TITLE VI PROGRAM: 2020
RESOLUTION NO. 2020-12

RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVING THE COMMISSION’S TITLE VI PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission is charged with the responsibility of carrying out a long-range comprehensive planning program for the seven counties in the Southeastern Wisconsin Region and, as a part of that program, is presently engaged in a continuing, comprehensive, areawide, cooperative land use-transportation planning process pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962 and the Federal Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended by the Federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century of 1998, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users of 2005, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act of 2012, and the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act of 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission has been designated by the Governor of the State of Wisconsin as the official cooperative, comprehensive, continuing, areawide transportation planning agency (Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO) under the rules and regulations promulgated by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and Federal Transit Administration, with respect to the Kenosha, Milwaukee, Racine, West Bend urbanized areas, and the Wisconsin portion of the Round Lake Beach urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission has prepared transportation plans for the Region that are consistent with applicable Federal laws and regulations; and

WHEREAS, the transportation planning process conducted by the Commission specifically meets the Federal planning requirements set forth in the Code of Federal Regulations (23 CFR 450); and

WHEREAS, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission has, in carrying out its responsibilities as the MPO, prepared a Title VI Program.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED:

FIRST:  That in accordance with 23 CFR 450.336(a), the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission hereby certifies that the regional transportation planning process is addressing the land use and transportation planning issues of the metropolitan planning area, and is being conducted in accordance with all applicable federal requirements of:

1. 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303, and this subpart;

2. In non-attainment and maintenance areas, Sections 174 and 176 (c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506 (c) and (d)) and 40 CFR part 93;

3. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2000d-1) and 49 CFR Part 21;

4. 49 U.S.C. 5332, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age in employment or business opportunity;

5. Section 1101(b) of the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act (P.L. 114-357) and 49 CFR Part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in USDOT funded projects;
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6. 23 CFR part 230, regarding the implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts;


8. The Older Americans Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6101), prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance;

9. Section 324 of title 23 U.S.C. regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender; and


SECOND: That the document entitled, Title VI Program, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, October 22, 2020, is hereby endorsed and approved.

THIRD: That a true, correct, and exact copy of this resolution and the document entitled, Title VI Program, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, shall be transmitted to the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, and any other State and Federal agencies as may be deemed appropriate by the Commission Executive Director.

The foregoing resolution, upon motion duly made and seconded, was regularly adopted at the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission held on the 22nd day of October 2020, the vote being: Ayes 7; Nays 0.

Charles L. Colman, Chairman

ATTEST:

Kevin J. Muhs, Deputy Secretary
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SEWRPC Staff Memorandum

TITLE VI PROGRAM

October 22, 2020

This staff memorandum documents the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission’s (SEWRPC) Title VI program in accordance with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Circular 4702.1B entitled, “Title VI Requirements and Guidelines for Federal Transit Administrative Recipients.” The enclosed information provides an update to the Commission’s last Title VI program submission that was transmitted to the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) on October 26, 2017. The Commission is a sub-recipient of FHWA/FTA planning funds through WisDOT.

This memorandum includes the following attachments:

Exhibit A  SEWRPC Title VI Notice to the Public – This notice is posted on an informational kiosk in the lobby of the Commission office and on the Commission website (www.sewrpc.org).

Exhibit B  SEWRPC Complaint Form

Exhibit C  SEWRPC Complaint Procedure

Exhibit D  SEWRPC Title VI Complaint Log

Exhibit E  SEWRPC Public Participation Plan – The Commission’s public involvement process is contained in a series of three related documents that were developed to serve the needs of different audiences:

Exhibit E-1  Public Participation Plan for Regional Planning for Southeastern Wisconsin, which was developed to serve as an encompassing yet easy-to-use reference for the public.

Exhibit E-2  An appendix entitled, Public Participation Plan for Transportation Planning, focusing on the public participation activities to be used in the Commission’s transportation planning and programming efforts, and providing further detail with respect to public meetings and comment periods, and describing measures to be used in the evaluation of the public participation plan.

Exhibit E-3  An appendix entitled, Regional Transportation Consultation Process, documenting the Commissions consultation process, which was followed during the preparation of VISION 2050, the year 2050 regional land use and transportation systems plan, which was adopted in July 2016.

Exhibit E-4  A summary brochure entitled, Public Participation in Regional Planning in Southeastern Wisconsin.
Exhibit F  SEWRPC Summary of Public Involvement and Outreach Activities Undertaken, Including Meaningful Access for Minority and Low Income Populations: April 2017 – March 2020


Exhibit H  SEWRPC Summary of the Membership of the Commission and Advisory Committees

Exhibit I  Demographic Profile of Southeastern Wisconsin

Exhibit J  SEWRPC Summary of the Identification and Consideration of the Mobility Needs of Minority Populations During the Regional Transportation Planning Process for Southeastern Wisconsin

Exhibit K  SEWRPC Summary of the Distribution of State and Federal Funding for Public Transportation Serving Minority Populations in Southeastern Wisconsin
NOTICE TO PUBLIC: TITLE VI COMPLIANCE

EXHIBIT A
Notice to Public: Title VI Compliance

The Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission hereby gives public notice of its policy to uphold and assure full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice, and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. Title VI requires that no person in the United States of America shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the Commission receives Federal financial assistance.

Any person who believes that they have been aggrieved by an unlawful discriminatory practice under Title VI has a right to file a formal complaint with the Commission. Any such complaint should be in writing and submitted to Elizabeth A. Larsen, Title VI Coordinator within one hundred eighty (180) days following the date of the alleged discriminatory occurrence.

A complainant may file a complaint directly with the Federal Transit Administration by filing a complaint with the Office of Civil Rights, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

For more information regarding SEWRPC civil rights obligations or if information is needed in another language, please contact:

Spanish: Para más información acerca de las obligaciones de los derechos civiles de SEWRPC o si la información es requerida en otro idioma, favor de contactar:

Hmong: Xav paub ntau ntxiv txog SEWRPC kev pab rau nrii txog tib neeg txoj cai los yog cov ntsiab lus uas txhais ua lwom hom lus, caw ntsib rau:

Elizabeth A. Larsen
Title VI Coordinator
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
W239 N1812 Rockwood Drive
PO Box 1607
Waukesha, WI 53187-1607
Phone: (262) 547-6721
SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION TITLE VI COMPLAINT FORM

EXHIBIT B
If you would like to submit a Title VI complaint to the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, please fill out this form and send it to: SEWRPC, Attn: Elizabeth Larsen, Title VI Officer, P.O. Box 1607, W239 N1812 Rockwood Drive, Waukesha, WI 53187-1607 or submit via e-mail to elarsen@sewrpc.org. You are not required to use this form; a letter with the same information is sufficient.

Name: ________________________________
Address: ________________________________
Phone: Day ______ Evening ______
E-Mail: ________________________________

Accessible Format Requirements Y/N?
Large Print _____ TDD _____ Other _____

_Person(s) discriminated against if different from above:
Name: ________________________________
Name: ________________________________
Address: ________________________________
Address: ________________________________
Phone: ________________________________
Phone: ________________________________

_Please explain your relationship to this person(s):
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_Does your complaint concern discrimination in the delivery of services or in other discriminatory actions of the Commission in its treatment of you or others? If so, please indicate below the base(s) on which you believe these discriminatory actions were taken. Please also explain as clearly as possible what happened, why you believe it happened, and how you were discriminated against. Indicate who was involved. Be sure to include how other persons were treated differently from you. (Please use additional sheets if necessary and attach any materials pertaining to your case).

_Please indicate which of the following is the basis of your complaint:
Race/Ethnicity _____ National Origin _____ Color _____
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
What is the most convenient time and place for us to contact you about this complaint?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

If we will not be able to reach you directly, you may wish to give us the name and phone number of a person who can tell us how to reach you and/or provide information about your complaint:

Name:  ____________________________________________
Phone:  ____________________________________________
Email:  ____________________________________________

If you have an attorney representing you concerning the matters raised in this complaint, please provide the following:

Name:  ____________________________________________
Address:  ____________________________________________
Phone:  ____________________________________________
E-Mail:  ____________________________________________

To your best recollection, on what date(s) did the alleged discrimination take place?

Earliest date of discrimination:  ____________________________
Most recent date of discrimination:  ____________________________

Complaints of discrimination should be filed within 180 days of the alleged discrimination. If the most recent date of discrimination, listed above, is more than 180 days ago, you may request a waiver of the filing requirement. If you wish to request a waiver, please explain why you waited until now to file your complaint.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Please list below any persons (witnesses or others), if known, whom we may contact for additional information to support or clarify your complaint.

Name:  ____________________________________________  Name:  ____________________________________________
Address:  ____________________________________________  Address:  ____________________________________________
Phone:  ____________________________________________  Phone:  ____________________________________________
Do you have any other information that you think is relevant to our investigation of your allegations?
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

What remedy are you seeking for the alleged discrimination?
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Have you filed a case or complaint with any of the following? (Check the appropriate item)

_____ Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice
_____ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
_____ U.S. Department of Transportation - Federal Highway Administration
_____ U.S. Department of Transportation – Federal Transit Administration
_____ Other Federal Agency
_____ State of Wisconsin Department of Justice
_____ Federal or State Court
_____ Attorney (note the name and address above)
_____ Other (specify) ____________________________________________________________

For any item checked above, please provide the following information:

Name of agency: ______________________________________________________________
Date filed: __________________________________________________________________
Case or docket number: ________________________________________________________
Date or trial or hearing: ________________________________________________________
Location of agency or court: ____________________________________________________
Name of investigator: __________________________________________________________
Status of case: ________________________________________________________________
Additional comments: __________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

We cannot accept a complaint if it has not been signed. Please sign and date this complaint form below:

____________________________________________________________________________  _____________________
Signature                                   Date
The Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires that no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color or national origin, be excluded from, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

These procedures apply to all complaints filed under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, relating to any program and/or activity administered by SEWRPC or its consultants, and/or contractors. Intimidation or retaliation of any kind is prohibited by law.

These procedures do not deny the right of the complainant to file formal complaints with other State or Federal agencies, or to seek private counsel for complaints alleging discrimination. These procedures are part of an administrative process that does not provide for remedies that include punitive damages or compensatory remuneration for the complainant.

Every effort will be made to obtain early resolution of complaints at the lowest possible level. The option of informal mediation meeting(s) between the affected parties and the Title VI Coordinator may be utilized for resolution, at any stage of the process. The Title VI Coordinator will make every effort to pursue a resolution of the complaint. Initial interviews with the complainant and the respondent will include requests for information regarding specific relief and settlement options.

If information is needed in another language, please contact the Title VI Coordinator at (262) 953-3201.

**PROCEDURES**

Any individual, group of individuals, or entity that believes they have been subjected to discrimination or retaliation prohibited by Title VI nondiscrimination provisions may file a written complaint to SEWRPC’s Title VI Coordinator or directly with the Federal Transit Administration, Office of Civil Rights, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. A formal complaint should be filed within 180 calendar days of the alleged occurrence or when the alleged discrimination became known to the complainant. The complaint must meet the following requirements:

1. Complaints must be in writing and signed by the complainant(s).

2. Complaints must include the date of the alleged act(s) of discrimination (date when the complainant(s) became aware of the alleged discrimination; or the date of the latest instance of the conduct).

3. Complaint must present a detailed description of the issues and activities perceived as parties in the action complained against.

4. Allegations received by fax or e-mail will be acknowledged and processed, once the identity(ies) of the complainant(s) and the intent to proceed with the complaint have been established. For this, the complainant is required to mail or hand deliver to the SEWRPC offices a signed, original copy of the fax or e-mail transmittal for SEWRPC to be able to process it.

5. Allegations received by telephone will be reduced to writing and provided to the complainant for confirmation or revision before processing. A complaint form will be forwarded to the complainant for the complaintant(s) to complete, sign, and return to SEWRPC for processing.

**RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE**

In order to be accepted, a complaint must meet the following criteria:

1. The complaint should be filed within 180 calendar days of the alleged occurrence or when the alleged discrimination became known to the complainant.

2. The allegation(s) must involve a covered basis such as race, color, or national origin.

3. The allegation(s) must involve a program or activity that receives Federal financial assistance.
4. When a complaint is received the Title VI Coordinator will provide written acknowledgement of the Complainant, within ten (10) days by registered mail.

5. If a complaint is deemed incomplete, additional information will be requested, and the Complainant will be provided thirty (30) business days to submit the required information. Failure to do so may be considered good cause for a determination of no investigative merit.

SEWRPC will assume responsibility for investigating complaints against any of its consultants and/or contractors. Complaints in which SEWRPC is named as the Respondent, shall be forwarded to the appropriate Federal agency for proper disposition, in accordance with their procedures.

DISMISSAL

A complaint may be recommended for dismissal for the following reasons:

1. The complainant requests withdrawal of the complaint.

2. The complainant fails to respond to repeated requests for additional information needed to process the complaint.

3. The complainant cannot be located after reasonable attempts

INVESTIGATION OF COMPLAINTS

In cases where SEWRPC assumes the investigation of the complaint, SEWRPC will provide the respondent with the opportunity to respond to the allegations in writing. The respondent will have ten (10) calendar days from the date of SEWRPC’s written notification of acceptance of the complaint to furnish their response to the allegation(s).

Within forty (40) calendar days, the SEWRPC Title VI Coordinator will prepare an investigative report for review by the agency’s Legal Counsel and Executive Director. The report shall include a narrative description of the incident, identification of persons interviewed, findings, and recommendations for remedial steps as appropriate and necessary. The remedial steps, if any, will be implemented as soon as practicable. The Complainant will receive a copy of the final report together with any remedial steps. The Complainant shall also be notified of their right to appeal the decision.

The Title VI Coordinator shall maintain a log of Title VI complaints received from this process. The log shall include the date the complaint was filed; a summary of the allegations; the status of the complaint; and actions taken by SEWRPC in response to the complaint. Should SEWRPC receive a Title VI complaint in the form of a formal charge or lawsuit, SEWRPC’s Legal Counsel shall be responsible for the investigation.
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PLANNING FOR OUR REGION

In Southeastern Wisconsin, regional planning for land use, transportation, and other elements of public works and facilities (for example, parks, sanitary sewerage, water supply, and stormwater management) is done by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, serving seven counties:

- Kenosha County
- Milwaukee County
- Ozaukee County
- Racine County
- Walworth County
- Washington County
- Waukesha County
- 148 cities, villages, and towns
- More than 2.1 million people
- About 1.2 million jobs
- Over $170 billion in equalized valuation
- More than one-third of Wisconsin’s population, jobs, and wealth

We invite you to participate in planning for the future of our Region, and this document discusses the many opportunities to get involved.

The Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) works to provide basic information and planning services to solve problems and explore opportunities that go beyond single units of government. In our Region, there are seven counties and nearly 150 communities, containing many public and private interests.

Planning for needs like efficient highways and public transit systems, beneficial parks and open spaces, affordable housing, major land use changes and employment centers, and a quality environment including clean water cannot be done well without working together. These and other needs require a multi-county planning effort and benefit from the participation of many residents, providing many unique perspectives.
IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public participation has become an important part of government decisions affecting many aspects of our lives. The Regional Planning Commission believes that having people participate in its work can help to accomplish positive things:

- Present opportunities to both provide and get back useful information
- Explain issues and choices that are sometimes complex using non-technical language
- Encourage residents to suggest ideas and make comments that can improve planning
- Guide planning through advisory committees containing key representatives and topic experts
- Create plans that are more likely to be carried out due to understanding and support
- Expand knowledge so that participants are better equipped to act or to join in public debate
- Give residents a voice while also meeting important legal requirements
- Build important partnerships and maintain key connections for success

The rest of this document explains in detail how the Regional Planning Commission plans to provide opportunities for public participation, how it will use the ideas and comments received, and how it is prepared to evaluate success and make improvements. Suggestions are welcome on how the Commission can meet participation needs and best receive public comments (please see back cover).

The SEWRPC website at www.sewrpc.org is a ready source of full information—from newsletters and meeting details to draft recommendations and complete plans—offering an open opportunity to comment on regional planning 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION GOAL

The Commission’s goal for public participation has three major parts:

- Ensure early and continuous public notification about regional planning
- Provide meaningful information concerning regional planning
- Obtain participation and input in regional planning
HOW PEOPLE MAY RELATE DURING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In pursuing its three-fold public participation goal, the Commission recognizes and appreciates that diverse audiences will approach regional planning topics from different perspectives. Some people may initially be unaware, or struggle to see the relevance. Others may wish to become active participants or even outreach partners.

The Commission will use a range of informational materials, activities, and events to meet a variety of needs. In this process, the Commission will respect that some people may want to participate only at a distance, if at all, while others may seek a great deal of information and involvement. In all cases, providing meaningful opportunities for participation will be considered a key for success by the Commission. The following describe different and generally growing levels of planning involvement upon which people often focus. However, the Commission strives to be flexible and encourages involvement in whatever way is desired and convenient.

- **Recipient** – a person or group perhaps merely wanting to become or remain informed, that may receive materials via mail, e-mail, or other means
- **Attendee** – someone taking the step of traveling to a meeting or other event, or consulting the SEWRPC website for updates
- **Participant** – an attendee who engages in discussion or provides comments and input
- **Stakeholder** – a person or represented interest that initially had a tie to the planning effort, or that developed a stronger interest via public participation, and that continues to actively participate during the process
- **Partner** – usually a specific interest or grouping of interests that works cooperatively with the Commission staff on completing key activities such as outreach events
- **Implementer or Plan Advocate** – participants that have the authority to implement plan recommendations or that use plan information or results in seeking to achieve plan recommendations

Credit: Milwaukee Community Journal
RECOMMENDED PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

The Commission will work to achieve its public participation goal cooperatively with other public agencies and units of government by coordinating efforts when possible. It will coordinate particularly with the Region’s counties, cities, villages, and towns, and the Wisconsin Departments of Transportation and Natural Resources. The Regional Planning Commission will seek to provide timely notices of important steps in planning, free and open access, and multiple means of participation within the Region in a number of ways.

The components of public participation will include:

• Open Meetings
• Advisory Committee Meetings
• Public Meetings and Comment Periods
  o Targeted Format and Frequency
  o Broad Notification
  o Convenient Scheduling
• Website Updates
• Document Availability and Notification
• Ensuring Environmental Justice in Planning
• Engaging Minority Populations, Low-Income Populations, and People with Disabilities
• Environmental Justice Task Force
• Public Outreach and Briefings
• Incorporation of Public Input
• Evaluation of Public Participation

Open Meetings

• Meetings of the Commission and its advisory committees are open to the public.
• Agendas are posted on the SEWRPC website and at the Commission offices at least five days in advance.
• Locations accessible by public transit are considered desirable and will be used for committee and public meetings if practical, especially for transportation planning, depending upon the subject matter and expected audience.
• People needing disability-related accommodations are encouraged to participate, and reasonable accommodations will be made upon request. All locations will comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.
Advisory Committee Meetings

- Advisory committee meetings take place throughout each planning process.
- Concerned government officials who can represent residents or are specialists in the planning topic serve on the committees, as well as other knowledgeable people.
- The Commission seeks committee diversity, especially members of minority population groups.
- Plan chapters are carefully reviewed by committees for approval, along with planning data.
- Agendas may provide an opportunity for public comments, and the committees review all comments.

Public Meetings and Comment Periods

Ongoing public comments are sought in many different ways. Formal comment periods will be used at times, with minimums noted below.

- 30 days for most updates, amendments, or adoptions:
  - Update or amendment of the regional transportation plan
  - Adoption of the transportation improvement program
  - Transportation improvement program amendment when it requires a plan amendment
  - Adoption of a transit development plan
  - Adoption of a jurisdictional highway system plan
- 45 days for the adoption of the public involvement process.
- 30 days for other planning or programming efforts, if a public meeting is determined necessary by the Commission or one of its advisory committees.
- A public meeting, if conducted, will be scheduled during these formal comment periods.
- If significant changes are made to a preliminary plan or program following completion of a public participation process, an additional notification and formal comment period may be provided prior to adoption.

Public meetings and informational materials used with them will provide opportunities to obtain public input, as well as to inform the public about transportation and other planning efforts.

Targeted Format and Frequency

- A variety of techniques provide information, including summary handouts, visual displays, keypad polling, interactive small group discussions, and availability of Commission staff to answer questions and make presentations.
- All meetings include the opportunity to provide comments in writing or orally in-person to Commission staff.
- An opportunity for oral testimony in town hall format and/or one-on-one with a court reporter occurs for meetings at which alternative plans or a preliminary recommended plan are presented.
- Annually at least one public meeting will be held, whether for a major or routine transportation plan update, where the regional transportation plan will be available for review and comment.
- During major regional plan updates, multiple series of public meetings will be held, with at least one early in the process to address the study scope and/or inventory findings, and later for comment on alternatives and/or a preliminary recommended plan.
• A single public meeting may be held for other efforts, including during a routine regional transportation plan review taking place every three or four years, for studies affecting only part of the Region, and during the preparation of the transportation improvement program.

**Broad Notification**

• Paid advertisements will be placed by the Commission in newspapers appropriate for the study area and meeting locations, published at least 10 days prior to the first meeting announced.

• Newspapers serving minorities and low-income populations will also be used for paid ads, with translations into non-English languages as appropriate, notably Spanish.

• Press releases announcing public meetings may be distributed for an area appropriate for each planning effort, and a media list will be maintained for this purpose.

• Development and distribution of summary materials via mail and e-mail may also be used for notification of public meetings – brochures, fact sheets, and/or newsletters.

• Website updates will be used to make meeting notifications and associated materials quickly and readily available.

**Convenient Scheduling**

For major regional plan updates, involving multiple series of public meetings, the following are routinely considered:

• At least one meeting per county is held during each meeting series, all at accessible locations substantially complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

• Central city locations are sought for meetings held in Kenosha, Milwaukee, Racine, and Waukesha Counties.

• As appropriate, community partners will hold meetings at the same time as similar public meetings.

• Public transit availability is considered in selecting meeting sites, notably in urban areas.

• Limited English proficiency steps are taken, including arrangements for requested translators, and typically providing a translator in Hispanic/Latino neighborhood locations.

**Website Updates – www.sewrpc.org**

• The SEWRPC website contains both background and comprehensive current information about the Regional Planning Commission.

• Detailed information about transportation planning and other planning activities is featured.

• Committee meeting materials including agendas, minutes, and chapters reviewed are regularly updated.

• Current studies as well as historic plan materials can be accessed.

• Postings also include newsletters, fact sheets, brochures, meeting announcements, public meeting presentations and handouts, and draft sections of reports.

• Contact information is available, and online comments can be submitted at any time.
Document Availability and Notification

- All draft preliminary plans are available for public review at the Commission offices and on the SEWRPC website.

- Documents including published plans are provided to all public library systems in the Region. They are also available for public review at the Commission offices and on the website. A charge to cover production and mailing costs may be applied to purchases.

- The Commission maintains a mailing and e-mailing list of governments, individuals, agencies, groups, and organizations that have expressed interest in receiving information.

- Newsletters are prepared and sent during each major study to some 3,000 recipients, including local elected and appointed officials, and anyone who requests receiving the newsletters or electronic newsletters.
  - Provide study updates, announce public meetings, and describe planning content
  - Serve as condensed but relatively thorough summaries of plans or plan progress

- Summary fact sheets or brochures are used to further shorten newsletter content.
  - Used as public meeting handouts and provided to groups as appropriate
  - Typically translated into Spanish
  - Mailed with personal letters to minority and low-income group contacts
  - Sometimes substituted for newsletters in smaller, shorter term, or local planning studies

Ensuring Environmental Justice in Planning

The Commission will continue working to ensure that environmental justice occurs in all its efforts, including public participation.

- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 forms the basis of environmental justice, stating in part that, “No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin be excluded from participation…”

- “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations” is an Executive Order signed by President Clinton in 1994.

- Ensuring full and fair participation of minority populations and low-income populations is one of the principles of environmental justice, along with avoiding, minimizing, or relieving unfair harmful effects and preventing the denial, reduction, or delay in benefits involving any Federal funds.

- The population that may be affected, and the potential benefits and impacts of a plan or program to be considered, will help determine the amount and type of public participation efforts.
Engaging Minority Populations, Low-Income Populations, and People with Disabilities

The Commission will seek to involve all interested and concerned segments of the public in its planning. Some practical applications, shown immediately below, identify how certain public participation steps unfold in major planning efforts to engage minority populations, low-income populations, and people with disabilities:

- Personal letters are sent to lead contacts of groups and organizations at each major stage of planning corresponding to study newsletters and/or public meetings, highlighting key points of potential interest.

- Telephone campaigns, emails, or regular contacts occur to arrange meetings, encourage participation, answer questions, and take any comments.

- Partnerships and other deeper relationships will be continued with eight community partners that serve and represent the Region’s minority populations, low-income populations, and people with disabilities.

- Opportunities are explored for more intensive engagement, including co-sponsored events, special meetings involving full memberships—particularly with the Commission’s eight community partners—and employing small group discussion techniques.

- At the same time as certain public meetings are held for the general public, the Commission works with its community partners to host meetings for their constituents, as a way to enhance or maintain engagement with minority populations, low-income populations, and people with disabilities.

- Primary organizational contacts are identified and cultivated, to provide a basis of regular or ongoing involvements with a subset of very active and broad-based representative groups.

Environmental Justice Task Force

The Commission has an advisory group called the Environmental Justice Task Force to enhance environmental justice throughout the regional planning process.

- Membership is appointed by the Regional Planning Commission after consultation with organizations representing one or more of the following communities: low-income, African-American, Latino, Asian, Native American, people with disabilities, and/or transit-dependent populations as appropriate.

- Up to 15 total Task Force members represent the seven counties in southeastern Wisconsin (one each); the four largest cities including Milwaukee (three members), Kenosha, Racine, and Waukesha; the remainder of the Region; and an at-large regional representative.

- Meetings are held as appropriate and necessary, usually on a quarterly basis. Meetings will be in accessible locations served by public transit, are publicly announced, and include a reasonable opportunity for public comment.

- The Task Force may meet in smaller or needs-based groups with invited local or specific subject representatives as appropriate.

Credit: Jake Rohde
Public Outreach and Briefings

- Presentations or briefings are given throughout planning efforts at any point in time.
- They are specifically offered to governmental units, as well as to central city, minority, and low-income groups and organizations.
- Any group may request a presentation or briefing, which the Commission welcomes and encourages.
- Comments are directed into the planning process, and given equal weight to public meeting comments.

Beyond Commission efforts to notify, inform, and obtain input from the general public, and to involve representatives on its Environmental Justice Task Force, the Commission will seek outreach opportunities to work directly with those most likely to be impacted by transportation proposals.

- Community groups in an affected/concerned area will be contacted, with an offer to provide briefings and presentations either held specially or during regularly scheduled meetings of those groups.
- User-friendly, lay language will be used to the extent possible for outreach contacts and materials, with offers to work with group or organization leaders to develop options.
- Minority populations, low-income populations, and people with disabilities will particularly be approached for such outreach, both early in each study, and later as alternatives have been developed and evaluated. Resulting meetings, including comment sessions, will be conducted anytime there is interest by a group.
- Limited English proficiency group and organization leaders will be contacted to determine how best to inform, and obtain input from, their communities.
- Continuing attempts to broaden group participation will occur by adding groups and organizations to contact lists, and renewing offers to meet on their turf as locally convenient.
- Other means will continue to be tried to obtain public participation, for example, interactive activities, focus groups, small group techniques, visioning or brainstorming, and non-traditional meeting places and events such as fairs, festivals, social media sites, or the like.

Incorporation of Public Input

The results of public participation will be documented and taken into account by the Commission and its advisory committees guiding planning efforts prior to any final recommendations.

- The input received during each public participation process will be documented, provided to the Commission and the study advisory committee, published on the SEWRPC website, and made available at the Commission offices.
- Individual comments in written form will be published, whether submitted in writing, offered as public hearing testimony, or provided orally to a court reporter.
- Either a full account or a summary of public comments will be contained in the primary plan or program document being produced.
- Responses to public comments will also be documented, addressing each issue raised, and will be included in the primary document or a separate document.
**Evaluation of Public Participation**

The effectiveness of the Commission’s public participation efforts will be monitored and evaluated, and improved when possible.

- At the conclusion of planning efforts, Commission staff will complete an evaluation of the public participation used, which will be used to guide public participation in future planning efforts. This evaluation will consider:
  - Commission publications, public participation techniques, and conclusions regarding the overall public participation
  - How public participation shaped the planning effort and the final plan
  - Any comments that were received during the planning effort about public participation

- Evaluations will be provided to the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and the U.S. Department of Transportation.

- Ongoing public participation will be modified while a planning effort is underway, as necessary and practical, factoring in any public comments that may apply.

- Individual activities and events will also be evaluated in response to measures such as participation level, feedback, and periodic sampling regarding effectiveness.

**Regional Transportation Consultation Process**

In addition to actively seeking participation by Southeastern Wisconsin residents, the Commission obtains considerable input during its transportation planning and programming efforts through its consultation process. This process involves coordination with and gathering input from agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities affected by transportation, as well as transit operators for public and other transit services, Indian Tribal governments, and Federal land management agencies. This valuable consultation is conducted primarily through Commission advisory committees, task forces on key issues, work with community partners, and consulting with numerous minority and low-income groups.
FOR MORE INFORMATION

For more detail on public participation specifically as it relates to the Commission’s regional transportation planning, see Appendix A to this document. For more detail on the Commission’s consultation process, see Appendix B to this document.

Your participation is valued! For more information, to provide comments, to request a meeting, or to be added to the Commission mailing or e-mailing list, please contact the:

Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Kevin J. Muhs, Executive Director
kmuhs@sewrpc.org

Nakeisha Payne, Public Involvement and Outreach Manager
npayne@sewrpc.org

Montré Moore, Public Involvement and Outreach Specialist
mmoore@sewrpc.org

W239 N1812 Rockwood Drive
P.O. Box 1607
Waukesha, WI 53187-1607

Global Water Center
247 W. Freshwater Way
Milwaukee, WI

www.sewrpc.org  |  (262) 547-6721
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EXHIBIT E-2
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN FOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
INTRODUCTION

The Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) is the official areawide planning agency for the seven-county Southeastern Wisconsin Region, including Kenosha, Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Racine, Walworth, Washington, and Waukesha Counties. The Commission also serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for transportation planning in the Kenosha, Milwaukee, Racine, Round Lake Beach (Wisconsin portion), and West Bend urbanized areas and the Federally designated six-county transportation management area, including Kenosha, Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Racine, Washington, and Waukesha Counties, and small portions of Dodge, Jefferson, and Walworth Counties.

The Commission is responsible for preparing the regional transportation plan and transportation improvement program for the seven-county Region, including the five urbanized areas and the six-county transportation management area.

This document outlines how the Commission will involve the public in its regional transportation planning and transportation improvement programming, including with respect to:

- Providing information about, and access to, regional transportation planning and programming activities
- Obtaining public input during regional transportation planning and programming activities
- Considering public input received when regional transportation planning and programming recommendations are made
- Evaluating the effectiveness of the public participation plan and continuing to improve public participation when possible

This appendix supplements, and adds detail to, the overall Commission “Public Participation Plan for Regional Planning in Southeastern Wisconsin.” The Public Participation Plan (including its appendices) and a summary brochure on public participation are available on the Commission’s website at sewrpc.org/ppp, which also contains a host of other information.

RECOMMENDED PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN FOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

The Commission aims to ensure early and continuous public notification about regional transportation planning and programming activities, provide meaningful information concerning such activities, and obtain participation in and input to the preparation and adoption of regional transportation plans and improvement programs. In addition, the public participation process described here satisfies the public participation process requirements for the Program of Projects, as prescribed in accordance with Chapter 53 of Title 49, United States Code, and the current metropolitan and statewide...
planning regulations, for the following Federal Transit Administration grantees: City of Hartford, City of Kenosha, Kenosha County, City of Milwaukee, Milwaukee County, Ozaukee County, City of Racine, Walworth County, Washington County, Waukesha County, City of West Bend, and City of Whitewater.

The Commission will work to achieve these goals cooperatively with other public agencies and units of government—local, State, and Federal—by coordinating public participation processes when possible. The Commission views these other agencies and governments as partners in the public participation process. In particular, the Commission will coordinate with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation regarding public participation efforts.

The remainder of this document describes how the Commission proposes to achieve these public participation goals, and outlines a framework for public participation to be followed for each type of transportation planning and programming effort. However, the Commission strives to be responsive and encourages involvement in whatever way is desired and convenient. Suggestions are welcome on how the Commission can meet participation needs and best receive public comments. Please go to www.sewrpc.org or see the contact information at the end of this document.

Public Notification, Access, and Input
Timely notification of and provision of access to Commission regional transportation planning and programming activities will be provided to encourage early and continuous public participation. The Commission’s planning and programming efforts benefit from having a well-informed citizenry. The ability for the general public to become actively involved and to provide meaningful input on needs, plans, and programs depends on knowledge of the issues under consideration and the study being undertaken to address those issues. In addition, the public will be encouraged to contribute to transportation planning and programming efforts to improve the results of planning and programming efforts, increase the public knowledge and understanding of those efforts, and increase the likelihood that those efforts are successfully implemented.

The techniques listed below will be used by the Commission to raise awareness of, provide public access to, and obtain public input on the preparation and adoption of regional transportation plans and programs.

Advisory Committees
Advisory committees will be formed by the Commission for each planning and programming effort to guide the development of the desired plan or program. The membership of the advisory committees will primarily, although not exclusively, consist of concerned and affected local government elected and appointed public officials who will have the authority and expertise to represent the residents of their local units of government. The membership will also include representatives of State and Federal transportation and environmental resource agencies. The Commission will seek diversity—specifically, members of minority population groups—as it considers, solicits, and makes appointments to advisory committees.

The use of advisory committees promotes intergovernmental and interagency coordination and broadens the technical knowledge and expertise available to the Commission. The members of advisory committees serve as direct liaisons between the Commission planning and programming efforts and the local and State governments that will be responsible for implementing the recommendations of those planning and programming efforts. The advisory committees will be responsible for proposing to the Commission, after careful study and evaluation, recommended plans and programs. Information regarding public comment received will be provided to the advisory committees, which will consider that public comment prior to determining final recommended plans and programs. In some cases, non-governmental officials will be asked to serve on advisory committees to represent different interests.

- Public Notice and Agenda Availability: The agendas for all meetings of the Commission and the Commission’s advisory committees will normally be posted on the Commission website and at the offices of the Commission as soon as available, but at least five business days prior to each meeting. Meeting notifications will request that people needing disability-related accommodations contact the Commission a minimum of three business days in advance of the meeting they wish to attend so that appropriate arrangements can be made.
Public Access: Meetings of the Commission and the Commission’s advisory committees will be open to the public to ensure that interested residents have access to the regional transportation planning and programming process. Advisory committee meetings will be held at transit-accessible locations, to the extent practicable, particularly meetings addressing plan alternatives, and preliminary and final recommended plans. Advisory committee meetings will be held at locations accessible to people with disabilities, and compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

Public Input: Numerous opportunities for submitting public comment for consideration by the Commission and the Commission's advisory committees will be provided. These include written comments, oral comments at public meetings, comments through the Commission website, comments through outreach activities, and other means. All comments will be documented as described below—under “Incorporation of Public Input”—and will be provided to the Commission and the Commission's advisory committees. This documentation is intended as the primary source of formal comment to these decision-making bodies. Meetings of the Commission's Planning and Research Committee and the Commission's Advisory Committees on Regional Land Use Planning and Regional Transportation Planning will include in their meetings a short public comment period (up to 15 minutes). The time allowed for public comment will be divided between each registered speaker, limited to a maximum of three minutes per speaker.

**Environmental Justice Task Force**

The Commission has formed and will use an Environmental Justice Task Force (EJTF) to enhance the consideration and integration of environmental justice throughout the regional planning process. The purposes of the EJTF include:

- Further facilitate the involvement of low-income communities, minority communities, and people with disabilities in regional planning
- Make recommendations on issues and analyses relevant to the needs and circumstances of low-income communities, minority communities, and people with disabilities
- Help identify the potential benefits and adverse effects of public infrastructure and services addressed in regional planning programs with respect to low-income communities, minority communities, and people with disabilities
- Advise and recommend methods to prevent the denial of benefits to low-income communities, minority communities, and people with disabilities, and to minimize or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse negative impacts on those groups
- Enhance awareness and implementation of plans, with emphasis on the needs of low-income communities, minority communities, and people with disabilities. The membership is appointed by the Regional Planning Commission, after consultation with organizations representing low-income communities, African-American communities, Latino communities, Asian communities, Native American communities, people with disabilities, and/or transit-dependent populations as appropriate.

EJTF members are from and represent low-income communities, minority communities, people with disabilities, and/or transit-dependent communities, and thereby enhance representation of such populations. Seven of the EJTF members represent the counties in the Region (one per county). Three additional members represent the largest city in the Region; three more represent the three next-largest cities in the Region (one per city); and one represents the remainder of the Region. The fifteenth member serves as an at-large regional representative. The EJTF meets as appropriate and necessary, usually on a quarterly basis. As provided for during EJTF formation, agenda topics including geographic or subject matter considerations may result in meetings in smaller or needs-based configurations, with invited local or specific subject representatives.
• **Public Notice and Agenda Availability:** The agendas for all EJTF meetings will normally be posted on the Commission website and at the offices of the Commission as soon as available, but at least five business days prior to each meeting. Meeting notifications will request that people needing disability-related accommodations contact the Commission a minimum of three business days in advance of the meeting they wish to attend so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

• **Public Access:** All EJTF meetings are open to the public to ensure that interested residents have access to the regional transportation planning and programming process. All EJTF meetings will be held in locations that are physically accessible to people with disabilities and served by public transportation.

• **Public Input:** All EJTF meetings will include two opportunities for public comment: one near the beginning of the meeting, before new business is discussed, and one at the end of the meeting, before the EJTF adjourns.

The impact of the EJTF will be evaluated by the EJTF and the Commission in terms of process (the extent to which public involvement of low-income communities, minority communities, and people with disabilities has been enhanced) and outcomes (the extent to which regional plans and planning processes balance the benefits and burdens of decisions, particularly as related to the interests of low-income communities, minority communities, and people with disabilities). The evaluation includes determination of the degree to which EJTF recommendations have been acted upon or implemented in practice by the Commission.

**Public Meetings and Public Comment Periods**
Public meetings provide opportunities to obtain public comment and input, as well as to notify and inform the public about transportation planning and programming. Public meetings will typically utilize a variety of techniques to provide information about transportation planning and programming, including the distribution of materials, the use of visual displays, the availability of Commission staff to answer questions, and summary presentations by Commission staff. Study Advisory Committee members and SEWRPC Commissioners will be encouraged to attend and participate. Public meetings will also use a variety of techniques to obtain public comment, including the use of keypad polling devices and interactive small group discussions as appropriate. Annually, at least one public meeting will be held whether for a major or routine regional transportation plan update, transportation improvement program preparation, or other major regional or sub-regional study. At these meetings, the regional transportation plan will be available for review and comment.

• **Public Notice:** The Commission will place paid advertisements in newspapers appropriate for the study area and meeting locations, with the amount and timing of the advertisements to be determined based upon the individual planning or programming effort. Paid advertisements will also be placed in newspapers serving minority populations and low-income populations. Advertisements providing notification of public meetings will be published 10 business days prior to the first meeting date announced. Additionally, press releases announcing the public meetings may be distributed for an area appropriate to each planning or programming effort. Any notification of meetings will request that people needing disability-related accommodations contact the Commission a minimum of three business days in advance of the meeting they wish to attend so that appropriate arrangements can be made. Notification of public meetings will also be provided on the Commission’s website, and through the Commission’s electronic newsletter distribution list.

Notification of public meetings may also be accomplished through the development and distribution of summary materials—brochures, fact sheets, and/or newsletters. A summary publication or brochure will be developed for each study, and may be updated during the course of the study as appropriate. A newsletter—or series of newsletters, depending on the planning study—will also be developed and may serve this summary purpose. The summary materials will provide general information regarding the study; updates on study progress, findings, and recommendations; and information regarding upcoming public meetings and hearings. These materials will be used to inform the general public and be distributed to media representatives when using press releases. Brochures, fact sheets, public meeting notices, and newsletters will be prepared in user-friendly lay language to the extent possible.
• **Public Access:** The Commission will attempt to select locations that are accessible to minority populations and low-income populations, and the selection of locations for public meetings and hearings will take into consideration the potential availability of transit-accessible locations. In all cases, meetings and hearings will be held in venues that substantially comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

• **Public Input:** The comments received by the Commission at public meetings—written and oral comments—will be recorded for consideration prior to preparing the final recommendations of the plan or program under consideration. All meetings will include the opportunity for written comment and to provide comments one-on-one to Commission staff. Some meetings may include question and answer sessions. Some meetings—specifically including those at which a preliminary recommended plan is being presented—will also include the opportunity to formally offer oral comment. Oral comment will either be taken in a town hall format or one-on-one with a court reporter, or sometimes both, if suitable facilities are available at meeting locations.

The number and locations of public meetings will be tailored to each transportation planning and programming study. For example, it may be appropriate to hold public meetings only in one county of the Region for a transit development plan focusing on the transit services within that county. The public meetings will be scheduled during a formal public comment period as discussed under each bullet below. The public will be notified of the duration of the formal comment period in conjunction with the announcement of a public meeting, or in a manner similar to that announcing a public meeting.

• **Major Regional Transportation Plan Updates and Other Major Regional Studies:** During the conduct of major regional transportation plan updates—anticipated to occur about every 10 years—and during other major regional studies, multiple series of public meetings will be held, with at least one meeting in each county during each series. At least one of the series will be held early in the study and may be expected to address topics such as study scope and inventory findings, and may also describe potential alternatives to be considered. Another series of meetings will be held later in the study, with plan alternatives presented for review and comment, and potentially a preliminary recommended plan as well.

A formal public comment period of at least 30 days will be offered before the adoption of a major regional transportation plan update or other major regional study, and will coincide with at least one series of public meetings.

• **Minor Reviews and Reaffirmations of the Regional Transportation Plan and Sub-Regional Studies:** During the conduct of a routine regional transportation plan review and reaffirmation—anticipated to occur about every three or four years—and during the conduct of sub-regional studies, at least one public meeting will be held. Sub-regional studies include, but are not limited to, county- or community-specific transit development plans and jurisdictional highway system plans. The meeting will be held when alternatives are being considered (if applicable) and when a preliminary recommended plan is presented.

A formal public comment period of at least 30 days will be offered before the adoption of a minor review and reaffirmation of the regional transportation plan or sub-regional study, and will coincide with at least one public meeting. In addition, a formal comment period of at least 30 days will be provided before the adoption of an amendment to the regional transportation plan or any sub-regional study.

• **Transportation Improvement Program:** During the preparation of the transportation improvement program (TIP)—anticipated to occur every two years—at least one public meeting will be held. A formal public comment period of at least 30 days will be offered before the adoption of the TIP, and will coincide with at least one public meeting.

Periodically, amendment to the TIP—adding or deleting a transportation projects, or incorporating changes in project scope, cost, or timing—are necessary to ensure the relevancy of the program. As part of incorporating these changes to the program—anticipated to occur every one to two months—appropriate opportunity for public review and comment will be provided. The criteria used to determine
the type of change (major or minor amendment or administrative modification) and attendant level of advisory committee and public involvement are provided in the TIP. Major amendments that do not also require amendment to the regional transportation plan will have a comment period of at least 14 days. Notification of the comment period for these amendments will be provided only through the Commission’s website. Information on proposed minor amendments that would not require a public comment period would be provided on the Commission’s website while the amendments are being considered for approval by the Commission and the appropriate advisory committee. All administrative modifications and approved amendments will also be provided on the Commission’s website.

• **Public Participation Plan:** The Commission will periodically review this public participation plan document, considering the evaluations of public participation following completed studies (see “Evaluation of Public Participation,” below), public comment regarding public participation efforts, and new applicable regulations and guidance. Should the Commission determine that a substantial modification of this public participation plan document is in order, the Commission will review and revise this public participation plan document including a public meeting and a 45 day public comment period, prior to its update.

Should it be determined by the Commission or an advisory committee guiding a particular effort that a public meeting will be held for a planning or programming effort other than those previously listed, a formal public comment period of at least 30 days will be established.

**Website**

The Commission will maintain and update a website. The website will include general information about the Commission as well as more detailed information regarding regional transportation planning and programming activities. A portion of the website will be dedicated to public participation, highlighting how the public can obtain additional information regarding Commission planning efforts, including methods of contacting Commission staff other than through the website. The website will also include this public participation plan document.

The Commission’s website will be designed as a portal into virtually all of the Commission’s work, which the public is encouraged to utilize. All committee memberships, meetings, agendas, minutes, notices, and materials pertaining to current planning efforts will be online, as well as hundreds of publications, planning data and resource inventories, and background information on relevant planning efforts. People visiting the website will have ready access to a full range of information prepared at various planning stages and levels of detail, including final reports, draft chapters, newsletters and brochures, comments received, and related website links. Importantly, the website will also provide ready access and an open opportunity to comment on regional planning 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

The website will also provide comprehensive information about each Commission regional and subregional transportation planning and programming effort underway. In some cases, individual websites (linked to the main Commission website) will be created for major regional studies to increase public involvement and understanding of the study. Regardless of whether or not an individual website is created, information provided for each planning and programming effort will include:

• **Background information, including the purpose of the effort**

• **Notification of public comment periods and meetings, including advisory committee, EJTF, and public meetings, and also Commission meetings addressing initiation or adoption of a regional transportation plan or transportation improvement program**

• **Advisory committee and EJTF meeting materials, such as agendas, minutes, and presentation materials**

• **Summary materials, such as newsletters and brochures**

• **Draft sections of reports**
• Contact information for Commissioners and Commission staff

• Means to submit comments regarding the planning or programming effort

• Records of public comments

**Mailing and E-Mailing Lists**
In order to increase awareness of public meetings, planning efforts, and other Commission activities, the Commission will maintain a regional listing of individuals, groups, agencies, and organizations that have expressed interest in receiving information regarding Commission activities. Interested individuals may sign up for these contact lists on the Commission website or by contacting the Commission staff. The contact lists will include organizations and media associated with minority populations and low-income populations. Newsletters prepared for Commission transportation planning studies will utilize these contact lists, and notification of all public meetings will be transmitted electronically to individuals on the e-mailing list.

**Media List**
The Commission will maintain and use a list of significant media outlets in the Region—including minority media outlets—for use in distributing materials such as news releases and newsletters as appropriate for each work effort.

**Document Availability**
In addition to the advisory committees, EJTF, public meetings, and other public involvement techniques described previously, all Commission preliminary plans will be available for public review on the Commission website and at the Commission offices in order to increase public awareness of the Commission’s work and provide an opportunity for the public to comment before a final plan is developed. Copies of preliminary plans will be distributed upon request. Preliminary regional plans will be summarized in newsletters and/or shorter documents and brochures, that will be widely distributed and available upon request.

All Commission published final plans and documents are provided to all public libraries within Southeastern Wisconsin and will also be available for public review at the Commission offices. In addition, Commission final plans and documents will be available on the Commission website. Published plans and documents may be obtained from the Commission. A charge may be applied for copies of publications to cover the approximate cost of producing and, if applicable, mailing the publication.

**Outreach and Briefings**
Beyond Commission efforts to notify, inform, and obtain input from the general public, the Commission will seek opportunities to notify, inform, and obtain input from those most likely to be impacted by transportation proposals. The Commission will, for example, contact community groups of an affected and concerned area, and offer briefings and presentations to those groups at meetings held expressly for that purpose or during regularly scheduled meetings of those groups. Outreach contacts and materials will be prepared in user-friendly, lay language. Outreach efforts will also particularly be made to notify and inform, and obtain input from, low-income populations and minority populations. A list of organizational contacts will be maintained for such purposes. Elected officials and citizen leaders may be offered such briefings and presentations as well. Briefings and presentations will be specifically offered during at least two periods in each study—in the early stages of study prior to the consideration of alternatives, and later in the study after alternatives have been developed and evaluated. Meetings with staff, including comment opportunities, will be conducted anytime there is interest during a planning effort.

During regional land use and transportation planning efforts, the Commission will also use other means to obtain public involvement and input, including for example, focus groups, small group techniques, visioning or brainstorming, and obtaining participation and input at non-traditional meeting places and events, such as fairs, festivals, social media, and others.
Incorporation of Public Input
The results of the public participation process will be documented and taken into account by the Commission and its advisory committees guiding regional transportation planning and programming.

Documentation of Public Input
The results of each public participation process will be documented and published. Individual comments will be included, whether submitted to the Commission in writing, offered as testimony at a town hall meeting, or provided orally to a public meeting court reporter. The documentation of public comment will be provided to the study advisory committee and the Commission and will be published on the Commission website and available at the Commission offices for review by the public. The documentation may be contained within the primary plan or program document being produced or within a separate document. If a separate document is produced to provide the full record of public comments, the primary planning or programming document will contain a summary of the public comment. Responses to public comments will also be documented, addressing each issue raised in public comments, and will be included in either the primary planning or programming document being produced or within the separate document. The summarization and documentation will occur prior to the consideration of any final recommended action.

Consideration of Public Input
The public input will be considered by the Commission and its advisory committees during key stages in the planning process, if applicable, and prior to determination of final recommended plans or programs.

Supplemental Opportunity for Public Review and Comment
Final recommended plans and programs are typically very similar to the preliminary plans and programs reviewed by the public. Normally, when changes are made following review of preliminary plans and programs, the changes are not significant, and the changes are made to respond to public comment. Also, when changes are made, they often reflect alternatives previously considered and reviewed during the public participation process. Therefore, no additional public review and comment is typically necessary following the completion of the planned public participation process. However, it is possible that significant changes that were not previously available for public review and comment may be made to a preliminary plan or program following the completion of a public participation process. In such a circumstance, either the Commission or advisory committee may direct that additional public notification and a formal period for public comment be provided regarding the revised plan or program prior to adoption.

Evaluation of Public Participation
The effectiveness of the Commission's public participation policies and practices will be monitored and evaluated, and modified as needed based on experience, consideration of suggestions, agency requirements, and/or the changing state of the art of public participation. The Commission will continue to seek improvements to its public participation processes when possible. Annually, the criteria outlined in Table 1 will be evaluated to assess the public participation in Commission regional transportation planning.

Evaluation of Individual Public Participation Efforts
Following the conclusion of each planning effort, Commission staff will complete an evaluation of the public participation process for that particular effort. The evaluation will indicate the effort being evaluated, the Commission publications where the effort is documented, the public involvement techniques used with brief evaluations of those techniques, and conclusions regarding the overall public participation effort undertaken for the specific planning study. The evaluation will also identify how public involvement and input shaped the planning effort and final plan, and explain the public comment incorporated, and not incorporated, in the final plan. The Commission staff will consider any comments that were made during the plan preparation effort regarding public participation when completing such an evaluation. Each evaluation completed by the Commission will be provided to the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and the U.S. Department of Transportation through the Commission's quarterly Progress Report, in which the Commission reports on the progress of the Commission's transportation work program every three months.
Table 1
SEWRPC Public Participation Process Evaluation Criteria*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured Activity Descriptions by Public Participation Goal Components</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria/ Mechanisms</th>
<th>Target or Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Part 1: Ensure Early and Continuous Public Notification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Central city, minority, and low-income group updates via personal letter, often with informational materials, and follow-up as appropriate</td>
<td>Such letters correspond to all major stages in relevant planning programs, notably transportation, otherwise routine updates are given</td>
<td>At least 2 updates per year to approximately 90 to 100 organization contacts (subgroupings for local studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Paid advertisements for public meetings and/or planning program announcements in a variety of newspapers (dependent on number of planning programs active and their respective stages of planning)</td>
<td>Publication in newspapers of record for counties as appropriate, and minority owned papers</td>
<td>Approximately 10 events or activities advertised per year, many with multiple ads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Website hits to be monitored numerically and for trends; website comments also monitored for trends</td>
<td>Research recent SEWRPC website use patterns; monitoring of use changes and comments</td>
<td>Increase hits by 5 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Part 2: Provide Meaningful Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Briefings, presentations, or other meetings with groups representing environmental justice interests</td>
<td>In-person contacts with group directors, boards, clientele, membership, or other parties</td>
<td>Reach at least 100 groups, totaling at least 200 meetings annually (includes primary contacts and key partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* SEWRPC newsletter development and distribution, to share information and maintain continuity</td>
<td>Newsletter published and distributed to interested parties and contacts</td>
<td>At least 2 issues per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Summary publications including brochures to help shorten and simplify newsletter content and other planning material, or to introduce programs or basic concepts</td>
<td>Publications are developed and used, matching needs</td>
<td>At least 3 products per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Part 3: Obtain Participation and Input</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Formal meetings with representatives from the primary organizational contacts identified by SEWRPC and its Environmental Justice Task Force</td>
<td>Written summary of key concerns and suggestions, follow-up contacts; and involvement in joint activities</td>
<td>At least 2 direct contacts with each of some 41 primary organizations per year, totaling at least 60 meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Public informational meetings held at each major stage of planning efforts</td>
<td>Numbers and locations of meetings are appropriate to the planning study/program; meetings are held in each appropriate county, including central cities</td>
<td>At least 1 meeting or a series of meetings each year, regardless of planning activity (often more)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Nontraditional public outreach techniques used in addition to the more traditional efforts noted above</td>
<td>SEWRPC presence is exhibited at festivals, fairs, neighborhood events and/or similar opportunities</td>
<td>Approximately 3-4 times per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The years 2009 and 2010 will be considered a base period for formal monitoring and evaluation of annual activity.
Modification of Public Participation Efforts
While the Commission’s evaluation of public participation efforts will occur after the completion of each regional or subregional planning effort, Commission staff will modify ongoing public participation while a planning effort is underway, as necessary and practicable. The Commission will in particular consider public comments made regarding the public participation efforts underway when considering any potential modification.

Individual public participation activities and events will also be evaluated in response to measures such as participation level, feedback which may be provided by attendees and/or reviewers, and periodic sampling with more formal assessment of a technique’s intent and outcome achieved. Examples may include how well meetings were attended and received by target audiences, receptivity regarding outreach publications, and number of hits or comments generated by the Commission website. Any improvements could then immediately be implemented for related future activities and events.

Engaging Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
The recommended public participation plan seeks to encourage the participation from all concerned and interested persons in the Region, but there is a recognized need to take additional specific steps to engage minority populations and low-income populations in transportation planning and programming studies, as partly described under the Public Notification, Access, and Input section. The Environmental Justice Task Force discussed in that section is one additional step taken by the Commission. Below, additional detail on engaging minority populations and low-income populations is provided.

The Commission is committed to complying with both Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Executive Order 12898, concerning Environmental Justice, including as they relate to public involvement in the Commission’s transportation planning and programming efforts. The Commission maintains and routinely updates demographic data that allows for the identification of the general size and location of low-income populations and minority populations. The Commission has taken steps to increase planning process participation by minority populations and low-income populations, and to remove any barriers to their involvement. The Commission will continue working to improve its techniques, and to seek out and consider the needs of these populations.

The amount and type of efforts undertaken by the Commission to encourage increased participation by minority populations and low-income populations will be determined for each individual planning effort, with factors affecting which techniques will be applied, and to what extent. These factors include:

- The population that may potentially be affected as a result of the planning or programming process. The results of a regional study could potentially affect the entire population of the Region, but other studies may include only a single municipality.

- The potential benefits and impacts of the plan or program to be considered—what effects a plan or program may have on the population of the study area.

While Title VI and Environmental Justice will be considerations under any planning or programming effort, the measures taken will vary by planning effort due to the considerations noted above. The following are steps that the Commission has taken in the past, and will continue to use to encourage early and continuous participation of minority and low-income populations:

- **Environmental Justice Task Force:** The Commission will involve the Environmental Justice Task Force in planning efforts, seeking input on scope, alternatives, potential costs, benefits and impacts, and public involvement.

- **Public Meetings Hosted by Community Partners:** The Commission has identified eight community partners that represent or work closely with low-income communities, minority communities, or people with disabilities. Currently, these partners include Common Ground of Southeastern Wisconsin, Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition, Hmong American Friendship Association, IndependenceFirst, Milwaukee Urban League, Southside Organizing Committee, Urban Economic Development Association
of Wisconsin, and Urban League of Racine and Kenosha. During each major planning effort, the Commission staff will work with each of these community partners to host a parallel series of public meetings targeted at gathering input from the communities that each partner represents to enhance and strengthen the Commission’s outreach to these communities and the level of public input received by the Commission from these communities.

• **Commission Outreach:** The Commission will actively conduct outreach to provide information to, and receive comments from, minority and low-income groups and organizations. The Commission will maintain a list of central city, minority, and low-income groups and organizations for this outreach. These groups and organizations will be consulted regarding effective means and materials for interacting with their membership and/or clientele, including types of meetings if appropriate and production of summary publications in lay language.

• **Public Meetings:** The number and location of public meetings will be selected to encourage participation of minority and low-income populations.

• **Media List:** The list of media contacts in the Region to be used for purposes such as the distribution of news releases and newsletters will include minority media outlets.

• **Newsletters:** Study newsletters and/or other summary materials will be mailed to all groups and organizations associated with minority and low-income populations.

• **Notices in Additional Publications:** Paid advertisements will be placed in newspapers appropriate for the study area for formal notification of public meetings and comment periods, and will also be placed in minority community newspapers—and possibly in languages other than English as discussed below.

• **Non-traditional Means or Strategies to Engage Participation:** Particularly those means demonstrated to have provided successful results elsewhere and/or which have been requested by the minority and low-income populations themselves will be considered and used.

• **Limited English Proficiency Considerations:** The Commission will also consider actions appropriate to each study effort to ensure that meaningful access is provided for persons having limited English proficiency. These measures include placing notifications of public meetings in minority publications in the Region’s predominant non-English languages, notably Spanish. At public meetings, the Commission will have a translator available upon request. Summary materials, particularly those relating to alternative, preliminary, and final plans will be produced in the Region’s predominant non-English languages, notably Spanish. The Commission will also contact leaders of the predominant limited English proficiency communities during studies to determine how best to inform, and obtain input from, their communities. These measures are provided to illustrate the types of activities that may be implemented by the Commission.

**Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act**

The Commission is also committed to complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), including as it relates to public involvement in its transportation planning and programming efforts. Measures will be taken to ensure that people with disabilities have opportunities to be involved in the Commission’s planning and programming studies. The Commission will take steps including, for example, that all Commission public meetings will be held in venues that are ADA compliant. Additionally, the Commission will respond to requests for disability-related accommodations, and will arrange to accommodate those needs. As stated earlier in this document, all public notices and advertisements of public meetings will indicate that people needing disability-related accommodations should contact the Commission offices to allow for arrangements to be made prior to the meeting date.
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CONSULTATION PROCESS

The Commission obtains considerable input through consultation with the agencies and officials within the metropolitan planning area who are responsible for other planning activities affected by transportation, as well as transit operators for public and other transit services, Indian Tribal governments, and Federal land management agencies. Federal Statute and regulations require the Commission, as the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for Southeastern Wisconsin, to carry out and document this consultation process. Appendix B to the “Public Participation Plan for Regional Planning in Southeastern Wisconsin” explains and documents this consultation process, which was followed most recently during the preparation of VISION 2050, the year 2050 regional land use and transportation system plan, which was adopted in July 2016.

* * *

Contact Information for the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission:

Kenneth R. Yunker, Executive Director
Kevin J. Muhs, Assistant Director
Stephen P. Adams, Public Involvement and Outreach Manager
Nakeisha N. Payne, Senior Public Involvement and Outreach Specialist
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 1607, Waukesha, WI, 53187-1607
Location: W239 N1812 Rockwood Drive, Pewaukee, WI
Phone: (262) 547-6721
Fax: (262) 547-1103
Website: www.sewrpc.org
INTRODUCTION

In addition to actively seeking participation by Southeastern Wisconsin residents, the Commission obtains considerable input through consultation with the agencies and officials within the metropolitan planning area who are responsible for other planning activities affected by transportation, as well as transit operators for public and other transit services, Indian Tribal governments, and Federal land management agencies. Federal Statute and regulations require the Commission, as the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for Southeastern Wisconsin, to carry out and document this consultation process. This memorandum documents the Commission’s consultation process, which was followed most recently during the preparation of VISION 2050, the year 2050 regional land use and transportation system plan, which was adopted in July 2016. For the purposes of this memorandum, the transportation component of the regional land use and transportation plan is referred to simply as the regional transportation plan.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The regional transportation plan is developed under the guidance and direction of the Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation Planning. This Advisory Committee reviews and approves each step of the regional transportation planning process, and is responsible for proposing to the Commission, after careful study and evaluation, a recommended regional transportation system plan. The advisory committee structure is intended to promote intergovernmental and interagency coordination, and to provide direct liaisons between the Commission’s planning effort and the local and State governments that are responsible for implementing the recommendations of the regional transportation plan. The Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation Planning includes representatives from:

- Each of the seven counties in the Region (Kenosha, Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Racine, Walworth, Washington, and Waukesha)

- Jefferson and Dodge Counties (which include small portions of the Milwaukee and West Bend urbanized areas, respectively)

- Selected municipalities in the Region

- Wisconsin Department of Transportation

- Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

- U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration

- U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
The development of the regional transportation plan also includes consultation with each of the seven jurisdictional highway planning advisory committees—one for each county. These advisory committees are involved throughout the planning process, including early in the process to contribute to the development of alternative regional transportation system plans, and later in the process to review and comment on preliminary and final recommended regional transportation plans. These advisory committees include representatives from:

- Each of the 148 local governments (cities, villages, and towns) in Southeastern Wisconsin
- Each of the seven counties (Kenosha, Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Racine, Walworth, Washington, and Waukesha)
- Wisconsin Department of Transportation
- U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration

Together, the Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation Planning and the jurisdictional highway planning advisory committees include the units of government, agencies, and officials in Southeastern Wisconsin responsible for land use planning and growth, economic development, environmental protection, airports, ports, freight movement, and transit operations (both public and specialized service for seniors and people with disabilities).

The transportation improvement program (TIP) includes projects consistent with the regional transportation plan to be implemented over the immediate four-year period. Its preparation is guided by five advisory committees on transportation system planning and programming—one for each of the five urbanized areas of the Region. These committees include units of government, agencies, and officials responsible for land use planning and growth, economic development, environmental protection, airports, ports, and transit operators (both public and specialized service). Also, as part of the TIP process, the Commission solicits projects from transit operators and local units of government and agencies.

OTHER CONSULTATION EFFORTS

The Commission conducts a number of additional consultation efforts during the preparation of the regional transportation plan. One such effort involves consulting with numerous groups, organizations, and officials representing minority and low-income populations. For this purpose, the Commission maintains a list of nearly 100 minority and low-income organization contacts, which is periodically reviewed and updated. Consultation with these groups is initiated at the beginning of the planning process and continues throughout the process. During major junctures in the process, staff makes personal contacts, sends summary materials, and holds meetings or presentations with groups, their staff, and/or their leadership. A subset of over 40 primary organization contacts have also been identified for more frequent and/or more intensive contact.

Initiated during VISION 2050, the Commission also has partnerships with eight community organizations (from the primary organization list) specifically targeted at reaching and engaging minority populations, low-income individuals, and people with disabilities. These community partners host meetings for their constituents that correspond with, and augment, public meetings held during the regional transportation planning process. Attendees at these meetings are specifically asked to identify their transportation needs. The eight partners include:

- Common Ground of Southeastern Wisconsin
- Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition
• Hmong American Friendship Association
• IndependenceFirst
• Milwaukee Urban League
• Southside Organizing Committee
• Urban Economic Development Association of Wisconsin
• Urban League of Racine and Kenosha

Another such effort is through a series of task forces convened to examine specific issues related to land use and transportation during the plan development process. Consultation occurs throughout the process, and includes meetings and other direct communications with task force members. These task forces and their associated issues include:

• Environmental justice (including minority populations, low-income populations, and people with disabilities)
• Freight movement
• Human services transportation needs (including seniors and people with disabilities)
• Land use (including farming, builder, realtor, and environmental interests)
• Natural resource agencies
• Non-motorized transportation (including bicycle and pedestrian facilities)
• Public transit
• Transportation needs of business, industry, workforce development, and higher education
• Transportation systems management
• Women’s land use and transportation issues

Environmental Justice Task Force
This task force, discussed in more detail in the Commission’s Public Participation Plan, was established to enhance the consideration and integration of environmental justice for minority and low-income groups and people with disabilities throughout the Commission’s regional planning processes. One of its roles is to review and comment on regional planning documents and analyses, with a specific focus on the plan’s effects on environmental justice populations and whether and how the benefits and burdens would be shared. The Environmental Justice Task Force is a formal advisory body to the Commission, meeting as appropriate, usually on a quarterly basis. Its appointed voting members are from and represent one or more of the following communities: minority populations, low-income individuals, people with disabilities, and/or transit-dependent populations.
Task Force on Freight Movement
The intent in consulting with this task force is to identify freight transportation problems and needs in the Region, and to identify potential improvements for consideration in the regional transportation plan. The task force includes air, rail, and highway freight movement interests. These groups and organizations include the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), the Port of Milwaukee, General Mitchell International Airport, freight logistics and parcel express companies, bulk freight transportation interests, railroads, trucking companies, freight transportation associations, and major industries.

Task Force on Human Services Transportation Needs
The object of this task force is to consider the transportation needs of seniors, particularly related to addressing challenges associated with seniors being able to age in place, and as well consider ways to independently meet the transportation needs of people with disabilities. Through this task force, the Commission consults with representatives of governmental agencies and non-profit organizations that receive Federal assistance to provide non-emergency transportation services from a source other than the U.S. Department of Transportation. The Commission also consults with these representatives in conducting other transportation planning activities, such as preparing coordinated public transit-human services transportation plans for each of the seven counties in the Region.

Task Force on Land Use
The purpose of consulting with this task force is to identify and consider issues related to land use development and redevelopment as well as open space preservation. As part of land use planning activities, such as preparation of the regional land use and transportation plan, the Commission consults with representatives of governmental agencies such as the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources; non-profit organizations such as land trusts and conservancies, farm bureaus, and builder and realtor associations; and the University of Wisconsin-Extension.

Task Force on Non-motorized Transportation
The intent in consulting with this task force is to identify bicycle and pedestrian problems and needs in the Region, and to identify potential improvements for consideration in the regional transportation plan. The task force includes representatives from local governments, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, WisDOT, non-profit organizations and university researchers interested in improving bicycle and pedestrian travel in the Region, and bicycle manufacturers and retailers.

Natural Resource Agencies Task Force
The goal of this task force is to link regional transportation planning with the National Environmental Policy Act and project preliminary engineering. Through this linkage, there is an improved understanding of the data and alternatives considered and recommendations made through the regional transportation planning process, as well as an enhanced consideration and evaluation of the environmental impacts of regional plan alternatives. The task force involves Federal and State environmental resource agencies, as well as transportation agencies. The agencies and groups involved include:

- Wisconsin Department of Transportation
- Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
- Wisconsin Historical Society
- Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
- U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration
- U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration
• U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service

• U.S. Coast Guard

• U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

• U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service

• U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

• U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

• U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

• Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council—a coalition of 12 Native American Tribes of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan, which includes Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, Forest County Potawatomi, Ho-Chunk Nation, Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, Lac Vieux Desert Tribe of Michigan, Menomonee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin, Oneida Nation, Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, Sokaogon Chippewa (Mole Lake), St. Croix Chippewa, and Stockbridge-Munsee Indians of Wisconsin

**Task Force on Public Transit**
The objective of consulting with this task force is to identify existing public transit problems and needs, and to identify potential public transit improvements for consideration in the regional transportation plan. The task force includes representatives of the operators of public transit services in the Region, local governments, WisDOT, non-profit organizations interested in improving public transit service in the Region, and private sector firms involved with planning public transit improvements. Outside the task force setting, the Commission also consults directly with the public transit operators.

**Transportation Needs of Business, Industry, Workforce Development, and Higher Education**
This group is consulted to identify the transportation needs of business, industry, workforce development, and higher education. Business and industry groups that are consulted include business alliances, economic development corporations, chambers of commerce, Greater Milwaukee Committee, Milwaukee Metropolitan Association of Commerce, the Milwaukee 7 Regional Economic Development Council, and the Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation. Workforce development and higher education groups consulted include workforce development/investment boards and major technical colleges and universities.

**Task Force on Transportation Systems Management**
This task force involves consulting with transportation system operations professionals to identify existing transportation systems operations actions and systems, and to identify alternative operations actions and systems to be considered for inclusion in the regional transportation plan. Involvement in this group includes: highway commissioners and directors of public works from the Region’s seven counties; city engineers and directors of public works from selected representative municipalities; and WisDOT engineering and traffic operations staff, including the director of the Statewide Traffic Operations Center.

**Task Force on Women’s Land Use and Transportation Issues**
This task force is focused on identifying land use and transportation issues for women and families in the Region, such as access to jobs, affordable housing and social services, as well as safety and security concerns. The task force primarily includes representatives from non-profit organizations such as Habitat for Humanity, Interfaith Caregivers, Sojourner Family Peace Center, United Way, Women’s Resource Center, and YWCA.

* * *
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
IN REGIONAL PLANNING FOR
SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN

SUMMARY
PLANNING FOR OUR REGION
We invite you to participate in planning for the future of our Region, and this document discusses the many opportunities to get involved.

The Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) works to provide basic information and planning services to solve problems and explore opportunities that go beyond single units of government. In our Region, there are seven counties and nearly 150 communities, containing many public and private interests.

Planning for needs like efficient highways and public transit systems, beneficial parks and open spaces, affordable housing, major land use changes and employment centers, and a quality environment including clean water cannot be done well without working together. These and other needs require a multi-county planning effort and benefit from the participation of many residents, providing many unique perspectives.

IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
Public participation has become an important part of government decisions affecting many aspects of our lives. The Regional Planning Commission believes that having people participate in its work can help to accomplish positive things:

• Present opportunities to both provide and get back useful information

• Use non-technical language to explain issues and choices that are sometimes complex

• Encourage residents to suggest ideas and make comments that can improve planning

• Guide planning through advisory committees containing key representatives and topic experts
• **Create plans that are more likely to be carried out** due to understanding and support

• **Expand knowledge** so that participants are better equipped to act or to join in public debate

• **Give residents a voice** while also meeting important legal requirements

• **Build important partnerships** and maintain key connections for success

This brochure summarizes how the Regional Planning Commission plans to provide opportunities for public participation, how it will use the ideas and comments received, and how it is prepared to evaluate success and make improvements. Suggestions are welcome on how the Commission can meet participation needs and best receive public comments (please see back cover).

**The SEWRPC website at [www.sewrpc.org](http://www.sewrpc.org) is a ready source of full information**—from newsletters and meeting details to draft recommendations and complete plans—offering an open opportunity to comment on regional planning 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION GOAL**
The Commission’s goal for public participation has three major parts:

• Ensure early and continuous public notification about regional planning

• Provide meaningful information concerning regional planning

• Obtain participation and input in regional planning
HOW PEOPLE MAY RELATE DURING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In pursuing its three-fold public participation goal, the Commission recognizes and appreciates that *diverse audiences will approach regional planning topics from different perspectives*. Some people may initially be unaware, or struggle to see the relevance. Others may wish to become active participants or even outreach partners.

The Commission will use a range of informational materials, activities, and events to meet a variety of needs. In this process, the Commission will respect that some people may want to participate only at a distance, if at all, while others may seek a great deal of information and involvement. In all cases, providing meaningful opportunities for participation will be considered a key for success by the Commission. The following describe different and generally growing levels of planning involvement upon which people often focus. However, the Commission strives to be flexible and encourages involvement in whatever way is desired and convenient.

- **Recipient** – a person or group perhaps merely wanting to become or remain informed, that may receive materials via mail, e-mail, or other means
- **Attendee** – someone taking the step of traveling to a meeting or other event, or consulting the SEWRPC website for updates
- **Participant** – an attendee who engages in discussion or provides comments and input
- **Stakeholder** – a person or represented interest that initially had a tie to the planning effort, or that developed a stronger interest via public participation, and that continues to actively participate during the process
- **Partner** – usually a specific interest or grouping of interests that works cooperatively with the Commission staff on completing key activities such as outreach events
- **Implementer or Plan Advocate** – participants that have the authority to implement plan recommendations or that use plan information or results in seeking to achieve plan recommendations

GREATER INVOLVEMENT
RECOMMENDED PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

The Commission will work to achieve its public participation goal cooperatively with other public agencies and units of government by coordinating efforts when possible. It will coordinate particularly with the Region’s counties, cities, villages, and towns, and the Wisconsin Departments of Transportation and Natural Resources.

The Commission will be accommodating, providing timely notices of important steps in planning, free and open access, and multiple means of participation.

The components of public participation will include:

- Open Meetings
- Advisory Committee Meetings
- Public Meetings and Comment Periods
  - Targeted Format and Frequency
  - Broad Notification
  - Convenient Scheduling
- Website Updates
- Document Availability and Notification
- Ensuring Environmental Justice in Planning
- Engaging Minority Populations, Low-Income Populations, and People with Disabilities
- Environmental Justice Task Force
- Public Outreach and Briefings
- Incorporation of Public Input
- Evaluation of Public Participation

A few of the key components are summarized on the following pages. For more detail on each component, please see the full Public Participation Plan, available on the Commission’s website.
ENGAGING MINORITY POPULATIONS, LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS, AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

The Commission will seek to involve all interested and concerned segments of the public in its planning. Some practical applications show steps typically used in major planning efforts to engage minority populations, low-income populations, and people with disabilities:

- **Personal letters are sent to lead contacts** of groups and organizations at each major stage of planning corresponding to study newsletters and/or public meetings, highlighting key points of potential interest.

- **Telephone campaigns, emails, or regular contacts** occur to arrange meetings, encourage participation, answer questions, and take any comments.

- **Partnerships and other deeper relationships** will be continued with eight community organizations that serve and represent the Region’s minority populations, low-income populations, and people with disabilities.

- **Opportunities are explored for more intensive engagement**, including co-sponsored events, special meetings involving full memberships—particularly with the Commission’s eight community partners—and employing small group discussion techniques.

- **Primary organizational contacts are identified and cultivated**, to provide a basis of regular or ongoing involvements with a subset of very active and broad-based representative groups.

OBTAINING AND INCORPORATING PUBLIC INPUT

Public input is documented and taken into account by the Commission and its advisory committees guiding planning efforts prior to any final recommendations. Ongoing public comments are sought in many different ways. Formal comment periods are used, with a minimum of 30 days for most efforts (45 days for the adoption of the public involvement process), when public meetings are held for an effort. For major regional plan updates, involving multiple series of public meetings, the Commission often considers:

- **Holding at least one meeting per county** during each series, all at ADA-accessible locations
• **Seeking central city locations** in Kenosha, Milwaukee, Racine, and Waukesha Counties

• **Selecting meeting sites with public transit availability**, particularly in urban areas

• **Working with its eight community partners to hold meetings** at the same time as public meetings

• **Accommodating individuals with limited English proficiency**, including providing translators as needed

A variety of techniques are used to provide information, including summary handouts, visual displays, keypad polling, and interactive small group discussions. All meetings include the opportunity to provide comments in writing or orally. Public meetings and comment periods are broadly noticed using paid newspaper advertisements (including newspapers serving minorities and low-income populations), press releases, distribution of summary materials via mail and e-mail, and website updates. Staff also gives presentations or briefings throughout planning efforts to any group that requests one.

**EVALUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The effectiveness of the Commission’s public participation efforts will be monitored and evaluated, and improved when possible. At the conclusion of planning efforts, Commission staff will evaluate the public participation used, identifying improvements for future planning efforts. Ongoing public participation will be modified while a planning effort is underway based on feedback.

**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CONSULTATION PROCESS**

In addition to actively seeking participation by Southeastern Wisconsin residents, the Commission obtains considerable input during its transportation planning and programming efforts through its consultation process. This valuable consultation is conducted primarily through Commission advisory committees, task forces on key issues, work with community partners, and consulting with numerous minority and low-income groups.
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INTRODUCTION

Public involvement and outreach efforts of the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission accelerated greatly between April 2017 and March 2020, particularly regarding outreach to minority and low-income populations. Key accomplishments are summarized in this document, including the continued active involvement of SEWRPC’s Environmental Justice Task Force (formed in 2007) and the increasingly active role of the Public Involvement and Outreach Division (PIO), which was formed in 2009. In 2014, a second full-time staff position was added. In 2019, the Commission expanded PIO by developing a cross-functional team with SEWRPC staff from all major planning divisions (Land Use, Transportation, Environmental A & B).

The goal of the Commission’s public involvement and outreach efforts is to ensure early and continuous public engagement regarding transportation planning and programming, including providing notification, meaningful information, and opportunities for public participation and input. Opportunities for public comment are provided via the SEWRPC website, SEWRPC social media, telephone, office locations, and U.S. mail. Public and on-request meetings and presentations also provide an opportunity for the Commission to receive and incorporate public input into the planning process in a timely, effective, and professional manner.

With the understanding that community engagement is the key to longevity and support of a project, the PIO Division 1) works to advance the Commission’s overall and specific public involvement and outreach efforts, 2) continues to build and expand relationships with potentially underserved populations, as well as, traditional audiences, and 3) addresses the growing workload related to public involvement. Through the Division’s outreach work and other Commission efforts, SEWRPC continues to fulfill its commitment to achieving environmental justice and Title VI compliance in transportation and other planning programs.

Additional staff capacity has allowed the Commission to increase the number of groups it reaches, presentations and meetings it conducts, and the number of people who are impacted by Commission planning. It has also enabled the Commission to further enhance existing relationships with what has been designated as primary organizations,
The primary organizations serve as a formal distribution network for information about Commission planning activities. These organizations serve low-income areas; areas predominantly consisting of communities of color and targeted ethnicities; individuals with disabilities; and/or communities or neighborhoods where issues related to employment, transportation, land use, economic development, housing and environmental deterioration relate directly to the Commission’s planning efforts.

This report outlines significant and new areas of emphasis by the Commission in response to past Title VI reviews, as well as, reviews of activities that it has found to be effective regarding environmental justice. Many of the Commission’s activities continue to be ongoing or are multi-year in nature.

Relationships and efforts that span multiple years also may not be listed under each year in which they were active, which merely reflects the constraints of a summary report. In some cases, however, the report references similar activities in more than one year in order to reflect a change in focus or the level of involvement with a key organization.

BACKGROUND FOR MINORITY POPULATION AND LOW-INCOME POPULATION PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING

Significant disparities exist between minority populations and non-minority populations in the Region, particularly in the Milwaukee metropolitan area, with respect to educational attainment levels, per capita income, and poverty. These disparities are long-standing, and are more pronounced than in almost all other metro areas.

With these disparities in mind, the Commission continued to involve minority and low-income populations in transportation and related planning via two parallel and complementary approaches:

1. Efforts to be open and accessible to the general public, including minority populations and low-income populations

2. Targeted efforts to reach minority and low-income population groups, including key constituents

Both approaches experienced significant activity over the reporting period, although the greatest emphasis was on targeted efforts.

GENERAL EFFORTS TO BE OPEN AND ACCESSIBLE

The Commission carries out an extensive public involvement and outreach program annually. In part, these efforts are integrated with the production of regional plan elements and generally involve traditional methods of conveying the Commission’s analytical findings and proposed plan recommendations to the general public through a variety of avenues, including website materials, newsletters, presentations to governmental and civic organizations, public informational meetings, and public hearings. Other efforts are directed at specific population subgroups, particularly including low-income populations, minority populations, people with disabilities, and students. This work program is carried out in accordance with a structured approach set forth in a document entitled “Public Participation Plan for Regional Planning for Southeastern Wisconsin,” which is available from the Commission offices and can be accessed at www.sewrpc.org/ppp (see Exhibit E).

Most public outreach and input occurs at key points in the planning process when significant information becomes available and is prepared for public input and/or review. Providing such information gives the intended audience a good sense of the plan’s purpose and approach, ensuring that the dialogue between the Commission staff and the public is meaningful and effective. The Commission’s Public Participation Plan calls for a minimum of two sets of public meetings: early in a study and at the stage of alternatives analysis, with, potentially, a preliminary recommended plan.

1 These disparities are documented in SEWRPC Memorandum No. 221 (Second Edition), A Comparison of the Milwaukee Metropolitan Area to Its Peers, March 2020.
Two major projects SEWRPC has been involved in between 2017 and 2020 are the federally required 2020 update to the regional land use and transportation plan (VISION 2050) and the Regional Chloride Study, a joint project funded by WisDOT, WDNR and SEWRPC.

For the VISION 2050 update, two series of public meetings were conducted, which is more frequent than the minimum called for in the Public Participation Plan. Announcements to the general public and interested parties at these stages occurred by newsletters and/or summary brochures, e-mails, social media, news releases, paid advertisements, and website listings. Most of these products and events are intended to benefit minority populations and low-income populations while meeting the needs of the greater public. This includes, for example, ensuring that meetings are scheduled in central locations accessible by public transit, that some meetings are held in minority neighborhood centers, that key summary materials are translated into Spanish, and that interpreters are provided as needed, and notices are published in African American and Hispanic/Latino newspapers, with some translated into Spanish.

The Regional Chloride Study is a comprehensive study of the environmental impacts of chloride on the water resources of the Region. This study will provide an inventory of the historical and present sources of chloride loads to surface and groundwater resources, an assessment of the impacts of these loads on the environment, a state-of-the-art component addressing current research and emerging technologies and policies related to mitigating the environmental effects of chloride from multiple sources, an identification of alternate means of achieving desired levels of the management of sources of chloride, and general recommendations for reducing the undesirable environmental impacts of the use of chloride. As part of initiating this effort, a general overview about the goals of the regional chloride study was shared with both our target markets and with the larger population through our SEWRPC booth at various regional expos and events. For our target market, in-person contacts, letters, and phone calls were made to inform 75+ primary organizations that the Commission engages with on a regular basis. More extensive public outreach will be conducted once additional information from the study is available.

IDENTIFYING ORGANIZATIONAL CONTACTS TO TARGET FOR OUTREACH

Each year the Public Involvement and Outreach Division evaluates and determines the primary organizations that are referred to throughout this Exhibit. Primary organizations are contacted on a frequent basis because of their relation to or interest in the Commission’s work. Together these primary contacts represent key populations, geographies, memberships, and interests.

Many of the primary organizational contacts were engaged multiple times since 2017 and are expected to continue to be involved in the future (receiving status reports on Commission projects, presentations, and formal or informal informational meetings regarding Commission plans and studies). Some organizations may also partner with the Commission to conduct activities and events of mutual interest. A number of these entities are included in this report’s descriptions of specific activities.

Primary organizations are also reviewed by the Commission’s Environmental Justice Task Force on an annual basis for their input. The Task Force is discussed later in this exhibit.
TARGETED EFFORTS TO REACH MINORITY POPULATIONS AND LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS

Throughout SEWRPC planning processes, additional and targeted steps have been taken to engage minority populations and low-income populations. Figure 1 outlines the objectives of the Commission’s targeted public involvement and outreach program. The Commission annually updates the list of minority and low-income primary organization contacts that fluctuates from between 70 to 100 organizations through recurring efforts to broaden targeted outreach and involvement. This allows the Commission to provide important information to under-represented constituents, which has resulted in increased feedback on plans as they are prepared.

As part of the extensive public outreach for VISION 2050 started in 2013, the Commission began a formal partnership with a select group of partner nonprofit community organizations, which SEWRPC designated as Community Partners. These Community Partners include: CommonGround, Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition (EDBC), Hmong American Friendship Association, IndepedenceFirst, Milwaukee Urban League, Southside Organizing Center, Urban Economic Development Association and Urban League of Racine and Kenosha. In 2017, Renew Environmental Public Health Advocates (REPHA) was added as a Community Partner. Through this formal partnership, the Community Partners agreed to conduct, for each round of the VISION 2050 meetings, a meeting with their constituents and encourage plan feedback.

During key points in planning processes, newsletters/brochures are sent to the individuals on the primary organization contact list with personal letters that call attention to specific information about meetings and resources of interest to the recipients. The primary organization representatives are invited by letter to meet personally with Commission staff at their convenience, in addition to attending public meetings. Each recent major study has also included a campaign to reach the representatives by telephone, followed as appropriate by email, resulting in multiple contacts. This additional proactive step was designed to remove any perceived barriers to participation by keeping the planning process in front of these audiences and allowing for individually scheduled meetings and other conversations. This process began with the regional housing plan and was carried forward for other major regional plans including VISION 2050.

Public Involvement and Outreach (PIO) staff annually reviews our outreach methods and has recently undertaken a broader approach. For example, in 2017, with the newly formed partnership with Renew Environmental Public Health Advocates (REPHA), PIO engaged with more organizations related to public health and social justice. Topics of interest included lead in the water and the effects of chloride in communities.

In 2018, PIO began to target their outreach efforts by establishing goals for the year. These goals focused both on internal SEWRPC efforts and external community outreach, which are defined in exhibit F-2. In addition, a concerted effort was made to engage minority and low-income populations during the process of amending VISION 2050 to incorporate land use changes and transportation improvements serving the Foxconn campus in Racine County.

For the majority of 2019, PIO engaged our traditional populations, most notably low-income populations, people of color, people with disabilities, and others included in the Commissions’ public participation plan. But after a strategic planning session that was held in October, a broader approach was developed to include three additional groups as defined in Exhibit F-3.

In 2020, PIO expanded our reach to include the South East Wisconsin Public Health professionals who are at the intersection of public health and social justice.

PIO staff will continue to engage the primary organizations with one-on-one meetings with directors, advisory boards, stakeholders, and also organization-wide events. These outreach efforts have provided another source of input in the Commission’s planning processes and afforded another avenue of opportunity for participation by minority populations and low-income populations.
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND OUTREACH (APRIL 2017-MARCH 2020)

Details on the public involvement and outreach activities conducted by Commission staff between April 2017 and March 2020 are summarized in Exhibits F-1 through F-4 by year. The summaries include SEWRPC-sponsored public informational meetings and workshops and efforts directed to targeted population groups. Many of the outreach efforts conducted throughout this time period were done in conjunction with the amendments to VISION 2050 that have been discussed in this Exhibit.

Environmental Justice Task Force: April 2017-March 2020

Under Federal law, SEWRPC has a responsibility to help ensure the full and fair participation throughout the regional planning process of minority populations, low-income populations, and people with disabilities. In addition to the public outreach efforts noted above, the Commission has an appointed Environmental Justice Task Force to help ensure that this requirement is met. This 15-member body is intended to be broadly representative of minority, low-income, and special needs populations from across Southeastern Wisconsin.

The primary role of the Task Force is to enhance the consideration and integration of environmental justice in transportation planning and other regional planning efforts. The purposes of the Task Force are summarized in Figure 2. In 2020, the Commission (in consultation with the Task Force members) began reviewing and updating the goals and purpose of the task force in an effort to respond to current planning issues and to consider additional voices that should be represented.

The Task Force met a total of ten times during this reporting period: two (2) times in 2017, four (4) times in 2018, three (3) times in 2019 and one time through March 2020. All meetings are held in locations that are physically accessible to people with disabilities and served by public transportation. Non-members are also able to attend meetings and comment, as all meetings are open to the public and provide ample comment opportunity.

Environmental Justice Task Force agenda items during the reporting period have included the following subjects:

- Current SEWRPC planning efforts and schedules
- Public involvement and outreach efforts, including primary organizational contacts; conferences, fairs, and expos attended; environmental justice group contacts; simplified communication pieces for key audiences; and English and Spanish versions

---

**Figure 1**

Major Objectives of SEWRPC Targeted Public Involvement and Outreach Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outreach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build awareness and inform residents regarding SEWRPC purpose, activities, resources, and participation opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved through media, mass distributions, and large public event exhibits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target key populations and organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage participation in SEWRPC planning efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote understanding of SEWRPC advisory plan recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboratively achieved through such group activities as organizations, committees, and task forces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target youth through adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved through the development of materials and events designed to convey facts and analytical findings, and, thereby, better equip audiences to understand and act upon SEWRPC plan recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote the consideration and integration of environmental justice principles throughout the SEWRPC planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved through the evaluation of plan recommendations, the public involvement and outreach program, and the work of the Environmental Justice Task Force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2
Purposes of the SEWRPC Environmental Justice Task Force

- **Involvement and Participation**
  To facilitate the involvement of, and help ensure the full and fair participation of, low-income, minority, and disabled individuals and communities at all stages in relevant areas of regional planning as determined in consultation with them.

- **Address Relevant Issues**
  To make recommendations on, and help monitor, issues and analyses potentially relevant to the needs and circumstances of low-income, minority, and disabled communities.

- **Identify Benefits and Effects**
  To help identify potential benefits and adverse effects of regional planning programs and activities with respect to minority, low-income, and disabled populations.

- **Advise and Recommend**
  To advise and recommend methods to prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits, and/or to avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority, low-income, and disabled populations.

- **Enhance Planning Awareness**
  To enhance awareness, understanding, appreciation, support, and implementation of planning recommendations and benefits, with emphasis on the needs of minority, low-income, and disabled populations.

- SEWRPC report on implementation of Task Force suggestions
- SEWRPC white paper on lead in drinking water
- Overview of the composition of applicants for recently filled Commission positions
- VISION 2050 regional plan amendments and an interim update, including updated equity analyses
- A 2020 update to the VISION 2050 companion report: *A Comparison of the Milwaukee Metropolitan Area to its Peers*
- 2018 EJTF Retreat, where a self-evaluation of its 10 years in operation was done to determine what its continued focus would be

More information on the Environmental Justice Task Force and other items noted in this report can be found at www.sewrpc.org.
This exhibit summarizes the public involvement and outreach activities carried out during 2017 in two specific categories: 1) SEWRPC-sponsored public informational workshops, meetings, and hearings; and 2) public involvement and outreach efforts directed to targeted population groups.

SEWRPC Public Involvement and Outreach Staffing
In 2017, the Public Involvement and Outreach division included two full-time staff and one part-time staff. During that time, staff engaged in many hours of direct and recurring contact as reflected in the table below.

Table 1
Listing of Staff Outreach Hours for the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission: 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Kenosha</th>
<th>Milwaukee</th>
<th>Ozaukee</th>
<th>Racine</th>
<th>Walworth</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Waukesha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Total</td>
<td>166.5</td>
<td>499.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>116.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2017 outreach primarily focused on VISION 2050 and included specific outreach targeted at population subgroups. The outreach mentioned above includes workshops with community partner organizations, publications, letters to primary organizations, presentations to community groups, and exhibits at community events.

SEWRPC-Sponsored Public Informational Workshops, Meetings, and Hearings
The ongoing technical work of the Commission includes many important public participation activities. Such activities tend to be focused on Commission findings and recommendations relative to new regional plans and updates to prior regional plans. There are standard Commission procedures for public meetings and public hearings, as specified in the Public Participation Plan, including widely disseminated meeting notifications and providing a variety of opportunities for members of the public to make their views known on the topic at hand. The Commission provides full documentation of comments from all public meetings. Moreover, all comments are considered by the Commission’s advisory committees and the Commission itself. The SEWRPC-sponsored outreach includes the following:

- Two SEWRPC newsletters (Regional Planning News), in January and June, one email announcement, two print versions of a brochure entitled SEWRPC Public Participation in Regional Planning in Southeastern Wisconsin and VISION 2050 articles were distributed to the general public relative to the progress being made in the planning process. These publications, emails, and articles included links to the VISION 2050 website (www.vision2050sewis.org). The VISION 2050 Summary report, presenting the final plan, was also completed in December 2016 and has been distributed across the Region.

- Personalized annual letters were distributed to the leaders of 75+ primary organizations representing low-income residents and minority residents of the Region. The letters provided updates about VISION 2050 and offered opportunities to meet individually with Commission staff if there were questions about the VISION 2050 process. The letters were used to distribute copies of the VISION 2050 brochures, Regional Planning News, and the VISION 2050 Summary report to these primary organizations.
The SEWRPC Environmental Justice Task Force met twice, in June and November, to review VISION 2050 efforts, materials, and other SEWRPC initiatives.

SEWRPC staff met with regional elected officials to discuss VISION 2050 recommendations and implementation.

Twenty-eight presentations relative to the VISION 2050 process were provided to a wide range of groups and organizations, including organizations that serve minority and low-income residents, community and neighborhood organizations, service clubs, business associations, school groups, and environmental organizations.

Thirty-nine staffed exhibits were provided at community events, with many events serving low-income residents and minority residents. Exhibits included VISION 2050 and related Commission materials for attendees. A new event SEWRPC participated in was the 2017 National Society of Black Engineers Fall Regional Conference in Milwaukee, which allowed SEWRPC to recruit possible future minority staff.

Outreach continued to eight partner nonprofit community organizations, which include Common Ground, the Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition, Hmong American Friendship Association, IndependenceFirst, Milwaukee Urban League, Southside Organizing Committee, Urban Economic Development Association of Wisconsin, and the Urban League of Racine and Kenosha. One additional partner nonprofit community organization, Renew Environmental Public Health Advocates (REPHA), was added to the Community Partners group. RPHA’s mission is to improve the quality of life for individuals and families, socially, physically, and economically in targeted neighborhoods by utilizing a community organizer and a population-health nurse (PHN) as the central operational unit of this initiative.

Public Involvement and Outreach Efforts Targeted to Selected Population Groups
Substantial work efforts are undertaken annually to engage members of specific population subgroups that traditionally have had lower levels of participation than the general population in regional planning activities and events. These efforts by SEWRPC are focused on working with approximately 75 organizations (which the Commission refers to as primary organizations) that represent or serve underrepresented populations, which are reviewed by the Environmental Justice Task Force, and are reflected in Figure 3. The nine Community Partners are also included in the primary organization list and denoted with bold text.

There were 329 direct contacts made with primary and other organizations and leaders in 2017—almost all of which serve low-income populations and minority populations. A portion of the direct contacts serve primarily transportation and environmental interests. The direct contacts include 284 recurring contacts and 45 new contacts. Contacts include meetings and activities that were held with individuals (one-on-one meetings), small group discussions, resource tables at special events, and activities sponsored by formal organizational entities. Recurring contacts are meetings and/or activities with organizations that have multiple activities the Commission is involved with throughout the year.
Partnership-Building Activities Beyond the Primary Organizations

In carrying out its targeted outreach efforts, the Commission engages in extensive partnership building activities. In addition to the targeted activities noted above, 2017 activities included the following:

- **Urban Economic Development Association**
  For the eighth consecutive year, the Commission continued to work with the Urban Economic Development Association of Wisconsin (UEDA), which has its headquarters in Milwaukee’s central city. Participation occurred in a number of ways, including assisting with the planning of the Association’s 16th Annual Community Development Summit, with the theme, “Building Economic and Social Inclusion with the Disability Community.” It was attended by more than 100 community and regional leaders. In preparation for the Summit, Commission staff assistance was provided to the Association through service on the Summit Planning Committee and printing of the program booklet. SEWRPC provided a staffed exhibit table at the Summit and iClicker polling devices, so the audience was able to give an immediate response to questions posted at the summit. Finally, Commission public outreach staff participated on a number of UEDA working committees, including the UEDA Board of Directors.

- **Neighborhood and Community Economic Development**
  In 2015, all seven counties approved the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) developed by the Regional Economic Partnership (REP), Milwaukee, Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation (WEDC), and SEWRPC. The CEDS is designed to bring together the public and private sectors to develop a strategic plan to diversify and strengthen the Region’s economy. Adoption of the CEDS by a County Board makes county and local governments in the county with economically distressed areas eligible to apply for grants under EDA Public Works and Economic Adjustment programs, provided the grant project would benefit the distressed area.

  The Commission networks with organizations and engages in activities that address neighborhood and community economic development issues. This effort includes ongoing interaction with:

  - Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC-Milwaukee)
  - Commercial Corridors Consortium in Milwaukee
  - Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) throughout the Region
  - Economic development organizations such as the Kenosha Area Business Alliance (KABA), Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce (MMAC), M7, Ozaukee Economic Development (OED), Racine County Economic Development Corporation (RCEDC), Racine Area Manufacturers and Commerce (RAMAC) Walworth County Economic Development Association (WCEDA), Elkhorn Economic Development Association (EEDA), Economic Development Washington County (EDWC) and Waukesha County Business Alliance (WCBA)
  - United Neighborhood Centers of Milwaukee

  These efforts also included participation in Doors Open Milwaukee, a public celebration of Milwaukee’s art, architecture, neighborhoods, community gardens, and more. SEWRPC participated in two ways for this two-day event: 1) staffed space at our Global Water Center satellite office and 2) staffed an exhibit table at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee School of Architecture and Urban Planning.

  The goal with each organization is sharing regional plan transportation, land use, and housing recommendations and discussing how those matters relate to the local economy and regional economic development. In addition, staff use these interactions to gather input on current issues facing the communities and groups these organizations represent and serve.
• **Workforce Development and Employment**
  In alignment with its neighborhood and community development efforts, the Commission also networks with organizations and engages in activities that address workforce development and employment issues. This effort includes:
  - Workforce Regional Training Partnership
  - African American Male Forum on Employment
  - Milwaukee and Racine-Kenosha Labor Development Committees
  - Southeast Wisconsin Migrant and Seasonal Workers Committee
  - Social Development Commission (SDC)
  - Workforce Development Centers within the Southeastern Wisconsin Region
  - Milwaukee Careers Cooperative.

• **Environmental Education and Outreach**
  As with SEWRPC’s housing, land use, and transportation planning work, the Commission’s environmental planning work is integrated into public involvement and outreach activities. As part of the 2017 VISION 2050 public outreach presentations and exhibits mentioned previously, SEWRPC staffed exhibit tables with VISION 2050 and environmental planning materials at the following events:
  - Johnson Foundation
  - Milwaukee Sustainability Summit
  - Southeastern Wisconsin Watersheds Trust, Inc.
  - Clean Rivers, Clean Lake Conference
  - Eco-Justice Center Fall Festival sponsored by the Racine Dominicans
  - Midwest Water Analyst Conference (first time – with presentation from Commission staff)
  - Root River Festival
  - County Public/Private Partnership for Emergency Preparedness

SEWRPC partnership-building science education activities include Commission participation in the Kenosha School of Technology Enhanced Curriculum (KTEC) Science Fair, the 1st annual Racine EcoFest, and the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee School of Fresh Water Science Career Fair.

During 2017, about 400 students and educators from Kenosha Unified School District public benefitted from Commission expertise related to environmental science, with one of the Commission staff serving as the science fair judge.

Racine EcoFest was facilitated by Greening a Greater Racine and Gateway Technical College. The purpose of the events is for attendees to learn about being “green,” and then apply what they’ve learned in their everyday life.
Education and Career Development for Communities of Color

The Commission networks with organizations and engages in activities focusing on building community leadership and developing organizational capacity for communities of color. This effort includes the following entities:

- Community Brainstorming Forum
- Manufacturing Diversity Institute
- African American Leadership Group
- Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition
- Community Action Agencies of Milwaukee-Racine-Kenosha
- Urban Leagues of Milwaukee and Racine-Kenosha
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Chapters (in 6 counties)
- Southeast Wisconsin Mentoring Program (in partnership with Gateway Technical College)
- Local colleges and universities - UW-Parkside, Carthage College, Gateway Technical College, Marquette University and UW Milwaukee
- Boys & Girls Club of Walworth County
- Big Brothers/Big Sisters of Kenosha & Racine
- Regional K-12 school systems - Kenosha Unified School District, Racine Unified School District, Milwaukee Public Schools
- United Way (each regional office)
- Latino Enterprise Network of Southeastern Wisconsin, Inc. (LEN)
- National Black MBA Association (NBMBAA)
- Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers (MSFW)/United Migrant Opportunity Services (UMOS)
- MARKETPLACE 2017 – Wisconsin Governor’s Conference on Minority Business Development

SEWRPC staff was able to take career development one step further in 2017 by staffing a booth at the National Society of Black Engineers Fall Regional Conference in Milwaukee, allowing SEWRPC to recruit possible future minority staff.
• **Public Health (Children and Family)**
  The Commission continued to work on a multi-year, multi-disciplinary effort to address the environmental conditions impacting children and family health by providing information about the importance of transportation and housing planning to groups engaged in the Social Determinants of Health effort. In this effort, the Commission worked with:
  
  - Aurora Health Care Social Responsibility Committee
  - SDC Poverty Summit
  - Kenosha Community Health Center
  - Lindsay Heights Neighborhood Health Alliance
  - Racine County Family Resource Network (a newly formed group)
  - Lifecourse Initiatives for Healthy Families (LIHF) through the United Way of Milwaukee and Waukesha
  - United Way (in all seven counties)
  - United Way Racine Health Investment Committee
  - YWCA of Southeast Wisconsin
  - Renew Environmental Public Health Advocates (REPHA) was added as one of SEWRPC’s community partners

• **Sustainable Communities and Quality of Life Enhancement for Seniors, Veterans and Women & Children**
  The Commission networks with organizations and engages in activities that address efforts relative to building sustainable communities and enhancing the quality of community life. This effort involves:
  
  - AARP
  - Racine Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC) Board & The Commission on Aging Groundwork Milwaukee
  - City of Milwaukee Green Team Sustainability Effort
  - Walnut Way Conservation Corporation
  - Urban Ecology Center
  - Fondy Food Center
  - Food Summit Leadership Group
  - Milwaukee HomeGrown Initiative
  - Greening a Greater Racine
  - WISDOM - Racine Interfaith Council (RIC), Citizens United to Serve Humanity (CUSH)
  - Milwaukee Inner City Congregations Allied for Hope (MICAH) and SOPHIA
Figure F.2
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Bold text denotes SEWRPC Community Partner

- Association for the Rights of Citizens with Handicaps (ARCH)
- Casa Guadalupe Education Center
- Coalition for Community Health Care Inc.
- **Common Ground**
- Community Action, Inc.
- Congregations United to Serve Humanity (CUSH)
- **Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition**
- Family Sharing of Ozaukee County
- Harambee Great Neighborhood Initiative/Riverwest Neighborhood Association/Riverworks Development Corporation
- Hispanic Business and Professional Association/Hispanic Roundtable
- **Hmong American Friendship Association**
- HOPES Center
- **IndependenceFirst**
- Interfaith Older Adult Programs/Caregivers
- Kenosha Achievement Center
- Kenosha Areas Family and Aging Services (KAFASI)
- La Casa de Esperanza
- Layton Boulevard West Neighbors
- Lindsay Heights Area, City of Milwaukee
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)
- Milwaukee Inner City Congregations Allied for Hope (MICAH)
- **Milwaukee Urban League**
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
- Networking Groups for Aging Population
- Ozaukee Family Services
- Racine County Family Resource Network
- Racine Interfaith Coalition (RIC)
- Racine Kenosha Community Action Agency
- Society's Assets
- SOPHIA
- Social Development Commission
- **Southside Organizing Committee**
- The 30th Street Industrial Corridor Revitalization Area
- The Salvation Army of Greater Milwaukee
- The Threshold, Inc.
- United Migrant Opportunity Services (UMOS)
- United Way Affiliated Entities Within the Southeastern Wisconsin Region
- Urban Ecology Center
- **Urban Economic Development Association of Wisconsin (UEDA)**
- **Urban League of Racine and Kenosha**
- Walworth County Literacy Council
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND OUTREACH SUMMARY: 2018
This exhibit summarizes the public involvement and outreach activities carried out during 2018 with respect to 1) SEWRPC-sponsored public informational workshops, meetings, and hearings and 2) public involvement efforts directed to targeted population groups.

SEWRPC Public Involvement and Outreach staffing
In 2018, the Public Involvement and Outreach division operated with one full-time staff and one part-time staff from January through March, and then added an additional full-time staff member in April. During that time, staff engaged in many hours of direct and recurring contact, as reflected in the table below.

Table 1
Listing of Staff Outreach Hours for the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission: 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Kenosha</th>
<th>Milwaukee</th>
<th>Ozaukee</th>
<th>Racine</th>
<th>Walworth</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Waukesha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Total</td>
<td>165.5</td>
<td>334.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2018 outreach primarily focused on VISION 2050 and included specific outreach targeted at population subgroups. The outreach mentioned above includes workshops with community partner organizations, publications, letters to primary organizations, presentations to community groups, and exhibits at community events.

SEWRPC-Sponsored Public Informational Workshops, Meetings, and Hearings
The ongoing technical work of the Commission includes many important public participation activities. Such activities tend to be focused on Commission findings and recommendations relative to new regional plans and updates to prior regional plans. There are standard Commission procedures for public meetings and public hearings, as specified in the Public Participation Plan, including widely disseminated meeting notifications and the provision of a variety of opportunities for members of the public to make their views known on the topic at hand. In September, six public meetings regarding an amendment to VISION 2050 to incorporate related land use changes and transportation improvements serving the Foxconn campus in Racine County were conducted. The Commission provides full documentation of comments from all public meetings. Moreover, all comments are considered by the Commission advisory committees as well as the Commission itself. The SEWRPC outreach includes the following:

- Three issues of the *Regional Planning News*, in March, September, and December, were published and active Facebook and Twitter accounts were maintained to keep followers up-to-date on Commission planning efforts and on other ongoing efforts being undertaken by the Commission’s various partners across the Region. Staff also distributed numerous summary publications across the Region in 2018.

- Two personalized letters, in February and September, were distributed to each of the leaders of approximately 75+ primary organizations representing minority and low-income residents of the Region. The letters provided updates about VISION 2050 and offered opportunities to meet individually with Commission staff and/or participate in the VISION 2050 process.
• VISION 2050 public meeting flyers for Racine, Kenosha, Milwaukee and Waukesha Counties, two email announcements, SEWRPC social media updates, a personalized letter, one print brochure (in English and Spanish), and VISION 2050 articles in the SEWRPC Regional Planning News were distributed to the general public to inform the public of the amendment process related to establishing targets for Federal performance measures related to highway safety and to the amendment related to the Foxconn manufacturing campus in Racine County and the. These publications, emails, and articles invited residents to attend the fall VISION 2050 interactive public meetings on the Foxconn amendment and included links to the VISION 2050 website http://www.vision2050sewis.org.

• Fourteen paid advertisements were published to newspapers of record to announce the VISION 2050 public workshops.

• The SEWRPC Environmental Justice Task Force met four times, in February, June, September and December, to review VISION 2050 materials and other initiatives. The Public Involvement and Outreach Division committed to and provided a quarterly update report at each meeting.

• SEWRPC staff met with regional elected officials to discuss VISION 2050 recommendations and implementation and other SEWRPC efforts that affect the population they represent.

• Twenty-four presentations relative to the VISION 2050 process were provided to a wide range of groups and organizations, including organizations that serve minority and low-income residents, community and neighborhood organizations, service clubs, business associations, school groups, and environmental organizations.

• Thirty-eight staffed exhibits were provided at community events, with many events serving low-income residents and minority residents. Exhibits included VISION 2050 and related Commission materials for attendees.

• Outreach continued to our nine VISION 2050 partner nonprofit community organizations, which include the Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition, Hmong American Friendship Association, IndependenceFirst, Milwaukee Urban League, Southside Organizing Committee, Urban Economic Development Association, Urban League of Racine and Kenosha, Common Ground, and Renew Environmental Public Health Advocates, Inc (REPHA). Each of these organizations continued to assist SEWRPC in its outreach to minority and low-income communities as the amendments to VISION 2050 were introduced.

Figure 1
2018 Community Partners – Number of In-Person Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Partner</th>
<th>Number of Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Ground</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong American Friendship Association</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IndependenceFirst</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Urban League</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renew Environmental Public Health Advocates (REPHA)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Organizing Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Economic Development Association</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban League of Racine and Kenosha</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The annual community partner meeting was held to bring the community partners together to share an update on SEWRPC projects with them, for the partners to share what projects they were working on, and to explore how our partnerships could grow. The pictures below are from the annual community partner meeting.

Public Involvement and Outreach Efforts Targeted to Selected Population Groups
Substantial work efforts are undertaken annually to engage members of specific population subgroups that, despite efforts to recruit the general public and its constituents, traditionally have had lower levels of participation than the population in regional planning activities and events. These efforts by SEWRPC were directed to over 75 specific population subgroups referred to as primary organizations, which are reviewed by the Environmental Justice Task Force, and are reflected in Figure 2. The nine VISION 2050 community partners are also included in the primary organization list and denoted with bold text.

There were 394 direct contacts made with community organizations and leaders in 2018—almost all of which serve low-income populations and minority populations. A portion of the direct contacts serve primarily transportation and environmental interests. The direct contacts include 99 direct contacts with the primary organizations and 260 recurring and 35 new contacts. Contacts include meetings and activities that were held with individuals (one-on-one meetings), small group discussions, resource tables at special events, and activities sponsored by formal organizational entities. Recurring contacts are meetings and/or activities with organizations that have multiple activities the Commission is involved with throughout the year.

Partnership-Building Activities
In carrying out its targeted outreach efforts, the Commission engages in extensive partnership-building activities. In addition to the targeted activities noted above, 2018 activities included the following:

- **Urban Economic Development Association**
  For the ninth consecutive year, the Commission continued to work with the Urban Economic Development Association of Wisconsin (UEDA), which has its headquarters in Milwaukee’s central city. Participation occurred in a number of ways, including planning the Association’s Emerging Topics series, which provided three sessions in which attendees connected and learned new best practices in economic and community development. The three topics were: 1) Building Wealth & Community Through Economic Development, 2) Financial Empowerment for People with Disabilities and 3) Social Enterprises: Advancing Mission, Extending Impact, Strengthening Sustainability. There were nearly 180 participants between the three sessions offered between May and October. SEWRPC provided a staffed exhibit table at the Emerging Topics series. Finally, Commission public outreach staff participated on a number of UEDA working committees, including the UEDA Board of Directors.

- **Neighborhood and Community Economic Development**
  In 2015, all seven counties approved the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) developed by the Regional Economic Partnership (REP), Milwaukee7, Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation (WEDC), and SEWRPC. The CEDS is designed to bring together the public and private sectors to develop a strategic plan to diversify and strengthen the Region’s economy. Adoption of the CEDS by a County Board makes county and local governments in the county with economically distressed areas eligible to apply for grants under EDA Public Works and Economic Adjustment programs, provided the grant project would benefit the distressed area.
The Commission networks with organizations and engages in activities that address neighborhood and community economic development issues. This effort includes ongoing interaction with:

- Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC-Milwaukee)
- Commercial Corridors Consortium in Milwaukee
- Business Improvement Districts (BIDS) throughout the Region
- Economic development organizations such as the Kenosha Area Business Alliance (KABA), Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce (MMAC), M7, Ozaukee Economic Development (OED), Racine County Economic Development Corporation (RCEDC), Racine Area Manufacturers and Commerce (RAMAC) Walworth County Economic Development Association (WCEDA), Elkhorn Economic Development Association (EEDA), Economic Development Washington County (EDWC) and Waukesha County Business Alliance (WCBA)
- United Neighborhood Centers of Milwaukee, 2nd annual summit
- IndependenceFirst Housing for all workshop
- Visioning a Greater Racine – Transportation WAVE team
- Doors Open Milwaukee is a public celebration of Milwaukee’s art, architecture, neighborhoods, community gardens, and more. SEWRPC participated in two ways for this two-day event – 1) staffed space at our Global Water Center satellite office and 2) staffed an exhibit table at the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee School of Architecture and Urban Planning.

The goal with each organization is sharing regional plan transportation, land use, and housing recommendations and discussing how those matters relate to the local economy and regional economic development.

- **Workforce Development and Employment**
  The Commission networks with organizations and engages in activities that address workforce development and employment issues. This effort includes:

  - Workforce Regional Training Partnership
  - African American Male Forum on Employment
  - Milwaukee and Racine-Kenosha Labor Development Committees
  - Southeast Wisconsin Migrant and Seasonal Workers Committee
  - Social Development Commission (SDC)
• Lakeside Curative Services – assisting Racine and Kenosha area citizens with disabilities
• Workforce Development Centers within the Southeastern Wisconsin Region.

- Environmental Education and Outreach
As with SEWRPC’s housing, land use, and transportation planning work, the Commission’s environmental planning work is integrated into public involvement and outreach activities. As part of the 2018 VISION 2050 public outreach presentations and exhibits mentioned previously, SEWRPC staffed exhibit tables with VISION 2050 and environmental planning materials at the following events:

• Southeastern Wisconsin Watersheds Trust, Inc.
• Clean Rivers, Clean Lake Conference
• Fox River Summit
• Root River Festival
• Kenosha County Public/Private Partnership for Emergency Preparedness
• STEM/Technology Day at Riveredge Nature Center (presentation by SEWRPC staff)
• Nature Homeschool Day at Riveredge Nature Center (presentation by SEWRPC staff)
• Building Blocks for Sustainable Communities Workshop at Riveredge Nature Center

SEWRPC partnership-building science education activities included Commission participation in the Kenosha School of Technology Enhanced Curriculum (KTEC) Science Fair, the 2nd annual Racine EcoFest, and the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee School of Freshwater Science Career Day.

During 2018, about 400 students and educators from Kenosha Unified School District benefitted from Commission expertise related to environmental science, with one of the Commission staff serving as the science fair judge.

- Workforce Development and Employment
The Commission networks with organizations and engages in activities that address workforce development and employment issues. This effort includes:

• Workforce Regional Training Partnership
• African American Male Forum on Employment
• Milwaukee and Racine-Kenosha Labor Development Committees
• Southeast Wisconsin Migrant and Seasonal Workers Committee
• Social Development Commission (SDC)
• Lakeside Curative Services – assisting Racine and Kenosha area citizens with disabilities
• Workforce Development Centers within the Southeastern Wisconsin Region.
• **Education and Career Development for Communities of Color**

  The Commission networks with organizations and engages in activities focusing on building community leadership and developing organizational capacity for communities of color. This effort includes the following entities:

  - Community Brainstorming Forum
  - Manufacturing Diversity Institute
  - African American Leadership Group
  - Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition
  - League of United Latin American Citizen (LULAC) – Commission Staff serves a co-chair for Environmental/Economic Empowerment/Health committee for Local #320
  - Community Action Agencies of Milwaukee-Racine-Kenosha
  - Urban League of Milwaukee and Urban League of Racine and Kenosha
  - National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Chapters throughout the Region
  - Southeast Wisconsin Mentoring Program (in partnership with Gateway Technical College)
  - Local colleges and universities - UW-Parkside, Carthage College, Gateway Technical College, Marquette University and UW Milwaukee
  - Boys & Girls Club of Walworth County
  - Big Brothers/Big Sisters of Kenosha & Racine
  - Regional K-12 school systems - Kenosha Unified School District (SEWRPC staff serving KUSD Board sub-committee), Racine Unified School District at their Family Empowerment Day event and Milwaukee Public Schools
  - United Way (each regional offices)
  - Latino Enterprise Network of Southeastern Wisconsin, Inc. (LEN)
  - National Black MBA Association (NBMBAA)
  - Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers (MSFW)/United Migrant Opportunity Services (UMOS)

During 2018, information was provided on housing, transportation, land use, and environmental issues, as well as the VISION 2050 amendments and the Regional Chloride study.
• **Public Health (Children and Family)**
  The Commission continued to work on a multi-year, multi-disciplinary effort to address the environmental conditions impacting children and family health by providing information about the importance of transportation and housing planning to groups engaged in the Social Determinants of Health effort. In this effort, the Commission worked with:

  - 16th Street Health Center – Health Equity Summit ZNA versus DNA
  - SDC Poverty Summit
  - Kenosha Community Health Center
  - Lindsay Heights Neighborhood Health Alliance
  - Health and Wellness Commons Initiative
  - Racine County Family Resource Network (a newly formed group)
  - Lifecourse Initiatives for Healthy Families (LIHF) through the United Way of Milwaukee and Waukesha
  - Lifecourse Initiatives for Healthy Families (LIHF) through Racine Kenosha Community Action, which sponsored the 1st annual Baby Expo due to the high infant mortality rate in Racine
  - United Way (in all seven counties)
  - United Way Racine Health Investment Committee
  - YWCA of Southeast Wisconsin

• **Sustainable Communities and Quality of Life Enhancement for Seniors, Veterans, and Women & Children**
  The Commission networks with organizations and engages in activities that address efforts relative to building sustainable communities and enhancing the quality of community life. This effort involves:

  - Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC) Board (for all seven counties)
  - Wisconsin Veteran’s Legislator event in Ozauckee
  - Walnut Way Conservation Corporation
  - Urban Ecology Center
  - Fondy Food Center
  - Greening a Greater Racine
  - Tosa Sustainability Summit
  - WISDOM - Racine Interfaith Council (RIC), Citizens United to Serve Humanity (CUSH), Milwaukee Inner City Congregations Allied for Hope (MICAH) and SOPHIA
  - Root-Pike Watershed Initiative Network
Figure 2
2018 SEWRPC Primary Organizations Contact List
Approved by the Environmental Justice Task Force

Bold text denotes SEWRPC Community Partner
(M) signifies operations in multiple counties within Southeastern Wisconsin

- 30th Street Industrial Corridor (Milwaukee)
- Association for the Rights of Citizens with handicaps (ARCH) (M)
- Casa Guadalupe Education Center (Waukesha)
- Coalition for Community Health Care Inc. (M)
  - Member organizations:
    » Gerald L. Ignace Indian Health Center
    » Health Care for the Homeless
    » Kenosha Community Health
    » Milwaukee Health Services
    » Progressive Community Health Centers
    » Sixteenth Street Community Health Centers
- Common Ground (M)
- Community Action Agencies
  - Community Action, Inc. (Walworth, Kenosha & Racine)
  - Racine Kenosha Community Action Agency (Racine & Kenosha)
  - Social Development Commission (Milwaukee)
- Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition (M)
  - Member organizations:
    » African American Chamber of Commerce
    » American Indian Chamber of Commerce of Wisconsin
    » The Business Council
    » Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
    » Hmong Wisconsin Chamber of Commerce
    » Multicultural Entrepreneurial Institute
    » Milwaukee Inner City Congregations Allied for Hope
    » The Milwaukee Urban League
    » National Association of Minority Contractors
    » Pan African Community Association
    » Wisconsin Black Chamber of Commerce
    » Wisconsin LGBT Chamber of Commerce
- Family Sharing of Ozaukee County (Grafton)
- Harambee Great Neighborhood Initiative / Riverwest Neighborhood Association / Riverworks Development Corporation
- Hispanic Business and Professional Association / Hispanic Roundtable (Racine)
- Hmong American Friendship Association (HAFA) (M)
- HOPES Center (Milwaukee, Racine, and Waukesha)
- IndependenceFirst (M)
- Kenosha Achievement Center
- La Casa de Esperanza (Waukesha)
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)
  - Member organizations:
    » Clarke Square
    » Harambee
    » Layton Boulevard
    » Lindsay Heights
    » Washington Park
- League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
- Milwaukee Urban League

Figure continued on next page.
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) (M)
- Networking groups for aging populations
  - Aging and Disability Resource Center - ADRC (M)
  - Interfaith Older Adult Programs / Caregivers (Milwaukee and Waukesha)
  - Kenosha Area Family and Aging Services (KAFASI)
- Ozaukee Family Services
- Racine County Family Resource Network
- **Renew Environmental Public Health Advocates, Inc.** (Milwaukee)
- Salvation Army (M)
- Society’s Assets (M)
- **Southside Organizing Center (SOC)** (Milwaukee)
- The Threshold, Inc. (Washington)
- United Migrant Opportunity Services (UMOS) (M)
- United Way (M)
- Urban Ecology Center
  - Milwaukee locations:
    - Menomonee Valley
    - Riverside Park
    - Washington Park
- **Urban Economic Development Association of Wisconsin (UEDA)** (M)
- **Urban League of Racine and Kenosha**
- Southeastern Wisconsin Veterans’ Affairs (M)
- Visioning a Greater Racine
- Walworth County Literacy Council
- Wisconsin Green Muslims
- WISDOM (M)
  - Member organizations:
    - Congregations United to Serve Humanity (CUSH) (Kenosha)
    - Milwaukee Inner City Congregations Allied for HOPE (MICAH) (Milwaukee)
    - Racine Interfaith Coalition (Racine)
    - SOPHIA (Waukesha)
- YWCA (M)
This exhibit summarizes the public involvement and outreach activities carried out during 2019 with respect to SEWRPC-sponsored public informational workshops, meetings, and hearings and public involvement efforts directed to targeted population groups.

For the majority of 2019, Public Involvement and Outreach Division engaged our traditional populations, most notably low-income populations, people of color, people with disabilities and others included in the Commissions’ public participation program. In October 2019, through the Public Involvement and Outreach strategy session, Commission staff identified ways to increase SEWRPC’s engagement with seniors, veterans, and women and children.

### SEWRPC Public Involvement and Outreach Staffing

In 2019, the Public Involvement and Outreach division operated with one full-time staff and one part-time staff from April – August, with an additional full-time staff during the remainder of the year. During that time, staff engaged in many hours of direct and recurring contact as reflected in the table below.

#### Table 1

**Listing of Staff Outreach Hours for the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission: 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Kenosha</th>
<th>Milwaukee</th>
<th>Ozaukee</th>
<th>Racine</th>
<th>Walworth</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Waukesha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>381.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>176.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2019 outreach primarily focused on VISION 2050 and included specific outreach targeted at population subgroups. The outreach mentioned above includes workshops with community partner organizations, publications, letters to primary organizations, presentations to community groups, and exhibits at community events.

### SEWRPC-Sponsored Public Informational Workshops, Meetings, and Hearings

The ongoing technical work of the Commission includes many important public participation activities. Such activities tend to be focused on Commission findings and recommendations relative to new regional plans and updates to prior regional plans. There are standard Commission procedures for public meetings and public hearings, as specified in the Public Participation Plan, including widely disseminated meeting notifications and the provision of a variety of opportunities for members of the public to make their views known on the topic at hand. The Commission provides full documentation of comments from all public meetings. Moreover, all comments are considered by the Commission advisory committees, as well as the Commission itself.

In late 2019, the Commission held the first of two rounds of public involvement for the 2020 Review and Update of VISION 2050. Every four years, the Commission conducts an interim review and update of the regional land use and transportation plan, in part to address Federal requirements. The interim plan update includes an assessment of the implementation to date of VISION 2050, a review of the year 2050 forecasts underlying the plan, and a monitoring of current transportation system performance. The review also examines whether it remains reasonable for the recommendations in VISION 2050 to be accomplished over the next 30 years, given the implementation of the plan to date and available and anticipated funding. The purpose of this first round of public involvement was to share information with the public about how well the various plan elements are being implemented and collect feedback about this progress. Staff also asked...
for comments on changes, since VISION 2050 was adopted, and what should be considered during the update to the plan’s recommendations. VISION 2050 activities included the following:

- Four SEWRPC Regional Planning News, in May, June, September and December, were distributed to the general public relative to VISION 2050 and the chloride study.

- Two personalized letters, in April and November, were distributed to each of the leaders of approximately 75+ primary organizations representing low-income residents and minority residents of the Region. The letters provided updates about VISION 2050 and offered opportunities to meet individually with Commission staff and/or participate in the VISION 2050 process.

- Fourteen paid advertisements were published to newspapers of record to announce the VISION 2050 public workshops.

- The SEWRPC Environmental Justice Task Force met three times, in May, September, and November, to review VISION 2050 efforts, the regional chloride study, SEWRPC materials and other SEWRPC initiatives.

- SEWRPC staff met with regional elected officials to discuss VISION 2050 recommendations and implementation and other projects SEWRPC projects that affect the population they represent.

- In December, the following materials were distributed to the general public alerting them of the VISION 2050 public meetings and update process: regional postcard notifications for each public meeting, community partner meeting postcard notifications, one personal letter, Facebook and Twitter notification email invitations, personal phone calls and VISION 2050 articles in the SEWRPC Regional Planning News. These publications, emails, social media, and articles invited residents to attend the December 2019 VISION 2050 interactive public meetings and included links to the VISION 2050 website (www.vision2050sewis.org). Figure 1 shows how participants heard about the public meetings.

**Figure 1**
Round 1 Feedback: How Participants Heard About the Public Meetings

![Figure 1](image-url)

Note: Respondents that selected the “Other” option provided the following additional ways they learned about the meeting: 1) through a member of the Commission’s Public Involvement and Outreach staff, 2) through one of the Commission’s nine community partners, and 3) through the SOPHIA Interfaith group in Waukesha.
Twenty-three presentations relative to the VISION 2050 process were provided to a wide range of groups and organizations, including organizations that serve minority residents and low-income residents, community and neighborhood organizations, service clubs, business associations, school groups, and environmental organizations.

Thirty-one staffed exhibits were provided at community events, with many events serving low-income residents and minority residents. Exhibits included VISION 2050 and related Commission materials for attendees.

Outreach continued to the nine VISION 2050 partner nonprofit community organizations, which include Common Ground, the Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition, Hmong American Friendship Association, Independence First, Milwaukee Urban League, Southside Organizing Committee, Urban Economic Development Association of Wisconsin, Urban League of Racine and Kenosha, and Renew Environmental Public Health Advocates, Inc.

The annual community partner meeting was held in August allowing for an update on SEWRPC projects, including VISION 2050. The community partners also shared updates on projects they were working on and explored how our partnerships could grow with SEWRPC participation in their on-going efforts.

All of the documentation developed as part of this public involvement and outreach effort is available on an archived website for the VISION 2050 process (www.vision2050sewis.com).

Public Involvement and Outreach Efforts Targeted to Selected Population Groups
Substantial work efforts are undertaken annually to engage members of specific population subgroups that, despite efforts to recruit the general public and its constituents, traditionally have had lower levels of participation than the population in regional planning activities and events. These efforts by SEWRPC were directed to over 75 specific population subgroups referred to as primary organizations, which are reviewed by the Environmental Justice Task Force, and are reflected in Figure 3. The nine community partners are also included in the primary organizations list.

Some of the groups PIO has reached out to and have newly formed relationships with are:

- AARP
- Milwaukee County Senior Centers
- The Wisconsin Veterans Chamber of Commerce
- African American Veterans of Wisconsin
- Veterans Outreach of Wisconsin
- We Got This!
- Unite MKE
- TEMPO (Milwaukee, Racine and Waukesha)
• Urban Economic Development Association

For the tenth consecutive year, the Commission continued to work with the Urban Economic Development Association of Wisconsin (UEDA), which has its headquarters in Milwaukee’s central city. Participation occurred in a number of ways, including planning the Association’s Emerging Topics Series, which provided three sessions in which attendees connected and learned new best practices in economic and community development. The three sessions topics were 1) City of Milwaukee 2020-2024 year HUD Consolidation plan, 2) Bank On Greater Milwaukee and 3) Mapping Prejudice and Divided by Design. There were nearly 180 participants between the three sessions offered between July and October. In addition to helping to plan the events, SEWRPC provided a staffed exhibit table at the Emerging Topic series. Finally, Commission public outreach staff participated on a number of UEDA working committees, including the UEDA Board of Directors.

• Neighborhood and Community Economic Development

In 2015, all seven counties approved the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) developed by the Regional Economic Partnership (REP), Milwaukee, Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation (WEDC), and SEWRPC. The CEDS is designed to bring together the public and private sectors to develop a strategic plan to diversify and strengthen the Region’s economy. Adoption of the CEDS by a County Board makes county and local governments in the county with economically distressed areas eligible to apply for grants under EDA Public Works and Economic Adjustment programs, provided the grant project would benefit the distressed area.

The Commission networks with organizations and engages in activities that address neighborhood and community economic development issues. This effort includes ongoing interaction with:

º Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC-Milwaukee)
º Commercial Corridors Consortium in Milwaukee
º Business Improvement Districts (BIDS) throughout the Region
º Common Bond
º Strengthening our Neighborhoods in Racine
º Economic development organizations such as the Kenosha Area Business Alliance (KABA), Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce (MMAC), M7, Ozaukee Economic Development (OED), Racine County Economic Development Corporation (RCEDC), Racine Area Manufacturers and Commerce (RAMAC) Walworth County Economic Development Association (WCEDA), Elkhorn Economic Development Association (EEDA), Economic Development Washington County (EDWC) and Waukesha County Business Alliance (WCBA)
º United Neighborhood Centers of Milwaukee, 3rd annual summit
º Visioning a Greater Racine – WAVE Transportation team

The goal with each organization is sharing regional plan transportation, land use, and housing recommendations and discussing how those matters relate to the local economy and regional economic development.
• **Workforce Development and Employment**
  The Commission also networks with organizations and engages in activities that address workforce development and employment issues. This effort includes:
  
  o Social Development Commission (SDC)
  o National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Chapters throughout the Region
  o Milwaukee Urban League and Urban League of Racine and Kenosha
  o Workforce Regional Training Partnership
  o Southeast Wisconsin Migrant and Seasonal Workers Committee
  o Workforce Development Centers within the Southeastern Wisconsin Region
  o Milwaukee Careers Cooperative

• **Environmental Education and Outreach**
  As with SEWRPC’s housing, land use, and transportation planning work, the Commission’s environmental planning work is integrated into public involvement and outreach activities. Work on the multi-year Regional Chloride study continued in 2019. The purpose of the study is to determine the impact of chloride (including road salt) on surface and groundwater within the Region. The study includes ongoing monitoring at 37 conductance monitoring stream locations. The SEWRPC staff developed the list of potential stream monitoring locations based on multiple factors including distribution of sites by watershed and county, types of contributing land use, proximity of sites to U.S. Geological Survey stream gaging sites, status of streams relative to impairment due to chloride, locations of potential chloride-contributing sources, and inclusion of a variety of stream sizes.

  As part of the VISION 2050 public outreach presentations and exhibits mentioned previously, SEWRPC staffed exhibit tables with VISION 2050 and environmental planning materials at the following events:
  
  o Southeastern Wisconsin Watersheds Trust, Inc.
  o Clean Rivers, Clean Lake Conference
  o Fox River Summit
  o Kenosha County Public/Private Partnership for Emergency Preparedness-Commission staff presented at the February monthly meeting about the Regional Chloride study

SEWRPC continued partnership-building science education activities include Commission participation in the Kenosha School of Technology Enhanced Curriculum (KTEC) Science Fair, Testing the Waters with Riveredge in Ozaukee and Washington counties, the annual Racine EcoFest, the Green School Consortium and the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee Freshwater Sciences school.
• **Education and Career Development for Communities of Color**
  
The Commission networks with organizations and engages in activities focusing on building community leadership and developing organizational capacity for communities of color. This effort includes the following entities:

  - Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition
  - Hispanic Collaborative
  - League of United Latin American Citizen (LULAC) – Commission Staff serves a co-chair for Environmental/Economic Empowerment/Health committee for Local #320
  - Manufacturing Diversity Institute
  - Community Action Agencies of Milwaukee-Racine-Kenosha - Walworth
  - Milwaukee Urban League and the Urban Leagues of Racine and Kenosha
  - National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Chapters throughout the Region with Commission staff serving on the Executive Board for the Waukesha and Ozaukee chapters
  - Local colleges and universities - UW-Parkside, Carthage College, Gateway Technical College, Marquette University and UW Milwaukee
  - Regional K-12 school systems - Kenosha Unified School District, Racine Unified School District, Milwaukee Public Schools
  - United Way (each regional offices)
  - Latino Enterprise Network of Southeastern Wisconsin, Inc. (LEN), with their 1st Unbox Summit
  - National Black MBA Association (NBMBAA)
  - Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers (MSFW)/United Migrant Opportunity Services (UMOS)

In 2019, SEWRPC staffed a booth at the National League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) Conference in Milwaukee. This event allowed SEWRPC to recruit possible future minority staff and educate the attendees about regional transportation and land use.
• **Public Health (Children and Family)**
  The Commission continued to work on a multi-year, multi-disciplinary effort to address the environmental conditions impacting children and family health by providing information about the importance of transportation and housing planning to groups engaged in the Social Determinants of Health effort. In this effort, the Commission worked with:

  - Federally Qualified Community Health Centers in the Southeastern WI Region
  - Lindsay Heights Neighborhood Health Alliance
  - Racine County Family Resource Network
  - Lifecourse Initiatives for Healthy Families (LIHF) through the United Way of Milwaukee and Waukesha
  - Lifecourse Initiatives for Healthy Families (LIHF) through the Racine and Kenosha Community Action Agency – specifically with the annual Baby Expo, due to the high infant mortality rate in that area
  - United Way (in all seven counties)
  - YWCA of Southeast Wisconsin
  - Renew Environmental Public Health Advocates (REPHA)

• **Sustainable Communities and Quality of Life Enhancement for Seniors, Veterans and Women & Children**
  The Commission networks with organizations and engages in activities that address efforts relative to building sustainable communities and enhancing the quality of community life. This effort involves with:

  - Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC) (for all seven counties)
  - Wisconsin Department of Veterans Affairs - Women in Action
  - The Wisconsin Veterans Chamber of Commerce
  - Veterans Outreach of Wisconsin
  - TEMPO (Milwaukee, Racine and Waukesha)
  - Urban Ecology Center
  - Fondy Food Center
  - Greening a Greater Racine
  - WISDOM - Racine Interfaith Council (RIC), Citizens United to Serve Humanity (CUSH), Milwaukee Inner City Congregations Allied for Hope (MICAH) and SOPHIA

  ![2019 Tosa Sustainability Summit](image1)
  ![SEWRPC participation with the ADA training workshop](image2)
  ![Wisconsin Veterans Summit, with Tiffany Koehler, Wisconsin Women Veteran State Coordinator](image3)
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- 30th Street Industrial Corridor /Northwest CDC (Milwaukee)
- Association for the Rights of Citizens with handicaps (ARCH) (M)
- Coalition for Community Health Care Inc. (M) Member organizations:
  - Gerald L. Ignace Indian Health Center Health Care for the Homeless
  - Kenosha Community Health
  - Milwaukee Health Services
  - Progressive Community Health Centers Sixteenth Street Community Health Centers
- **Common Ground** (M)
- Community Action Agencies
  - Community Action, Inc. (Walworth, Kenosha & Racine)
  - Racine Kenosha Community Action Agency (Racine & Kenosha)
- **Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition** (M)
  - Member organizations:
    - African American Chamber of Commerce
    - American Indian Chamber of Commerce of Wisconsin The Business Council
    - Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
    - Hmong Wisconsin Chamber of Commerce Multicultural Entrepreneurial Institute
    - Milwaukee Inner City Congregations Allied for Hope The Milwaukee Urban League
    - National Association of Minority Contractors
    - Pan African Community Association
    - Wisconsin Black Chamber of Commerce
    - Wisconsin LGBT Chamber of Commerce
- Family Sharing of Ozaukee County (Grafton)
- Harambee Great Neighborhood Initiative / Riverwest Neighborhood Association / Riverworks Development Corporation
- Hispanic Business and Professional Association / Hispanic Roundtable (Racine)
- **Hmong American Friendship Association (HAFA)** (M)
- HOPES Center (Milwaukee, Racine, and Waukesha)
- **Independence First** (M)
- Kenosha Achievement Center
- La Casa de Esperanza (Waukesha)
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) Member organizations:
  - Clarke Square Harambee
  - Layton Boulevard Lindsay Heights Walnut Way Washington Park
- League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
- **Milwaukee Urban League**
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) (M)
  - Networking groups for aging populations
  - Aging and Disability Resource Center - ADRC (M)
  - Interfaith Older Adult Programs / Caregivers (Milwaukee and Waukesha) Kenosha Area
  - Family and Aging Services (KAFASI)
- Ozaukee Family Services
- Racine County Family Resource Network
- **Renew Environmental Public Health Advocates, Inc. (REPHA)** (Milwaukee)
- Root River Environmental Educational Community Center
- Salvation Army (M)
- Sherman Park Neighborhood Association
- Society’s Assets (M)

*Figure continued on next page.*
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- Social Development Commission (M)
- **Southside Organizing Center (SOC)** (Milwaukee)
- The Threshold, Inc. (Washington)
- United Migrant Opportunity Services (UMOS) (M)
- United Way (M)
- Urban Ecology Center Milwaukee locations:
  - Menomonee Valley
  - Riverside Park
  - Washington Park
- **Urban Economic Development Association of Wisconsin (UEDA)** (M)
- **Urban League of Racine and Kenosha**
- Southeastern Wisconsin Veterans’ Affairs (M)
- Visioning a Greater Racine
- Walworth County Community Alliance
- Wisconsin Green Muslims
- WISDOM (M) Member organizations:
  - Congregations United to Serve Humanity (CUSH) (Kenosha)
  - Milwaukee Inner City Congregations Allied for HOPE (MICAH) (Milwaukee) Racine
  - Interfaith Coalition (Racine)
  - SOPHIA (Waukesha)
- YWCA (M)
EXHIBIT F-4
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND OUTREACH SUMMARY: 2020
This exhibit summarizes the public involvement and outreach activities carried out during the first three months of 2020, including the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, with respect to 1) SEWRPC-sponsored public informational workshops, meetings, and hearings and 2) public involvement efforts directed to targeted population groups.

**SEWRPC Public Involvement and Outreach staffing**

In 2020, the Public Involvement and Outreach division included two full-time staff and one part-time staff. During that time, staff engaged in many hours of direct and recurring contact as reflected in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listing of Staff Outreach Hours for the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission: 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2020 outreach primarily focused on VISION 2050 update and included specific outreach targeted at population subgroups. The outreach mentioned above includes workshops with community partner organizations, publications, letters to primary organizations, presentations to community groups, and exhibits at community events.

**SEWRPC Sponsored Public Informational Workshops, Meeting and Hearings**

Public meetings and additional contacts with groups and individuals offered opportunities for the Public Involvement and Outreach Division to provide presentations, engage in educational and networking opportunities, and conduct briefings about Commission activities in 2020, as outlined below. Larger collaborative efforts are described in this report’s organizational networking and partnership section.

- One personalized letter distributed in February to each of the leaders of 75+ primary organizations representing minority and low-income residents of the Region. The letters provided information about the upcoming second round of public involvement for the VISION 2050 Review and Update and offered opportunities to meet individually with Commission staff and/or participate in the VISION 2050 process.

- In March, due to COVID-19 and the Safer at Home mandate, a portion of the second round of public involvement for the VISION 2050 Review and Update had to be done virtually. Specifically, Commission staff utilized GoToMeeting for two public meetings (March 31 during the day and April 1 in the evening) and posted it on YouTube for future viewing. Email communication and personal phone calls were done to the nine community partners and to leaders of primary organizations representing minority and low-income residents throughout the Region.

- Fourteen paid advertisements were published to newspapers of record to announce the VISION 2050 public workshops to gather input on the Review and Update.

- The SEWRPC Environmental Justice Task Force met once in February to review VISION 2050 update materials, and other SEWRPC initiatives.

- SEWRPC staff conducted meetings in February specifically for regional elected officials to gain a better understanding of VISION 2050 and other SEWRPC-related projects.
Staffed five exhibits at community events, serving minority and low-income residents related specifically to transportation, housing, sustainability, and environmental issues. Exhibits included VISION 2050 and related Commission materials for attendees at the Milwaukee Fair Housing Summit, the Fox River Summit, the National Association of Minority Contractors’ Golden Shovel Expo, URBANO: A Hispanic Milwaukee Development Conference, and Kenosha Home and Health Expo.

In preparation for the second round of public involvement of the VISION 2050 Review and Update, partnership continued with the nine VISION 2050 partner nonprofit community organizations, which include the Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition, Hmong American Friendship Association, Independence First, Milwaukee Urban League, Southside Organizing Committee, Urban Economic Development Association, Urban League of Racine and Kenosha, Common Ground and Renew Environmental Public Health Advocates.

Public Involvement and Outreach Efforts Targeted to Selected Population Groups
Substantial work efforts are undertaken annually to engage members of specific population subgroups that, despite efforts to recruit the general public and its constituents, traditionally have had lower levels of participation than the population in regional planning activities and events. These efforts by SEWRPC were directed to over 75 specific population subgroups referred to as primary organizations, which are reviewed by the Environmental Justice Task Force, and are reflected in Figure 3. The nine community partners are also included in the primary organizations list and denoted with bold text.

There were 53 direct contacts made with community organizations and leaders in 2020, pre-COVID-19 pandemic—almost all of which serve minority and low-income populations. A portion of the direct contacts serve primarily transportation and environmental interests. The direct contacts include 45 recurring contacts and 8 new contacts. Contacts include meetings and activities that were held with individuals (one-on-one meetings), small group discussions, resource tables at special events, and activities sponsored by formal organizational entities. Recurring contacts are meetings and/or activities with organizations that have multiple activities the Commission is involved with throughout the year.

In carrying out its targeted outreach efforts, the Commission engages in extensive partnership-building activities. In addition to the targeted activities noted above, 2020 activities included the following:

- **Urban Economic Development Association**
  Commission public outreach staff participated on a number of UEDA working committees, including the UEDA Board of Directors.

- **Neighborhood and Community Economic Development**
  In 2015, all seven counties approved the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) developed by the Regional Economic Partnership (REP), Milwaukee7, Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation (WEDC), and SEWRPC. The CEDS is designed to bring together the public and private sectors to develop a strategic plan to diversify and strengthen the Region’s economy. Adoption of the CEDS by a County Board makes county and local governments in the county with economically distressed areas eligible to apply for grants under EDA Public Works and Economic Adjustment programs, provided the grant project would benefit the distressed area.
The Commission networks with organizations and engages in activities that address neighborhood and community economic development issues. This effort includes ongoing interaction with:

- Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC-Milwaukee)
- Commercial Corridors Consortium in Milwaukee
- Business Improvement Districts (BIDS) throughout the Region
- Economic development organizations such as the Kenosha Area Business Alliance (KABA), Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce (MMAC), M7, Ozaukee Economic Development (OED), Racine County Economic Development Corporation (RCEDC), Racine Area Manufacturers and Commerce (RAMAC) Walworth County Economic Development Association (WCEDA), Elkhorn Economic Development Association (EEDA), Economic Development Washington County (EDWC) and Waukesha County Business Alliance (WCBA)
- United Neighborhood Centers of Milwaukee, 2nd annual summit
- Independence **First** Housing for all workshop
- Visioning a Greater Racine – Transportation WAVE team

The goal with each organization is sharing regional plan transportation, land use, and housing recommendations and discussing how those matters relate to the local economy and regional economic development.

**Workforce Development and Employment**
The Commission networks with organizations and engages in activities that address workforce development and employment issues. This effort includes:

- Social Development Commission (SDC);
- Urban League of Milwaukee and Urban League of Racine and Kenosha,
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Chapters throughout the Region;
- Workforce Development Centers within the Southeastern Wisconsin Region.

**Environmental Education and Outreach**
As with SEWRPC’s housing, land use, and transportation planning work, the Commission’s environmental planning work is integrated into public involvement and outreach activities. As part of the VISION 2050 public outreach presentations and exhibits mentioned previously, SEWRPC staffed exhibit tables with VISION 2050 and environmental planning materials at the following events:

- Southeastern Wisconsin Watersheds Trust, Inc.
- Clean Rivers, Clean Lake Conference
- Fox River Summit

SEWRPC continued partnership-building science education activities include Commission participation in the Kenosha School of Technology Enhanced Curriculum (KTEC) Science Fair, Testing the Waters with Riveredge in Ozaukee and Washington counties, the annual Racine EcoFest and the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee Freshwater Sciences school.
• **Education and Career Development for Communities of Color**
  The Commission networks with organizations and engages in activities focusing on building community leadership and developing organizational capacity for communities of color. This effort includes the following entities:
  - African American Leadership Group
  - Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition
  - League of United Latin American Citizen (LULAC) – Commission Staff serves a co-chair for Environmental/Economic Empowerment/Health committee for Local #320
  - Urban League of Milwaukee and Urban League of Racine and Kenosha,
  - National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Chapters throughout the Region;
  - United Way (each regional offices)
  - National Black MBA Association (NBMBAA),

During 2020, information was provided on housing, transportation, land use, and environmental issues, as well as the VISION 2050 updates and amendments and the Regional Chloride study.

• **Public Health (Children and Family)**
  The Commission continued to work on a multi-year, multi-disciplinary effort to address the environmental conditions impacting children and family health by providing information about the importance of transportation and housing planning to groups engaged in the Social Determinants of Health effort.

As part of this effort, during Round 1 of the 2020 update to VISION 2050, participants were asked to give feedback about their greatest concerns regarding public health. (See chart below)
In this effort, the Commission worked with:

- Federally Qualified Community Health Center
- Lindsay Heights Neighborhood Health Alliance
- Racine County Family Resource Network
- United Way (in all seven counties)

There was also a presentation of VISION 2050 planned for March with the South East Wisconsin Public Health professionals, with a goal to find ways that the Regional Departments of Health and Human Services could work with SEWRPC. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, it was postponed.

- **Sustainable Communities and Quality of Life Enhancement for Seniors, Veterans and Women & Children**

  The Commission networks with organizations and engages in activities that address efforts relative to building sustainable communities and enhancing the quality of community life. This effort involves with:

  - Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC) Board (for all seven counties);
  - The Wisconsin Veterans Chamber of Commerce
  - African American Veterans of Wisconsin
  - Veterans Outreach of Wisconsin
  - Urban Ecology Center
  - WE GOT THIS!
  - Fondy Food Center
  - WATERshed for Racine and Kenosha
  - Greening a Greater Racine
  - WISDOM

  » Racine Interfaith Council (RIC), Citizens United to Serve Humanity (CUSH), Milwaukee Inner City Congregations Allied for Hope (MICAH), SOPHIA
**Figure 2**
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- Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC) (M)
- Clarke Square Neighborhood Initiative
- **Common Ground** (M)
- Eras Senior Network (Waukesha)
- **Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition member organizations** (M):
  - African American Chamber of Commerce
  - American Indian Chamber of Commerce of Wisconsin
  - Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
  - Hmong Wisconsin Chamber of Commerce
  - Multicultural Entrepreneurial Institute
  - Milwaukee Inner City Congregations Allied for Hope
  - Milwaukee Urban League
  - National Association of Minority Contractors
  - Pan African Community Association
  - The Business Council
  - Wisconsin Black Chamber of Commerce
  - Wisconsin LGBT Chamber of Commerce
- Harambee Great Neighborhood Initiative
- Hispanic Business and Professional Association (Racine)
- Hispanic Collaborative (Milwaukee)
- Hispanic Roundtable (Racine)
- **Hmong American Friendship Association (HAFA)** (M)
- **Independence First** (M)
- Interfaith Caregivers of Ozaukee County
- Interfaith Caregivers of Washington County
- Kenosha Achievement Center
- Kenosha Area Family and Aging Services (KAFASI)
- Kenosha Community Health Center
- Kenosha County Veterans Services
- La Casa de Esperanza (Waukesha)
- Layton Boulevard West Neighbors
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)
- League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
- **Milwaukee Urban League**
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) (M)
- Ozaukee Family Services
- Racine County Family Resource Network
- Racine Kenosha Community Action Agency (Racine & Kenosha)
- **Renew Environmental Public Health Advocates, Inc. (REPHA)** (Milwaukee)
- Riverwest Neighborhood Association/Riverworks Development Corporation
- Root River Environmental Educational Community Center
- Sherman Park Community Association
- Sixteenth Street Community Health Centers
- Social Development Commission (Milwaukee)
- Society’s Assets (M)
- **Southside Organizing Center (SOC)** (Milwaukee)
- The Threshold, Inc. (Washington)
- United Migrant Opportunity Services (UMOS) (M)

*Figure continued on next page.*
• United Way (M)
• Urban Ecology Center
• **Urban Economic Development Association of Wisconsin (UEDA)** (M)
• **Urban League of Racine and Kenosha**
• Visioning a Greater Racine
• Walnut Way Conservation Corporation
• Walworth County Community Alliance
• Washington Park Partners
• We Got This (Milwaukee)
• Wisconsin Green Muslims
• Wisconsin Veterans Chamber of Commerce
• Wisconsin Department of Veterans Affairs
• WISDOM (M) member organizations:
  ∘ Congregations United to Serve Humanity (CUSH) (Kenosha)
  ∘ Milwaukee Inner-city Congregations Allied for Hope (MICAH) (Milwaukee)
  ∘ Racine Interfaith Coalition (Racine)
  ∘ SOPHIA (Waukesha)
• YWCA Southeast Wisconsin (M)
INTRODUCTION

This exhibit documents the continued practices and procedures of the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) regarding the openmess and accessibility of all programs and materials, particularly to individuals in Southeastern Wisconsin that are considered to be limited English proficient (LEP)—having a limited ability to read, write, speak, or understand English. Specifically, this exhibit includes a detailed examination of the LEP population and its needs in Southeastern Wisconsin, based on guidance developed by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and a monitoring of LEP activity conducted by the Commission.

This exhibit serves as a review and update to the LEP four-factor analysis and LEP accommodation plan developed and included in the Commission’s 2017 Title VI Program. Much of the background for the LEP four-factor analysis and the framework for the LEP plan contained in the 2017 LEP analysis and plan was derived from a document entitled, “Meeting the Regional Planning Information Needs of Southeastern Wisconsin Residents Having Limited English Language Proficiency”, which was last updated in 2016. The development of this document was based on guidance developed in 2001 by U.S. DOT for recipients of U.S. DOT funding to provide special language services to LEP people in response to Executive Order 13166 related to improving access to services for people with limited English proficiency. Following the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) issuing updated LEP guidance based on public comment and a clarifying memorandum issued by the Assistant Attorney General, the U.S. DOT issued revised LEP guidance entitled, “Policy Guidelines Concerning Recipient Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons,” Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, dated December 14, 2005, hereafter referred to simply as “guidance.” The revised guidance requires conducting a four-factor analysis to determine the level of assistance required to provide meaningful access. These documents were referenced by Commission staff while conducting this four-factor analysis and accommodation plan.

This exhibit serves two principal functions and consists of two parts. The first part is an updated assessment of the LEP population in Southeastern Wisconsin, and of the regional transportation planning and programming efforts and associated public participation activities conducted by the Commission relating to LEP people. The evaluation includes an LEP needs assessment based upon the “Four-Factor
Analysis” framework provided in the Federal guidance to assist in determining the appropriate level of language assistance to be employed by the Commission in its regional planning and programming efforts for the LEP population in Southeastern Wisconsin to attempt to ensure that their language needs are not inadvertently overlooked. The evaluation includes an assessment of the characteristics of the LEP population in Southeastern Wisconsin, of previous encounters with LEP people during the Commission’s planning and programming efforts, of the nature and relevance of the Commission’s planning and programming work to LEP people and the resources available to the Commission to provide language assistance to LEP people. In the spirit of sound planning, considerable attention is devoted here to matters of inventory and analysis—of the requirements set forth, prospective LEP population needs, Commission experiences providing such assistance, outcomes and applications, and the context relevant to regional planning.

The second part of this exhibit constitutes the Commission’s LEP plan describing the measures used by the Commission to ensure meaningful opportunities for LEP people to access and participate in future regional planning and programming programs efforts relevant to them.

The discussion that follows provides the vision and framework for continuing implementation of LEP policy steps. This discussion is important, because the document as a whole examines the guidance and discusses past examples of how the Commission has met LEP needs—while it also applies this context to help refine recommendations for future efforts. For example, the Commission staff recently employed—in addition to its regular public involvement and outreach and LEP activities—enhanced measures to engage the Region’s residents, including the LEP population, as part of developing VISION 2050—the year 2050 regional land use and transportation plan completed in 2016, and most recently updated in 2020. This included partnering with nine community organizations serving and representing minority populations, low-income populations, and people with disabilities in conducting workshops at key stages during the development of VISION 2050. The nine community partners included one organization serving Hispanic populations in Milwaukee County—the Southside Organizing Center—and one organization serving Hmong populations in Milwaukee County—the Hmong American Friendship Association. Based on the Commission’s experiences with outreach to LEP populations as part of developing VISION 2050, and other past planning efforts, meaningful and reasonable outreach steps will continue to be explored and used for current and future planning efforts.

The Commission has worked to overcome a perceived foreign language and cultural barrier for at least a decade preceding the first LEP guidance prepared by U.S. DOT published in 2001. The principles of application are as follows:

- Language groups of Southeast Asian origin should be further pursued; but this will need to surmount additional challenges. The technique of employing non-threatening survey interviewers of the same culture and language as the beneficiary group (interviewees) worked with moderate success in the Hispanic community. But it did not perform nearly so well among those of Hmong descent. The subtle variations of primarily Latin American Spanish do not appear comparable to the differences in dialects originally created by the isolated mountain ranges of Laos and adjoining Southeast Asian countries.

- Demographically, the pattern of linguistic isolation among people of Asian and Pacific Island origin was changing during the 1990s and 2000s in Southeastern Wisconsin. Though individual LEP requests will be considered important regardless of trends, the number of households of Asian and Pacific Island heritages that were not linguistically isolated nearly doubled between 1990 and 2000—while the number experiencing linguistic isolation grew by 50 percent. A comparison of 2000 census data to 2011-2015 five year ACS data indicates a 65 percent growth in households of Asian and Pacific Island heritages not linguistically isolated and a 21 percent growth in households of Asian and Pacific Island heritages experiencing linguistic isolation. This signals, at least in part, an acculturation process and community infrastructure that should be proportionately better today at meeting internal translation needs. (By contrast, a similar comparison of 2000 census data to 2011-2015 five-year ACS data shows a 40 percent growth in linguistic isolation among Spanish-speaking households while those households speaking Spanish and not linguistically isolated grew by 25 percent.)
FOUR-FACTOR ANALYSIS

This section documents the update to the “Four-Factor Analysis” based on the 2005 U.S. DOT guidance. That 2005 guidance provides additional direction for conducting the LEP needs assessment based upon four analysis factors:

- **Factor 1:** The number and proportion of LEP people served or encountered in the eligible service population
- **Factor 2:** The frequency with which LEP individuals come into contact with your programs, activities, and services
- **Factor 3:** The importance to LEP people of your program, activities, and services
- **Factor 4:** The resources available to the recipient and costs

**Factor 1: The Number and Proportion of LEP People Served or Encountered in the Eligible Service Population**

This section includes an evaluation of the LEP population in Southeastern Wisconsin. This section also includes a review and evaluation of the LEP people encountered during recent and past regional planning efforts conducted by the Commission, including the regional land use and transportation plan – VISION 2050. This is done to identify higher concentrations of LEP people among the numerous languages spoken in Southeastern Wisconsin, and to identify the appropriate language services to provide to such individuals.

Estimates of the number of people over the age of five within the seven-county Southeastern Wisconsin Region that have a limited English proficiency by their spoken language were obtained from the 2011-2015 and 2014-2018 U.S. Census five year American Community Survey (ACS) data. The number of people within the seven counties in the Region and the Region itself that identified themselves as having limited English proficiency—the ability to speak English at a level less than “very well”—on the 2014-2018 five year ACS data is provided in Table 1 and on Map 1. At this time, the Census Bureau has not provided updates to the data shown in Tables 2 through 4, and therefore, these tables utilize 2011-2015 ACS data. Table 2 provides the number of LEP people within the Region by their spoken language. Table 3 provides the number of LEP people within Milwaukee County—the county within Southeastern Wisconsin with the highest number of LEP people—by their spoken language.

The Spanish speaking LEP population throughout the Region and its counties remains the predominant language group numerically in terms of potential LEP needs, representing 2.8 percent of the total population of the Region. Map 2 shows the census tracts where the Spanish-speaking LEP people exceed the Regional average. The concentration of Spanish speaking LEP people are highest in Milwaukee County—which has the highest concentration of LEP people within the Region—at 4.1 percent of the population age five and over. Other Indo-European languages, comprising the next largest LEP grouping, are quite fragmented in terms of discrete languages spoken. Thus, a very small percent of the population regionally or by counties would be speaking any particular LEP Indo-European language. For example, the largest such sub-grouping is German speaking LEP people in the Region which comprised 0.1 percent of the County’s population age five or older. With respect to Milwaukee County, the highest sub-grouping of Indo-European languages other than Spanish is Russian which comprised 0.1 percent of the Region’s population age 5 or older. The third largest LEP grouping is Asian and Pacific Islander languages, of which the Hmong subgroup is the largest representing 0.2 percent of the Region’s population age five or older. In Milwaukee County, Hmong LEP people comprised 0.3 percent of the County population age five and over and potentially merit attention for LEP needs, particularly within Milwaukee County. Map 3 shows those census tracts where LEP people speaking Asian and Pacific Islander languages exceed the regional average of 0.8 percent.

The 2011-2015 ACS also identifies the number of “linguistically isolated” households within the Region and its counties based on no one over the age of 14 speaking English “very well.” This subset of the LEP population is of particular concern as the individuals residing in such households may face significant language barriers as there may not be a minor or adult relative who has the ability to provide English translation assistance. Further, the individuals in such households may be unable to understand or participate in the planning and
### Table 1
**People with Limited English Proficiency (LEP): 2014-2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Speaking Only English</th>
<th>Speaking Languages Other Than English</th>
<th>Total People</th>
<th>LEP&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; People</th>
<th>Total People</th>
<th>LEP&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; People</th>
<th>Total People</th>
<th>LEP&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; People</th>
<th>Total People</th>
<th>LEP&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; People</th>
<th>Total People</th>
<th>LEP&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; People</th>
<th>Total People</th>
<th>LEP&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; People</th>
<th>Total People</th>
<th>LEP&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>158,447</td>
<td>140,399</td>
<td>Speaking Spanish</td>
<td>12,867</td>
<td>4,471</td>
<td>3,332</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>18,048</td>
<td>6,220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>887,569</td>
<td>738,787</td>
<td>Speaking Indo-European Languages</td>
<td>92,369</td>
<td>36,436</td>
<td>23,298</td>
<td>7,280</td>
<td>23,917</td>
<td>11,449</td>
<td>9,198</td>
<td>3,042</td>
<td>148,782</td>
<td>58,207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaukee</td>
<td>83,785</td>
<td>79,157</td>
<td>Speaking Asian and Pacific Islander Languages</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4,628</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>183,330</td>
<td>167,107</td>
<td>Speaking Other Non-English Languages</td>
<td>11,986</td>
<td>4,078</td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>16,223</td>
<td>5,103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth</td>
<td>97,694</td>
<td>87,981</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,735</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9,713</td>
<td>4,189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>127,363</td>
<td>122,366</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4,997</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha</td>
<td>378,381</td>
<td>351,288</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,261</td>
<td>3,222</td>
<td>9,768</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>6,322</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>27,093</td>
<td>7,421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>1,916,569</td>
<td>1,687,085</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>138,978</td>
<td>52,981</td>
<td>44,036</td>
<td>12,197</td>
<td>34,898</td>
<td>15,290</td>
<td>11,572</td>
<td>3,617</td>
<td>229,484</td>
<td>84,085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> People age five and older having identified an ability to speak English at a level less than very well.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census American Community Survey and SEWRPC.
Map 1

1 DOT REPRESENTS 5 PEOPLE
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- SPEAKING INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES
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- SPEAKING OTHER NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGES

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census American Community Survey and SEWRPC
### Table 2
Number of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) People by Their Language Spoken in the Region: 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Total Speaking Language</th>
<th>LEP People(^a)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total Population(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>136,403</td>
<td>56,128</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>11,503</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>6,032</td>
<td>3,370</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>5,516</td>
<td>2,297</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>10,824</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3,222</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td>3,697</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Includes individual languages spoken by at least 1,000 LEP persons.

\(^a\) People age five and older having identified an ability to speak English at a level less than very well.

\(^b\) The total used for percent calculations is the number of people in the Region age five and older.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census American Community Survey and SEWRPC

### Table 3
Number of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) People by Their Language Spoken in Milwaukee County: 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Total Speaking Language</th>
<th>LEP People(^a)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total Population(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>101,970</td>
<td>35,806</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages of Asia</td>
<td>6,418</td>
<td>4,288</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>6,392</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3,694</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3,443</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>5,233</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td>2,314</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) People age five and older having identified an ability to speak English at a level less than very well.

\(^b\) The total used for percent calculations is the number of people in the Region age five and older.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census American Community Survey and SEWRPC

### Table 4
Household Linguistic Isolation in Southeastern Wisconsin by County and Language Group: 2011-2015\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Linguistically Isolated Households</th>
<th>Households Isolated by Non-English Language Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>62,330</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>381,715</td>
<td>13,779</td>
<td>8,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaukee</td>
<td>34,543</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>75,183</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth</td>
<td>39,648</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>52,897</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha</td>
<td>154,991</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>801,307</td>
<td>18,702</td>
<td>11,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) A household in which all members 14 years old and over speak a non-English language and also speak English less than very well (have difficulty with English) is linguistically isolated.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census American Community Survey and SEWRPC
Map 2
Concentrations of LEP Populations Speaking Spanish in the Region: 2014-2018

CENSUS TRACTS WHEREIN THE PERCENTAGE OF LEP PEOPLE SPEAKING SPANISH EXCEEDS THE REGIONAL AVERAGE OF 2.8 PERCENT BASED ON THE 2014-2018 U.S. CENSUS AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY

- **FEWER THAN 100 LEP PEOPLE**
- **100-199 LEP PEOPLE**
- **200-299 LEP PEOPLE**
- **300 OR MORE LEP PEOPLE**

Note: Areas in white are comprised of census tracts wherein the percentage of LEP people speaking Spanish is less than or equal to the regional average of 2.8 percent.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census American Community Survey and SEWRPC
Map 3
Concentrations of LEP Populations Speaking Asian and Pacific Islander Languages in the Region: 2014-2018

CENSUS TRACTS WHEREIN THE PERCENTAGE OF LEP PEOPLE SPEAKING ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER LANGUAGES EXCEEDS THE REGIONAL AVERAGE OF 0.8 PERCENT BASED ON THE 2014-2018 U.S. CENSUS AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY

FEWER THAN 100 LEP PEOPLE
100-199 LEP PEOPLE
200-299 LEP PEOPLE
300 OR MORE LEP PEOPLE

Note: Areas in white are comprised of census tracts wherein the percentage of LEP people speaking Asian and Pacific Islander languages is less than or equal to the regional average of 0.8 percent.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census American Community Survey and SEWRPC
programming efforts conducted by the Commission. Table 4 shows that there were 18,702 households, or
2.3 percent of the Region’s households, linguistically isolated based on the 2011-2015 ACS five-year data.
Map 4 shows the distribution of linguistically isolated households in the Region. Such isolation ranges from
a low of 0.4 percent of the total households in Washington County to a high of 3.6 percent in Milwaukee
County. By comparison, there were 19,491 households or 2.4 percent regionally, linguistically isolated in
2014, 16,182 households or 2.2 percent regionally, linguistically isolated in 2000, and 11,039 households,
or 1.6 percent regionally, linguistically isolated in 1990. As in the previous decade, a significant majority of
the growth in linguistically isolated households is in Spanish-speaking households, which comprise 11,506
households, or 62 percent of the 18,702 linguistically isolated households in the Region. Regionally, 1.4
percent of the households are linguistically isolated households speaking Spanish. Map 5 shows those
census tracts where linguistically isolated Spanish-speaking households exceed the regional average.

Evaluation of Recent and Past Interaction with LEP People

A principal concern of the Commission regarding measures of public participation relates to the size and
location of LEP populations, as well as the level of interest. It is unquestionable that all communities within the
Region (including LEP “communities”) are affected by Commission programs and activities. Except perhaps
for Community Assistance Planning and other localized efforts, however, regional planning tends to lack
immediacy or is seldom “close enough to the scene” to generate widespread public interest. The Commission
has thus worked extensively with local officials, broadly representative advisory committees, interest groups,
and public agency staff. It has also attempted to inform and involve potentially interested citizens.

To increase interest and participation in regional planning within Southeastern Wisconsin’s LEP communities,
the Commission staff has incorporated the language, goals, and approaches from the LEP plan as part of its
local, county, and regional transportation planning efforts, including VISION 2050.

The following sections include a discussion of recent efforts by the Commission to ensure reasonable access
to regional planning processes by people with limited English proficiency. The specific examples described
below include the travel surveys and the workshops with nine community partner organizations, including
those that represent LEP people, throughout the 2020 Review and Update of VISION 2050 process.

Interaction with LEP Populations During Travel Surveys

Waukesha Area Transit Plan Survey of Families and Students in the Waukesha Public School District

In coordination with the Waukesha Public School District, Commission staff administered an online survey
between March 5, 2020, and March 18, 2020. The survey was offered in English and Spanish. If the individual
taking the survey preferred to continue in Spanish, there was a prompt at the beginning in Spanish that
took them to the Spanish translation of the full survey. The Spanish translation was provided by School
District staff. Invitations to participate in the survey were distributed by the Waukesha Public School District
through email to the approximately 12,000 families in the district. There were a total 1,054 respondents to
the survey, although not all respondents answered every question. The survey included a series of questions
for parents and guardians and a similar but separate series of questions for students. The student questions
focused on transit use for school trips. The survey questions for parents and guardians included questions
related to transit use for their school-aged children and questions about personal travel utilizing Waukesha
Metro Transit or Waukesha County Transit. Approximately 25 percent of the respondents were students
and 75 percent of the respondents were parents or guardians. The results from the survey were utilized to
develop potential alternatives for the Waukesha Area Transit Development Plan.

Milwaukee Streetcar Survey

In order to validate The Hop automatic passenger counters and to determine the ridership profile of users
of The Hop, SEWRPC and City of Milwaukee staff conducted a ridership survey on The Hop over three days,
October 22-24, 2019. Riders were counted boarding and alighting the streetcar at every stop, and survey
staff made an attempt to hand out survey forms to each of the passengers on every trip even if they had
previously filled out a form on an earlier trip. The mail-back survey form asked questions regarding locations
of origin, destination and home addresses, and other demographic and ridership information. Golf pencils
were available for passengers to fill out the form on the streetcar and return it immediately; Survey forms
could also be completed after the trip and be mailed back. Information was provided in Spanish, Hmong,
and Arabic that indicated how to access additional information about the survey.
Map 4
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Household Travel Survey

Several Commission surveys during 2011 and 2012 designed to determine travel origin and destination patterns within the Region can be described as proactive regarding LEP people and linguistically isolated household participation. These comprehensive travel surveys provide essential information for developing a travel demand model, which is used to help determine existing and future transportation needs and for developing and evaluating alternative long-range regional land use and transportation plans, such as VISION 2050.

The Household Travel Survey began with a telephone or on-line prequalification (households willing to complete the survey). These were selected on the basis of random selection of a household address from a set of household addresses for the Region to ensure a statistically valid, and therefore representative, sample group. This set of address information for the Region also included known phone numbers for some but not all, of the addresses. If a randomly selected household had a phone number associated with it, an initial contact would be attempted using the phone. After satisfactory connection, survey staff online would transfer the call to available survey staff fluent in Spanish or if Spanish speaking staff were not available, survey staff online would “flag” the number just dialed for callback by survey staff fluent in Spanish if the answering party (or others in the household) did not speak English well enough to proceed, and the language spoken appeared to be Spanish. This allowed for prequalification to occur, and a Spanish language version of the survey could then be completed via phone, e-mail, or U.S. mail. For those addresses without a valid phone number, a letter was mailed to the address that directed the household located at the address, in both English and Spanish, to indicate their willingness to participate in the survey either by phone or through the survey website, which had both English and Spanish versions.

For the Commission’s Onboard Bus Survey, both English and Spanish language versions of the survey were available. Survey administrators were trained to hand riders the Spanish language version if that was the apparent language being spoken and English was not effective.

For the Commission’s External Travel Survey, both English and Spanish language versions of the survey were available. Survey administrators were trained to hand motorists the Spanish language version if that was the apparent language being spoken and English was not effective.

The broader applications as related to meeting LEP person needs are as follows:

- Travel surveys are important to the Commission in determining peoples’ behavior, which is one of the most reliable means of defining trends and helping to forecast future transportation needs. Research also correlates behavioral practice with underlying values and attitudes, i.e., preferences. Thus, properly designed surveys may be expected to accurately and objectively provide public participation in the planning process. That step is extremely valuable in terms of defining the best set of recommendations based upon representative needs and desires, including LEP people.

- The telephone prequalification and Spanish language follow-up in the 2011 Household Travel Survey marked an improvement in LEP person and linguistically isolated household participation compared to a similar survey in 2001. These steps in broadening access helped address changing demographics in the Region and emerging LEP guidance by DOT. As such, this approach will be continued in the future, despite some unavoidable difficulties discussed below.

- Within the LEP and linguistically isolated Hispanic community, there is some apprehension regarding contact with a governmental agency. This, in part, is tied to concerns about immigration status, as well as some general distrust. These observations correlate directly with the findings of a study involving immigrant agricultural workers in Manitowoc County conducted by UW-Extension in 2000 (The Latino Focus: An Assessment Process, 2002). That study used an Hispanic female as a non-threatening means of contact. Apprehensions likely will depress LEP participation rates; and it is unrealistic to expect that these households would routinely call back a government agency on their own.

- Though continuing or expanding the above outreach is imperfect, it performs better and more accurately than reliance upon simple feedback, whether the latter is generated by solicitation for
public meeting-type events or via inquiry by an individual. Commission preparations for meeting individual LEP needs or requests will still occur, but there is little evidence to conclude that it can be representative.

**Interaction with LEP Populations During Public Involvement and Outreach**

**VISION 2050**

The Commission conducted a visioning and scenario planning process emphasizing public involvement and outreach, including to LEP populations, to develop VISION 2050—the year 2050 regional land use and transportation plan for the Southeastern Wisconsin Region, and its 2020 Review and Update. The public involvement and outreach activities conducted in developing VISION 2050 were designed to establish a shared long-range vision for future land use and transportation development that is understood and embraced by the Region’s residents. It involved extensive public outreach to obtain residents’ input—including input from the LEP populations—at each step of the process, as well as expanding public knowledge on the implications of existing and future land use and transportation development in the Region. Specifically, the outreach included a regularly distributed VISION 2050 e-newsletter, periodic brochures (translated into Spanish), media contacts and news releases (including to Spanish-language newspapers), and extensive outreach to minority and low-income groups and organizations (including those representing LEP populations), business groups, service groups, community and neighborhood groups, environmental groups, and others.

The outreach to the public also included five rounds of interactive workshops held in each of the seven counties at key stages of the process to provide information on, and obtain input into, the development of VISION 2050. The workshops were designed to be interactive and engage participants to obtain their feedback in nontraditional ways. The materials prepared for the meetings were designed to be more understandable to the general public by using more direct and understandable language, avoiding technical words, and using more graphics and illustrations to assist in visualization of the data and concepts presented. Feedback from the participants was facilitated through various techniques, such as round-table discussions, SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) exercises, and interactive polls.

In addition to the seven county-wide workshops, the Commission partnered with eight community organizations that serve and represent minority populations, low-income populations, and people with disabilities to host five workshops for their constituents. Two of the organization partners include LEP people, the Southside Organizing Center and the Hmong American Friendship Association. The Southside Organizing Center represents near south side City of Milwaukee residents, including a large concentration of Hispanic residents, many of whom have limited English proficiency. The Hmong American Friendship Association serves the Hmong populations in Milwaukee County and Southeastern Wisconsin, including Hmong LEP people. Specifically, the partner organizations were responsible for holding each of the five workshops, promoting attendance and encouraging participation at each workshop, and providing reports on the process and results of each workshop.

With respect to the workshops conducted with the Southside Organizing Center, many of the workshop materials were available in Spanish and interpreters were available to assist Spanish-speaking LEP people for materials available in English and workshop activities conducted in English. Participant numbers at these workshops ranged from 10 to 30 residents. The feedback received at these workshops was positive and constructive, and was used to refine the engagement activities in subsequent workshops. The experiences gained and feedback received at these workshops will be considered during the development of public outreach and LEP activities for the Spanish-speaking population in Milwaukee County, and the Region, as part of future planning efforts, as appropriate.

With respect to the workshops conducted with the Hmong American Friendship Association, some of the workshop materials were available in Hmong and, while Hmong interpreters were not available, some of the participants assisted Hmong-speaking LEP people in understanding the materials available and workshop activities conducted in English. Participant numbers at each workshop ranged from 21 to 56 residents. The feedback from these workshops was positive and constructive, and was used to refine the engagement activities in subsequent workshops. Some of the challenges experienced at the workshops included participants having difficulty following materials presented by native English-speaking presenters, visualizing some of the concepts presented, and staying engaged in the earlier workshops. In addition, it was noted that it was difficult to communicate with participants having Laotian ethnicity. The experiences
gained and feedback received at these workshops will be considered during the development of public outreach and LEP activities for the Hmong population in Milwaukee County, and the Region, as part of future planning efforts, as appropriate.

In addition, Commission staff worked with numerous other organizations and groups and individuals throughout the VISION 2050 planning process, including a number of organizations that represent LEP populations. These organizations were given regular updates on the VISION 2050 planning effort, and were requested to encourage constituents to participate in the planning process. While there was some success in getting greater representation of certain populations, such as the African-American population, in participating in the seven-countywide workshops, particularly those in Milwaukee County, it did not appear that there was a noticeable increase in LEP person participation in the workshops beyond those participating in the workshop held by the Southside Organizing Center.

The extensive outreach conducted to LEP populations and feedback received is documented in the Commission’s 2017 Title VI Program. The following information identifies outreach conducted as part of the 2020 Review and Update of VISION 2050.

2020 Review and Update of VISION 2050
Every four years, the Commission conducts an interim review and update of the regional land use and transportation plan, in part to address Federal requirements. The 2020 Review and Update assessed implementation to date of VISION 2050, reviewed the year 2050 forecasts underlying the plan, and monitored current transportation system performance. The review also examined whether it remains reasonable for the recommendations in VISION 2050 to be accomplished over the next 30 years, given the implementation of the plan to date and available and anticipated funding.

Two rounds of public involvement were conducted as part of the interim review and update. Staff conducted the first of two rounds of public involvement for the Review and Update in late 2019. This effort included holding seven public meetings across the Region and obtaining input from the Commission’s nine community partners. The purpose of this first round of public involvement was to share information with the public about how well the various plan elements were being implemented and collect feedback about this progress. Staff also asked for comments on changes, since VISION 2050 was adopted, and what should be considered during the update to the plan’s recommendations. Comments for the first round were accepted through December 20, 2019, and were considered by staff during the preparation of a draft 2020 Review and Update and by the Advisory Committees guiding the Review and Update.

The public meeting on December 12, 2019, in the City of Milwaukee was promoted by the Southside Organizing Center. The sign-in sheet indicates that 14 of the 41 attendees were from the Southside Organizing Center, who publicized the event and arranged for a Spanish language translator to be available. Although the comments were not provided based on affiliation with the Southside Organizing Center, generally, comments from this meeting supporting more transit and biking investments, additional multifamily housing, and utilizing taxes to support transportation investments.

In addition, a meeting on the 2020 Review and Update was coordinated by the Hmong American Friendship Association on December 15, 2020, with 19 participants. Based on feedback during the meeting, participants favored more residential density, including single-family houses on smaller lots and two-family houses. Participants also expressed interest in more funding for transit and protected bike lanes and sidewalks. There were also concerns about distracted driving and speeding with support expressed for red-light cameras, additional stop signs, and increased enforcement. Lastly, there was general support for the use of state taxes for transportation improvements.

Staff conducted the second round of public involvement for the Review and Update in early 2020. This round involved providing an opportunity to learn about and provide feedback on proposed plan changes. Staff also shared information about a funding gap for the recommended transportation system and discussed how the plan would help improve equity across the Region. This round was interrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic and resulted in staff cancelling three of seven planned public open house meetings across the Region and a community conversation. In lieu of the canceled in-person meetings, staff extended the comment period and provided alternative ways for residents to learn about the draft plan update and to provide feedback,
including two virtual meetings, a YouTube video presentation, and an online questionnaire. Comments for the second round were accepted through April 8, 2020, and staff reviewed, summarized, and responded to all comments received. Staff provided them to the Advisory Committees guiding VISION 2050 for review as they continued guiding the Review and Update, and at their April 29th meeting, the Committees approved the draft 2020 Review and Update. The Commission adopted the Review and Update on June 17, 2020.

**Key Conclusions**

The Spanish speaking LEP population throughout the Region and its counties, including census tracts where the LEP population is greater than average, remains the predominant language group numerically in terms of potential LEP needs. The concentration of Spanish speakers is highest in Milwaukee County, for example, at 4.1 percent of the population age five and over. Other Indo-European languages, comprising the next largest LEP grouping in the Region and the third-largest LEP grouping in Milwaukee County, are quite fragmented in terms of discrete languages spoken. Thus, a very small percent of the population regionally or by county would be speaking any particular LEP Indo-European language (0.9 percent in Milwaukee County). For example, the largest such sub-grouping in Milwaukee County is Russian LEP speakers, which comprised 0.2 percent of the County’s population age five and over. The third largest LEP grouping is Asian and Pacific Islander languages, of which the Hmong subgroup is the largest. Milwaukee County reflects a particular concentration of Hmong speakers, for example, which comprised 0.3 percent of the County population age five and over, potentially meriting attention for LEP needs. Demographically, the pattern of linguistic isolation among those of Asian and Pacific Island origin was changing in recent years in Southeastern Wisconsin. Though individual LEP requests will be considered important regardless of trends, the number of households not linguistically isolated despite displaying Asian and Pacific Island heritages grew 65 percent between the 2000 census and the 2011-2015 five year ACS—while the number experiencing linguistic isolation grew by 21 percent. This signals, at least in part, an acculturation process and community infrastructure that should be proportionately better today at meeting internal translation needs. By contrast, there continues to be greater linguistic isolation among Spanish-speaking households as most of the growth in households, 40 percent, occurred in the linguistically isolated category while those households not experiencing linguistic isolation grew by 25 percent. The rate of increase in both the non-linguistically isolated and linguistically isolated categories decreased significantly between the 1990s and 2000s. These trends are expected to continue as new population data are obtained and analyzed.

With respect to recent intersections with the LEP population as part of the Commission’s planning activities, improvements to the accommodations to the LEP people as part of the 2011 Household travel survey—such as telephone prequalification and Spanish-language follow-up—resulted in an improvement in participation of LEP people and linguistically isolated households compared to a similar survey conducted in 2001. As part of developing and updating VISION 2050—the year 2050 regional land use and transportation plan—the Commission partnered with community organizations to promote and hold workshops. The partner organizations included two organizations that, in part, serve LEP populations—the Southside Organizing Center and the Hmong American Friendship Association. The feedback from the participants of these meetings were positive and constructive. In addition, Commission staff worked with numerous other organizations and groups and individuals throughout the VISION 2050 planning and update processes, including a number of organizations that represent LEP populations.

**Factor 2: The Frequency with Which LEP Individuals Come into Contact with Your Programs, Activities, and Services**

As the LEP population is a small proportion of the total population of the Region (4.4 percent based on the 2014-2018 five year ACS data), the level of contact from people of limited English Proficiency is relatively limited. That is, few would personally experience a need for regional planning or seek out the Commission for assistance on a matter perceived as important for their lives. But Commission policy has been, and will remain, to meet any requests in a courteous and effective manner. In addition, as indicated later in this section, the VISION 2050 and 2020 Review and Update processes, including outreach developed in coordination with each of the community partners, presented an opportunity for enhanced interactions with members of the LEP population. Those opportunities have continued as the Commission maintains and enhances the community partner relationships going forward. In response to the positive interactions with the community partners, all eight partners expressed a desire to continue to partner with SEWRPC on future projects. In 2017, an additional community partner was added, Renew Environmental Public Health Advocates, Inc. In addition, the Commission has established goals for the Public Involvement and
Outreach Division, including the goals to increase the amount of time spent in each County by two to five percent, increase contact made with partner organizations, present a biannual update letter to partners, update annual reporting to reflect contact made, and conduct educational outreach. Specifically, the Public Involvement and Outreach Division has a goal to meet with the nine community partners at least four times per year, the primary organizations at least three times per year, and all other partners at least two times per year. Updates on the levels of outreach are provided to the Environmental Justice Task Force and their input is sought regarding new groups or contacts to engage.

Long-range regional planning relates to and helps guide the provision of future transportation services. Commission planning for specific transportation facilities and local transit services, as examples, are thus closer at hand to relieving LEP vulnerabilities. Nevertheless, obtaining and benefiting from direct transportation access via driver licensure, safe and effective navigation of a motor vehicle on highways, or understanding and use of interconnecting bus routes and other transportation alternatives, are the primary concerns for people in Southeastern Wisconsin who do not speak or understand English. This assessment is supported in the U.S. DOT guidance where it discusses potential disparate impact based on national origin with inability to drive a car adversely affecting individuals in the form of lost economic opportunities, social services, and other quality of life pursuits and inability to access public transportation adversely affecting ability to obtain health care, education, and jobs.

Thus, the frequency of Commission contacts with LEP individuals or groups is largely governed by its proactive efforts to establish and cultivate participation via representatives of key populations. Recent contacts with LEP individuals or groups include the following:

- As stated above, there was extensive public outreach for VISION 2050 and the 2020 Review and Update, which included partnering with community organizations serving and representing minority and low-income populations and people with disabilities. The eight partner organizations that were coordinated with during VISION 2050 included: Common Ground, Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition, Hmong American Friendship Association, IndependenceFirst, the Milwaukee Urban League, Southside Organizing Center, Urban Economic Development Association of Wisconsin, and the Urban League of Racine and Kenosha. These partner organizations hosted five of their own workshops, which corresponded with the five sets of workshops open to the general public. In addition to the visioning and scenario planning activities done as part of public workshops, the participants of the workshops sponsored by the partner organizations were specifically asked to identify their transportation needs. Input at these workshops, including the identification of transportation needs, was documented in VISION 2050. A ninth community partner was added in 2018, Renew Environmental Public Health Advocates, Inc. (REPHA), a 501(3)(c) that works on health and safety issues in the City of Milwaukee. The more-targeted outreach by the Commission through its partnerships with these community organizations improved minority participation in the VISION 2050 planning process and the 2020 Update. Specifically, two of the Community organizations, the Hmong American Friendship Association and Southside Organizing Center, provided translators for individuals speaking Hmong and Spanish respectively, at the community workshops. These workshops had participation by LEP individuals who utilized these services. The community workshops were well attended, indicating a general interest in regional issues related to transportation and land use. In general, the comments received during the VISION 2050 development process that were related to how information was being conveyed focused on reducing the amount of text and using more graphics and photos to convey information. Efforts were made during the remainder of the VISION 2050 process and during the 2020 Review and Update process to continue to increase the approachability of different subjects, including by simplifying language and using more graphics. Comments related to plan elements and recommendations given by members of the Region’s LEP population were discussed previously.

- In 2011 and 2012, the Commission conducted a comprehensive travel survey to assist in the reevaluation of the existing regional transportation system plan and to aid in the design of a sixth-generation transportation plan to serve travel needs through the year 2050. The information obtained from the survey was used to estimate the current travel habits and patterns of the population of the Region, identify trends in those travel habits and patterns, and assist in the development of mathematical models to forecast future travel behavior in the Region. The travel
survey consisted of five elements—a household travel survey, a group quartered travel survey, an external travel survey, a public transit travel survey, and a commercial truck survey. Based on the Commission’s LEP plan, language accommodations for Spanish speaking people were provided on the household, public transit, and external travel surveys. In addition, a card written in Hmong was developed for the external travel survey, explaining that language assistance would be provided upon request. The Spanish survey instruments and Spanish speaking staff were not heavily used. There was no interaction with Hmong individuals needing language assistance and no cards were distributed.

- The Commission staff continued its efforts to network within the Hmong community in 2010 by serving on a steering committee to plan an annual conference coordinated by the University of Wisconsin-Extension entitled, “Working Together: Understanding Hmong Culture,” held for the first time in Milwaukee County. The Commission suggested from its area of planning responsibilities three subjects for consideration as session topics: Transportation, notably public transit; housing needs; and natural resource utilization and conflicts. The leadership from and/or working within the Hmong community chose use of natural resources to complement other break-out topics of youth and families, agriculture, and health. The Commission accordingly prepared a natural resources case study for the associated discussion of cultural influences in decision making. Other agenda topics included personal experiences in becoming Hmong-American, decision making in the Hmong culture, and generational and gender differences in Hmong families. The conference topics chosen by the Hmong community support conclusions reached in the LEP plan, and cited focus group research from areas including Milwaukee County, regarding the lack of prominence of transportation among the most pressing Hmong issues. Rather, the other topics noted above, many hinging on respect and cultural disconnects, have been repeated as being important in contacts with the Hmong, as well as in the literature.

- Multiple targeted meetings and regular mailings have occurred, and continue to occur, with leadership from the Hmong American Friendship Association located within Milwaukee’s central city. These meetings and mailings are intended to maintain a channel of communication and inform this organization of possible comment opportunities related to Commission planning activities. As previously indicated, the Commission partnered with the Hmong American Friendship Association, as one of the community partners, as part of developing VISION 2050 and the 2020 Review and Update. The workshops were relatively well attended by members of the Hmong community, including Hmong LEP people, with attendance ranging from 19 to 56 participants per workshop. The feedback received at these workshops were positive and constructive, and were used to refine the engagement activities in subsequent workshops.

- Multiple targeted meetings with and regular mailings have occurred, and continue to occur, with the Southside Organizing Center in Milwaukee’s central city, as well as on-going coordination with the Hispanic Business and Professional Association / Hispanic Roundtable in Racine, the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, and United Migrant Opportunity Services in Milwaukee; the Hispanic Business and Professionals Association and League of United Latin American Citizens in Racine; and La Casa de Esperanza in Waukesha. Commission outreach materials were routinely available and/or distributed. As previously indicated, the Southside Organizing Center, as one of the community partners, held five workshops as part of developing VISION 2050 and coordinated outreach for workshops for the 2020 Review and Update. The workshops were relatively well attended by members of the Spanish-speaking community, including Spanish-speaking LEP persons, with attendance ranging from 10 to 30 participants per workshop. As with the workshops held by the Hmong American Friendship Association, the feedback received at these workshops was positive and constructive, and was used to refine the engagement activities in subsequent workshops.

- The Commission’s Environmental Justice Task Force has included representatives of both the Hispanic/Latino and Southeast Asian populations at different points since 2017. Specifically, leaders of the League of United Latin American Citizens, the Hispanic Collaborative, the Hispanic Business and Professionals Association, representatives of Southeast Asian descent working for the Greater Milwaukee Foundation and the Hmong Chamber of Commerce, and a representative of Asian descent who founded Wisconsin Green Muslims, served as Task Force members between 2017 and
2020. Since mid-2007 the Task Force has reviewed and commented upon Commission planning and programming efforts, significantly including transportation. In this capacity, members have also reviewed and commented upon Commission public involvement and outreach efforts. Members have received draft copies of brochures and newspaper advertisements for various Commission efforts, both of which have been translated into Spanish. Their suggestions have included identifying particular Spanish language newspapers for placement of public meeting notices, which have been pursued and utilized, and recommendations of environmental justice-related groups to add to the Commission’s primary organizational contacts. The Task Force has advocated a simpler and shorter approach to outreach publications, and provided input into developing VISION 2050 and the 2020 Review and Update, including the extensive public outreach efforts to LEP communities. All of these considerations and suggestions are in concert with the Commission’s LEP analyses and plan. Recently, the Task Force has requested Commission staff to prepare and update a list of requests from each meeting as a way to track how and when recommendations are addressed. The action item list includes coordinating with appropriate groups to encourage participation in the 2020 U.S. Census, which includes outreach to LEP people. In addition, there have been requests to diversify Commission staff and identifying opportunities to promote open positions and generate interest in careers at SEWRPC among minority populations, including LEP people.

- For recent short-range transit development planning conducted by the Commission, a number of concerted efforts were undertaken regarding possible LEP needs. These items include an online survey for the Waukesha Area Transit Development Plan with an option for participants to respond to the survey in Spanish and an on-board survey conducted for the Milwaukee Streetcar that included translated materials showing where individuals could access additional information. In addition, summary materials related to major planning efforts are translated into Spanish, such as the summary of VISION 2050 and an overview of regional planning conducted by SEWRPC.

Recent discussions with leaders and/or representatives of LEP populations confirm the following, which should be noted regarding frequency and nature of contacts:

- Within the LEP and linguistically isolated Hispanic community, there continues to be some apprehension regarding contact with a governmental agency. This, in part, is tied to concerns about immigration status, as well as some general distrust. These observations correlate directly with research findings, thus, apprehensions will likely depress LEP participation rates; and it is unrealistic to expect that these households would routinely contact or call back a government agency on their own. This condition extends well beyond the Commission’s capacity to effect change; however, efforts will continue with Hispanic organization leadership toward maintaining connections and building trust.

- The Hmong written language has not been prominently mentioned or discussed by Hmong representatives as a solution to needs. However, some Hmong participants in the VISION 2050 planning process expressed appreciation to Commission staff when materials were provided in written Hmong at the workshops held by the Hmong American Friendship Association, as it demonstrated the Commission’s commitment to include the Hmong-speaking populations in the planning process. Therefore, except possibly for limited applications (such as public meetings involving Hmong organizations or community groups) or language referral sheets (indicating that there are not interpreter present who speaks Hmong and seeking information for follow-up), the use of written Hmong does not appear expedient related to Commission programs. The Hmong language referral sheet thus seems to reflect a reasonable and cost-efficient step in providing LEP access opportunities, especially for county-wide and region-wide public meetings.

- Commission summary materials in Spanish continue to be accepted periodically by a number of people at events who seem to be genuinely appreciative. Partly due to this receptivity, such materials will continue to be prepared at key junctures of appropriate planning programs. For example, Commission staff attended the LULAC National Convention in Milwaukee in July 2019, where SEWRPC materials were presented in Spanish, including summaries of VISION 2050 and an overview of regional planning activities. The materials were well received and appreciated by attendees that visited the booth.
Factor 3: The Importance to LEP People of Your Program, Activities, and Services

The Commission is pleased and understandably proud that its work improves the quality of life in the Region. But while that work ultimately can touch daily lives, the connection to a person’s perception of need—and actual immediate needs—may be far removed.

The following help characterize the Commission’s planning work relative to public involvement challenges, including with respect to the LEP population:

- Subject matter is relatively diverse and often requires technical analyses
- Focus is ultimately not local, but on a multi-county Region
- Context emphasizes functioning systems before specific facilities or projects
- Horizon is typically 20 years or more (long term), rather than immediate
- Decisions are forced by coordinated agreement, often from complex interrelationships

Long-range regional planning relates to and helps guide the provision of eventual transportation services. Commission planning for specific transportation facilities and local transit services, as examples, are thus closer at hand to relieving LEP vulnerabilities. Nevertheless, obtaining and benefiting from direct transportation access via driver licensure, safe and effective navigation of a motor vehicle on highways, or understanding and use of interconnecting bus routes and other transportation alternatives, are of more concern for people in Southeastern Wisconsin who do not speak or understand English.

Many of the Commission’s publications are relatively long and are, necessarily, written in a technical style. However, they do provide citizens, elected officials, and technicians with all of the data and information needed to comprehend fully the scope and complexity of the areawide developmental and environmental problems and of the Commission’s recommendations for the resolution of those problems. To reach a more diverse audience and gather input, the Commission has produced and translated summary fact sheets and brochures, typically translating into Spanish (but also, as appropriate, into Hmong). Examples of Spanish- and Hmong-translated materials can be found in Attachment 1 at the end of this Exhibit.

The Federal guidance defers to individualized determinations of LEP need(s) and response(s) by numerous references regarding “reasonable steps or effort to assure meaningful access.” However, the DOT examples largely underpin the necessity of LEP populations achieving independence and security:

- Driver licensing
- Navigation and safety on the road
- Actual use of public transportation
- Access to jobs
- Receipt of health care
- General pursuit of local civic life

These needs are not the crux of regional planning, yet are generally related to land use and transportation planning.

The Commission shares the concern that anyone in the Region who is linguistically isolated or of limited English proficiency should not societally be left behind. Therefore, the Commission will continue to reach out to LEP people in an effort to meet their information needs relative to Commission planning programs.
Factor 4: The Resources Available to the Recipient and Costs

Context of Approach and Application of Resources

As indicated in the three previous factors of this analysis, efforts have been made to engage and provide meaningful access to LEP Communities in Southeastern Wisconsin. However, a very encompassing or detailed LEP plan would not seem fiscally responsible for the Commission as it conducts its regional planning and programming effort. Based on recent efforts, a targeted approach utilizing the networks and expertise of local groups has proven effective in gathering input from LEP people in the Region.

The results documented in the LEP plan and informed by recent experiences reflect small, but important, adjustments in the way that the Commission approaches its business. If interest is expressed, staff will certainly react in a responsive way toward meeting that need.

Given this context, the costs to implement the Commission’s LEP plan and associated activities may be described as small to modest. Part of the reason is that the substantial efforts to engage minority populations and low-income populations will often, as a matter of course, involve organizational contacts representing Hispanic/Latino and Hmong populations. These respective contacts are the same ones that would be approached regarding LEP-focused efforts. Thus, the LEP costs outlined below may be considered the incremental difference estimated for LEP compliance alone, importantly including out-of-pocket costs for translation of publications and/or website materials, Spanish language advertisements, and providing an outside interpreter at public meetings, as appropriate.

Annual Estimated Costs

Estimated incremental staff costs for LEP activities are approximately $5,000 on an annual basis, or approximately 5 percent of a professional full time employee. This includes two principal staff members dedicating an estimated annual average of two percent of their time, plus other staff contributions.

Outside translation assistance will need to be secured for public information meetings, particularly when held in central city locations or a Hispanic neighborhood center. Past experience with outside translators yields an expense estimate of approximately $2,500 annually.

Based upon recent experience, advertising in local minority newspapers (including Spanish translations) has cost an average of approximately $2,000 annually. This does not include the advertising costs involving other minority newspapers, notably African-American owned or directed, which may be reaching selective LEP populations or the parties which assist them particularly in central city locations.

Based upon recent experience, the outside costs to translate materials for publication in print and/or on the Commission’s website is estimated to be approximately $4,000 annually. During the process of contracting with translators, important lessons have been learned regarding the selection of individuals who understand the “language” of regional planning, use appropriate dialect for the Region’s LEP populations, and have adequate attention to detail.

Although the past several years have exhibited what may be a heavier pattern than normal of LEP publications translated into Spanish, notably brochures, the estimated annual cost of internal production including format needs, layout, paper, and printing is estimated to be approximately $2,000 annually. Distribution costs are not considered here, because the Commission’s website may be used as well as U.S. mail containing other materials (e.g., transmittal letters in English).

The total estimated in the above calculations is an approximate annual cost of $15,500 to meet discrete LEP needs.
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY PLAN FOR MEETING LEP NEEDS ASSOCIATED WITH COMMISSION PROGRAMS

LEP Framework
The Commission is committed to optimizing both the prospects and its performance related to serving people of limited English proficiency in the Region. Indeed, the previous examples included in the Four-Factor Analysis highlight how the Commission has provided as part of its various planning activities some meaningful opportunities for LEP information and involvement. These have increased over time. Also, examining lessons learned and synthesis toward broader application in the context of DOT guidance should help ensure opportunities in the future.

The guidance specifically requires reasonable steps to ensure meaningful access, with the key word for this discussion being “access.” Among the factors to be considered in taking steps to ensure access, per DOT guidance, are the following (items in italics reflect SEWRPC refinement or identified emphasis):

1. Number and proportion of LEP people in the Region, and the variety of languages spoken. 
   Locations of LEP concentration where need may be greatest and agency efforts most fruitful or cost-effective, highlighted by the ongoing analysis of key geographic areas.

2. Frequency with which LEP individuals come in contact with the program or activity. 
   Or, which reasonably might be expected to come into contact via targeted outreach efforts, given that infrequent contact is the norm.

3. Importance of service provided by the program or activity. 
   Specifically, the likely level of importance to an LEP individual, or the relative importance in their life— which has generally been determined to be low.

4. Resources available to the Commission. 
   Ways in which the Commission plans to allocate staff and resources to provide needed language services, including coordination by the Public Involvement and Outreach Coordinator and contracting for translation services.

It may be noted that the refinements to Factors 1 and 2 above will result in a prospectively greater effort to serve LEP people than might otherwise be conveyed, while the proposed refinement to factor No. 3 raises the question of how relevant an LEP individual might ordinarily find long-range, areawide planning. The latter is essentially the same question/challenge which exists with respect to involving many English-speaking citizens in the Region. Thus, to the extent possible, efforts to reach certain LEP individuals will also be applied to help better reach certain English-speaking citizens of limited understanding/interest. Conversely, as required by law, efforts to reach the citizenry in general will include evaluation of the potential need for LEP focused programs and/or products.

Goals
In attempting to determine what is reasonable, and, in fact, realizable for the busy lives of LEP people in Southeastern Wisconsin, the following goals comprise an optimistic view of what can be undertaken and accomplished.

- Strive to be receptive and responsive to LEP comments or requests, so that such contacts can be handled in a courteous, effective, and expeditious manner

- Seek to understand LEP populations in the Region, focusing on their characteristics and preferences with respect to Commission involvement, so that relevant information is provided

- Be concerted and directed in efforts to approach LEP populations whenever and wherever most appropriate and productive
• Explore simple and straight-forward ways to reach residents of Southeastern Wisconsin, and concomitantly evaluate the potential for LEP-focused products and activities

• Affirm that Commission staff are generally aware of LEP needs and requirements, so that the agency is prepared to appropriately act either directly or by referral

• Approach all audiences in an honest and forthright manner, using legitimate needs as impetus for generating LEP involvement

General Steps or Approaches
Various means of public involvement should ideally be employed, including public meetings, summary publications, and survey-type needs assessments, among others. These range from open and subjective to closely orchestrated and objective in their ability to generate input for regional planning. Each is useful, but for different purposes, and not all involve personal contact or appearances for interests to be adequately addressed.

Below are the LEP steps that the Commission will generally apply during the planning process. Many relate to the initiation of, or preparedness for, project-specific actions.

• Examine past procedures with respect to public participation in comparable Commission planning studies to guide similarities and differences in strategies that may be useful to employ under LEP scenarios.

• Cultivate the network of LEP community contacts in key areas of the Region to enhance preparedness for meeting relevant needs. Similarly, maintain and expand the network of utilized and recommended translators.

• Contact LEP community leaders at the outset of relevant planning studies to complement prior needs assessments in identifying subject matter or planning stages that may be of interest to their constituents.

• Identify the most important agency messages and outreach opportunities concerning the public, and evaluate these in light of both potential LEP person needs and options for meeting those needs.

• Prepare summary materials translated into Spanish at key junctures of major or regional studies and locally relevant planning efforts: inception, findings or preliminary recommendations, and completed plan(s). Make these available to local community sources.

• Target LEP populations discretely, by means of messages, media, and meetings tailored to their neighborhoods and/or communities. Explore local sites for events, unless travel to a common location is customary for the audiences involved.

• Provide parallel English versions of all translated materials to respect the objectives of LEP communities who advocate mainstreaming, and to further local understanding via bilingual community leaders who may be aware of and accustomed to addressing differences in dialects.

• Use translator availability notices in news releases and paid advertisements submitted to the Hispanic media for certain local planning efforts and regional studies with events conducted in Spanish speaking neighborhoods. Provide translation services upon request, or occasionally automatically when advisable.

• Have available translation referral notices in Spanish and Hmong which explain the option for subsequent follow-up services, particularly when conducting surveys, meetings for certain local planning efforts, or regional hearings in LEP neighborhoods.

• Investigate additional ways in which the “language” of regional planning materials shared with the public can be made colloquial and user-friendly (English included), with the prospect that fewer, clearer message points will concomitantly benefit LEP populations.
• Staff orientation or training materials that outline LEP needs and requirements to enhance staff understanding of this issue will be distributed to new staff at the time of their initiating work at the Commission and to current staff annually; and protocols like the above will be observed to help ensure appropriate LEP services, though the expected number of recipients may be small.

• Attempt to meet any LEP requests for information or participation in a manner satisfactory to the recipient(s)—regardless of particular study demographics or level of LEP involvement anticipated—and evaluate the implications of multiple requests and trends in activity success, with the objective of improving the effectiveness of providing information during as well as after the planning effort.

Simplification and distilled messages will be investigated and used wherever appropriate. However, for detailed and involved subject matter like the Commission’s, simplification entails the risk of misunderstanding while attempting to facilitate more widespread understanding among the populace.

Shortening, sometimes attempted as a surrogate for simplifying, risks deleting important elements or content—which may be needed to help establish context. Thus, shortening messages will be avoided as a sole objective. On the other hand, the complexity of regional planning matters may require “bite-size” pieces if the information is to be “consumed” and “digested” by LEP people. It has already been established that long and technical materials are not appropriate. If, however, shorter and simpler messages become too numerous to hold attention for complete disclosure over time, then they also will be inappropriate.

Surveys
While remaining receptive to all forms of contact, an emphasis upon surveys will continue to be important to Commission LEP involvement. Both behavioral and attitudinal survey findings have a relationship to underlying values and preferences. And, in aggregate form, the data indicate perhaps the most accurate and reliable trends upon which to base planning decisions. Identifying travel habits and patterns may not be considered public involvement by some, but the Commission has recognized the importance of obtaining such “statements” of preference. Regardless of one’s perspective on how to regard survey responses, the data perform a crucial function in hearing from people in an equitable and representative way. That is a reason for the frequent mention of surveys herein, and for the Commission’s corresponding outreach to LEP populations during, and even preceding, the assemblage of this LEP plan.

Large Scale Surveys, Random Sampling
Generally, for household-type, return-by-mail, random sample surveys that are regional in scope:

• Include a referral notice in Spanish for LEP assistance (or a translated survey copy) and evaluate the same for the Hmong population.

• Indicate in English that alternative accommodations may be available for other languages by contacting the Commission offices— in the event that an English speaker assisting the LEP household(s) can direct recipients appropriately.

• Produce in advance a Spanish language survey translation to have available.

• Consider interviews with Hmong community leaders and/or resident focus groups as alternative information gathering techniques.

• Recognize that a survey notice in Hmong might be more a courtesy than a practical solution (lesser probability of being sampled, less understanding or use of written Hmong compared to Spanish, and variability in dialects such that not all people reading Hmong may comprehend the selected translation). Further, regional planning may be outside of the immediate interest or needs of many LEP populations, and suspicions may exist regarding a government agency inquiring about behavioral practices or preferences.
On-Board Transit Surveys

- Continue the use of both English and Spanish language versions of surveys, along with training of survey administrators to detect when the Spanish version may be expedient.

- Particularly for Milwaukee County Transit routes and the Milwaukee Streetcar, have available a language referral sheet in Hmong. Train administering staff to identify when this aid may be useful, how to avoid cultural stereotyping, and why differences in dialect may inherently limit the practicality.

- In general, evaluate means of survey design or administration contexts that would not be viewed as threatening to LEP or linguistically isolated people (given that a government agency is attempting to gain information). Even so, certain cultural differences or immigration issues transcend, and are not expected to be resolved by, an exposure to regional planning inventories.

Small Scale Community Surveys

- Evaluate LEP implications on a case-by-case basis considering the community demographics. Because of the characteristic property or business owner sampling criteria, explore alternative means of input where the number of LEP or linguistically isolated households warrant.

- Pursue translation accommodations for those communities (or neighborhoods) in which the LEP population is five percent or larger, or exceeds 1,000 residents. The relative concentration of subject households will help determine whether targeted translated surveys or notices of availability in non-English language(s) are preferable.

- Avoid introducing inequities or invalidating survey techniques while broadening LEP outreach. Obtain input by other means if an enabling survey criterion, like property ownership, voting registration, or utility payment, is not met at an adequate threshold by otherwise prevalent LEP households.

Planning Program Emphases

Below, distinguished very generally, are three basic levels of planning in which the Commission is engaged and may expect to conduct the indicated LEP activities. Some fluidity would be expected among the categories noted.

Regional Plans

This level of planning is distinguished by the following characteristics:

- Broad geography and subject matter functionality
- Long-term or distant planning horizon
- Succeeding steps or refinement necessary before implementation
- Likely always moderate LEP involvement potential

Regional planning efforts are distinguished by the following LEP responses:

- Contact LEP community leaders to inform them of the initiation of the planning program, its scope, timing, and implications. Seek to identify the potential relevance to constituents and obtain suggestions regarding public involvement.

- Update the network of local contacts if there have been changes

- Prepare to produce summary materials in Spanish at least three prospective junctures: study or planning program inception, inventory findings or preliminary recommendations, and final recommendations or completed plans
• Hold at least one public meeting in each regional open house/information/hearing series at a facility serving LEP community(ies), such as the Southside Organizing Center, the United Community Center, or United Migrant Opportunity Services for Spanish-speaking LEP populations in Milwaukee County and the Hmong American Friendship Association for Hmong-speaking LEP populations in Milwaukee County

• Work with LEP community leaders to explore neighborhood meeting alternatives that may offer a comfortable or productive setting, or identify other means of hearing views on the subject matter, that would be conducive to discussion

• Provide copies of summary materials in English and Spanish during public meetings, and to relevant media outlets and community centers

• Advertise public events and/or the planning program in Hispanic cultural newspapers, including Milwaukee’s El Conquistador and the Spanish Journal.

• Monitor and assess the audience(s), planning program coverage, and distribution patterns of the above publications, and supplement news releases with follow-up contacts with newsletter/publication sources and/or radio stations serving the Hmong or other ethnic communities

**County Plans**

Planning level characteristics:

• Narrower geography and often narrower subject matter functionality than regional plans (e.g., single modality characteristic for transportation system planning)

• Characteristically medium range or intermediate planning horizon and implementation schedule

• Variable and sometimes limited LEP involvement, depending upon county and subject matter focus

County planning efforts are distinguished by the following LEP efforts:

• Prepare a brief assessment or evaluation of LEP needs and prospects for the particular planning program

• For Milwaukee County—generally anticipate that LEP involvement may have to be more aggressive than for a comparable regional study as described above, given that the relative proportion of need is greater than regionally. The relevance to LEP people may also be greater, depending upon subject matter, since the geography is more limited and localized.

• For Kenosha, Racine, and Waukesha Counties—anticipate that the level of LEP involvement may be roughly parallel to the regional level described above. (Waukesha County may pertain based not on the proportion, but on the total number of LEP households and the concentration of Spanish speaking households in the City of Waukesha).

• For Ozaukee, Walworth, and Washington Counties—which are less populous and/or proportionately less diverse in terms of LEP households, anticipate that a lower level of LEP involvement may be suitable. (With subject matter dependency, Walworth County may warrant more in representative needs assessment, based on the cumulative percent of dispersed Spanish speaking households).

• Regardless of demographic composition, anticipate that county plans, which are shorter in range or which attend to needs more characteristic of LEP households than the majority of households regionally, will require more LEP involvement. Transit system development plans, which are service-oriented, would thus take precedence over jurisdictional highway system plans, which affect administration and management, but not functionality.
Community Assistance Plans
Planning level characteristics:

- Focused or limited geographic area and sometimes subject matter, the latter especially for transportation facility planning
- Often implementable immediately upon adoption, or with little refinement (but also may be distant, as in a community long-range plan)
- Highly variable LEP involvement, between intensive and little to none, depending upon location and subject matter (there may or may not be an LEP presence and relevance)

Community assistance planning efforts are distinguished by the following LEP efforts:

- Prepare a brief assessment or evaluation of LEP needs and prospects for the particular planning program
- For the Cities of Milwaukee, Kenosha, Racine, and Waukesha—which would also be focal points for their respective Counties noted above, examine demographics with particular care relative to LEP needs in neighborhood or community planning
- For all communities—anticipate that greater need for LEP involvement may be expected on subjects such as comprehensive planning or transit service planning, but not necessarily so for sewer service area planning. Though the latter could be relevant because of broader implications, it is questionable whether LEP people would perceive the access as meaningful. Plan accordingly for summary materials, community and neighborhood meetings, newsletters and other direct mailings, culturally targeted radio coverage, and postings, if advisable.
- For neighborhood planning—which could have high subject matter relevance, structure the level of LEP involvement based upon demographic composition. Plan accordingly for summary materials, neighborhood meetings, newsletter mailings or door-to-door distribution, and postings.

The most meaningful LEP involvement, and the most rewarding for participants, would likely be in the arena of local community assistance planning. This could, for example, include local transit service plans or neighborhood plans where there are substantial LEP households.

LEP Plan Evaluation and Updates
Evaluating the effectiveness of the Commission’s LEP plan will be ongoing through the normal monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of the public outreach efforts it conducts. During the proactive interaction with LEP individuals and community organizations, improvements or enhancements to the LEP plan may be made through careful consideration of comments received during that interaction. In addition, changes in Federal or State law or guidance may necessitate changes to the LEP plan. As such the Commission anticipates that updates to the LEP plan will be made as necessary, while the evaluation of the effectiveness of the LEP plan is ongoing.

In conclusion, the Commission will strive to be receptive and appropriately responsive to both the guidelines and the LEP individuals who may need assistance. As the Commission anticipates the level of need, prepares to meet any LEP requests expeditiously, and examines policies and procedures to guide agency reactions to LEP scenarios, those steps are viewed as opportunities for furthering agency ideals and Civil Rights Act compliance. And, as the Commission submits its plan for meeting the needs of those LEP individuals in Southeastern Wisconsin, it does so with an eye toward changing demographics and a desire to serve all who may have an interest in regional planning activities and may be directly affected by those activities. Examples such as the extensive public outreach for VISION 2050 and the 2020 Review and Update, prior Household Travel Surveys, and the translation of materials demonstrate the Commission’s commitment to its policy to engage LEP individuals and meet any requests in a courteous and effective manner.
¿QUÉ ES VISIÓN 2050?
VISIÓN 2050 es un plan a largo plazo para el uso de la tierra y la transportación del Sureste de Wisconsin. VISIÓN 2050 hace recomendaciones al gobierno local y Estatal para formar y guiar el desarrollo en el uso de la tierra y mejoras a la transportación, incluyendo transporte público, calles principales y autopistas, transporte de carga pesada, e instalaciones para bicicletas y peatones hasta el año 2050. La Comisión adoptó VISIÓN 2050 en el año 2016, después de un proceso de desarrollo de tres años guiado por los Comités Consultivos para la Planeación Regional del Uso de la Tierra y Transportación de la Comisión.

CRONOLOGÍA

OCTUBRE 2019
REUNIÓN DEL COMITÉ CONSULTOR

DICIEMBRE 2019
RONDAS 1 REUNIONES PÚBLICAS
Revisar la implementación a la fecha y ofrecer comentarios

PRIMAVERA 2020
RONDAS 2 REUNIONES PÚBLICAS
Revisar el borrador, incluyendo análisis de patrimonio y financieros, y ofrecer comentarios.

VERANO 2020
LA COMISIÓN ADOPTA LA REVISIÓN Y ACTUALIZACIÓN DEL 2020

FEBRERO 2020
REUNIÓN DEL COMITÉ CONSULTOR
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VISIÓN 2050 es un plan a largo plazo para el uso de la tierra y la transportación del Sureste de Wisconsin. VISIÓN 2050 hace recomendaciones al gobierno local y Estatal para formar y guiar el desarrollo en el uso de la tierra y mejoras a la transportación, incluyendo transporte público, calles principales y autopistas, transporte de carga pesada, e instalaciones para bicicletas y peatones hasta el año 2050. La Comisión adoptó VISIÓN 2050 en el año 2016, después de un proceso de desarrollo de tres años guiado por los Comités Consultivos para la Planeación Regional del Uso de la Tierra y Transportación de la Comisión.

VISIÓN GENERAL DE LA REVISIÓN Y ACTUALIZACIÓN DEL AÑO 2020

PROpósito de la revisión y actualización
Cada cuatro años, la Comisión lleva a cabo una revisión y actualización provisional del plan regional del uso de la tierra y la transportación, en parte para cumplir con requisitos Federales. La Revisión y Actualización del año 2020 examina que tan bien está siendo implementado VISIÓN 2050, compara los pronósticos para el año 2050 usados en el plan con los estimados actuales, y explora como está funcionando el sistema de transportación existente. La revisión también examinará si es razonable que las recomendaciones de VISIÓN 2050 sean logradas durante los siguientes 30 años, dada la implementación del plan a la fecha y los fondos disponibles y anticipados. Como resultado del proceso de revisión y actualización, recomendaciones pueden ser añadidas o cambiadas, y el análisis financiero será actualizado para reflejar cualquier cambio en los fondos anticipados o gastos esperados.

MéTAS DE LA PARTICIPACIÓN DEL PÚBLICO

Ronda 1

- Compartir información con el público acerca del progreso en la implementación de las recomendaciones del plan
- Colectar comentarios acerca de la implementación y de cambios que han ocurrido, desde que VISIÓN 2050 fue adoptada, que se deban considerar al actualizar las recomendaciones del plan

Ronda 2

- Permitir que el público revise y comente sobre el borrador de la Revisión y Actualización del año 2020, incluyendo análisis financieros y de patrimonio actualizados

vision2050sewis.org
@SEWRPC
@SEW_RPC
¿QUÉ ES VISIÓN 2050?

VISION 2050 es un plan a largo plazo para el uso de la tierra y la transportación del Sureste de Wisconsin. VISION 2050 hace recomendaciones al gobierno local y Estatal para formar y guiar el desarrollo en el uso de la tierra y mejorar la transportación, incluyendo transporte público, calles principales y autopistas, transporte de carga pesada, e instalaciones para bicicletas y peatones hasta el año 2050. La Comisión adoptó VISION 2050 en el año 2016, después de un proceso de desarrollo de tres años guiado por los Comités Consultivos para la Planeación Regional del Uso de la Tierra y Transportación de la Comisión.

CRONOLOGÍA

OCTUBRE 2019
JUNTA # 1 DEL COMITÉ ASESOR

DECIEMBRE 2019
RONDA 1 DE JUNTAS PÚBLICAS
Se revisó la implementación a la fecha y se obtuvieron los primeros comentarios.

FEBRERO 2020
JUNTA # 2 DEL COMITÉ ASESOR

PRIMAVERA 2020
RONDA 2 DE JUNTAS PÚBLICAS
Revisar el borrador de la actualización del plan, incluyendo análisis de equidad y financieros, y ofrecer comentarios.

ABRIL 2020
JUNTA # 3 DEL COMITÉ ASESOR

VERANO 2020
LA COMISIÓN ADOPTA LA REVISIÓN Y ACTUALIZACIÓN DEL AÑO 2020

VISIÓN GENERAL DE LA REVISIÓN Y ACTUALIZACIÓN DEL AÑO 2020

PROPÓSITO DE LA REVISIÓN Y ACTUALIZACIÓN

La Revisión y Actualización del Año 2020 examina el progreso que se ha hecho hacia la implementación de VISIÓN 2050 desde que fuera originalmente adoptado en el año 2016 y los cambios que pudieran ser necesarios como resultado de ese progreso, cambios en tecnología, o cambios en las prioridades de la Región para el desarrollo de la tierra y el sistema de transporte.

METAS DE LA PARTICIPACIÓN DEL PÚBLICO

Ronda 1 – COMPLETADA
- Compartir información con el público acerca del progreso en la implementación de las recomendaciones del plan
- Colectar comentarios acerca de la implementación y sobre cambios que han ocurrido, desde que VISIÓN 2050 fue adoptada, que deberíamos considerar al actualizar las recomendaciones del plan

Ronda 2 – EN PROCESO
- Proporcionar actualizaciones propuestas al público para su revisión y comentarios, incluyendo actualizaciones a los análisis financieros y de equidad.

RESULTADOS DE LOS ANÁLISIS FINANCIEROS Y DE EQUIDAD

Un análisis financiero actualizado identificó un déficit significativo entre los fondos de ingresos razonablemente anticipados y los costos estimados para implementar el sistema de transporte de VISION 2050. Por lo tanto, personal de SEWRPC identificó la porción fiscalmente restringida del sistema de transporte. Bajo el sistema fiscalmente restringido, se espera que los niveles del servicio de transporte público disminuyan cerca de un 35 por ciento para el año 2050, y menos calles y autopistas serían reconstruidas, ampliadas, o construidas nuevas. Muchos de los caminos recomendados para reconstrucción serían solo rehabilitados, posiblemente resultando en pavimentación de menor calidad.

Un análisis de equidad actualizado evaluó si los beneficios e impactos del plan recomendado serían compartidos de manera justa y equitativa entre las diferentes poblaciones de la Región. Los resultados muestran que el implementar VISION 2050 ayudaría a reducir las existentes desigualdades entre la población blanca y la de personas de color, y que sin fondos adicionales para el transporte público, un impacto desproporcionado a personas de color, a poblaciones de bajos ingresos, y a personas con capacidades diferentes muy posiblemente ocurriría.

¿QUÉ ES VISIÓN 2050?
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NECESITAMOS SUS COMENTARIOS
SOBRE LAS ACTUALIZACIONES PROPUESTAS AL PLAN

ACERCA DE LAS ACTUALIZACIONES

La mayoría de las recomendaciones de VISIÓN 2050 no cambiarían con esta actualización. El plan continuará recomendando una combinación de usos de la tierra con desarrollos urbanos enfocados en áreas urbanas, transporte público significativamente expandido y mejorado, aceras y redes de bicicletas expandidas y conectadas, y ampliaciones estratégicas de capacidad para incluir a todos los usuarios de caminos. Los cambios propuestos al plan afectan principalmente recomendaciones relacionadas a normas y son en respuesta a los comentarios del público, a cambios recientes en tecnología, y a otros cambios en la Región. Mapas y otros documentos serán también actualizados para reflejar la implementación que ha ocurrido desde que el plan fue adoptado en el año 2016.

Las más importantes actualizaciones propuestas al plan están listadas abajo. Usted puede revisar más información acerca de estas actualizaciones en los paneles de exposición y puede ofrecer comentarios en las formas correspondientes.

**BICICLETAS Y PEATONES**

Añadir scooters eléctricas sin anclaje a la recomendación existente de expandir la implementación de bicicletas de uso compartido, y recomendar a los gobiernos locales el examinar los posibles problemas de seguridad relacionados con scooters eléctricas sin anclaje.

**TRANSPORTE PÚBLICO**

Recomendar que alternativas a servicio de autobuses de rutas fijas (por ejemplo, servicios flexibles de enlaces, microbuses, y vehículos de uso compartido) deberían ser consideradas al expandir el transporte público en ciertas áreas.

**CALLES Y AUTOPISTAS**

Incorporar estrategias para combatir circulación descuidada
Añadir estrategias de uso y acceso a aceras como un ejemplo de calles apropiadas para la movilidad de todo tipo de usuario
Añadir una nueva recomendación para monitorear el crecimiento y desarrollo de vehículos automatizados en relación a como podrían impactar el plan.
This exhibit describes the membership and structure for the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), its transportation-related Advisory Committees, and the Environmental Justice Task Force. In addition, a summary of the racial characteristics of these bodies is provided.

COMMISSION

Since SEWRPC was created in 1960, its governing structure has been mandated by State law and remains unchanged to this day. That structure provides equal representation on the governing board from seven counties, a total of 21 members, three selected to represent each of the counties. One of the three members from each County is appointed by the County Executive/County Board Chair and is, by custom, a County Board Supervisor or County Executive. The other two members from each county are appointed by the Governor, with one of the gubernatorial appointments coming from a list provided by the county. Each of the 21 members has a six-year term.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

For more than 60 years this board membership has officially sponsored a comprehensive regional planning process that by law produces plans that are advisory to the constituent county and local governments. In carrying out its metropolitan planning organization (MPO) responsibilities, SEWRPC relies very heavily upon a system of advisory committees for carrying out its regional transportation planning efforts and for programming of transportation projects for the five urbanized areas in Southeastern Wisconsin. While the Commission board itself is responsible for the formal adoption of regional plans as required by State law, that board has accepted the recommendations of its advisory committees that deal with the MPO function as the preparation and adoption of transportation plans and programs is pursued. Copies of the current rosters of these transportation advisory committees are enclosed in Figure 1 of this exhibit.

Membership on the SEWRPC MPO, or transportation, Advisory Committees is highly intergovernmental in nature, since these committees have primary responsibilities for overseeing the Commission’s MPO-related work programs and since State agencies and county and local governments are responsible for ultimately implementing the array of recommendations that are included in SEWRPC regional transportation plans. With respect to voting
memberships on these MPO committees, two committees have county and local membership structures that approximate population proportionality (One committee dealing with regional transportation system planning and the other dealing with programming of transportation projects in the Milwaukee urbanized area where SEWRPC, as the MPO, has responsibilities to allocate Federal transit and highway funds made available to that area—currently about $25 million of Federal Highway Administration Surface Transportation Block Grant Program – Milwaukee Urbanized Area (STP-M) funds and about $20 million annually of Federal Transit Administration Section 5307 – Milwaukee Urbanized Area funds). The following describes further detail on the structure of these two population-proportion committees.

- **Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation Planning:** Structured on a population-proportional basis, this Committee provides guidance and direction to the Commission staff in the preparation of the regional transportation plan, and provides to the Commission a recommended regional transportation plan for the Commission to consider adopting. The 33 members of the Committee include local technical staff and elected officials typically appointed by the community/county’s chief elected official, along with representatives from State and Federal transportation and natural resource agencies. In addition, a member of the Commission’s Environmental Justice Task Force serves as a liaison on the Committee. The structure of the county/community members of the Committee reflects the population proportionality of each County and municipality within Southeastern Wisconsin. This Committee includes four members representing Milwaukee County (with three members appointed by the County Executive and one member appointed by the County Board Chairman) and five members representing the City of Milwaukee (with four members appointed by the Mayor and one member appointed by the Common Council President.) As small portions of the Milwaukee and West Bend urbanized areas are located in counties outside of the seven-county Region (Jefferson County and Dodge County, respectively), the Committee also includes a liaison from Jefferson County to represent the portion of that county in the Milwaukee urbanized area and a liaison from Dodge County to represent the portion of that county in the West Bend urbanized area.

- **Advisory Committee for Transportation System Planning and Programming in the Milwaukee urbanized area (Milwaukee Area TIP Committee):** Also structured on a population-proportional basis reflecting the population proportionality of each County and municipality within the Milwaukee urbanized area. This Committee guides preparation of the Milwaukee urbanized area transportation improvement program; guides the development of the procedures to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend projects for STP-M funding; reviews and approves the allocation of FTA Section 5307 Milwaukee urbanized area funds to the area’s six public transit operators; and, along with the TIP Committees for the Region’s other urbanized areas, guides development of the procedures to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend projects for Federal Highway Administration Congestion Management and Air-Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funding. The 22 members of the Milwaukee TIP Committee include local technical staff and elected officials typically appointed by the community/county’s chief elected official, and include five members representing Milwaukee County (with four members appointed by the County Executive and one member appointed by the County Board Chairman) and six members representing the City of Milwaukee (with five members appointed by the Mayor and one member appointed by the Common Council President). The Milwaukee TIP Committee also includes representation from each of the six public transit operators within the Milwaukee urbanized area—Milwaukee County, City of Milwaukee, Waukesha County, City of Waukesha, Washington County, and Ozaukee County. As a small portion of the Milwaukee Urbanized Area is located outside of the seven county Region in Jefferson County, the Committee includes a liaison from Jefferson County to represent the portion of the Milwaukee Urbanized Area in that county.

The deference to local authorities for appointing members of these two committees, particularly with respect to Milwaukee County and the City of Milwaukee (the County and City with the highest number and proportion of minorities in Southeastern Wisconsin), provides substantial opportunities for the appointment of members of minority groups to important advisory committees. In addition, as openings occur on existing committees, the Commission seeks diversity as it solicits or makes appointments to its Advisory Committees.
The Commission also has Advisory Committees on Transportation System Planning and Programming for the smaller urbanized areas in the Southeastern Wisconsin Region: Kenosha, Racine, West Bend, and Round Lake Beach (Wisconsin portion). The local government representatives on these committees are appointed by the chief elected official of the communities/counties which are represented on the Committees.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE TASK FORCE

The Commission established the Environmental Justice Task Force (EJTF) in 2007 to enhance the consideration and integration of environmental justice for minority and low-income groups, and the representation of such groups, throughout the regional planning and programming process. The Task Force is made up of a diverse collection of individuals and organizations representing interests of low-income populations, minority populations, people with disabilities, and/or transit dependent communities. The Task Force meets as appropriate and necessary, usually on a quarterly basis. The Commission staff has consulted with, and sought recommendations from, this Task Force on appointment of members to new committees, such as the advisory committee that was established to guide the development of the regional housing plan. In addition, a member of the Task Force, as previously noted, serves as a liaison to the Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation Planning. The current roster of the Environmental Justice Task Force is provided in Figure 1 of this exhibit.

RACIAL MAKE-UP OF COMMISSION, ADVISORY COMMITTEES, AND EJTF

The racial make-up of the Commission, the two population-proportional advisory committees, the EJTF, and the other urbanized area advisory committees are shown in Table 1. Table 2 provides the racial make-up of the Region and of each urbanized area in the Region.
Figure 1
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission Transportation Advisory Committees

Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation Planning

Members

Donna Brown-Martin, Chair. Commissioner, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission; Director, Milwaukee County Department of Transportation

Fred Abadi ............................................................................................................Director of Public Works, City of Waukesha

Clement Abongwa ..................................................Director of Highways/Highway Commissioner, Kenosha County

Samir Amin ..............................................................................................................................City Engineer, City of Milwaukee

Julie A. Anderson .............................................Director of Public Works and Development Services, Racine County

Mitch Batuzich............................................................Transportation Planner, Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation

Shelly Billingsley ..................................................Director of Public Works/City Engineer, City of Kenosha

Daniel Boehm ..................................................President and Managing Director, Milwaukee County Transit System

Scott Brandmeier .............................................Director of Public Works/Village Engineer, Village of Fox Point

Karen Braun ........................................................Manager of Engineering Services, Waukesha County Department of Public Works

Allison M. Bussler ..................................................Director of Public Works, Waukesha County

Peter Daniels .....................................................................................................................City Engineer, City of West Allis

Jon Edgren ..........................................................Director of Public Works/Highway Commissioner, Ozaukee County

Julie Esch .............................................................Deputy Director, Milwaukee County Department of Transportation

Gail Good ..........................................................Director, Air Management Program, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

Thomas M. Grisa ..........................................................Director, Department of Public Works, City of Brookfield

Roberto Gutierrez ..................................Deputy Director, Southeast Region, Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Richard Hough ..................................................Director of Public Works/Highway Commissioner, Walworth County

Nik Kovac ........................................................................................................................................Alderman, City of Milwaukee

Max Marechal .....................................................................................................................City Engineer, City of West Bend

Kimberly Montgomery ..........................................................Legislative Liaison Director, City of Milwaukee

Jeffrey S. Polenske ..........................................................Commissioner of Public Works, City of Milwaukee

Ron J. Pritzlaff .....................................................................................................................Assistant Village Engineer, Village of Mount Pleasant

John Rooney ..........................................................Commissioner of Public Works/City Engineer, City of Racine

Scott M. Schmidt ..........................................................Highway Commissioner/County Engineer, Washington County

David Simpson .....................................................................................................................Director of Public Works, City of Wauwatosa

Kurt Thiede ..........................................................Regional Administrator, Region 5, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Charles Wade ..........................................................Director, Bureau of Planning and Economic Development, Division of Transportation

Investment Management, Wisconsin Department of Transportation

John F. Weishan, Jr. ..................................................Supervisor, 16th District, Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors

William Wheeler ..........................................................Community Planner, Federal Transit Administration – Region 5, U.S. Department of Transportation

Dennis Yaccarino ..........................................................Senior Budget and Policy Manager, Budget and Management Division, Department of Administration, City of Milwaukee

Vacant ........................................................................................................................................Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
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Liaison to Environmental Justice Task Force
Vacant

Liaison to Jefferson County
Brian Udovich .............................................Highway Operations Manager, Jefferson County Highway Department

Liaison to Dodge County
Brian Field ..................................................................................................................Highway Commissioner, Dodge County

Liaison to Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
Doug Ferguson .................................................................Senior Analyst, Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning and Programming for the Milwaukee Urbanized Area

Voting Members

Donna Brown-Martin, Chair.................. Commissioner, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission; Director, Milwaukee County Department of Transportation
Fred Abadi ..........................................................Director of Public Works, City of Waukesha
Samir Amin ..................................................City Engineer, City of Milwaukee
Robert J. Bauman ........................................ Alderman, City of Milwaukee
Daniel Boehm ........................................ President and Managing Director, Milwaukee County Transit System
Scott Brandmeier ..................................Director of Public Works/Village Engineer, Village of Fox Point
Karen Braun ..................... Manager of Engineering Services, Waukesha County Department of Public Works
Allison M. Bussler ........................................ Director of Public Works, Waukesha County
Peter Daniels ...........................................City Engineer, City of West Allis
Brian Dranzik..........................Director, Milwaukee Mitchell International Airport, Milwaukee County
Jon Edgren ...........................................Director of Public Works/Highway Commissioner, Ozaukee County
Thomas M. Grisa ..................................Director, Department of Public Works, City of Brookfield
Tom Hafner ............................................. Administrator/Public Works Director, City of Delafield
Sam Leichtling .....................................Planning Manager, City of Milwaukee Department of City Development
Michael J. Martin ..................................Director of Public Works, Village of Hales Corners
Kimberly Montgomery ..........................Legislative Liaison Director, City of Milwaukee
Jeffrey S. Polenske .......................................Commissioner of Public Works, City of Milwaukee
Scott M. Schmidt ....................................Highway Commissioner/County Engineer, Washington County
Andrea Weddle-Henning ..................................Transportation Engineering Manager, Milwaukee County Department of Transportation
William T. Wehrley ......................................City Engineer, City of Wauwatosa
John F. Weishan, Jr. ..............................Supervisor, 16th District, Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors
Dennis Yaccarino .....................................Senior Budget and Policy Manager, Budget and Management Division, Department of Administration, City of Milwaukee

Nonvoting Technical Staff Members

Kevin J. Muhs, Secretary ..............Executive Director, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Mitch Batuzich ........................................Transportation Planner, Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation
David Bizot ..................................................Chief, Air Quality Planning and Standards Section, Air Program, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Tom Dieckelman .....................................President, Wisconsin Coach Lines, Inc.
Dewayne Johnson ............................Director, Southeast Region, Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Charles Wade ...........................................Director, Bureau of Planning and Economic Development, Division of Transportation Investment Management, Wisconsin Department Transportation
William Wheeler ..................................Community Planner, Federal Transit Administration - Region 5, U.S. Department of Transportation

Liaison to Jefferson County

Brian Udovich ...........................................Highway Operations Manager, Jefferson County Highway Department
Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning and Programming for the Racine Urbanized Area

Julie A. Anderson, Chair..............................Director of Public Works and Development Services, Racine County
Kevin J. Muhs, Secretary..................Executive Director, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Mitch Batuzich..........................................................Transportation Planner, Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation
David Bizot..............................................................Chief, Air Quality Planning and Standards Section, Air Program, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Gerald Nellessen ...............................................................Village Administrator, Village of Sturtevant
Tom Dieckelman ..............................................................President, Wisconsin Coach Lines, Inc.
Dewayne Johnson..................................................President, Wisconsin Coach Lines, Inc.
Tom Lazcano ..............................................................Director of Public Works, Village of Caledonia
Michael J. Maierle ............................................................Transit and Parking System Manager, City of Racine
Roger Mellem ..............................................................President, Village of North Bay
Douglas Nelson ..............................................................President, Village of Yorkville
Cheryl L. Newton............................................Environmental Protection Specialist, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V
Ron J. Pritzlaff ..............................................................Assistant Village Engineer, Village of Mount Pleasant
John Rooney ..............................................................Commissioner of Public Works/City Engineer, City of Racine
Ernie Rossi ..............................................................Village President, Village of Elmwood Park
Susan Sanabria ..............................................................President, Village of Wind Point
Charles Wade..............................................................Director, Bureau of Planning and Economic Development, Division of Transportation Investment Management, Wisconsin Department of Transportation
William Wheeler ..............................................................Community Planner, Federal Transit Administration – Region 5, U.S. Department of Transportation
Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning and Programming for the West Bend Urbanized Area

Scott M. Schmidt, Chair
Highway Commissioner/County Engineer, Washington County

Kevin J. Muhs, Secretary
Executive Director, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Mitch Batuzich
Transportation Planner, Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation

Richard L. Bertram
Chairman, Town of Barton

Joseph Gonnering
Chairman, Town of Trenton

Ray Heidtke
Chairman, Town of Jackson

Matt Heiser
Village Administrator, Village of Kewaskum

Dewayne Johnson
Director, Southeast Region, Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Ryan Lippert
Chairman, Town of Hartford

Max Marechal
City Engineer, City of West Bend

Jason Schall
City Engineer, Engineering Department, City of Hartford

Albert Schulteis
Chairman, Town of Polk

Charles Wade
Director, Bureau of Planning and Economic Development, Division of Transportation Investment Management, Wisconsin Department of Transportation

John Walther
Village Administrator, Village of Jackson

William Wheeler
Community Planner, Federal Transit Administration – Region 5, U.S. Department of Transportation

Margaret Wilber
Village Administrator, Village of Slinger

Scott Wollner
Chairperson, Town of Kewaskum

**Liaison to Dodge County**

Brian Field
Highway Commissioner, Dodge County
Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning and Programming for the Round Lake Beach-McHenry-Grayslake, IL-WI Urbanized Area (Wisconsin Portion)

Clement Abongwa, Chair..................................................Director of Highways/Highway Commissioner, Kenosha County
Kevin J. Muhs, Secretary ..................................Executive Director, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Bill Antti .................................................................................................................................President, Village of Genoa City
Dan Aronson ..................................................................................................................................President, Village of Bloomfield
Mitch Batuzich ..........................................................Transportation Planner, Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation
David Bizot ..........................................................Chief, Air Quality Planning and Standards Section, Air Program, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Terry Burns .................................................................................................................................President, Village of Paddock Lake
Susan Crane ..................................................................................................................................Chairwoman, Town of Brighton
William M. Glembocki ...............................................................Chairman, Town of Wheatland
Richard Hough ..........................................................Director of Public Works/Highway Commissioner, Walworth County
Dewayne Johnson ..........................................................Director, Southeast Region, Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Randall Kerkman ..........................................................Administrator/Public Works Director, Village of Bristol
Cheryl L. Newton ..........................................................Environmental Protection Specialist, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V
Daniel Schoonover .................................................................................................................................Chairman, Town of Bloomfield
Howard K. Skinner .................................................................................................................................President, Village of Twin Lakes
Robert Stoll ..................................................................................................................................Chairperson, Town of Randall
Diann Tesar ..................................................................................................................................President, Village of Salem Lakes
William Wheeler ..........................................................Community Planner, Federal Transit Administration – Region 5, U.S. Department of Transportation
Environmental Justice Task Force

Aloysius Nelson, Chair ............................. Commissioner, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission; Director, Division of Veterans Services, Kenosha County

Yolanda Adams ........................................................................................................ Wisconsin Deputy State Director for the Elderly, League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)

Huda Alkaff ........................................................................................................ Founder & Director, Wisconsin Green Muslims

Ella Dunbar ............................................. Program Services Manager, Social Development Commission, Milwaukee

Patricia Goeman .......................................................... Deputy Director, Local Initiatives Support Corporation-Milwaukee

Fabi Maldanado .................................................. Supervisor, 2nd District, Racine County Board of Supervisors

Keith Martin .................................................. Engineering Specialist – Advanced 2, Wisconsin Department of Transportation

N. Lynnette McNeely .......................................................... Legal Redress Chair, Waukesha County NAACP

Andrea Mendez Barrutia .................................. Director of Community Engagement, Hispanic Collaborative

Guadalupe “Wally” Rendon .......................... President, Hispanic Business and Professionals Association of Racine

Sandra Rubin ............................................................................................................ Equal Opportunity Specialist (retired), Milwaukee HUD Field Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity

Jackie Schellinger .......................................................... Indian Community Representative, Retired Judge

Theresa Schuerman .................................................. Walworth County Bilingual Migrant Worker Outreach

Wallace White .......................................................... Principal/CEO, W2EXCEL, LLC
### Table 1
**Racial Characteristics of The Commissioners of the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission and Members of Select Advisory Committees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commission/Committees</th>
<th>White alone, Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Black/African American</th>
<th>American Indian and Native American</th>
<th>Asian and Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>18 (85.7%)</td>
<td>2 (9.5%)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
<td>21 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation Planning</td>
<td>23 (74.2%)</td>
<td>5 (16.1%)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>2 (6.5%)</td>
<td>1 (3.2%)</td>
<td>31 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning for the Milwaukee Urbanized Area</td>
<td>17 (77.3%)</td>
<td>3 (13.6%)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>2 (9.1%)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>22 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice Task Force</td>
<td>2 (14.3%)</td>
<td>5 (35.7%)</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
<td>5 (35.7%)</td>
<td>14 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning for the Kenosha Urbanized Area</td>
<td>13 (81.3%)</td>
<td>3 (18.7%)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>16 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning for the Racine Urbanized Area</td>
<td>17 (94.4%)</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning for the West Bend Urbanized Area</td>
<td>15 (88.2%)</td>
<td>2 (11.8%)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>17 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning for the Round Lake Beach (Wisconsin Portion) Urbanized Area</td>
<td>16 (88.9%)</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>-- (--)</td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2
**Population by Race and Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Urbanized Areas</th>
<th>Six-County Metropolitan Planning Area</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Racine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>90,318</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>12,929</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>8,522</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17,852</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124,060</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As part of the 2010 Federal census, individuals could be reported as being of more than one race. In addition, people of Hispanic ethnicity can be of any race or combination of races. The figures on this table indicate the number of people reported as being white alone and non-Hispanic (non-minority) and those of a given minority race or Hispanic ethnicity (as indicated by the column heading), including those who were reported as that race exclusively and those who were reported as that race and one or more other races. Accordingly, the population figures by race and Hispanic ethnicity sum to more than the total population for each County and the Region.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC.
Estimates of the magnitude and location of the minority populations in the Region were obtained from data available from the most recent year 2010 decennial U.S. Census of population. Based upon the year 2010 Census, the magnitude and location of minority populations in the Region are shown on Maps 1 through 6 and in Table 1. The magnitude and the location of the low-income populations within Southeastern Wisconsin, based upon the 2014-2018 U.S. Census American Community Survey, are shown on Map 7 and summarized in Table 2. The low-income population was defined as families with income below Federally-defined poverty levels.

Although the automobile is the dominant mode of travel for the Region’s minority population, minority residents utilize public transit at a higher percentage relative to other modes of travel than the white population. Based on data from the 2017 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS), the Region’s minority population utilizes public transit for more of its travel (6 percent) than the Region’s white population (less than 1 percent). Automobile travel is the dominant mode of travel by both the Region’s minority population (76 percent) and white population (86 percent). In addition, based on the transit travel survey conducted as part of the Commission’s 2011 travel survey for Southeastern Wisconsin, the minority population represents a greater proportion of total transit ridership than it does of total population, as shown in Table 3.

More robust and detailed data available by county from the year 2014-2018 ACS indicate a similar pattern by race and ethnic group for work trips in Southeastern Wisconsin as for all travel, as shown in Table 4. As these data only include travel to and from work, they exclude those without employment who are more likely to be among the poorest people in the Region. Nonetheless, the data indicate that, in Milwaukee County, between 4 and 13 percent of the minority population uses public transit to travel to and from work, with the highest proportion (13 percent) by the African-American population. Only about 3 percent of the white population uses public transit for travel to and from work. Similarly, about 13 percent of the low-income population (residing in a family with an income below the poverty level) uses public transit to travel to and from work, compared to 5 percent of the population with higher wages. Regarding automobile use in Milwaukee County, minority populations use the automobile for 80 to 89 percent of their travel to and from work. This compares to 87 percent of the white population. Similarly, about 70 percent of travel by low-income populations to and from work is by automobile,
compared to 89 percent for populations of higher income. Data as robust as the 2014-2018 ACS data are not available for modes of travel for non-work trips within Southeastern Wisconsin by race and ethnicity.

As shown in Tables 5 through 7, low-income households and a number of minority populations are particularly dependent upon transit, as a significant proportion of these populations have no private vehicle available for travel. For example, in Milwaukee County, about 74 percent of Black/African-American households indicated they had an automobile available for travel, compared to about 92 percent of non-minority households. Similarly, only about 65 percent of Milwaukee County families in poverty indicated they had an automobile available for travel, compared to 91 percent of families not in poverty. Historical driver’s license data indicate a similar conclusion.
Map 1
Concentrations of Black/African American People in the Region: 2010

CENSUS BLOCKS WHEREIN THE PERCENTAGE OF BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN PEOPLE EXCEEDS THE REGIONAL AVERAGE OF 15.8 PERCENT BASED ON THE 2010 U.S. CENSUS

- **500 OR MORE** BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN PEOPLE
- **200 TO 499** BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN PEOPLE
- **100 TO 199** BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN PEOPLE
- **25 TO 99** BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN PEOPLE
- **10 TO 24** BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN PEOPLE
- **1 TO 9** BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN PEOPLE

MINORITY CONCENTRATIONS ARE ATTRIBUTABLE TO CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN THESE LOCATIONS

Note: Areas in white are comprised of census blocks wherein the percentage of Black/African American people is less than or equal to the regional average of 15.8 percent.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC
Concentrations of American Indian and Alaska Native People in the Region: 2010

Map 2

CENSUS BLOCKS WHEREIN THEIR PERCENTAGE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PEOPLE EXCEEDS THE REGIONAL AVERAGE OF 1.1 PERCENT BASED ON THE 2010 U.S. CENSUS

- 500 OR MORE AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PEOPLE (NONE)
- 200 TO 499 AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PEOPLE (NONE)
- 100 TO 199 AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PEOPLE (NONE)
- 25 TO 99 AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PEOPLE
- 10 TO 24 AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PEOPLE
- 1 TO 9 AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PEOPLE

MINORITY CONCENTRATIONS ARE ATTRIBUTABLE TO CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN THESE LOCATIONS

Note: Areas in white are comprised of census blocks wherein the percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native people is less than or equal to the regional average of 1.1 percent.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC
Map 3
Concentrations of Asian and Pacific Islander People in the Region: 2010

CENSUS BLOCKS WHEREIN THE PERCENTAGE OF ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER PEOPLE EXCEEDS THE REGIONAL AVERAGE OF 3.1 PERCENT BASED ON THE 2010 U.S. CENSUS

- **Red**: 500 OR MORE ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER PEOPLE (NONE)
- **Orange**: 200 TO 499 ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER PEOPLE
- **Brown**: 100 TO 199 ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER PEOPLE
- **Green**: 25 TO 99 ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER PEOPLE
- **Gray**: 10 TO 24 ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER PEOPLE
- **Yellow**: 1 TO 9 ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER PEOPLE

**Note:** Areas in white are comprised of census blocks wherein the percentage of Asian and Pacific Islander people is less than or equal to the regional average of 3.1 percent.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC
Map 4
Concentrations of Other Minority People in the Region: 2010

CENSUS BLOCKS WHEREIN THE PERCENTAGE OF OTHER MINORITY PEOPLE EXCEEDS THE REGIONAL AVERAGE OF 4.5 PERCENT BASED ON THE 2010 U.S. CENSUS

- **500 OR MORE OTHER MINORITY PEOPLE (NONE)**
- **200 TO 499 OTHER MINORITY PEOPLE**
- **100 TO 199 OTHER MINORITY PEOPLE**
- **25 TO 99 OTHER MINORITY PEOPLE**
- **10 TO 24 OTHER MINORITY PEOPLE**
- **1 TO 9 OTHER MINORITY PEOPLE**

**Note:** Areas in white are comprised of census blocks wherein the percentage of other minority people is less than or equal to the regional average of 4.5 percent.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC
Map 5
Concentrations of Hispanic People in the Region: 2010

CENSUS BLOCKS WHEREIN THE PERCENTAGE OF HISPANIC PEOPLE EXCEEDS THE REGIONAL AVERAGE OF 9.9 PERCENT BASED ON THE 2010 U.S. CENSUS

- **500 OR MORE HISPANIC PEOPLE** (NONE)
- **200 TO 499 HISPANIC PEOPLE**
- **100 TO 199 HISPANIC PEOPLE**
- **25 TO 99 HISPANIC PEOPLE**
- **10 TO 24 HISPANIC PEOPLE**
- **1 TO 9 HISPANIC PEOPLE**

Note: Areas in white are comprised of census blocks wherein the percentage of Hispanic people is less than or equal to the regional average of 9.9.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC
Map 6
Concentrations of Year 2010 Races/Ethnicities

1 DOT REPRESENTS 25 PEOPLE
• WHITE ALONE, NOT HISPANIC
• BLACK ALONE, NOT HISPANIC
• ASIAN ALONE, NOT HISPANIC
• SOME OTHER RACE ALONE, OR TWO OR MORE RACES NOT HISPANIC
• 10 TO 24 MINORITY PEOPLE

Note: Population densities are based on the 2010 U.S. Census.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC
Table 1
Population by Race and Ethnicity in the Region by County: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>White Alone, Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Black/African American</th>
<th>American Indian and Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian and Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Other Race</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>129,892</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>13,336</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>514,958</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>269,246</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>13,729</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>38,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaukee</td>
<td>80,689</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>145,414</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>24,471</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth</td>
<td>88,690</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>124,348</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha</td>
<td>353,114</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>6,528</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>1,437,105</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>318,275</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>21,592</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>63,002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As part of the 2010 Federal census, individuals could be reported as being of more than one race. In addition, people of Hispanic ethnicity can be of any race or combination of races. The figures in this table indicate the number of people reported as being white alone and non-Hispanic (non-minority) and those of a given minority race or Hispanic ethnicity (as indicated by the column heading), including those who were reported as that race exclusively and those who were reported as that race and one or more other races. Accordingly, the population figures by race and Hispanic ethnicity sum to more than the total population for each county and the Region.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC
Concentrations of Families in Poverty in the Region: 2014-2018

Map 7

Note: Areas in white are comprised of census tracts wherein the U.S. Census American Community Survey average of 9.5 percent based on 2014-2018 families in poverty exceeds the regional census tracts wherein the percentage of families in poverty is less than or equal to the regional average of 9.5 percent.

The information reflected on this map is from the American Community Survey, which is based on sample data from a small percentage of the population. Consequently, the data has a relatively large margin of error that can result in larger census tracts being identified as having concentrations of families in poverty even though there are only small enclaves of such families located within the tract identified.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census American Community Survey and SEWRPC
Table 2
Families with Income Below the Poverty Level in the Region by County: 2014-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Families</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>41,876</td>
<td>4,027</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>215,024</td>
<td>32,691</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaukee</td>
<td>25,144</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>52,243</td>
<td>4,559</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth</td>
<td>26,787</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>38,089</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha</td>
<td>110,394</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>509,557</td>
<td>48,576</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census American Community Survey and SEWRPC

Table 3
Comparison of the Percentages of Minority Populations and Minority Population Transit Ridership in Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Washington, and Waukesha Counties, and the Cities of Kenosha, Racine, and Waukesha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Transit Operations</th>
<th>Year 2010 Percent Minority Population</th>
<th>Year 2011 Percent Minority Transit Ridership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee County</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaukee County Commuter Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaukee County Shared Ride-Taxi Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County Commuter Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County Shared-Ride Taxi Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha County</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kenosha</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Racine</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Waukesha</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC
### Table 4
Distribution of Employed People by County of Residence, Race, and Mode of Travel to Work: 2014-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Mode of Travel</th>
<th>Kenosha</th>
<th>Milwaukee</th>
<th>Ozaukee</th>
<th>Racine</th>
<th>Walworth</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Waukesha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Alone, Non-Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work at Home</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black or African American Alone</strong></td>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work at Home</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian Alone</strong></td>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work at Home</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Race Alone or Two or More Races</strong></td>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work at Home</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work at Home</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census American Community Survey and SEWRPC
### Table 5
Households by Number of Vehicles Available and Race/Ethnicity of Householder: 2014-2018

#### Kenosha County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity Group Household Vehicle Availability</th>
<th>No Vehicle Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>One or More Vehicles Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>51,150</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>48,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>3,955</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Minority</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6,195</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,804</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Milwaukee County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity Group Household Vehicle Availability</th>
<th>No Vehicle Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>One or More Vehicles Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>229,536</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>210,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>101,768</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>75,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaskan Native</td>
<td>3,897</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>13,838</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Minority</td>
<td>21,651</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>19,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>43,993</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>39,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>384,280</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>334,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ozaukee and Washington Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity Group Household Vehicle Availability</th>
<th>No Vehicle Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>One or More Vehicles Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>86,832</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>84,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaskan Native</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Minority</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>89,404</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Racine County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity Group Household Vehicle Availability</th>
<th>No Vehicle Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>One or More Vehicles Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>60,627</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>57,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>9,153</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>6,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaskan Native</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Minority</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6,215</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76,808</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>71,412</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continued on next page.
**Walworth County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity Group Household Vehicle Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>37,976</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaskan Native</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Minority</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Total</td>
<td>40,865</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Waukesha County                      |            | Race/Ethnicity Group Household Vehicle Availability |
|                                      | Total      | Percent | One or More Vehicles Available | No Vehicle Available |
| White (Non-Hispanic)                 | 144,633    | 90.2    | 138,847 | 5,786 | 4.0 |
| Black/African American               | 4,033      | 2.5     | 4,033   | --    | 0.0 |
| American Indian and Alaskan Native   | 570        | 0.4     | 570     | --    | 0.0 |
| Asian and Pacific Islander           | 4,665      | 2.9     | 4,541   | 124   | 2.7 |
| Other Minority                       | 347        | 0.2     | 347     | --    | 0.0 |
| Hispanic                             | 6,167      | 3.8     | 6,167   | --    | 0.0 |
| County Total                         | 158,369    | 100.0   | 152,459 | 5,910 | 3.7 |

| Region                                |            | Race/Ethnicity Group Household Vehicle Availability |
|                                      | Total      | Percent | One or More Vehicles Available | No Vehicle Available |
| White (Non-Hispanic)                 | 610,754    | 71.7    | 576,413 | 34,341 | 5.6 |
| Black/African American               | 120,720    | 14.2    | 91,554  | 29,166 | 24.2 |
| American Indian and Alaskan Native   | 6,710      | 0.8     | 5,301   | 1,409  | 21.0 |
| Asian and Pacific Islander           | 22,778     | 2.7     | 21,559  | 1,219  | 5.4 |
| Other Minority                       | 23,981     | 2.8     | 21,445  | 2,536  | 10.6 |
| Hispanic                             | 66,960     | 7.8     | 62,501  | 4,459  | 6.7 |
| County Total                         | 815,022    | 100.0   | 745,479 | 69,543 | 8.5 |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample and SEWRPC
Table 6
Households by Number of Vehicles Available and Minority Householders: 2014-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Minority Household Vehicle Availability</th>
<th>Non-Minority Household Vehicle Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or More Vehicles Available</td>
<td>No Vehicle Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha County</td>
<td>11,779</td>
<td>1,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee County</td>
<td>150,758</td>
<td>34,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaukee and Washington Counties</td>
<td>5,397</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine County</td>
<td>14,644</td>
<td>2,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth County</td>
<td>4,124</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha County</td>
<td>15,658</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>202,360</td>
<td>38,789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample and SEWRPC

Table 7
Households by Number of Vehicles for Families in Poverty: 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Vehicle Availability for Families in Poverty</th>
<th>Vehicle Availability for Families Not in Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or More Vehicles Available</td>
<td>No Vehicle Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha County</td>
<td>6,530</td>
<td>1,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee County</td>
<td>47,935</td>
<td>26,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaukee County</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine County</td>
<td>6,520</td>
<td>2,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth County</td>
<td>4,480</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>2,635</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha County</td>
<td>7,115</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>76,985</td>
<td>33,705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Transportation Planning Products and SEWRPC
This document summarizes the procedures that are used by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission in identifying and considering the transportation needs of minority populations during regional transportation planning efforts. Specifically, the document describes the regional transportation planning process used to identify transportation needs and develop recommendations to address those needs, the public involvement and outreach that is conducted throughout the planning process, and the evaluation conducted of the benefits and impacts to minority populations from alternative and final plans. Most recently, the process was used to develop VISION 2050—the year 2050 regional land use and transportation plan—that was adopted by the Commission in 2016, and its update in 2020. Information on VISION 2050 can be found on the plan’s website (www.vision2050sewis.org). The development of VISION 2050 used a visioning and scenario planning process to create a vision for land use and transportation system development in Southeastern Wisconsin that reflects how residents—including minorities and low-income persons—want their communities and the Region to develop. The visioning and scenario planning techniques used as part of the VISION 2050 effort were designed to obtain greater public input—particularly from minority populations and low-income populations.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS

Identifying transportation needs in Southeastern Wisconsin—including those of minority populations and low-income populations—and developing recommendations to address those needs is integral to the regional transportation planning process. This section describes the methods used as part of the process to identify the transportation needs of the minority populations and low-income populations of the Region. In addition, this section describes how the identified needs are used to develop and evaluate alternative plans and to develop final plan recommendations.

Advisory Committee

The Commission has established its Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation Planning to guide Commission staff throughout the regional transportation planning process, including recommending a final plan to the Commission. The Committee is structured on a population proportional basis, consisting of concerned and affected local government elected and appointed public officials who will have the authority and expertise to represent the residents of their local units of government. The Committee also includes involvement of
the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, the Region’s transit operators, and representatives of other transportation modes including airports and Port Milwaukee. Commission seeks diversity—specifically, members of minority population groups—as it considers, solicits, and makes appointments to this, and all of its advisory committees.

**Identifying Transportation Needs**

Developing the regional land use and transportation plan begins with identifying the Region’s current and potential future transportation needs and deficiencies, including for low-income populations and minority populations, by evaluating the existing transportation system. For evaluating future demand on the system, future changes in population, households, and employment are considered. With respect to streets and highways, identifying needs or deficiencies includes identifying existing and potential future traffic congestion, indirect arterial street routing, and inadequate arterial street spacing. Also reviewed is the extent to which the existing street and highway system provides—throughout the Region’s urban areas, including the locations of minority populations and low-income populations—reasonable accessibility to jobs, retail centers, health care facilities (including the Milwaukee Regional Medical Center), parks, public technical colleges and universities, grocery stores, and Milwaukee Mitchell International Airport.

With respect to public transit facilities and service, the magnitude and location of minority populations and low-income populations, and other transit-dependent populations (school age children between the ages of 10 and 16, seniors, people with disabilities, and households with no personal vehicle available) in addition to the overall population are identified. The locations of these populations are then compared to existing transit service locations to identify specific transit needs. Similar to the arterial system evaluation, the level of accessibility via the public transit system to jobs and other activity areas is reviewed. Also reviewed is the directness of transit routes and the extent to which transit route travel times exceed comparable automobile travel times. As part of the Commission’s short-range transit planning, analyses are made of the location within the urban areas of transit-dependent populations, and of jobs, and of the ability of existing transit services and planned transit services to connect the transit-dependent populations with jobs. Based on these analyses being conducted as part of past planning efforts, the identified needs have included expanding transit availability and accessibility to the entire metropolitan area (linking to jobs and activity centers) and improving the quality of transit service (frequency of service, speed of service, and the number of transit routes).

Following the evaluation of the existing land use development and the transportation system, transportation needs of the Region—including the needs of minority populations and low-income populations—are then confirmed by public involvement and outreach, and reviewed by the advisory committee. With respect to minority populations and low-income populations, this is accomplished, in large part, based upon comments received as part of public outreach to such populations throughout the planning process.

**Developing and Evaluating Alternative Plans**

The defined transportation needs are used to assist with developing and evaluating alternative transportation plans. The number of alternative plans considered is dependent on input from the advisory committee and public input received. For each alternative developed, a wide range of alternatives are considered to address the forecast travel demand, including various land use development alternatives, along with public transit system improvement and expansion, travel demand management measures, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and transportation system management measures. Residual travel, traffic, and traffic congestion are identified following consideration of the above measures, and potential highway improvement and expansion projects are then considered as a measure of last resort to address the residual traffic volume and congestion.

With respect to transit, the alternatives include transit improvements for addressing the needs of minority populations and low-income populations, including expanded days and hours of transit service; increased frequency of service; a rapid transit network for faster service; expanded commuter transit routes with reverse-commute service; and expanded transit service areas. In addition, the location of jobs and activity centers are used to guide the development of alternative expanded and improved transit services, which would address the transit service needs of minority populations and low-income populations.
Each alternative plan is then evaluated based on its ability to address the identified existing and future transportation system needs and deficiencies. The evaluation includes estimating and assessing a wide range of impacts including transportation, socio-economic, environmental, and financial impacts of the plan. An explicit evaluation is conducted of the impacts of plans on minority populations and low-income populations in Southeastern Wisconsin. This includes identifying the location of minority populations and low-income populations and an evaluating the impacts of the plan on those populations. The analyses identify whether minority populations and low-income populations receive a disproportionate share of the estimated impacts, both costs and benefits of the regional transportation component of the regional land use and transportation plan.

With respect to evaluating the street and highway element of alternative plans, an assessment of the accessibility provided by the highway system is conducted, and documented in tables and maps. Also, areas of residual traffic congestion are identified and mapped, and the location of all proposed highway capacity expansion projects are mapped. All of these are compared to the locations of minority populations and low-income populations to determine the extent to which they receive benefits—such as improved accessibility—from the alternative plans, and preliminary and final recommended plans, and as well, to determine whether they disproportionately incur the costs and impacts from the plan, specifically the location of major highway improvements through their communities. With respect to evaluating the public transit element of alternative plans, an assessment of the accessibility provided by the transit system plan element is conducted to determine whether the transit plan results in improvements, and whether the minority population of the Region benefits from these improvements. A qualitative assessment is also made of the transit system improvements included in the plan to assess those areas of the Region that may be receiving the most benefit from the proposed improvements.

The alternatives and the results of their evaluation are then presented to, and refined by, the Advisory Committee, along with the transportation systems management task force. The alternative plans and their evaluation are then presented to the public for review and comment.

**Developing the Final Plan**

A preliminary recommended regional transportation and congestion management plan is then developed based on the results of the evaluation and input from the public and local officials. The preliminary recommended plan is again evaluated in the similar manner as the alternatives and is compared to existing conditions and the trend alternative. Following potential refinement, and approval, of the preliminary recommended plan by the Advisory Committee, the plan and its evaluation are then presented to the public for review and comment. Based on input from the public and local and State officials, adjustments are made to the preliminary recommended plan to develop the final recommended regional transportation and congestion management plan. The final plan is then considered for approval by the Advisory Committee and the Commission.

The final plans adopted by the Commission, as part of its regional transportation planning work, have historically recommended significantly improved and expanded transit service, which is particularly focused on serving, and addressing the needs of, minority populations and low-income populations throughout Southeastern Wisconsin. For example, the improved and expanded transit service included in VISION 2050 would expand the transit service area to the full metropolitan region, significantly increase service hours so service is available throughout the day and on weekends, greatly improve frequency of service so that it is more convenient, and implement express, rapid transit, and commuter services which would increase the speed of transit travel. All of these transit improvements and expansion are principally directed towards serving the transit-dependent populations in the Region, including minority populations and low-income populations.

**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND OUTREACH**

This section describes the public involvement and outreach process that is used as part the regional transportation planning process. As part of the outreach, significant effort is made to reach and involve the Region’s minority populations and low-income populations in the regional transportation planning process, including in identifying their transportation needs.
Environmental Justice Task Force

Another advisory body important to the regional transportation planning process is the Commission’s Environmental Justice Task Force. The members of this advisory body are intended to be broadly representative of minority, low-income, and special needs populations from across Southeastern Wisconsin. One member of the Task Force also serves as a committee liaison for the Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation Planning. The Task Force’s primary role is to enhance the consideration and integration of environmental justice for minority and low-income groups on transportation planning and other issues throughout the regional planning process. In this capacity, the Task Force has reviewed and commented upon Commission planning and programming efforts, significantly including transportation, since its creation in 2007. This includes reviewing draft chapters of plan reports, Commission public involvement and outreach efforts for each planning effort, public participation plan documents, and studies of the impacts of plan benefits and costs on minority populations and low-income populations.

Public Involvement and Outreach

The planning process includes extensive public involvement including a series of newsletters and public meetings conducted as part of developing the plan, task forces to address specific issues under the plan, public outreach conducted to reach minority and low-income communities, and a website. The goal of the public involvement is to achieve public awareness of, and input into, the planning process and final plan. At key steps in the planning process, newsletters are prepared, public meetings are held, and outreach is conducted. All information prepared and provided as part of the planning and programming process is provided on the Commission website, including notices of meetings and meeting materials, such as minutes, draft reports, and final reports. The Commission also attempts to summarize plan documents in newsletters and brochures that are made widely available to obtain public awareness and input throughout the planning process.

With respect to VISION 2050, seven public workshops—one in each county of the Region—were conducted at five key stages in the visioning and scenario planning process to provide information on, and obtain input to, the development of the regional land use and transportation plan. In addition to the public meetings, the public was able to review and provide input at each stage on a website developed for the effort (www.vision2050sewis.org). The first set of workshops were held in September 2013 and used public outreach techniques designed to engage members of the public in visioning for the future, encouraging them to better understand land use and transportation development consequences, and discuss and identify their land use and transportation goals and needs. Input provided at these meetings—along with input collected from similar activities accessed from the VISION 2050 website and a telephone survey—were used to develop a set of Guiding Statements describing the future direction of growth and change in the Region with respect to land development and transportation. These Guiding Statements provided general direction to develop and evaluate conceptual scenarios and detailed alternative plans. An opportunity to review and comment on a draft set of Guiding Statements was provided during the second set of workshops held in December 2013. The next step in the VISION 2050 process was to develop and evaluate the conceptual land use and transportation scenarios, which were reviewed and commented on by the public during the third set of workshops held in the fall of 2014. The public then had an opportunity in the fall of 2015 at the fourth set of workshops to review and comment on detailed alternative plans and on the results of an evaluation of those alternative plans, developed based on the public comment received on the conceptual scenarios. Finally, the public had an opportunity at the fifth set of workshops held in the spring of 2016 to review and comment on the preliminary recommended year 2050 regional land use and transportation plan.

Through the Commission’s public involvement process, public meetings are located in areas with minority populations and specific outreach is directed to groups and organizations representing minority populations and low-income populations. As part of this outreach, the Commission attempts to build awareness and obtain input, and in particular, identify the transportation needs of minority populations and low-income populations. For example, as part of the extensive public outreach for VISION 2050, the Commission partnered with eight community organizations specifically targeted at reaching and engaging minority populations, low-income populations, and people with disabilities. The eight partner organizations include: Common Ground, Ethnically Diverse Business Coalition, Hmong American Friendship Association, IndependenceFirst, the Milwaukee Urban League, Southside Organizing Committee, Urban Economic Development Association of Wisconsin, and the Urban League of Racine and Kenosha. Each of these partner organizations hosted five of their own workshops, which correspond to the five sets of workshops open to the general public.
In addition to the visioning and scenario planning activities conducted as part of public workshops, the participants of the workshops sponsored by the partner organizations were specifically asked to identify their transportation needs. Input at these workshops, along with the identification of transportation needs, was documented and considered in developing VISION 2050. Following the initial VISION 2050 process, the Commission continued to engage these partner organizations, and added Renew Environmental Public Health Advocates as a ninth partner. During outreach for the 2020 Review and Update of VISION 2050, staff engaged its now nine community partners once again, including holding multiple meetings with the partners during both rounds of meetings for the general public.

The transportation needs identified by participants at the workshops held by the eight community organization partners during the initial VISION 2050 process included expanded and integrated public and private transportation modes; better connections by transit to jobs and other activity centers (including better links between urban and suburban areas); expanded bus routes and hours of service; more transit options and services for seniors and people with disabilities; an expanded transit system to include more streetcar, commuter, and rapid transit service; improved roadway maintenance; and better bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. Comments received were mixed with respect to expanding the capacity of the arterial system, with most comments expressing opposition to widening existing arterials and adding new arterial facilities, but some comments expressing support for expanding capacity to improve access within or between communities. Comments received during the 2020 Review and Update of VISION 2050 generally affirmed the needs identified during the initial VISION 2050 process, in particular needs associated with improving public transit services. Notable additional needs identified during the 2020 Update included support for providing additional funding for public transit and the transportation system as a whole and for identifying ways to address reckless driving and excessive vehicular speeds on roadways.

With respect to outreach to minority and low-income population groups, the Commission’s Public Involvement and Outreach Division staff contacts these groups through letter and phone calls to arrange meetings at the key steps in the regional transportation planning process to provide information, identify transportation needs, and obtain comment and input into the planning process and final plan. The extensive outreach conducted by the Commission’s public involvement and outreach staff over the last three years is documented in Exhibit F of the Commission’s Title VI Program.

EVALUATING THE BENEFITS AND IMPACTS TO MINORITY POPULATIONS

As part of evaluating the regional land use and transportation plan, with respect to Title VI and environmental justice requirements, an extensive analysis is conducted with respect to whether minority populations and low-income populations receive disproportionate impacts—costs and benefits—of the transportation component of the plan. The documentation of the benefits and burdens of VISION 2050, including the detailed alternative plans and the preliminary recommended plan developed during the planning process, along with the fiscally constrained transportation plan, on minority populations and low-income populations, included quantitative evaluation of the extent to which plan recommended transit service improvement and expansion provides service to minority populations and low-income populations. This included mapping of the magnitude and location of minority populations and low-income populations, and evaluating the extent to which proposed transit service improvements meet identified minority and low-income population transit service needs. This was accomplished by evaluating the characteristics of the population served by proposed express and rapid transit (bus rapid transit and light rail) systems; evaluating the characteristics of the population in areas recommended to receive improved frequency of transit service; and evaluating the characteristics of population of areas which would be served by new transit service. These evaluations were documented in the VISION 2050 report as part of the evaluation of the more detailed alternative plans (Appendix F-2: www.sewrpc.org/v2050vol2appf.pdf), the preliminary recommended plan (Appendix H-2: www.sewrpc.org/v2050vol2apph.pdf), and the fiscally constrained system (Appendix N: www.sewrpc.org/v2050vol3apnn.pdf). The evaluations were also conducted on the VISION 2050 plan and the fiscally constrained system as part of an amendment related to the Foxconn development in 2018 (Appendix C: www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPFiles/Vision2050/AdoptedAmdtDec2018.pdf) and the interim update to VISION 2050 in 2020 (Appendix D).
An evaluation of impacts of the regional transportation improvement program (TIP) on minority populations and low-income populations is conducted as part of the biennial TIP update. The last such evaluation completed as part of the preparation of the 2019-2022 TIP, as adopted by the Commission in 2018, is documented in Appendix I of the 2019-2022 TIP report (www.sewrpc.org/tip). The evaluation includes a mapping of transit improvement and expansion projects and a comparison of project location to the location of minority populations and low-income populations. A similar assessment is made of the location of existing transit systems and funding programmed in the TIP to preserve, or continue operation of, existing transit systems.
The Southeastern Wisconsin Region, as shown on Map 1, has 16 public transit systems that are owned and operated by 13 local governments. Federal and State funding provide over 80 percent of the total annual public capital and operating funding for transit in the Region. Table 1 provides the number of boarding passengers and the amount of revenue miles in each of the transit systems for the years 2017 and 2018. The largest transit operator in the Region in 2018 by far is the Milwaukee County Transit System (MCTS) with 30.9 million boarding passengers, or about 88 percent of the total transit ridership for the Region, and 16.4 million revenue vehicle miles of service, or about 80 percent of total fixed-route revenue vehicle-miles of transit service in the Region and about 70 percent of the total revenue vehicle-miles of transit service for the Region including shared-ride taxi service. The bus systems for the Cities of Kenosha, Racine, and Waukesha together represent in 2018 another 9 percent of total transit ridership in the Region and another 13 percent of total fixed-route bus revenue vehicle-miles of service in the Region (11 percent of total revenue vehicle-miles of transit service in the Region including shared-ride taxi service). Thus, the transit systems for Milwaukee County and the Cities of Kenosha, Racine, and Waukesha represent in 2018 a combined 98 percent of the transit ridership in the Region, 98 percent of the fixed route bus service, and 96 percent of total transit service (including shared-ride taxi).

Table 2 and Map 2 show the geographic distribution of the minority population of the Region. About 73 percent of the minority population of the Region resides in Milwaukee County. Another 22 percent of the Region’s minority population resides within Kenosha, Racine, and Waukesha Counties. As discussed previously, the transit service in Southeastern Wisconsin is primarily provided in Kenosha, Milwaukee, Racine, and Waukesha Counties, which contain 95 percent of the minority population of the Region.

Map 3 shows the year 2019 routes and service areas for the public transit systems in the Region in comparison to concentrations of minority populations. Comparing the existing transit services to the location of minority populations indicates that most of the transit systems—and in particular MCTS—serve the principal concentrations of minority population in the Region. Specifically, about 487,440 members of the minority population (or 83.6 percent of the Region’s total minority population), compared to about 590,900 non-minority people (or 41.1 percent of Region’s total non-minority population), were served by fixed-route transit service in 2019.
Map 1
Existing Public Transit Services in the Southeastern Wisconsin Region: 2019
### Table 1
**Public Transit Revenue Ridership and Service: 2017 and 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Transit System</th>
<th>Boarding Passengers</th>
<th>Revenue Vehicle Miles of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus and Streetcar</strong></td>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>Kenosha Area Transit (City of Kenosha)</td>
<td>1,342,000</td>
<td>1,407,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Kenosha County Transit (Kenosha County)</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>17,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ozaukee</td>
<td>Ozaukee County Express Bus (Ozaukee County)</td>
<td>102,500</td>
<td>92,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milwaukee</strong></td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Milwaukee County Transit System (Milwaukee County)</td>
<td>32,063,000</td>
<td>30,960,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukee Streetcar (City of Milwaukee)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>156,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>Racine Transit, RYDE (City of Racine)</td>
<td>1,159,400</td>
<td>1,111,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee Commuter Bus (City of Racine)</td>
<td>52,200</td>
<td>49,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Washington County Commuter Express (Washington County)</td>
<td>80,900</td>
<td>78,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waukesha</td>
<td>Waukesha County Transit System (Waukesha County)</td>
<td>487,400</td>
<td>474,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waukesha Metro Transit (City of Waukesha)</td>
<td>522,600</td>
<td>508,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,826,100</td>
<td>34,856,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxi</strong></td>
<td>Ozaukee</td>
<td>Ozaukee County Shared-Ride Taxi (Ozaukee County)</td>
<td>116,300</td>
<td>112,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walworth</td>
<td>Whitewater Taxi Service (City of Whitewater)</td>
<td>26,100</td>
<td>25,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walworth County Dial-a-Ride Taxi Service (Walworth County)</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>26,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Washington County Shared-Ride Taxi (Washington County)</td>
<td>85,200</td>
<td>91,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford City Taxi (City of Hartford)</td>
<td>19,100</td>
<td>18,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Bend Taxi Service (City of West Bend)</td>
<td>99,600</td>
<td>99,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>366,800</td>
<td>374,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36,192,900</td>
<td>35,231,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: National Transit Database*
### Table 2
**Population by Race and Hispanic Ethnicity in the Region: 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>White Alone, Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>129,892</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>13,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>514,958</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>269,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaukee</td>
<td>80,689</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>1,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>145,414</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>24,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth</td>
<td>88,690</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>1,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>124,348</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>1,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha</td>
<td>353,114</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>6,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>1,437,105</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>318,275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As part of the 2010 Federal census, individuals could be reported as being of more than one race. In addition, people of Hispanic ethnicity can be of any race or combination of races. The figures in this table indicate the number of people reported as being white alone and non-Hispanic (non-minority) and those of a given minority race or Hispanic ethnicity (as indicated by the column heading), including those who were reported as that race exclusively and those who were reported as that race and one or more other races. Accordingly, the population figures by race and Hispanic ethnicity sum to more than the total population for each county and the Region.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC
Concentrations of Total Minority Population in the Region: 2010

CENSUS BLOCKS WHEREIN THE PERCENTAGE OF MINORITY PEOPLE, INCLUDING HISPANIC PEOPLE, EXCEEDS THE REGIONAL AVERAGE OF 28.9 PERCENT BASED ON THE 2010 U.S. CENSUS
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Note: Areas in white are comprised of census blocks wherein the percentage of minority people, including Hispanic people, is less than or equal to the regional average of 28.9 percent.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC
Comparison of Existing Concentrations of Total Minority Population to Public Transit Services: 2019

Map 3
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Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC
Map 4 shows the level of transit quality—Excellent, Very Good, Good, and Basic\(^1\)—of the year 2017 fixed-route transit service in the Region based on the amount and speed of transit service. Table 3 shows the numbers of minority population and non-minority population that are served by each of the four levels of fixed-route transit service provided in the Region in 2019. Maps 5 and 6 compare the quality of the existing year 2017 fixed-route transit service within the Region and within Milwaukee County to concentrations of minority population. As shown in Table 3 and on Maps 5 and 6, the quality fixed-route transit service—Excellent, Very Good, and Good—provided in 2017 principally serves the minority populations in the Region. Specifically, about 286,600 members of the minority population (or 49 percent of the Region’s minority population), as compared to 213,100 members of the non-minority population (or 17 percent of the Region’s non-minority population), are served by quality fixed-route transit service.

As shown in Table 4, about 54 percent of the minority population in the Region has access to 10,000 or more jobs by transit within 30 minutes, as compared to 19 percent of the Region’s non-minority population. Table 5 shows the percentage of the minority population and non-minority population that have reasonable access by fixed-route transit service in 2017 to activities centers, such as retail centers, public technical colleges and universities, major parks, health care facilities (including the Milwaukee Regional Medical Center), grocery stores, and General Mitchell International Airport. The percentage of the minority population that has reasonable access to the various activity centers is generally greater than the percentage of the non-minority population with the same level of access.

With respect to public transit operating assistance, the public transit operators in the Region rely heavily on Federal and State operating assistance, which typically funds about 50 to 60 percent of total annual transit operating expenses and represents about 80 to 90 percent of total annual public operating funding for transit. The transit operators located within the urbanized areas of the Region utilize most of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 funding they receive to fund their operating costs (through using the funds for capitalized maintenance). In addition to the FTA funding available to the Region, transit operators have used Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Congestion Mitigation and Air-Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funding to fund the operation of new transit routes for a limited period of time and to fund capital transit projects. Table 6 provides the public transit operating assistance for years 2017 and 2018 for the transit systems in the Region. The amount of State and Federal public transit assistance in the Region totaled $109.6 million in 2017 and $116.8 million in 2018, about 75.1 percent and 80.0 percent, respectively, of the total of annual transit operating assistance. State transit operating assistance was $81.3 million in 2017 and $82.9 million in 2018, and Federal transit assistance used for operating was $28.3 million in 2017 and $34.0 million in 2018. The amount of Federal and State operating assistance used by MCTS totaled $89.5 million in 2017 and $96.4 million in 2018, or about 61.3 percent and 66.0 percent, respectively, of the total Federal and State funds available to the Region. The transit systems in the Cities of Kenosha, Racine, and Waukesha received $11.3 million of Federal and State operating funding in 2017 and $12.5 million in 2018, representing 7.8 percent and 8.6 percent of total funding received by the Region. The City of Milwaukee began receiving operating funds for the streetcar line in 2018, including $1.2 million in Federal funds.

With respect to State and Federal public transit capital funding, only Federal funds are available to the transit operators in the Region to fund transit capital projects with the amount of Federal funds used for transit capital projects varying from year-to-year. Prior to the enactment of the Moving Ahead to Progress

---

\(1\) Areas with “Excellent” transit service are typically within walking distance of at least one rapid transit station, and also within walking distance of multiple frequent local or express bus services. A resident living in an area with Excellent transit service has a high likelihood of not needing to own a car.

Areas with “Very Good” transit service typically are within walking distance of a rapid transit or commuter rail station but may have fewer local or express bus routes nearby than an area with Excellent service. Alternatively, areas with Very Good service may not be within walking distance of a rapid transit or commuter rail station but may instead be near multiple frequent local and express bus routes.

To have “Good” transit service, an area would be within walking distance of one local or express bus route that provides service at least every 15 minutes all day or may be near three or more local bus routes that do not provide such frequent, all-day service. An area with Good transit service typically would not have access to a rapid transit line.

If an area is served by “Basic” transit service, it is within walking distance of at least one local bus route, but generally not more than two routes, that are not likely to have service frequency better than 15 minutes all day.
(MAP-21) in 2012, much of the funding used by transit operators in the Region for capital projects was FTA Section 5309 – capital program funding. In recent years, MCTS has also used other Federal funding sources to fund transit capital projects, such as FHWA Interstate Cost Estimate funds and FHWA Surface Transportation Program funds. As shown in Table 7, the Federal capital funding that was used by transit operators totaled $30.3 million in 2017 and $28.9 million in 2018. MCTS utilized $7.8 million in 2017 and $2.3 million in 2018, or about 25.8 percent and 8.0 percent, respectively, of the total Federal capital funds expended in the Region. The transit system in the City of Waukesha received $741,900 of Federal capital funds in 2017 and $765,038 million in 2018, representing 2.5 percent and 2.7 percent of total Federal capital transit funding received by the Region. The City of Milwaukee reported $21.1 million in 2017 and $25.3 million in 2018 in capital expenditures related to the construction of the downtown streetcar line, which began service in November 2018.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

As the vast majority of State and Federal transit funding is used to provide quality transit service to those areas with substantial minority populations, the distribution of State and Federal transit funding does not have a disparate impact on the minority population of the Region. Kenosha, Milwaukee, Racine, and Waukesha Counties together account for 95 percent of the Region’s minority population and received over 96 percent of the State and Federal transit funding provided to the Region. In addition, review of the service areas of these four transit systems and of the quality of transit service provided by these transit systems indicates that their transit service—which is primarily funded by Federal and State funds—serves their minority populations.

Table 3
Transit Service Quality of Fixed-Route Transit Service for Minority and Non-Minority Populations in the Region: 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>224,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>58,700</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>177,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minority population and non-minority population are based on the 2010 U.S. Census.

Source: 2010 U.S. Census and SEWRPC
Map 5
Comparison of Existing Concentrations of Total Minority Population to Transit Service Quality: 2017
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Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC
Map 6
Comparison of Existing Concentrations of Total Minority Population in Milwaukee County to Transit Service Quality: 2019
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Source: SEWRPC
### Table 4
Access to Jobs Within 30 Minutes by Fixed-Route Transit Service in the Region: 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population*</th>
<th>100,000 or More Jobs</th>
<th>50,000 or More Jobs</th>
<th>10,000 or More Jobs</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>21,800</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>43,300</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Minority population and non-minority population are based on the 2010 U.S. Census.

Source: 2010 U.S. Census and SEWRPC

### Table 5
Reasonable Access to Activity Centers by Fixed-Route Transit Service in the Region: 2017*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Center</th>
<th>Minority Population*</th>
<th>Non-Minority Population*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Centers</td>
<td>108,300</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Parks</td>
<td>41,600</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Technical Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>141,900</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Facilities</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Stores</td>
<td>470,100</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Mitchell International Airport</td>
<td>71,200</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Regional Medical Center</td>
<td>128,800</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Totals</td>
<td>582,900</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table shows the existing minority populations and non-minority populations that would have reasonable access (within 30 minutes) by transit to various activity centers under existing conditions. More information can be found in Appendix Equity Analysis of Updated Transportation Component of the 2020 Update to VISION 2050.

*Reasonable access is defined as the ability to travel by transit within 60 minutes to General Mitchell International Airport and the Milwaukee Regional Medical Center and within 30 minutes to all the other activity centers.

*Minority population and non-minority population are based on the 2010 U.S. Census.

Source: 2010 U.S. Census and SEWRPC
Table 6
Public Transit Operating Assistance Within the Region: 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Services</th>
<th>2017 Actual/Estimated</th>
<th>2018 Actual/Estimated</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus and Streetcar Systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intracounty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee County</td>
<td>19,356,962</td>
<td>70,127,479</td>
<td>28,324,000</td>
<td>117,808,441</td>
<td>24,076,790</td>
<td>115,877,342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Racine</td>
<td>2,299,241</td>
<td>1,877,184</td>
<td>1,803,900</td>
<td>5,980,325</td>
<td>2,636,230</td>
<td>6,514,114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kenosha</td>
<td>2,560,062</td>
<td>1,704,815</td>
<td>2,040,930</td>
<td>6,305,807</td>
<td>2,115,854</td>
<td>7,050,170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Milwaukee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,226,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>306,748</td>
<td>1,533,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Waukesha</td>
<td>526,786</td>
<td>2,356,370</td>
<td>1,195,358</td>
<td>4,078,514</td>
<td>532,887</td>
<td>1,811,258</td>
<td>1,533,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>24,743,051</td>
<td>76,065,848</td>
<td>33,364,188</td>
<td>134,173,087</td>
<td>30,588,754</td>
<td>135,160,418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercounty Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee Counties</td>
<td>336,287</td>
<td>274,557</td>
<td>401,236</td>
<td>1,012,080</td>
<td>-.</td>
<td>-.</td>
<td>-.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaaukee-Milwaukee Counties</td>
<td>480,574</td>
<td>382,086</td>
<td>192,701</td>
<td>1,055,361</td>
<td>332,618</td>
<td>624,500</td>
<td>1,358,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington-Milwaukee Counties</td>
<td>453,118</td>
<td>372,240</td>
<td>266,444</td>
<td>1,091,802</td>
<td>441,787</td>
<td>366,661</td>
<td>1,314,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha-Milwaukee Counties</td>
<td>513,039</td>
<td>1,930,404</td>
<td>930,331</td>
<td>3,373,774</td>
<td>525,287</td>
<td>1,747,813</td>
<td>3,199,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Kenosha County</td>
<td>251,305</td>
<td>53,963</td>
<td>187,997</td>
<td>493,265</td>
<td>235,670</td>
<td>43,529</td>
<td>282,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>2,034,323</td>
<td>3,013,250</td>
<td>1,978,709</td>
<td>7,026,282</td>
<td>1,535,362</td>
<td>2,782,503</td>
<td>1,847,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region Total</strong></td>
<td>28,272,311</td>
<td>81,302,612</td>
<td>36,311,323</td>
<td>145,886,246</td>
<td>33,954,349</td>
<td>82,864,603</td>
<td>41,453,598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Operating assistance for Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee transit service was reported jointly with City of Racine intracounty transit services in 2018.

Source: National Transit Database and SEWRPC
### Table 7
Federal and Local Public Transit Capital Funds Expended within the Region: 2017 and 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Services</th>
<th>2017 Actual/Estimated</th>
<th>2018 Actual/Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-Route Systems – Intracounty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kenosha</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee County</td>
<td>7,798,075</td>
<td>1,949,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Racine</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>32,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Waukesha</td>
<td>741,900</td>
<td>198,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Milwaukee</td>
<td>21,139,171</td>
<td>1,949,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>29,679,146</td>
<td>4,129,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared-Ride Taxi Systems – Intracounty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hartford</td>
<td>26,574</td>
<td>7,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaukee County</td>
<td>307,871</td>
<td>87,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>174,282</td>
<td>43,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of West Bend</td>
<td>74,739</td>
<td>23,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth County</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Whitewater</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>583,466</td>
<td>162,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region Total</strong></td>
<td>30,262,612</td>
<td>4,292,309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Intercounty commuter bus services did not expend and public transit capital funds in 2017 or 2018. No state funds expended for capital were reported to the National Transit Database in 2017 or 2018.

*Source: National Transit Database*