



COMMUNITY BENEFITS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING

~ MINUTES ~

Monday, April 3, 2023

4:00 PM – 6:00 PM

Virtual Meeting

Overview

The Community Benefits Advisory Committee (CBAC) will meet to advance its purpose to act on the Guiding Principles for Community Benefits Funding set forth in the Community Needs Assessment.

I. Welcome and Introduction

II. Minutes and Updates

CBAC members present approved minutes from previous meetings:

- March 06, 2023

III. CBAC Updates

[slide 4]

March 16: Year 4 of Implementation began!

April:

- City finalizing contracts to send to Partnerships
- Interviews of potential CBAC members
- Discussion of Year 4 scope with HRiA

May:

- May 1: CBAC meeting (including discussion of ARPA)
- HRiA's Year 3 evaluation activities wrap up

June 5: CBAC meeting (including possible City Manager visit)

From February 2023 *Guidance to Partnerships for Year 4 Renewal*

Here are some additional considerations as you complete your Year 4 proposals:

Year 4 calendar - CBAC anticipates hosting more cross-Partnership convenings to advance collaboration, share learning, and the capturing of ideas for Partnerships and CBAC to use and share more broadly. CBAC anticipates these convenings happening quarterly:

- *March 16, 2023: Year 4 begins*
- *June 2023: Cross-Partnership convening*
- *September/ October 2023: Cross-Partnership convening (to coincide with HRiA evaluation report release)*
- *December 2023/ January 2024: Cross-Partnership convening*
- *March 2024: Cross-Partnership convening and celebration*

March 15, 2024: Year 4 ends

CBAC Discussion about CBAC vacancies:

- Paul Parravano, a CBAC member from the start of the Committee and the university representative, has moved off of CBAC
- There is one remaining resident vacancy
- Per the City Council Ordinance (see below*), new members are appointed by the City Manager based on CBAC recommendation
- Historically, the process has differed based on the type of vacancy –
 - Originally, City Staff were looking for people that had interest in the work we were doing and were a diverse group – along a lot of different lines, including lived experience; we should consider what we might be looking for in a community member now
 - With the business and university representatives, the process was a little different

Question: Does university seat need to be from MIT?

- No – it does not; MIT has identified a possible candidate, and there are many reasons that MIT makes sense – it is a community partner with the City and many nonprofits, it has strong engagement within the nonprofit community, and it has a significant financial stake within Cambridge

Question: Is MIT a large part of committed Community Benefits funds moving forward, as it was with initial \$7m?

- There is a large amount associated with the Volpe project; we are not aware of significant Community Benefits funds coming from any other college or university

Question: Have any of the other colleges or universities proactively reached out, and is there a responsibility on the part of the CBAC to reach out to them? And MIT seems likely to be engaged either way – so might this provide an opportunity to engage others in the work?

- From a business and organizational perspective, there does not seem to be a strong interest
- And Paul seemed to have the ability and a certain level of decision-making/ seniority to commit resources – is that an expectation?
 - Yes - seniority of the person does matter; we likely want to have confidence that the representative is appropriate and prepared to be actively bringing back CBAC-related considerations to their institution/ department

Question: Where/ how else are Harvard, Lesley, others engaged with the City?

- Affordable Housing Trust is one place that comes to mind, and there is definitely a relationship in other forms and venues
- In terms of what questions CBAC might ask of interested candidates, we can find, share, and revisit the questions from the last time we did a round of resident interviews; some considerations might include: time of meeting; experience with nonprofits and the social sector – e.g., been a client/ consumer of a nonprofit, worked at a nonprofit, served on a nonprofit board
 - Yes – it seems important to have a consumer/ client of a nonprofit as part of CBAC

Considering the CBAC timeline:

- Beyond Year 4, how are we thinking about another round of CBAC funding – i.e., for what purposes, and what about a needs assessment?
 - Part of Year 4 focus of CBAC is to learn from Year 4 about our its own job, how we did, what we learned, how it informs approach moving forward

**According to the City Council Ordinance: The Committee shall be comprised of the following representatives—three members shall be representatives of non-profit organizations that provide services to Cambridge residents; three members shall be City staff designees including the City Manager or his or her designee; four members shall be Cambridge residents, who shall be residents of the City at the time of appointment; one member shall be a representative of the Cambridge Community Foundation; one member shall be a representative of the City's business or property development community; and one member shall be a representative from one of the City's universities or colleges*

IV. Year 4: CBAC draft goals & support for partnerships

[slide 5]

1. Partnerships to fully complete three years of evaluation. Each Partnership is at a different stage of implementation, so some may benefit from this extra time. Ideally, this would include at least 12 months of follow-up data; more specific details may be determined as additional follow-up information is received from HRiA.
2. Allow time to work with families that Partnerships may not be working with or may be working with in different ways beyond Year 4. (For example: transitioning families to lesser services, different providers, or successfully out of the program.)
3. Maximize learning within and across Partnerships, including each Partnership's ability to tell the story of their model.
4. Work with Partnerships to determine ways to continue their models after year 4 Community benefits funding ends.

Our discussion today – considering goals 3 & 4:

- What might CBAC ask of HRiA in the scope for Year 4?
 - How else does CBAC want to consider its approach to supporting Partnerships in Year 4 (including allocation of available resources)?
-
- With HRiA, original scope was through Year 3 plus time for report analysis; with Year 4, need to scope out with HRiA what happens beyond May; 4-6 months beyond May, analysis will lead to report, then working with CBAC and Partnerships – collaborative review, plus other strategic support to tell the story, what we have learned from this data, what we can use moving forward
 - And what piece(s) of what Partnerships have already named might CBAC be able to support?
 - The big buckets seem to be – telling the stories, creating videos, marketing materials; supporting fundraising/ helping prepare materials that can be used in fundraising

- With regards to telling the story piece, there is an opportunity for the City to tell the story, and Partnerships telling their part of the story – once we have data, using it to tell the story in a creative and dynamic way, and the City using it to share story of building community, inclusive of businesses and universities – an enormous opportunity to tell our story/ tell its story, and for us to think about how to engage the broader community
- And some piece of telling story – is about evaluation information and about stories of support to residents and work of Partnership itself; this includes pinpointing work of how each Partnership can individually use the work in the evaluation – and do they need individualized support to use the evaluation to tell their story, which is different than wanting support for marketing/ videography; and then also considering interest of Partnerships as a collective vs. Partnerships as individuals
- With HRIA’s strategic arm, I don’t know enough about its work and competencies to know what to ask; we don’t know what to ask for because we don’t know what they do, what types of deliverables they might offer
 - HRIA: Will bring CBAC notes back to internal team consider what might be possible
- On the City side, there will be some procurement/ purchasing considerations
- What might be tricky about this is four different Partnerships with different interests and the City’s limitations; what is helpful is a partner with a strategic orientation that can flexibly support Partnerships where they are at – something like that may be easier to respond to
- It may not be the same for all the Partnerships – and you could imagine what Partnerships don’t have time for; it may be helpful to offer thoughtful facilitated support to do some planning – i.e., here are some considerations – and maybe not all the partnerships want that, and that is separate from how do you tell your story
- It seems there may be three things present: How HRIA might help Partnerships use evaluations to tell their individual story; helping Partnerships think strategically about the future; Partnerships and individual organizations telling their story, and how do we market ourselves
- And the data will inform all of this
- There may need to be some more thought here – all of them, both within each Partnership/ organization and collectively as a group, being offered some strategic thinking/ planning help may set them up well

V. Next Steps & Next Meeting Dates

Next CAB meetings:

- Monday May 1, 4pm – 6pm; discussion of ARPA: What questions do members have?
- Monday June 5, 4pm – 6pm; possible visit by the City Manager: What do members want to know/ prioritize?

Discussion of ARPA: What questions do members have?

- I know very little, I only know about guaranteed income piece, and I don’t know about work with nonprofits – a basic primer would be useful
- How does it work, how does it get dispersed? Need a general understanding of what is possible in terms of funding – what flows through the City/ different buckets through the City?
- How would this interact with inform/ what is already in process – where does this fit in?
- HRIA had mentioned the possible impact of guaranteed income pilot/ ARPA funding on participants in the Partnerships’ projects; would that fund any individuals being supported by Partnership? It would be helpful to understand that
 - HRIA: Yes, that was going to be part of a question we were considering to ask families about sources of income
- With Cambridge RISE, there was a relatively small number of people that were recipients that were also part of a Partnership; HRIA’s family-level data collection will have ended before new RISE has started
- There is the guaranteed income money, there is \$6m in ARPA money available to nonprofits, and there are a number of nonprofits that are direct ARPA recipients, and then a number of projects where money was assigned and not yet allocated

June visit by the City Manager: What do members want to know/ prioritize?

- Long-term sustainability of having some kind of City Community Benefits Fund that supports nonprofits – know more about how funding ends up in Community Benefits Fund – how those things can be structured given the tons of things happening in Cambridge, and the tons of wealth
- The City Manager will be interested in learning from the CBAC what has been done thus far, how its benefited nonprofits, plans for future
- We need a primer on all of that – a background sense of the mechanics of how the Community Benefits Funding works

- One of Sandra’s colleagues in the Community Development Department could explain when a piece of development ends up in Community Benefits Funds and with other residential and community benefits – might be able to provide a primer on that
 - It is a zoning question
 - Developers may have to provide mitigation for certain things – e.g., traffic, sewer, housing – to address impact on the City, and then there were other developments that it wasn’t so neatly in a category, and so that is where the Community Benefits Fund came into play and this Committee to inform that process so that individual developers are not making individual deals
 - We spent a lot of time brainstorming and coming up with this funding strategy, asked Wendell (City staff at the time) to go find case studies, and couldn’t find many examples; the City Manager may know about community benefits from his hospital background – and this is kind of unique. And that was a bit of a struggle, based on a needs assessment, how were we going to find nonprofits; he might benefit from hearing the perspective of the CBAC members about the work that we have done and the voices of nonprofits and experience of community benefits
 - Yes – context is everything
 - And we do not want to miss the opportunity to show off the work that we have done, and the impact of this funding, as we consider sustainability
 - Yes – I am really thinking that opportunity is to be informative to the City Manager
 - Success will be if he comes away with an understanding of what has been done to date over the past 5 years, where we are at now, what we are hoping to do in next 12 months – so that he can have perspective when others ask come to him
- And:
- What about June convening with Partnerships – is that happening?

VI. Public Comment

- Considering HRIA and supports for Partnerships: Wherever flexibility can be built in for Partnerships is important – put Partnerships in the driver seat a bit more, provide extra flexibility within a frame
- Considering the question about what is next for future CBAC round(s) of funding: One of the things that will help map that out is the financial picture – i.e., what is the total dollar amount pledged, what is the timing of that? That will help guide what is feasible and reasonable in terms of the next iteration of this – both for the group to see, and to make public
- Yes, and – I do think we should be able to have more certainty, and given that payments are tied to building completion, we can minimally provide: “At some point, this is expected, and this is the timeline...” – we could at least frame what we do or don’t know even as it is a bit challenging to predict when a building will get its Certificate of Occupancy

VII. Attendance

Committee Members Present: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caleb Hurst-Hiller • Elizabeth Aguilo • Ellen Semonoff • Erin Muirhead McCarty • Maria LaPage • Rowan Murphy • Sandra Clarke • Taha Jennings 	Committee Members Absent: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amal Mohamed • Geeta Pradhan • Michelle Lower
	Community Development Department: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lev McCarthy
	Facilitator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daniel Michaud Weinstock, dmw360 consulting
	Health Resources in Action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nicole Robertson