

Resolution #R-75-21

Resolution in Opposition to Proposed Legislation on use of ARPA for Housing

WHEREAS, on March 11, 2021, the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 was signed into law designating \$350 billion dollars in COVID-19 relief funds to state, local, tribal, and territorial governments; and

WHEREAS, \$2.5 billion dollars of these funds were allocated to Wisconsin, with \$1.1 billion dollars in direct aid going to counties; and

WHEREAS, Assembly Bill 605 was introduced on October 8, 2021, requiring counties to expend the lesser of \$1M or 10% of ARPA funds on (1) workforce housing infrastructure (water, sewer, etc.); (2) establishing a loan program for rehabilitation of older workforce housing; (3) establishing a loan program for building new workforce housing; or (4) redeveloping old shopping malls; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Treasury Guidance allows counties to expend ARPA funds on infrastructure without regard to any relationship between the expenditure and the impacts of the COVID; and

WHEREAS, in addition, many counties have already formed committees to discuss how to expend their respective ARPA allocations; and

WHEREAS, in some cases, counties have approved plans to designate over 95% of their federal funds; and

WHEREAS, Marathon County believes that it is in a better position to establish spending priorities to address local needs and has created an open and transparent process to all its residents to provide comments on the use of ARPA funds and is in the process of developing a plan in response to those comments; and

WHEREAS, the requirements in this bill preempt the authority of elected county boards to spend ARPA funds in a manner consistent with federal law and U.S. Treasury Guidance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Marathon County oppose Assembly Bill 605 requiring political subdivisions to use a portion of ARPA funds toward workforce housing projects.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Kurt Gibbs, Chair

Sara Guild

Craig McEwen, Vice-Chair

Jacob Langenhahn

Matt Bootz

Alyson Leahy

Tim Buttke

John Robinson

Jean Maszk

Fiscal Impact: None. The proposed changes do not have a direct budgetary impact.