

Sweetened Beverage Tax Community Advisory Board

Planning Workshop #1

December 8, 2018

9am-5pm

Seattle Municipal Tower

Workshop facilitated by Pomegranate Center

Key Action Items

(1) **Two Ad Hoc groups will refine the Values, Ground Rules and Bylaws based on the large group work during the workshop.** Their job description is:

- 1-2 quick meetings (or phone check-ins) before January 4
- Take work from today and refine it, answer open questions, wordsmith
- Send recommendations to Board before January 4
- Present at January 4 meeting for comment
- Be transparent about why changes were made, if any
- Collect additional feedback at the January 4 meeting and refine content further, if needed
- Send revised recommendations to Board before January 19
- Present at January 19 meeting for comment and approval

Ad Hoc groups are:

- **Values and Ground Rules Group:** Leika Suzumura and Yolanda Matthews
- **Bylaws Group:** Ahmed Ali, Jim Krieger, Laura Flores Cantrell

(2) The Board came to consensus to make a recommendation to the City to develop and dissemination additional information about the Sweetened Beverage Tax. Jim Krieger will work with Board staff to draft a letter for the Board to review.

Workshop Notes

9:15 AM | Start of meeting

Present at start of workshop

Yolanda Matthews

Ruth Brown

Leika Suzumura

Jim Krieger

Christina Wong

Jesse Jones-Smith

Ahmed Ali (arrived at (9:37 AM)

Jessica Marcinkevage (stepped out from 9:15-9:30 AM)

Absent at start of workshop:

Laura Flores Cantrell (arrived ~ 10:30 AM)

Mackenzie Chase (arrived ~ 10:30 AM)
Lisa Chen (out of town)

Guests

Bridget Igoe (Office of Sustainability & Environment, OSE)
Katya Matanovic (Pomegranate Center, workshop facilitator)
Milenko Matanovic (Pomegranate Center, workshop facilitator)
Scott Winn (workshop facilitator)
Sharon Lerman (OSE)

Welcome and Introductions

B. Igoe opened the meeting by welcoming Board members, thanking them for taking the time to participate in all day workshop. She acknowledged the first two Board meetings focused on highly technical information – i.e. the City budget processes and SBT evaluation activities – and understands people may have felt disoriented, rushed, or pushed. Would like to take this workshop to “re-boot” and focus on some foundational activities to kick-off the Board powerfully and effectively.

B. Igoe briefly introduced the three facilitators, S. Winn, K. Matanovic, and M. Matanovic.

K. Matanovic reviewed the day’s agenda and goals, which were all written on flip chart paper and posted at the front of the room.

Big, Big goal: Advance equity in health, access to healthy food, child wellbeing, and educational outcomes for residents of Seattle

Phase Goal: Lay the foundation for equitable, thoughtful and collaborative process that guides the board

Today’s Goals: AM – Get to know each other, develop a shared understanding of frameworks and strategies to achieve racial equity

PM – Get to know each other, more! Begin sharing board’s working culture/structure; prepare for Jan 19, 2018 workshop

Agenda

- Welcome
- Goals
- Introductions
- Racial Equity Workshop
- Lunch (small groups)
- More introductions
- AM Takeaways
- Background
- Group Work I
- Group Work II
- Prepare for Jan 19
- Adjourn

9:30 AM – 12:15 PM | Leading with a Racial Equity Lens for Structural Transformation – Facilitated by Scott Winn

Goal: Develop a shared understanding of frameworks and strategies to achieve racial equity.

Facilitated by Scott Winn, Board members participated in exercises and discussions to explore a framework for racial justice efforts that moves beyond merely valuing racial diversity to creating racial equity. Exercises and discussions included the following:

- Board members explored their own positions of advantage and disadvantage, how these impact their lived experiences (and those of communities we serve), and the importance of an intersectionality lens.
- Board members explored ways to relate to differences – comparing colorblindness, diversity, culture competency, and anti-oppression/equity lenses – and discussed the difference between equality and equity lenses.
- An introduction to the difference between transactional and transformational approaches to creating racial equity.
- An introduction to how racial equity impact assessment tools can be used to analyze and transform policies and practices to support the achievement of racial equity.
- How leading with a racial equity lens is an essential component of a strategy for structural transformation to create equity for all.

12:15 PM – 1:00 PM | Break/Lunch

During lunch, Board members were divided into three groups and asked to participate in a get-to-know-you activity.

1:00 PM – 1:45 PM | Takeaways – Facilitated by Katya Matanovic and Milenko Matanovic

K. Matanovic reviewed the day's agenda and goals again and asked the Board to reflect on the morning session.

What words or phrases from the morning really stood out to you?

- For some people, the word “justice” is correlated with revenge – it was interesting to learn this is an association for some people
- Implicit bias
- Positionality
- Groups move forward at the rate of trust
- Root approach to equity work is changing systems, practices
- Call in culture
- Diversity – getting along and getting together
- The triangles (*note: triangles were a visual aid Scott Winn used to represent advantage and disadvantage in a system*)

- Equity trickles up, not down
- Taking the lead from leaders of color
- The work is about re-centering – we need to re-center around the people who are most affected by the issues this tax is intended to address

How did you feel at the end of the session?

- Informed
- Challenge
- Energized
- Grounded

What part felt most helpful?

- Transformation – systems must be transformed. And this will be a process that requires people to listen and respect one another
- Allies do not have to be the same race, but need to understand the race of those oppressed
- The most helpful was also the most intimidating and challenging – organizing by looking at positionality, but how do we get there?

What most challenged you?

- How do we actually put this into action – both in the work of the Board and personally. This is life work. It's a labyrinth to make major and meaningful systems change – and the triangles and historical approaches [colorblindness, diversity, culture competency, and anti-oppression/equity] represent that. Excited that we are in this together and don't want to lose hope and get lost.
- This is a really big agenda to take on this morning. How do we move that big picture forward with the work of this Board? How do we integrate the Board's works and the big [racial equity/anti-oppression] framework in a way that mutually reinforcing?

How did this AM session challenge or affirm the work you'll be doing together?

- The ordinance is out there, but we have the power to put our ideas out there too. We just need to make sure some of our ideas are being heard. All may not be heard. But we set the precedent as a group.
- Everyone is really committed to equity. That should be the foundation of the work and that's a powerful place to start. We may hit some bumps in the roads, but that's okay, because we are all coming to this work with good intentions that will help us move forward and make a difference.

What could you do make Scott's recommendations happen?

- If we have a universal, common goal
- If we think about how to apply an equity toolkit and lens – we should think about what this means for this group. And [we should think about] how are we going to engage with communities and communities of color that are working on the equity issues, or people who are agents of oppression/target of oppression.

1:45 PM – 2:45 PM | Group Work I

Context Setting

B. Igoe briefly reviewed a rough timeline leading up to the current workshop, starting with the passage of the SBT ordinance. She emphasized the ordinance provides key context and information about the tax itself and, as reflected in the ordinance Recitals (Whereas clauses), the intent of SBT legislation.

It was suggested that all Board members carefully read the SBT ordinance.

B. Igoe noted the ordinance established the SBT Board, which is tasked with making recommendations to the Mayor and City Council on programs and activities funded by the tax revenues. The City would like some of the Board's recommendations in the first half of 2018. The afternoon was going to be an opportunity for the Board to start articulating how it wanted to work together. The next workshop in January would focus more on the criteria and priorities to inform the Board recommendations.

K. Matanovic and M. Matanovic introduced ground rules for the rest of the day and invited others to suggest additional ground rules.

Ground rules:

- Share airtime
- No blame
- Seek multiple victories
- Balance and knowledge and intuition
- Propose something better
- Change your mind in view of new information
- Be open to fresh approaches
- Avoid making inferences – seek understanding (suggested by a Board member)

Question #1: What ideas do you have for this board to work at its best?

Process: Board members were invited to independently reflect on this question and write a list. Then they were asked to circle their best ideas and share these with the group (round robin). There were several rounds of sharing out ideas until all ideas were recorded on the flip chart paper and posted at the front of the room. At the end, there was an opportunity to question and clarify any of the ideas. Check marks indicate if someone agreed with that idea.

1. Involve community in every decision. Community involvement outside the individual person here sitting on the board – in every decision-making process ✓✓
2. No judgement. Communicate without being super judgmental – also listen without judgement, no judgement, no offense
3. Building a culture of trust
4. Commit to finding common vision. Be willing to suspend your own personal or organizational agenda ✓✓
5. Don't limit ourselves
6. Understand each other's experience or lens through which we are approaching this work

7. Space for slow thinking. Enable or create space for the Board/individual to review and revisit any decisions or recommendations. Give time for slower thinkers.
8. Cultural humility – understand the diversity of the perspectives in the room
9. Name and identify our shared values
10. Prioritize access to healthy food
11. Be realistic, decisive, don't overthink the process, get to the meat
12. Commit to engaging and serving the communities most impacted by health disparities
13. Recommend or do a few things that have a big impact, rather than spread thinly across the board
14. Incorporate pauses – take time to pause and reflect and ask ourselves if this really what we want to do
15. Know when to just make a decision, balance inclusiveness with decisiveness ✓✓
16. Zip code analysis
17. Be transparent about our interests and goals that we bring to the conversation
18. Keep early education and learning a priority, including birth-3yo
19. Accountability to the group, the community, the city
20. Commit to be present and focused at the meeting

Discussion, questions and clarifications

- **Question:** What is meant by including the community in every decision? For example, we are not including the community now in this exercise of our values.
 - **Response:** I'm one person sitting on this board, I'm the mouthpiece for a larger conversation happening in my community.
- **Question:** What is slow thinking?
 - **Response:** I may need time to digest and process the information and the proposal. Many other people will be quicker to respond or decide. The suggestion is to build in time for pauses and reflection.

Process: Next, the Board was asked to analyze the ideas and look for Themes, Tensions and Values. The responses were recorded on flip chart paper. During this process, there was an opportunity to question and clarify any of the ideas.

Themes

- Common ground – alignment
- Healthy food for all, starting prenatal / at birth
- Reducing disparities
- Balance big ideas with timeline

Tensions

- Slow and fast time
- Is there a tension between early learning and food access?
- Healthy food vs. health food access
- Balance intuition, lived experience versus empirical scientific evidence

Values

- Trust, which is cultivated by building relationships
- No judgment
- Cultural humility
- Transparency
- Equity
- Voice of the community
- Justice, equitable distribution of resources

Discussion, questions and clarifications

- Early learning and food access (tension) – Nutrition starts with 3, 4, and 5 year olds. I see families below the poverty line buying process foods. Families with very young children need healthy food/food access support.
 - **Question:** Are you suggesting we limit food access to early learning?
 - **Response:** No.
- “Early learning” is a more inclusive term than education. Early learning includes nutrition.
- **Question:** How is “no judgment” (value) possible? Judgement is part of a decision-making process. Isn’t there a healthy form of judgement?
 - **Response:** There is judgement of proposals and ideas, but not people. Judge ideas, not people.
- **Question:** What is meant by “cultural humility” (value)? This is how I understand it: There are cultural nuances and I may not know them or understand them, but I am open to learning without judgement
 - **Response:** We have the same understanding of “cultural humility”. Certain communities are not going to have the same access, based on how they define access.
- **Comment:** When it comes to “balancing intuition, lived experience versus empirical scientific evidence” (tension) – this is related to “no judgement”, when someone speaks with an intelligence that is different from your own
 - **Comment:** Storytelling narrative of communities can be overshadowed by science rigor, relates to accountability and transparency

Question #2: If the best happens in the next five years, how has your work on this Board impacted the lives of Seattle residents?

Process: Board members were invited to independently reflect on this question and write a list. Then they were asked to circle their best ideas and share these with the group (round robin). There were several rounds of sharing out ideas until all ideas were recorded on the flip chart paper and posted at the front

of the room. At the end, there was an opportunity to question and clarify any of the ideas. Check marks indicate agreement from others in the group.

1. More equitable distribution of public resources/money
2. More access to healthy, nutritious food ✓✓
3. Some effort on root causes, like investment in education and economic resources ?-needs more discussion
4. Lower food insecurity or hunger rate ✓✓
5. More access to healthy foods and supports for very young children ✓
6. Decrease exposure to unhealthy food and more access to healthy food (food environments) ✓✓
7. Food environment and the education side – what does a child have around them when they go to school and preschools (physical environment and systems)
8. Start to see decrease in high rates of diabetes and obesity and other health disparities in disadvantaged communities; see positive indicators ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓
9. City of Seattle #1 healthiest city in country
10. Closing disparities in infant mortality rates ?-needs more discussion
11. More education and awareness of healthy choices; nutrition education
12. Shift in food culture in general, so that healthy is the norm ✓
13. Education around harmful effects around sugary beverages, namely soda; Role of big soda in driving consumption
14. Increased water consumption – added via email after the meeting by Lisa Chen, who was absent

Discussion, questions and clarifications

- **Question:** Could you elaborate on the “root causes” of #3
 - **Response:** There is interest in investing in education, not specific to food access. I want to keep it top of mind that investing in education is a way to address healthy food access.

2:45 PM – 2:55 PM | BREAK

3:00 PM – 4:40 PM | Group Work II

K. Matanovic asked the Board to reflect on some questions about past groups individuals have been involved with.

In past groups or committees you have been involved with, what made it work really well? What qualities or tools did the group use?

- Clearly defined decision-making process
- Agenda making process
- Accountability
- Setting ground rules, and upholding them
- Not just saying “No” to an idea, but proposing an alternative idea or option
- Leadership structure
- Centering on the relationships in the group, to develop trust. I was involved with a successful group that was led very matriarchically – and decisions were centered on the good of the whole

- Intentional pauses for new topics, giving space for new topics (e.g. in a planned agenda)
- Pre-work so people are informed before meetings

What's been frustrating?

- Lack of time management for discussion – when discussion is too long
- An overly packed agenda
- Gate keeping on agenda setting
- Lack of action steps
- Not knowing when the discussion is over
- Not empowering small groups to move things forward
- Some of us have commonalities (*not sure if this note was captured accurately*)
- You worry there are dominant and quiet personalities and voices, there can be things we do to bring more voices in the table

////

K. Matanovic briefly reviewed the Board's pre-meeting work focused on leadership and decision-making structures. She invited Board members to share any other structures they were familiar with. There no comments.

There was a question about modified consensus, which often refers to proposals passing "consensus minus one". On other words, it takes more than one person to block a proposal.

For the next group activity, the Board split into three groups. Each group was asked to answer the following question: **Given what has been discussed and presented today, what is your proposal for this board's ground rules, leadership structure and decision-making model?** Each group generated a first draft in about 20 minutes, presented their ideas to the larger group, then returned to their small groups to make revisions to incorporate the best ideas from other groups. Those revisions were then presented to the whole group to look for patterns and which ideas migrated most frequently.

Red text reflects the second round of group presentations in which group modified their proposals by integrating the best ideas from other groups.

Group A: Mackenzie, Ruth and Ahmed

Leadership Structure

- Co-chairs – equals or with a vice chair
- Subcommittee structure with leadership in subject matter areas
- *Liked subject areas included in leadership structure*
- *Separating leadership and facilitation could be valuable – have an external facilitator rather than Board leadership facilitating*

Decision Making

- Majority rules (2 votes)
- Modified consensus (1 vote)
- *Liked having tools to gauge temperature and need for time but not for making final decisions)*

Ground Rules

- Respect
- Value other's opinions
- Preparation
- Value time
- Think outside the box and challenge our own lens
- Space for reflection
- Not over structuring participation
- **Commitment to good facilitation and time keeping**

Group B: Jesse, Yolanda, Jim

Leadership Structure

- Executive committee (3 people including co-chairs)
- + 2 Co-Chairs: **1 nutrition, 1 education, plus additional skills, set roles**
 - Roles: meeting facilitation, agendas, staff contact, place for board members to raise issues, external point of contact
 - Other roles to assign: note taker, time keeper
- Committees: discuss later, need identification

Decision Making

- Modified consensus and majority vote if needed
- Blocking concern – 2 people, explore why concerned
- Use check-ins to surface concerns early (any process like fist-to-five or red/yellow/green)

Ground rules

- **Share airtime – step up and step back**
- **No blame – accept collective responsibility for decisions the group has made**
- **Propose something better, don't just criticize**
- **Be open to new and different ideas than the ones you hold**
- **Respect different learning styles and processing styles**
- **Don't react – first, listen to understand and then comment**
- **Be present at meeting, turn cell phones off**

Group C: Leika, Christina, Jessica, Laura

Leadership Structure

- 2 ideas:
 - **Co-chairs** with one chair representing education and one chair representation nutrition
 - **Executive committee of four**, with two people representing education and two people representing nutrition – OR – comprised of people who have expertise in policy, program
 - Creates succession process

- Chair – leads agenda, point person
- Explicitly define the roles of the executive team or co-chairs

Decision Making

- Consensus: regarding concerns or resisting recommendation, publicize reasoning in documentation with decision
 - Thumb meter
 - Fist-to-five
- Rating priorities to clarify values, weighting greatest importance
- Timelines dictates how much we can deliberate
- Modified consensus (to acknowledge tight timelines), but aim for consensus
- Question about proxy voting – if we cannot make a meeting, can we assign another committee member to represent our vote?

Ground Rules

- Communication on attendance (quorum and decisions)
- Preparation (executive committee): adequate time for agenda and pre-work
- If you miss a meeting, you follow-up to check-in with someone

Discussion, questions and clarifications

- **Question:** Why majority vote?
 - **Response:** Consensus takes time and we have an ambitious timeline – need to expedite the decisions.

K. Matanovic asked for volunteers to take the group’s work and continuing working on values and Bylaws (Leadership & Decision Making). She presented a brief **job description for the ad hoc groups:**

- 1-2 quick meetings (or phone check-ins) before January 19
- Take work from today and refine it, answer open questions, wordsmith
- Send recommendations to board before January 19
- Present at January 19 meeting for comment and approval
- Be transparent about why changes were made, if any

The following people volunteered:

- **Values and Ground Rules Group:** Leika Suzumura and Yolanda Matthews
- **Bylaws Group:** Ahmed Ali, Jim Krieger, Laura Flores Cantrell

4:40 PM – 4:55 PM | Tax Communications

Jim Krieger introduced the next topic to the Board. The topic was added to agenda by the Board’s ad hoc planning committee.

J. Krieger: A question for the Board is has the information about the tax been adequately communicated to the retailers and the public? The concern is that there is an [anti-tax campaign](#) [provided as a handout] out there. When you look at the experiences of Boulder, Philadelphia and other cities, the cities that

have been proactive to talking with the distributor, retailer, and public on the intent and purpose of the tax have done a whole lot better with regard to confusion about the tax or pushback from industry.

J. Krieger provided handouts of example an example webpage and poster from other cities:

- Philadelphia: <http://www.phillybevtax.com>
- Boulder: https://www-static.bouldercolorado.gov/docs/Boulder_Bev_Tax-1-201706231747.pdf?_ga=2.220431259.2045647624.1513109304-1724384996.1513109304

J. Krieger: would this group want to make a recommendation to the city about tax communications? The proposal is essentially:

- Put up a website with information for retailers, distributors and public. Include tax filing process, forms, etc. Include revenue dedication information and purpose of tax to address health equity, invest in communities affected by inequities, etc.
- Develop infographic for use in all outreach (e.g. posting in retail sites) and posting online that explains tax (e.g. [Boulder poster](#)).
- Hire PR firm to do quick public education about tax via social media, earned media, and other channels available to city.

C. Wong: There is a large tax argument issue going on nationally. There could be opinion pieces written that combine the purpose and value of this tax and tie this to the larger federal tax debate.

Organizations can do this, don't know if city can. You can educate about this tax in the larger context.

J. Krieger: Are there questions about the proposal or can this group make a recommendation to the city, FAS. We can try and see what it happens.

L. Suzumura: I agree that it would be good for our Board and the City if there was clear information available. People I have been talking with don't know this tax is coming. And the first thing that comes to mind is that this tax is regressive, but people don't know that the proceeds from this tax is benefiting the community. Who is going to do and how will it be put out there? What is the role of the city?

M. Chase: I agree, broadly. Has anyone talked with the City about this?

B. Igoe: The Finance Department has a webpage that provides comprehensive information to the businesses subject to the tax, which are the distributors. On the webpage there are FAQs, the final rule, an email and phone number for questions/concerns.

J. Krieger: My understanding is, if it's less than \$40,000, the Mayor's Office can issue a contract to do communications, but there has to be resources for it. It would be reasonable to ask the city to find that resource.

The Board used Fist to Five to test for agreement on the proposal. Ten Board members reached consensus to draft a letter to the City recommending more comprehensive communication about the tax. One Board member was absent and did not participate.

5:00 PM | Adjourn