



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

Thursday, April 28, 2022

2:00 – 3:00 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/85375250957?pwd=TxzazZkUjdNU2ZKWTFFS0tgQlJVOT09>

Password: 493771

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

A meeting of the Federal Funds Equity & Accountability Review Panel was held via teleconference on Thursday, April 28, 2022, in accordance with Section 20 of Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021.

Meeting was called to order at 2:05PM

Panel members comprising a quorum:

Jose Delgado, Panel Co-Chair, Access and Opportunity, Office of the Governor
Nicole Obi, Panel Co-Chair, Coalition for an Equitable Economy
Suzanne Bump, Auditor of the Commonwealth
Amy Nable, Office of the Comptroller
Michael Frieber, Inspector General's Office
Erica Seery, Chief Digital Officer, Executive Office of Technology Services and Security
Leemarie Mosca, Massachusetts Nonprofit Network, Inc.
Denella Clark, Massachusetts Commission on the Status of Women
Gabrielle King Morse, Center for Women and Enterprise, Inc.
Joe Kriesberg, Massachusetts Association of Community Development Corporations
Yasmin Padamsee, Commission on the Status of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders
Marie-Frances Rivera, Massachusetts Budget and Policy Center, Inc.
Elizabeth Weyant, Massachusetts Association of Regional Planning Agencies
Joe Curtatone, Northeast Clean Energy Council, Inc.
Cindy Luppi, Green Justice Coalition
Beverley Johnson, Massachusetts Minority Contractors Association, Inc.

Members Absent:

Bill McAvoy, Supplier Diversity Office
Kristina Johnson, Chief Data Officer, Executive Office of Technology Services and Security
Shaheer Mustafa, Massachusetts Nonprofit Network, Inc.
Geoff Foster, Common Cause Massachusetts
Raquel Halsey, North American Indian Center of Boston, Inc.
Bishop Tony Branch, NAACP New England Area Conference

Others in attendance:

Kelly Govoni, Executive Office for Administration and Finance, Panel Secretary
Heath Fahle, Executive Office for Administration and Finance
Robert Braza, Executive Office for Administration and Finance
Judith Bromley, State Auditor's Office
Phineas Baxandall, Massachusetts Budget and Policy Center
Nancy Wagman, MassBudget

1. Administrative Matters

- I.** Ms. Govoni conducted the roll call for the meeting. Co-chair Delgado called the meeting to order and went over some housekeeping items for the meeting.
- II.** On a motion from Auditor Suzanne Bump and duly seconded, the Panel members voted unanimously by roll call vote to approve the March 15, 2022, meeting minutes. Ms. Clark sustained from voting because she was not present at the March 15th meeting.

2. Update from Equity Metrics Subcommittee

- I.** Ms. Rivera provided an update on the Equity Metrics Subcommittee's work. Ms. Rivera went over the subcommittee's mission, which is to establish equity metrics and allocation goals to track and monitor the equitable allocation of ARPA funds, as described by the Legislature and the Panel. These metrics will be shared with the Data and Technology subcommittee and the Panel to fulfill the mission outlined in the enabling legislation.

Ms. Rivera noted that the subcommittee met on April 11th and agreed on a mission statement and timeline, received an update from the Data and Technology Subcommittee, along with their needs and timeline. The subcommittee met again on April 22nd, and reviewed the timeline, finalized data to be collected and discussed next steps. Ms. Rivera noted that because of the speedy timeline, the draft allocation goals have not been finalized yet, but the Equity Metrics Subcommittee has come up with the data that they would like to see collected so that the Data and Technology Subcommittee can get started on their work. Ms. Rivera then shared the data that the Equity Metrics Subcommittee would like to see tracked:

From recipient, 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. (People and families and "sub-recipient" and beneficiaries').

From independent sources to validate:

- Environmental justice populations
- Social vulnerability index
- Qualified Census Tracts
- Vaccine Equity Communities
- Diverse businesses

Ms. Lippi noted that her question is related to the broad definition of equity which includes environmental justice, racial justice, and economic justice issues. Ms. Lippi noted that for her organization, that means labor affiliations and asked if the Panel is tracking these dollars and tracking whether businesses or institutions are affiliated with organized labor. Ms. Rivera noted

that Mr. Fahle sent helpful information about what the state needs to track in terms of ARPA dollars and she believes that the state needs to track on the PLAs, but it did not come up in their discussion.

Ms. Nable noted that the last bullet states that income and other demographic information should be gathered on individuals, businesses, nonprofits leadership/ staff, (People and families and “sub-recipient” and beneficiaries’) and asked if the subcommittee is proposing that we collect that information for the grant recipient and separately from the communities and the individuals that they serve? Ms. Rivera noted that from her understanding there is certain information they are able to get based on the reporting that either the recipient or subrecipient has to provide but does not know if they can get the income from that information. Ms. Rivera explained that there is still iterative work that needs to be done on this. She pointed out that for the premium pay program, they could likely get income information about the recipients but does not know that they can receive that from every person that is touched by the funding. Mr. Kriesberg noted that for the Panel’s purposes, if the program itself is income restrictive, does the Panel need to know whether they make \$12,000 or \$17,000 if we know that they are a priority population? Co-chair Delgado noted that is a great point and that this is just a baseline, and it can be amended and changed. Ms. Morse noted that she is really interested in the individual head of household and thinks that it is an interesting distinction that she would want to look at even more, and would like to add that to the list, knowing that it may or may not be possible. Ms. Rivera thanked both Ms. Morse and Ms. Lippi for their suggestions and will discuss it further at the next Equity Metrics Subcommittee meeting.

On a motion from Auditor Suzanne Bump and duly seconded, the Panel voted unanimously by roll call vote to approve the data to be collected and focus populations that will help the Equity Metrics Subcommittee establish the draft allocation goals. Ms. Rivera then went over the next steps for the subcommittee, which is to establish funding/ allocation goals based on the people and families in our target areas (EJ communities, Qualified Census Tracts, Vaccine Equity Communities, etc.) and draft and finalize next steps on the public comment period.

3. Update from Data and Technology Subcommittee

- I. Ms. Seery then provided an update from the subcommittees work. Ms. Seery went over the subcommittees mission, which is to facilitate the creation of a user-friendly tracking system for federal funds spending, as described by the legislature and defined by the Panel. The subcommittee will oversee the iterative work of the tracking-system implementation team, including work related to data collection, processing, and building the website, and make recommendations to the Panel for accepting the implementation team’s deliverables at key milestones.

Ms. Seery then went over the tracking system, which at a high level, fund recipients need to be able to submit data into a database, the database needs to process the data and then it will be brought into a public facing website where people can review the data. Ms. Seery noted that for the public facing website, the subcommittee concluded that it will be on a mass.gov website, displaying PowerBi data visualization and will meet the requirements from the legislation. On the data processing end, ANF has a project started to implement and use Salesforce, which should meet the needs of the Panel. Ms. Seery noted that Salesforce would intake data from fund recipients, process the data, and send it to PowerBi. The Salesforce project plan will be available by 4/30. Ms. Seery noted that next steps will be to review the project plan to ensure actual timelines and functionality is in line with the Panel’s needs, and if it’s not the subcommittee will come up with alternatives. Ms. Seery noted that on the data collection side, there will need to be an interim phase while Salesforce is still getting set up. The first phase would be to continue using ANFs current procedure where agencies submit spending to MMARS, ANF follows up to ask for additional COVID funds related data, and agencies send

COVID data in spreadsheet. For Phase 2, it will be a much more automated process, where MMARS and Salesforce will be able to communicate with each other. Ideally, Salesforce would automatically send reminders to submit data, and agencies would then submit data directly to Salesforce. Ms. Seery then moved on to the data collection. ANF already collects much of the data that is needed from fund recipients. Additional data will be needed based on the legislation and the Panel's chosen metrics. Ms. Seery noted that next steps for the subcommittee are to cross reference data requested in legislation and data being collected by ANF today to identify gaps and determine data needed for the Panel's draft metrics.

Ms. Obi asked if once the switch to Salesforce happens, if she expects there to be any additional cost for implementation those solutions. Ms. Seery responded that there is an existing process to add Salesforce, but there still should be a project team focused on this constituent facing website, and to some degree that is a next step conversation with ANF to figure out if there is an internal team that can set all that up. Ms. Seery noted there have been some conversations about potentially needing to hire a vendor to support the data visualization, and that is one potential area where they may need to request funds for. Ms. Seery wrapped up her presentation by going over next steps and action items for the subcommittee which include:

1. Review Salesforce project plan to ensure actual timelines and functionality are in line with our needs, otherwise discuss alternatives
2. Determine data needed for the Panel's draft metrics
3. Cross reference data needs with data being collected by ANF today to identify gaps
4. Create timeline for implementation
5. Identify implementation team and resources needed
6. Create draft reporting form

Ms. Morse asked who puts the data into the system. Ms. Seery noted that the group spending the money would be responsible for uploading the data. Mr. Fahle noted it will depend on the level of detail and identified metrics, but conceptually they will have to amend existing grant agreements or exercise provisions in their current agreements related to data collection to add a data collection workflow. For example, EHS is delivering programs related to local public health and they work with their partners to push out the link to the portal to put in whatever metrics are identified and then those get rolled up into a single table. Ms. Morse asked if this is something that will be filled out when applying for the funds or after the fact. Mr. Fahle noted that it will depend on the metrics identified and where in the process each of the programs and initiatives are. For those that have already occurred, there will have to be an effort to collect things retrospectively. For programs that haven't been rolled out yet, we can implement these requirements as a component part of the programs, and they could be collected as part of the application process or ongoing reporting process. Mr. Fahle noted that will be one of the Panel's challenges given that there are dozens of different programs in various stages and developments.

Mr. Frieber asked if it would be possible to put state agencies on notice earlier than later and let them know that they may be requesting this kind of data from their partners even if they haven't finalized what that might be yet. Mr. Fahle noted that they are aware of this Panel's existence and depending on the nature of the programs they are running there may be federal requirements around KPI's, but agencies are aware that there may be a data request in the future but without the exact data it's a little bit theoretical. Mr. Frieber noted that makes sense, but he is imagining a boilerplate provision that could be put into agreements noting that the Commonwealth has the right to request particular data points at a future time from vendors

working alongside state agencies. Mr. Fahle noted that is a component part of the process now but without identified metrics it does present some planning challenges for folks.

4. A&F Update

- I. Mr. Fahle shared a document with the Panel that summarizes the Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Fund. Mr. Fahle explained that the Commonwealth received approximately \$5.3 billion dollars from the state fiscal recovery fund. There were allocations for funds that were made before the legislation that created this Panel was adopted, and \$469 million dollars' worth of spending that will occur that is not subject to the purview of this Panel. There is \$2.5 billion dollars of appropriation that is included in the ARPA 1.0, which is the first portion of the funds that are subject to this Panels purview, and then there are \$2.267 billion dollars left to appropriate. Mr. Fahle then went over the allocations for the State Fiscal Recovery Fund to date for each category. Ms. Luppi asked whether within these allocations, this group in general has committed to a value or commitment to a Justice 40 spending or oversight approach within these buckets of funds to ensure that low income or communities of color are getting a clear chunk of the funding within the different categories. Co-chair Delgado noted that is part of the work that the Equity Metrics Subcommittee is going to be doing moving forward.

5. Next Steps

- I. Co-chair Delgado noted that the hope is that the subcommittees will meet again in the month of May so that the Panel can vote on the draft allocation goals by the end of May.

6. Adjournment

- I. The meeting was adjourned at 3:05PM.

Kelly Govoni, Secretary