

Sweetened Beverage Tax Community Advisory Board Meeting Notes

MEETING SUMMARY	Date: Wednesday, April 18, 2018
	Time: 11:00 AM – 1:00 PM
	Location: Seattle Municipal Tower, 27 Floor, Room 2750 700 Fifth Ave, Seattle 98104
MEMBERS PRESENT:	Ahmed Ali, Christina Wong, Jim Krieger, Leika Suzumura (left at noon), Lisa Chen (arrived at 11:30)
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Jessica Marcinkevage, Laura Cantrell Flores, Mackenzie Chase, Yolanda Matthews, Seat 8 – Vacant (Public Health Representative), Seat 11 – Vacant (Early Learning/Education Representative)
GUESTS:	Public Health – Seattle & King County: Elizabeth Kimball Office of Sustainability & Environment: Bridget Igoe, Shaunice Wilson

DECISIONS MADE	N/A – No quorum most of the meeting
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	

FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS			
#	ITEM	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	TARGET DATE
1	Send out action alert about Farm Bill	C. Wong	ASAP
2	Community input survey (race/ethnicity question); get cost estimate for translation	L. Suzumura, B. Igoe (staff)	ASAP
3	Provide input to SBT study team regarding grocery items to be added to store audit	All CAB members	April 23
4	Provide input to SBT study team regarding food bank network and food desert assessment	All CAB members	April 30
5	Follow-up with Lisa Powell regarding when sales and consumption data will be available	J. Krieger	May 2
6	Outline desired features for a public awareness campaign to help estimate potential costs	A. Ali, J. Krieger, L. Suzumura	May 2

Meeting Notes

J. Krieger and C. Wong, Co-Chairs, facilitated the meeting
No public comment

Quick Business

Updates

- C. Wong provided an update about the House Agriculture Committee Chairman Conaway's draft Farm Bill legislation, introduced on April 12. The Chair's proposal includes harsh policy changes that will limit access and eligibility for SNAP. C. Wong will send out an action alert.

- J. Krieger provided an updated about the renegotiation of NAFTA, which US trade representatives are using to try to block Mexico, Canada and the US from developing mandatory front-of-package nutrition labeling. In response, a broad coalition of health and consumer advocates are urging the Trump administration to withdraw, and Congress to oppose, this proposal.
- The deadlines to provide input to the SBT study team on several aspects of the SBT evaluation have been extended, as follows:
 - **Due 4/23** – CAB members are invited to suggest up to 8 additional fresh food items to add to the store audit survey. The store audit is collecting information on the prices of sugary and diet beverages to study the impact of the SBT. While the research teams are in the stores, they can also collect information on prices and availability of a small set of foods (including healthy and unhealthy items). This is a chance for the CAB to provide input on new items that could be included in the data collection. The results can be used to see if there are differences in the prices of healthy and unhealthy items in different neighborhoods. Refer to B. Igoe’s email for details.
 - **Due 4/30** – Feedback on the proposed methods for the food bank network assessment and revised food desert analysis. Questions to consider: *Given the proposed methods, will these assessments collect the most meaningful information possible? Do these proposed methods address the original intent of the ordinance?* Refer to B. Igoe’s email for details and documents from the SBT study team.

The meeting notes from April 6 were not moved for approval due to absence of a quorum.

Community Engagement Survey

This agenda item was moved since L. Suzumura had to leave early.

L. Suzumura provided a draft of the online survey that will be used to gather input from stakeholders in the community about how to spend the tax revenue. Feedback from CAB members present:

- Concern about the limited response choices for Q15 and Q17 which ask about populations served by the organization and respondent’s race/ethnicity. Recommend disaggregating broad groups and providing a dropdown menu with more race/ethnicity choices.
- Recommendation to consult the census survey and HSD to see how they handle race/ethnicity.
- Recommendation to provide a short (4-5 minute) video explaining the purpose of the survey. Organizations can use this video when they share the survey link with constituents.
- There was discussion about translating the survey into other languages, but concern about the timeline since survey results are needed within the next month. One suggestion is to launch the survey in English ASAP and provide versions in other languages as available. B. Igoe will get a cost estimate and timeline for translation services.

L. Chen joined the meeting midway through the discussion.

Present CAB members discussed and added to the list of community organizations and coalitions that would be invited to complete the survey.

2018 Unallocated Funds

C. Wong and K. Krieger recapped the discussion about the \$2.8 million from the last CAB meeting on April 6.

Present CAB members reviewed the results from the internal CAB survey about the 2018 unallocated funds. This survey was developed by the Executive Committee and was designed to gather input from individual CAB members about how to allocated the funds. The survey also asked CAB members to choose and rank a set of criteria they think should be used to select activities to recommend for funding. The purpose of the survey was to serve as a starting place for CAB discussion around a budget framework. All nine, seated CAB members completed the survey (100% participation).

Present CAB members recognized the absence of a quorum, therefore no decisions would be made about the budget. What follows are some proposed frameworks that were drafted based on results from the CAB budget survey and discussion.

Table 1: Proposed budget targets by broad funding category for 2018

Funding Category	Proposed Budget Targets		Discussion notes
	% of total	Dollar Amount	
Community	90%	\$2,497,640	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Community” excludes government • “Community” includes for-profit and non-profit entities • Further work will be done to define “for-profit” eligibility criteria. For example, may specify that priority is given to small, minority-owned businesses. • Further work will be done to establish minimum/maximum budget caps on for-profit and non-profit. • Public awareness campaign is included in this funding category (see Table 2). There was discussion about the merits of a campaign led by a professional PR firm versus community-based organizations, with CAB members voicing support on either side.
Capital projects	10%	\$277,516	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital project may include water bottle filling stations, upgrades to parks (lights, turf for soccer fields) • Capital projects could be led and managed by a range of entities (e.g. community-based organizations, schools, institutions, etc.) • 10% of total amount is the <u>maximum</u> cap for this category
TOTAL	100%	\$2,775,156	

In addition to the broad breakdown of funding by “community” projects vs. capital projects, present CAB members also discussed a potential breakdown by focus area (see Table 2). L. Suzumura departed the meeting midway through this discussion.

Table 2: Proposed budget targets by focus area for 2018

Funding Category	Proposed Budget Targets		Discussion notes
	% of total	Dollar Amount	
Healthy food and beverage access (includes subsidies and vouchers to help low-income people buy healthy food, healthy food and beverages in school and childcare settings)	33%	\$915,801	
Community-based programs and activities to support good nutrition and physical activity (other than access to healthy food)	22%	\$610,534	
Early learning and kindergarten readiness	18%	\$499,528	Recognition that no one representing early learning was present for the discussion
Public awareness campaign about sugary drinks, includes youth engagement	9%	\$249,764	A work group will outline desired features for a public awareness campaign to help estimate potential costs (A. Ali, K. Krieger, L. Suzumura)
Evaluation of activities funded by tax	9%	\$249,764	
Support for people with obesity and diabetes	9%	\$249,764	Recognition that activities in other funding categories also support this focus area
TOTAL	100%	\$2,775,156	

Finally, the present CAB members discussed how to allocate funding by population groups:

Table 3: Proposed budget targets by target population for 2018

Funding Category	Proposed Budget Targets		Discussion notes
	% of total	Dollar Amount	
Priority populations (e.g. specific subgroup populations or geographic areas, TBD)	100%	\$2,775,156	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationale: studies show there are certain population groups that are disproportionately targeted by beverage industry marketing; certain population groups that are more likely to purchase sugary drinks; certain population groups are disproportionately impacted by the negative effects of sugary drink consumption.
All Seattle residents	0%	\$0	
TOTAL	100%	\$2,775,156	

There was not enough time to discuss the budget principle of depth vs. breadth, i.e. *Should the \$2.8 million be concentrated on a smaller set of activities/strategies, or be spread across a larger number of activities/strategies?*

Additionally, there was not enough time to discuss the criteria. However, based on the survey results, the following outline was proposed as a starting place to discuss the criteria in the future:

Keep	Discuss	Drop
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity • Community interest, priority, support • Impact/Reach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses current gap or need • Builds capacity • Effectiveness of activity (it works) • Feasibility • Cost effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unintended, negative consequences • Bold, innovative • Co-benefits - ??

The meeting adjourned at 1:00pm.