

Sweetened Beverage Tax Community Advisory Board Meeting Notes

MEETING SUMMARY	Date: Thursday, November 2, 2017
	Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
	Location: Seattle City Hall, Historical Room, 7th Floor 601 Fifth Ave, Seattle 98104
MEMBERS PRESENT:	Leika Suzumura, Laura Flores Cantrell, Jim Krieger, Mackenzie Chase, Yolanda Matthews, Jessica Marcinkevage (arrived 10:33 am)
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Ahmed Ali, Christina Wong, Jessica Jones-Smith, Lisa Chen
VACANT POSITION(S):	Seat 11—Vacant (Early Learning/Education Representative)
GUESTS:	Bridget Igoe (Office of Sustainability & Environment, OSE), David Mendoza (Mayor’s Office, MO), Monica Liang-Aguirre (Department of Education and Early Learning), Nadine Chan (Public Health – Seattle & King County), Natalie Thomson (Human Service Department, HSD), Saroja Reddy (City Budget Office), Seferiana Day (MO), Sharon Lerman (OSE), Tara James (HSD)

AGENDA ITEMS	
TOPIC	NOTES
Public Comment	No public comment.
Welcome and Review Agenda	B. Igoe reviewed the agenda.
Board Introductions	Board members introduced themselves to each other, including their “superhero powers” (special skills, experiences, perspectives they bring to the work). There was recognition that six other members (not present) will bring many additional superhero powers.
Quick Business	<p>Boards and Commissions training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> November 29, 2017 is the last training session of the calendar year. There will be additional sessions in 2018, but they are not yet scheduled. There may be an online training option starting in 2018, but it is not available yet. Board members should attend this training as soon as possible. An important note: Board members may meet with Council members as individuals or representing their organizations. The meeting may or may not be related to Board business. Unless the Board has officially decided to send a member to Council to represent the Board, it is important that members acknowledge they are representing themselves, not the Board. Otherwise it can be confusing to Council members.

AGENDA ITEMS	
TOPIC	NOTES
	<p>Board website:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B. Igoe is working to put up a simple website to house Board agendas, meeting schedules, meeting notes, Board roster and bios, etc. • There was a question about how to share background materials with the Board. For now, the best option is to share with B. Igoe who can send it to the Board. Any emails sent to the full Board or even a majority could constitute a “meeting” if members on the email start to exchange and discuss the Board business. This would violate the Open and Public Meetings Act. <p>Meeting minutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a discussion about the preferred style of meeting minutes. The general sentiment is that transcript-like notes are not necessary/desired, but the notes should capture key questions raised, issues, key pieces of information shared. <p>Planning Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L. Suzumura, J. Krieger, and M. Chase offered to form a planning committee to work on agenda setting for the next meetings and workshops until formal Board bylaws are established. The estimated time commitment is one-hour phone calls twice a month between now and January. <p>Other updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Got Green is hosting Dr. Xavier Morales on November 9, 2017. He might be available to meet with Board members. J. Krieger will reach out to Dr. Morales to see if he is available. If a meeting is scheduled and a majority of the Board will attend, B. Igoe will publicize the meeting.
2018 Budget Process Review & Updates	<p>S. Reddy presented the following regarding the current state of the 2018 budget:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council is deliberating the proposed budget. On Monday, Council released an initial balancing package, which included 125 action sheets, including Statements of Legislative Intent (SLIs) and Green Sheets (see Budget of Glossary Terms for definitions). • The second public meeting was last night and went on for four hours. That was the last formal opportunity for the community to weigh in on the budget. Next week, there will be more discussion and Council can still introduce new action sheets. Council is expected to vote on a revised balancing package the week of November 13. At that point, it is difficult for Council members to make changes. Then, staff do the technical balancing. The Full Council is expected to vote the morning of November 20. <p>S. Reddy summarized the proposed Green Sheets and SLIs related to the SBT budget:</p>

AGENDA ITEMS

TOPIC	NOTES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GS 80-1-B-1 (Juarez): Cut \$153,750 for a Manager 3 position in Department of Parks and Recreation to fund My Brother's Keeper mentoring program, add \$153,750 to HSD for Food Banks, and impose a proviso that funding can solely be spent on food banks. • SLI 31-1-B-2 (Johnson): Council requests Seattle Department of Transportation and OSE to produce a report regarding how it would implement a transportation voucher pilot program for residents living in food deserts. • SLI 30-1-A-2 (Herbold): Council requests that OSE produce a report on strategies to improve healthy food access in Seattle's food deserts and achieve the goals of the Healthy Foods Here report. • SLI 163-1-A-1 (Juarez): Council requests DEEL to produce a report on including K-12 education programs funded by the SBT in future Families and Education Levy. <p>S. Reddy said the 2018 proposed SBT budget also includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisos on the early learning and community food access services provided by DEEL and HSD. The Board will want to make recommendations related to those services sooner rather than later so that work can start. • \$2.8 million that is unallocated. If the Board wants those dollars spent in 2018, the City would like its recommendations no later than June. It will take legislation to appropriate those funds to departments. If there is an RFP process, that will also add time. • Regarding the timeline for submitting Board recommendations on the 2019-2020 budget, it would be best if the Mayor's Office received the Board's recommendations by April 2018, to help inform the departments' budget process. <p>S. Lerman reviewed the budget diagram handout provided at the last meeting to provide context for the timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departments submit their own budget recommendations by June. If the Board submit its recommendations by April, it can inform the departments' budget recommendations, rather than having two separate sets of information going to the Mayor's office. <p>A Board member asked what happens after the Board submits its recommendations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board's recommendations are advisory to the Mayor and Council. The Mayor and Council make budgetary decisions but can use the Board's recommendations to inform their decisions. <p>Another question addressed when there will be updated revenue forecast/projections for the SBT.</p>

AGENDA ITEMS	
TOPIC	NOTES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is still to be determined, but there may be preliminary information by April.
Board's Role in 2018 Budget Process	<p>Discussion shifted to what programs in the 2018 proposed budget are open to the Board's review and recommendations, and why some programs are not subject to review, such as Fresh Bucks and some of the early learning programs. The Board could provide valuable input on these programs.</p> <p>There was a question about why Fresh Bucks is not under proviso to allow for Board review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> S. Lerman said the decision not to include Fresh Bucks in the proviso was made by the City Budget Office. Fresh Bucks expansion was a specific community priority raised during the legislative process and is named in the ordinance as a priority investment. The executive branch wants to get this priority work started immediately in 2018 so that the revenue from the tax can benefit communities most impacted by food insecurity. OSE is very open to the Board's input, and hopes to engage with the Board during the expansion planning process. <p>There was a series of questions about OSE's SBT funding, including <i>How much of the \$2.4 million is to support staff? How many FTE does this include? How much is allocated for incentives?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> S. Lerman explained the \$2.4 million is a budget package that includes continued funding for the existing Fresh Bucks program, the proposed Fresh Bucks expansion, as well as staff to support other work, such as a position to support the Board. Currently, Fresh Bucks has 1.5 FTE, which is barely enough to keep up with program maintenance. OSE is has a goal of distributing \$1 million in total incentives/healthy food benefits next year. <p>Since Fresh Bucks is not under proviso, several members asked what opportunity there could be for the Board to provide input on Fresh Bucks implementation plans, and what this might look like.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> D. Mendoza said OSE designs the work, but OSE could solicit feedback from the Board as the work moves forward. Part of the reason why Fresh Bucks was included without proviso is it was a significant part of the ordinance. S. Lerman said Fresh Bucks is planning to get input from the Board as part of a broader community engagement strategy. She said Fresh Bucks could provide a full briefing for the Board on its planning efforts and ideas early next year. <p>One Board member asked if it is possible to proviso Fresh Bucks funding to reinforce the Board's opportunity to provide feedback.</p>

AGENDA ITEMS	
TOPIC	NOTES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D. Mendoza said a proviso is a very specific budget action and is not something the Board can enact. M. Chase added that pragmatically, this is not a feasible option to pursue—the 2018 budget is going to be adopted within two weeks. <p>There was strong interest in having OSE brief the Board in early 2018 on its plans for Fresh Bucks expansion. S. Lerman agreed to this.</p> <p>Discussion turned to the SBT evaluation and concerns about 2018 funding. N. Chan explained the SBT evaluation is proposed to get \$500,000 in the 2018 budget, of which \$480,000 was already provided in 2017 via an interfund loan to be repaid from 2018 SBT collections. The interfund loan supported the evaluation start-up costs, but this means only \$20,000 are left to support 2018 evaluation activities. The estimated cost to fully support the 2018 evaluation activities is \$596,000. The evaluation team is still seeking a commitment to fully support the 2018 evaluation activities. Another interfund loan transfer to be repaid from 2019 funds may be possible.</p> <p>Several members expressed an interest in proposing the Board formally recommend that the 2018 evaluation activities be fully funded.</p> <p>J. Krieger recused himself from further discussion on the matter, citing a conflict of interest as an investigator with the SBT evaluation. With J. Krieger recused, the Board did not have a simple majority present. The issue was postponed for further discussion until the next meeting.</p>
DECISIONS MADE	N/A
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> There is interest in reviewing Fresh Bucks plans for expansion. A briefing from the program in 2018 is desired. There is concern about the 2018 SBT evaluation activities being adequately funded. However, a proposal to have the Board formally recommend funding for the 2018 evaluation activities was postponed due to lack of a simple majority of the Board present.

FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS			
#	ITEM	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	TARGET DATE
1	Compile information on the mechanics and processes for what happens after the Board submits its various recommendations.	Bridget Igoe	By mid-December
2	Compile information on the interfund loan transfer used to fund the SBT evaluation activities.	Bridget Igoe	By mid-December