

Minutes of the Thirty Third Meeting of the
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE TASK FORCE

DATE: April 7, 2015
TIME: 4:30 p.m.
PLACE: Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD)
General Commission Room
260 W. Seeboth Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Members Present

Nancy Holmlund..... Past President, Racine Interfaith Coalition
Vice Chair
Tyrone Dumas..... Educational Consultant,
SOS Center Garden of Hope After School Program, Milwaukee
Ella Dunbar Program Services Manager, Social Development Commission, Milwaukee
Jackie Schellinger Indian Community Representative, Retired Judge
Theresa Schuerman..... Walworth County Bilingual Migrant Worker Outreach

Guests and Staff Present

Stephen P. Adams Public Involvement and Outreach Manager, SEWRPC
Nancy M. Anderson Chief Community Assistance Planner, SEWRPC
Gary K. Korb Public Involvement and Outreach Specialist, SEWRPC
Benjamin R. McKay Principal Planner, SEWRPC
Kevin J. Muhs Principal Transportation Planner, SEWRPC
Kenneth R. Yunker Executive Director, SEWRPC

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Holmlund called the meeting of the Environmental Justice Task Force to order at 4:35 p.m., welcoming those in attendance.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF OCTOBER 7, 2014

Ms. Holmlund noted that there were several last minute cancelations and not enough Task Force members were present at this time to constitute a quorum. No action will be taken on the October 7, 2014, meeting minutes. Ms. Schellinger noted her title should be changed to “Indian Community Representative, Retired Judge.” Ms. Schellinger then referred to Attachment 1 of the minutes “Review of Sketch Scenarios” and asked if VISION 2050 is intended to be implemented over time through the year 2050. Mr. Yunker confirmed that the recommended VISION 2050 plan is intended to be implemented incrementally through the 2050 plan design year.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Holmlund noted public comments regarding the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) for Southeastern Wisconsin were emailed to Task Force members earlier in the day from Karyn Rotker, ACLU of Wisconsin. Mr. Yunker noted the CEDS is agenda item No. 6. Mr. Yunker noted the comments will be attached to the meeting minutes (see Attachment 1). The following discussion points were made regarding Ms. Rotker's comments:

1. Mr. Yunker noted the CEDS is prepared by the Milwaukee 7 (M7) and Southeast Wisconsin Regional Economic Partnership (REP) with assistance from SEWRPC. The M7 is a public-private regional economic development organization. The M7 is governed by a 56 member Advisory Council that includes representatives from many sectors of the Region's economic base, labor, elected officials, and economic development representatives from each of the seven counties in the Region and the City of Milwaukee. The REP consists of the directors of economic development organizations or staff from each of the Region's seven counties, and representatives from the City of Milwaukee Department of City Development, the Wisconsin Energy Corporation, and SEWRPC. He stated that the CEDS is not a SEWRPC regional plan. He added that the economic development plan recommendations in the CEDS are essentially the same as those in M7's Framework for Economic Growth, and the projects in the CEDS were submitted by the local government REP members.
2. Ms. Schellinger suggested the Task Force forward the comments to the M7. Mr. Yunker noted Ms. Rotker's comments can be formally submitted to the M7 through the CEDS website, or through a letter or email. Ms. Schellinger asked if the Task Force is an appropriate body for submission of public comments on the CEDS. Mr. Yunker responded that SEWRPC's role in developing the CEDS is to assist the M7 and REP, which have the lead roles in developing the CEDS. Mr. Yunker explained that each of the seven County Boards in the Region may consider the final CEDS for approval. Approval would then make that county and its local governments eligible to apply for U.S. Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration (EDA) funding to assist economically distressed areas. These areas are census tracts meeting EDA economic distress criteria based on high unemployment and/or low per capita income levels (see Attachment 2 for a map of economically distressed areas based on EDA criteria). To be eligible for funding, projects must be shown to be located in economically distressed areas or directly benefit economically distressed areas. Mr. Yunker noted the economically distressed areas generally align with areas with concentrations of minority populations, particularly in the Cities of Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine (see maps included in Attachment 2).
3. Ms. Holmlund noted Ms. Rotker's comment which asks whether any of the CEDS advisory committee members represent minority owned businesses. Mr. Yunker noted the CEDS is not a SEWRPC regional plan and there is no SEWRPC advisory committee for the CEDS. He explained that development of the CEDS is guided by the M7 Advisory Council and the REP.
4. Ms. Schellinger suggested that the Commission staff have Ms. Rotker's comments entered and considered as public comments regarding the CEDS. Mr. Yunker responded that staff would do this. He added that SEWRPC is a participant in the CEDS development process and the CEDS is not a regional plan. He noted the CEDS is an informational agenda item for the Task Force, and that is why it appears later on the agenda. The intent of the agenda item is to allow Task Force members the opportunity to comment on the CEDS and bring those comments to the attention of

the M7 and the REP. Mr. Yunker also noted staff is not seeking Task Force action on the CEDS, but comments by members will be recorded in the Task Force meeting minutes.

5. Ms. Schuerman asked if the Task Force should consider whether they share Ms. Rotker's concerns. Mr. Dumas suggested that Ms. Rotker's comments should be provided to M7 Advisory Council. Mr. Dumas noted that minority chambers of commerce may be in a better position through their expertise to address the concerns identified by Ms. Rotker regarding the CEDS. Mr. Yunker stated that Ms. Rotker's comments will be entered into the record of public comments on the CEDS and will be considered by the M7 and REP as they develop the final CEDS. All comments received on the CEDS and changes to the CEDS to address those comments will be included in the CEDS record of public comment.

[Secretary's Note: A CEDS summary PowerPoint, executive summary, and a draft of the full CEDS report are available on the [SEWRPC website](#).]

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. Holmlund noted there will be two updates under this agenda item, including an update on the fixed-guideway stations for Alternative Plans I and II and an update on plan objectives and alternative plan evaluation criteria.

Fixed-Guideway Stations for Alternative Plans I and II

Ms. Holmlund asked Commission staff to provide an overview of the land use and transportation components of the Trend and Alternative Plans I and II to be evaluated during the alternative plan stage of VISION 2050, including the fixed-guideway stations included in Alternative Plans I and II. Mr. Muhs of the Commission staff noted a handout outlining the land use and transportation components of the VISION 2050 alternative plans (see Attachment 3) and a handout presenting the fixed-guideway lines and stations to be included in Alternative Plans I and II (see Attachment 4) were distributed to Task Force members. Mr. Muhs then reviewed the handouts.

Mr. Dumas noted discussions regarding commuter rail service in the Region have not advanced. Mr. Muhs responded that State legislation was enacted in 2011 that resulted in the indefinite postponement of the Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee (KRM) Commuter Rail study. He added that the visioning process is intended to generate discussions about different alternatives for future development of the Region's land use and transportation. Mr. Yunker noted that Alternative Plans I and II include extensive expansion of public transit in the Region, including commuter rail and rapid transit lines in addition to increased local transit service. Mr. Yunker added that the impacts of these proposals will be evaluated as part of the alternative plans phase of VISION 2050 and shared with the Task Force for comment.

Plan Objectives and Alternative Plan Evaluation Criteria

Mr. Yunker noted the alternative plans will be evaluated using a set of plan objectives and alternative plan evaluation criteria. Mr. Yunker then asked Mr. Muhs to review the objectives and criteria. Mr. Muhs stated that a set of plan objectives and a set of alternative plan evaluation criteria were developed using the Guiding Statements that form the initial Vision for regional land use and transportation system development. Mr. Muhs noted the Task Force discussed the Guiding Statements at the March 4, 2014, meeting. He stated that the objectives focus on how the Region should desirably look and function in the future. The criteria measure the extent to which each alternative plan meets each plan objective, and will

be used to evaluate and compare the alternative plans. Mr. Muhs noted a draft of the plan objectives and evaluation criteria and a draft of evaluation criteria descriptions were distributed to Task Force members (see Attachment 5). The following comments and discussion points were made during the review:

1. Mr. Dumas noted the Healthy Neighborhoods program, initiated by the Greater Milwaukee Foundation and the City of Milwaukee, engages neighbors and homeowners in strengthening City neighborhoods. Mr. Yunker noted the objectives under Healthy Communities incorporate elements of the Healthy Neighborhoods program.
2. Mr. Dumas referred to Criterion 1.2.1 and asked if the Artery will be considered in evaluating bicycle level of service in the alternative plans. Mr. Muhs responded that off street bicycle paths will be incorporated into the evaluation of bicycle level of service. He noted that off street paths will receive a high grade because bicycle level of service measures the comfort level of using a facility. Mr. Yunker noted the year 2035 regional transportation system plan includes a recommendation for expanding the existing 200 mile off street bicycle path system to over 500 miles. He noted significant expansion has occurred since the plan was adopted in 2006. All Counties in the Region have experienced expansions to the system.
3. Ms. Holmlund noted the Governor's proposed budget may cut the State complete streets statute. Mr. Muhs responded that there are Federal complete streets requirements as well, and they apply to most of the same streets as the State statute.
4. Ms. Holmlund noted there are several different types of commuter and rapid transit technologies that have been implemented throughout the Nation. She noted there are several presentations on YouTube that could be useful in helping people visualize different transit technologies. Mr. Muhs agreed and noted that staff is attempting to help residents visualize various transit technologies that could be implemented in the Region through VISION 2050.
5. Ms. Schellinger referred to Objective 2.1 and asked if it applies only to minority populations. Mr. Yunker referred to Criterion 2.1.1 under the objective and noted the benefits and impacts of the alternative plans on both minority populations and low-income populations will be evaluated. Ms. Schellinger noted there are individuals in other Federal and State protected classes where equity requires consideration beyond race. Mr. Yunker responded that the Criterion 2.1.1 is intended to address Federal Title VI and environmental justice requirements. Mr. Muhs noted staff discussed broader analyses with U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) staff; however, U.S. DOT staff suggested focusing the evaluation on Title VI requirements.
6. Mr. Dumas asked how pavement condition in relation to areas with concentrations of minority and low-income populations will be evaluated between the alternative plans. Mr. Yunker responded that the selection of specific facilities for resurfacing is a higher level of detail than will be addressed by VISION 2050. He noted that this would be a question for municipal governments for municipal streets and counties for county streets and highways.
7. Ms. Dunbar asked for further detail regarding how Objective 2.1 will be evaluated. Mr. Muhs responded that the evaluation criteria are detailed on the two pages following the objectives in the handout. He noted that potential evaluation criteria to be used to estimate the impacts and benefits of the VISION 2050 alternative plans on minority and low-income populations in the Region include the level of accessibility to jobs and activity centers by mode of transportation,

populations served by transit, transit service quality, populations benefited and impacted by new and widened arterial street and highway facilities, and transportation-related air population impacts.

8. Mr. Dumas noted the Black Health Coalition cites high asthma rates for school age children in certain areas. Mr. Yunker noted air pollutant emissions from transportation have significantly declined as instances of asthma have increased.
9. Mr. Dumas asked if Objective 3.3 concerns transportation options with increased efficiency. Mr. Yunker responded that Alternative Plans I and II will include transit technology that is new to the Region and more compact land use development patterns. The private transportation costs under each alternative will then be evaluated. Ms. Dunbar asked if the Ways to Work program, which helps provide reverse commute transportation options, would apply to Objective 3.3. Mr. Muhs responded that Ways to Work is a good example of a program that would minimize an individual's transportation costs, although the scope of individual programs are generally too small in scale to impact evaluation through the travel demand model. Mr. Yunker added that continuation and expansion of the program could be addressed through a plan recommendation. Ms. Dunbar noted the program is still operating in Milwaukee County, but no longer operates in Ozaukee, Washington, or Waukesha Counties.
10. Mr. Dumas noted transportation needs of the elderly and people with disabilities should be considered. Mr. Yunker responded that the ability of the alternative plans to accommodate demographic shifts, including accessibility, will be considered in the evaluation of the alternatives.

REVIEW OF COMMISSION STAFF MEMORANDUM REPORT "A COMPARISON OF THE MILWAUKEE METROPOLITAN AREA TO ITS PEERS"

Ms. Holmlund asked Commission staff to provide an overview of the report. Mr. Muhs noted the report was prepared in response to requests from the Commission's Advisory Committees on Regional Land Use Planning and Regional Transportation System Planning for data regarding how the Milwaukee metropolitan area compares to other large metropolitan areas in a number of key measures, such as population growth and characteristics, economy, and transportation. Mr. Muhs noted the report will be published as a Commission memorandum report and included in the VISION 2050 report as Appendix D. Mr. Muhs then noted the report was distributed to Task Force members and provided an overview (the report is available on the SEWRPC website at www.sewrpc.org/mr221). The following comments and discussion points were made:

1. Mr. Dumas asked how the report will be distributed. Mr. Yunker responded that the report will be reviewed by the Advisory Committees, and Commission staff will prepare a press release and newsletter to highlight the findings once it is approved. The newsletter will also highlight the lack of implementation of the public transit element of the currently adopted year 2035 regional transportation system plan. He noted the intent is to release the findings to the media to encourage public discussion about improving transit and disparities between minority and non-minority residents in the Region.
2. Mr. Dumas suggested holding a public presentation regarding the report. He also suggested encouraging Task Force members to attend. Mr. Yunker responded that Commission staff will

consider the proper format for presenting the report upon reactions to the press release and newsletter. Ms. Dunbar noted the Social Development Commission Board of Commissioners may also be interested in a presentation. Mr. Yunker responded that staff would be pleased to make a presentation to any group or individual upon request. Ms. Holmlund stated that the report may be a catalyst for groups to discuss possible solutions to concerns in the Region. Mr. Dumas agreed that the report presents valuable information and suggested forwarding the report to the M7.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Mr. Yunker noted Commission staff is continuing to develop alternative plans and evaluation criteria. He suggested that staff email a list of potential meeting dates for the Task Force to consider as progress continues.

FURTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no additional public comments.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Yunker announced that this will be Ms. Holmlund's last meeting as a Task Force member, recognizing that she has served as a member since the Task Force was created in 2007. Mr. Yunker thanked Ms. Holmlund for her dedicated service on behalf of Task Force members and Commission staff. Mr. Yunker then thanked those in attendance and attending by phone. He announced the meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin R. McKay
Recording Secretary

* * *