

Sweetened Beverage Tax Community Advisory Board (CAB) Notes from the Annual Planning Workshop

MEETING SUMMARY	Date: December 10, 2018
	Time: 9:00 AM – 4:30 PM
	Location: El Centro de La Raza 2524 16th Avenue S, Seattle 98144
MEMBERS PRESENT:	Christina Wong, Dila Perera, Jim Krieger, Lisa Chen, Leika Suzumura, Laura Cantrell, Mackenzie Chase, Yolanda Matthews,
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Ahmed Ali, Jen Hey, <i>Seat 8 – Vacant (Public Health Representative)</i>
GUESTS:	Office of Sustainability & Environment: Bridget Igoe, Sharon Lerman Facilitator: Teddy McGlynn-Wright

Meeting Notes

Teddy McGlynn-Wright facilitated the meeting.

Welcome and Introductions

- CAB members introduced themselves by sharing their names and organizations. City staff introduced themselves by sharing their names and departments.
- The CAB reviewed the workshop agenda.

Public Comment

None

Surfacing Our Values

CAB members reviewed the [Board values](#) and discussed the following in pairs:

- *What is the one value that drives you in this work?*
- *Why is it important? Why is it hard?*
- *How did the CAB “do” on its values?*

The CAB identified these values as being in occasional conflict in conflict 2018:

- *Balance between community-driven solutions and scientific evidence* – some CAB members would prefer to prioritize community-led solutions.
- *Voices of the community* – the CAB recognizes it has tried to both BE the voice of the community and collect the voice of the community.
- *Trust* – the CAB discussed how lack of time to build relationships is a major challenge to building trust.

Other issues that surfaced during the discussion:

- Early learning and food access were set up as competing priorities. This created a zero-sum game when it came to creating budget recommendations. The CAB’s approach of identifying focus areas and assigning percent budget allocations to those focus areas only intensified the division between early learning and food access. This conflict is an artifact of the legislative

process that created the Sweetened Beverage Tax ordinance and the way the CAB itself is set up, per the ordinance, with the different seats (see below).

- Throughout 2018, some CAB members felt more connected and accountable to the food access programming. This situation also lent itself to creating blocs within the CAB rather than coming together with a unified vision.
- The different CAB seats and the uneven numbers of them (i.e. 4 public health seats, 3 food access seats, 2 community seats, and 2 early learning seats) creates power imbalances, even with a consensus-based decision-making process.

Looking Back Moving Forward

Individual CAB members listed habits or processes they would like to Start, Stop, and Continue. Ideas were recorded on flip chart paper and then discussed as a whole group.

START (flip chart)

- Make voting more equitable
- Face-to-face/in-person community engagement on recommendations and process + other means to hear broad and representative set of voices
- Discuss assess long-term sustainability of the tax (i.e. external threat of repeal) + role of CAB in advocating for tax
- Establish ground rules/principles for making allocations
- Reimagining the structure of the CAB to increase participation and involvement
- Develop strategy for engaging executive office (mayor)
- Define what requires a CAB response in budget process to we can plan for how we approach and know how we can best use our time + how to engage CAB members in this/how to make rapid response decisions in a political process
- Determine external communication plan → including around budget rollout
- Making voting more equitable
- Think about how to balance time of members → value shared presence and time constraints

STOP (flip chart)

- The emphasis on seats and make voting more equitable
- Thinking about allocation as a zero sum game
- Imbalance of funding to City staff over community investments

Discussion:

- Can we find common ground around a vision, even though we are appointed into separate seats?
- Personal connection and representation to community – some CAB members feel more connected and accountability to food access topics
- Is there a way to act/recommend first and foremost as a CAB, and then as individual seats?
- CAB may need to lean heavily on early learning seats for expertise
- When it came down to divvying up allocations, early learning got washed out in the average

CONTINUE (flip chart)

- Fist to five
- Broadening/deepening community engagement
- Online and in-phone options for CAB meetings → better technology
- Communication with city council (+ mayor) and develop our approach to advocating for our recommendations
- Finding out common ground by looking for yes/and when possible; creating a stronger whole by incorporating/synthesizing diverse perspectives

Discussion:

- *There was a vision to fund the food gap, and SBT was identified as a way to fund this work*
- *Are there other opportunities to fund 0-3 services?*
- *Some CAB members were charged to hold the line to fund food gap*
- *Appreciate the sentiment of zero-sum game, we have been put in to fight for the crumbs. How do we let go of that pressure to compete for funding? Our access to funding is different.*
- *Funding and access inequities*
- *If this is the right distribution of where we're going – then let's take a holistic approach. That fight felt constant. Had to keep fighting. Are we good with these %s or do we need to spend any time next year assessing the proportions?*
- *Figure out the right framework – then discuss synergies between the topical areas*
- *What is the agreement for how this is beneficial for all topical areas?*
- *CAB took a divide and conquer approach in its 2018 and 2019 recommendations*

The CAB took a break for lunch from 12:00-12:45

Equity and Impact Deep Dive

In small groups, the CAB discussed the following questions for each of the three focus areas featured in its 2018 and 2019 budget recommendations.

<p>Discussion Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What does equity mean?• What would success look like?
<p>Focus Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Healthy Food and Beverages• Community-based programs focused on nutrition and physical activity• Birth-to-Three Services

Small groups recorded their ideas on flip chart paper and then presented to the whole group. Flip charts are transcribed below. One of the key takeaways from this exercise is that CAB members noted there were lots of overlap between the early learning and food access focus areas.

Healthy Food and Beverage Access (flip chart)

- Success for Fresh Bucks:
 - # of people reached, impact on food security, access to healthy food, on nutrition/diet
 - Diverse access points/people know how to use the programs/program works from the user perspective/program works well from end-to-end
 - Ease of use of Fresh Bucks, stores know how to process
- Other indicators of success:
 - Decreased consumption of SSBs / increased consumption of water
 - Increased awareness of SSBs as health risk/Big Soda tactics/rejection of Big Soda
 - Investments/\$ to organizations led by community members/POC
- Success for school programming:
 - Kids like food and have input into food choices
 - # of kids reached, increase in healthy food in diet
- Success continued:
 - Culturally relevancy of food across all program areas
 - In food banks, available and promoted food is culturally appropriate, healthy
 - Local sourcing across all of these program, and the schools in particular, to support local food system and economy
- Failure:
 - Increased inequity
 - Too many investments are going to government/big institutions/white-led organizations

Community-based programs focused on nutrition and physical activity (flip chart)

- Cost per person will be higher to impact the most marginalized communities
- Need to define community-based/led programming – e.g.
 - led by and for POC,
 - in South Seattle,
 - org's ED, leadership and core membership reflective of the community
 - specific geographic and priority populations
- Physical activity indicators (age relevant, across lifespan):
 - Increased access to safe spaces for social and physical activities
 - Increase in programming
 - Increase in healthy habits/knowledge
- Nutrition indicators
 - Increase affordability
 - Culturally relevant / intergenerational knowledge and practices
 - Increase in variety and healthy foods
 - Increase healthy habits/knowledge
 - Better access (location)
 - Programming broadened reach beyond young kids and families, recognize purchasing power of teenagers and their responsibilities for their family, and seniors
 - Communications are linguistically appropriate and culturally relevant
- Strength-based, asset-based, increasing capacity of organizations doing good work – not just charity

- Breastfeeding is a good nutrition strategy that aligns with 0-3 - synergies

Birth-to-Three Services (flip chart)

- Vision: healthy foundation for early and lifelong learning
 - Recognition that 0-3 is rather amorphous, need to put a frame around it

Success	Status quo	Not successful
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Holistic support (meets multiple needs, e.g. housing, food, health care) – Decreased risk of unhealthy outcomes for families (e.g. child abuse, hunger) – Closing opportunity gaps – More \$ for food and other essential needs – Culturally supportive and appropriate services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Investments go to traditional v. innovative programs – Short-term reach is high, but no long-term, lasting impact or change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Silo-ed programs – Programs are not integrated by other organizations or agencies – Not reaching families with greatest needs – Funding gets diverted into something else

What potential tensions are there with the CAB’s equity and impact criteria?

- It’s going to cost more to reach marginalized communities
- When we talk about “community-led” – need to be explicit in what we mean
- Focusing too much on *impact* inhibits the important lessons we can gain from trying out new ideas (even if those ideas ultimately fail). How can we gather information about gaps and fund those gaps?
- When we become too rigid [in our criteria], we lose space for innovation
- We should have a mix of strategies (innovative, community-led, government)

The CAB also discussed a range of topics related to equity and efficiency:

- Smaller CBOs cost more – how much of that can we accept?
- Status quo vs. innovative; efficiency vs. equity – could be another way to distribute the budget
- False tensions seem to be arising – what are the real tensions?
- Equity – *Who’s in the process? Who’s delivering the programming?*
- Would more efficiency in the process (lower cost, reaching more people) actually reduce inequities? How do we want to manage inequities at the population level vs. equity in the process? They are both important, and important to be aware of the tradeoffs.
- There’s not a denial of efficiency and impact – but this comes down to the integrity of a regressive tax. If we’re going to tax low-income people of color, why wouldn’t the majority of

funds go back to those communities? The regressivity of this tax means we are obligated to maximize the funds back to the communities.

- SBT is viewed as a tax on poor people and tax on poc, so the majority of funds should go back to those communities. This is an approach that was strongly backed by community support and public support during the legislative process of passing this tax.
- Access to funding; that's what this comes down to
- If we are truly to take an equity-based approach, the majority of SBT revenue should be invested in programming led by communities most impacted
- Communities distrust the institutions being funded by SBT. Even if some of those entities can deliver most efficiently. By funding smaller organizations, we aim to gain trust (a core CAB value).
 - When we say "community" – what do we mean? Does that mean the residents/members of those communities? Or does that mean *organizations* authentically led by poc. What do we mean about going to affected/most impacted communities?
 - It takes different spheres of influence to reach a community, and requires working with other institutions/organizations/organized community groups/neighborhood leaders. Each sphere takes different tactics and time.
- Efficiency is always about the numbers, which is important, but it doesn't capture the relationship aspect of quality programming. Efficient programming may not foster trusted relationships. Where is the value. Reach? Efficiency? Relationships?
- Programming can be community-led and evidence-based, but it depends on who's asking. What becomes evidence-based isn't right for every community. Can we create new ways to demonstrate what evidence-based looks like?
 - We have to listen to the people and then go from there
- Going forward – let's not think about these strategies. I would love to prioritize organizations that mix interventions. A holistic approach → more successful. Prioritize community organizations that do this.
- A common grantmaking strategy is to even the playing field for grantees – after all, smaller orgs better at partnering.
- We could develop recommendations that are cross-discipline and aimed at grant seekers who hit multiple areas.

This conversation had to be cut short but is a topic the CAB wants to revisit in the future.

What do things need to look like for 2019?

CAB members individually reflected on the following questions and used notecards to record their thoughts: *What would it take for you to meaningfully participate in the CAB? What does meaningful participation mean?*

What would it take for you to meaningfully participate in the CAB?

- Access to a variety of meeting spaces; Access to more technology – face-time options
- Move the meetings around, get them out of downtown
- Time; communication with clear action/needs; community support and buy-in

- Dedicated time, resources for advocacy and community education
- Reasonable time commitment; advance notification of meetings to get on calendar; ease of communication for
- Meetings scheduled with sufficient notice at a place with
- Not more than two hours, near public transit, by 3pm
- Less time, slower processes that are easier to engage
- Quorum only with at least 2 CBOs. No more middle of the day, meetings in S. Seattle.

What does meaningful participation mean?

- Showing up when you can for the collective
- Attend majority of meetings, commit to the work of advocating/education outside of meetings, hold broader vision of tax
- More participation from community of color groups
- Having a seat at the table; when you're there, you're heard and shaping the discussion and the time is well spent
- Using a unified voice to influence budget recommendations
- Be well-informed, have information you want, be heard, be able to present your perspective
- Predictable – attend meetings; meetings are productive; no busy work;

Additional ideas for meeting schedule and logistics

- CAB meetings should be once a month, maximum
- Consider meetings every other month; use off months to participate in work groups
- Consider hosting meetings at a site that is supported with SBT revenues
- Consider some meetings specifically designed to community engagement
- Really take a look at structural/procedural adjustments (e.g. the bylaws, centering on community seats or people who represent small community-based orgs, not institutions) as some folks are not feeling valued by the CAB
- Develop a strategy (buddy system?) to keep people who miss meetings up-to-speed. Also, take responsibility if you miss meetings.

-END-