

RACIAL EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE TOOL

COMPREHENSIVE VERSION



Racial Equity
& Social Justice Initiative



Racial Equity and Social Justice Initiative

Racial Equity Analysis Tool

Comprehensive Version



INSTRUCTIONS

Use this tool as early as possible in the development of City policies, plans, programs and budgets.

For issues on a short timeline or with a narrow impact, you may use the RESJI Racial Equity Analysis Tool – Fast Track Version.

This analysis 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 Initiative (RESJI): 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).

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:

Do the proposed revisions make for a more equitable street assessment policy?
Is there a way to transition the policy to be more equitable?

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

Chris Petykowski, Principal Engineer 2
City of Madison Engineering Division
cpetykowski@cityofmadison.com

Names and affiliations of others participating in the analysis:

Chris Petykowski, Engineering
Rebecca Cnare, PCED
Aaron Canton, Engineering
Phil Gritzmacher, Transportation
Doran Viste, City Attorney's Office
Kristine Koh, Finance

1. WHAT

a. What is the policy, plan or proposal being analyzed, and what does it seek to accomplish?

The City assesses all or a portion of the cost of public sidewalk, curb, and streets improvements to benefiting properties. The current policy for assessing The cost to property owners varies by project type (resurfacing, reconstruction, rural-to-urban) as well as the contract amount for each individual contract. As the costs assessed to property owners include the cost of sidewalks, this naturally creates conflict when a project includes installing sidewalks where there previously were none.

The goals of revising this policy are:

- Make Rural to Urban Projects less burdensome
- Reduce number of obstacles to installation of new sidewalks
- Make assessments more uniform whether street has existing curb and gutter or sidewalk or not
- Preserve existing development requirements
- Provide similar amount of assessment revenues
- Provide a more reliable estimate for residents

b. What factors (including existing policies and structures) associated with this issue might be affecting communities of color and/or low-income populations differently?

Certain projects like rural to urban construction where the City installs new sidewalk & curb and gutter and storm sewer are more expensive to property owners than others
Property owners pass on these costs to tenants which can be difficult to fit into personal budgets.

c. What do available data tell you about this issue? (See page 5 for guidance on data resources.)

Black and Hispanic residents are more likely to live within an 1/8th mile of a priority sidewalk gap (complete and green streets study)
Walkability is listed as #1 priority (complete and green streets study)
AARP fact sheet states sidewalk can return 15 times investment on property value
AARP fact sheet states neighborhood with sidewalks, people are 40% more likely to be active at least 39 minutes a day.
FHWA safety study- sidewalks show a 65-89% reduction in ped crashes along roadway
52% of Town of Madison non white – Madison is 27% non white – so new additions (rural to urban projects) will be have disparate impact on minority populations under existing policy

d. What data are unavailable or missing?

Does density per sidewalk factor in?
Resurfacing projects are assessed more in new policy – is there data to suggest those areas have higher income?

- e. Which focus area(s) will the policy, plan or proposal primarily impact?
Please add any comments regarding the specific impacts on each area:

<input type="checkbox"/> Community/Civic Engagement	<input type="checkbox"/> Food Access & Affordability
<input type="checkbox"/> Criminal Justice	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government Practices
<input type="checkbox"/> Early Childhood	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing
<input type="checkbox"/> Education	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning & Development
<input type="checkbox"/> Employment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service Equity
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)	
Comments:	

2. WHO

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

Property owners adjacent to Rural to Urban projects will end up being assessed substantially less on average.

Property owners adjacent to resurfacing may end up being assessed more on average, however it is still a fairly modest assessment in comparison to reconstruction projects.

- b. Who would benefit?

Property owners and residents who have unimproved streets in front of their property
Property owners and residents who have no sidewalk in front of their property
Property owners and residents who have more extreme projects (challenging grades, poor bid timing, etc)
Property owners and residents who have deficient sidewalk in front of their property

- c. Who would be burdened?

Property owners who have already been assessed under current policy
Property owners who have a simple resurface in front of their property
Property owners and residents who do not want sidewalk

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

Generally, the proposed policy would have a positive impact upon rural to urban projects. There is a lower percentage of parcels within MPO's Environmental Justice Areas 1 & 2 that do not have curb & gutter than parcels outside of those areas. It is possible that there could be more resurfacing assessments to these parcels, however the resurfacing assessment is fairly modest.

- e. Have stakeholders from different racial/ethnic and socioeconomic groups—especially those most affected—been informed, involved and represented in the development of this proposal or plan? Who is missing and how can they be engaged? (See page 6 for guidance on community engagement.)

Lets talk streets engagement with under represented groups – talked about facilities, but not assessments – implementation of that discussion
Years of staff experience of public hearing discussions
Alder Foster (D15 – lots of unimproved streets) part of team revising policy
Town Hall Meetings with Town of Madison
There has been informational meetings with the Transportation Policy & Planning Board and Board of Public Works.
The Wisconsin State Journal did an article discussing the proposal.

- f. What input have you received from those who would be impacted and how did you gather this information? Specify sources of comments and other input.

Years of staff experience in using the existing policy has informed staff on what parts of the policy have been burdensome to property owners. That is a big part of how the new policy was formed. Feedback from the TPPB & BPW was very favorable.

3. WHY

- a. What are the root causes or factors creating any racial or social inequities associated with this issue? (Examples: Bias in process; Lack of access or barriers; Lack of inclusive engagement)

Property ownership inequities, property locations (annexed in town areas), renters may want something different than owners, historic disinvestment in certain areas of City

- b. What are potential unintended consequences? What benefits or burdens may result? (Specifically consider social, economic, health and environmental impacts.)

The Engineering Division is more likely to reconstruct streets that we were holding off (and an assessment is applied). People living on a busy street may need resurfacing more. Construction is an inconvenience to residents. Utility reconstruct would go along with street reconstructions (so more additional costs for city & assessments). Property value can go up, but that may mean property tax could go up. People will have to maintain sidewalk. People with disabilities would have more choices for homes. Paratransit eligibility requirement may change. We could end up taking out more trees (but would hopefully have a new tree terrace for new installations).

- c. What identified community needs are being met or ignored in this issue or decision?

Installing pedestrian network with less financial burden on property owner. Overall policy will be continuous across system – no longer pitting neighbors vs others. Policy will increase transit shed. Decreasing disproportionately high assessments with this policy. Promotes better modal shift for city. Trying to right the wrong of historic disinvestment in the City. Potential for increased assessments to elderly with fixed income.

4. WHERE

- a. Are there impacts on geographic areas? (Select all that apply.)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Madison neighborhoods | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Park Edge/Park Ridge |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Allied Drive | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Southside |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Balsam/Russet | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> East Madison (general) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brentwood/Northport Corridor | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> North Madison (general) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Darbo/Worthington | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> West Madison (general) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hammersley/Theresa | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Downtown/Campus |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leopold/Arbor Hills | <input type="checkbox"/> Dane County (outside Madison) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Owl Creek | <input type="checkbox"/> Outside Dane County |

Comments:

Policy affects all streets within the City of Madison – will affect future annexations

5. HOW: RECOMMENDATIONS SECTION

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

Do we add a transition period for resurfacing projects? We can allow for a transition period where projects approved but not finalized yet under the old policy can utilize new policy if it benefits them to do so. Consider some kind of program to help fund clearing sidewalks for elderly or disabled persons?

- b. Is the proposal or plan:

- ☒ Realistic?
- ☒ Adequately funded?
- ☒ Adequately resourced with personnel?
- ☒ Adequately resourced with mechanisms (policy, systems) to ensure successful implementation and enforcement?
- ☒ Adequately resourced with provisions to ensure ongoing data collection, public reporting, stakeholder participation and public accountability?

If you answered "no" to any of the above, what resources or actions are needed?

- c. Who is accountable for this decision?

Common Council approves policy, City Engineering implements it

- d. How will impacts be documented and evaluated? What are the success indicators and progress benchmarks?

TE track pedestrian network gaps. Success would lower these gaps.
Assessment budget is tracked, we will adjust rates each year.
Compare sidewalk construction data over time, success would see increases in this over time.
Are gaps in lower income areas being closed?
Success would be less resistance for sidewalk projects

- e. How will those impacted by this issue be informed of progress and impacts over time?

Public information meetings have slides in each presentation

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):
www.cityofmadison.com/data
- Madison Measures (City of Madison):
<https://www.cityofmadison.com/finance/documents/MadisonMeasures-2016.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):
[U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States](https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/wisconsin)
- Demographics Services Center (WI Dept of Administration):
[DOA Demographic Services Center \(wi.gov\)](http://doa.wisconsin.gov/demographic-services-center)
- Applied Population Laboratory (UW-Madison):
www.apl.wisc.edu/data.php

Federal

- US Census:
[Explore Census Data](https://www.census.gov/data.html)
- 2010 Census Gateway (US Census):
www.census.gov/2010census

CITY OF MADISON RACIAL EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CONTINUUM

Adapted from *Community Engagement Guide: A tool to advance Equity & Social Justice in King County*

The continuum provides details, characteristics and strategies for five levels of community engagement. The continuum shows a range of actions from county-led information sharing that tends to be shorter-term to longer-term community-led activities. The continuum can be used for both simple and complex efforts. As a project develops, the level of community engagement may need to change to meet changing needs and objectives.

The level of engagement will depend on various factors, including program goals, time constraints, level of program and community readiness, and capacity and resources. There is no one right level of engagement, but considering the range of engagement and its implications on your work is a key step in promoting community participation and building community trust. Regardless of the level of engagement, the role of both the City of Madison and community partners as part of the engagement process should always be clearly defined.

Levels of Engagement				
City Informs City of Madison initiates an effort, coordinates with departments and uses a variety of channels to inform community to take action	City Consults City of Madison gathers information from the community to inform city-led projects	City engages in dialogue City of Madison engages community members to shape city priorities and plans	City and community work together Community and City of Madison share in decision-making to co-create solutions together	Community directs action Community initiates and directs strategy and action with participation and technical assistance from the City of Madison
Characteristics of Engagement				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primarily one-way channel of communication One interaction Term-limited to event Addresses immediate need of City and community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primarily one-way channel of communication One to multiple interactions Short to medium-term Shapes and informs city projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two-way channel of communication Multiple interactions Medium to long-term Advancement of solutions to complex problems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two-way channel of communication Multiple interactions Medium to long-term Advancement of solutions to complex problems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two-way channel of communication Multiple interactions Medium to long-term Advancement of solutions to complex problems
Strategies				
Media releases, brochures, pamphlets, outreach to vulnerable populations, ethnic media contacts, translated information, staff outreach to residents, new and social media	Focus groups, interviews, community surveys	Forums, advisory boards, stakeholder involvement, coalitions, policy development and advocacy, including legislative briefings and testimony, workshops, community-wide events	Co-led community meetings, advisory boards, coalitions and partnerships, policy development and advocacy, including legislative briefings and testimony	Community-led planning efforts, community-hosted forums, collaborative partnerships, coalitions, policy development and advocacy, including legislative briefings and testimony

NOTES