

## MINUTES

### SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

#### PLANNING AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Tuesday, August 7, 2012

1:30 p.m.

SEWRPC Office Building  
Commissioners' Conference Room  
W239 N1812 Rockwood Drive  
Waukesha, Wisconsin

Present:

Excused:

#### Committee Members:

Daniel S. Schmidt, Chairman  
Charles L. Colman  
Michael A. Crowley  
David L. Eberle  
William E. Johnson  
Robert W. Pitts  
John Rogers  
Nancy Russell  
Linda J. Seemeyer  
Peggy L. Shumway  
Daniel W. Stoffel  
David L. Stroik

Gilbert B. Bakke, Vice-Chairman  
Kimberly L. Breunig  
José M. Delgado  
William R. Drew

#### Staff:

Kenneth R. Yunker  
Elizabeth A. Larsen  
Nancy M. Anderson  
David A. Schilling  
Debra A. D'Amico

Executive Director  
Business Manager  
Chief Community Assistance Planner  
Principal Planner  
Executive Secretary

#### ROLL CALL

Chairman Schmidt called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was declared present. Mr. Yunker noted for the record that Commissioners Bakke, Breunig, Delgado, and Drew had asked to be excused.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF MAY 15, 2012**

Chairman Schmidt asked if there were any changes or additions to the May 15, 2012, meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Pitts, seconded by Mr. Crowley, and carried unanimously, the minutes of the meeting of May 15, 2012, were approved as published.

**CONSIDERATION OF SEWRPC COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE PLANNING REPORT NO. 131 (2<sup>ND</sup> EDITION), A PARK AND OPEN SPACE PLAN FOR KENOSHA COUNTY**

Chairman Schmidt asked Mr. Schilling to review with the Committee Community Assistance Planning Report No. 131 (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), *A Park and Open Space Plan for Kenosha County*. Mr. Schilling gave an overview of *A Park and Open Space Plan for Kenosha County* utilizing a PowerPoint presentation (copy attached to Official Minutes), noting that the plan has been approved by the Kenosha County Public Works/Facilities Committee and the Kenosha County Board of Supervisors.

As Mr. Schilling gave his presentation, the following questions and comments were made by the Commissioners.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Stoffel relative to how the outdoor recreation and open space planning standards were defined for a county, Mr. Schilling responded that the standards were originally based on National standards that were reviewed and refined by the Commission for use in the Southeastern Wisconsin Region as part of the original Regional park and open space plan adopted in 1977. As individual county or local government plans were developed, their staffs, advisory committees, and governing bodies may have revised the standards to be more applicable to their specific county or community.

Mr. Stoffel then inquired about how the Commission devised the concept of environmental corridors. Mr. Stroik stated that Professor Lewis at the University of Wisconsin-Madison first proposed the environmental corridor concept. Mr. Yunker noted that the Commission then beginning with the original regional land use plan completed in 1966 refined the concept, and applied it to Southeastern Wisconsin, so the boundaries of primary and secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas could be defined, and preservation of these areas could be considered. He noted that this is described in the book presenting the history of the Commission, "*Master Planners – Fifty Years of Regional Planning in Southeastern Wisconsin: 1960-2010.*"

Mr. Colman asked whether all plans prepared by the Commission for county and local governments are reviewed by the Planning and Research Committee and adopted by the Commission. Mr. Yunker responded that this is done only for those county and local plans which refine and amend Commission regional plans.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Crowley, Mr. Yunker confirmed that this park and open space plan for Kenosha County report was originally requested by Kenosha County in 2009.

There being no further questions or discussion, on a motion by Mr. Pitts, seconded by Mr. Rogers, and carried unanimously, SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 131 (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), *A Park and Open Space Plan for Kenosha County*, was approved and recommended for Commission adoption as a component of the regional park and open space plan.

**CONSIDERATION OF PRELIMINARY REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS; PART 3, PLAN ENDORSEMENT, MONITORING, AND UPDATES OF CHAPTER XII, "RECOMMENDED HOUSING PLAN FOR THE REGION;" AND CHAPTER V, "NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT" AND APPENDICES B, C, D, AND E OF SEWRPC PLANNING REPORT NO. 54, "A REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN FOR SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN: 2035"**

Chairman Schmidt asked Mr. Yunker to briefly describe the remaining chapters and materials of the regional housing plan to be completed. Mr. Yunker responded that the Planning and Research Committee has reviewed and approved all chapters of the plan, with the exception of Chapters V and XII, which will be considered at this meeting, and Chapter XIII, the plan summary. Chapter XII, the recommended plan chapter, will be updated following public meetings on the plan. Mr. Yunker noted that Ms. Anderson will first review with the Committee the preliminary housing plan recommendations from Part 2 of Chapter XII as approved by the Advisory Committee on July 23, focusing on recommendations that have changed since the Planning and Research Committee reviewed Parts 1 and 2 of Chapter XII at its May 15, 2012, meeting. Part 3 of Chapter XII, "Plan Endorsement, Monitoring, and Updates," and Chapter V, "New Housing Development" along with Appendices B, C, D, and E, will also be reviewed.

Mr. Yunker then introduced Ms. Nancy Anderson, Chief Community Assistance Planner of the Commission staff and requested that she present the materials to the Committee.

Ms. Anderson reviewed with the Committee the preliminary regional housing plan recommendations approved by the Regional Housing Plan (RHP) Advisory Committee on July 23, 2012 (copy attached to Official Minutes). Ms. Anderson noted that all of the changes to the recommendations discussed at the Planning and Research Committee meeting on May 15, 2012, were considered by the Advisory Committee and are included in the recommendations approved by the Advisory Committee on July 23.

Following are questions and comments that were made during Ms. Anderson's review of the preliminary regional housing plan recommendations.

In reference to Recommendation 9 on page 3 which recommends that distressed properties not be considered as comparables when calculating the value of properties for sale, Ms. Russell asked if this practice is typical. Ms. Shumway noted that the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act may restrict the consideration of foreclosed homes in an appraisal. She recommended that Commission staff contact appraisers to establish precisely what they are required to consider, and not to consider. Mr. Stoffel remarked that foreclosed homes have an impact on the market by driving down prices on all homes in an area, even if they are not used as comparable sales.

[Secretary's Note:

Based on information from the Appraisal Institute website and from a conversation with an appraiser with the appraisal firm Chudnow and Druck Valuation, Inc. in Milwaukee, there are certain situations in which foreclosed properties are used as comparable sales in appraisals of residential properties. Use of foreclosures as comparables is most common in areas with high rates of foreclosures, where foreclosures are often the only source of comparable sales. Use of foreclosed properties as comparables consider only properties that were foreclosed due to economic reasons (loss of income) where the property was properly maintained, and not foreclosures that were due to the property owner abandoning the property due to deferred maintenance or the need for

costly repairs. Short sales are never used as comparables because a third party is dictating the price, and the sales price does not reflect market value. Appraisers cannot use foreclosed properties as comparables when preparing appraisals for eminent domain.

Appraisers practicing in Wisconsin comply with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, which have been adopted as part of the Wisconsin Administrative Code as the standards to be used in Wisconsin. The recommendation is proposed to be revised as follows to delete the portion of the recommendation relating to the use of distressed properties as comparables, since this issue is comprehensively addressed by the National standards:

“Appraisers should consider all three approaches to value (cost, income, and sales comparisons) to ensure that values, building costs, and other unique factors are considered when conducting property appraisals.”]

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Stoffel relative to Recommendation No. 10 on page 3, relating to the extension of tax increment financing (TIF) districts, Mr. Yunker said that this recommendation would assist municipalities in providing affordable housing by extending TIF districts for an additional year, which is permitted by State law. Mr. Stoffel then inquired whether the Joint Review Board (JRB) must approve TIF extensions for affordable housing.

[Secretary’s Note: Based on a review of Section 66.1105(6)(g) of the Wisconsin Statutes, which is the section which gives a city or village the authority to extend a TIF for one year to provide funding for affordable housing, it appears that a city or village can extend the TIF by adopting a resolution to that effect, without receiving approval from the Joint Review Board (JRB). Under the Statutes, the JRB is the body that may approve TIF extensions for all other purposes, based on a request from a City Council or Village Board.]

During Ms. Anderson’s presentation of Recommendations No. 4 and No. 5 on page 6, there was discussion about the recommended limits on formation of TIFs and the awarding of economic development incentives. Mr. Colman commented that the proposed recommendation would appear to require a community with a job/housing imbalance to identify steps to address the imbalance, if it proposed to create a new TIF district. Mr. Yunker stated that Recommendation No. 4 will be edited to more clearly identify the proposed change in TIF approval.

[Secretary’s Note: Recommendation No. 4 on page 6 is proposed to be revised to read as follows to clarify the intent of the recommendation:

“4. Amend State law to prohibit the creation of new TIF districts in communities with a job/housing imbalance, as determined by a Statewide job/housing balance analysis conducted by a State agency, unless the TIF proposal includes documented steps that will be taken to reduce or eliminate the job/housing imbalance. Examples of provisions to reduce or eliminate the job/housing imbalance include use of the one-year TID extension authorized by current State law to

fund affordable housing; development of a mixed-use project that includes affordable housing as part of the TID; contributions to a Housing Trust Fund or other funding for the development of affordable housing; and/or amendments to community plans and regulations that remove barriers to the creation of new affordable housing which would address the job/housing imbalance. To avoid creation of a TIF that would cause a job/housing imbalance, State law should also be amended to require TIF proposals to include an analysis of the number and wages of jobs likely to be created as a result of the TIF in relation to the cost of housing in the community, and to include steps to address any potential job/housing imbalance identified through the analysis.”]

With regard to Recommendation No. 6 on page 6, Mr. Stroik asked if the recommendation proposes that the Commission deny a sewer service area expansion based on a job/housing imbalance in a community. Mr. Yunker responded that under State law the Commission does not approve or deny sewer service areas, but rather makes recommendations to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) regarding changes to sewer service areas, and the DNR makes the final decision. When considering sewer service area expansions, State law limits the DNR to consideration of how the expansion affects water quality and other environmental resources, and whether the proposed expansion is consistent with population projections and sewage treatment plant capacity within the proposed service area, and the Commission’s analysis is limited to those factors. Mr. Yunker stated that these considerations were discussed by the Advisory Committee, which did not intend to make any changes to existing SEWRPC and DNR review and approval procedures. Instead, the Advisory Committee approved a recommendation that when a community requests an expansion of their planned sanitary sewer area, the sewer service expansion report provided by the Commission to the community would include job/housing balance analysis findings from the housing plan. This would be intended to encourage the community to discuss and consider ways to address job/housing imbalance.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Stoffel relative to Recommendation No. 8 on page 7, Mr. Yunker indicated that the Round Lake Beach urbanized area includes part of the northwest suburban area of Chicago, a portion of southwestern Kenosha County, and also includes a small part of the far southeastern corner of Walworth County. Mr. Yunker also stated that SEWRPC works with local governments, in its role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the four urbanized areas in the Region, to select transportation projects for inclusion in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that are proposed to be funded under the two programs listed in Recommendation No. 8. The RHP Advisory Committee has recommended that the TIP Advisory Committees consider job/housing balance and provision of transit when selecting transportation projects to be included in the TIP for funding by those two programs.

With regard to Recommendation No. 9 on page 7, Ms. Russell asked what would happen if a person participating in an employer-assisted housing program changes jobs. Ms. Anderson responded that she expected the former employee would need to reimburse the company, but would research the issue for clarification in the minutes.

[Secretary's Note: Employer-assisted housing programs typically provide \$3,000 to \$5,000 of down-payment assistance as a forgivable grant provided the employee maintains full-time employment; continuously occupies the house; and does not sell or otherwise transfer ownership of the house for a specified period, which is typically five years. The grant must be repaid if the conditions are not met.]

Mr. Rogers stated that he had a concern related to Recommendation No. 2 on page 1 regarding alternatives to property taxes to fund schools and local government services. Mr. Yunker responded that the reason this recommendation is being advanced is that local government approvals of proposed housing developments are at times based on a preference for higher-priced housing that will generate more in property tax revenue for schools and local governments, thereby affecting the provision of affordable housing. He stated that the Advisory Committee included this recommendation to address this concern.

A discussion ensued regarding the steps remaining to complete this plan and the work of the Planning and Research (P&R) Committee. Mr. Yunker stated that RHP Advisory Committee had completed its review and approval of the preliminary housing plan recommendations. Following review, modification and approval by the P&R Committee, the preliminary recommendations will be the subject of a series of public meetings. The comments received will be considered by the staff and RHP Advisory Committee, and the staff and Advisory Committee will then make final plan recommendations to be reviewed and considered by the P&R Committee. The P&R Committee will then review and modify, if needed, the final recommendations and consider approval and forwarding the final recommendations and the entire plan for adoption by the full Commission. He further explained any changes recommended by the P&R Committee today will be outlined in "Secretary Notes" in the P&R Committee meeting minutes. Mr. Rogers expressed concern about the report being overwhelming for anyone to read. Mr. Yunker said that staff will prepare a newsletter, brochure, flyer, and PowerPoint to summarize the plan, with a focus on key findings and recommendations.

In response to a question by Mr. Pitts relative to the interests and expertise of the members serving on the RHP Advisory Committee, Mr. Yunker stated that the committee includes County and local planning directors and other staff; representatives from the Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority (WHEDA); the Metropolitan Builders Association; Public Policy Forum; Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council; Independence First; and a variety of other interests that serve on the RHP Advisory Committee. He then explained that the RHP Advisory Committee has met many times and has adopted many plan chapters unanimously, but some of the preliminary plan recommendations were approved through split votes of the Advisory Committee.

[Secretary's Note: See Attachment A for a list of RHP Advisory Committee members.]

In further discussion, Ms. Russell said that the P&R Committee should not approve recommendations as a matter of course, but rather when in agreement with what is being proposed. She then noted that, in particular, she wanted to see the issue of landscaping for low income housing, particularly street trees, included in the plan. Ms. Anderson commented that the Advisory Committee and Commission staff tried to strike a middle-of-the-road approach regarding low or modest cost homes relative to landscaping requirements and noted that there may be cases where existing requirements would not need to be as stringent to achieve desired results. Ms. Russell commented that there should be further clarification

made regarding landscaping issues for moderate and low-income housing and that landscaping should not be eliminated.

[Secretary's Note: Recommendation No. 5 on pages 2 and 3 is proposed to be revised as follows:

- “5. Communities should review requirements that apply to new housing development to determine if changes could be made that would reduce the cost of development without compromising the safety, functionality, and aesthetic quality of new development. For example:
- a. Communities should strive to keep housing affordable by limiting zoning ordinance restrictions on the size and appearance of housing, such as requiring masonry (stone or brick) exteriors or minimum home sizes of more than 1,100 square feet in all single-family residential zoning districts. Home builders and local governments should limit the use of restrictive covenants that require masonry exteriors and home sizes larger than 1,100 square feet.
  - b. Public and private housing developers could make use of alternative methods of construction, such as the panelized building process, for affordable and attractive new homes. Local governments should accommodate the use of the panelized building process as a method of providing affordable housing.
  - c. Site improvement standards set forth in land division ordinances and other local governmental regulations should be reviewed to determine if amendments could be made to reduce the cost of housing to the consumer while preserving the safety, functionality, and aesthetic quality of new development. Particular attention should be paid to street width and landscaping requirements. Recommended street cross-sections are provided on Table V-20 in Chapter V. Landscaping requirements should provide for street trees and modest landscaping to enhance the attractiveness of residential development and the community as a whole. Communities should limit the fees for reviewing construction plans to the actual cost of review, rather than charging a percentage of the estimated cost of improvements.
  - d. Exterior building material, parking, and landscaping requirements for multi-family housing set forth in local zoning ordinances should be reviewed to determine if amendments could be made to reduce the cost of housing to the consumer while preserving the safety, functionality, and aesthetic quality of new development. Communities should work with qualified

consultants, such as architects with experience designing affordable multi-family housing, to review these requirements and develop non-prescriptive design guidelines that encourage the development of attractive and affordable multi-family housing. Landscaping requirements should provide for street trees and modest landscaping to enhance the attractiveness of multi-family development and the community as a whole.”]

Mr. Pitts stated that the P&R Committee in their reviews of the regional housing recommendations should carefully consider the work done by the RHP Advisory Committee. Mr. Crowley noted that the Waukesha County Board of Supervisors relies in many instances on the recommendations of advisory committees when making decisions. Mr. Stoeffel stated that the P&R Committee should not be timid; if it agrees with the Advisory Committee’s suggestions, they should be included in the plan. Mr. Yunker noted that the Commission’s recommendations are not always well received initially, such as environmental corridor preservation, but over time are accepted and embraced.

Mr. Yunker suggested that the P&R Committee could meet prior to the Commission meeting on September 12 to consider approval of the preliminary plan recommendations. Staff will modify the draft recommendations to incorporate discussion from this meeting, and note which recommendations were approved unanimously by the Advisory Committee, and which were approved by a split vote. Mr. Rogers and Mr. Crowley agreed that reviewing how the RHP Advisory Committee voted would be a good way to narrow the issues down for P&R Committee review. Mr. Yunker noted that Commissioners could call or email him any further suggested changes to the preliminary recommendations prior to the September 12 meeting. After more discussion, it was decided to set a P&R Committee meeting for Wednesday, September 12, 2012, at 1:30 p.m. to take place before the full Commission Quarterly Meeting to consider the preliminary plan recommendations.

Chairman Schmidt noted that Part 3, Plan Endorsement, Monitoring, and Updates of Chapter XII, “Recommended Housing Plan for the Region” provides proposed methods and schedules for monitoring plan implementation, and can be considered for approval following approval of the preliminary plan recommendations. He said that the Committee should proceed to discuss any questions or concerns regarding Chapter V, “New Housing Development.” He noted that Chapter V’s appendices B, C, D, and E are data relative to new housing development, and then requested that Mr. Yunker give a brief summary of Chapter V. Mr. Yunker then gave a brief summary of Chapter V, “New Housing Development.”

There being no further questions or comments, it was moved by Mr. Stroik, seconded by Mr. Colman, and carried unanimously, to approve Chapter V, *New Housing Development* and Appendices B, C, D, and E for consideration and approval by the full Commission.

#### **CORRESPONDENCE/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Chairman Schmidt asked Mr. Yunker if there were any correspondence or announcements. He reported that there was no correspondence and then noted that there will be a Planning and Research Committee meeting at 1:30 just prior to the Quarterly Commission Meeting on September 12, 2012, being held in Waukesha County at a location to be announced.



Mr. Stoffel asked what chapters and work on the regional housing plan were remaining to be completed, and Mr. Stroik requested a schedule for completion. Mr. Yunker responded that the recommended plan chapter and summary chapter remain to be completed and a schedule for completion will be attached to the minutes.

[Secretary's Note: Attachment B provides the current schedule.]

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on a motion by Mr. Crowley, seconded by Mr. Stroik, and carried unanimously; the meeting was adjourned at 3:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth R. Yunker  
Deputy Secretary

KRY/WJS/NMA/dad  
P&RAug12Min (00206229).DOC

Attachment A

**SEWRPC REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

William R. Drew, Chairman..... Executive Director, Milwaukee County Research Park and  
Commissioner, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission  
Julie A. Anderson..... Director, Racine County Department of Public Works and Development Services  
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  
Kalan R. Haywood, Sr..... President, Vanguard Group, Milwaukee  
Joseph G. Heck, Jr..... Assistant Director (Retired), Racine Department of City Development  
Rob Henken..... President, Public Policy Forum, Milwaukee  
Douglas J. Koehler..... Planner, City of Waukesha  
Gary Koppelberger..... City Administrator, City of Hartford  
Jeffrey B. Labahn..... Director, Department of Community Development and Inspections,  
City of Kenosha  
J. Scott Mathie..... Senior Director, Government Affairs,  
Metropolitan Builders Association of Greater Milwaukee  
George E. Melcher..... Director, Kenosha County Planning and Development Department  
Michael J. Murphy..... Alderman, City of Milwaukee  
Falamak Nourzad..... Principal, Continuum Architects & Planners, Milwaukee  
Linda Olson..... Director, Aging and Disability  
Resource Center of Washington County  
Antonio M. Pérez..... Executive Director, Housing Authority of the City of Milwaukee  
Brian Peters..... Housing Policy Advocate, Independence *First*, Milwaukee and  
Member, SEWRPC Environmental Justice Task Force  
Kim Plache..... Senior Community Relations Officer, Milwaukee Office of WHEDA  
Maria Prioletta..... Redevelopment and Special Projects Manager, Milwaukee  
Department of City Development  
Welford Sanders..... Executive Director, M.L. King Economic  
Development Corporation  
Mary Kay Schleiter..... Associate Professor, Department of Sociology-Anthropology,  
University of Wisconsin-Parkside  
Kori Schneider-Peragine..... Senior Administrator, Inclusive Communities Program,  
Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council  
Dale R. Shaver..... Director, Waukesha County Department of Parks and Land Use  
Michael J. Soika..... Director, Milwaukee Succeeds  
Andrew T. Struck..... Director, Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department  
Marne J. Stück..... Governmental Affairs Director, Greater Milwaukee Association of Realtors  
Scott Thistle..... Principal, Halen Homes, Brookfield  
Rev. James C. Thomas..... Retired, Board of Ezekiel Community  
Development Corporation  
John F. Weishan, Jr..... Supervisor, Milwaukee County Board

## Attachment B

**REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN REVIEW STATUS**  
**August 28, 2012**

Chapter	Review and Approval Status			
	Reviewed by Advisory Committee	Approved by Advisory Committee	Reviewed by EJTF	Approved by Planning and Research Committee
Chapter I: Introduction	9/23/09	9/23/09	11/4/10	11/10/09
Chapter II: Objectives, Principles, and Standards	9/23/09	9/23/09	11/4/10	11/10/09
Chapter III: Housing Plans and Programs	3/24/10	3/24/10	11/4/10	2/23/10
Chapter IV: Existing Housing	10/27/10 and 1/26/11	4/6/11	11/4/10 and 3/3/11	8/9/11
Chapter V: New Housing Development				
Part 1: Community Plans and Regulations	3/24/10 and 9/28/11	7/23/12	11/4/10	8/7/12
Part 2: Housing Development Costs	7/28/10	(all parts)		
Part 3: Cost of Community Services Analysis	7/23/12			
Chapter VI: Housing Discrimination and Fair Housing Practices	10/27/10 and 1/26/11	9/28/11	11/4/10	11/8/11
Chapter VII: Demographic and Economic Characteristics	4/6/11	4/6/11	5/12/11	8/9/11
Chapter VIII: Job/Housing Balance	9/28/11	10/26/11	9/22/11	11/8/11
Chapter IX: Accessible Housing	12/1/10	11/30/11	1/6/11	2/7/12
Chapter X: Subsidized and Tax Credit Housing	5/25/11	10/26/11	9/22/11	2/7/12
Chapter XI: Best Housing Practices	11/30/11	11/30/11	5/9/12	5/15/12
Chapter XII: Preliminary Recommended Plan				
Part 1: Plan Determinants	1/30/12	7/23/12	5/9/12	5/15/12
Part 2: Plan Recommendations	4/18, 5/23, 6/13, and 7/23/12	(Parts 1, 2, and 3)	(Parts 1, 2, and 3)	5/15/12; 8/7/12; 9/12/12
Part 3: Plan Endorsement, Monitoring, and Updates	7/23/12			9/12/12
Part 4: Conclusions	<i>Jan 2013</i>	<i>Jan 2013</i>	<i>Jan 2013</i>	<i>Feb 2013</i>
Chapter XII: Summary	<i>Jan 2013</i>	<i>Jan 2013</i>	<i>Jan 2013</i>	<i>Feb 2013</i>

NOTE: Dates in italics are tentative.

## **Tentative Schedule for Completion and Adoption of Regional Housing Plan**

### ***September 2012:***

Complete summary brochure and bulletin and translate into Spanish  
Review Draft Socio-Economic Impact Analysis and Distribute to Environmental Justice Task Force (EJTF) and Advisory Committee  
Planning and Research Committee meeting and briefing on plan at Commission meeting: Sept 12  
Schedule public meetings on preliminary plan

### ***October 2012:***

Advisory Committee and EJTF meetings to review Socio-Economic Impact Analysis (SEI)  
Final, print, and mail newsletter  
Organize meeting for local planners and administrators to review plan recommendations  
Prepare public notices, news releases, and displays for public meetings  
Meet with Journal-Sentinel editorial board

### ***November/December 2012:***

Hold meeting for planners/administrators  
Hold public meetings  
Prepare record of public comments

### ***January 2013:***

Complete and publish record of public comments  
Update Chapter XII to reflect SEI findings and public comments  
Prepare summary chapter (Chapter XIII)  
Hold EJTF and Advisory Committee meetings to review updated Chapter XII and Chapter XIII

### ***February 2013:***

Planning and Research Committee meeting to consider approval of final plan (final part of Chapter XII and Chapter XIII)  
Print final report

### ***March 2013:***

Commission meeting to consider plan adoption