

Sweetened Beverage Tax Community Advisory Board Meeting Notes

MEETING SUMMARY	Date: Thursday, February 15, 2018
	Time: 11:00 AM – 1:00 PM
	Location: Seattle Municipal Tower, 27 th Floor, Room 2750 700 Fifth Ave, Seattle 98104
MEMBERS PRESENT:	Ahmed Ali, Christina Wong, Jessica Marcinkevage, Jim Krieger Laura Cantrell Flores, Leika Suzumura, Mackenzie Chase, Yolanda Matthews
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Lisa Chen, Seat 8 – Vacant (Public Health Representative); Seat 11 – Vacant (Early Learning/Education Representative)
GUESTS:	City Budget Office (CBO): Aaron Blumenthal Department of Education and Early Learning (DEEL): Monica Liang-Aguirre, Sonja Griffin, Erica Johnson, Raka Bhattacharya Human Services Department (HSD): Javier Pulido, Natalie Thomson, Pat Wells, Tanya Kim, Tara James, Edwin Obras, Leslie Stewart, Carol Cartmell Public Health – Seattle & King County (PHSKC): Sara Rigel, Seth Schromen-Wawrin Office of Sustainability & Environment (OSE): Bridget Igoe, Hannah Hill, Sharon Lerman

DECISIONS MADE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Board reached consensus on supporting DEEL’s proposal and recommending the proviso is lifted 2. The Board reached consensus on supporting HSD’s proposal and recommending the proviso is lifted 3. The Board voted on an Executive Committee. Results of the vote: Co-Chair – Christina Wong Co-Chair – Jim Krieger At-large-Member – Leika Suzumura
-----------------------	---

FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS			
#	ITEM	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	TARGET DATE
1	HSD will provide responses to questions	HSD staff	2/23/2018
2	Executive Committee will meet	B. Igoe will coordinate	Before 3/1/2018
3	Board will continue forming recommendations for DEEL and starting forming recommendations for HSD	Board	At 3/1/2018 Board meeting

AGENDA ITEMS & MEETING NOTES	
TOPIC	NOTES
Welcome and Introductions	<p>B. Igoe 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> <p>Board reviewed agenda, majors goal of the meeting, and ground rules. Board also reviewed the 5-month look-ahead based on the timeline and process presented by the City Budget Office at the Jan. 19 meeting. Over the next 5 months, the Board’s goals are to submit recommendations on the following beverage tax investments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HSD and DEEL funding under proviso (March) • 2018 unprogrammed funds (April) • 2019 proposed SBT budget (June) <p>There was a request that the City and departments brief the Board on the 2019 proposed SBT budget by end of April so the Board has ample time to review and form recommendations by June.</p>
Public Comment	No public comment.
Follow-up discussion with the Department of Education and Early Learning (DEEL) on birth-to-three investments under proviso	<p>Board reviewed the goals of this session:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask clarifying questions about birth-to-three SBT investments • Provide comments, suggestions, recommendations • Decide on whether to support DEEL’s proposal and recommend lifting the proviso <p>Board reviewed the decision-making process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Go-around #1: Questions • Go-around #2: Comments, suggestions, recommendations • Take stock of comments – are there any tensions points? Comments that need clarification? • Check-in: Is anyone NOT ready to make a decision • Use Fist to Five to test for agreement on whether the Board supports DEEL’s proposal and recommends lifting the proviso • Final check: Are there any blocking concerns? It takes 2 to block the proposal. <p>There was a clarifying question about whether the Board has to decide on endorsing the entirety of DEEL’s proposal. Response: Yes, the decision point is whether or not to recommend lifting the proviso on the whole package. However, the Board is encouraged to include recommendations about the proposed investment strategies. The purpose of the second go-around is to start</p>

AGENDA ITEMS & MEETING NOTES

TOPIC	NOTES
	<p>collecting the comments, suggestions and recommendations from the Board that it can use in a future letter. There were no other questions or comments about the process.</p> <p>Monica Liang-Aguirre, DEEL’s Early Learning Division Director, and Sonja Griffin, Manager of Quality Practice and Professional Development at DEEL, responded to clarifying questions about the birth-to-three investments, following the presentation (Feb. 1) and two memos (Feb. 1, Feb. 12) DEEL provided to the Board.</p> <p>The proposed investment priorities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coaching and professional development for 0-3 child care providers • Family Child Care program support development • Comprehensive developmental and health support for 0-3 providers • Support for families of children 0-3 with developmental delays • DEEL 0-3 infrastructure supports <p>See DEEL’s presentation and memos for full details (available on CAB webpage)</p> <p>Go-around #1: Clarifying Questions (two Board members had questions)</p> <p>Question: In the table displaying number of families and children reached (Feb. 12 memo, page 5), is this an unduplicated count? Response: As detailed in the memo, accurately predicting the number of adults and children who will be impacted by the birth-to-three interventions is challenging for a number of reasons (see memo for details). It’s possible there are some duplicates in these estimates, but how many are unknown.</p> <p>Question: What is the cost per child of this investment. Is it roughly \$2700 per child, or \$2.73M for 1000 kids reached? Response: Yes, that’s one way to calculate it. But our goal is figure out what type of impact we are making with these investments. It will be tricky to evaluate, but it’s a priority and we’re working on it.</p> <p>Question: Can you expand on the question about long-term plans for funding these investments given that SBT could be a declining revenue source (Feb.12 memo, page 6). Is there another revenue source? Response: The reality is we are 80% funded through levies and all our funding is contingent on external factors. Our goal is to</p>

AGENDA ITEMS & MEETING NOTES

TOPIC	NOTES
	<p>prove the worth of these programs so the Mayor and Council will continue to allocate funds accordingly.</p> <p>Question: What is the plan for evaluation? Are there resources available? Will we see some metrics next year? Response: Yes, we have an internal data team to help us think through the types of metrics we can expect to see in the short term and long term. Next year, we'll be looking at outputs especially in terms of number of kids served. Then we'll create an evaluation plan.</p> <p>Go-around #2: Comments, Suggestions, Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for the informative and detailed presentation and memos. <i>(multiple people)</i> • Supportive of this work. This is a worthwhile effort. Comfortable endorsing this proposal. No concerns moving this forward. Conceptually want to support it. <i>(multiple people)</i> • There are great opportunities for a rich evaluation and collection of important data and information on measures like reach, return on investment (ROI), demographics, best practices and promising practices from the pilot in family home child care <i>(multiple people)</i> • Appreciate the peer-to-peer support approach and the emphasis on both family home child care and child care centers. This work will help to increase quality of care and also help immigrant-owned business. • Recommend that DEEL try to collect data that can address key questions on target population and reach such as how many children could benefit from these interventions, how many children are actually being served by these interventions, and what would it look like to serve all eligible children (gap analysis). • As the Board prepares to form recommendations on the 2019 SBT budget, in addition to ROI and other metrics mentioned, it would be beneficial to understand the results from the pilot projects to inform what successful interventions should carry forward and what should be phased out. Comment from DEEL: Not all of this information will be available by May since this is work just getting started. • Support the prioritization on the birth-to-three population. <i>(multiple people)</i> • When DEEL reports back to the Board, would like to know how the recruitment and outreach efforts are going to get providers—especially family home providers—to participate

AGENDA ITEMS & MEETING NOTES

TOPIC	NOTES
	<p>in these interventions. What’s working and what’s not working? <i>(multiple people)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like the focus on birth to 3 and the use of evidence-based programs. Want to see a stronger emphasis on the family home providers since they tend to be the ones that need the most support. Center-based sites have more resources. Very interested in the results from the pilot in family home child care and would like to see this evaluated. Comment from DEEL: Based on the questions about ROI and cost per child, it’s important to recognize that interventions in family home settings are more resource intensive and reach fewer children. Additionally, the birth-to-three population is the most expensive population to serve. A focus on 0-3 will cost more and means we can serve fewer numbers. We won’t be able to serve the same numbers we serve in K-12/preschool. • Concerns about dollars going into infrastructure and less amount going out to the field or into programs. Recommend DEEL explore if K-12 money or other funding can support infrastructure costs to free up more SBT money for the birth-to-three interventions. Would like to see fewer administrative costs in 2019. • Reaching only 1,000 children seems like a low number. Will that be the ongoing target in 2019? • The largest group of children served by these programs is Black/African American, but there’s also a large segment of children of color with no further detail available (Feb. 12 memo, page 2). Can you explain the difference? Response from DEEL: the data isn’t measured the same across programs and data collected doesn’t always allow us to disaggregate. <p>Decision point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B. Igoe asked if any Board member was NOT ready to vote on the proposal. No comments from the Board. • Board used Fist to Five to test for agreement on supporting DEEL’s proposal and recommending the proviso is lifted. There was strong agreement within the Board and no blocks. • Final decision: Board supports DEEL’s proposal and recommends lifting the proviso.
<p>Presentation from the Human Services Department on healthy food access programs under proviso</p>	<p>Board reviewed the goals of this session:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share information about the Human Services Department’s Sweetened Beverage Tax proviso budget • Ask questions • Provide comments, suggestions, recommendations

AGENDA ITEMS & MEETING NOTES

TOPIC	NOTES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• If the Board is ready, decide on whether to support HSD's proposal and recommend lifting the proviso <p>Natalie Thomson, Planning and Development Specialist, and Tara James, Strategic Advisor, from the Human Services Department presented on the healthy food access investments in HSD's Sweetened Beverage Tax proviso budget. The proposed investment priorities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Farm to Table• Fresh Bucks to Go• Food Bank & Meals Program• Out-of-School Time Nutrition <p>See HSD's presentation materials for full details (available on CAB webpage)</p> <p>Board reviewed the process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Take a moment to collect thoughts individually• Go-around #1: Questions• Go-around #2: Comments, suggestions, recommendations• Take stock of comments – are there any tensions points? Comments that need clarification?• Check-in: Is anyone NOT ready to make a decision• Use Fist to Five to test for agreement on whether the Board supports HSD's proposal and recommends lifting the proviso• Final check: Are there any blocking concerns? It takes 2 to block the proposal. <p>Q&A: See HSD's 2/23/2018 memo for details (available on CAB webpage)</p> <p>There was not enough time to do the second go-around focused on providing comments, suggestions, and recommendations on the HSD proposal. This will be moved to the March 1 meeting.</p> <p>Decision point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• B. Igoe asked if any Board member was NOT ready to vote on the proposal. She then asked if anyone needs responses to these questions before deciding on whether or not to support HSD's proposal and recommend the proviso is lifted.• Only one Board member was opposed.• B. Igoe asked again to confirmed that everyone else would feel comfortable making a decision at this time.

AGENDA ITEMS & MEETING NOTES

TOPIC	NOTES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leika Suzumura recused herself and left the room. • Board used Fist to Five to test for agreement on supporting HSD’s proposal and recommending the proviso is lifted. There was one block but otherwise agreement within the Board. • Blocking concern: I feel like I need more time and want responses to these questions before moving forward. I’m feeling caught between the need to make decisions quickly and the desire to deliberate. I would like to discuss if it is better to invest more funds in a few areas rather than spreading investments thinly across many areas. • Perspective from Board member who voted high agreement with proposal: I think we have enough information to move forward, and I feel comfortable knowing that we will get more information on these programs in the future. • Board used Fist to Five a second time to test for agreement on supporting HSD’s proposal and recommending the proviso is lifted. There was one block but agreement within the group increased (one Board member shifted from 3 to 4 in their vote). • Final decision: Board supports HSD’s proposal and recommends lifting the proviso.
<p>Board Business:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve minutes from Jan. 19 meeting • Elect co-chairs • Board updates 	<p>Board approved the draft minutes from the Jan. 19 meeting.</p> <p>Board elected co-chairs from a slate of 3 candidates who were previously nominated and expressed an interest to serve in this role. The candidates were: Christina Wong, Jim Krieger, Leika Suzumura.</p> <p>Results from the vote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-Chair – Christina Wong • Co-Chair – Jim Krieger • At-large-Member – Leika Suzumura <p>These three Board members now constitute the Executive Committee.</p> <p>There was no time to review the Board updates in the written summary provided by B. Igoe on Feb. 12.</p> <p>Meeting adjourned at 1:02 pm.</p>