

Minutes of the Thirtieth Meeting of the
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE TASK FORCE

DATE: March 4, 2014
TIME: 4:30 p.m.
PLACE: Independence *First*
540 S. 1st Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Members Present

Adelene Greene..... Director of Workforce Development, Kenosha County
Chair
Yolanda Adams..... President and CEO, Urban League of Racine and Kenosha
Tyrone Dumas..... Administrative Assistant and Educational Consultant, Growing Power
Ella Dunbar Program Services Manager, Social Development Commission, Milwaukee
Nancy Holmlund..... Past President, Racine Interfaith Coalition
Jedd Lapid..... Regional Chief Development Officer,
American Red Cross of Eastern Wisconsin
Lynnette McNeely Legal Redress Chair, Waukesha County NAACP
Theresa Schuerman..... Walworth County Bilingual Migrant Worker Outreach
Willie Wade Alderman, City of Milwaukee

Guests and Staff Present

Stephen P. Adams Public Involvement and Outreach Manager, SEWRPC
Ann Dee Allen Senior Public Involvement and Outreach Specialist, SEWRPC
Christopher T. Hiebert Chief Transportation Engineer, SEWRPC
Ryan W. Hoel..... Principal Engineer, SEWRPC
Gary K. Korb Public Involvement and Outreach Specialist, SEWRPC
Eric D. Lynde..... Principal Transportation Planner/Engineer, SEWRPC
Benjamin R. McKay Principal Planner, SEWRPC
Alex Muellur..... Student, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Don Moberg..... Student, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Karyn Rotker..... ACLU of Wisconsin
David A. Schilling Chief Land Use Planner, SEWRPC
Kori Schneider-Peragine..... Senior Administrator, Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Greene called the meeting of the Environmental Justice Task Force to order at 4:30 p.m., welcoming those in attendance.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 5, 2013

Ms. Greene noted that not enough Task Force members were present at this time to constitute a quorum, although additional members are expected to attend. She suggested that this agenda item be moved to later in the meeting when a quorum of Task Force members may be present for approval of the minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Greene asked if there were any public comments on the agenda or other Task Force business. There were none.

UPDATE ON THE MAJOR UPDATE AND REEVALUATION OF THE REGIONAL LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLANS, AND EXTENSION OF DESIGN YEAR FROM 2035 TO 2050

Ms. Greene noted there are three sub-items under this agenda item, including discussion of the VISION 2050 draft Guiding Statements, development of sketch land use and transportation scenarios, and the chapters of the VISION 2050 regional land use and transportation plan report that have been reviewed to date by the Advisory Committee on Regional Land Use Planning and the Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation System Planning.

Discussion of VISION 2050 Guiding Statements

Ms. Greene asked Mr. Lynde of the Commission staff to review the draft VISION 2050 Guiding Statements. Mr. Lynde stated that the Guiding Statements were e-mailed to Task Force members prior to the meeting and a paper copy was distributed at the meeting ([see Attachment 1](#)). Mr. Lynde presented a description of each of the 15 draft Guiding Statements and stated that they will serve as a basis for developing the year 2050 regional land use and transportation plan. He stated that the draft Guiding Statements are based on public input received from two series of visioning workshops and an online survey. He noted that the Statements are intended to be free of jargon and provide a broad vision for future development of the Region. Mr. Lynde also noted that a 16th Guiding Statement specifically addressing environmental justice principles was prepared by Commission staff for review by the Task Force and distributed at the meeting ([see Attachment 2](#)). The draft Guiding Statements, including comments and suggested edits from the Task Force, will be presented to the Advisory Committee on Regional Land Use Planning and the Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation System Planning at their joint meeting on March 12. The following discussion points and comments were made:

1. Ms. McNeely asked if the draft Guiding Statements were developed before or after the initial visioning workshops. Mr. Lynde responded that the draft Guiding Statements were developed based on input from the first series of visioning workshops, and a second series of workshops were held to present the preliminary draft Guiding Statements to the public for feedback. Ms. McNeely asked if the proposed Guiding Statement 16 was considered at the visioning workshops. Mr. Lynde stated that Commission staff developed Guiding Statement 16 after the public workshops.
2. Ms. McNeely asked how the Guiding Statements will be used. Mr. Lynde responded that the Guiding Statements will be used to guide development of sketch land use and transportation development scenarios for the Region, which will be the basis for developing more detailed alternative land use and transportation plans. Ms. McNeely stated that environmental justice principles will be relevant to each step of the planning process and they should be reflected in

each of the Guiding Statements. Mr. Lynde noted staffs' initial thought was that environmental justice principles are reflected in the first 15 Guiding Statements. Ms. McNeely stated that the impacts of the regional plan on urban areas and minority and low-income populations and people with disabilities have to be measured in concert with each of the Guiding Statements.

3. Ms. Holmlund suggested moving Guiding Statement 16 to No. 1. She stated that residents of urban areas have been negatively impacted by past highway construction projects and the Commission should be sensitive to residents who live in areas that will be impacted by the VISION 2050 plan. She stated that it cannot be assumed that all residents of the Region are familiar with environmental justice principles. Ms. McNeely stated that environmental justice principles should be incorporated into all of the Guiding Statements and there should also be a Guiding Statement that specifically addresses environmental justice.
4. Mr. Lapid asked if the Guiding Statements are organized by their priority. Mr. Lynde responded that no priority is implied by the order of the Guiding Statements. Ms. Holmlund stated that Guiding Statement 16 appears to be less important if listed last. Mr. Wade agreed that Guiding Statement 16 should be the first Guiding Statement and environmental justice principles should be included in all of the Guiding Statements. Mr. Wade stated that past plans should be revisited to determine whether resources have been allocated according to the plan recommendations. Mr. Lynde stated that one of the VISION 2050 plan chapters that will be reviewed later in the meeting includes analyses regarding the progress towards implementation of the year 2035 regional plan recommendations.
5. Ms. Dunbar asked which VISION 2050 chapter will be most relevant to Guiding Statement 3, Balance Jobs and Housing. Mr. McKay responded that related plan objectives and analyses from the recently adopted regional housing plan may be brought forward in the VISION 2050 plan. He noted that the current job/housing balance analysis map was added to Chapter II, *Existing Conditions and Trends: Population, Employment, and Land Use*, of the VISION 2050 plan report.
6. Ms. Greene asked the Task Force members if they would like to suggest that the Advisory Committees move Guiding Statement 16 to No. 1 when they review the draft Guiding Statements at the March 12 joint meeting. Mr. Lynde noted that no order of importance is implied by the order of the Guiding Statements; however, Guiding Statements 1 through 8 are primarily related to land use development and Guiding Statements 9 through 14 are primarily related to transportation system development that would serve the Region's planned land use pattern. He stated that Guiding Statements 15 and 16 are related both to land use and the transportation system. Mr. Wade noted that Guiding Statement 16 was provided separately from the others and should be highlighted. Mr. Lapid and Ms. Holmlund agreed that the Task Force believes environmental justice principles need to be reflected in all of the Guiding Statements. Mr. Lapid noted that priority is implied by the order of the Guiding Statements whether or not it is intended.
7. Ms. Greene asked if it is the recommendation of the Task Force to incorporate environmental justice into the introductory paragraph or move Guiding Statement No. 16 to No. 1. Mr. Lapid suggested including environmental justice principles in the introductory paragraph to serve as an overarching consideration that would apply to all the Guiding Statements rather than adding the proposed 16th Guiding Statement. The Task Force agreed. Ms. Dunbar asked if a small group of people unaffiliated with the planning process could review the Guiding Statements to ensure they

are properly understood. Mr. McKay stated that the revision suggested by the Task Force along with revisions suggested through public input will be reviewed by the Advisory Committees. Ms. McNeely suggested removing the reference to minority and low-income populations and people with disabilities to express environmental justice principles in a fashion that is more inclusive of all of the Region's residents. Ms. Greene asked about the timeline for making revisions to the Guiding Statements. Mr. McKay responded that the Advisory Committees will review a revised draft of the Guiding Statements that incorporates comments from the Task Force and public input at the March 12 joint meeting. Mr. McKay noted that the meeting will begin at 9:30 a.m. in the West Allis City Hall, 7525 W. Greenfield Avenue.

[Secretary's Note: Based on the recommendation of the Task Force, Guiding Statement 16 will not be added and the following sentence has been added to the introductory paragraph of the Guiding Statements:

“An overriding consideration for all Guiding Statements is that the benefits and impacts of investments in the Region's land and transportation system should be shared fairly and equitably among all groups of people.”]

8. Mr. Wade noted that he has noticed the graphic with “VISION 2050: One Region, Focusing on Our Future” on all of the VISION 2050 public outreach materials. He asked if this is a brand or logo. Mr. Lynde stated that “VISION 2050” is the brand for the plan, “One Region, Focusing on Our Future” is the slogan, and the graphic is the logo. Mr. Wade complemented staff on the VISION 2050 brand, slogan, and logo.

Discussion of Development of Sketch Land Use and Transportation Scenarios

Ms. Greene asked Mr. Lynde of the Commission staff to discuss the development of sketch land use and transportation scenarios. Mr. Lynde stated that an outline of the staffs' initial concept of the sketch scenarios was e-mailed to Task Force members prior to the meeting and a paper copy was distributed at the meeting ([see Attachment 3](#)). Mr. Lynde stated that this outline will be used to develop four or five different scenarios for the Region that combine land use and transportation. He stated that the sketch scenarios will be conceptual alternatives of how the Region might look and function in the future, representing a range of possible futures for land use and transportation. He stated that variations among the scenarios will be based on location, density, and mix of development and the different components of the transportation system. The scenarios will be presented to the public in an interactive manner at a series of workshops to be held in summer 2014. The following discussion points and comments were made:

1. Ms. Holmlund stated that presenting the sketch scenarios to the public will be a good educational opportunity.
2. Mr. Dumas noted that road improvement projects involve resurfacing in some areas of the Region and complete reconstruction in other areas of the Region. He expressed concern regarding pavement condition of the roads, with the type and durability of repairs, and that there are not consistent design standards throughout the Region. Mr. Wade noted that he is a member of the City of Milwaukee Public Works Committee. He stated that the City has a five-year paving plan. The street condition is evaluated as part of this planning process. Street repairs are prioritized based on the condition of the street. Some streets are repaired and others are added to a list for

repair. He stated that a wheel tax is now the source of funding for street repairs, which has assisted the City in cutting its backlog of repair projects in half. He stated that some streets are reconstructed and some streets are resurfaced based on condition. Mr. Wade stated that the City works with a variety of private contractors to conduct street repairs and quality varies between contractors. If the quality of work of a particular contractor is poor, that contractor will not be awarded additional future work. Mr. Dumas stated that high quality must be expected of a contractor to hold them accountable. Mr. Wade noted that he does not allow some contractors to work in his Aldermanic District because of past poor performance.

3. Ms. McNeely asked for further explanation about how the sketch scenarios will be incorporated into the planning process. Mr. Lynde stated that the scenarios will be used to identify the benefits and consequences of various land use and transportation system development decisions. Feedback on the conceptual, sketch scenarios will be used to develop more detailed alternative land use and transportation system plans to be evaluated later in the process.
4. Ms. Dunbar asked if green space, such as urban agriculture, will be considered in any of the scenarios. Mr. McKay responded that compact development will be included in one or more of the scenarios. He stated that a benefit of this type of development pattern is converting less undeveloped land to urban uses. Mr. Schilling noted that providing adequate open space should be a constant between all of the scenarios. Mr. Dumas noted that an area of focus should be community gardening. Mr. Schilling agreed that there has been increased interest in community gardening and noted that the City of Milwaukee and other communities have programs that allow individuals or organizations to obtain a permit for community gardening. Mr. McKay noted that the sketch scenarios will be conceptual development patterns, or pictures of how the Region could look in the future. He noted that issues such as community gardening can be addressed as the VISION 2050 plan is developed. Ms. Dunbar stated that community gardens are important to many neighborhoods.
5. Mr. Dumas stated that sidewalks are an important planning consideration with respect to pedestrian travel and for people with disabilities. He asked if sidewalks will be considered by the sketch scenarios. Mr. McKay noted that the year 2035 regional transportation plan includes standards on the types of streets where sidewalks should be provided and anticipated that the VISION 2050 plan would also include standards for sidewalks. He also noted that one criterion to compare the sketch scenarios will be walkability. Mr. Wade asked if Mr. Dumas's question is in regard to the City of Milwaukee or other parts of the Region. Mr. Dumas stated both. Mr. Lynde responded that Wisconsin State Statutes and Federal policy now require sidewalks and bicycle accommodations be provided in highway construction and reconstruction projects utilizing Federal or State funding.
6. Ms. Adams asked if park-ride lots will be addressed in the VISION 2050 plan. Mr. Hiebert responded that park-ride lots would be addressed in the VISION 2050 plan.

Discussion of VISION 2050 Plan Chapters to Date

Ms. Greene noted that Chapter I, *Introduction*; Chapter II, *Existing Conditions and Trends: Population, Employment, and Land Use*; Chapter III, *Review of Currently Adopted Regional Land Use and Transportation System Plans*; and Chapter VI, *Future Population, Households, and Employment in the Region* of Volume I of the VISION 2050 plan report were distributed to Task Force members at the meeting and asked Mr. McKay to review the accompanying summary PowerPoint handout. Mr. McKay

noted that the PowerPoint had been distributed to members at the meeting and e-mailed along with the chapters to members prior to the meeting. He noted that each chapter is available on the SEWRPC website:

(http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPC/VISION_2050/2050RegLandUseTranspPlan.htm).

He also noted that the PowerPoint will be made available on the SEWRPC website:

(<http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPC/DataResources/CommissionAdvisoryCommittees/EnvironmentalJusticeTaskForce.htm>). Mr. McKay stated that the four chapters to be discussed by the Task Force have been reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Regional Land Use Planning and the Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation System Planning and that staff will share Task Force comments and suggestions on the chapters with the Committees at the March 12 joint meeting. The following discussion points and comments were made:

1. Mr. McKay noted that the Advisory Committees suggested adding information to Chapter II. The Committees suggested adding population, household, race and ethnicity, and income data for the largest cities in the Region and the remainder of their respective counties. In addition, information from the regional housing plan job/housing balance analysis was added to the chapter. Mr. McKay noted that the Advisory Committees will review a revised draft of Chapter II at their March 12 meeting. Ms. McNeely asked why the Advisory Committees wanted additional race and ethnicity data in the Chapter. Mr. Schilling responded that the Committees wanted information for major cities and counties in addition to the data for the Region as a whole.
2. Mr. Dumas asked if urban agricultural sites are included in the land identified as being in agricultural use in the Region in 2010. Mr. McKay responded that urban agricultural land is not included in the 2010 total acres; however, it could be addressed by the VISION 2050 plan. Ms. McNeely asked if 2010 public water utility data was impacted by increases in urban agriculture. Mr. McKay responded that the data refers to area and population served by public water utilities.
3. Ms. McNeely referred to the amount of land converted to commercial and industrial uses between 2000 and 2010 and asked if development was happening faster than anticipated. Mr. McKay noted that 42 percent of the commercial land and 43 percent of the industrial land envisioned to be converted by 2035 had been converted by 2010. Mr. McKay noted that only one additional major economic activity center proposed in the 2035 regional land use plan had not experienced any growth between 2000 and 2010. Ms. Adams asked which one had not experienced growth. Mr. McKay responded that the Caledonia center had not experienced growth. Mr. Schilling noted that the Caledonia center is proposed in the Village's comprehensive plan, but development of the area has not begun.
4. Ms. Adams asked if there has been a large amount of growth in Kenosha and Pleasant Prairie. Mr. McKay responded that Commission staff recently met with City of Kenosha and Village of Pleasant Prairie staff as part of preparing the VISION 2050 plan and noted that there has been significant growth in both communities.
5. Ms. McNeely asked about the major economic activity center on the northwest side of the City of Milwaukee that is shown as dropping below the threshold employment level in 2010. Mr. Schilling responded that it is the 76th/Brown Deer Road center, which is where Northridge Mall was located. He noted that the area will likely be redeveloped and may regain its major economic activity center status in the future.

6. Ms. McNeely asked for clarification about what an urban service area constitutes. Mr. Schilling responded that these are typically areas with existing or planned public services and facilities, such as sanitary sewer and water service.

Mr. McKay noted that Mr. Lynde would present pages 22 through 33 of the PowerPoint handout. The following discussion points and comments were made:

7. Mr. Dumas asked for clarification about whether the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) included high-speed rail service in its long-range State rail plan. Mr. Lynde responded that implementation of the planned high-speed rail line was indefinitely postponed following withdrawal of Federal funding in December 2010, although high-speed rail remains part of WisDOT's long-range State rail plan.
8. Mr. Wade asked if weather is a consideration in bicycle and pedestrian facilities recommendations. Mr. Lynde responded that Wisconsin State Statutes and Federal policy now require sidewalk and bicycle accommodations be provided in many highway construction and reconstruction projects. Mr. Hiebert noted that this requirement applies to projects funded with State or Federal funds. Mr. Wade asked if bicycle facility user statistics are available. Mr. Hiebert stated that it may be possible to determine general trends in bicycle use using data from the Commission's origin destination travel surveys, but there would not be data for bicycle use on specific facilities. Mr. Wade stated that including bicycle and pedestrian facilities in reconstruction projects should be based on data. Mr. Dumas noted that Milwaukee County has collected data on the usage of bike racks on Milwaukee County Transit System (MCTS) buses. Ms. Holmlund noted that bicycle use is a health issue and many bicyclists in the City of Racine use bicycles because of inadequate public transit service.
9. Ms. McNeely stated that new travel technologies and preferences should be addressed by the regional transportation plan. Mr. Lynde noted that travel patterns will be considered in Volume I, Chapter V, *Travel Habits and Patterns*, of the VISION 2050 plan report and new travel technologies could be considered as the plan is developed.
10. Mr. Dumas stated that safety issues need to be addressed by the plan, particularly related to freeway on-ramps. Mr. Hiebert noted that the regional transportation plan includes a safety element that was developed at a systems level. Specific recommendations related to the geometric configuration of intersections and freeway ramps at specific locations would likely be beyond the scope of the plan and would be addressed during the preliminary engineering of a project.
11. Ms. Dunbar expressed concern that transit reverse commute options between residential areas in the City of Milwaukee and outlying areas with employment are not being provided. Mr. Hiebert responded that the year 2035 regional transportation plan recommends rapid and express transit services that provide both traditional commuter and reverse-commute service. He noted that VISION 2050 will consider travel habits and patterns and look at recommendations for reverse commute service as well.
12. Ms. McNeely asked if the VISION 2050 plan could address hiring minority workers and including emerging businesses in government construction projects. Mr. Wade noted that various governmental units have different requirements for the proportion of minority workers and

emerging businesses included in their construction projects. He noted that the City of Milwaukee has hiring requirements for City projects, which differs from that of Federal and State requirements. He stated that City-financed construction projects are beneficial to area workers because of these requirements. Mr. Dumas stated that a policy statement in the regional plan about the positive impact of hiring requirements for government funded construction projects on areas with low-incomes and high unemployment would be appropriate. Mr. Hiebert responded that language reinforcing this policy could be incorporated into a future chapter of the VISION 2050 plan report.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 5, 2013

Ms. Greene noted that a quorum of Task Force members was now present and asked for a motion to approve past minutes. Ms. Adams moved and Mr. Lapid seconded approval of the Environmental Justice Task Force meeting minutes of November 5, 2013. There was no discussion. The motion was approved unanimously.

FURTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Greene asked if anyone in attendance had additional comments. There following comments were made:

1. Ms. Rotker noted that the regional planning agencies in the San Francisco Bay area included an Environment, Equity, and Jobs (EEJ) scenario in a review of possible alternatives to the proposed regional plan presented in Plan Bay Area. Plan Bay Area is the long-range transportation, land use, and housing plan for the San Francisco Bay Area. She stated that the EEJ scenario was determined to have the best outcomes for equity and environmental quality of the land use and transportation alternatives considered. She stated that a similar scenario, which would maximize equity to underserved and disadvantaged communities, should be developed as part of the VISION 2050 scenario planning process. She stated that the VISION 2050 plan should acknowledge specific populations that will experience a disproportionate adverse impact if the plan is not implemented. She noted as an example that households with no access to a personal vehicle experience a disproportionate adverse impact to declines in transit service compared to the population as a whole.
2. Ms. Rotker stated that she has additional comments that she will submit to Commission staff by e-mail ([see Attachment 4](#)).

NEXT MEETING DATE

Ms. Greene noted that the meeting lasted almost two and a half hours, which is much longer than the scheduled time. She noted that the VISION 2050 planning process is moving along at a rapid pace and asked the Task Force if there is too much related material to review on the current quarterly meeting schedule. Task Force members in attendance expressed concern regarding the amount of materials that would have to be reviewed at each meeting if the quarterly meeting schedule continues. Ms. Greene suggested meeting every two months and asked Mr. McKay to e-mail Task Force members a potential meeting date in early May for their consideration. Mr. McKay noted that Commission staff had e-mailed materials to Task Force members prior to the meeting related to a Title VI complaint relating to the procedures to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend projects for Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

Surface Transportation Program – Milwaukee Urbanized Area (STP-M) funding. He then noted that staff has distributed paper copies of the materials to members during the meeting and that staff will mail paper copies to members who could not attend.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Greene thanked those in attendance and asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Several Task Force members had announcements regarding upcoming events. Ms. Greene suggested adding an item for announcements by Task Force members to future Task Force meeting agendas. Ms. McNeely moved and Ms. Dunbar seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin R. McKay
Recording Secretary

* * *