



# City of Milwaukee

200 E. Wells Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin  
53202

## Meeting Minutes

### ARPA FUNDING ALLOCATION TASK FORCE

*Ald. Milele Coggs, CHAIR*

*Molly King, Luke Knapp, Ald. Jocasta Zamarripa, Ald. Mark Chambers, Aycha Sawa, Nik Kovac, Bernadette Karanja, Steven Mahan, Cecilia Gilbert, and Stephanie Mercado*

*Staff Assistant, Chris Lee, 414-286-2232, Fax: 414-286-3456, cleee@milwaukee.gov*

*Legislative Liaison, Tea Norfolk, 414-286-8012, tea.norfolk@milwaukee.gov*

*Andrea Fowler, ARPA Director, 414-286-3556, anfowler@milwaukee.gov*

---

Monday, March 20, 2023

1:00 PM

Room 301-B, City Hall

---

This is also a virtual meeting conducted via GoToMeeting. Should you wish to join this meeting from your phone, tablet, or computer you may go to <https://meet.goto.com/989200317>. You can also dial in using your phone United States: +1 (224) 501-3412 and Access Code: 989-200-317.

**1. Call to order.**

*The meeting was called to order at 1:11 p.m.*

**2. Roll call.**

*Present 7 - Coggs, Gilbert, Karanja, Biscobing, Chambers, Jr., Zamarripa, Knapp  
Excused 2 - Kovac, Mercado  
Absent 2 - Mahan, King*

*Ms. Toni Biscobing serving as a member in place of Ms. Aycha Sawa for this meeting.*

**Also present:**

*Andrea Fowler, Budget Office ARPA Director  
Tea Norfolk, LRB Fiscal Planning Specialist  
Amanda Cervantes, Budget Office*

**3. Review and approval of the previous meeting minutes from February 27, 2023.**

*The meeting minutes from February 27, 2023 were approved without objection.*

**4. Review, update, discussion, and/or motion(s) on the task force reporting deadline.**

*Mr. Lee said that recent legislation was passed to extend the task force deadlines to introduce a file by June 20, 2023 and recommendations to the Finance and Personnel Committee by July 7, 2023 and the Common Council by July 11, 2023.*

**5. Review, update, discussion, and/or motion(s) on information gathered from public input meetings, surveys, and other correspondence.**

*Ms. Fowler gave an overview of public testimony from the three public input meetings.*

*Specific funding request testimony made from organized groups included \$5 million seed investment for the establishment of a Lead-Free and Healthy Homes Fund for the Coalition on Lead Emergency (COLE), \$300k in matching funds to the Office of Violence Prevention requested by MERA Response Team, and \$100k to address food insecurity requested by Feed Milwaukee Coalition.*

*Additional general testimony requests included addressing effects of climate change on the City and its residents, financial support for the Beautiful Imperfection k-12 education curriculum, robust accountability and oversight of the organizations funded through ARPA, combating gentrification of Milwaukee's neighborhoods, requests for participatory budgeting, support for youth programming, mental health training for youth instructors, jobs training for youth, collaborative policing, additional support for the Office of Violence Prevention, additional policing, additional speed humps, assistance to the Miller Park Corridor, services to undocumented residents, bike lanes, housing support, mental health support, libraries, parks, funding the reconstruction of National Avenue, support from the City's Environmental Collaboration Office, assistance with older properties (updating electrical, legal aid action fund for tenants vs. attorneys), Mighty Small Moments, free bus passes, healthy food boxes, community lighting, alternative community policing strategies, hot spots (internet), small diverse business support (\$2.5 million request), minimum wage increase, using abandoned spaces to create healthy living centers (smoking cessation, parenting skills, conflict resolution, assistance with alcoholism, stress and depression management), and affordable dental clinics and health care.*

*Additionally, proposals or requests to submit proposals were received from COLE (\$5 million for Healthy Homes seed fund), AARP (focus on pedestrian safety, public transportation, and housing), MacCannon Brown Homeless Sanctuary, League of Women Voters, Feeding America - Eastern Wisconsin, Mr. Odell Ball (round-a-bout and speed-bump construction), and ComForce for non-police community first responders.*

**6. Review, update, discussion, and/or motion(s) on task force ARPA allocations review and recommendations process.**

- A. Request form, instructions, and evaluation criteria*
- B. RFP submission, review, recommendations, and timeline*
- C. Other aspects*

*Ms. Fowler said that the Proposal, Collection, Review Funding and Criteria Work Group wanted the full task force to review and approve an ARPA RFP project request summary form, ARPA RFP project request instructions, and ARPA RFP project request criteria. Additionally, the work group wanted further guidance from the full task force on an RFP proposal scoring mechanism (numerical), proposal review timeline, specific amount determined available for requests, and party or entity to score*

*proposals. The RFP timeline process would need to consider having adequate time for RFP solicitation, review, and scoring. Initial recommendations would need to be sent to the full task force for final recommendations. There also needs to be a check for federal compliance concerning the proposals. A proposed timeline could be posting an RFP in the next few weeks (3-4 weeks) followed by RFP submissions due by beginning of May in order to meet the task force deadlines. There was no actual RFP document, and it would need to be created. Sponsorship from an alder or department head was needed for a proposal to proceed to the task force for consideration.*

*Member Zamarripa said that the current task force deadline, recently extended, was too tight, would not allow enough time for the whole RFP submission and review process, and the community would need more time to prepare their submissions.*

*Member Chambers, Jr. said that the new deadline was a compromise in part to properly coincide with the City budgeting process for the fall, the community should have adequate public knowledge on the availability of ARPA funding, and the community should already be preparing in advance to apply.*

*Member Karanja concurred that the proposed RFP timeline was too short to make it competitive, normal RFP submission deadline was 6 to 8 weeks from her experience, and the task force was not presently prepared to move forward with a full RFP process.*

*Chair Coggs said that her preference would be to simplify the process, RFP processes were generally challenging, community meetings would need to be held to assist RFP applicants, perhaps proposals could be by resolution sponsored by an alder, and the task force deadline could be extended again if needed.*

*Ms. Fowler added that at a minimum it was important for there to be upfront metrics and standardized scoring mechanism for the public's benefit and predictability, that the Comptroller's Office would need to check for the financial capacity compliance of those awarded or applying, the task force should avoid using simple majority voting as the scoring mechanism, that there be initial scoring done to produce finalists, and that those finalists would then be brought to the full task force for consideration.*

*Member Biscobing said that scoring information should be included as part of the application.*

*Members and participants discussed whether the group to conduct scoring would either come from the work group or be an independent third party group, whether community participants should be included, whether it would be appropriate for community individuals to be involved in scoring due to privacy issues, that applications would be of public record, whether there should be scoring interviews done, and whether to specify the amount of ARPA funding made available for requests to satisfy performance indicators.*

*Chair Coggs, members Zamarripa and Chambers, Jr. said that there should be no specific ARPA funding amount determined on the application, that the entire \$97.5 million should be generally understood as being available, that the application should include an ask of an applicant to indicate whether or not they could implement their program at a lesser amount, that the first ARPA tranche allocation process was done in this fashion, and for an award factor to include whether or not an applicant was previously awarded ARPA funds.*

*Members discussed that they were not ready to approve the three ARPA documents in format, as presented, due to not having consensus on whether to proceed with a full RFP process.*

*Members discussed, led by member Karanja, that Ms. Fowler and the workgroup proceed to develop a more definitive and simplified RFP and open application and submission/review process (as opposed to a full RFP application process), that the process include verifying an organization's fiscal capacity compliance with federal regulations, that the workgroup develop an final application including a component for the applicant to state whether they could implement their program at a lesser amount, that the workgroup determine the scoring review body and scoring mechanism, that there be initial scoring and finalists produced by staff and/or the chosen scoring body, that those finalists be submitted to the full task force for consideration, and for Ms. Fowler and the workgroup to proceed to incorporate all suggestions discussed today and present final determinations to the full task force at the next meeting for consideration.*

*Chair Coggs yielded chairmanship of the meeting to member Zamarripa due to technical issues.*

*Member Knapp said that the workgroup initially wanted further guidance on the entire process but would proceed, as directed by the task force, to determine all aspects of the process as suggested.*

*Members discussed to set the next meeting to April 24th instead of April 17th at 10 a.m. to provide sufficient time to Ms. Fowler and the work group to make those determinations.*

*Member Chambers, Jr. moved to hold agenda item 6 to the next meeting. There was no objection.*

**7. Review, update, discussion, and/or motion(s) relating to work group activities.**

*A. Public Engagement and Information Dissemination Work Group*

*Chair Zamarripa said that the work group handled its work well with the public input meetings and that the feedback provided by Ms. Fowler earlier was sufficient.*

*B. Proposal, Collection, Review Funding and Criteria Work Group*

*Members discussed the work group membership to include members King, Sawa, Knapp, Mercado, and Gilbert. Non-members to include Leah Redding.*

*Mr. Lee said the work group should avoid having a quorum of task force members.*

*The next work group meeting to be determined and would commence prior to the next full task force meeting.*

**8. Update on the City's budget and processes.**

*Ms. Cervantes, on behalf of member Kovac, said that the next pension contribution would increase and the budget gap would increase based on the latest actuary numbers that were being finalized.*

*Member Chambers, Jr. said that he was frustrated with the ongoing pension contribution issue.*

**9. Next steps.**

*A. Items for future agenda*

*Standing items and review and approval of task force ARPA allocation review and recommendations process.*

*B. Set next meeting date(s) and time(s)*

*Monday, April 24, 2023 at 10 a.m.*

**10. Adjournment.**

*Meeting adjourned at 2:14 p.m.*

*Chris Lee, Staff Assistant  
Council Records Section  
City Clerk's Office*

**Meeting materials of the task force can be found within the following file:**

[220789](#)

Communication relating to the activities of the American Rescue Plan Act Funding Allocation Task Force.

**Sponsors:** THE CHAIR