



CITY-COUNTY TASK FORCE ON CLIMATE AND ECONOMIC EQUITY

Preliminary Report

March, 2020

This page intentionally left blank.



CITY-COUNTY TASK FORCE ON CLIMATE AND ECONOMIC EQUITY PRELIMINARY REPORT

City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin
March, 2020

Prepared by:

Task Force Working Groups & Legislative Reference Bureau
City of Milwaukee
Room 307, City Hall
200 E. Wells Street
Milwaukee, WI 53202
www.milwaukee.gov/lrb

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Ald. Nik Kovac, Co-Chair

City of Milwaukee

Sup. Supreme Moore-Omokunde, Co-Chair

Milwaukee County

August Ball

Cream City Conservation

Ayanna Lee - Inactive

City of Milwaukee Youth Council

Barbara Richards

Sierra Club

Erick Shambarger

City of Milwaukee – Environmental Collaboration Office

George Martin

NAACP

Janet Meissner Pritchard

Citizen Appointee

Julie Kerksick

Community Advocates Public Policy Institute

Pam Fendt

Milwaukee Area Labor Council

Pamela Ritger

Clean Wisconsin

Rafael Smith

Citizen Action of Wisconsin

Ted Kraig

Wisconsin Climate Table

STAFF

Linda Elmer

City of Milwaukee – City Clerk’s Office

Luke Knapp

City of Milwaukee – Legislative Reference Bureau

WORKING GROUP – CITIZEN MEMBERS

Ariana Hones

League of Conservation Voters

Bruce Wiggins

Private Citizen

Gordie Bennett

Milwaukee County

Larry Hoffman

MECA

Linda Frank

350 Milwaukee

Lisa Sasso

MMSD

Nadia Vogt

MMSD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
II. INTRODUCTION	9
III. EMISSIONS ASSESSMENT AND INVENTORY	11
A. Findings	11
B. Recommendations for Plan and Planning Process.....	13
C. Short Term Projects/Programs	17
IV. JOBS AND EQUITY.....	19
A. Findings	19
B. Recommendations for Plan and Planning Process.....	27
C. Short Term Projects/Programs	28
V. FINANCE AND FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES	30
A. Findings	30
B. Recommendations for Plan and Planning Process.....	41
C. Short Term Projects/Programs	42
VI. EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY OUTREACH.....	43
A. Findings	43
B. Recommendations for Plan and Planning Process.....	45
C. Short Term Projects/Programs	51
VII. MONITORING AND ACCOUNTABILITY.....	52
VIII. APPENDICES.....	55

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Year after year and study after study have shown a clear scientific consensus: the global climate is changing, with human activity as the primary contributor. In the last 5 years alone, reports from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the United States Global Change Research Program, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District and countless other reputable entities have all contributed key findings that the planet's climate is drastically changing, primarily due to human activity. The effects of climate change are wide-ranging and will have disastrous consequences unless significant structural changes are implemented. In light of this comprehensive research, the United States signed the Paris Agreement (Paris Climate Accord), a global plan to counteract climate change and prevent the average global temperature from rising to or above 2 degrees Celsius. At the local level, in 2017 the City and County of Milwaukee declared their intent to adhere to the Paris Agreement.

Simultaneously, Milwaukee's socioeconomic inequity has risen to extremes, both before and since the 2008 Great Recession. De-industrialization, outsourcing, hyper-segregation, and numerous other effects of structural racism have resulted in economic conditions similar to those seen during the Great Depression for minorities and disadvantaged communities in Milwaukee.¹ As recently as 2019, University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee researchers found that in the 53206 zip code only approximately 50% of working-age adults were employed, more than one-fifth of employed residents had income below the federal poverty level, and the area had an overall poverty level 42%, which is 6 times the poverty rate in Milwaukee overall.²

Confronted with the climate emergency and persistent economic disparities, the City and County of Milwaukee have recognized an opportunity to simultaneously address both of these pressing issues. In 2019, resolutions from the City of Milwaukee Common

¹ Levine, Marc. "Race and Male Employment in the Wake of the Great Recession", January, 2012.

² Levine, Marc. "Milwaukee 53206: The Anatomy of Concentrated Disadvantage In an Inner City Neighborhood, 2000-2017". March, 2019.

Council and County Board of Supervisors created the City-County Task Force on Climate and Economic Equity. This Task Force was charged with the responsibility of “making recommendations on how to address the ongoing climate crisis, ensure Milwaukee meet the obligations set forth in the Paris Climate Accord, and mitigate racial and economic inequity through ‘green’ jobs.”

A comprehensive climate action plan is a time-intensive endeavor; generally taking one to two years to complete and numerous years to implement.³ This preliminary report takes stock of the work already being done in this arena around Milwaukee, charts a path to achieve ambitious medium- and long-term climate and equity goals, and provides recommendations for short-term solutions that may make an immediate impact. The Task Force created 4 work groups to investigate and make recommendations on the following categories:

1. Finance and Funding
2. Emissions
3. Jobs and Equity
4. Education and Community Outreach

These 4 categories were specifically chosen for the ways in which they frame any climate action moving forward. The emissions inventory and assessment provides a foundation, showing where Milwaukee is and where it needs to go. The jobs and equity work group identifies the need for big structural changes to bend the curve towards greater inclusion and proposes a baseline measurement and clear metrics for progress in this area. The finance and funding work group identifies sources and mechanisms for accomplishing the goals set forth in this report. The education and community outreach work group provides a plan to expand the number of stakeholders and residents involved in the process of addressing the climate crisis and ensure public accountability.

³ Reopelle, Keith. “The Dane County Climate Action Plan”. January, 2020

DRAFT

II. INTRODUCTION

The City-County Task Force on Climate and Economic Equity was created in November of 2019 for the purpose of making recommendations on how to address the ongoing climate crisis, ensure Milwaukee meets the obligations set forth in the Paris Climate Accord, and mitigate racial and economic inequity through “green” jobs. The Task Force is comprised of appointees from the City of Milwaukee Common Council, the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors, Citizen Action of Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Climate Table, the Sierra Club, the Community Advocates Public Policy Institute, the NAACP, the Milwaukee Area Labor Council, Clean Wisconsin, the City of Milwaukee Youth Council, the City of Milwaukee Environmental Collaboration Office, and Cream City Conservation.

The City-County Task Force on Climate and Economic Equity met frequently to identify the priority areas in this document. The need to address the climate crisis offers a unique opportunity to reshape the local economy and address the inequities that have plagued Milwaukee’s metro area for generations. As the planet continues to warm, Milwaukeeans will encounter increases in rainfall in overall quantity and frequency, a decrease in agricultural productivity, the degeneration of biodiversity and forestry, and poor air quality brought on by dangerous heat and extended pollen seasons. Beyond changes in the weather, there will be countless social impacts spanning from job market volatility, at-risk infrastructure, and redirected migration patterns.

The effects of climate change touch every sector of public life, and will not affect residents equally. Milwaukee has pronounced racial disparities that will be exasperated by the climate crisis. Low-income communities face environmental hazards at a higher rate, and are prone to more toxic jobs, schools and homes. Climate change will continue to heighten these disparities unless intentionally addressed.

Numerous programs and projects are currently underway to address both the climate crisis and Milwaukee’s disparities; however, these efforts are underfunded and

understaffed. In addition to the newly proposed programs and projects laid out in this document, existing programs should be expanded.

These reasons are why the 4 focus areas were chosen: an *emissions assessment* to fully grasp where Milwaukee is and where it needs to go, *jobs and equity* to incorporate marginalized populations into the new green economy, identifying *finances and funding* sources to ensure that solutions can realistically be accomplished, and *education and community outreach* to broaden the stakeholders and participants in the City and County's efforts to combat climate change.

What follows is both an inventory of the current state of affairs, as well as guiding recommendations as the region enters the new "green" economy. As a preliminary report, this document should not be viewed as the conclusive guidelines for addressing climate change and economic equity in the region, but rather a crucial step in the process.

III. EMISSIONS ASSESSMENT AND INVENTORY

Work Group members: Erick Shambarger, Pamela Ritger, Barbara Richards, Gordie Bennett, Linda Frank and Ted Kraig

A. Findings

In 2013, Milwaukee adopted the Refresh Milwaukee plan and has operated significant programs to increase the adoption of energy efficiency measures and renewable energy. ReFresh Milwaukee was intended to cover a wide range of environmental sustainability topics and was not specifically focused on climate action. Since that time 150 municipalities across the nation, including Milwaukee, have adopted the goal of achieving 100% clean renewable energy by at least 2050 and developed comprehensive climate action plans to achieve these goals. The following is a summary of sustainability actions that are relevant to climate action:

The City of Milwaukee has a range of energy efficiency and solar programs, including the Me2 residential energy efficiency program, the Better Buildings Challenge program for commercial buildings and municipal buildings, and the Milwaukee Shines solar program that provides energy efficiency and renewable energy services to buildings. Mayor Barrett has also joined the Climate Mayor and Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy. Furthermore, the City has a Climate Action website and the Environmental Collaboration office provides education. To date, the City has focused resources on the management of these programs and reporting related to the ReFresh Milwaukee Sustainability Plan, however outreach resources are limited.

The ReFresh Milwaukee 2018 Annual Report is the most recent comprehensive reporting for the City's sustainability plan. This report provides an overview of the metrics, progress and challenges associated with a wide range of environmental sustainability issues in Milwaukee, including issues that pertain to climate change. Both the City of Milwaukee and Milwaukee County also track their respective building's

energy use, as well as municipal fleet fuel and transit fuel use.

Despite the reporting and tracking efforts underway at the City and County, neither the City nor County currently has an inventory of community emissions. We Energies has not provided community level energy data, commercial businesses do not centrally report waste and recycling data, and there is a lack of readily accessible data in other categories within ICLEI software.

We Energies has made progress in assisting on the City's sustainability initiatives in a number of areas. The utility has:

- Converted the Valley Power Plant from coal to natural gas
- Responded to the City's request for new renewable energy options (Solar Now and Dedicated Renewable Energy Resource pilot program)
- Closed the Pleasant Prairies Power Plant
- Continued to participate in Focus on Energy
- Been a major contributor to Area of Concern clean-up and Harbor District Brownfield cleanup
- Sponsored expanded streetcar services during the 2020 Democratic National Convention
- Proposed EV charging in rate case (that was not approved by PSC).

Despite these well-intentioned efforts, the utilities still has focus areas in need of greater collaboration and environmental stewardship. The utility has not provided community greenhouse gas (GHG) Data. In 2002, We Energies built a baseload coal plant in Oak Creek that could be open for decades. The utility proposed a solar tax that was ultimately dropped and refused to interconnect third-party projects. They have offered low net metering rates and during construction of the Milwaukee streetcar system advocated for a State law which put \$10 million in utility relocation cost onto the City instead of private utility companies.

B. Recommendations for Plan and Planning Process

First and foremost the City should use ICLEI Clear Path US Protocol for Emissions, which is already underway. ICLEI was hired by the City of Milwaukee Environmental Collaboration Office in February, 2020 to assist with a GHG inventory. The baseline will be the most recent year of available data. This inventory will look at emissions from within the geographic boundaries of the City of Milwaukee, including County of Milwaukee government operations that occur within those boundaries. This includes Scope 1 and 2 emissions, plus Scope 3 emissions associated with solid waste only. The Emissions Assessment and Inventory working team determined that getting emissions data from every municipality in Milwaukee County makes doing a county-wide GHG inventory challenging. However, efforts should be made to encourage other Milwaukee communities to report data in a unified framework (see Appendix ___). While the GHG inventory is being created, the City of Milwaukee – Environmental Collaboration Office will pursue further data requests from We Energies and other agencies associated with major emissions categories.⁴ Following the creation of the GHG inventory, either a firm should be hired or City and County sustainability staffing should be expanded to create a narrative format of the GHG Inventory that is clear and understandable to the general public, using the City of Chicago as an example⁵.

In addition to completing the GHG Inventory, there should be continued efforts toward the development of a Milwaukee Climate and Equity Action Plan. These efforts include hiring a Sustainability Consulting Firm (such as AECOM, which has a current Master Services Contract for Environmental Consulting with the City of Milwaukee. This consulting firm should conduct a Literature Review of High Impact practices (e.g. climate action plans from other municipalities, *Drawdown*, *USDN high impact practices; Climate Action Planning; NAACP Our Communities our Power; Legal Pathways to Deep Decarbonization in the United States; MMSD Resilience plan and Sustainability Plan*). The consulting firm should also develop strategies for emissions reductions that may include various scenarios. Strategies adopted should balance the GHG reduction

⁴ Xcel Community Energy Data Reports

⁵ https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/progs/env/GHG_Inventory/Chicago-2017-GHG-Report_Final.pdf

potential, up-front and ongoing costs, impact on economic equity and social and political feasibility. Strategies of potential focus are included in Table 1.

Other recommendations include:

- Coordinate with the Education and Outreach workgroup for planning community meetings for additional stakeholder input,
- Extend the City-County Task Force on Climate and Economic Equity for additional planning, and add academic, business, community and utility members,
- Comply with reporting requirement of the Compact of Mayors and Global Covenant of Mayors,
- Identify methods of creating a “decision forcing capacity” (i.e. policy triggers and process, if emission and economic targets are not met),
- Develop a clear agenda for lobbying the state legislature and the PSC on matters such as building codes, utility regulation and transportation funding.

Table 1

Sectors	<p>Electricity</p> <p>Transportation/Mobility</p> <p>Land Use (trees, agriculture, water, sequestration, etc.)</p> <p>Commercial/Industrial Buildings</p> <p>Residential Buildings</p> <p>Industrial Operations</p> <p>Water Infrastructure</p> <p>Food Systems</p> <p>Solid Waste</p>
---------	--

DRAFT

<p>Strategies</p>	<p>Energy Demand Side</p> <p>Efficiency (conserve electricity, heat, air conditioning, hot water; carpool;</p> <p>Alternatives (eliminate kiln processing for cement)</p> <p>Energy Supply Side</p> <p>Decarbonization (replace coal, natural gas for electricity; eliminate petroleum burning)</p> <p>Wind turbines, #2</p> <p>Solar, #8, #10</p> <p>Electrification (switch motor vehicles, HVAC, etc. to electric)</p> <p>Land Use, #5</p> <p>Urban planning</p> <p>Natural landscapes (forests, prairies, native plants for carbon sequestration, plant & wildlife habitat, water resource management)</p> <p>Food Systems / Agriculture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce food waste, increase food composting • Support urban and local sustainable agriculture #3; • promote plant-based, lower carbon diet <p>Refrigerants, #1</p>
-------------------	--

	<p>Eliminate release of potent HFCs</p> <p>Safe disposal of refrigerants</p> <p>Solid Waste / Landfills</p>
--	--

C. Short Term Projects/Programs

The following activities could be accelerated in the next 1-2 years:

Utility Scale Solar

The City recently approved participation in a new utility scale solar program through We Energies called Solar Now. Continue to move forward with the program and look into We Energies other utility solar program DRER. Explore approaches to expand the College Avenue landfill solar project to fill the entire site.

Dialogue with Investor Owned Utility on Shared Climate Goals

Identify and evaluate strategies to partner with the local investor owned utility to a) change the fuel sources for electricity production to renewable, zero emission sources as quickly as possible; b) assist with making electricity the end use energy for transportation and space heating; c) prioritize locally produced energy in its energy production; d) provide a [Community Solar](#) option; e) share emissions data. Explore MOU with Investor owned utility on shared climate goals.

Maintain and expand ECO programs

Consistent funding for existing ECO programs, including Me2, Better Buildings Challenge, Milwaukee Shines, HOME GR/OWN, and Green Lots programs. Obtain funding for staff dedicated to marketing, promotion and public education with respect to sustainability programs in order to achieve widespread participation in these programs,

such as ME2, the Better Buildings Challenge, the ECO Toolkit and Milwaukee Shines.

City Vehicle Fleet

Replace retired city vehicles with low carbon vehicles, prioritizing all-electric vehicles, plug-in hybrids, and fuel-efficient vehicles, in that order, while also considering cost and feasibility, per pending ECO Energy Efficiency Report on Buildings and Fleet.

Electric Vehicle Infrastructure

Work with State of Wisconsin to develop plan to utilize Volkswagen settlement funds to expand electric vehicle charging infrastructure and electric fleet in Milwaukee.

Increase Ridership on County Transit Buses

1. Install Wi-Fi on buses, as a strategy to increase ridership.
2. Address funding gap of MCTS
3. Status of Bus Rapid Transit

Explore Creation of Ongoing University Student Projects

Identify City or County projects that could be undertaken by university students engaged in a relevant course of study and explore collaboration with one or more local universities on an ongoing basis. This approach could be an option for implementing and marketing the ECO Toolkit, for example.

Food Waste

Develop strategies to reduce food waste, increase composting, and develop markets for compost.

Commercial Recycling Inspections

Implement proactive enforcement of recycling laws among Milwaukee's businesses, particularly fast food restaurants.

Low income energy efficiency

Work to combat energy poverty by strengthening existing programs to promote and fund energy efficiency and renewable energy for LMI (low to moderate income) residents in Milwaukee and Milwaukee County. Explore new program options such as Cincinnati's [Warm Up Cincy](#) program as a possible model.

Strengthen Green Building Standards on City Financed Projects

- PACE Financed projects
- City subsidized projects
- New Municipal Buildings

IV. JOBS AND EQUITY

Work Group members: Rafael Smith, August ball, Supreme Moore Omokunde, Julie Kersick, Nadia Vogt, Lisa Sasso, Pam Fendt, and George Martin.

A. Findings

Finding 1: There is a deep and persistent economic equity crisis in the Milwaukee Metro Area.

Economic disparities in the Milwaukee economy are massive, have not improved over 4 decades, and divide along racial lines. During the Great Recession People of Color were harmed by far the most, and have benefited the least from one of the longest economic expansions in U.S. history.

While the United States has the most acute economic inequality among advanced industrial economies, ranking 40 out of 40, there is overwhelming research documenting over the past three decades that Milwaukee's County's race-based economic inequality is among the worst in the U.S.:

- A shocking 79% of African American households in Milwaukee County have

incomes beneath the minimum family survival budget.⁶

- The African American poverty rate is 300% higher, and the Latino poverty rate is 85% higher, than the white poverty rate, even after social safety net programs are accounted for.⁷
- African American men in Milwaukee have among the lowest levels of employment of any major city in the country. “The employment rate for working-age African American males in Milwaukee in 1970 was 73%. In 2010, the employment rate had plummeted to 45%. According to Marc Levine of the UW-Milwaukee Center on Economic Development: “No metro area has witnessed a more precipitous erosion in the labor market for black males over the past 40 years than has Milwaukee,” and “in no other large metro area is the contemporary black male employment crisis more acute than in Milwaukee.”
- In its 2020 update of its Vision 2050 plan, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Authority concludes: Racial disparities in the Milwaukee metro area “are long standing, and are more pronounced than in almost all other metro areas.”⁸
- Inequality is being driven not only by an absence of job opportunities for people locked out of private employment, but also by the plummeting quality of the jobs that are available.
- Racial disparities in home ownership, one of the major drivers of intergenerational wealth accumulation for American families, has been identified as one of the major legacies of 20th century racist housing policies and government mandated segregation.⁹ As bad as these disparities already were, they have actually grown dramatically worse in Milwaukee since the Great Recession. According to a recent analysis from the Marquette University Law School: “Homeownership fell by an average of 5.5% in mostly white census

⁶ UW-Madison Institute for Research on Poverty, September 2018

⁷ Id.

⁸ SEWRPC February, 2020, Appendix D Preliminary Draft.

⁹ Richard Rothstein, *The Color of Law*, 2017.

tracts but declined by 10.3% in mostly Latino census tracts, and 16.6% in majority-black census tracts. The change in ownership of residential properties in Milwaukee has resulted in an enormous transfer of family housing wealth to out-of-state individuals and businesses.”¹⁰

- Closely intertwined with economic inequality, is environmental racism: the disproportionate location of environmental hazards in or near economically disadvantaged communities, including more toxic jobs, schools, and homes. This environmental and health inequality cuts along racial lines due to housing and school segregation and economic inequity. Nationally over 71% of Blacks and 50% of the Latinx community reside in areas with the most polluted air, while only 34% of whites do.

Finding 2: Milwaukee’s Economic Inequality is Structural in Nature, and Constitutes Structural Racism

Structural Racism in the United States can be defined as “the normalization and legitimization of an array of dynamics – historical, cultural, institutional and interpersonal – that routinely advantage whites while producing cumulative and chronic adverse outcomes for people of color.”¹¹ The equity crisis in Milwaukee has its origins in centuries of discrimination and in deliberate government policies such as systematic race-based housing discrimination during the post-World War II economic boom when the great American middle class was built.

Milwaukee’s vibrant manufacturing sector and the Great Migration combined to temporarily create the most prosperous African American middle class in the U.S. Just as African Americans were beginning to reap the rewards of the region’s robust manufacturing economy, and Latinos began to come here in large numbers in search of good jobs, a new national and international economic order that reached critical mass in the late 1970s and 1980s stripped Milwaukee of its plentiful supply of good jobs that were broadly available. Decades of deindustrialization, outsourcing to the suburbs and

¹⁰ *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, 1/31/20.

¹¹ Lawrence & Keleher, 2004.

overseas, hyper-segregation, a global economic race to the bottom, and other dimensions of structural racism, have stolen fleeting prosperity away from people of color communities in Milwaukee.

The persistence of sky high levels of inequality through all economic cycles shows that the problem is systemic in nature, and can only be addressed through structural interventions up to the scale of the problem. In Milwaukee, large scale race-based economic inequality is not only impervious to the business cycle; it is getting worse during periods of prosperity. Even as employment has increased during the longest economic expansion in American history over the last decade, poverty is on the rise because the economic benefits are skewed to the top of income earners, while low wage service sector jobs have not even kept up with the cost of living.¹²

Finding 3: Current efforts to address economic inequality and racial disparities in Milwaukee are not to scale, are not comprehensive and integrated, and are not directed to achieving community-wide outcome goals.

There is an absence of community-wide and broadly accepted equity outcome goals that are agreed to by area decision makers or understood by the general public. Equity initiatives are often episodic in nature, and are not connected to long term outcome goals. Where these equity initiatives exist, they are small scale and not remotely scaled to the magnitude of the equity crisis in Milwaukee.

Current programs and initiatives to improve economic equity are radically siloed from each other, so that major governmental decision makers do not have a clear picture of what is being done comprehensively and whether efforts are aligned and complementary. Equity outcome goals, if they exist, are not evaluated based on established community-wide benchmarks for success. As a result decision makers and the public at large lack clear and actionable information on whether the programs together are improving equity, making it worse, or having little impact.

¹² UW-Madison Institute for Research on Poverty. September, 2019.

As a result of the siloed and short term nature of such initiatives, no one in Milwaukee knows whether the collective efforts of local government and private partners have improved overall economic equity, or reduced racial disparities, and by how much. Even if Milwaukee local governments established clear and broad based equity goals, and reshaped the existing set of economic and community development initiatives to make them more comprehensive, integrated, and accountable to established equity goals, there is a real question as to whether current policy tools are at a combined scale necessary to make any measurable impact on economic inequality.

Below is a list of specific city programs and equity initiatives:

- ME2 Community Workforce Agreement;
- HOME GR/OWN and Walnut Way collaboration with national grants;
- HACM and choice neighborhoods;
- Promise Zones;
- City efforts on Healthy Food Access;
- City efforts to green MPS schools;
- New County Office of African American Affairs;
- City Disparity Study;
- 10,000 affordable homes initiative;
- MMSD job training programs;
- Massive investments by City and MMSD in 30th Street Corridor;
- MMSD funded outreach efforts to Triangle Neighborhood.

Finding 4: A large scale climate transition offers a great opportunity to intervene into the economic structures that cause and reinforce racial disparities. However such a transition will not naturally do so, and could also reproduce current patterns of massive inequality.

Milwaukee City and County governments have officially committed to meeting the UN climate targets, which include cutting community-wide greenhouse emissions by 45% in 10 years. The level of economic intervention necessary to achieve this creates a once in

a lifetime opportunity to dramatically improve economic equity. Intensive research conducted by economist Robert Pollin for the Obama Administration found that a climate transition could create a major increase in employment. Extrapolating these numbers to the Milwaukee economy, the climate transition could increase employment by 3% by 2050, which would amount to 8,000 new jobs.¹³

Economic research shows that the jobs that could be created by a climate transition are promising avenues for improving job quality and improving economic equity. Green jobs are higher paying than comparable occupations, have lower barriers to entry than other similar professions, and are more accessible to people without high educational attainment.¹⁴ Many analysts believe that because of the growing severity of the climate crisis, there will eventually be [massive federal and state investments](#). Communities with developed plans where equity goals are fully integrated will be better positioned to maximize the economic and social benefits of these future investments.

A green transition will not inevitably improve economic equity unless the government intervenes to the economy to make it a major priority. Milwaukee government and business leaders have put a major emphasis over the last decade in promoting the water sector. But research by the UWM Center on Economic Development commissioned by the Water Commons found that employment in this sector is highly unequal and not representative of the diversity of the Milwaukee region.¹⁵

Preliminary assessment of what could be done based on examples from other counties/municipalities and other empirical evidence

Finding 1: Although some local and state-level climate transition plans include economic equity provisions, none that we have reviewed include the level of structural interventions necessary to break down barriers to employment and dramatically improve community-wide equity

¹³ *American Prospect*, December 2019.

¹⁴ Brookings Institution, 2019.

¹⁵ UWM Center on Economic Development, 2020.

There is a great deal of variance between different state and local climate transition plans in their treatment of economic equity. While some plans only hope resulting jobs will be available to the whole community, others do include significant equity provisions.

While the climate plans which are intentional about economic equity offer many interesting directions for incremental improvement, none that task force members have reviewed offer the scale of a fully integrated approach with structural interventions necessary to remove the barriers to employment which produce large scale economic inequality.

Finding 2: To dramatically improve economic equity in Milwaukee, the equity impacts of each policy decision must be built into every policy choice as fundamentally as greenhouse emissions reductions.

The model of building an accountability plan to meet a 10 year climate emissions target community wide creates an unprecedented opening in the local economy at the level necessary to meaningfully address the chronic economic equity crisis in Milwaukee. The task force recommends that equity goals and tracking should be as specific and accountable as the climate goals. On the climate side of the planning, a baseline must be established (community wide greenhouse emissions), specific annual goals established, and progress rigorously tracked on a regular basis until the UN climate targets are met in 2030. Applying the same model in an integrated way to economic equity would mean that all policy choices would be double sided, with policies chosen and measurable that advance the climate targets (lower community greenhouse emissions) and fully aligned equity targets and benchmarks (as measured by relative rates of poverty, employment, living wage jobs, etc)

To do this, Milwaukee local units of government will need to set global economic equity goals with a baseline, and tracking capacity across all initiatives. This means adopting a double screen on each major policy choice in the climate transition plan. Policies that would reduce emissions and create the best opportunity for improving economic equity would be chosen over policies that were only successful on one dimension.

Finding 3: The most promising empirically successful model for dramatically improving economic equity is in the field of child poverty.

From 1997 to 2008 Great Britain followed a similar model, adopting a goal of ending child poverty by 2020, implementing a series of evidenced-based policy up to the scale of the problem, and a rigorous tracking system to measure success and provide policymakers the information they needed to make policy adjustments based on results. The result was a dramatic $\frac{2}{3}$ reduction in child poverty over a decade. The British child poverty model also included parallel local planning processes where cities such as Liverpool adopted their own community-wide goals, and rigorous tracked progress. California is currently considering whether to adopt a similar child poverty reduction model.

A description of challenges to overcome in order to meet the work group's goals

There a number of challenges to meet these goals, including:

- Limited local government resources given the severe revenue constraints imposed by the state government.
- Limited governing authority given the limited home rule powers of municipal and county government, and the number of authorities the state has preempted over the last two decades.
- Substantial research, including a 2020 report by the UW-Milwaukee Center for Economic Development commissioned by the Water Commons, documenting persistent barriers to entering and advancing in water occupations which produce chronic racial disparities in employment in these fields.
- The Milwaukee region lacks agreed upon goals for improving economic equity, and metrics for measuring progress towards an inclusive economy.

B. Recommendations for Plan and Planning Process

Funded planning process: It is the task force's preliminary assessment that Milwaukee cannot develop an effective economic equity plan without paying for additional expert capacity. These consultants, hired from as diverse a pool as possible, will need to have expertise in the different areas of creating a comprehensive equity plan, and the ability to participate in community engagement and collaborate with local officials. They also will need the capacity to collaborate with experts in the field of climate mitigation so that equity initiatives are fully integrated into all climate transition programs.

Aggregate basic economic data on the emerging green economy in Milwaukee, and project the growth of emerging sectors not yet substantial present in the local economy.

Elements should include:

- Identifying entry-level skill and credential requirements, as well as starting wages and potential for growth.
- Assessing current employment rates by race and geography.
- Identifying what has worked and not worked in current efforts to recruit, train, and employ workers of color.
- Assessing current hiring, development and retention practices with an equity lens
- Developing mechanisms for measuring progress over time, and reporting these outcomes at regular intervals to Milwaukee City and County officials, and the public.

Strategies for improving equity in the current Milwaukee employment market and with current policy approaches. The goal would be to maximize the equity outcomes that are possible within current public systems and market relationships, and to evaluate what magnitude of equity outcomes is achievable absent more fundamental structural reforms. Considerations in developing such a plan include:

- Proposing specific goals for recruiting, training, hiring and retaining under-represented groups in current and future green jobs.
- How to induce employers to institute multi-pronged approaches (since the problem is multifaceted) to develop diverse candidate pools while simultaneously building up racial literacy within their workforce to ensure shared language and

practice regarding the attraction, selection, development and retention of historically excluded identities.

Evaluate the potential of larger scale structural interventions to leverage a climate transition to dramatically improve regional economic equity. This would include examining the value of market interventions, such as large scale transitional jobs programs, for breaking down barriers to employment and creating a pipeline of green economy workers from Milwaukee's most disadvantaged communities.

Examine the jobs and equity potential of sectors the economic equity work group has tentatively identified as major drivers of a climate transition, and any others that experts can derive from research by other cities and states. Also assess whether and how under-represented groups are getting training, hiring and advancement opportunities in these sectors. These sectors tentatively include:

- Energy Conservation and Retrofitting (including remediation of lead paint and dust)
- Renewable Energy (e.g. solar, wind)
- Water Conservation and Clean Water (including remediation of lead pipes that leach into water supply)
- Transportation
- Food Waste/Waste and Recycling

C. Short Term Projects/Programs

As planning goes forward for the overall Climate Change and Economic Equity report, there are some existing efforts that could be supported now. Two examples are:

- Tree-planting projects (Ex. Branch Out Program, Ash Tree Replacement)
- Milwaukee Water Commons recommendations related to water quality and diversifying the workforce in water-related jobs

There are also possible projects that could begin or be supported in the near term that we know will likely fit into a comprehensive plan

- Energy conservation retrofitting programs that employ local residents. Based on existing research, this activity has tremendous greenhouse gas reduction and employment impacts, if brought to scale.
- Identify ways to immediately increase residential recycling levels, which does have a major positive Greenhouse gas emissions impact. King County has identified direct climate reduction impacts of increasing recycling, lowering food waste, and reducing the use of single use containers and bottles <https://kingcounty.gov/depts/dnrp/solid-waste/programs/climate/climate-change-recycling.aspx>
- Enabling electrification, a key component of a green transition, by increasing the number of public EV charging stations and working to incentivize large scale apartment and condo buildings to develop EV charging capacity for their residents.

DRAFT

V. FINANCE AND FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

Work group members: Janet Meissner Pritchard, Pamela Ritger, Erick Shambarger, Ted Kraig and George Martin

A. Findings

According to Robert Pollin, professor of economics at the University of Massachusetts, the aggressive goals called for by the IPCC to avoid a climate catastrophe could be met with an annual investment equal to only about 2% of national gross domestic product and the investments would pay for themselves in the long term. Yet, for cities and counties governed by debt limits and other constraints, identifying the money up front to pay for such investments is a challenge. The City and County have already utilized a variety of funding sources and finance mechanisms for sustainability investments and there is a long list of additional mechanisms currently being used in other municipalities around the nation.

The City of Milwaukee has deployed a variety of financing mechanisms to conduct climate action work, particularly in energy efficiency and renewable energy. These include:

1. *Federal Grants*- Particularly from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act ([ARRA](#)) from 2010-2014. These federal funds were deployed locally to:
 - a. Launch the Me2 energy efficiency program, which supported over 1,300 home energy efficiency projects and 130 energy efficiency projects in commercial buildings
 - b. Launch the ME3 sustainable manufacturing initiative
 - c. Build the wind turbine at the Port of Milwaukee
 - d. Fund the ReFresh Milwaukee Sustainability Plan
 - e. Purchase hybrid and electric vehicles
 - f. Perform energy efficiency audits and projects in municipal buildings
 - g. Fund the first BublR Bike Share station

- h. Install 4 electric vehicle charging stations
 - i. Upgrade streetlights to LED lighting
2. *Energy Saving Performance Contracts*
 - a. The City has deployed Energy Saving Performance Contracts at the Safety Academy in 2010 and Central Library in 2019. The 2019 energy saving performance contract supported over \$2m in energy efficiency improvements. Details [here](#).
3. *The Me2 and Milwaukee Shines programs* provide residential loans for energy efficiency and renewable energy, respectively. Both utilize a “Loan Loss Reserve” to leverage private capital for loans, through a Partnership with Summit Credit Union. Milwaukee.gov/ME2
4. *PACE Financing:* The City of Milwaukee established Wisconsin’s first Commercial [PACE financing](#) program that has financed over \$14m in commercial energy efficiency projects. Milwaukee County (communities outside of the City of Milwaukee) can participate in the [PACE Wisconsin](#) program. The City of Milwaukee briefly had a residential PACE program, but suspended it after the [Federal Housing Administration threatened communities](#) that implemented residential PACE.
5. In 2008, the City of Milwaukee pursued on-bill financing with We Energies, but could ultimately not come to agreement on a program.
6. *Third party financing of rooftop solar projects:* Other states explicitly allow solar companies to lease rooftops to finance and install solar, which allows government entities to monetize federal tax credits for solar. A map of states that explicitly allow third-party solar can be found [here](#). This is a gray area in Wisconsin law, with utilities taking the position that solar companies providing this service are “acting as public utilities.” The City of Milwaukee has argued that Solar companies acting in this fashion, especially when the system is co-owned, do not meet the definition of a public utility. The issue is currently being [reviewed](#) by the State Courts and the Wisconsin Public Service Commission.
7. *General Obligation Borrowing:* The City of Milwaukee invests about \$100,000

annually in energy efficiency improvements in municipal buildings through General Obligation Borrowing. The City has overall limits on the amount of General Obligation Borrowing, which is used for a wide variety of city infrastructure projects including roads, bridges, etc.

8. *Rebate Programs:* Wisconsin's Focus on Energy program uses utility surcharges paid by electricity ratepayers to incentivize consumer and business investments by providing rebates for qualified energy efficiency and renewable energy projects. The City of Milwaukee actively uses the Focus on Energy program, and has established an account so that rebates received from this program can be directly reinvested in new energy efficiency and renewable energy projects.
9. In January 2020, the City of Milwaukee's Environmental Collaboration Office proposed utilizing the *Solar Now program* to construct a 2,250 kW solar field over approximately 8 acres of a retired city-owned landfill. The now approved project will be built and maintained by We Energies, provide a new annual revenue to the City of Milwaukee of \$90,000+ that is intended for further climate action work, and can provide back- up power to the Air National Guard's 128th Air Refueling Wing.
10. *Group Purchasing (Cross Sector Partnerships).* The City of Milwaukee's [Milwaukee Shines Group Buy](#) program works with the Midwest Renewable Energy Association to offer bulk pricing for solar projects.

The following are additional funding sources and financing options used in other municipalities that might support continuation and expansion of programs referenced above or additional programs and projects. A comprehensive survey of financing options used to support climate action called *Financing Sustainable Cities Scan and Toolkit* was developed in 2016 by the Urban Sustainability Directors Network with input from the City of Milwaukee. Careful consideration of these options is important because some of them could be regressive and work against the task force's goal of greater economic equity if they are not structured and implemented properly.

1. **State Grants.** The State of Wisconsin's Department of Administration provides

community funding for [low-income energy assistance and weatherization services](#).

2. **We Energies renewable energy programs.** In 2018, The City of Milwaukee, Milwaukee County, MATC, and MMSD worked with the regional electric utility, We Energies, to create new renewable energy programs for large institutional customers. [These new programs were approved by the Wisconsin Public Service Commission in December 2018](#) and include the *Solar Now pilot program and the Dedicated Renewable Energy Resource (DRER) program*. These two programs provide the City with a realistic pathway to source 25% of the electric power needs for municipal operations by the year 2025.
3. **Dedicated Fees** (City Funding). Fees for things like paying online, facility use, etc. Example, \$5 surcharge on parking tickets to pay for EV infrastructure. *Technically feasible.*
4. **Dedicated Taxes** (City Funding). Could include tourism taxes, sin taxes and other taxes that are dedicated to climate related investments. *Technically feasible.*
5. **Developer Impact Fees** (City Funding). Commonly used to offset anticipated public costs of a development. Example, fees on market rate housing units to incentivize more affordable units or pay for subsidizing affordable units elsewhere. *Technically feasible but depends on a strong real estate market.*
6. **Feebates and Density Bonuses** (City Funding). Charge a fee that is then rebated to pay for energy efficiency or renewable energy investments in a development. For example, allow more floors to a building if meets climate impact criteria. *Technically feasible.*
7. **Fines, Penalties and Violation Funds** (City Funding). Money from penalties like polluting violations. *Unknown feasibility.* May be limits in state statute.
8. **Local Carbon Tax** (City Funding). Done in some cities to fund climate mitigation efforts, either on direct emitters or electricity, or large emitters. *Technically feasible.* Municipal-level carbon taxes exist in various cities in Colorado, California and Massachusetts. Below are examples of how these are

administered in other cities:

- i. **BOULDER, COLORADO** The Climate Action Plan (CAP) tax was the first voter-approved climate mitigation tax passed in the U.S. in 2006. Under this program, the city's only electric utility, Xcel Energy, charges residents and businesses a fee via their monthly utility bills. The CAP tax is not a traditional carbon tax because it is imposed based on electric usage (in kWh), not carbon content. But because there is only one electric provider, and because CAP exempts renewable energy consumers, it has the same effect of a carbon tax. It effectively imposes a \$8.62 per carbon ton fee for residents and a \$1.52 per ton fee for businesses. Tax revenue is used to fund weatherization efforts, sustainability projects, and solar rebates. The program was renewed in 2012.¹⁶
- ii. **BAY AREA, CALIFORNIA** In 2008, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, which spans nine counties, passed a 4.4 cent per carbon ton fee that applies to 500 businesses. This established a much lower price on carbon pollution than is needed to truly incentivize a transition to clean energy, but was nevertheless the time a locale in the US approved carbon pricing. The tax was approved by air pollution regulators 15-1. It generates \$1.1 million per year in revenue.¹⁷
- iii. **ASPEN AND PIKE COUNTY, COLORADO** The Renewable Energy Mitigation Program (REMP) requires new homes to meet a strict energy budget or pay additional fees. Homeowners who go over their established budget, and consume extra energy, must either install a renewable energy system or pay an emissions tax. Revenue from this tax, established in 2000, is subsequently invested in energy efficiency measures. While this is not a straight

¹⁶ <https://climate-xchange.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Implementing-a-Carbon-Price-at-the-Municipal-Level-Climate-XChange-compressed.pdf>

¹⁷ <https://climate-xchange.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Implementing-a-Carbon-Price-at-the-Municipal-Level-Climate-XChange-compressed.pdf>

carbon tax, it effectively incentivizes renewable energy usage. The REMP model has been applied to a number of other locales in Colorado, including Snowmass Village, Carbondale, and Eagle County. It has also been implemented in Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts.¹⁸

9. **Carbon pricing**, either a carbon tax or a cap-and-trade program, is considered to be essential to any effective climate policy.¹⁹ Of the two options, a carbon tax is generally easier to administer than a cap-and-trade program.²⁰ For at least two reasons, it makes more sense for such a carbon tax to be imposed at the state level versus the municipal level. The first reason is the point of taxation, or where the tax is assessed. Imposing the tax further upstream, such as at the point of fuel extraction, processing or import, minimizes the number of taxed parties, thereby minimizing leakage and maximizing revenues. Moreover, from a political standpoint, an upstream tax is less visible than a downstream tax.²¹ As the State of Wisconsin does not extract or process fossil fuels, such an upstream tax could be imposed at the point of import. The second reason a state-level carbon tax is preferable is because a carbon tax will be regressive, and hurt poorer households, without some form of revenue recycling, such as income tax relief for those households in lower income tax brackets.²² Such income tax relief could be provided through the state, but not through the city or county.
10. **Microgrid enhanced with parking and EV charging fees** (City Funding). Pay for electric vehicle infrastructure, energy efficiency and renewable energy with parking and charging fees. *Technically feasible*.
11. **Public Benefit Funds** (City Funding). Small surcharge on energy bills to pay for renewable energy and energy efficiency. *Feasible*. What Focus on Energy already does.

¹⁸ <https://climate-xchange.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Implementing-a-Carbon-Price-at-the-Municipal-Level-Climate-XChange-compressed.pdf>

¹⁹ Gerrard, Michael B. and Dernbach, John C., *Legal Pathways to Deep Decarbonization in the United States*, p. 70.

²⁰ *Id.* p. 80.

²¹ *Id.* p. 82

²² *Id.* p. 84

12. **Renewable Energy Credits (RECs)** (City Funding). Require utilities to buy RECs at a certain price from behind the meter producers of certain size. *Technically feasible but governed by State Law.* Depends on PSC approval.
13. **Tax Increment Financing (TIFs)** (City Funding). Anticipated increased property tax receipt from investments given up front and paid off by actual increased tax collection that occur. *Technically feasible.* Commonly used for many developments. State law allows for a one-year extension of TIFs to pay for programs to make housing more affordable and can be used for efficiency upgrades.
14. **Value Capture Tools** (City Funding). Special assessments to property that will increase in value due to public investments like transit improvements. *Technically feasible.*
15. **Performance Contracts** (Cross Sector Partnerships). Pay for Performance, Pay for Success. Contractor makes upgrades and is paid for outcomes like energy savings. Small up-front cost. Can be used to subsidize and consolidate many small loans. Utilized for recent improvements at the Milwaukee Public Library. *Technically feasible.*
16. **Power Purchase Agreements** (Cross Sector Partnerships). Detailed agreements between energy producers and purchasers including finance. Developer gets low financing cost. These can be done at utility scale, but there are substantial regulatory hurdles in Wisconsin.
17. **Public Private Partnerships** (Cross Sector Partnerships). Generally involves agreements with larger employers. Example electric vehicle shuttle partnership with Google. *Technically feasible.*
18. **Corporate Foundation Clean Energy Innovation Grants** (Donor Grants). Direct grants. Funds San Francisco microgrids and New York Retrofit Accelerator. *Technically feasible.*
19. **Department of Energy Grants** (Donor Grants). Direct grants like SunShot Program and conservation block grants. *Technically feasible and already used by City.*

20. **State Grants** (Donor Grants). Wisconsin Office of Energy Innovation has competitive grants. *Technically feasible and already used by City.*
21. **Board of Commissioners of Public Lands** (Investor Financing). Managed by State Treasurer. Fast, no fee, fixed rate loans from 2 to 20 years, 4% to 4.5%. May be up to \$400 million available. *Unknown feasibility– needs further investigation.*
22. **Capital Leases** (Investor Financing). Common with performance contracts. Lessee takes on much risk and gets tax advantages of depreciation and the like. Often bargain purchase option at end. *Technically feasible and already used by City.*
23. **Certificates of Participation** (Investor Financing). Multiple parties funding securities. Unlike bonds not considered debt. *Technically feasible.*
24. **Energy Efficiency Loans** (Investor Financing). Money available from State and Federal governments. Backs loans so low cost. Example is Milwaukee Loan Loss Reserve Program. *Technically feasible and already used by City.*
25. **Energy Efficiency Mortgages Investor Financing**. Cost of energy efficiency and renewable energy improvements wrapped into full original or refinance mortgage. Sometimes subsidized by state or local government. Example, [Citizen Action of Wisconsin's Green Homes, Good Jobs program](#). *Technically feasible.* Need to generate demand for loan money that is already available.
26. **General Municipal Bonds (munis)** (Investor Financing). Utilize general bonding. Attractive because no Federal or State taxes on earnings. *Technically feasible.* Debt limit is a barrier. Milwaukee could increase the proportion of its general obligation borrowing to sustainability efforts.
27. **Green Bonds** (Investor Financing). Same as muni bonds but for dedicated green purpose. Very popular investment vehicle now. *Technically feasible.*
28. **Industrial Development Bonds (IDBs)** (Investor Financing). Bonds to fund private investments. Limited to \$10 million. Can fund manufacturing facilities. *Technically feasible.*
29. **Lease Purchase Agreements** (Investor Financing). Lease to own agreements to

capture tax credits and get low rates. Get asset at end of leasing for low cost. *Technically feasible.*

30. **Loan Loss Reserve Funds, Debt Service Reserves, Loan Guarantees** (Investor Financing). Different kinds of funds to guarantee repayment. Reduces risk and makes loans affordable. Me2 program gets 20:1 leverage. *Technically feasible.* Problem is generating demand for the loans.
31. **Municipal Industrial Revenue Bonds (IRB)** (Investor Financing). Bonds to fund private investments. Municipality holds collateral. Tax free. No property taxes until paid off. *Technically feasible.*
32. **On Bill Financing** (Investor Financing). Overlaps with various sources of finance. Depends on utility limits. Two kinds - loans for which individuals are liable and tariffs which stay with the property. *Technically feasible.* On-bill financing provides an affordable, accessible option for making energy efficiency upgrades, so that home or building owners can pay for improvements to their property through subsequent regular payments on their energy bills, without the need to pay a large upfront cost. In addition, some utilities in the U.S. are also providing the opportunity for customers to pay for the installation of solar energy systems on their homes and buildings using on-bill financing, making that solar energy much more affordable and feasible for a larger sector of the population. Please follow this link: <https://www.seia.org/sites/default/files/2019-12/SEIA%20Solar%20On%20Bill%20Financing%20Webinar%20December%202019.pdf> for a recent presentation from the Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA) highlighting (1) Where utilities across the U.S. are providing on-bill financing to customers, and (2) Examples of utilities that offer on-bill financing both for energy efficiency upgrades and solar energy systems, resulting in excellent results both for customers and utilities.
33. **Operating Leases** (Investor Financing). Full ownership by entity providing equipment means no debt to user. IRS rules govern what qualifies. *Technically feasible.* For renewable generation may be opposed by utility.
34. **Pool Bond Financing** (Investor Financing). Municipalities pool for loans. Low

- cost. Structured based on each municipality's bond rating. *Technically feasible.*
35. **Qualified Energy Conservation Bonds (QECCB)** (Investor Financing). Taxable bonds that better for non-profit investors. Can be used for efficiency upgrades of renewable generation. Higher interest rates but subsidized by Fed government. *Technically feasible.* May no longer be available.
 36. **Qualified School Construction Bonds (QSCB)**. (Investor Financing). Interest free, tax credit bonds that can be issued by state and local governments. Energy savings pays off bonds. *Technically feasible.* May no longer be available.
 37. **Qualified Zone Academy Bonds (QZAB)** (Investor Financing). For schools in high poverty or enterprise zone areas. Same structure as QECCB. Only for efficiency upgrades. Department of Energy regulates and subsidizes. Can do 0% if private match. *Technically feasible.* May no longer be available.
 38. **Residential Energy Efficiency Financing** (Investor Financing). Combines loans, incentives from state and federal governments and utilities. *Technically feasible.*
 39. **Revenue Bonds** (Investor Financing). Bonds repaid by revenue generated by investment. Tax free like munis. Higher interest. Example parking structure paid off by parking fees. *Technically feasible if have the revenue generation.*
 40. **Revolving Loan Funds** (Investor Financing). Funds new investments on returns from prior loans. Often used for small businesses. Below market rates because of low risk. *Technically feasible but takes years to build up significant capital.*
 41. **Social Impact Bonds** (Investor Financing). Like Pay for Success and Pay for Performance Bonds. Relatively new. Agreed on valued outcome and pay off after it's achieved. *Technically feasible.*
 42. **Solar Leasing** (Investor Financing). Property owner rents the equipment and covers the cost with reduced energy costs. *Technically feasible and exists in many states, but opposed for solar by We Energies; currently being reviewed by Wisconsin courts.*
 43. **Tax Exempt Lease Purchase Agreements** (municipal leases). Investor Financing. Government owns equipment at end of lease. Lower cost because no

taxes on interest paid. *Technically feasible.*

The following are additional funding sources and financing options used in other municipalities that we think are less likely to be feasible for the City of Milwaukee and Milwaukee County but which could become more viable if conditions in Wisconsin change.

1. [Community Choice Aggregation \(CCA\)](#) is a policy available in states with deregulated energy markets that allows municipalities to aggregate community energy load to directly source renewable power with distribution infrastructure provided by the incumbent utility. Wisconsin's regulations for energy production and distribution currently do not allow for individual or community choice in selecting energy sources.
2. **Parcel Tax** (City Funding). Uniform tax on parcels to pay for sustainability investments. Not related to property value. *Most likely not feasible.*
3. **Traffic Congestion Fee** (City Funding). Charge a toll to come and go to downtown or other high traffic areas with higher rates at high traffic times. *Technically feasible, but unlikely in Milwaukee due to a relatively low level of congestion and parking issues by comparison with other cities.*
4. **Infrastructure and Economic Development Banks** (Investor Financing). Issues taxable and non-taxable bonds. Funds infrastructure. Can do credit enhancements. Can leverage state and Federal funds. *Unknown feasibility.* Can't do in all states.
5. **Lease Revenue Bonds** (Investor Financing). Low cost financing. Used by community colleges in California. *Unknown feasibility.*

Given the fiscal challenges facing local governments in Wisconsin, it is difficult for municipalities and counties to directly fund additional efforts to mitigate climate change and adapt to its impacts. Local governments may be in a position to play a role in encouraging and organizing financing in partnership with other public and private organizations.

Local governments have strict limits on their ability to increase current revenues and

create new revenues. Existing revenues, such as service fees and the property tax levy, are fully committed to existing services. In addition to providing core services such as police, fire, garbage collection, and road construction, the City and County of Milwaukee already commit some resources to environmental and equity issues. Given the condition of aging infrastructure, many local and county governments also need to fund replacement and improvement of infrastructure — these costs will be exacerbated by the impacts of climate change.

B. Recommendations for the Plan and Planning Process

The City's Budget and Management Division and/or hired consultants should explore expanding the financing options mentioned under Findings 1, such as additional use of Energy Saving Performance Contracts.

The City-County long-term plan to address climate change and economic equity ('Climate & Equity Plan') needs to include an analysis of finance options to address climate change, including those referenced above. The analysis of finance options should:

- Take into consideration the challenges described under the Findings section and how they can be addressed.
- Include thoughtful analysis of the equity implications and opportunities for different types of finance.
- Include short-, medium-, long-term projections of the funding needed to implement the actions and measures recommended in the Climate & Equity Plan as well as a projection of how the recommended finance options will result in a funding growth curve that aligns with the funding required to fully implement the Plan.

An assessment of expected financial savings that could be achieved through the adoption of the recommended Climate & Equity Plan -- on the part of local government, and other public entities, businesses, and households -- should be included in the

analysis of what the full implementation of the Climate & Equity Plan would cost.

When considering opportunities to fund efforts in vulnerable neighborhoods with low property values, the planning process should consider how to overcome the ‘vicious circle’ of constraints in which conventional investment streams for community and economic development are constrained by requirements that peg investment opportunities to the existing property values in a neighborhood.

C. Short Term Projects/Programs

The following is a list of short term projects/programs that can be accomplished in the within the next year at least:

1. The City should explore use of the DRER program, including to further expand the solar field at the landfill at 1600 E College Ave., to achieve 25% renewable energy by 2025 for municipal operations.
2. The City should continue the Me2, PACE financing, and Milwaukee Shines loan programs.
3. The City and County should work with other aligned Wisconsin municipalities to advocate for a State decision to supplement Focus on Energy funding with a charge pegged to energy usage above a “basic allowance” determined for each class of customers, similar to the Boulder, Colorado case study referenced under the Findings section. Alternatively, the City and County should advocate for a State decision to increase in Public Benefits funding for Focus on Energy as a surcharge on energy bills. [within one year]
4. The City and County should ask the Public Service Commission (PSC) to initiate an open docket to explore on-bill financing in terms of likely benefits to ratepayers such as cost savings from energy efficiency upgrades, as well as benefits to utilities, such as reductions in peak load demand due to more distributed generation resources. [within 6 months]
5. The City and County should ask the PSC to initiate an open docket examining the benefits of having the local electric utility pay for EV infrastructure. [within 6 months]

6. The City should generate a report indicating how it would use an additional \$1 million dollars, if it had such funds in its current budget, specifying how additional funding receipts up to this amount would be prioritized. [within 3 months]
7. The City should prepare a set of proposals for “shovel ready projects” that could take advantage of a large infusion of federal funds that might be anticipated from the adoption of Green New Deal agenda at federal level at some point within the next 2-4 years. These proposals should include a process for vetting the proposed projects in a manner consistent with the Outreach and Education recommendations of the Task Force. [within one year]

I. EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY OUTREACH

Work Group Members: Supreme Moore Omokunde, Rafael Smith, Barbara Richards, Ariana Hones and George Martin

A. Findings

For their book *Climate Action Planning*, Michael Boswell, Adrienne Greve, and Tammy Seale conducted a survey of the perception of climate change in America and found the following information:

The Alarmed (21%) are fully convinced of the reality and seriousness of climate change and are already taking individual, consumer, and political action to address it.

The Concerned (30%) - the largest of the six Americas - are also convinced that global warming is happening and a serious problem but have not yet engaged the issue personally.

Three other Americas - the Cautious (21%), the Disengaged (7%) and the Doubtful (12%) - represent different stages of understanding and acceptance of the problem, and none are actively involved.

The final America - the Dismissive (9%) - are very sure it is not happening and are actively involved as opponents of a national effort to reduce greenhouse gas

emissions. (Maibach et.all)²³

In an article in Milwaukee's Neighborhood News Service, Jabril Faraj wrote the following of Milwaukee's economic inequity as follows:

Milwaukee's employment rate for black males is under 50 percent. The city's poverty rate of 29 percent is almost double the national average of 14.8 percent, a number that makes the city the fifth poorest large metro area in the country. The poverty rate among African-Americans is even higher at almost 40 percent. Among children 18 and under, a segment that makes up about 27 percent of Milwaukee's population, more than 42 percent live in poverty.

A 2012 report by the Social Development Commission (SDC) analyzed 18 neighborhoods identified by the City of Milwaukee Community Block Grants Administration as the city's most impoverished areas. That analysis showed that while poverty rates were above 60 percent for those with a high school diploma or less, individuals in those areas who have had some college (53 percent) or have gone through an apprentice program (44 percent) also experience high rates of poverty.

In Milwaukee County, 42 percent of all working age, single individuals who filed tax returns had incomes below the poverty line. The SDC report also points out that those who are not in the labor force are even more likely to live in poverty.²⁴

SEWRPC:

<https://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPCFiles/EnvironmentalJustice/Files/PresentationRegionalEquityPlanning.pdf>

The organization Bread for the World has also listed Wisconsin as the 46th Hungriest State:

²³ *Public Awareness: Range of Views from Climate Action Planning* by Boswell, Greve, and Seale (p.75):

²⁴ *NNS October 14, 2015* by Jabril Faraj

One in 11 households struggles to put food on the table.

- *937,629 people live in counties with poverty rates of 20 percent or more.*
- *13,158 veterans live below the poverty line.*

An individual must earn \$16.04 per hour in Wisconsin to provide for a family, yet, the state minimum wage is \$7.25²⁵

As a model for the Outreach going forward we present this model: based on NAACP Our Community Our Power A Testimonial: *“I know that I am not alone in wanting to present the other side of lives not bombarded with daily fears and horrors that overrun mass media telecasts. Despite what communities like my own often convey, there are many of us who sidestep gang violence, assaults, robberies and the like. Not because we turn a deaf ear or are unaware. Primarily because I think we maintain a sense of kinship and integrity that is based on mutual respect, hope and a belief in the higher power that sustains each of us.*

There is a long history of misconceptions that plague communities of color, driven by people who perceive that a small percentage dictates the entire populace. Many stereotypes are unfairly placed on our cultures because those who have no interactions tend to go by what they read and hear, refusing to see for themselves what is true and what is false. Sadly it appears that the inclination is to keep the mass hysteria and mistrust in the headlines and bury solutions on the back page.”²⁶

B. Recommendations for the Plan and Planning Process

Below are a number of goals that should be front and center when thinking of community education and outreach as the City and County move forward:

- To provide accessible information about the Climate Action Planning process - a resident of Milwaukee County without any prior knowledge of local climate action should be able to do a google search and find information on the CAP process.

²⁵ *Bread for the World Fact Sheet 2020*

²⁶ *May 30, 2016 by Denise Wooten, NNS*

- To engage a critical mass of participants at each key decision making point during the CAP process.
- To identify key community organizations/nonprofits to partner with on information sharing and recruitment of participants (for roundtables, listening sessions, educational events, etc).
- Create a “Climate Message” for the City and County of Milwaukee that allows the city to form an identity as a “climate champion” and for residents to get excited about.
- Develop a strategy for a media campaign for a Climate Action Plan. Residents of Milwaukee should know 1. The urgency of the climate crisis 2. The leadership that Milwaukee is taking 3. Their individual and collective ability to be involved in the change making process.

Below are additional strategies for identifying stakeholders, messaging, and recommendations tailored to specific groups.

Target Audience List and Identify Stakeholders

- Assembling a critical mass is key to creating an effective target audience list (for convening meetings and messaging).
- Host a listening session series (in different locations around the city) with partner organizations to hear about the ideas and concerns of that particular neighborhood/community.
 - Builds relationships with community partners
 - Creates an open line of communication between task force (city/county) and residents.
 - Creates an accessible space to share (we go to the community, not the other way around).
 - Creates more public trust and buy in.
- Identify a few organizations to work long term with (ie. UW-Milwaukee, Metcalfe Park, United Community Center). These long term partnerships could be convening

locations for educational sessions, decision making, etc.

Create a Key Message and an “Identity”/Publicize the Climate Action Planning Process

- A message that unifies and challenges the community to be involved. This message recognizes the challenges and opportunity to “re-imagine” our community. It is also a message that is locally rooted.
- Social media/digital strategist to create a unifying “climate message” that is general enough for a greater Milwaukee area, but also specific enough that it grounds the CAP process locally and with Milwaukee’s unique struggles and talents.
- A campaign that shows what the local government is doing (and how to be involved) as well as “asks” for the community (how each resident needs to be part of this process for it to be effective).
- Need A branding such “A.R.E. MKE”- *Action for Resilience and Equity* - Hire a marketing firm
 - Two sides of the same coin Climate and equity

Recommendations for NonProfits/Community Organizations

- A number (to be decided) of nonprofits and community organizations should be identified to potentially partner with.
- Criteria for partnership could be based on 1. Location (where it is) 2. Membership (who uses this institution) 3. Issue area (what are they talking about) 4. Capacity to partner for educational and outreach events. (add on to this list, ie: who would be the ideal community partner?)

Recommendations for 4 year Colleges/Universities

- Educational events at the university or college hosted by the taskforce.
- Service learning opportunities with certain professors/disciplines in order to engage students more deeply in task force work.
- Hosting a Task Force meeting at a college or University

Develop a target audience list and identify stakeholders

- City of Milwaukee: Eco Office: See ECO website for programs that do outreach:
<https://city.milwaukee.gov/EnergyEngagement#.XIAXtmhKjIV>
<https://city.milwaukee.gov/Climate-Action.htm#.XIAVkJhKjIU>
- Milwaukee Public Schools /Greater Milwaukee Area Schools /Trade Schools/2 year Colleges:
 - Educational institutions that could and should be involved with the promotion and development of climate-relevant careers for Milwaukee-area residents include the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS), districts surrounding MPS, and local institutions of higher learning, particularly Milwaukee Area Technical College (MATC).
 - At MATC, a solar installation program was discontinued because it was ahead of its time. An apprenticeship program for solar power currently under consideration would likely include training for related viable careers such as wind installation, solar and wind management, and systems engineering. Rather than train “one-off” jobs, they believe training should be comprehensive for an industry, so people can be skilled and comfortable in multiple types of work. MATC might call it an “energy conservation” program. Although electricians might not see solar projects as a frequent part of their mix, solar would be a valuable additional skill set. Solar inverters are handled by electricians, not solar installers. MATC could train in repair and maintenance, for family-sustaining jobs that will last. One such field is “environmental service technician.”
 - Because experts in certain trades and climate-related careers are very well paid, it can be difficult to obtain such experts for teaching. Qualified instructor can be difficult to come by.
 - MATC has recently met with a large group of MPS middle and high school students to introduce them to the trades and a route to the trades through the technical college. MATC has also met with administrators from other Milwaukee area school districts to discuss preparation for the trades.
 - Among MPS and other Milwaukee-area districts, there appears to be no

concerted effort at the present time to pursue schooling or training in the trades or careers in climate change. However, at MPS, Board members, faculty, administrators, and climate activist groups are working together to prepare a resolution on climate justice that the Board may consider this spring. It is likely to call for an assessment by administration of the status quo and for: (a) development of curriculum and instruction in climate science and climate justice to prepare youth for leadership; (b) career preparation in green technologies, construction trades, sustainable agriculture, environmental science and restoration; (c) climate-sensitive improvement in physical plant, land use, choice of materials for purchase and disposal of waste products; and (d) collaboration with environmental preservation efforts by government and nonprofits.

- Create key messages and an “identity”
- Publicize the climate action planning process (via media, web-sites, social media, email, events)

PROCESS/AIMS

We recommend using the process of outreach in the “NAACP Our Community Our Power”²⁷

Module 1: A Community Coming Together

In this module we outline the steps groups can take to establish an Environmental and Climate Justice (ECJ) Committee or community workgroup, develop partnerships with other stakeholders, and build a vision for your community’s future.

Module 2: Building Social Cohesion

This module is dedicated to cultivating social cohesion. We discuss what social cohesion means and how to strengthen social cohesion as a community. This includes discussions regarding healing justice, sanctuary, and cultural preservation.

²⁷ <https://live-naacp-site.pantheonsite.io/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Our-Communities-Our-Power-TOOLKIT-FINAL.pdf>

Module 3: Developing a Community Climate Adaptation Plan

This module is all about advancing equity in climate adaptation planning. We discuss how to locate state and local plans, how to evaluate existing plans with a lens for equity in resilience building, and how to organize your own plan. We also provide examples of what equitable, resilient climate adaptation plans might look like.

Module 4: Passing Policy for Climate Resilience

This module is all about how to pass policies and enact legislation. We break down the legislative process and explain how ECJ Committees can write and pass state and local policy for climate resilience.

Below is a list of challenges that community outreach and education efforts will have to overcome:

- Misconceptions
- Willingness to prioritize spending money for climate adaptation/ mitigation by all community stakeholders/ Government/ Private, Individuals
- Change consumer culture to a producer culture and a create financial ability to make climate friendly choices
- White fragility
- Empowerment of community voices
- Lack of Funding overall
- Outreach position funding

Overall we find the MMSD 2019 Resilience Plan a good base on which to set the work of the Task Force. We also recommend the NAACP Our Community: Our Power

What the one- or two-year long planning process for Education and Outreach should include

- *-MMSD Resilience Plan---*

- Vision 1 MMSD Resilience Plan: Make the Milwaukee region a better place to live by improving the public's participation in decision making and their environment.

Action 1 Identify Gaps that may exist in Current Partnerships And/Or Employment Sectors To Create More Meaningful and Intentional Relationships

Action 2 Create A City County Resilience/Equity Outreach Group That Can Serve as a Community Resource

Action 3 Engage Stakeholders In Collaborative Decision Making And Implementation Of Resilience and Equity Plans

Action 7 Increase Access To And Understanding Of Existing Resources By Connecting Residents To Available Community Resources

C. Short Term Projects/Programs

- Plan a kickoff event
- Communicate with the community
- Hold workshops/ meetings - focus groups
- Monitor Council and Supervisors Meetings/Developers at Licensing Committee Hearings

VI. Monitoring and Accountability

Each of the work groups developed plans to ensure accountability when carrying out the plans set forth in this report. The monitoring plans involved the creation of a committee charged with oversight and frequent public meetings, as well as other best-practices to ensure transparency.

Supervisory Committee/Board

Each of the Task Force's work groups recommended either the creation of a new oversight committee, or charging the Task Force itself with the oversight of the goals. If a new oversight committee is formed, it should be composed of business, nonprofit, community group, academic, local government and other organized groups. Furthermore, each recommendation should link to the relevant city or county department/division, and there should be monthly or bi-monthly public sessions where city and county staff report out on their achievement and challenges in meeting specific goals from the recommendations.

Additionally, a third party (not necessarily part of local government) should conduct a survey and data research on a bi-annual basis to measure progress made in employment goals, both new jobs and jobs held by individuals who have been under-represented in the workforce. Data should include information on the wages and benefits, and whether they are ongoing or temporary positions.

Community Events/Presentations

The general public should be updated on the progress of goals and metrics frequently, through events such as implementation activities, celebrations, and adoption meetings. To effectively do so, the following modules from the NAACP should be used:

Module 2: Building Social Cohesion: This module is dedicating to cultivating social cohesion. We discuss what social cohesion means and how to strengthen social cohesion as a community. This includes discussions regarding healing justice,

sanctuary, and cultural preservation. NAACP pp. 59-76

Module 5: Communicating For Impact: In this module we explain how to utilize and develop a story-based strategy to change narratives in climate change adaptation. We also outline various communications strategies ECJ Committees can use to advance these narratives. NAACP pp. 170-198+

Module 6: Educating and Organizing for Climate Resilience:

In order to change the way the world thinks about climate adaptation and resilience, we must develop education and awareness campaigns that convey our systems-change approach to climate resilience. In this module, we outline some of the platforms that Environmental and Climate Justice Committees can use to engage the community in creative and innovative ways. NAACP pp. 199-212

Module 7: Democracy and Governance: An important part of building community resilience is reforming our systems of governance to reflect a vision of deep democracy that is truly by the people and for the people. In this module, we discuss the concept of “deep democracy” and the important role that it plays in effective, community-driven climate resilience planning. We also introduce several strategies ECJ Committees can incorporate into adaptation plans to improve democratic governance. NAACP pp. 214-223

Module 12: Gender and LGBTQ Responsive Climate Resilience: This module provides strategies on how to protect and empower marginalized gender and identities during weather disasters and other climate-related events. We explain some of the ways that women and those in the LGBTQ community experience the impacts of climate change differently and how climate adaptation planning can be more responsive to gender. NAACP pp. 331-345

Other Transparency Processes

1. Utilize Renewable Energy Certificates/Credits to properly account for the City’s

renewable energy investments

2. Add GHG Inventory and Strategy to city websites
3. Update inventory and review strategies in 2025 and 2030

DRAFT

VII. APENDICES

DRAFT

DRAFT

Prepared by: Luke Knapp, Legislative Fiscal Analyst - Lead

Edited by: Jeff Osterman, Legislative Research Supervisor

Last Updated: March 11, 2020