

## Sweetened Beverage Tax Community Advisory Board Meeting Notes

<b>MEETING SUMMARY</b>	<p><b>Date:</b> Thursday, March 1, 2018</p> <p><b>Time:</b> 11:00 AM – 1:00 PM</p> <p><b>Location:</b> Seattle Municipal Tower, 27 Floor, Room 2750 700 Fifth Ave, Seattle 98104</p>
<b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b>	Christina Wong, Jim Krieger, Leika Suzumura, Lisa Chen, Mackenzie Chase
<b>MEMBERS ABSENT:</b>	Ahmed Ali, Jessica Marcinkevage, Laura Cantrell Flores, Yolanda Matthews, Seat 8 – Vacant (Public Health Representative), Seat 11 – Vacant (Early Learning/Education Representative)
<b>GUESTS:</b>	<p>City Budget Office (CBO): Catherine Cornwall (from 12:10-12:50)</p> <p>Department of Education and Early Learning (DEEL): Monica Liang-Aguirre</p> <p>Human Services Department (HSD): Natalie Thomson, Tara James</p> <p>Public Health – Seattle &amp; King County (PHSKC): Elizabeth Kimball</p> <p>Office of Sustainability &amp; Environment (OSE): Bridget Igoe, Sharon Lerman, Shaunice Wilson</p>

FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS			
#	ITEM	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	TARGET DATE
1	Write first draft of Board's proviso letter	Executive Committee (J. Krieger, L. Suzumura, C. Wong)	March 8
2	Review draft and provide comments/edits	Board	March 12
3	Compile best practice recommendations for food banks on healthy foods and beverages, and healthy options for clients who may not have kitchen access	Staff (E. Kimball, PHSKC)	March 15
4	Get more information from Ethics and City Budget Office about Board's questions related to conflict of interest and feasibility of an external grantmaking process	Staff (B. Igoe, OSE)	March 15
5	Review draft vision statement and provide comments/edits to L. Suzumura	Board	March 9

MEETING NOTES	
TOPIC	NOTES
<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>	<p>J. Krieger, Co-Chair, facilitated the meeting.</p> <p>Board members introduced themselves by sharing their names and organizations. City staff introduced themselves by sharing their names and departments.</p>

MEETING NOTES	
TOPIC	NOTES
	Board reviewed agenda.
<b>Public Comment</b>	No public comment.
<b>Follow-up discussion with the Human Services Department (HSD) on programs under proviso</b>	<p>Natalie Thomson and Tara James from the Human Services Department responded to clarifying questions about the healthy food access investments, following the presentation (Feb. 15) and follow-up memo (Feb. 23) HSD provided to the Board.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> Is there demographic data available for these programs?  <b>HSD:</b> Yes, we can provide that in future briefings.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Given the federal government’s policies on immigration, it would be good to track, if possible, trends in utilization of programs by immigrant families.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Would like to know what’s possible in terms of evaluating the impact Fresh Bucks to Go has on the dietary quality of the participating families. In future briefings, could you provide metrics like <i>How many servings of fruits and vegetables per day are provided by the bags? What’s the cost/ servings per day added? What does this add to the family food budget?</i> <b>HSD:</b> If you would like to provide a list of metrics you are interested in, we would look into what is feasible.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> From the perspective of a small organization, recommend being careful with the level of detail and rigor we are asking for. Data collection like this can quickly over-burden small, grassroots organizations. <b>HSD:</b> We appreciate this comment and agree a balanced approach is necessary, especially given the capacity of some of our partner organizations.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> A summary of the relative strengths of providing vouchers vs. bags of food would be interesting.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> There are probably some additional benefits to the program design of providing bags of food on-site, with intentionally curated foods and with complementary education, rather than vouchers. Also, we know from WIC that there are some challenges with voucher programs.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Understanding that resources for program evaluation are limited, perhaps the Board should look at whether SBT funds can be used for program evaluation. Or maybe there are academic partners who would be interested in evaluating these programs.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> Who are the food vendors for the Out-of-School Time Nutrition program. <b>HSD:</b> The vendors include Fare Start and Food</p>

MEETING NOTES	
TOPIC	NOTES
	<p>Revolution. <b>Comment:</b> Recommend examining the cultural relevance of the vendors and the foods they distribute.</p> <p><b>HSD:</b> We are interested in working with the Board to identify best practice recommendations for our food bank contractors on foods to encourage. <b>Comment:</b> Participatory advisory council with food banks could be a resource. The Council identified a need for community kitchens and bringing more attention to the homeless and their food access struggles.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> For the Farm to Table program, is there a way to track how much produce is sourced from farms operated by people of color, including immigrants and refugees? <b>HSD:</b> Yes. Our vendors include Tilth Alliance, Pike Place Market, and Pacific Coast Harvest. They have information on where the produce was sourced.</p> <p>The Board discussed a proposed process and timeline to draft the proviso letter. The Board agreed on this timeline as a goal, understanding it may need to adjust if more discussion is needed on specific language or recommendations to include in the letter. The Board will aim to prepare a final draft of the proviso letter by March 15.</p>
<b>Board discussion about approaches for 2018 unprogrammed funds</b>	<p>J. Krieger reviewed a summary of key questions for the Board to consider in advance of its deliberations about the \$2.8M unprogrammed funds.</p> <p>Some key timeline and process considerations discussed with City staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2018 unprogrammed funds don't necessarily expire at the end of the calendar year, but there is a carry-forward process for unspent funds.</li> <li>• The 2018 unprogrammed funds are held in a reserve and Council action is needed to move them. This process could take anywhere from 6-8 weeks.</li> <li>• Council has a recess in August and is focused on the overall City budget by November.</li> <li>• Per City rules, any expenditure over \$50,000 would require an RFP process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Board comment:</b> An educational campaign may be something for the Board to consider recommending</p> <p><b>Board comments:</b> This Board should review the forthcoming report from the Equity and Environment Initiative on recommendations for an Environmental Justice Fund. The Environmental Justice Committee shares many of the same values as this Board and recently grappled with some of these same questions about investment strategies that</p>

MEETING NOTES	
TOPIC	NOTES
	<p>advance equitable outcomes. The City’s funding processes are not necessarily equitable and there are some unintended consequences that should be examined. Is it feasible for the Board to recommend a grantmaking process that is managed by an outside organization?</p> <p><b>Board question:</b> How much input can the Board have on the City’s RFP processes? For example, in addition to specifying intended outcomes, could the Board recommend certain parameters, criteria, eligible activities for funding, etc.?</p> <p><b>Board comment:</b> Would like more guidance on how to handle potential conflicts of interest since there are members of the Board who come from organizations that provide direct service and programming that aligns with the intent of the SBT ordinance.</p> <p><b>City comment:</b> Recommend the Board focus first on which outcomes and activities it wants to prioritize, rather than the mechanics of the RFP/RFQ process.</p> <p>There was general agreement that whatever process/strategy the Board uses this year to make recommendations on the 2018 unprogrammed funds will not be the same as for 2019, when there will be more time for the Board to do some information gathering, community engagement, and deliberation.</p>
<b>Other items</b>	<p>L. Suzumura provided a first draft vision statement and requested Board members to send her comments or edits.</p> <p>M. Chase shared some information about recent beverage industry action. On Monday, the beverage industry began an initiative campaign aimed at stopping other Washington communities from adopting taxes similar to Seattle’s SBT. “Yes! To Affordable Groceries” registered as a ballot committee, the first step in a process to explore a statewide ballot measure.</p>