

Racial Equity and Social Justice Initiative RESJ Tool: Fast-Track Version



INSTRUCTIONS

This abbreviated version of the full RESJ Tool is intended for issues on a short timeline or without a widespread impact.

Examples:

- single piece of legislation already drafted and introduced.
- creation of a single position description and job posting for an open position
- development of a single budget item proposal

For broader policies and legislation in its beginning phase, please use the full version of the RESJ Toolkit.

This tool should be completed by people with different racial and socioeconomic perspectives. When possible, involve those directly impacted by the issue. Include and document multiple voices in this process. The order of questions may be re-arranged to suit your situation.

Mission of the Racial Equity and Social Justice (RESJ) Initiative: To establish racial equity and social justice as core principles in all decisions, policies and functions of the City of Madison.

Equity is just and fair inclusion into a society in which all, including all racial and ethnic groups, can participate, prosper, and reach their full potential. Equity gives all people a just and fair shot in life despite historic patterns of racial and economic exclusion (www.policylink.org).

The persistence of deep racial and social inequities and divisions across society is evidence of bias at the individual, institutional and structural levels. These types of bias often work to the benefit of White people and to the detriment of people of color, usually unintentionally or inadvertently.

Purpose of this Tool: To facilitate conscious consideration of equity and examine how communities of color and low-income populations will be affected by a proposed action/decision of the City.

The “*What, Who, Why, and How*” questions of this tool are designed to lead to strategies to prevent or mitigate adverse impacts and unintended consequences on marginalized populations.

BEGIN ANALYSIS

Name of topic or issue being analyzed:

Food Cart Review Policy and Process Changes

Main contact name(s) and contact information for this analysis:

Meghan Blake-Horst, Dan Kennelly

Names and affiliations of others participating in the analysis:

Dan
Meghan
Kay-tee
Rena Gelman
Jonny
Josh
Adam Hoen
Stephanie
Peggy
Linda
Rebecca

1. WHAT

a. What does the policy, plan or proposal seek to accomplish?

Make updates to the current evaluation of food carts.

b. What do available data tell you about this issue? (See page 3 for guidance on data resources.)

Data analysis needs to be standardized. Over 60% of carts are owned and operated by people of color. 3% of City of Madison own businesses are owned by people of color.

Prior review years scoring has shown very similar reviews.

Seniority points end up significantly impacting the scores of carts that have existed for some time.

c. What data are unavailable or missing?

General public/customer data about food carts.

Data about the demographics of food cart owners/operators over time.

Sales numbers, where the general public spends their money.

What do seniority points go with? Two-wheel axle? The person? The menu/food?

Who exactly are the reviewers and what are their demographics?

2. WHO

a. Who (individuals or groups) could be impacted by the issues related to this policy, plan or proposal?
Who would benefit?

Reviewers and carts could benefit from longer time period to review. Giving away free food impacts the financials of some carts for weeks, so spreading it out over a longer period of time would be a benefit.

Reviewers continue to get free lunch.

Food carts could benefit by having reviewers take training so scores could be more consistent.

If new carts were able to serve customers they could recoup costs for operating and giving away free food.

If carts did not have to make substitutions they could save time and money.

Reviewing seniority points could benefit newer carts.

Who would be burdened?

Reviewing seniority points could severely burden some long standing carts and put them out of business.

80% per cart could burden some carts if there were not enough reviewers.

Making these changes could result in confusion among cart owners who are not dominant English speakers.

When these changes go to the Vending Oversight Committee, people who are not comfortable coming out to meetings may not make it to provide feedback. Getting public feedback in a committee meeting is limiting.

Not allowing for substitutions on carts could go against cultural norms for some carts.

Having a training for cart reviewers that is not accessible (correct times, online, etc.) could deter them from being reviewers.

The review process overall (above and beyond these specific changes) restricts carts and leads to burdens for potential cart owners.

Are there potential disproportionate impacts on communities of color or low-income communities?

Initial data, while not reviewed in detail, indicate that cart owners are over 60% people of color. Several participants also indicated that many are low-income. It appears that any changes made will impact these communities given they make up the majority of cart owners.

3. WHY

a. What are potential unintended consequences (social, economic, health, environmental or other)?

Changes into the future should ensure the continued ability for low income and communities of color to have access to this business opportunity. These changes will not likely impact one group more than the others, but if changes in the future limit the ability for low income populations and populations of color to access this business opportunity, there may be unintended consequences.

4. HOW: RECOMMENDATIONS SECTION

a. Describe recommended strategies to address adverse impacts, prevent negative unintended consequences and advance racial equity (program, policy, partnership and/or budget/fiscal strategies):

Conduct an equity impact review of the entire street vending process.

Work with groups that can support folks of color and low income populations to understand any changes that are being made.

Continue to create opportunities for 1:1 appointments for vendors with Megan and staff.

Ask these questions with folks who were not in the room today. Many racial groups were not present.

Continue to deepen relationships with FEED kitchen and other groups.

Include more veteran food cart owners in any final recommendations.

DATA RESOURCES FOR RACIAL EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE IMPACT ANALYSIS

City of Madison

- Neighborhood Indicators (UW Applied Population Lab and City of Madison):
<http://madison.apl.wisc.edu>
- Open Data Portal (City of Madison):
<https://data.cityofmadison.com>
- Madison Measures (City of Madison):
www.cityofmadison.com/finance/documents/madisonmeasures-2013.pdf
- Census reporter (US Census Bureau):
<http://censusreporter.org/profiles/06000US5502548000-madison-city-dane-county-wi>

Dane County

- Geography of Opportunity: A Fair Housing Equity Assessment for Wisconsin's Capital Region (Capital Area Regional Planning Commission):
www.capitalarearpc.org
- Race to Equity report (Wisconsin Council on Children and Families):
<http://racetoequity.net>
- Healthy Dane (Public Health Madison & Dane County and area healthcare organizations):
www.healthydane.org
- Dane Demographics Brief (UW Applied Population Lab and UW-Extension):
www.apl.wisc.edu/publications/Dane_County_Demographics_Brief_2014.pdf

State of Wisconsin

- Wisconsin Quickfacts (US Census):
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/55000.html>
- Demographics Services Center (WI Dept of Administration):
www.doa.state.wi.us/section_detail.asp?linkcatid=11&linkid=64&locid=9
- Applied Population Laboratory (UW-Madison):
www.apl.wisc.edu/data.php

Federal

- American FactFinder (US Census):
<http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>
- 2010 Census Gateway (US Census):
www.census.gov/2010census