

Minutes of the Twentieth Meeting of the

**REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

DATE: July 23, 2012  
TIME: 1:30 p.m.  
PLACE: Milwaukee County Research Park  
Technology Innovation Center, Room 121  
10437 W. Innovation Drive  
Wauwatosa, Wisconsin

Members Present

William R. Drew ..... Executive Director, Milwaukee County Research Park,  
Chairman ..... Commissioner, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission  
Julie A. Anderson..... Director of Public Works and Development Services, Racine County  
Michael P. Cotter ..... Director, Walworth County  
Land Use and Resource Management Department  
Joseph G. Heck, Jr. .... Assistant Director (retired), Racine Department of City Development  
Rob Henken ..... President, Public Policy Forum, Milwaukee  
Douglas J. Koehler..... Planner, City of Waukesha  
Jeffery B. Labahn..... Director of Community Development and Inspections, City of Kenosha  
George E. Melcher..... Director of Planning and Development, Kenosha County  
Michael J. Murphy ..... Alderman, City of Milwaukee  
Antonio M. Pérez ..... Executive Director, City of Milwaukee Housing Authority  
Brian Peters ..... Housing Policy Advocate, IndependenceFirst  
Maria Prioretta ..... Redevelopment and Special Projects Manager,  
Milwaukee Department of City Development  
Mary Kay Schleiter ..... Associate Professor, Department of Sociology-Anthropology,  
University of Wisconsin-Parkside  
Kori Schneider-Peragine ..... Senior Administrator, Inclusive Communities Program,  
Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council  
Michael J. Soika ..... Director, Milwaukee Succeeds  
Andrew T. Struck..... Director, Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department  
Marne J. Stück ..... Government Affairs Director, Greater Milwaukee Association of Realtors  
John F. Weishan, Jr. .... Supervisor, Milwaukee County

Guests and Staff Present

Stephen P. Adams ..... Public Involvement and Outreach Manager, SEWRPC  
Nancy M. Anderson..... Chief Community Assistance Planner, SEWRPC  
Gary K. Korb ..... Regional Planning Educator, UW-Extension/SEWRPC  
Cathie Madden ..... City of Milwaukee Housing Trust Fund  
and Local Initiatives Support Corporation  
Catherine Madison ..... Policy Analyst, UWM Center for Economic Development  
Kevin McDonell..... Senior Underwriter, WHEDA  
Benjamin R. McKay ..... Principal Planner, SEWRPC

Sean O'Brien..... WHEDA  
 Christopher D. Parisey ..... Planner, SEWRPC  
 Karyn L. Rotker .....Senior Staff Attorney, ACLU of Wisconsin  
 Sandy Scherer ..... Senior Planner, Waukesha County Department of Parks and Land Use  
 Lamar Speed ..... Manager, Homeric  
 Monica Wauck .....Urban and Regional Planner, Wisconsin Department of Transportation  
 Kenneth R. Yunker ..... Executive Director, SEWRPC

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Drew called the meeting of the Regional Housing Plan Advisory Committee to order at 1:30 p.m., welcoming those in attendance.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 13, 2012**

Mr. Drew asked if there were any questions or comments on the June 13, 2012, meeting minutes. There were none. Mr. Koehler made a motion to approve the minutes from the June 13, 2012, meeting. Mr. Soika seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the minutes were approved unanimously by the Committee.

**REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS HELD OVER FROM THE JUNE 13, 2012, COMMITTEE MEETING**

Mr. Drew asked Ms. N. Anderson of the Commission staff to review the plan recommendations that were held over from the June 13, 2012, Committee meeting. Ms. N. Anderson asked the Committee members to turn their attention to the document titled “Additional Regional Housing Plan Recommendations Suggested by Advisory Committee Members” (see Attachment 1). The following discussion points and comments were made during the review:

[Secretary’s Note: The preliminary draft plan recommendations approved by the Committee are included in Attachment 2, “Regional Housing Plan Recommendations July 23, 2012.”]

1. Mr. Weishan asked if each recommendation will be considered individually. Mr. Drew responded that each recommendation will be considered individually.
2. Ms. N. Anderson explained the revisions to Recommendation No. 1 (Housing Trust Fund Recommendation) under the Proposed Revised Recommendations section. Mr. Weishan made a motion to approve the Housing Trust Fund Recommendation. Mr. Soika seconded the motion. Mr. Drew asked if there was any further discussion on the motion. Mr. Henken referred to the last sentence and noted that it may allow some communities to avoid developing needed affordable housing. Mr. Soika acknowledged that this may be a problem; however, there is a concern that contributing communities will subsidize affordable housing for non-contributing communities.

Ms. Madden asked from the audience if she could provide a comment. Mr. Drew acknowledged her contributions to the proposed Housing Trust Fund of Southeastern Wisconsin (HTF-SW) and provided her an opportunity to comment. Ms. Madden suggested striking the next to last sentence because real estate transfer fees have been heavily lobbied against as a funding source

for the proposed HTF-SW and other housing trust funds. She also noted that it may be too early in the HTF-SW development process to identify specific funding sources. Ms. Stück stated that the Greater Milwaukee Association of Realtors would not support a real estate transfer fee as a funding source for the HTF-SW. Ms. Schneider-Peragine asked if the current motion would include the last two sentences of the recommendation. Mr. Drew responded that the current motion includes the last two sentences and asked for a vote on the motion. The motion failed on a voice vote. Ms. Schneider-Peragine made a motion to approve the Housing Trust Fund Recommendation without the last two sentences. Mr. Peters seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

[Secretary's Note: The recommendation approved by the Committee is Recommendation No. E-10 in Attachment 2.]

3. Ms. N. Anderson explained the revisions to Recommendation No. 2 (Tax Incremental Financing (TIF) Recommendation) under the Proposed Revised Recommendations section. Mr. Soika asked why the reference to communities with a job/housing imbalance was struck from the first sentence. Ms. N. Anderson responded that the proposed recommendation would require all communities proposing a TIF to conduct an analysis of wages and jobs. Communities with a job/housing imbalance would be prohibited from creating a new TIF unless the proposal includes documented steps that would be taken to reduce or eliminate the job/housing imbalance. Mr. Soika made a motion to approve the Tax Incremental Financing Recommendation. Mr. Weishan seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a voice vote.

[Secretary's Note: The recommendation approved by the Committee is Recommendation No. C-4 in Attachment 2.]

4. Ms. N. Anderson explained Recommendation No. 1 (Prevailing Wage Recommendation) under the Proposed New Recommendations section. Mr. Soika made a motion to strike the Prevailing Wage Recommendation. Ms. Schneider-Peragine seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.
5. Ms. N. Anderson explained Recommendation No. 2 (Employer-Assisted Housing Recommendation) under the Proposed New Recommendations section. Ms. Schneider-Peragine asked if the intent of the recommendation was to encourage employers to provide financial assistance to their employees to purchase a home. Ms. N. Anderson confirmed that is the intent of the recommendation. A motion to approve the Employer-Assisted Housing Recommendation was made by Ms. Priolella. Ms. Schneider-Peragine seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

[Secretary's Note: The recommendation approved by the Committee is Recommendation No. C-9 in Attachment 2.]

6. Ms. N. Anderson explained Recommendation No. 3 (Tax Incremental Financing Recommendation) under the Proposed New Recommendations section. Mr. Peters asked if each of the bullet points under the recommendation will be considered individually. Mr. Drew responded that each bullet point will be considered individually and referred to as Recommendations 3a, 3b, 3c, and 3d for the purpose of recording the meeting minutes.

7. Ms. Prioletta referred to Recommendation 3a and asked for a clarification of the intent of the recommendation. Mr. Weishan responded that the intent is to broaden the criteria a Joint Review Board may consider when reviewing a proposed TIF district (TID) to enable the Board to consider social impacts. Ms. Prioletta asked for some examples. Mr. Weishan responded that examples may include the types of jobs anticipated to be created by the TID and anticipated impacts of the TID on transit service. Ms. J. Anderson stated that the language in the recommendation is too broad and could result in extended debates over the type of impacts that could be considered. Mr. Henken stated that the recommendation may have merit, but is not germane to the regional housing plan. He stated that he could not support the recommendation, even though it may be good public policy, because including recommendations that are not relevant to plan objectives may interfere with implementation of the plan. Mr. Weishan made a motion to approve Recommendation 3a. Ms. Schneider-Peragine seconded the motion. The motion failed on a voice vote.
8. Mr. Weishan referred to Recommendation No. 3b and noted that the intent of amending State TIF law to require initiation of a TID at the County level is to encourage regional cooperation. He noted that TIDs are often created to encourage the movement of businesses between communities within the same regional economy and that Joint Review Boards are currently structured for greater representation of the municipality proposing the TIF, rather than as a cooperative body. Mr. Weishan made a motion to approve Recommendation No. 3b. The motion failed due to lack of a second.
9. Mr. Weishan made a motion to approve Recommendation No. 3c. Ms. Schneider-Peragine seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken but it could not be concluded whether the motion passed or failed. Chairman Drew requested a show of hands of those in favor and those opposed. The motion failed on a vote of seven in favor and 10 opposed.
10. Mr. Weishan referred to Recommendation No. 3d and stated that TIF law has changed dramatically since its initial adoption in 1975 and it warrants a legal review by the State Attorney General to determine the constitutionality of TIF under the Rule of Taxation uniform clause of the State Constitution. Ms. Schneider-Peragine asked if the review would also include the “but for” clause and the blight requirement. Mr. Weishan responded that the Attorney General’s office would determine the parameters of the review. Mr. Weishan made a motion to approve Recommendation No. 3d. The motion failed due to lack of a second.
11. Ms. N. Anderson explained Recommendation No. 4 (Project Selection Criteria for Transportation Improvement Program Recommendation) under the Proposed New Recommendations section. Ms. Schneider-Peragine suggested including SEWRPC’s Environmental Justice Task Force (EJTF) in addition to SEWRPC’s Committees for Transportation System Planning and Programing when considering revised project selection criteria for the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Mr. Murphy stated that the recommendation is intended to encourage the TIP Advisory Committees to consider developing new project selection criteria using the job/housing balance and other information presented in the housing plan. He stated there is a relationship between housing, jobs, and transportation that should be considered by the TIP Committees. He also noted that other MPOs include housing related criteria as part of the TIP project selection process. Mr. Yunker stated that the project selection criteria is reviewed, approved, and applied about every two years by the TIP Committees, which include local government representatives. He stated that the TIP Committees could then consider this regional

housing plan recommendation. He suggested, in response to Ms. Schneider-Peragine's comment, that the recommendation be modified to include review by the EJTF.

Mr. Peters asked if Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Surface Transportation Program (STP) – Milwaukee Urbanized Area (MUA) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) are the only Federal funds that are available for transportation projects. Mr. Yunker responded that these are the Federal funds, along with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 funds, which are allocated directly to the Milwaukee metropolitan area, rather than to the State. Mr. Peters asked why the Racine and Kenosha Urbanized Areas are not included in the recommendation, as well as all STP funds. Mr. Yunker responded that the FTA and FHWA funds for these areas, and the remainder of the STP funds, are allocated to the State, and not to urbanized areas. Mr. Yunker suggested that a recommendation could be made that the State and/or Federal government allocate these funds to the urbanized area.

Mr. Peters asked the Committee Chairman if Ms. Rotker could provide a comment from the audience. Mr. Drew allowed Ms. Rotker two minutes to provide a comment. Ms. Rotker stated that it is critical to include the EJTF in the recommendation, to add affordable housing as a criterion, and to include all STP funding. She noted the reductions in transit service due to funding shortages, and suggested that FHWA STP funding could be flexed to transit to address this shortage. Mr. Yunker stated that staff supports adding the EJTF to the recommendation to provide review of revised project selection criteria as they are developed by the TIP Advisory Committees. Mr. Yunker noted that the transit funding problem which has led to transit service reductions and passenger fare increases is a problem with transit operating funding. Under Federal law, the use of Federal transit funds for operating funding is limited, particularly in the Milwaukee Urbanized Area. Transit operators are, and have been, making maximum use of all available FTA funds for operating funding. While some FHWA funds may be flexed, or transferred, to public transit, these funds are principally limited to capital funding. He noted that in the early 1990's almost \$10 million of FHWA STP MUA funds were flexed for transit use, but these funds remained unused until 2010 for a transit capital project.

Mr. Murphy stated that the proposed recommendation was reviewed by the City of Milwaukee Engineer and noted that transportation funding and project selection is a complex process. He reiterated that the intent of the proposed recommendation is to give flexibility to the TIP Committees to consider housing related criteria when selecting projects to be included in the TIP. Mr. Drew asked for a motion on the recommendation. Mr. Murphy made a motion to approve the Project Selection Criteria for Transportation Improvement Program Recommendation with the addition of the EJTF. Ms. Prioletta seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

[Secretary's Note: The recommendation approved by the Committee is Recommendation No. C-8 in Attachment 2.]

12. Mr. Murphy noted that he arrived after the discussion of Recommendation No. 1 (Housing Trust Fund Recommendation) under the Proposed Revised Recommendations section and Recommendation No. 1 (Prevailing Wage Recommendation) under the Proposed New Recommendations section. He stated for recording in the meeting minutes that he supports the Housing Trust Fund Recommendation in its original form and does not support the Prevailing

Wage Recommendation. Mr. Yunker noted that his opinions were consistent with Committee actions taken earlier in the meeting.

### **REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF PART 3 OF CHAPTER XII, RECOMMENDED PLAN FOR THE REGION**

Mr. Drew asked Mr. McKay of the Commission staff to review Part 3, Plan Endorsement, Monitoring, and Updates, of Chapter XII. The following discussion points and comments were made during the review:

1. Ms. Schneider-Peragine referred to Table XII-11 and suggested adding the Milwaukee Field Office of HUD as an anticipated source of data for SEWRPC to monitor the recommendation that entitlement jurisdictions require sub-grantees to affirmatively further fair housing. She noted the requirements for entitlement jurisdiction consolidated plans may change soon as a result of pending HUD regulations. Mr. McKay responded that staff will make the suggested addition.
2. Ms. Schleiter asked if agencies and units of government responsible for implementation of various plan recommendations would be provided with feedback from SEWRPC as part of the plan monitoring system. Mr. McKay responded that SEWRPC will provide the annual and five-year plan implementation summary reports to the implementing agencies and communities.
3. Mr. Drew noted that Part 1, Plan Determinants, of Chapter XII was reviewed by the Committee at the January 30, 2012, and April 13, 2012, meetings and that the Committee concluded its discussion on the preliminary draft plan recommendations, which are included in Part 2 of Chapter XII, at today's meeting. Mr. Drew then asked for a motion to approve Parts 1, 2, and 3 of Chapter XII, *Recommended Housing Plan for the Region*. Ms. J. Anderson made a motion to approve Parts 1, 2, and 3 of Chapter XII, *Recommended Housing Plan for the Region*. Mr. Struck seconded the motion. Mr. Drew asked if there was any further discussion on the motion. Ms. J. Anderson clarified that Part 3 would be updated to reflect the preliminary draft plan recommendations as approved by the Committee at today's meeting and Ms. Schneider-Peragine's suggestion for Table XII-11. Mr. Yunker responded that staff will update Part 3. The motion was approved unanimously by the Committee.

### **CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF FIGURES V-4 THROUGH V-7 AND THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF PART 3 OF CHAPTER V, NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

Mr. Drew asked Ms. N. Anderson to review Figures V-4 through V-7. Ms. N. Anderson stated that the Committee requested examples of the types of new construction that would be affordable to low- and moderate-income households as identified in the analyses set forth in Chapter V, *New Housing Development*, at the July 2010 meeting. The following discussion points and comments were made during the review:

1. Mr. Peters asked about the source of the single-family home site and floor plan examples. Ms. N. Anderson responded that the example shown in Figure V-4 is based on her home and the example shown in Figure V-5 is based on a home built recently by Mr. McKay's parents. Mr. Peters noted that Figure V-5 includes Universal Design features; however, the position of the kitchen sink may be difficult to access for a person in a wheelchair. Ms. N. Anderson responded that staff would work with IndependenceFirst on the details of the floor plan as they relate to accessibility.

[Secretary's Note: Figure V-4 has been eliminated based on comments received from *IndependenceFirst*. See Attachment 3 for revisions to the floor plan originally shown in Figure V-5, which has been renumbered as Figure V-4.]

2. Ms. Prioletta asked why a 1,100 square foot home was used as an example of a modest single-family home. Ms. N. Anderson responded that the example is based on the analysis documented in Chapter V, which found that a moderate-income household could afford a new home of 1,100 to 1,200 square feet on a lot of 10,000 square feet or smaller. She noted that the example does not use a 10,000 square foot lot because a 7,200 square foot lot is a more typical lot size for a 1,100 square foot home. Ms. Prioletta stated that the room sizes in the example may be too small. Mr. Yunker noted that there is a gap between the cost of new housing construction and household incomes in the Region and that the Metropolitan Builders Association has stated that there is a market for modest single-family homes of this size. Mr. Yunker suggested adding an additional example of a 1,200 to 1,400 square foot home. Ms. Prioletta stated that she could provide examples from a pattern book of homes intended for infill development on narrow lots.

[Secretary's Note: See Attachment 3 for an example of a site and floor plan for a 1,400 square foot single-family home on a narrow lot.]

3. Mr. Melcher requested, in regard to Figure V-5, that a garage be shown rather than a carport, in keeping with standard practice in the Region.

[Secretary's Note: The requested change has been made and is reflected in Figure V-4 in Attachment 3.]

Mr. Drew asked Ms. N. Anderson to review Part 3, Impacts of Home Building on Local Governments and Economy, of Chapter V. Ms. N. Anderson stated this section includes an analysis of the costs for County and local governments, including school districts and other special-purpose units of government, to provide public facilities and services to new housing development compared to the revenue generated by new housing development through taxes and fees. Analyses were conducted for the Milwaukee Metropolitan Area, Racine County, and Walworth County, which are available on the SEWRPC website. An analysis could not be conducted for Kenosha County because the data necessary for the analysis is combined with Lake County Illinois, and Kenosha County could not be isolated. She noted that the revenue generated by both new single-family and multi-family development is greater than the costs to the various units of government to provide services; although multi-family housing has a longer payback period than single-family housing. She also noted that an analysis was conducted of the estimated overall economic impact of new housing development in each of the areas, including impacts of spending by new residents. The following discussion points and comments were made during the review:

1. Mr. Cotter noted that there is a typographical error on page 6 where "Racine" County should be changed to "Walworth" County. Ms. N. Anderson responded that staff will make the necessary correction.
2. Mr. Peters asked if the single-family and multi-family analyses were adjusted to incorporate cost. Ms. N. Anderson responded that the single-family analyses were based in part on the average single-family home price and the multi-family analyses were based in part on average rents. She also noted that the cost of services to multi-family development is less than that of single-family development primarily due to smaller average household sizes.

Mr. Drew asked for a motion to approve the updates to Chapter V. Mr. Melcher made a motion to approve Figures V-4 through V-7 and Part 3, Impacts of Home Building on Local Governments and Economy, of Chapter V, incorporating Committee comments. Mr. Cotter seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously by the Committee.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Mr. Drew asked if there were any public comments. Mr. Peters noted that some entrances to the Technology Innovation Building are not accessible and should have a sign directing persons with disabilities to an accessible entrance. Mr. Drew agreed that the lack of signage is a concern and stated that it will be addressed.

## **CORRESPONDENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mr. Drew asked if there were additional correspondence or announcements. Additional correspondence and announcements included the following:

1. Ms. N. Anderson noted that with the exceptions of Chapters V, VIII, and XII, all regional housing plan draft chapters and appendices have been revised to incorporate comments from the Advisory Committee, Environmental Justice Task Force, and SEWRPC's Planning and Research Committee. The updated chapters and appendices are posted on the SEWRPC website.
2. Mr. Yunker noted that the next Public Policy Forum (PPF) Viewpoint Luncheon will focus on the regional housing plan. Mr. Henken noted that, as discussed at the June Committee meeting, the Luncheon will include a brief presentation followed by a panel discussion. The Luncheon will be held at the Italian Community Center from 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. The tentative date is September 10<sup>th</sup> and an announcement confirming the final date will be e-mailed to Committee members.
3. Ms. Schneider-Peragine noted that the UWM Urban Planning Alumni Chapter is planning its 3<sup>rd</sup> annual Planning and a Pint event for fall. The topic will be Great Lakes water diversions. Details on the event will be provided to Committee members when they are finalized.
4. Ms. N. Anderson noted that SEWRPC has contracted with the UWM Center for Economic Development to conduct a socio-economic impact (SEI) analysis of the regional housing plan, which is underway.

## **NEXT MEETING DATE**

Mr. Drew noted that the next meeting is not scheduled, but is anticipated for late September or early October. The meeting date will be finalized when the draft SEI analysis is completed.

[Secretary's Note: The next Committee meeting has been scheduled for October 10, 2012.]



**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Drew thanked the Committee members and guests for their time and participation and declared the meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin R. McKay  
Recording Secretary