

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

DATE: September 29, 2015  
TIME: 4:30 p.m.  
PLACE: Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD)  
General Commission Room  
260 W. Seeboth Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Members Present

Adelene Greene..... Director of Workforce Development, Kenosha County  
Chair  
Yolanda Adams..... President and CEO, Urban League of Racine and Kenosha  
Tyrone Dumas..... Educational Consultant,  
SOS Center Garden of Hope After School Program, Milwaukee  
Ella Dunbar..... Program Services Manager, Social Development Commission, Milwaukee  
N. Lynnette McNeely..... Legal Redress Chair, Waukesha County NAACP  
Rodney Prunty..... President, United Way of Racine  
Jackie Schellinger..... Indian Community Representative, Retired Judge  
Theresa Schuerman..... Walworth County Bilingual Migrant Worker Outreach

Guests and Staff Present

Stephen P. Adams..... Public Involvement and Outreach Manager, SEWRPC  
Jackie Clark-Ivy..... Resident  
Delores Green..... Resident  
Dennis Grzezinski..... Law Office of Dennis Grzezinski  
Michael G. Hahn..... Deputy Director, SEWRPC  
Christopher Hiebert..... Chief Transportation Engineer, SEWRPC  
Ryan W. Hoel..... Principal Engineer, SEWRPC  
Eric D. Lynde..... Principal Transportation Planner/Engineer, SEWRPC  
Benjamin R. McKay..... Principal Planner, SEWRPC  
Kevin J. Muhs..... Principal Transportation Planner, SEWRPC  
Truesillia Shank..... Community Outreach Specialist, UW-Milwaukee  
Kenneth R. Yunker..... Executive Director, SEWRPC

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Greene called the meeting of the Environmental Justice Task Force to order at 4:35 p.m., welcoming those in attendance. Ms. Greene introduced new Task Force member Mr. Rodney Prunty, President, United Way of Racine, and thanked him for joining the Task Force. She then asked the others in attendance to briefly introduce themselves.

## **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF OCTOBER 7, 2014, AND APRIL 7, 2015**

Ms. Greene asked if there were any questions or comments on the October 7, 2014, or April 7, 2015, meeting minutes. Ms. Adams referred to point No. 3 in the email from Ms. Karyn Rotker of the ACLU to Task Force members in Attachment No. 1 of the April 7<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes and noted that Ms. Rotker commented on whether the Plan of Action included in the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) for the Region includes language to target benefits of the proposed actions to persons of color. Mr. Yunker responded that the CEDS has been revised to address this comment. He noted that the CEDS is available on the [Economic Development](#) page of the SEWRPC website.

Ms. Greene asked if there were any further questions on the April 7, 2015, meeting minutes. There were none. On a motion from Ms. Adams seconded by Ms. Schellinger, the April 7, 2015, meeting minutes were approved. Ms. Greene asked again if there were any questions or comments on the October 7, 2014, meeting minutes. There were none. On a motion from Ms. McNeely and seconded by Ms. Schellinger, the October 7, 2014, meeting minutes were approved.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

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

## **PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON THE EVALUATION OF VISION 2050 ALTERNATIVE REGIONAL LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLANS**

Mr. Yunker stated that the purpose of the alternative plans stage of VISION 2050 is to examine the outcomes and consequences of following recent trends in land use development and transportation system investment over the next 35 years compared to possible outcomes and consequences of alternative land use development patterns and transportation system investments. Mr. Yunker stated that the evaluation of the alternatives will be the focus of a series of workshops later in the fall. He then stated that input from those workshops will be incorporated into the next step of the VISION 2050 planning process, which is to develop a preliminary recommended regional land use and transportation system plan. Mr. Yunker added that the preliminary recommended plan may draw from elements of multiple alternatives as well as from concepts that may not have been included in the alternatives.

Mr. Yunker noted that Task Force members received copies of the preliminary drafts of Volume II, Chapter III, "Alternative Land Use and Transportation System Plans" and Appendix F, "Complete Alternative Plan Evaluation Results" in their meeting packets. He also noted that a summary PowerPoint handout of the alternatives evaluation was distributed to members at the meeting (the chapter and appendix are available [here](#) and the summary PowerPoint handout is available [here](#)). He asked Mr. McKay, Mr. Lynde, and Mr. Muhs of the Commission staff to provide an overview of the VISION 2050 alternatives and their evaluation using the summary PowerPoint. The following comments and discussion points were made during the overview:

1. Ms. McNeely asked if continued development in suburban areas of the Region is the focus of the Trend. Mr. McKay responded that the Trend does include such continued development, and envisions a lower density, more scattered development pattern than Alternatives I and II.
2. Ms. Schellinger asked if development trends resulting from the economic downturn starting in 2008 are reflected in the population, household, and employment projections used to develop the

alternatives. Mr. Yunker responded that the projections are intended to provide an indication of future growth trends over the next 35 years. The projections do not reflect fluctuations in growth associated with shorter-term business cycles. He explained that the economic downturn was not projected to continue on a long-term basis; however, growth is projected to be relatively modest through 2050. The modest growth is generally consistent with State level projections. Mr. Yunker added that there will be a large number of residents leaving the workforce over the projection period, which will require an in-migration of population from outside the Region to replenish the workforce.

3. Ms. Schellinger stated that the Region's population is aging and noted that a continuation of development trends from the last 25 years may not meet the Region's needs. Mr. Yunker responded that Alternatives I and II include more compact development patterns than the Trend, which may better suit the needs of the Region in light of the aging of the large baby boom generation. He then clarified that the Trend is not a prediction of future development, but an extrapolation of past development trends to the year 2050. He stated that Alternatives I and II were prepared as "what if" futures to compare to the Trend and evaluate outcomes and consequences of different development patterns and transportation system investments.
4. Mr. Dumas asked if access to water supply constrains development under the alternatives. Mr. Yunker responded that there is enough water in the Region, including Lake Michigan supply and groundwater supply, to supply the projected growth throughout the Region under each of the alternatives. Mr. Yunker added that water supply is only one consideration. He noted that one of the academic members of the Commission's Regional Water Supply Planning Advisory Committee suggested that scattered low density development could be the most sustainable in terms of water supply; however, such low density development is likely not the best type of development for the Region for a number of other reasons. Ms. Schellinger noted that the socio-economic impact analysis of the regional water supply plan conducted by UWM for the Commission concluded that water supply would not constrain the growth envisioned in the year 2035 regional land use plan. Mr. Yunker added that this conclusion would hold true for growth under the Commission's year 2050 intermediate projections.
5. Ms. Schellinger referred to slide seven of the PowerPoint and asked for clarification regarding fixed-guideway transit station areas. Mr. McKay responded that station areas include a radius of about one-half mile around a station that has the potential to support high-density, mixed-use development, often referred to as transit-oriented development (TOD). He noted that a strong demand for housing has been demonstrated around certain stations in other Regions that have fixed-guideway transit networks. Mr. Lynde added that fixed-guideway transit operates in its own exclusive guideway and could include bus rapid transit (BRT), light rail, or commuter rail. Ms. Dunbar asked if population density would fluctuate between the alternatives given the presence of a fixed-guideway transit station. Mr. Yunker responded that population density would increase in fixed-guideway transit corridors under Alternatives I and II. Ms. Schellinger noted that the fixed-guideway transit networks envisioned under Alternative I and Alternative II could change the landscape of the Region.
6. Ms. Adams referred to Maps III-4, III-6, and III-8, which show incremental household allocations under the alternatives, and noted that there appears to be a large allocation of households in the area of Chiwaukee Prairie in the Village of Pleasant Prairie under each of the alternatives. Mr.

Yunker responded that staff would report the household allocations to this area in meeting minutes.

[Secretary's Note: About 370 households were allocated to the five transportation analysis zones (TAZ) that encompass Chiwaukee Prairie under each of the alternatives. Most of these households were allocated to the Greater Kenosha sewer service area located adjacent to Chiwaukee Prairie. The only households allocated outside of the Greater Kenosha sewer service area in these five TAZs were to existing vacant lots located outside of environmentally significant lands.]

7. Mr. Dumas asked if previous rail service proposals, such as high speed rail and the Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee (KRM) commuter rail line, are incorporated in the alternatives. Mr. Yunker responded that the proposal for high speed rail focused on long distance travel and was studied by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT). He noted that a commuter rail line between Milwaukee and Oconomowoc is envisioned under Alternative II for the segment of the proposed high speed rail line between Milwaukee and Madison that is located within the Region. Mr. Yunker then noted that the commuter rail line between Kenosha and Milwaukee envisioned under Alternatives I and II would follow the proposed KRM route.
8. Ms. McNeely referred to the expansion of the bicycle networks under the alternatives and questioned whether it is a widely used mode of transportation during the cold weather months. Ms. Schellinger asked if bike sharing programs stop service in cold weather months. Mr. Yunker responded that similar questions have been raised at recent Advisory Committee and public meetings. He noted that the most bicycle usage occurs in densely populated areas of the Region where enhanced facilities are envisioned under Alternatives I and II. Mr. Yunker added that bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are required for new highway construction and reconstruction projects using Federal funds, unless demonstrated to be prohibitive. Ms. McNeely suggested providing data on bicycle trips taken for work purposes and trips taken for non-work purposes.

[Secretary's Note: Regional travel inventories conducted in 2011 indicate that on an average weekday 26,600 bicycle trips were for work purposes, 27,800 trips were for non-work purposes, and 13,900 trips were for school purposes.]

9. Ms. Schellinger stated that increased bicycle usage can contribute to healthy lifestyles. Mr. Dumas noted that the Beerline Trail in Milwaukee is an example of how a bicycle facility can be integrated with art and commerce in creative place making. Mr. Yunker added that bicycle and pedestrian facilities can add to the attractiveness of an area.
10. Ms. Dunbar asked if transportation programs to connect residents to jobs are included in the alternatives, such as the Ways to Work Program. She suggested that funding could be directed to these types of programs. Mr. Lynde responded that transportation infrastructure is the focus of the alternatives. Mr. Yunker added that staff will consider how to address transportation programs that connect people to jobs through plan recommendations. He noted that a driver license recovery program, previously suggested by Mr. Dumas, is another example of a transportation program that could be addressed through plan recommendations. Mr. Yunker stated that staff

will work with Ms. Dunbar and Mr. Dumas to develop recommendations. Mr. Dumas noted that the Urban League may also be able to provide assistance in developing recommendations.

11. Ms. McNeely suggested expanding the transit service areas in Waukesha County under Alternatives I and II. Mr. Lynde responded that the transit service areas in Waukesha County under Alternatives I and II were expanded to those areas with population density to support transit service. He noted that shared-ride taxi service is envisioned for all areas of the Region not envisioned for fixed-route public transit service under Alternatives I and II. Mr. Prunty asked if the transit element of the alternatives could be overlaid on their development patterns. Mr. Yunker responded that staff would prepare these maps and attach them to the minutes (see Attachment 1).
12. Ms. Schellinger asked for more information regarding the VISION 2050 schedule. Mr. Yunker responded that the fourth series of VISION 2050 workshops will be held in November, with one workshop in each of the seven counties and a workshop with each of the eight VISION 2050 community organization partners. Input from the workshops, EJTF, Advisory Committees, and VISION 2050 Task Forces on key areas of interest will be considered as staff prepares a preliminary recommended plan. The fifth series of VISION 2050 workshops will be held in spring 2016 to obtain comment on the preliminary recommended plan. The final recommended plan is scheduled to be completed in mid-2016.
13. Ms. Schellinger noted that Alternative II seems to perform better than Alternative I and the Trend under the evaluation criteria and asked if there are areas where Alternative II does not perform as well as Alternative I or the Trend. Mr. Yunker responded that Alternative II would require greater public investment in the transit system than the other alternatives. Ms. Schellinger noted that Alternative II would result in more vibrant neighborhoods and should be supported by the Task Force if the costs are reasonable compared to the other alternatives and implementation is realistic. Mr. Yunker noted that results from the Commission's travel simulation model show that ridership on most of the fixed-guideway transit lines envisioned under Alternative II would be strong enough to support implementation. Ms. Schellinger suggested continuing the discussion of the alternatives at the next Task Force meeting after the public has had an opportunity to comment on the alternatives at the workshops. Mr. Dumas noted that the Task Force had an extensive discussion regarding the evaluation criteria at a previous meeting and more than one meeting may be needed to provide enough time to discuss the evaluation results. Mr. Yunker responded that further discussion on the evaluation of the alternatives would be on the agenda for the next Task Force meeting.
14. Ms. Schellinger noted that park-ride facilities are important for commuters living in outlying areas of the Region that wish to ride public transit to downtown Milwaukee. She asked if the alternatives include park-ride facilities at fixed-guideway transit stations in urban areas. Mr. Yunker responded park-ride facilities in urban areas would generally be provided at commuter rail stations, but not typically at rapid transit stations. He noted that there would be more park-ride facilities under Alternatives I and II than the Trend.
15. Ms. McNeely referred to slide 19 of the PowerPoint handout and questioned the population with access to 100,000 or more jobs within 30 minutes via transit. Mr. Yunker responded that the travel simulation model considers the locations of households and jobs and travel times using public transit services between those locations. Mr. Muhs noted that transit access to jobs within

30 minutes is shown under existing conditions and each of the alternatives on Maps F-124 through F-127 in Appendix F.

16. Mr. Dumas stated that public transit is often criticized for operating during hours with little ridership; however, it is important to provide service to third shift workers. Mr. Yunker noted that many public works facilities operate during off-peak hours with greatly decreased demand (including highways and airports), but do not receive the same criticism. Ms. Schellinger added that improved frequency of public transit service during evening hours may contribute to a feeling of security.
17. Ms. Schellinger asked if the potential for gentrification under Alternatives I and II has been considered. Mr. Muhs responded that the potential for increased property values in fixed-guideway transit station areas and strategies for including affordable housing in these areas is discussed under Criterion 3.1.1 – Impact of the Distribution of Growth on Property Values. Mr. Muhs noted that more discussion regarding research on gentrification will be added to the criterion write-up (see highlighted text in Attachment 2). Ms. Schellinger noted that displaced low-income populations could experience longer travel times. Mr. Yunker responded that this concern will be addressed in text added to the Criterion 3.1.1 write-up. Mr. Dumas noted that the West Lawn development lost housing capacity when it was redeveloped and some low-income households may have been displaced to areas with lower quality transit service. Ms. Dunbar suggested seeking input from neighborhood groups. Mr. Yunker noted that SEWRPC is working with eight community organization partners to obtain input at all stages of the VISION 2050 process, including evaluation of the alternatives.
18. Ms. Green stated from the audience that she has attended previous VISION 2050 workshops and expressed concern regarding potential gentrification of low-income neighborhoods that may result from transit-oriented development and fixed-guideway transit. She urged engagement of low-income residents in the planning process. Ms. Schellinger stated that it is important that the VISION 2050 plan does not displace low-income residents in the effort to provide more public transit options. She added that the intended outcomes of Alternatives I and II are not to displace low-income residents and added that it is laudable that Commission staff has presented the evaluation of the alternatives to the Task Force to discuss how to present the information to the public. Mr. Yunker stated that Commission staff will continue to work with the eight VISION 2050 community organization partners and other neighborhood groups to ensure the participation of low-income neighborhood residents in the VISION 2050 planning process. He suggested that Ms. Green discuss with Mr. Adams the outreach that should be conducted.
19. Ms. Schellinger stated that Alternative I could be seen as a compromise between the Trend and Alternative II. She noted that Alternative II may perform the best; however, its benefits must be weighed against its costs. Ms. Schellinger added that the potential for gentrification is also a concern. Mr. Yunker explained that the intent of Alternative II would be to provide high quality public transit service to existing populations that rely on transit to reach important destinations. He added that if elements of Alternative II are included in the recommended plan, policies would be included to mitigate the potential for detrimental impacts, such as displacement resulting from gentrification.
20. Ms. Schellinger referred to slide 27 of the PowerPoint handout and asked where the additional costs for Alternative II are focused. Mr. Yunker responded that the increased cost of Alternative

II is largely due to the annual operating costs of increased public transit service, including fixed-guideway transit and increased frequency of local transit service. Mr. Yunker added that if public reaction to Alternative II is positive, but there is also concern about its cost, Commission staff will consider how to decrease the cost while providing high quality public transit service. He then noted that implementing Alternatives I and II without highway improvements would only save approximately \$43 million to \$50 million per year in transportation system investment.

21. Mr. Dumas stated that there is value to long-range planning because information needs to be provided to policy makers to secure the increased revenue required to depart from past trends. Ms. Dunbar suggested that Mr. Adams of the Commission staff connect with community organizations to ensure those groups that wish to participate in the VISION 2050 effort are aware of the opportunity.

#### **BREIFING ON THE WISCONSIN STATE FREIGHT PLAN BY WISCONSIN DEPARMTENT OF TRANSPORTATION STAFF**

This item was deferred to a future meeting.

#### **PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND OUTREACH DIVISION UPDATE ON PRIMARY ORGANIZATIONAL CONTACTS**

This item was deferred to a future meeting.

#### **NEXT MEETING DATE**

Ms. Greene suggested scheduling a meeting in December to continue discussion of the alternatives evaluation and feedback received from the fourth series of VISION 2050 workshops. She requested that Commission staff email Task Force members with a prospective date and schedule the December meeting based on the availability of Task Force members. She noted that a 2016 meeting schedule should be determined after the December meeting. Ms. Greene then requested that a volunteer for Vice Chair of the Task Force be identified at the next meeting.

#### **FURTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Ms. Greene asked if there were any public comments. Ms. Shank stressed the importance of public health in evaluating the alternatives.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Greene thanked those in attendance and attending by phone. She announced the meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin R. McKay  
Recording Secretary

\* \* \*

KRY/EDL/KJM/BRM  
EJTF Minutes - Mtg 34 - 9/29/15 (00228305).DOCX