RACIAL EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE TOOL

COMPREHENSIVE VERSION

Racial Equity
& Social Justice Initiative

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

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

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

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

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

BEGIN ANALYSIS

Title of policy, plan or proposal:

Developing community engagement strategies for diverse participation in a community meeting to finalize identification of a community gardens site within or near the University Hill Farms neighborhood.

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

Toriana Pettaway (lead) - tpettaway@cityofmadison.com
Nancy Saiz (co-facilitator) - nsaiz@cityofmadison.com

Names and affiliations of others participating in the analysis:

George Reistad, Food Policy Coordinator, Mayor's Office
Kay Rutledge, Asst. Parks Superintendent, Parks Department
Janet Schmidt, Planning and Development Manager, Parks Department
Jule Stroick, Community Planner, Planning Department
Arvina Martin, Alder, District 11 – City of Madison
Mark Clear, Alder, District 19 – City of Madison
Nan Fey – Chair, Madison Food Policy Council
Karen Von Huene – Exec Director, Community Groundworks
Shelly Strom – Land and Gardens Director, Community Groundworks

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

This comprehensive RESJ tool is being utilized to develop community engagement strategies that allow for diverse and inclusive participation from homeowners and renters or those with limited access to land within the area in and near University Hill Farms Neighborhood with the goal to finalize a community garden site to replace land lost by Sheboygan Community Garden.

Background: Former Alder Chris Schmidt called a public meeting on January 21, 2016 to discuss finding space for the Sheboygan Community Garden that was going to be lost to the State of Wisconsin's Department of Transportation redevelopment on Sheboygan Avenue. Approximately 75 people gathered to hear a presentation, review displays and provide feedback about the garden space. This information can be found in Legistar file #41789.

Legistar file # 42079) required city staff "to explore land options in the University Hill Farms Neighborhood and nearby areas for potential gardening space lost in the Hill Farms state office building redevelopment on Sheboygan Avenue". Staff's final report and findings recommended three feasible locations in three city parks. The next step in the process required by the Resolution is to subject those locations "to a public process to engage the community in a full equity analysis, identify potential gardeners, and design site specifics prior to any formal consideration of approval".

This continues to be an iterative process to replace the land lost to the Sheboygan Community Garden. To date, approximately 7,700 square feet of park space within Rennebohm Park was converted into community gardens space which equates to approximately 20% of their original garden land.

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

Mainstream community engagement strategies, specifically traditional outreach methods, meeting times, and amenities offered or not offered (transportation assistance, childcare, food, etc), can disproportionately affect representation and participation for Communities of Color and low-income populations. It has been observed through demographic data for recent planning efforts such as Madison in Motion, the Park and Open Space Plan and the Imagine Madison Community Meetings that for similar planning and outreach efforts that the majority of participants who attend evening community meetings are disproportionately people who identify as white.

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

The parks identified by staff are located in three different Planning Districts (PDs): Bordner Park is in Crestwood, Indian Hills Park is in Spring Harbor, and Rennebohm Park is in University Hills. Data from the Neighborhood Indicators Project (NIP 2015 edition) illustrates that there are relatively low numbers of People of color (PoC) and higher median household incomes in two out of the three districts (Crestwood and Spring Harbor) than citywide. The data for University Hills indicate higher than average numbers of people of color and lower than average median incomes.

City of Madison PoC population: 24.3%; median household income (2016): $54,896
Crestwood PD PoC population: 13.5%; median household income (2015): $83,811
Spring Harbor PD PoC population: 21.4%; median household income (2015): $60,759
University Hills PD PoC population: 33.1 %; median household income (2015): $49,701
- Significant Asian population in this PD; 24% of the population is identified as Asian

Crestwood and Spring Harbor have owner-occupied housing unit rates above 69%, while University Hill Farms has owner-occupied housing unit rates below 31%. The City of Madison as a whole has an owner-occupied housing unit rate of 49.3%.

For full breakdowns on data for the discussed Planning Districts, please refer to RES-17-00853 (Legislative File 42334)
Attachment: Potential Garden Sites Near Univ. Hill Farms - Final Staff Report (https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5407098&GUID=1828AB2D-15A5-4247-BCF0-79AB969813BA) and
Attachment: App. A - Potential Garden Sites Near University Hill Farms Neighborhood Final Eval Matrix (https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5407099&GUID=581002D3-3291-438D-BFC0-51D967B0B797)

d. What data are unavailable or missing?

Data we lack includes:
- The college student population of the three planning districts. In planning districts like University Hills with high renter populations, this is especially important for this plan.
- The total number of gardeners/potential gardeners -- and demographically under-represented gardeners -- in these planning districts.

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

☒ Community/Civic Engagement	☒ Food Access & Affordability
☐ Criminal Justice	☐ Government Practices
☐ Early Childhood	☒ Health
☐ Economic Development	☐ Housing
☐ Education	☒ Planning & Development
☐ Employment	☐ Service Equity
☒ Environment	☐ Transportation
☐ Other (please describe)	

Comments:

2. WHO

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

Residents who have typically been unable or unwilling to attend public meetings would benefit from this plan because it seeks to develop more inclusive strategies for fuller community participation, offering those whose voices are not often heard the opportunity to shape the decision-making process.

Who would be burdened?

An argument could be made that those who have historically participated in public meetings could be burdened by the inclusion of other voices, as this approach would dilute their voices and in turn affect their efficacy. However, in the end, everyone gains from increases in diverse attendance at public meetings, as it represents a more accurate community voice, not just the voice and preferences of the majority audience.

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

There are disproportionate impacts on Communities of Color and low-income communities, however, these impacts are positive as these are the populations that this plan seeks to target and make aware of public meetings relating to the community garden siting.

b. 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.)

This proposal seeks to enact this question and optimize strategies to gather this input from diverse groups. The Common Council tasked City staff with exploring land options in the Hill Farms area and developing recommendations, which would then go through a community engagement process. At the time of this analysis, efforts to continue a "City engages in dialogue" (see the Community Engagement Continuum) style of community engagement is underway, with assistance sought from Community Groundworks, a partner of the Gardens Network, as well as garden leadership for Sheboygan Community Garden, which maintains strong relationships with a diverse base of gardeners in the area.

c. 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.

Prior to the original 2016 relocation of 20% of garden space in Rennebohm, there was mixed feedback from community members, who attended meetings organized by the alder, on siting within Rennebohm Park. Due to this mixed feedback it is important to have a robust engagement process to gather as much feedback as possible prior to making a selection. Input gathering continues through the engagement process. City staff and the district alders will ascertain community feedback and sentiment on the 3 parks identified via a community engagement meeting a community survey.

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)

There are a few root causes or factors that create social and/or racial inequities associated with this engagement process:
1. By holding evening public meetings as the only medium of engagement, it increases barriers to access for residents who do not have the time, interest, or expertise to either attend or be aware of the meetings
2. Other technological forms of engagement (email, online surveys, etc) assume that residents have dependable computer and internet access
3. Not offering essential services like transportation, childcare, dinner, etc. creates barriers or disincentives for residents. Examples include those who are transit-dependent, have children but lack the ability to hire a sitter, or those that have to prepare dinner for their family.
4. The public meeting form of engagement can create a forum where minority voices have to "stand up" to majority voices in a somewhat confrontational manner. Because of this, community members who may represent a minority opinion (or feel as if they do) may opt not to attend and voice their opinion.
5. In neighborhoods that are higher income and have overwhelmingly White residents (which these districts are/do), there *may* exist sentiments that the voices of residents who are not homeowners, white and who are not middle or higher-income do not have an equal say in the decisions made via public process and so those residents may not attend public meetings or provide public feedback.

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

By not fully engaging the community the voices of people of color and low-income individuals, or at least not working to create strategies that include those voices, there can be burdensome unintended consequences, including but not limited to:
- Making land use decisions and deciding on implementation strategies that further restrict or disincentivize park usage by those populations
- Creating a tangible narrative that the minority voice in these communities is not respected or embraced by city and elected officials in public input processes, thereby decreasing future participation
- Perpetuating processes that allow the majority voice to potentially operate without any checks and balances, in the form of collecting feedback from groups who may not have the same cultural norms, lived experiences/perspectives, etc.

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

Based on the neighborhood demographics, there is a clear need to use intentionality when crafting engagement strategies so that the relatively small population of people of color and low-income individuals are aware and feel welcome at public meetings.

4. WHERE

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

☐ All Madison neighborhoods   ☐ Park Edge/Park Ridge
☐ Allied Drive   ☐ Southside
☐ Balsam/Russet   ☐ East Madison (general)
☐ Brentwood/Northport Corridor   ☐ North Madison (general)
☐ Darbo/Worthington   ☒ West Madison (general)
☐ Hammersley/Theresa   ☐ Downtown/Campus
☐ Leopold/Arbor Hills   ☐ Dane County (outside Madison)
☐ Owl Creek   ☐ Outside Dane County

Comments:

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):

1. Reach out to individuals or user groups that use the parks in question (available in RecTrack).
2. Using the expertise and data of the City's Planning, Preservation + Design section to determine how and where we can direct innovative/inter-personal engagement resources, including providing fliers in English/Spanish/Hmong to landlords for dissemination to tenants within our areas of focus.
3. Work closely with community organizations to promote public meetings and disseminate promotional/information resources.
4. Ensure that there are Spanish, and Mandarin Chinese translators or other language as requested at public meetings.

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?

Without clear staff designations moving forward, it will be difficult to continue to hold the planned level of engagement on community gardens siting on public land.

Additionally, this particular process has been an extraordinary one; a reactive approach to an issue that emerged from a land tenure issue outside of the City's control, but which the City stepped in to assist with. Moving forward, following the community gardens siting process as prescribed by the Gardens Network and establishing a new entry on the Master Lease is recommended.

c. Who is accountable for this decision?

Madison Food Policy Council
City of Madison Parks Staff
Gardens Network staff representatives (City of Madison, Community Groundworks)

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

By recording and evaluating the demographic turnout at these meetings, we can ascertain whether strategies employed to increase diverse turnout at these meeting was effective. Additionally, we can request attendees to do short "exit surveys" or "post-event surveys" to determine how they found out about the meetings and what their motivation for attendance was.

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

Once a final site has been selected, Parks Division staff will host a meeting that would be required to amend the Master Plan for that particular park to include the garden space. Information will be posted to the Madison Food Policy Council website and the Parks Division project website. Gardens Networks representatives will continue to work with garden leaders and receive membership demographics, programming updates, and anecdotal neighborhood feedback on garden sentiments.

DATA RESOURCES FOR RACIAL EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE IMPACT ANALYSIS

City of Madison

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

Dane County

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

State of Wisconsin

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

Federal

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

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				
• Primarily one-way channel of communication • One interaction • Term-limited to event • Addresses immediate need of City and community	• Primarily one-way channel of communication • One to multiple interactions • Short to medium-term • Shapes and informs city projects	• Two-way channel of communication • Multiple interactions • Medium to long-term • Advancement of solutions to complex problems	• Two-way channel of communication • Multiple interactions • Medium to long-term • Advancement of solutions to complex problems	• 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