



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

Tuesday, May 31, 2022

12:00 – 1:00 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/86272426120?pwd=UWpEZmtUZ2J6ZGUzVVMwVHQxelFoQT09>

Password: 656410

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

A meeting of the Federal Funds Equity & Accountability Review Panel was held via teleconference on Tuesday, May 31, 2022, in accordance with Section 20 of Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021.

Meeting was called to order at 12:03PM

Panel members comprising a quorum:

Marie-Frances Rivera, Massachusetts Budget and Policy Center, Inc.
Elizabeth Weyant, Massachusetts Association of Regional Planning Agencies
Joe Curtatone, Northeast Clean Energy Council, Inc.
Bill McAvoy, Supplier Diversity Office
Geoff Foster, Common Cause Massachusetts
Kristina Johnson, Chief Data Officer
Bishop Tony Branch, NAACP New England Area Conference

Members Absent:

Shaheer Mustafa, Massachusetts Nonprofit Network, Inc.
Joe Kriesberg, Massachusetts Association of Community Development Corporation
Yasmin Padamsee, Commission on the Status of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders
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

Nicole Obi, Coalition for an Equitable Economy

Kelly Govoni, Executive Office for Administration and Finance, Panel Secretary

Robert Braza, 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.
- II. On a motion from Mr. Bishop Branch and duly seconded, the Panel members voted unanimously by roll call vote to approve the May 18, 2022, meeting minutes.
- III. Materials used during the meeting: GIC ARPA Equity Metrics Indices Draft map, and ANF Matrix.

2. Update from Data & Technology Subcommittee/ Discussion of Data and Metrics

- I. Ms. Rivera noted that at the last meeting, they presented the LA County dashboard and proposed doing something similar around tiering communities in Massachusetts based on need, so that the Panel can select which communities should receive ARPA funding. Ms. Rivera noted that since that meeting, EOTSS has put together some mapping based on what was proposed around economic justice communities that are in the top half of the social vulnerability index, and the vaccine equity communities and gateway cities. Ms. Rivera noted that they are proposing ARPA equity communities. ARPA Equity Communities - Proposed Definition: Communities that are “environmental justice communities” that “score in the top half of the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s social vulnerability index” and are also Vaccine Equity and Gateway communities. Ms. Rivera noted that if the subcommittee agrees with this approach, the next step will be to determine how the money should be allocated.

Ms. Johnson then presented the map with the identified indices. She noted that the map takes the four indicators discussed and maps the Commonwealth along the four indicators to give a picture of how everything arrays. Ms. Johnson noted that from the map exercise, they took the indicators that are at the census tract and census block levels and aggregated them up to the municipal level. She noted that for the environmental justice communities they looked at the percentage of the population of the municipality that resides in an environmental justice community or census block. Ms. Johnson explained that for the SVI census tracts they don’t map directly to municipalities, so they worked with the GIC team to develop an indicator which looks at the geographic area of a municipality that was covered by an SVI census tract and then they calculated the share of that area by municipality that is covered by one or more SVI census tracts. Ms. Johnson noted that they then put together a table that pulls each municipality and indexes it by which of the indicators that it falls under. She noted that for the EJ communities they pulled the municipalities where more than 50 percent of the population lives in an EJ community and pulled two different EJ indicators: the straight EJ indicator, which is all of the different components of an EJ community, and communities that specifically have an income characteristic associated with their EJ association. Ms. Johnson noted that they then tiered the cities on a 1-4 scale based on how many indicators they meet. The tiers represent:

- Tier 1: It meets all four indicators, more than 50 percent of its population resides in an EJ income community, more than 50 percent of the area of

the municipality is in a social vulnerability index census tract, it is a vaccine equity municipality, and it is a gateway city

- Tier 2: The municipality has any three of the above
- Tier 3: The municipality has any two of the above
- Tier 4: The municipality has one of the above

Ms. Rivera asked if the population of the municipalities can be pulled based off the tiers, and Ms. Johnson noted that is possible. Ms. Rivera noted that she may want to reconsider the tiering idea based on what the map is showing. Ms. Weyant agreed and noted that she is worried that when they just look at Tier 1 and Tier 2, they have so few rural communities and does not feel that it adequately represents some of the expected future employment impacts related to COVID. Ms. Johnson explained that because the gateway cities and vaccine equity is a requirement and they are all cities, you don't get any suburban or rural areas. Ms. Weyant noted that it would be interesting to see on the communities that are falling into just one of the indices, which one because if some of the rural areas fall pretty heavily on one of the SVI indices then you might want to pull that into the top Tier 1. Ms. Obi noted they might want to consider removing the Tier system and just consider all of the communities that have been identified as an ARPA Vaccine Equity Community.

Ms. Rivera noted that for the full Panel meeting, they will propose this tiering scheme and see what the Panel thinks but there may be some changes that they want to make before that vote. Ms. Weyant noted that she would like to have a sense of what the population density piece looks like to ensure they are being helpful in directing how the dollars should be spent. Mr. Foster noted that this is great but asked if it could be more laser-like and instead of focusing on the municipality as the metric, focus on certain census tracts. Ms. Rivera explained that the challenges they are coming up against is that some of the data they are trying to collect can only go down to the municipal level. Mr. Brazza noted that another thing to think about is the way that the money flows through government and explained that it may not be possible to bypass the city or town and get the funds to a certain zip code. Mr. Foster noted that he hopes some of the money will be accessible through state agencies and that not all of it will be pass-through dollars through municipal governments.

Ms. Rivera explained that for next steps, they will take this approach to the full Panel for a vote. Ms. Obi and Mr. Delgado agreed that the full Panel should see this work and then they can decide what will go out for public comment.

3. ANF Update

- I. Ms. Littman presented a matrix that ANF put together that shows what they can collect at the municipal level, based on the metrics the subcommittee decided on at the last meeting. Ms. Littman noted its very possible to collect a lot of the information the subcommittee has requested. Mr. Delgado asked if there is anything on the matrix that the full Panel voted on that is not possible to collect.

Ms. Littman explained that she does not think there is one category that's a "no" for every single program, but it will depend on what the "they" is for each program.

4. Next Steps

- I. Ms. Rivera noted that the subcommittee will meet again in mid-June to come up with a formula for how the money will be allocated. For the next Panel meeting, the Panel will vote on the tier approach and then the subcommittee will continue to work on the allocation formula.

5. Adjournment

- I. Meeting adjourned at 1:02PM