary draft recommendations based on comments from the April 18, 2012, Advisory Committee meeting are shown with an underline for proposed additions and a strike-through for proposed deletions. She also noted that the Environmental Justice Task Force (EJTF) and SEWRPC Planning and Research Committee reviewed the preliminary recommendations on May 9 and May 15, respectively. Comments from the EJTF and Planning and Research Committee are not reflected in the handout, but will be described during the review. In addition, several e-mail comments were received from Committee members and interested parties, which were distributed to the Committee (see Attachment 2). The following discussion points and comments were made during the review:

[Secretary’s Note: Additional revisions to plan recommendations based on Advisory Committee, EJTF, and Planning and Research Committee comments are shown in the document titled “Revised Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, June 13, 2012.”]

1. Mr. Mathie referred to Affordable Housing Recommendation No. 2 and stated that property taxes are higher in Wisconsin than most other states and that the issue should be looked at in a broader context than shifting more of the cost for supporting local schools from property taxes to other

sources. Ms. N. Anderson responded that staff will revise the recommendation for review at the next meeting.

[Secretary's Note: See the document titled "Revised Regional Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, June 13, 2012" for revisions to Affordable Housing Recommendation No. 2.]

2. Mr. Mathie referred to Affordable Housing Recommendation No. 6 and noted that an alternative term to "building systems construction" could be used, such as "optimum value engineering." Mr. McKay responded that building systems construction refers to panelized construction and noted that the term "panelized building process" could be used in the recommendation instead of "building systems construction."

[Secretary's Note: See the document titled "Revised Regional Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, June 13, 2012" for revisions to Affordable Housing Recommendation No. 6 (now Recommendation No. 5b).]

3. Mr. Mathie referred to Fair Housing/Opportunity Recommendation No. 4 and noted that the recommendation is intended to include any organization that has programs aimed at increasing awareness of fair housing. He suggested removing the specific reference to the Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council. Ms. Schneider-Peragine agreed.

[Secretary's Note: See the document titled "Revised Regional Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, June 13, 2012" for revisions to Fair Housing/Opportunity Recommendation No. 4.]

4. Mr. Mathie referred to Fair Housing/Opportunity Recommendation No. 5 and asked if there are any existing assisted housing mobility programs. Ms. N. Anderson responded that there are existing programs and an example from Baltimore is included in Chapter XI (*Best Housing Practices*).
5. Mr. Cappon referred to Fair Housing/Opportunity Recommendation No. 5 and noted that Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers are portable; however, the current system makes it inconvenient for voucher holders to move to other jurisdictions. Ms. Schneider-Peragine noted the Chicago Regional Housing Choice Initiative as an example of a regional voucher program. She stated that one of the positive outcomes of the program has been administrative savings in helping households move between area jurisdictions. She noted that a 2007 survey of Chicago area public housing authorities (PHA) found that PHAs were spending about \$1 million annually helping households move between each other's jurisdictions. Mr. Henken noted that the Public Policy Forum (PPF) study titled "Give Me Shelter: Responding to Milwaukee County's Affordable Housing Challenges" recommends combining the existing voucher programs in Milwaukee County and suggested a separate recommendation regarding vouchers. Mr. Cappon noted that separate voucher programs were combined in Waukesha County under the Waukesha County Housing Authority. Mr. Pérez suggested adding examples of features that have made other regional voucher programs successful. Mr. Drew suggested adding text regarding the steps needed to establish a regional program. Ms. N. Anderson suggested adding a finding regarding a regional voucher program to the related study findings under the Subsidized and Tax Credit Housing Recommendations section of Chapter XII.

[Secretary's Note: The following finding was inserted at the end of the fifth paragraph under the subsidized and tax credit housing related study findings on page XII-32 of Chapter XII:

“Establishing a regional voucher program in Southeastern Wisconsin may support this effort. The Chicago Regional Housing Choice Initiative, which is described in greater detail in Chapter XI, provides an example of a program intended to reduce administrative costs to local program administrators and increase voucher portability in the Chicago metropolitan area.”

See Attachment 3 for text proposed to be added to Chapter XI.]

6. Mr. Shaver referred to Fair Housing/Opportunity Recommendation No. 6 and noted that State “builder’s remedy” legislation may be redundant because decisions made by plan commissions and governing bodies are subject to judicial review and decisions made at the staff level are subject to review by County boards of adjustment or local boards of zoning appeals. Ms. N. Anderson noted that builder’s remedy legislation would provide an expedited appeal process that could reduce costs to the developer. Mr. Shaver noted that the developer could appeal an unfavorable State review board decision to civil court, which would then be an added expense. He also noted that the appeal process could take longer through a State level review board than in civil court. Ms. N. Anderson noted that the cost and length of the litigation process for developers of affordable housing were mentioned as concerns at previous Advisory Committee meetings. Mr. Cappon noted that the judicial process worked well in the New Berlin case and has set a precedent for similar cases. Mr. Murphy stated that builder’s remedy legislation would provide a State level review board that would not be influenced by concerns of local constituents and may be less costly to developers than the traditional judicial process. He also noted that State level legislation may be difficult to implement. Mr. Shaver stated that the plan should focus on recommendations that reduce the cost of housing such as critical review of local government regulations and project review policies. Mr. Mathie made a motion to strike Fair Housing/Opportunity Recommendation No. 6. Mr. Pérez seconded the motion. The motion was carried on a voice vote.

7. Mr. Shaver referred to the suggested revision by the Environmental Justice Task Force (EJTF) of Job/Housing Balance Recommendation No. 2 to include employer vanpool service in areas without fixed-route public transit as an interim measure until public transit is provided and noted that there are challenges with employer-sponsored vanpool programs. He noted that Waukesha County implemented a vanpool service at the request of area employers when a bus route with low ridership was discontinued; however, vanpool ridership has also been low. Mr. Yunker clarified that the EJTF suggested interim job-ride shuttle programs until such time as fixed-route public transit service is provided, and noted that such shuttle services are currently being provided in some areas by non-profit groups using State funding. Mr. Henken asked if this would result in shuttle-type services replacing public transit service recommended in the regional transportation plan. Mr. Yunker responded that the recommendation only acknowledges current need in areas without public transit. He stated that shuttle service is not a replacement for public transit services recommended in the regional transportation plan.

[Secretary's Note: See the document titled "Revised Regional Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, June 13, 2012" for revisions to Job/Housing Balance Recommendation No. 2.]

8. Mr. Soika referred to Job/Housing Balance Recommendation No. 3 and suggested separating it from Recommendations 3a and 3b. Mr. Mathie stated that a Statewide job/housing balance analysis is a good recommendation; however, it should not be used to prohibit the use of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) because this may discourage potential affordable housing developments in communities with a job/housing imbalance. Mr. Mathie suggested a motion to revise Job/Housing Balance Recommendation No. 3a to allow affordable housing to be leveraged in a TIF and to revise Job/Housing Balance Recommendation No. 3b to provide direct Federal and State funding to address job/housing imbalances. Mr. Mathie made a motion to make these revisions to Job/Housing Balance Recommendation Nos. 3a and 3b. Mr. Shaver seconded the motion.

Mr. Soika stated that he supports the current language in No. 3a because prohibiting the use of TIF in communities with a job/housing imbalance would discourage communities from exacerbating these imbalances. Mr. Murphy stated that the current approach to the use of TIF does not work. He noted that urban communities with large areas of blight have a competitive disadvantage compared to suburban communities in attracting new development because blighted properties often have high remediation costs which undeveloped areas in suburban communities do not. He stated that many of the suburban communities that use TIF lack affordable housing and transit service. He stated that Job/Housing Balance Recommendation Nos. 3a and 3b encourage balance between jobs and housing and that job/housing imbalances in suburban communities have a negative impact.

Mr. Mathie stated that this is the first time job/housing balance has been analyzed and provided to communities in the Region. Ms. J. Anderson expressed concern regarding a recommendation prohibiting TIF because one large project could have a positive economic impact on an entire county. Mr. Shaver noted that counties only have one vote on TIF joint review boards and cannot veto the creation of a TIF district (TID). Mr. Lebahn stated that economic growth should be defined in the context of Job/Housing Balance Recommendation No. 3a. Mr. Yunker stated that economic growth in the context of the proposed recommendation means commercial and industrial development. He stated that the recommendation will be revised to address this concern. Ms. Prioletta stated that TIDs that would support the development of higher cost housing should also be restricted.

Mr. Weishan stated that recommendations focused on the appropriate use of TIF should be considered. Mr. Weishan noted that in some instances developers in TIDs may receive preferential tax treatment, which may violate the equal protection clause of the State Constitution. Ms. Prioletta noted that the "but for clause," or the requirement that a development be feasible only through TIF, does not seem to be applied in all cases.

Mr. Drew clarified that Mr. Soika's suggestion was to separate Job/Housing Balance Recommendation No. 3 from Nos. 3a and 3b. Mr. Weishan noted that a motion was made regarding the language of Recommendation Nos. 3a and 3b. Mr. Mathie clarified that the motion was to revise Job/Housing Balance Recommendation No. 3a to allow affordable housing to be leveraged in a TIF and to revise Job/Housing Balance Recommendation No. 3b to provide direct Federal and State funding to address job/housing imbalances. Mr. Soika asked if the intent of the

motion is to replace the current language of Recommendation Nos. 3a and 3b. Mr. Mathie responded that the intent of the motion is to replace the language. Mr. Drew noted that the new language would change the nature of the recommendations from prohibitive to incentive. Mr. Mathie noted that changes in TIF law are not likely to occur.

Mr. Soika stated that the data and analyses in the housing study suggest that changes in the nature of housing development are necessary to reverse the patterns of segregation in the Region. Mr. Mathie noted that changes relative to this particular recommendation are unlikely to occur and it may be more appropriate under a list of lower-priority recommendations. Mr. Soika responded that the housing plan needs to make bold statements. Mr. Mathie stated that the plan recommendations will be most effective if they focus on core affordable housing issues. Mr. Cappon noted that Mr. Mathie's revised version of Job/Housing Balance Recommendation No. 3a could be added to the current recommendation instead of replacing it, which would discourage the use of TIF in communities with a job/housing imbalance except in cases where TIF would be used to encourage the development of affordable housing.

Mr. Peters suggested that if the Committee is reluctant to include a recommendation that would prohibit the use of TIF in communities with a job/housing imbalance, the recommendation could be revised to require the use of the one year extension of a TID to benefit affordable housing in communities with a job/housing imbalance, which is permitted under current State law. Mr. Henken stated that TID proposals in communities with a job/housing imbalance should not be allowed to proceed unless the community proposes concrete steps to address the imbalance. Mr. Shaver stated that a TID proposal should be viewed as positive if it would help to address an imbalance.

Mr. Murphy suggested holding the existing motion to allow staff to revise the language further. Mr. Drew agreed that staff could work on the language for review at the next meeting and also address separating Job/Housing Balance Recommendation No. 3 from Nos. 3a and 3b. Mr. Yunker noted that Committee members can provide staff with written comments regarding TIF. Mr. Drew asked for a motion to hold the motion to revise Job/Housing Balance Recommendation Nos. 3a and 3b. Mr. Murphy made a motion to hold the motion to revise Job/Housing Balance Recommendation Nos. 3a and 3b. Mr. Melcher seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously by the Committee.

[Secretary's Note: See the document titled "Revised Regional Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, June 13, 2012" for proposed revisions to Job/Housing Balance Recommendation Nos. 3, 3a, and 3b (now Recommendation Nos. 3, 4, and 5).]

9. Ms. Schneider-Peragine referred to Job/Housing Balance Recommendation No. 4 and asked about SEWRPC's role in community sanitary sewer service area planning. Mr. Yunker responded that SEWRPC is advisory to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) with regard to sewer service area planning and the Wisconsin Administrative Code specifies the criteria that DNR can consider during the sewer service area amendment review process. He noted that the criteria include amended service area population consistent with service area population forecasts; sewage treatment to be provided by an appropriate facility with adequate planned capacity; and protection of water quality including preservation of environmentally sensitive lands such as primary environmental corridors, wetlands, floodplains, and steep slopes. Ms. Schneider-Peragine stated that she would like to strengthen the recommendation. Mr. Struck

noted that DNR cannot consider job/housing balance considerations under the Administrative Code; however, SEWRPC can provide the information to communities, which may act as a trigger for communities to review their plans and regulations. Mr. Murphy noted that in his experience the DNR relies on SEWRPC analyses to make decisions; however, incorporation of job/housing balance as a criterion in the review would require State legislation. Mr. Yunker noted that the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission for Dane County has provided the DNR with recommendations outside the criteria identified in the Administrative Code, and the DNR did not accept those recommendations. Mr. Melcher stated that the recommendation should not impede the extension of sewer service to areas with failing septic systems that create public health and environmental hazards.

10. Mr. Mathie referred to the suggested recommendation provided to the Committee by Mr. Peters regarding funding accessibility modifications for renters (see Attachment 2) and noted that this would require modifications to housing units that are not owned by the tenant. Mr. Peters responded that the intent of the recommendation is for government agencies to provide financial assistance to renters to install accessibility modifications. The tenant would notify the property owner and the property owner would not have to pay for the modification. In addition, the modification should add value to the property. Ms. Schneider-Peragine stated that the Federal Fair Housing Act requires property owners to allow tenants with disabilities to make “reasonable modifications” to a housing unit; however, funding to do so is not always available. Mr. Mathie asked if the owner would initiate installation of a modification(s). Ms. Olson noted that the recommendation is similar to a weatherization program where the renter can request funds for improvements but the landlord must approve any changes to the housing unit.
11. Ms. Prioletta referred to Subsidized and Tax Credit Housing Recommendation No. 6 and suggested that WHEDA should revise its Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP) to award extra points to non-elderly housing projects in communities with a job/housing imbalance. Mr. Lebahn questioned the recommendation for WHEDA to reduce or eliminate points allocated for community support. Ms. N. Anderson responded that there is a concern that proposals in communities with a need for affordable housing have received lower scores in the past because existing residents of the community were unsupportive. She stated that staff will reword this portion of the recommendation.

[Secretary’s Note: See the document titled “Revised Regional Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, June 13, 2012” for revisions to Subsidized and Tax Credit Housing Recommendation No. 6 (now Recommendation No. 8).]

12. Mr. Pérez referred to Subsidized and Tax Credit Housing Recommendation No. 4 and suggested changing “PHAs” to “Administrators of voucher programs” because other entities in addition to public housing authorities, such as WHEDA, administer the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program.

[Secretary’s Note: See the document titled “Revised Regional Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, June 13, 2012” for revisions to Subsidized and Tax Credit Housing Recommendation No. 4 (now Recommendation No. 6).]

13. Mr. Shaver referred to the revisions to Subsidized and Tax Credit Housing Recommendation Nos. 9 and 10 provided to the Committee by City of Milwaukee Housing Trust Fund Vice Chair Cathie Madden (see Attachment 2) and suggested changing “Milwaukee” to “Region” in the second sentence and eliminating the bulleted portion. Mr. Murphy agreed with the suggestions.

[Secretary’s Note: See the document titled “Revised Regional Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, June 13, 2012” for revisions to Subsidized Housing Recommendation Nos. 9 and 10 (now Recommendation No. 10).]

14. Mr. Shaver referred to Housing Development Recommendation No. 3 and stated that redevelopment and infill development should not be limited to industrial sites. He suggested eliminating the word “industrial.”

[Secretary’s Note: See the document titled “Revised Regional Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, June 13, 2012” for revisions to Housing Development Recommendation No. 3.]

15. Mr. Mathie referred to Housing Development Recommendation No. 1 and questioned the need for the bullets. Ms. N. Anderson responded that the bullets are neighborhood planning recommendations set forth in the regional land use plan.

16. Mr. Mathie suggested reorganizing and prioritizing plan recommendations under new topics including financing, job/housing balance, and regulations. He stated that lower priority recommendations should be listed under one topic, such as other considerations. Mr. Yunker suggested prioritizing recommendations under the existing topics. Mr. Mathie stated that he favors new housing topics and that recommendations related to housing financing, including subsidized housing, are the highest priority related to providing affordable housing. Ms. Schleiter asked if Mr. Mathie had identified any examples of low priority recommendations. Mr. Mathie responded that low priority recommendations should be identified jointly by the Committee. Ms. Schleiter stated that the Committee would also need to come to agreement on high priority recommendations. Mr. Mathie noted that a number of recommendations would fall under the three suggested topics. Mr. Murphy stated that the existing topics are based on major findings of the report and are all important. Mr. Mathie stated that a “laundry list” of recommendations will not be reader-friendly. Mr. Murphy stated that the plan should be comprehensive and various entities can identify the recommendations that are most important to those they represent.

Ms. Schneider-Peragine suggested prioritizing recommendations based on their impact on plan objectives. Ms. Schleiter stated that it is difficult to differentiate high priority recommendations because the Region’s housing problems are interrelated. Mr. Drew noted that the Commission’s Planning and Research Committee, the full Commission, and County Boards will review and adopt the plan and that the recommendations should be broad enough to reflect the concerns of the entire Advisory Committee. He stated that it would be reasonable to include an accompanying document from the Advisory Committee that includes high priority recommendations from various groups, but it does not seem reasonable to change the existing structure of the recommendations. Mr. Melcher suggested leaving the recommendations in their current form. Mr. Yunker noted that a final newsletter will be prepared providing a focused discussion of key recommendations under each topic.

17. Ms. Schneider-Peragine referred to the discussion regarding tying implementation of the regional housing plan to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) from the Advisory Committee meeting on April 18, 2012, and noted that she found three examples of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) that incorporate environmental justice criteria when evaluating projects for inclusion in the TIP. She then distributed a handout of examples from the Nashville TN, Chapel Hill NC, and Boston MA MPOs (see Attachment 4). Mr. Yunker stated that MPOs are intended to work cooperatively with the local governments they serve and the State and transit operators. He stated that SEWRPC staff could explore with local governments through its TIP Advisory Committees to potentially establish revised criteria that would take job/housing balance into consideration when recommendations are developed for funding, and including in the TIP, projects with Federal Highway Administration Surface Transportation Program Milwaukee Urbanized Area funding and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program funding.

Mr. Yunker explained that the TIP is reviewed by SEWRPC's Advisory Committees for Transportation System Planning and Programming for the Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine urbanized areas, which are population proportional. He stated that projects are recommended for funding within the aforementioned funding categories and included in the TIP every two to three years. He stated that these Committees have established and approved the project selection and programming process. Ms. Schneider-Peragine suggested including a recommendation in the regional housing plan for housing related criteria to be included in the project prioritization process. Mr. Drew responded that the TIP project prioritization process is not a simple issue. Mr. Peters suggested that projects in communities implementing regional plans could get higher priority than projects in communities not implementing regional plans. Mr. Yunker stated that SEWRPC should not dictate changes to the process, but staff would be willing to work with the three Committees that help prepare the TIP to consider revising the criteria now used.

At the request of Ms. Schneider-Peragine, Mr. Drew asked Ms. Rotker to provide clarification regarding the comments on TIP project prioritization that she provided the Committee, which are included in the minutes of the April 18, 2012, Advisory Committee meeting. Ms. Rotker agreed that SEWRPC cannot dictate to local governments which projects will be included in the TIP; however, Federal regulations allow MPOs to work with local governments to set project priorities. She referenced the examples from other MPOs provided by Ms. Schneider-Peragine. She stated that the current TIP process in the Region allows communities to ignore providing their fair share of affordable housing, which enables continued residential segregation. She stated that the Federal Sustainable Communities Initiative encourages links between affordable housing and transportation. She also stated that SEWRPC has political and not legal barriers to including environmental justice criteria in the TIP project selection process and that local governments also need to work cooperatively in the process. She stated that projects that comply with environmental justice criteria would provide communities with an incentive to implement the regional housing plan in addition to the regional transportation plan.

Mr. Murphy stated that the process for prioritizing projects in the TIP is a topic for the Commission to address. Mr. Drew agreed that the Commission is the proper body to address the topic and there should be discussion among the Commission and the Commission's Advisory Committees for Transportation System Planning and Programming regarding the proposal to revise the criteria for project selection.

18. Mr. Murphy noted that attendance at public meetings for the Regional Housing Plan has been low. He stated that he would work with his colleagues on the Milwaukee Common Council to encourage greater public attendance, possibly through mailings and Council members' websites. Mr. Drew requested that Committee members submit any additional ideas to encourage greater public participation to staff to compile for discussion at a future meeting.

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS OF THE PRELIMINARY REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN

Mr. Drew asked Mr. Yunker of the Commission staff to review the proposed scope of work for the socio-economic impact (SEI) analysis of the preliminary regional housing plan. Mr. Yunker stated that the Environmental Justice Task Force has recommended that a consultant be hired to conduct the SEI. He noted that the consultant will be asked to determine the socio-economic impact of each plan recommendation on environmental justice populations based on the five questions set forth on page 8 of the proposed SEI scope of work. He also noted that the consultant will be expected to help staff obtain public input on the SEI findings concurrently with review of draft housing plan recommendations during the next series of public meetings. Mr. Soika suggested asking the consultant to determine the impact of not implementing plan recommendations on environmental justice populations. Mr. Yunker noted that the Environmental Justice Task Force also made this suggestion and it will be incorporated into the scope of work.

[Secretary's Note: The following two paragraphs have been added following the five questions on page 8 of the preliminary draft scope of work for the SEI based on comments made by the EJTF at the May 9, 2012, Task Force meeting:

“In addition, the SEI should include a discussion of the potential impacts on environmental justice populations if the plan recommendations are not implemented. This discussion should be based upon the conclusions reached by the consultant with respect to positive and negative impacts of the plan recommendations on environmental justice populations.

Also, the SEI should include an identification of potential alternative means to obtain implementation of plan recommendations, such as means used in other metropolitan areas.”

The revised scope of work has been posted on the SEWRPC website at:
<http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPCFiles/HousingPlan/Files/SEI-final-RHP.pdf>.]

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION REGARDING PUBLIC OUTREACH EFFORTS

Mr. Drew noted the time and stated that this agenda item would be discussed at the next Committee meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Drew asked if there were any public comments. There were none.

CORRESPONDENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Drew asked if there were additional correspondence or announcements. Ms. N. Anderson stated that there were none.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Mr. Drew noted that the next meeting is scheduled for June 13, 2012, from 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. He noted that the usual meeting room is not available and the meeting will be held in the Exposition Center at State Fair Park.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Drew thanked the Committee members and guests for their time and participation and declared the meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin R. McKay
Recording Secretary