Minutes of the Fifteenth Meeting of the
REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: November 30, 2011
TIME: 1:30 p.m.
PLACE: Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center, Meeting Room 4
       State Fair Park
       640 S. 84th Street
       Milwaukee, Wisconsin
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William R. Drew ..................................................... Executive Director, Milwaukee County Research Park,
            Chairman Commissioner, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
David Cappon ................................................................. Executive Director, Waukesha Housing Authority
Michael Cotter .................................................................................................... Director, Walworth County
            Land Use and Resource Management Department
Joe Heck.................................................................................. Assistant Director, Racine Department of City Development
Jeff Labahn........................................................................ Director of City Development, City of Kenosha
George Melcher ....................................................Director of Planning and Development, Kenosha County
Linda Olson .................................... Director, Aging and Disability Resource Center of Washington County
Antonio M. Pérez ...............................................Executive Director, City of Milwaukee Housing Authority
Brian Peters........................................................................... Housing Policy Advocate, IndependenceFirst
Kim Plache........................................................... Senior Community Relations Officer, Milwaukee Office of WHEDA
Welford Sanders.................................................. Executive Director, M. L. King Economic Development Corporation
Kori Schneider-Peragine ...................................................... Senior Administrator, Inclusive Communities Program,
            Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council
Michael Soika. .....................................................Vice President, Urban Strategy and Social Responsibility
            YMCA of Metropolitan Milwaukee
Andrew Struck ....................................................Director, Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department
Marne Stück ........................................................... Government Affairs Director, Greater Milwaukee Association of Realtors
John Weishan Jr. ......................................................... Supervisor, Milwaukee County
            Commissioner, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Guests and Staff Present
Stephen P. Adams ..................................................... Public Involvement and Outreach Manager, SEWRPC
Nancy M. Anderson .......................................................... Chief Community Assistance Planner, SEWRPC
Benjamin R. McKay ...........................................................Principal Planner, SEWRPC
Tom Nelson................................................................. Fair Housing Director, Milwaukee Office of HUD
Christopher D. Parisey ................................................................. Planner, SEWRPC
Karyn Rotker........................................................................... Senior Staff Attorney, ACLU of Wisconsin
Sandy Scherer ..................................................... Senior Planner, Waukesha County Department of Parks and Land Use
Kenneth R. Yunker ................................................................. Executive Director, SEWRPC
CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Drew called the meeting of the Regional Housing Plan Advisory Committee to order at 1:37 p.m., welcoming those in attendance.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF OCTOBER 26, 2011

Mr. Drew asked if there were any questions or comments on the October 26, 2011, meeting minutes. There were none. Hearing no comments, Mr. Drew asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Mr. Struck made a motion to approve the minutes from the October 26, 2011, meeting. Mr. Cotter seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the minutes were approved unanimously by the Committee.

DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF THE REVISED DRAFT OF CHAPTER IX, ACCESSIBLE HOUSING, OF THE REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN

Mr. Drew asked Ms. N. Anderson of the Commission staff to review the revised draft of Chapter IX, Accessible Housing. Ms. N. Anderson noted that the Committee had reviewed the preliminary draft of Chapter IX at the December 1, 2010, meeting and revisions to address comments from that meeting are underlined in the revised draft of the Chapter. She then described the revisions. The following discussion points and comments were made during the review:

1. Mr. Yunker noted that the hatches showing public transit service areas on Map IX-3 are difficult to see and will be made bolder (see Attachment 1).

2. Mr. Struck noted that the City of Port Washington shared ride taxi service was discontinued in 2011, and that the Ozaukee County shared ride taxi service now serves the City. He noted that the date of Map IX-3 is 2010, so the information shown on the map is correct, but suggested adding a note stating that the County now provides the taxi service in the City. Mr. Peters noted that there are other shared ride taxi services in the Region that provide service for the elderly that are not shown on Map IX-3. Mr. Yunker responded that only those services open to the general public are shown on Map IX-3.

   [Secretary’s Note: The following note has been added to Map IX-3:
   “Beginning in 2011, shared ride taxi service in the City of Port Washington is provided as part of the Ozaukee County shared ride taxi service.”]

3. Mr. Drew asked if age composition data are available regarding the number of households including at least one person with a disability. Ms. N. Anderson responded that staff would look into this matter.

   [Secretary’s Note: The Census provides only the number of households reporting a member with a disability. Age composition is not available for persons with a disability within a household.]

4. Mr. Drew asked if there were any further questions or comments regarding Chapter IX. There were none. Hearing no additional comments, Mr. Drew asked for a motion to approve the Chapter. Mr. Pérez made a motion to approve Chapter IX, Accessible Housing, incorporating
comments discussed by the Committee. Mr. Struck seconded the motion. Mr. Peters asked if the Chapter could be revised further after approval by the Committee based on public comments received during the second series of public meetings. Mr. Yunker responded that additional changes could be made by the Committee after approval of the Chapter. There being no further discussion, the Chapter was approved unanimously by the Committee.

DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF CHAPTER XI, BEST HOUSING PRACTICES, OF THE REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN

Mr. Drew asked Mr. McKay of the Commission staff to review the preliminary draft of Chapter XI, Best Housing Practices. The following discussion points and comments were made during the review:

1. Ms. Schneider-Peragine referenced the Land Use Control Practices section and asked how it was determined that sewer communities should allow for areas with home sizes of 1,100 to 1,200 square feet. Mr. McKay responded that this comes from the findings in Chapter V, which includes a cost analysis showing that a new home of this size may be affordable to a household earning 80 percent of the Region median household income. Ms. Schneider-Peragine noted that developers may be able to build smaller homes that could be even more affordable. Mr. Yunker responded that home-building industry representatives have indicated at previous meetings that there is a market for 1,100 to 1,200 square foot single-family detached homes. Mr. Drew suggested adding a reference to the income ranges to the Chapter.

   [Secretary’s Note: The third sentence under the Land Use Control Practices section on page XI-8 has been revised as follows:

   “The findings are based on the costs related to the development of new-single family housing that may be affordable to moderate-income households (households earning 80 to 95 percent of the Region’s median household income) and new multi-family housing that may be affordable to low-income households (households earning 50 to 80 percent of the Region’s median household income.”]

2. Ms. Schneider-Peragine referenced the Tax Increment Finance (TIF) section and asked if the potential contribution to affordable housing from the tax increment from a one year extension of an example tax increment district (TID) could be included in the section. She suggested using the Pabst Farms TID as the example. Mr. Peters referenced the second sentence on page XI-19 and noted that “up to” 75 percent of any tax increments received in the one year extension must be used to benefit affordable housing and the remainder must be used to improve the municipality’s housing stock.

   [Secretary’s Note: Three TID examples, including the Pabst Farms TID, are shown in Attachment 2. The second sentence on page XI-19 has been revised as follows:

   “In that year, up to 75 percent of any tax revenue received from the value increment must be used to benefit affordable housing in the municipality and the remainder must be used to improve the municipality’s housing stock.”]
3. Mr. Pérez referenced page XI-23 and noted that all of the housing units assisted through the Milwaukee County Housing Trust fund are located in the City of Milwaukee. He suggested that this point be emphasized in the text.

[Secretary’s Note: The last sentence of the first paragraph on page XI-23 has been revised as follows:

“Although the CHTF is a countywide program, all of the 260 affordable housing units that have received financial assistance through the CHTF are located in the City of Milwaukee.”]

4. Mr. Peters noted that single-family housing developed with the use of Federal funds, such as HUD Community Development funds, must be accessible to persons with disabilities. He also noted that the development of accessible single-family housing can be encouraged through the use of planned unit developments (PUD). He suggested adding text to the accessible housing section.

[Secretary’s Note: Text regarding the development of accessible single-family housing through the PUD process is shown in Attachment 3.]

5. Mr. Drew asked if additional costs that could be associated with “green” construction practices have been examined, especially in relation to affordable housing. Mr. McKay responded that possible additional costs of green construction were not researched by staff. Ms. N. Anderson stated that staff will examine possible costs.

[Secretary’s Note: Text regarding additional costs that could be associated with environmentally responsible construction practices in relation to affordable housing is shown in Attachment 4.]

6. Mr. Drew asked if there were any further questions or comments regarding Chapter XI. There were none. Hearing no additional comments, Mr. Drew asked for a motion to approve the Chapter. Mr. Melcher made a motion to approve Chapter XI, Best Housing Practices, incorporating comments discussed by the Committee. Ms. Schneider-Peragine seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the Chapter was approved unanimously by the Committee.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION REGARDING POTENTIAL PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Yunker stated that staff would like to continue the discussion regarding potential plan recommendations that was begun at the October 26, 2011, meeting. He asked Ms. N. Anderson to review a handout intended as a framework for the discussion. Ms. N. Anderson noted that a group of Committee members has submitted an e-mail including a list of issues that plan recommendations should address (see Attachment 5). She asked Mr. Soika if he would like to review the e-mail. Mr. Soika noted that a group of Committee members met after the October 26 Committee meeting to discuss policy recommendations that should be addressed by the housing plan. He noted that the overarching goal of the policy recommendations is racial and economic integration throughout the Region and the group has identified six areas of consideration that should be addressed by policy recommendations to encourage affordable housing throughout the Region. Mr. Soika noted that policy recommendations are intended for
Commission staff as a starting point for plan recommendations that will address the corresponding areas of concern regarding affordable housing in the Region. The areas of consideration include:

1. Policy recommendations that address “carrots and sticks” to facilitate action by municipalities to provide affordable housing for current and future needs.
2. Policy recommendations that provide both “carrots and sticks” as incentives to help communities alleviate job/housing imbalances by providing more affordable housing.
3. Policy recommendations on how local governments may be required to contribute to a regional housing trust fund using both “carrots and sticks,” especially for communities with a job/housing imbalance.
4. Policy recommendations intended for MMSD regarding the use of job/housing imbalance as a criterion for approval/disapproval of an expansion of sanitary sewer service.
5. Policy recommendations regarding how new tax increment finance (TIF) districts can be used as a lever to require development of affordable housing in communities with a job/housing imbalance.
6. Policy recommendations regarding the provision of job tax credits linked to the development of affordable housing in communities with a job/housing imbalance.

Ms. Plache noted that while she participated in the group, WHEDA cannot take an official position on the policy recommendations until they are reviewed by WHEDA officials.

Mr. Yunker thanked the group for its work and encouraged further discussion. He noted that plan recommendations may have to identify changes or additions to State law to allow the “carrots” and “sticks” that would address the areas of concern identified by the group.

Mr. Drew noted that SEWRPC is an advisory body and stated that local governments may not implement plan recommendations after the Commission adopts the plan. He stated that there must be an action plan component that will motivate political leaders in the Region to implement plan recommendations. Ms. Plache stated that there is a need for an action plan to promote the regional housing plan. She noted that there is interest in the plan among State legislators and agency officials, but awareness of the plan needs to be increased. Mr. Yunker noted that the plan will include an implementation component that will identify actions to implement the plan and various government and private sector entities responsible for undertaking the actions.

Mr. Yunker explained that the handout prepared by Commission staff identifies study findings related to each of the plan objectives and the recommendation suggestions are intended to facilitate discussion. He then asked Ms. N. Anderson to review the study findings and related recommendation suggestions included in the handout. The following discussion points and comments were made during the review:

1. Mr. Schneider-Peragine asked if recommendations will be specific to individual communities in the Region or if they will be written on a regionwide basis. Ms. N. Anderson stated that one possibility is to identify the implementing agency or level of government for each recommendation.

2. Ms. Plache suggested preparing an executive summary for government officials. Mr. Yunker stated that a final newsletter will be prepared that will focus on key recommendations when the plan is complete. He also noted that a PowerPoint presentation could be prepared that focuses on raising awareness of the plan’s key recommendations.
PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Drew asked if there were any public comments. The following public comments were made:

1. Ms. Rotker stated that the WHEDA qualified allocation process scoring makes it difficult to develop Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) developments in areas of opportunity.

2. Ms. Rotker stated that water conservation is an important consideration for residential development, and should be included in Chapter XI.

3. Ms. Rotker stated that the Milwaukee metropolitan area is the most residentially segregated large metropolitan area in the Country for African Americans and one of the most residentially segregated large metropolitan areas for Hispanics. Non-elderly persons with disabilities may also be experiencing residential segregation. She stated that she agrees with the policy recommendation set forth by the group of Advisory Committee members regarding the use of job/housing imbalance by MMSD as a criterion for denial of sewer service expansion. She stated that SEWRPC should include implementation of the regional housing plan as a criterion when approving the expansion of sewer service areas and including arterial street and highway capacity expansion projects in the regional transportation improvement program. She added that under Federal law and regulations, the Commission as the metropolitan planning organization (MPO), can take such action. She stated that she has made similar suggestions in the past to Commission staff.

Mr. Yunker responded with respect to sewer service areas that the Commission as the areawide regional water quality management planning agency has the responsibility to recommend to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) for their approval sewer service area expansion. Such recommendation is required under State law to be narrowly focused on protecting water quality, including whether there is adequate treatment plant and conveyance capacity, environmentally sensitive lands are to be preserved, and the expanded area is consistent with planned and projected population levels. With respect to the regional transportation improvement program, Mr. Yunker stated that he has responded to similar suggestions before. He stated that while the Commission as the MPO could withhold projects from the regional transportation improvement program, such actions would be clearly inconsistent with State law which established the Commission as an advisory regional planning agency.

CORRESPONDENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Drew asked if there were additional correspondence or announcements. Ms. N. Anderson noted that a public meeting and public hearing will follow the Advisory Committee meeting. The public meeting will start at 4:30 p.m. in the Multi-Purpose Room of the Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Mr. Drew noted that the next meeting is scheduled for January 30, 2012, from 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. He noted that the location has not been confirmed, but will likely be the Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center located at State Fair Park, 640 S. 84th Street.
ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Drew thanked the Committee members and guests for their time and participation and asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Pérez made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Plache seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin R. McKay
Recording Secretary

* * *

00160073-1 RHP AC MINUTES - MTG 15- 11/30/11
KRY/NMA/BRM/CDP