

Minutes of the Thirty Seventh Meeting of the  
**ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE TASK FORCE**

DATE: June 21, 2016  
TIME: 4:30 p.m.  
PLACE: Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD)  
General Commission Room  
260 W. Seeboth Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Members Present

Adelene Greene..... Director of Workforce Development, Kenosha County  
Chair  
Tyrone Dumas..... Educational Consultant,  
Vice-Chair SOS Center Garden of Hope After School Program, Milwaukee  
Yolanda Adams..... President and CEO, Urban League of Racine and Kenosha  
Huda Alkaff ..... Founder and Director, Wisconsin Green Muslims  
Ella Dunbar ..... Program Services Manager, Social Development Commission, Milwaukee  
N. Lynnette McNeely..... Legal Redress Chair, Waukesha County NAACP  
Jackie Schellinger ..... Indian Community Representative, Retired Judge  
May yer Thao..... Director, Hmong Chamber of Commerce  
Willie Wade ..... Vice President, Milwaukee Area Workforce Investment Board

Guests and Staff Present

Stephen P. Adams ..... Public Involvement and Outreach Manager, SEWRPC  
Mary Florenza..... Transportation Planner, Systems Planning and Performance,  
Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation  
Dennis Grzezinski ..... Law Office of Dennis Grzezinski  
Michael G. Hahn..... Deputy Director, SEWRPC  
Benjamin R. McKay ..... Principal Planner, SEWRPC  
Kevin J. Muhs ..... Principal Transportation Planner, SEWRPC  
Karyn Rotker..... Senior Staff Attorney, ACLU of Wisconsin  
Kenneth R. Yunker ..... Executive Director, SEWRPC

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 22, 2016, MEETING MINUTES**

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

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Ms. Greene asked if there were any public comments. The following public comments were made:

1. Ms. Rotker referred to Appendix N of VISION 2050, which documents the equitable access analysis of the Federally Recognized Transportation Plan, and noted that although over 80 percent of the minority population in Milwaukee County uses automobiles for work trips, a high percentage of African American and Hispanic residents are not employed and do not have a driver's license. She stated that this results in a greater adverse impact on minority residents than nonminority residents from reductions in transit service, and suggested acknowledging this impact in the analysis.

[Secretary's Note: The Federally Recognized Transportation Plan has been renamed the Fiscally Constrained Transportation Plan and is referred to as such in the remainder of the meeting minutes.]

Mr. Yunker responded that, as discussed at previous Task Force meetings, Federal regulations require the Region's transportation plan to only include projects that can be funded with existing and reasonably expected future revenues. Therefore, only the funded portion of the VISION 2050 Final Recommended Plan would be considered the regional transportation plan by the Federal government. Commission staff have titled this collection of funded projects the Fiscally Constrained Transportation Plan (FCTP). Mr. Yunker noted that the Public Transit Element of the VISION 2050 Final Recommended Plan cannot be implemented within existing and reasonably expected future funds and the existing and likely expected future limitations and restrictions on the uses of those funds. Therefore, transit service under the FCTP would be expected to decline rather than significantly improve as proposed under the Final Recommended Plan. Mr. Yunker then noted that the potential consequences of reduced transit service have been presented throughout the VISION 2050 planning process by comparing the Trend, which includes significant reduction in transit services, to four conceptual land use and transportation scenarios, two detailed alternative plans, and the Preliminary Recommended Plan. Mr. Yunker added that Appendix N documents that minority populations rely on public transit more than the nonminority population in the Region.

2. Ms. Rotker referred to the analysis of the Arterial Street and Highway Element of the FCTP and stated that expansion of IH 43 between Howard Avenue and Silver Spring Drive in Milwaukee County may have adverse impacts on residents living near the freeway and may also have benefits for residents that do not live near the freeway. Mr. Yunker responded that select link analysis, as recommended by Alex Karner, PhD, of the Global Institute of Sustainability at Arizona State University, was used to determine utilization of segments of arterial streets and highways that would be improved under the Preliminary Recommended Plan. Mr. Yunker noted that the Final Recommended Plan does not make a recommendation regarding the reconstruction of IH 43 between Howard Avenue and Silver Spring Drive. The Final Plan recommends that preliminary engineering consider alternatives for rebuilding with additional lanes and rebuilding with the existing number of lanes. VISION 2050 would be amended to reflect the decision made in preliminary engineering. Mr. Yunker then noted that the Commission's Advisory Committees on Regional Transportation System Planning and Regional Land Use Planning unanimously approved this decision.

Ms. Greene asked if there were any further public comments. There were none.

## **DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDED PLAN AND DISCUSSION OF THE FINAL RECOMMENDED PLAN FOR VISION 2050**

Mr. Yunker noted that agenda items No. 4, discussion of public feedback on the Preliminary Recommended Plan, and No. 5, discussion of the Final Recommended Plan, will be presented using the PowerPoint handout distributed for the meeting (available [here](#)). Mr. Yunker then asked Mr. Muhs of the Commission staff to provide an overview of the public feedback on the Preliminary Plan. Mr. Muhs noted that the public feedback is summarized in the first half of the PowerPoint handout. He noted that further discussion of the public feedback is documented in Part III of Volume II, Chapter IV of the VISION 2050 report and presented in greater detail in Appendix J of the VISION 2050 report (available [here](#)). The following comments and discussion points were made during the overview:

1. Ms. Adams noted the extensive public outreach conducted to obtain feedback on the Preliminary Plan, including working with the eight VISION 2050 partner community organizations to obtain feedback from minority and low-income populations. She asked if this outreach is documented. Mr. Yunker responded that Part III of Volume II, Chapter IV includes a summary of the public outreach conducted for the Preliminary Plan, including the public and partner workshops and the interactive website. Mr. Yunker added that Appendix J includes a detailed description of the partner workshops with reports from each partner as well as summary of all the feedback on the Preliminary Plan obtained from the public workshops, partner workshops, and website.
2. Ms. McNeely asked for clarification on Table J-1 in Appendix J. Mr. Muhs responded that Table J-1 presents partner workshop attendance for each partner during the five rounds of VISION 2050 workshops. He noted that a total of 975 people attended partner workshops and 195 people attended a partner workshop during the fifth and final round of outreach, which was on the Preliminary Plan.
3. Ms. McNeely noted a comment stating that the Preliminary Plan includes too much population growth in Walworth County. Mr. Yunker responded that population levels included in the Preliminary Plan are based on detailed projections developed by the Commission. Those projections include a range of future population levels – high, intermediate, and low. The projections consider vital events that affect populations levels, including births, death, and migration. The Commission’s Advisory Committees on Regional Land Use Planning and Regional Transportation System Planning determined that the intermediate projection is the mostly likely to be achieved and was used as the basis for the population forecast for Walworth County in the Preliminary Plan. Mr. Yunker added that the Commission compares actual population levels to forecast population levels on an annual basis, and these comparisons have shown that past forecast population levels have been accurate.

Mr. Yunker noted that a similar comment was received at the Ozaukee County workshop. The basis of that comment was that the Preliminary Plan was over forecasting population in Ozaukee County to justify transit improvements. Mr. Yunker explained that the Region will need to compete with other Regions for the first time in decades to attract the workers needed for the economy to grow. He stated that the Transit Element of the Preliminary Plan will help the Region compete with other Regions for workers and employers. Mr. Yunker then noted that the FCTP does not include the significant increase in transit that is recommended by the Preliminary

Plan because it cannot be funded with existing or reasonably expected future revenues. Mr. Yunker stated that the FCTP would be amended to include additional transit projects as potential revenue sources become available over time.

4. Mr. Dumas suggested that Commission staff share suggestions for publicizing events with the partner organizations. Mr. Yunker responded that Commission staff will continue to work with the partner organizations in the future.

Ms. Greene asked if there were any further comments regarding public feedback on the Preliminary Plan. There were none. Ms. Greene then asked Mr. Yunker to provide an overview of the VISION 2050 Final Recommended Plan. Mr. Yunker noted that the second half of the PowerPoint handout includes changes to the Preliminary Plan to be included in the Final Plan, an outline of the Final Plan, a summary of the equity analysis of the Land Use Component, a summary of the FCTP, and a summary of the equitable access analysis of the FCTP. Mr. Yunker then stated that the Final Recommended Plan, FCTP, equity analysis of the land use component, and equitable access analysis of the FCTP will be included in Volume III, *Recommended Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan*, of the VISION 2050 report (available [here](#)). The following comments and discussion points were made during the overview:

1. Ms. Schellinger asked for clarification regarding the inclusion of the Milwaukee Streetcar in the Final Plan. Mr. Yunker responded that the City of Milwaukee has requested a revision to the recommendation regarding the rapid transit network to remove references to the potential extension of the Milwaukee Streetcar service as light rail service. The Streetcar will serve downtown and connect downtown to nearby neighborhoods. He noted that the Streetcar and rapid transit may operate in the same corridor for a limited extent in some instances. Mr. Yunker added that VISION 2050 identifies potential rapid transit corridors, which may change in the future based on detailed corridor studies undertaken by the implementing agency.
2. Mr. Wade commented on the importance of the corridor connecting UW-Milwaukee to the airport. Mr. Yunker responded that the Final Plan will include rapid transit lines that connect UW-Milwaukee to downtown Milwaukee and the airport (see Attachment 1 for a map of the VISION 2050 public transit system). Mr. Yunker noted that Milwaukee County is currently pursuing bus rapid transit (BRT) for the corridor between downtown Milwaukee and the Regional Medical Center. Ms. McNeely commented that expanding local bus routes may also provide residents with better transit service. Mr. Muhs responded that the proposed BRT line and other rapid transit service would be designed to complement perpendicular local bus service to allow transit users to travel longer distances at faster speeds. Mr. Yunker noted that rapid transit for the corridor between downtown Milwaukee and the Regional Medical Center has been a long standing recommendation in previous regional transportation system plans.
3. Ms. Schellinger noted that there were several public comments in opposition to adding additional lanes to IH 43 between Howard Avenue and Silver Spring Drive. She commented that it is important to consider public feedback, but it is also important to consider quantitative analyses. Mr. Yunker responded that the benefits and impacts of widening and not widening this segment of IH 43 were analyzed by Commission staff and presented to the Advisory Committees on Regional Transportation System Planning and Regional Land Use Planning, which unanimously approved the recommendation that preliminary engineering consider both alternatives and amending VISION 2050 to reflect the decision made as a result of preliminary engineering. Mr. Yunker noted that the same recommendation was made for this segment of IH 43 in the regional

freeway reconstruction plan completed in 2003. Mr. Muhs added that this option was accepted by officials representing the City of Milwaukee and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation on the VISION 2050 Advisory Committees.

4. Ms. Schellinger referred to the equity analysis of the Land Use Component and commented that implementing the land use recommendations would benefit a diverse population because the recommendations promote access to opportunities throughout the Region. Mr. Wade asked if previous generation regional land use plans include similar recommendations. Mr. Yunker responded that the land use recommendations in VISION 2050 are long standing recommendations that have been included in previous regional land use plans. He noted that the City of Hartford in Washington County is a good example of a community that has implemented regional plan recommendations by allowing the development of housing that is affordable to moderate-income households to meet the demand created by a number of growing businesses in their industrial park.
5. Mr. Wade commented that transportation is also a concern. Mr. Yunker noted that investing in public transit will help the Region compete with other regions for needed labor force. Mr. Yunker noted that jobs grew steadily in the Region between 1983 and 2001; however, that type of job growth cannot occur again without in-migrating workers. The existing population provided the potential to grow labor force sufficient for a more than doubling of jobs in the previous 30 years. This was a result of the baby boom generation coming of age, as the baby boom generation was twice as big as the previous generation. In addition, this was a period when women entered the labor force in increasing numbers. The next 35 years will not have the same potential to grow the labor force from within the existing population. The generations that follow the baby boom generation are no longer larger than the baby boom generation, and women now participate in the labor force in nearly the same proportion as men. As a result, jobs will only grow if the Region can attract population and labor force, and every other region in the United States will be in the same position.
6. Ms. McNeely referred to Recommendation 1.15, develop a regional food system, and suggested including vertical farming as an example of urban agriculture. Mr. Dumas noted that organizations such as Growing Power can work with local governments regarding urban agricultural policies.

[Secretary's Note: Vertical farming has been added to Recommendation 1.15 as an example of urban agriculture.]

7. Ms. Thao asked for clarification regarding the basis of the Land Use Component equity analysis findings. Mr. McKay responded that results from the evaluations of the Alternative Plans and Preliminary Plan were considered, along with public comment obtained during the VISION 2050 planning process and findings from prior planning efforts such as the regional housing plan.

Ms. Greene asked if there were any further comments regarding Final Recommended Plan for VISION 2050. There were none.

## **APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 22, 2016, MEETING MINUTES**

Ms. Greene noted that a quorum of Task Force members was now present and asked if there were any questions or comments on the March 22, 2016, meeting minutes. There were none. Ms. Greene then asked for a motion to approve the March 22, 2016, meeting minutes. Ms. Adams moved and Ms. Schellinger seconded the approval of the March 22, 2016, meeting minutes. The motion was approved unanimously.

## **NEXT MEETING DATE**

Ms. Greene noted that the next meeting would be in September if the Task Force would like to stay on a quarterly schedule. She requested that Commission staff email Task Force members with prospective September meeting dates.

## **FURTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Ms. Greene asked if there were any public comments. The following public comments were made:

1. Mr. Grzezinski referred to the fourth bullet under Section 2.2 of the FCTP and suggested adding information that demonstrates the disproportional reliance of the minority population on public transportation compared to the nonminority population.

[Secretary's Note: The following text has been added to the bullet:

“Only 50 percent to 60 percent of Black and Hispanic adults in Milwaukee County have a driver's license, compared to about 80 percent of nonminority adults.”]

2. Ms. Rotker referred to the equitable access analysis of the FCTP and commented that not only would minority populations experience a disproportionate share of adverse impacts from reduction in transit services compared to nonminority populations, but nonminority populations would receive a disproportionate share of positive impacts from highway expansion because they are less dependent on transit than minority populations.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Greene thanked those in attendance and attending by phone. She then declared the meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin R. McKay  
Recording Secretary

\* \* \*