

Minutes of the Seventeenth Meeting of the

REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: April 18, 2012
TIME: 1:30 p.m.
PLACE: Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center, Banquet Room 2
State Fair Park
640 S. 84th Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Members Present

William R. Drew Executive Director, Milwaukee County Research Park,
Chairman Commissioner, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Julie Anderson Director of Public Works and Development Services, Racine County
David Cappon Executive Director, Waukesha Housing Authority
Doug Koehler Planner, City of Waukesha (representing Steven Crandell)
Jeff Labahn Director of City Development, City of Kenosha
J. Scott Mathie Senior Director, Government Affairs,
Metropolitan Builders Association of Greater Milwaukee
George Melcher Director of Planning and Development, Kenosha County
Michael Murphy Alderman, City of Milwaukee
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, Independence *First*
Maria Prioletta Redevelopment and Special Projects Manager,
Milwaukee Department of City Development
Kori Schneider-Peragine Senior Administrator, Inclusive Communities Program,
Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council
Dale Shaver Director, Waukesha County Department of Parks and Land Use
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
Cathie Madden City of Milwaukee Housing Trust Fund
and Local Initiatives Support Corporation
Benjamin R. McKay Principal Planner, SEWRPC
Christopher D. Parisey Planner, SEWRPC
Karen Rotker Senior Staff Attorney, ACLU of Wisconsin
Lemar Speed Manager, Homerica
Kenneth R. Yunker Executive Director, SEWRPC

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Drew called the meeting of the Regional Housing Plan Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 p.m., welcoming those in attendance.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 30, 2012

Mr. Drew asked if there were any questions or comments on the January 30, 2012, meeting minutes. There were none. Hearing no comments, Mr. Drew asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Mr. Murphy made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 30, 2012, meeting. Mr. Struck seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the minutes were approved unanimously by the Committee.

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF THE REVISED DRAFT OF PART 1 AND THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF PARTS 2 AND 3 OF CHAPTER XII, *RECOMMENDED HOUSING PLAN*, OF THE REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN

Mr. Drew asked Mr. McKay of the Commission staff to review the revised draft of Part 1, "Plan Determinants," of Chapter XII, *Recommended Housing Plan*, of the regional housing plan. The following discussion points and comments were made during the review:

1. Mr. Peters referred to Table XII-2, "Potential Affordable Housing Need in the Region by Sub-Regional Housing Analysis Area: 2035," and asked if opportunity areas, such as areas with good job and educational opportunities, had been considered. Mr. Soika expressed concern that Table XII-2 understates the need for affordable housing in some sub-areas of the Region. Mr. Yunker noted that Table XII-2 is one part of the affordable housing analysis that compares existing household income to the existing housing stock in the Region by sub-area. He noted that the job/housing balance analysis, another component on the affordable housing need analysis, compares job wages to housing stock in the Region by sub-area. Mr. Soika expressed concern that Table XII-2 could be used to oppose affordable housing projects. Mr. Peters suggested changing the title of Table XII-2.

[Secretary's Note: The title of Table XII-2 has been changed to "Household Income/Housing Balance in the Region by Sub-Regional Housing Analysis Area: 2010."]

2. Mr. Murphy noted that the growth of some communities in the Region will be connected to water supply and asked if the Metropolitan Milwaukee Sewerage District (MMSD) could require an analysis of affordable housing during the sewer extension review process. Mr. Yunker responded that SEWRPC staff would discuss this with MMSD staff. Mr. Murphy noted that past SEWRPC plans such as the 1975 housing plan have included good recommendations, but they have not been enforceable. He noted that agencies with implementing authority need to take a role in implementing the regional housing plan recommendations. Mr. Drew noted that Counties and local governments will have to agree with the recommendations if they are to be implemented. He noted the importance of working with Counties and local governments.
3. Mr. Struck noted that MMSD does not serve the entire Region and suggested that SEWRPC could include a job/housing balance analysis when a community amends its sanitary sewer

service area plan. Mr. Yunker noted that SEWRPC is advisory to the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) with regard to sewer service area planning and the *Wisconsin Administrative Code* specifies the criteria that the DNR can consider during the amendment review process. The consideration of job/housing balance would require a change to the Administrative Code. Mr. Struck suggested that SEWRPC provide communities with an advisory job/housing balance analysis as part of the amendment process for sanitary sewer service area plans.

4. Mr. Murphy referred to the first full paragraph on page XII-7 and noted that the affordable housing stock in the City of Milwaukee may decline because there are currently 4,000 vacant homes in the City and many will be razed. Mr. McKay noted that the need to replace aging housing stock, particularly in the Cities of Milwaukee and Racine, is addressed in the Chapter.

[Secretary's Note: The following text is included in the last paragraph on page XII-13 under the Anticipated (Year 2035) Housing Need section:

“As shown on Map XII-10, it is also anticipated that each sub-area in the Region will need to add housing units to accommodate a projected increase in the number of households, with the exception of sub-areas 13-16 (City of Milwaukee), 30 (City of Racine), and 39 (Fontana/Walworth/Williams Bay). Although these sub-areas do not need to increase the current number of housing units, new housing development may be needed to replace aging housing stock in these sub-areas. This is particularly true for sub-areas 13-16 and 30, which have the highest percentage of housing units built before 1940 in the Region, as shown on Table IV-27 in Chapter IV. Other sub-areas in the Region may also need new housing development, over the number of additional housing units identified by the regional land use plan, to replace aging and/or unsound housing units. Table IV-26 in Chapter IV shows that over 8,800 housing units were demolished between 2000 and 2010, which is about 1 percent of the Region's housing stock.”]

5. Mr. Peters noted that job/housing imbalances are referred to as Type 1, which is a shortage of lower cost housing, and Type 2, which is a shortage of moderate cost housing, and it is difficult to remember what they mean. He suggested changing the terms “Type 1” and “Type 2” to something easier to remember.

[Secretary's Note: The term “Type 1” imbalance will be changed to “lower cost housing” imbalance and the term “Type 2” imbalance will be changed to “moderate cost housing” imbalance throughout the report.]

6. Mr. Murphy requested adding the consent decree for the settlement reached between the City of New Berlin and the U.S. Department of Justice to the report as an appendix. Ms. N. Anderson noted that the lawsuit is summarized in Chapter VI, *Housing Discrimination and Fair Housing Practices*, and suggested adding the consent decree as an appendix to Chapter VI.

[Secretary's Note: The consent decree will be added to the plan report as Appendix I.]

7. Mr. Drew referenced the last paragraph on page XII-8 and suggested revising the text to more accurately describe the adverse effects of concentrations of low-income and minority populations

in central city areas of the Region. Ms. Olson noted that that access to vital services is also a concern for low-income residents of rural areas. Mr. Pérez noted that it may be a question of availability of vital services in central city areas of the Region due to households with very low-incomes rather than the location or distance of services.

[Secretary's Note: The last paragraph on page XII-8 has been revised as follows:

“The concentration of low-income and minority populations in the Region’s central city areas results in numerous adverse effects in addition to decreased employment opportunities. Areas with concentrations of low-income and minority populations typically suffer from low academic achievement, limited commercial establishments, and high crime rates. As shown on Table VII-5 in Chapter VII, educational attainment of residents age 25 and older is generally lower in sub-areas 13-16 and 30 than in the rest of the Region. In addition, the average middle/high income student in the Milwaukee metropolitan area attends a school that ranks 33 percentage points higher on State exams than schools an average low-income student attends.¹ Access to vital services, such as stores providing healthy foods, may also be reduced in in some areas of the Region with concentrations of low-income and minority populations. A number of census tracts in sub-areas 13-16 and 30 have been identified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as “food deserts,” where residents are more than one mile from a supermarket or large grocery store.”]

8. Mr. Mathie referred to the Sustainability Determinant on page XII-10 and stated that sustainable construction does not typically rank high with consumers as a need. Ms. Schneider-Peragine stated that while sustainable construction may not be an individual need, it is a need in the context of the greater good of the Region. Ms. Prioletta noted that energy conservation is an important component of housing affordability. Mr. Mathie stated that new construction is already energy efficient and energy saving programs, such as the Energy Star Program, already exist. Mr. Soika suggested that the sentence be revised to recognize the importance of environmentally responsible development, rather than the need for such development.

[Secretary's Note: The first sentence in the “Sustainability” section on Page XII-10 has been revised as follows:

“Much of the focus of the regional housing plan is on the provision of affordable housing; however, the plan also recognizes the importance of encouraging sustainable, or environmentally responsible, residential development practices.”]

9. Mr. Peters expressed concern regarding housing for very low-income households. Mr. Pérez noted that project based Section 8 vouchers can be used to help private developers build affordable housing. Mr. Cappon noted that he does not support the use of project-based Section 8

¹Housing Costs, Zoning, and Access to High Scoring Schools, *Brookings Institute*, April 2012.

vouchers because they are not portable and can increase concentrations of low-income households. Ms. Prioletta noted that project-based vouchers can be used for mixed income developments. Mr. Peters stated that the demand for vouchers is much greater than the supply and stated that this needs to be expressed in the chapter. Mr. Cappon noted that vouchers as a source of income are not a protected class under the Wisconsin Open Housing Law and a change in State law may increase the number of rental units available to voucher holders. Mr. Yunker noted that Table XII-4 sets forth the number of extremely low- and very low-income households and government assisted housing in the Region by County.

10. Mr. Drew asked if there were any further comments on Part 1 of Chapter XII. There were none.

Mr. Drew asked Ms. N. Anderson of the Commission staff to review the preliminary draft of Part 2, “Plan Recommendations,” of Chapter XII, *Recommended Housing Plan*, of the regional housing plan. The following discussion points and comments were made during the review:

[Secretary’s Note: Revisions to preliminary plan recommendations based on Committee comments are shown in the document titled “Revised Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, May 23, 2012,” which was provided to Committee members as part of the packet for the May 23 Advisory Committee meeting. The proposed changes are also reflected in the revised version of Chapter XII posted on the SEWRPC website.]

1. Ms. Schneider-Peragine referred to Fair Housing/Opportunity Recommendation No. 4 on page XII-25 and noted that the Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council (MMFHC) will continue its fair housing activities and that the recommendation should address funding for such work. Mr. Yunker asked what the sources are for MMFHC’s funding. Ms. Schneider-Peragine responded that much of the funding is from entitlement jurisdictions and HUD.

[Secretary’s Note: See the document titled “Revised Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, May 23, 2012,” or the revised version of Chapter XII for revisions to Fair Housing/Opportunity Recommendation No. 4.]

2. Mr. Mathie asked about the source of Fair Housing/Opportunity Recommendation No. 6 regarding “builder’s remedy” legislation. Mr. McKay responded that the recommendation is carried forward from the 1975 housing plan and is from the chapter on best housing practices. Mr. Mathie stated that a recommendation for State builder’s remedy legislation is not necessary because there is already a judicial process in place. Mr. Yunker explained that the recommendation is intended specifically for affordable housing projects that are denied by a local government, but are consistent with the community zoning ordinance and comprehensive plan. Mr. Soika stated that the recommendation should be retained. Mr. Mathie noted that the affordable housing case in New Berlin was resolved under the current system. Ms. Prioletta stated that State builder’s remedy legislation may help to streamline the appeal process for developers and reduce the cost. Mr. Murphy noted that the cost of the current process can act as a deterrent to developers. Mr. Mathie stated that he does not oppose the recommendation; however, he noted that the 1975 recommendation has not been implemented and the plan should focus on recommendations that may be more feasible to implement. Mr. Pérez noted that Federal

action was taken to resolve the New Berlin case and State level builder's remedy legislation would provide for resolution at the State, rather than Federal, level.

3. Mr. Peters referred to Fair Housing/Opportunity Recommendation No. 5 and noted that an assisted mobility housing program could be established by local and county governments in addition to State government. Mr. Cappon noted that additional rental housing in outlying areas of the Region and including vouchers as a source of income as a protected class under the Wisconsin Open Housing Law would also provide more opportunities for Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher holders. Ms. Schneider-Peragine stated that the recommendation should identify the potential levels of government that could implement the program.

[Secretary's Note: See the document titled "Revised Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, May 23, 2012," or the revised version of Chapter XII for revisions to Fair Housing/Opportunity Recommendation No. 5.]

4. Ms. Prioletta noted that implementation strategies are important. Mr. Shaver noted that the plan will lose credibility if the recommendations cannot be implemented. Mr. Drew noted that the support of local officials will be necessary for implementation of recommendations. Mr. Shaver noted that recommendations should specify the actions sewerer communities with a lack of multi-family housing should undertake.
5. Ms. Schneider-Peragine noted that protected classes in local government fair housing ordinances that are more inclusive than those in the Wisconsin Open Housing Law are not enforceable. She requested the addition of a new recommendation to amend the Wisconsin Open Housing Law to recognize housing vouchers as a lawful source of income.

[Secretary's Note: See Subsidized Housing Recommendation No. 5 in the document titled "Revised Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, May 23, 2012," or the revised version of Chapter XII.]

6. Mr. Yunker referred to the earlier job/housing balance discussion and stated that at Mr. Struck's suggestion a recommendation will be added in the Job/Housing Balance section stating that SEWRPC will provide an advisory community-level job/housing balance analysis for communities located in sub-areas identified in Chapter VIII as having a current or projected job/housing imbalance at the time such communities request an amendment to expand their sanitary sewer service area.

[Secretary's Note: See Job/Housing Balance Recommendation No. 4 in the document titled "Revised Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, May 23, 2012," or the revised version of Chapter XII.]

7. Ms. N. Anderson noted that Mr. Soika had submitted a suggested recommendation related to job/housing balance to staff prior to the meeting, which was distributed to the Committee (see Attachment 1). Mr. Soika stated that the recommendation is related to prohibiting new Tax Increment Financing (TIF) districts in communities in a sub-area identified as having a job housing imbalance in a regional housing plan until the community conducts a local job/housing balance analysis, and if necessary, enacts plans and regulations to remove barriers to affordable housing.

[Secretary's Note: See Job/Housing Balance Recommendation No. 3a in the document titled "Revised Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, May 23, 2012," or the revised version of Chapter XII.]

8. Mr. Weishan stated that he believes establishment of TIF districts should have some oversight by the County affected. Mr. Murphy stated that TIFs are intended to be used to encourage the redevelopment of blighted areas, but are now commonly used as a tool to encourage development in outlying areas that have not experienced blight. He stated that this has given suburban communities an additional development advantage over central city areas, while central cities continue to assume the financial responsibility of providing services to concentrations of low-income populations without assistance from suburban communities. He noted that western suburban communities may receive additional development assistance through the provision of water from Lake Michigan and should provide additional affordable housing. He also noted that additional tax credits should be made available for brownfield clean-up.
9. Mr. Cappon stated that there is a need to create jobs in areas of the Region with affordable housing in addition to developing more affordable housing in outlying portions of the Region. He also stated that plan recommendations should promote Milwaukee's strengths and improve resident incomes. He stated that redevelopment of central city areas is also an environmental issue because productive farmland in the outlying portions of the Region continues to be converted to urban uses.

[Secretary's Note: See Job/Housing Balance Recommendation No. 5 in the document titled "Revised Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, May 23, 2012," or the revised version of Chapter XII.]

10. Mr. Peters referred to Accessible Housing Recommendation No. 3 on page XII-30 and suggested adding independent living programs. Mr. Mathie asked how these programs relate to housing. Ms. Olson stated that these programs provide funding for accessibility modifications and other care that allows people to stay in their existing homes. Mr. Mathie noted that the programs are already funded so a recommendation may not be needed. Ms. Olson stated that the recommendation is for the State to continue funding these programs. Mr. Peters noted that funding for some of these programs was in jeopardy in the past.

[Secretary's Note: See Accessible Housing Recommendation No. 3 in the document titled "Revised Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, May 23, 2012," or the revised version of Chapter XII. A suggested revision to the policy from Ms. Olson is included in Attachment 2 and is reflected in Accessible Housing Recommendation No. 3.]

11. Mr. Mathie referred to Accessible Housing Recommendation No. 2 and stated that local governments cannot create their own accessibility standards outside those of the Uniform Dwelling Code. Ms. Schneider-Peragine suggested directing the recommendation to the State. Mr. Mathie noted that accessibility requirements are required for new multi-family development and the Uniform Dwelling Code is intended to address basic safety issues in single- and two-family structures. Mr. Cappon stated that the market will demand increased accessibility features as the baby boom generation ages. Mr. Mathie stated that market demand should be the driver for

single-family housing with accessibility features. Mr. Yunker noted that the recommendation is intended for anticipated future need as housing is developed over the next 20 to 25 years. Mr. Peters noted that many people are not aware of market demand and accessibility will become a greater issue because of the Region's aging population. He noted that universal design and visitability provide increased housing choice for persons with disabilities and the elderly. Mr. Mathie noted that multi-family housing is an alternative. Ms. Olson noted that some may want to remain in single-family homes. Mr. Mathie noted that universal design provides flexibility for persons of all ages and many features are already included in builders' designs. Mr. Peters noted that current building codes include many safety requirements that are not market driven. He noted the need to provide accessible housing options because many existing single-family homes are not accessible. Mr. Cappon noted that many visitability features are easy to incorporate into home design when homes are initially constructed.

[Secretary's Note: See Accessible Housing Recommendation No. 2 in the document titled "Revised Housing Plan Recommendations for Review by Advisory Committee, May 23, 2012," or the revised version of Chapter XII.]

12. Mr. Mathie stated that recommendations should be streamlined to remove those that are not feasible to implement to increase the likelihood of plan implementation. Mr. Shaver noted that plan adoption is important for implementation. Mr. Yunker noted that counties and local governments generally endorse rather than adopt regional plans to avoid confusion with local comprehensive plans. He noted that in the past some counties and local governments that were uncomfortable with specific recommendations have endorsed the plan and noted the specific recommendations that were not endorsed. Mr. Shaver noted that the regional housing plan should provide policy direction to counties and local governments as they amend and update their comprehensive plans. He stated that if the Committee strikes recommendations from the plan it should be with the intent of making the plan more likely for counties and local governments to endorse and implement. Mr. Melcher noted that County boards of supervisors experience turnover, which makes plan endorsement more difficult and the Committee should be practical about plan recommendations to encourage plan endorsement. Mr. Weishan stated that plan recommendations should retain high standards and each County and local government will determine which recommendations it will implement.
13. Mr. Drew noted the time and stated that the discussion of plan recommendations will be continued at the next meeting. He encouraged Committee members to provide comments in writing to staff.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION REGARDING PUBLIC OUTREACH EFFORTS

Mr. Drew stated that this agenda item would be discussed at the next Committee meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

1. Mr. Speed stated that although additional affordable housing is needed in suburban communities, it will not promote business opportunities in central city areas. He stated that incentives are needed to create jobs and increase entrepreneurship in central city areas.

2. Ms. Madden referred to Subsidized Housing Recommendation No. 8 and noted the Housing Trust Fund of Southeastern Wisconsin (HTF-SW) is intended to start with the consolidation of the City of Milwaukee and Milwaukee County trust funds and expand to other Counties and local governments in the Region, which is consistent with a recommendation from the Public Policy Forum. She stated that the HTF-SW is intended to be inclusive of as many entities as possible. She suggested combining Subsidized Housing Recommendations Nos. 8 and 9 because the HTF-SW would be one component of an interjurisdictional housing collaborative. She also noted that HUD requirements do not allow Milwaukee County to allocate Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to projects that primarily serve City of Milwaukee residents, such as Journey House, because the City receives its own CDBG allocation. Ms. Schneider-Peragine suggested that the recommendations should remain separate to allow either proposal to move forward.
3. Ms. Schneider-Peragine noted that Ms. Rotker of ACLU Wisconsin had to leave the meeting but wanted to suggest that SEWRPC should use its role as the Metropolitan (transportation) Planning Organization with respect to transportation projects. She stated that Ms. Rotker provided her a page of notes on this subject. Mr. Yunker responded that Ms. Rotker's notes will be attached to the minutes of the meeting (Attachment 3) and the Commission staff will provide a response in a secretary's note to the meeting minutes. He noted that this could be discussed by the Committee at the next meeting as part of the review and approval of the minutes, and/or as part of the continued review of preliminary plan recommendations.

[Secretary's Note: Ms. Karyn Rotker's notes dated January 23, 2012, address the Regional Planning Commission on its responsibilities as the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) under Federal administrative regulations to develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and through that program to select transportation improvement projects for construction. Ms. Rotker states that two sections of the Federal regulations concerned indicate that the MPO shall develop a transportation improvement program for the metropolitan planning area, and that transportation projects shall be selected by the MPO for Federal funding. Ms. Rotker omits two key operative statements contained in the Federal regulations, namely that transportation improvement programs shall be prepared by the MPO in cooperation with the State and public transit operators, and also the local governments which are part of the MPO, and that projects for funding shall be selected by the MPO in consultation with the State and public transit operators, and also local governments.

The Commission has, since 1977, biennially adopted a TIP by subareas of the seven-county planning region, and for 35 years transportation projects have been selected for Federal funding under that program. The Commission has carefully developed an organizational structure for meeting the Federal requirements that the TIP and projects recommended for Federal funding under that program be developed in cooperation with the State, public transit operators, and also county and municipal governments within the Region which the MPO serves and represents. That organizational structure consists of four Commission Advisory Committees comprised of over 60 representatives of the State, public

transit operators, and county and municipal governments concerned. The Advisory Committee for the Milwaukee urbanized area is structured on a population proportional basis. The Committees are charged with assisting the Commission in preparing the biennial TIP, which lists the public transit and arterial street and highway improvement projects proposed to be undertaken by the State, county, and local governments within the Region over the next four calendar years. The projects are reviewed by the Advisory Committees concerned for consistency with the regional transportation system plan, and for consistency with existing and likely available funding. The Advisory Committees concerned make their recommendations to the Regional Planning Commission which has responsibility for final approval of the recommended program and list of projects. Including a project in the TIP makes the project eligible to receive Federal funding, but does not, and cannot, require the specific project to move forward to implementation, that decision resting with the State, county, and municipal unit and agency of government concerned. Conversely, projects not listed in the TIP are not eligible for Federal funding, but may proceed without such funding on decisions of the State, county, and municipal units and agencies of government concerned.

The Commission's approach to transportation improvement programming and transportation improvement project selection has been a cooperative and collegial one with the units and agencies of government concerned, as envisioned in Federal law and regulation.

Moreover, it is the position of the Commission that the Wisconsin State Statutes which provide for the creation, organization, powers, and duties of regional planning commissions in the State of Wisconsin (Section 66.0309), establish the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission as an advisory regional planning agency. Therefore, it would be inconsistent with State law for the Commission to require local governments or the State to implement specific projects, or for the Commission to prohibit local governments or the State from implementing specific projects.]

CORRESPONDENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Drew asked if there were additional correspondence or announcements. Ms. N. Anderson stated that there were none.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Mr. Drew noted that the next meeting is scheduled for May 23, 2012, from 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. in Banquet Room 2 of the Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center at State Fair Park, 640 S. 84th Street, Milwaukee. He stated that the focus of the next meeting will be on further discussion of plan recommendations. He stated that staff will also identify an additional meeting date in June for continued discussion of Chapter XII if needed.

[Secretary's Note: A meeting has been scheduled for June 13, 2012, from 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. in Banquet Room 2 of the Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center.]

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. Mr. Melcher seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin R. McKay
Recording Secretary

* * *