



THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR
ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

STATE HOUSE ▪ ROOM 373

BOSTON, MA 02133

TEL: (617) 727-2040
FAX: (617) 727-2779
www.mass.gov/eoaf

Meeting Minutes

Federal Funds Equity & Accountability Review Panel Equity Metrics Subcommittee

Friday, April 22, 2022

1:00 – 2:00 p.m.

In accordance with Section 20 of Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021, this meeting will be conducted, and open to the public, via Zoom and Teleconference:

Zoom URL: <https://mass-gov-anf.zoom.us/j/87804460257?pwd=SGtiV0xDcUtiRDlLaGt1OTg3REdEZz09>

Password: 748390

Teleconference Line: 713-353-7024, **conference code:** 319738

A meeting of the Federal Funds Equity & Accountability Review Panel was held via teleconference on Friday, April 22, 2022, in accordance with Section 20 of Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021.

Meeting was called to order at 1:11PM

Panel members comprising a quorum:

Marie-Frances Rivera, Massachusetts Budget and Policy Center, Inc.
Bill McAvoy, Supplier Diversity Office
Geoff Foster, Common Cause Massachusetts
Yasmin Padamsee, Commission on the Status of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders
Bishop Tony Branch, NAACP New England Area Conference
Erica Seery, Executive Office of Technology Services and Security

Members Absent:

Elizabeth Weyant, Massachusetts Association of Regional Planning Agencies
Joe Curtatone, Northeast Clean Energy Council, Inc.
Shaheer Mustafa, Massachusetts Nonprofit Network, Inc.
Joe Kriesberg, Massachusetts Association of Community Development Corporation
Gabrielle King Morse, Center for Women and Enterprise, Inc.

Others in attendance:

Jose Delgado, Deputy Chief of Staff for Access and Opportunity, Office of the Governor
Kelly Govoni, Executive Office for Administration and Finance, Panel Secretary
Nicole Obi, Coalition for an Equitable Economy
Courtney Brunson, Black Economic Opportunity Council
Heath Fahle, Executive Office for Administration and Finance
Danielle Littman, Executive Office for Administration and Finance

1. Administrative Matters

- I. Ms. Govoni conducted the roll call for the meeting. Co-chair Rivera called the meeting to order and went over some housekeeping items for the meeting.
- II. On a motion from Mr. Bishop Branch and duly seconded, the Panel members voted unanimously by roll call vote to approve the April 11, 2022, meeting minutes.
- III. Materials used during the meeting: ARPA Data and Technology Subcommittee PowerPoint, Equity Metrics Template.

2. Review Data and Technology Subcommittee Chapter 102 Federal Funds

- I. Co-chair Rivera went over the mission statement for the subcommittee and the timeline for the Panel's work. Ms. Obi noted that the goal for today is to be able to bring to the full Panel the draft allocation goals, so that it can be voted on at the next Panel meeting and submitted to the Legislature after that. Co-chair Rivera then went over the data tracking requirements set in the legislation and displayed the data collection categories that the subcommittee decided on at their last meeting. The data collection will be used by the Data and Technology Subcommittee when they build out the dashboard. The breakdown is:

From recipients, spending broken out by:

- Category
- County/ municipality/ zip code/ census tract
- Businesses awarded contracts, business size/ number of employees; small business purchasing program
- Nonprofit awarded grants/ subgrants; nonprofit size/ number of employees
- Profit/ non-profit status
- Contractor/ subcontractor designations
- As much as possible race, immigration status, gender, income, and other demographic information should be gathered on individuals, businesses, nonprofits leadership/ staff, etc.

From independent sources to validate:

- Environmental justice populations
- Social vulnerability index
- Qualified Census Tracts
- Diverse businesses
- Etc.

Co-chair Rivera asked if members had any thoughts on the breakdown. Mr. Delgado asked for clarity about the business size/ number of employees and if they would determine a specific number or size for each business being tracked. Mr. Foster responded and noted that he could see six major municipalities and non-profits getting all the grants and thinks that part of the conversation needs to be about limiting the size of businesses. Mr. Foster also flagged that he would be interested in language that limits the amount of money that goes through a municipal government to a service provider, and instead makes sure that there are

some funds that potential non-profits can go directly to the state for. Co-chair Rivera noted that the next step in this process is to set allocation goals, and they need to define what that means. She asked if they should consider putting a metric around how much of the money should be going to non-profits of 5-15 employees and set that as a benchmark. Ms. Obi noted that right now they need to focus initially on the who and the where and then the how much is something else that the Panel needs to resolve, and the rest of the how's that are associated with it, but right now we are looking at the individuals who are members of the communities who are disproportionately affected.

Ms. Seery noted that Mr. Foster brings up an interesting point, where it feels like we are trying to choose pieces of data, but the first step is to define who it is that the Panel will want to see gets the money, for instance small non-profit organizations and then the Panel can choose what data to collect to define that. Mr. McAvoy noted that for the last bullet, he thinks a data point for non-profits should be to determine if they are certified by the Supplier Diversity Office.

Co-chair Rivera noted that the U.S. Treasury's guidance on this money is very clear and the expectation around this money is that it would go to the hardest hit communities. Co-chair Rivera then provided a map of what the qualified census tracts in Massachusetts are. Mr. Fahle from A&F noted that Co-chair Rivera is correct, and the way that the U.S. Treasury's guidance is laid out, is that one of the ways to validate the eligibility of the spending is to pursue certain types of programs in communities that have been identified as disproportionately impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. They lay out in their regulation two potential methods for defining disproportionately impacted communities and one way is the qualified census tracts framework. The other method for identifying disproportionately impacted communities is that the Commonwealth as the recipient, can create their own definition of disproportionately impacted communities but they need to go through an exercise in which they compare demographic and other COVID related statistics in those qualified census tracts, to the geography or population that they are attempting to define. Mr. Fahle noted that last summer when the Governor proposed the uses of the first half of these ARPA dollars, A&F proposed an alternative definition of disproportionately impacted communities. Mr. Fahle explained that when they took the 26 gateway cities, and overlayed it with the 20 Vaccine Equity Communities, there were 29 communities in total in that bucket. Mr. Fahle noted that when those programs were proposed, that's the definition that A&F used, and he can circulate that list. Mr. Fahle noted that there will be some cases where the programs fit pretty well but in other instances it could be more difficult.

The subcommittee then reviewed a template which has four indexes that the subcommittee can use to determine draft allocation goals. The indexes include Gateway City populations, Environmental Justice populations, the Social Vulnerability Index, and the Vaccine Equity Communities. Mr. Delgado noted that the subcommittee can take the Gateway Communities and the Vaccine Equity

Communities, and put them together, determine the overlaps and determine what else may be missing. Mr. Delgado noted that the Vaccine Equity Communities were based on the Social Vulnerability index and so the only other thing to incorporate would be the Environmental Justice Communities. Ms. Obi asked the subcommittee if they were comfortable with this approach as a starting point. Mr. Bishop Branch noted that Boston is one of the cities listed and asked if the entire city of Boston would be the focus or if they would be able to focus on communities such as Rochester, Dorchester, Mattapan or East Boston. Co-chair Rivera noted that that's why they are offering the qualified census tracts in order to get more granular with the data.

Ms. Rivera then shared the ARPA Equity Dashboard that Los Angeles has. The dashboard can be found here: [American Rescue Plan Act Equity Dashboard – Los Angeles County \(lacounty.gov\)](https://lacounty.gov/american-rescue-plan-act-equity-dashboard). Co-chair Rivera noted that it has the breakdown of communities down to the census level so that individuals can see exactly who and which communities received the money. Ms. Obi asked if it would be possible to say to the Panel that the subcommittee wants to track by these cities and towns but at the census tracts level. Ms. Rivera responded that a town or zip code has census tracts in it and it's just a more detailed way of looking at the data. Ms. Obi asked what the best approach is to get the data at a granular level and present it to the Panel next week. Ms. Rivera stated that she thinks the best approach would be to go to the Panel and note that the subcommittee wants this data collected in a dashboard at a very granular level. In the meantime, the subcommittee can set goals for how much money it wants to be directed at these communities and then can evaluate the available data.

Ms. Padamsee noted that for the cities chosen, the zip code level may not reach the communities the Panel intends it to and asked how the Panel would address those issues. Co-chair Rivera explained that this is something the Data and Technology Subcommittee has considered and noted that setting metrics at the program level will be complicated to track and may be problematic because programs change over time. The Panel may consider applying general metrics across programs. Mr. Delgado noted that if the Panel considers both a geographic lens and a diverse business lens, they may be able to reach more individuals. Mr. McAvoy noted that the Supplier Diversity Office does certify and track Minority Business Enterprises, Women Business Enterprises, Service-Disabled Veteran Businesses Enterprises, Veteran Business Enterprises, LGBT Business Enterprises, and Disability-Owned Businesses Enterprises. Mr. McAvoy noted that this part of the discussion is complicated because you could have a diverse business in Andover, which is not a heavily impacted community, that's providing services to individuals in a heavily impacted community, and you could also have a certified business located in Lawrence that's not providing services for the Lawrence community. Mr. McAvoy noted that is why you have to look at multiple factors such as the certification status, mission statement and what the business is doing. Co-chair Rivera asked how much detail businesses have to provide currently to the Supplier Diversity Office. Mr. McAvoy noted that

currently if the Commonwealth has a contract with a business and their supposed to be subcontracting out a certain percentage to go to minority businesses or women, etc. the Commonwealth does track that information and the business is on the hook to meet those commitments and provide that information. Mr. Fahle noted that in terms of the federal requirements for this money, there is a complicated process for determining whether the recipient of the funds is a subrecipient or a beneficiary. If it is a subrecipient, there is an ongoing responsibility to provide more detailed information for how those funds are being used. To the extent that we make subawards to municipalities who then contract with entities to provide services, the municipality must gather that information and provide it to the Commonwealth.

Co-chair Frances noted that she will make a few updates to the data collected and will share the PowerPoint with the members.

3. Next Steps

- I. Ensure the Data and Technology Subcommittee has enough information to move forward, set up another Equity Metrics Subcommittee meeting to establish equity/ allocation goals, determine next steps on the public comment period.
- II. The full Panel will meet on April 28th, 2022 at 2:00PM. The Equity Metrics Subcommittee will share their work with the full Panel then.

4. Adjournment

- I. Meeting adjourned at 2:02PM