

Minutes of the Fifth Meeting of the

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE TASK FORCE

DATE: July 29, 2008
TIME: 4:00 p.m.
PLACE: HeartLove Place, Inc.
3229 N. Martin Luther King Jr. Drive
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Members Present

Ness Flores.....Attorney, Flores and Reyes Law Offices
Adelene Greene..... Director, Division of Workforce Development,
Chair Kenosha County
Joette HeckenbachCope Services, Ozaukee County
Daryl JohnsonExecutive Director, Riverworks Development Corporation
Lynette McNeely Attorney, Law Offices of Thomas J. Awen; NAACP
Brian PetersHousing Policy Advocate, Independence First
Yolanda Santos Adams Director, League of United Latin American Citizens
Willie Wade Alderman, City of Milwaukee

Guests and Staff Present

Roger BrooksCitizen
Jennifer Epps..... Organizer, Good Jobs and Livable Neighborhoods Coalition
Philip C. Evenson..... Executive Director, SEWRPC
William E. Johnson..... Commissioner, SEWRPC
Joseph T. KleuCitizen
Peter McAvoy16th Street Community Health Center
Dwight McCombPlanning and Program Development Engineer,
U.S. Department of Transportation,
Federal Highway Administration
Benjamin R. McKaySenior Planner, SEWRPC
Karyn Rotker..... Attorney, ACLU of Wisconsin
Jim RowenCitizen
Carlos Pena U.S. Department of Transportation,
Federal Highway Administration
George F. SandersCitizen
Kori A. Schneider - PeragineProgram Manager, Community and Economic Development,
Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council
Todd Sprewer..... Intern, Good Jobs and Livable Neighborhoods Coalition
Kenneth R. Yunker Deputy Director, SEWRPC
Marcus White..... Greater Milwaukee Foundation
Brenda Wood City of Milwaukee

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chairperson Greene called the meeting of the Environmental Justice Task Force to order at 4:10 p.m., welcoming those in attendance. She asked the other Task Force members, staff, and guests present to briefly introduce themselves.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MAY 27, 2008, MEETING

Ms. Greene noted that not enough Task Force members were present to constitute a quorum. Therefore, the minutes of the May 27, 2008, meeting could not be approved or changed; however, she asked if there were any questions or comments on the May 27, 2008, Task Force meeting minutes. There were none.

SEWRPC AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN AND RELATED MATTERS

Ms. Greene requested that Mr. Evenson give an overview of the SEWRPC Affirmative Action Plan. Mr. Evenson proceeded to provide the Task Force with an overview of the Affirmative Action Plan. Mr. Evenson explained that State law specifies the composition of, and appointment of Commissioners to, the Southeastern Regional Planning Commission. The Commission is comprised of three representatives from each County in the Region, including a Commissioner appointed by the Governor, a Commissioner appointed by the County Executive or Board Chairman, and a Commissioner appointed by the Governor from a list provided by the County. Mr. Evenson then stated the SEWRPC Commission presently includes three African-American Commissioners and two Hispanic Commissioners. He then stated that the Commission is comprised of 24 percent minority members, which mirrors the minority fraction of the Region's population.

Mr. Evenson also reviewed the racial composition of SEWRPC staff as reported in the Affirmative Action Plan. Mr. Evenson reported that there are a total of 78 employees and noted that the number of persons employed by SEWRPC has been reduced over the past five years due to stagnant funding levels. Mr. Evenson then referred to Tables 1 and 2, which were distributed to Task Force and audience members (see Attachment 1). He noted that there are currently 10 non-white employees at SEWRPC. Over the past five years the number of non-white employees has fluctuated between 7 and 11 persons. Mr. Evenson then noted that Table 2 shows that 6 percent of the professional staff is comprised of non-white persons and about 13 percent of the overall staff is comprised of non-white persons. Mr. Evenson noted that most of the hiring done by SEWRPC is at the entry level, with promotion to senior and managerial positions largely from within the agency. Mr. Evenson then asked Mr. Yunker to review SEWRPC's minority recruitment outreach efforts.

Mr. Yunker explained that SEWRPC is involved in several outreach efforts. He noted that SEWRPC advertises for open positions in minority newspapers and media outlets and also contacts organizations such as the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Yunker also explained that SEWRPC has participated in a minority student co-op program for the last 10 years. The intent of the program is to identify minority students in, or interested in, civil engineering and planning, provide them a summer and part-time school year job, and attract them to Commission employment upon graduation. Until recently SEWRPC participated in the Encompass Program, which was led by then Milwaukee County Supervisor James White. The Encompass Program encouraged the recruitment of minority students into the engineering and planning fields through internships with Milwaukee County, SEWRPC, and private engineering firms. The focus of the program, which was staffed by current Milwaukee alderperson Milele Cogs, was to recruit minority college and high school students. The program recently ended as Milwaukee County and private firms ended their funding and participation in the program.

Mr. Yunker explained that when the Encompass Program ended SEWRPC continued to operate a minority student co-op program with a focus on working directly with area universities including Marquette University, UW-Milwaukee, and UW-Madison. There are currently four minority student/employees participating in the program. Mr. Yunker stated that SEWRPC will strive to build the

program through continued relationships with the engineering program at Marquette, the engineering and planning programs and UWM and UW, and the minority engineering student associations at each school.

Task Force members raised the following discussion points and comments regarding the SEWRPC Affirmative Action Plan and related matters:

1. Mr. Flores noted the only opportunities for minorities to be hired by SEWRPC are in entry level positions because of the policy to promote from within when senior and managerial positions open. Mr. Evenson responded that the staffing process at SEWRPC has historically been to hire persons who have recently graduated, typically from a graduate level program. He then stated that new hires gain experience with SEWRPC and are promoted within as positions with greater responsibility become available, or use their experience with SEWRPC to obtain a position with greater responsibility with another organization. Mr. Flores then stated that SEWRPC may need to change its hiring policy to open all positions to outside applicants. This may increase the hiring of minorities.
2. Mr. Wade noted the location of the office could be part of the problem and asked if SEWRPC had ever considered creating a satellite office in Milwaukee. Mr. Evenson responded that SEWRPC employees are fairly well compensated and can afford transportation from Milwaukee to the office's current location. He noted that 70 of the 78 positions are professional or technical specialists. Mr. Evenson also noted that throughout the history of the Commission the number of employees residing in the City of Milwaukee has been as high as 25 percent. Mr. Evenson added that a satellite office has been established in the Milwaukee County Research Park and is presently used primarily for meetings.
3. Mr. Flores stated that the location of the main office may in fact be a barrier to some minority applicants. He noted that only one of the eight clerical positions is staffed by a minority. Mr. Flores then stated that possible minority applicants may not be applying for these job openings because of the cost of commuting to the current location of the office. Mr. Evenson stated that the low number of minority clerical employees is more likely due to the reduced need for clerical staff and low turnover rate. Mr. Evenson noted that historically the number of clerical staff has been greatly reduced due to increased efficiency resulting from new technologies. Mr. Evenson noted that as a result the clerical staff at the Commission is long tenured. He added that the most recent clerical hire is an African-American and is his Executive Secretary.
4. Mr. Johnson asked what the turnover rate is for clerical, technical, and professional staff. Mr. Evenson responded that the turnover rate is very low for clerical and technical staff. He stated that the turnover rate of professional staff is somewhat greater. This may be attributed to hiring most new professional staff out of graduate programs. Young professional staff has the opportunity to use the experience gained at SEWRPC to apply for positions with other organizations if they desire. Mr. Johnson then responded that if professional level positions are where there is the greatest turnover, then the hiring process should be open to outside applicants. Mr. Evenson responded that the current hiring practice for those entry professional positions is open, and there are opportunities for minority and non-minority candidates in entry level professional positions to move up in the organization.
5. Ms. Heckenbach asked if SEWRPC job recruitment is typically limited to the Milwaukee area. Mr. Yunker stated that job recruitment is nationwide with the exception of the minority student co-op program, as attracting college and high school students to summer jobs and part-time jobs

during the school year require they attend one of the area universities or are from Southeastern Wisconsin. Ms. Heckenbach suggested that it may be advantageous to increase nationwide recruitment efforts if it is difficult to find minority applicants for professional positions. Mr. Yunker noted that SEWRPC advertises open positions with nationwide professional associations such as the American Planning Association, Institute of Transportation Engineers, and American Society of Civil Engineers. Mr. Evenson noted that if public agencies would combine efforts to do nationwide job recruitment as many private firms do, SEWRPC would take part. Mr. Yunker expressed disappointment that the Encompass Program ended, due to lack of funding and interest by other units of government and private firms. Ms. Heckenbach expressed appreciation for the Encompass Program; however, she stated that the hiring of minority applicants to professional positions needs to happen now because several important regional studies, including the water supply and housing plans, are currently underway.

6. Ms. Greene stated that the outreach efforts SEWRPC has performed to attract minority job applicants are commendable, but perhaps the Task Force can identify additional outreach ideas and techniques. Mr. Wade noted that location is one of the factors stated in the Affirmative Action Plan as a barrier to hiring minorities. Mr. Evenson responded that in the past he thought that location might be a factor; however, due to the nature of the positions he has come to the conclusion that location is not a significant factor. Mr. Wade asked if this statement will be removed from future reports. Mr. Evenson responded that the statement likely will be modified.
7. Ms. Heckenbach suggested SEWRPC could use a specialist to assist with minority recruitment and recruitment for specialized positions that are difficult to fill. Mr. Evenson stated that this possibility has come up in the past. Mr. Yunker noted that some positions are very difficult to fill such as the current transportation travel demand modeler position, which has been vacant for some time. Mr. Flores recommended SEWRPC use a specialist to help with identifying minority job candidates.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MAY 27, 2008, MEETING

Ms. Greene asked to return to agenda item number two because the Task Force now has enough members present to constitute a quorum. Mr. Flores made a motion to approve the minutes from the May 27, 2008, meeting. Ms. Santos Adams seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

SEWRPC REGIONAL HOUSING STUDY

Mr. Evenson noted that Task Force members were requested to submit their individual lists of candidates for the SEWRPC Housing Advisory Committee by August 8, 2008.

Task Force members raised the following discussion points and comments regarding the regional housing study advisory committee selection and appointment process:

1. Mr. Flores stated that the list of organizations that should be represented on the Advisory Committee may be too structured (see Attachment 2). He also stated that there should be public representation on the committee. He noted that representatives from the public who are not affiliated with an interest or governmental organization may bring a perspective to the committee that otherwise might go without representation. Mr. Evenson stated that the list of organizations is just a starting point to work from and does not need to be followed rigidly. Mr. Evenson added

that Jennifer Epps, an Organizer with the Good Jobs and Livable Neighborhoods Coalition, had made a similar suggestion at the May 27, 2008, meeting.

2. Ms. Greene stated that 13 representatives from the government category may be too many. Mr. Evenson stated that there are many potential government agencies including 147 local governments within the Region and County, State, and Federal government agencies that need to be represented on the Advisory Committee. There should be balanced geographical representation to accommodate the large number of government agencies present in the Region; however, the list of organizations is not intended to be overly prescriptive.
3. Mr. Wade submitted a list of candidates to Mr. Evenson.
4. Ms. Greene then asked the Task Force if all of the candidates should be put into a pool individually for consideration or if they should be organized by category. Mr. Wade stated that his list of candidates is organized by category and it should be easier if candidates in the larger pool are organized by category. Mr. Yunker stated SEWRPC will organize all submittals into categories following the August 8 deadline with brief biographies. Mr. Evenson stated that self-nominated candidates would also be included. Ms. Santos Adams asked if any audience members present would like to be considered by the Advisory Committee. Mr. Evenson noted that some audience members had already requested consideration. Mr. Sanders then requested consideration for membership on the Committee.
5. Ms. Heckenbach asked if the categories could be discussed further. She suggested that “green developer” be added under the Housing Production category. Mr. Evenson stated “green developer” is one of the intended representatives from the Housing Production category. Ms. Heckenbach requested that the specific term “green developer” be included on the list. Mr. Evenson stated the need for specialists in multi-family green building and affordable housing development has been mentioned in feedback he has received from the housing development community regarding the list. Ms. Heckenbach requested that a letter F) for green developers be added under the Housing Production category and a letter I) for affordable housing be added under the Housing Advocacy Organizations category. Mr. Evenson stated that affordable housing advocacy overlaps with all of the housing advocacy organization types listed.
6. Mr. Evenson asked for clarification of Mr. Flores’s suggestion for public representatives on the Advisory Committee. Mr. Flores stated that the categories on the list of organizations do not accommodate representatives who are not affiliated with a housing-related organization, builder, or government agency, further stating that there is no category for a citizen of the Region who may be interested in housing issues.
7. Mr. Peters inquired if there would be a problem with Federal government agency representatives participating on an advisory committee. Mr. Yunker stated that SEWRPC will review this with potential Federal governmental representatives. He noted that sometimes Federal officials may be reluctant to participate in some committee actions, as they may not want to influence local decisions. He added that their service on the committee would provide a valuable informational resource, for example, regarding Federal housing programs. Mr. Evenson noted that Federal representatives have participated as non-voting members on some Commission advisory committees.

8. Mr. Johnson asked if bankers and mortgage professional are represented on the list. Mr. Evenson replied that they are included in D) housing finance under the Housing Production category.
9. Mr. Peters asked if SEWRPC staff would prepare the entire plan or if consultants will be hired to assist with preparation of the plan. Mr. Evenson stated that at this time there are no plans to hire a consultant; however, as work on the plan proceeds, consultants could be hired if deemed desirable.
10. Ms. Heckenbach stated that one of the duties assigned to the Task Force is to make recommendations regarding preparation of SEWRPC plans. With this duty in mind, Ms. Heckenbach suggested that all SEWRPC plans, including the housing plan and water supply plan, should include a socio-economic impact analysis. She also stated that the analysis should be prepared by a qualified independent consultant. Ms. Heckenbach then made a motion stating that all SEWRPC plans incorporate a socio-economic impact analysis prepared by a qualified independent consultant. Ms. McNeely seconded the motion. Mr. Evenson stated that SEWRPC has skilled staff that can prepare an analysis of this nature. Mr. Evenson then stated that a socio-economic impact analysis can be included in the regional housing plan work program and as work progresses it can be determined if an outside consultant is needed. Mr. Evenson also suggested that the scope of the socio-economic impact analysis should be discussed and reviewed as part of the housing plan work program.
11. Mr. Flores asked Ms. Heckenbach if the term she used for the analysis was “socio-economic impact analysis.” Ms. Heckenbach responded that the term is indeed socio-economic impact analysis. Mr. Flores asked if this type of analysis would include an environmental justice component. Ms. Heckenbach stated that it would. Mr. Flores then asked Mr. Evenson if, given the further clarification regarding the components of the analysis, he still believes SEWRPC can perform the analysis in-house. Mr. Evenson reiterated that he believes SEWRPC can perform such an analysis. Ms. Heckenbach then stated that SEWRPC is very skilled at performing quantitative analysis, but she has not seen SEWRPC complete an analysis of the nature that she is requesting. Mr. Evenson responded that it is a matter of including a socio-economic impact analysis in the work program as a plan is prepared. Mr. Yunker stated that SEWRPC staff would work with Ms. Heckenbach and the Environmental Justice Task Force to define and include a socio-economic impact analysis in the regional housing plan.
12. Ms. Heckenbach stated that she had distributed information regarding the socio-economic impact analysis on the Task Force list serve in December 2007.
13. Ms. Santos Adams noted that Ms. Heckenbach’s motion would recommend to SEWRPC that a socio-economic impact analysis be included in all SEWRPC plans. Ms. Heckenbach stated that the motion would also recommend that a qualified independent consultant perform the analysis. Mr. Wade asked if Ms. Heckenbach’s desire to have the analysis performed by a consultant was because SEWRPC had not performed this type of analysis in the past. Mr. Wade then asked Mr. Evenson to comment on this. Mr. Evenson stated SEWRPC is capable of performing a socio-economic impact analysis. Mr. Evenson also stated that he does not support the position that SEWRPC is not capable of performing an analysis of this nature. He further stated that the analysis could be included in the regional housing plan work program. Mr. Wade responded that he thinks some members of the Task Force may be uncomfortable with SEWRPC performing the analysis because of SEWRPC’s lack of experience in performing this type of analysis.

14. Mr. Flores asked whether the current wording of the motion precludes SEWRPC staff from performing the socio-economic impact analysis. Ms. Heckenbach stated that the motion requires the analysis to be performed by a qualified independent consultant, and thus precludes SEWRPC staff from performing the analysis. Ms. Heckenbach also noted that the motion would apply to all SEWRPC plans, not just the regional housing plan. Ms. Santos Adams suggested striking from the motion the requirement that an independent consultant conduct the analysis. Mr. Flores indicated that he would second the amended motion. Ms. Santos Adams stated that she would like SEWRPC staff to have a chance to undertake the analysis. Mr. Wade asked if this was a friendly amendment to the existing motion. Ms. Santos Adams stated it was meant as a friendly amendment.
15. Ms. Heckenbach then suggested that action on the motion be postponed to allow Task Force members a chance to read information on the subject. She also stated she would re-send the information via the list serve. Mr. Flores then suggested the motion should be tabled. Mr. Evenson then suggested that no action be taken on the motion and the meeting minutes would include the lengthy discussion regarding the socio-economic impact analysis. Mr. Wade then stated that there may need to be action on the motion to ensure the item is on the agenda for the next Task Force meeting. Ms. Greene assured the Task Force that this item will be on the next agenda regardless of whether action is taken on the motion. Mr. Evenson stated that the meeting minutes could show the motion was effectively withdrawn.
16. Mr. Peters asked Ms. Heckenbach if she would be satisfied if a socio-economic impact analysis expert was on the Advisory Committee and reviewed the work done by SEWRPC staff. Ms. Heckenbach responded that the socio-economic impact analysis is too large of a task to be undertaken in this manner. Mr. Flores inquired about budgetary constraints. Mr. Yunker responded that SEWRPC staff will examine in depth the potential scope of the requested analysis and estimate its cost.
17. Mr. Wade stated that it seems the Task Force supports the idea of a socio-economic impact analysis as a component of all SEWRPC plans, but there seems to be disagreement over who should conduct the analysis. Mr. Wade then stated that when the Task Force revisits the motion, it should be the original motion as stated by Ms. Heckenbach. Ms. McNeely then agreed to remove her second to the motion and the matter was effectively postponed to the next meeting.

The Task Force then discussed the status of the scope of work of the regional housing plan. Mr. Evenson stated the scope of work remains an incomplete work product and will need to be updated to include today's discussion about a socio-economic impact analysis component. The intent will be to release the scope of work simultaneously to the Advisory Committee and the Task Force for review. Both groups will be asked to comment on the scope of work this fall, the comments will be shared, and the Advisory Committee will make a recommendation to the full Commission.

Mr. Peters recalled that a Task Force motion regarding Advisory Committee composition was made at the May 27, 2008, meeting. He asked whether women were also included in the 20 percent goal. Mr. Evenson and Ms. Santos Adams responded that women were part of the motion that was made at the May 27, 2008, meeting.

SEWRPC REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY STUDY

Mr. Evenson asked Mr. Yunker to update the Task Force on the regional water supply study. Mr. Yunker reviewed with the Task Force a PowerPoint handout entitled "Update on Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Water Supply Study" (see Attachment 3).

Task Force members raised the following discussion points and comments regarding the regional water supply study:

1. Mr. Flores asked how widespread the deep aquifer is. Mr. Yunker stated that the deep aquifer extends beyond the Region to Northeastern Illinois and into Jefferson County.
2. Mr. Flores asked if the City of Waukesha would have to install new return flow infrastructure or utilize existing New Berlin or Metropolitan Milwaukee Sewerage District (MMSD) infrastructure, if Lake Michigan water is extended to the City. Mr. Yunker stated that two alternatives are being examined, one including construction of new return infrastructure to Lake Michigan, and another that would return treated water to water courses within the Lake Michigan Basin. The environmental implications of the second alternative will require in-depth examination in follow up work should that alternative be selected.
3. Ms. Heckenbach asked if there is a target date for coming to a decision on a recommended plan. Mr. Yunker responded that there is still a great deal of work still to be completed. Mr. Evenson stated there may be discussion regarding the testing and evaluation of a composite alternative at a fall or winter Task Force meeting.
4. Ms. McNeely asked if capital costs are the costs of building new infrastructure. Mr. Yunker stated that is correct. Ms. McNeely questioned whether the capital cost would be paid by those that receive the benefits. Ms. McNeely asked what the cost to current users of Lake Michigan water would be for the capital improvements involved with the expansion of Lake Michigan water to other outlying communities. Mr. Yunker stated that expansion costs would not be incurred by current users of Lake Michigan water, but would be paid by the outlying communities. Mr. Evenson noted that water utility rates for current users should decrease if additional users are paying for Lake Michigan water. Ms. McNeely noted the high capital cost of Alternative Plan 4, and asked if this makes the alternative unattractive. Mr. Yunker agreed, and responded that the composite alternative is being developed to incorporate the most attractive components of the four alternatives. Mr. Evenson stated that the Advisory Committee for the water supply plan is attempting to develop an alternative that is sustainable, meets the requirements of the Great Lakes Compact, eliminates drawdown from the deep aquifer, and does so at a reasonable cost.
5. Mr. Flores asked if the connection between the deep aquifer and the Great Lakes could be argued as satisfying the Great Lakes Compact requirements for using water within the Lake Michigan basin. Mr. Evenson responded that this would not meet the requirements of the Compact. Mr. Wade stated that another item to be considered is that water supply infrastructure only needs to be built to the point where infrastructure already exists. Mr. Wade noted that City of Milwaukee water is high quality and low cost, which makes it an attractive source for other communities. Mr. Wade stated that expanding public transit and affordable housing should be considered during water sale negotiations. Ms. McNeely asked if the City is trying to require public transit expansion in current water sale negotiations. Mr. Wade responded there had been a City of

Milwaukee Public Works Committee meeting earlier in the day at which it addressed these issues with the City of New Berlin as part of the potential provision of City of Milwaukee water to the central portion of New Berlin. Mr. Wade also stated that the outcome of the meeting may have an impact on future negotiations with other communities. Mr. Wade stated that the City is to receive a \$1.5 million payment from the City of New Berlin, and a study is to be done by the City regarding the value of City water for use in future negotiations. Mr. Evenson noted that the Commission had participated in negotiations in the Racine area regarding water supply and sewage treatment, which resulted in tax base sharing by Racine suburbs with the City of Racine

6. Mr. Flores noted that the meeting was running over schedule and suggested that in the future the public comment item be placed first on the agenda because Task Force meetings are typically very lengthy. Mr. Evenson suggested that the remaining agenda items be placed on the agenda for the next Task Force meeting to accommodate those members of the public who have stayed and would like a chance to comment. Ms. Greene then moved to agenda item 7, "Public Comments."

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Greene thanked the Task Force for their active participation, and audience members for their patience. She then asked whether those in attendance wished to comment. The following comments were made:

1. Ms. Rotker stated that the socio-economic impact analysis discussed today should be incorporated into the regional water supply study. She also stated that it is important to incorporate special expertise in preparing the analysis.
2. Mr. Rowen stated that he agrees with Mr. Wade that the discussion at the City of Milwaukee Public Works Committee regarding the water sale negotiation with New Berlin was very interesting. He requested that, if possible, SEWRPC post video of the meeting on its website. Mr. Rowen then made some observations regarding the SEWRPC Affirmative Action Plan. He stated that he had reviewed the previously published plans and most of the data are consistent throughout the years. He stated that the number of minority employees is low and consistent from year to year and that the number of minority workers have not been identified as part-time or full-time employees. Mr. Rowen then stated that the location of the office was noted as a concern regarding minority employment during years when the office was located in downtown Waukesha and also at its current location. Mr. Rowen suggested that a program needs to be implemented to increase the number of minority employees, and that the SEWRPC office location should be reconsidered.
3. Mr. McAvoy stated that he looks forward to further discussion of his comments from the May 27, 2008, Task Force meeting at the next meeting of the Task Force. Mr. McAvoy then stated that he agrees with Ms. Heckenbach's suggestions regarding the socio-economic impact analysis. He further stated that a socio-economic impact analysis should be an essential element of the regional water supply plan and regional land use plan. Mr. McAvoy stated that this type of analysis will add additional cost to the preparation of regional plans; however, the result of the analysis should lead to plans that are of a greater benefit to the Region.
4. Mr. Sanders stated the most important aspect of any affirmative action plan is how an agency assesses its capacity to activate goals and timetable objectives. Agency composition, or its

selection process, while important, should be carefully approached, otherwise intended objectives may become difficult. Mr. Sanders also suggested that information regarding the water supply plan, including how citizen participation is employed and how specific funds are distributed, should be provided to local governments. Mr. Sanders then noted that smaller municipalities in the Region may not be aware of the non-entitlement CDBG program which replaced the Small Cities Program in the State. Mr. Sanders then provided a written copy of his comments to be included in the meeting minutes (see Attachment 4).

5. Ms. Rotker stated that all communities in the Region should comply with regional principles, not just those communities purchasing water from Milwaukee.

NEXT MEETING

There being no further comments, Ms. Greene indicated that the next meeting of the Task Force would be on Tuesday, September 30, 2008. She then asked where the location will be. Mr. Evenson stated that a specific location has not been set; however, it will be in Waukesha County. It was then noted that there were religion-based observation conflicts with the September 30 date. Accordingly, the meeting date was re-scheduled for September 23, 2008.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Greene again thanked the Task Force and guests for their time and participation. With several Task Force members departing, Ms. Greene declared the meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin R. McKay
Recording Secretary

* * *