

Sweetened Beverage Tax Community Advisory Board Meeting Notes

MEETING SUMMARY	Date: Friday, April 6, 2018
	Time: 11:00 AM – 1:00 PM
	Location: City Hall, Floor L2, Room L280 600 Fourth Ave, Seattle 98104
MEMBERS PRESENT:	Ahmed Ali, Christina Wong, Jim Krieger, Laura Cantrell Flores, Lisa Chen (arrived at 11:15), Mackenzie Chase
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Jessica Marcinkevage, Leika Suzumura, Yolanda Matthews, Seat 8 – Vacant (Public Health Representative), Seat 11 – Vacant (Early Learning/Education Representative)
GUESTS:	Human Services Department: Tara James (arrived at 12:15) Office of Sustainability & Environment: Bridget Igoe, Shaunice Wilson Public Health – Seattle & King County: Elizabeth Kimball

DECISIONS MADE	1. Board approved bylaws by consensus
	2. Regarding the budget parameters and criteria that are under development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will focus on the 2018 process (i.e. \$2.8 million in reserve) • Will not include parameter “D” (<i>Evidence-based versus innovative</i>) • Will reconsider parameter “D” for the 2019 budget process • Recognize there is more work that needs to be done to define “evidence-based”, or to determine if that’s the right term • Will consider “evidence-based” in criteria
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	For threshold criteria, need to further define Equity; Within scope of ordinance; Feasibility

FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS			
#	ITEM	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	TARGET DATE
1	Draft community engagement survey and send to CAB to review	L. Suzumura and C. Wong	4/16/2018
2	Re-tool parameters and criteria to focus on 2018 budget process	J. Krieger, L. Suzumura, C. Wong, L. Flores, L. Chen	4/18/2018

Meeting Notes

J. Krieger, Co-Chair, facilitated the meeting

Welcome and Introductions

- Board members introduced themselves by sharing their names and organizations. City staff introduced themselves by sharing their names and departments.
- Board reviewed agenda and major goals of the meeting—to work on tools that can be used to develop budget recommendation

Public Comment

None

Quick Business

Meeting Notes

- Board approved the March 15 meeting notes

Board member updates

- NW Harvest is hosting their annual conference on April 13, focused on food access and food banking. There will also be an equity and inclusion workshop. C. Wong will send out the registration information.
- The statewide ballot initiative, led by industry-funded “Yes! To Affordable Groceries”, will most likely be on the ballot and could bring negative media attention to Seattle. If passed, Seattle wouldn’t be able to make any amendments to its SBT (no tax increases, no adding beverages such as diet soda). Childhood Obesity Prevention Coalition is trying to pull funds for polling. Additionally, American Heart Association is pursuing a lawsuit to challenge the ballot title, which focuses on food and groceries and is misleading. Organizations that are interested in these efforts should contact Vic Colman and Lindsay Hovind ASAP.
- Pepsi Co is hiring new Government Relations people in the area.
- Coca-Cola bringing a lot of funding to the Latino community
- *Keep Seattle Livable* representatives have approached Somali-owned neighborhood grocers to garner opposition to the tax

Community Engagement Workgroup

- In need of more members
- Decided on an abbreviated community engagement effort for this year, given the short timeline
- Will conduct an online survey of community groups and coalitions, asking respondents for feedback on priorities and strategies identify by Board, and for input on how best to directly engage with their members in the future
- Workgroup will send the Board the draft survey and list of potential survey respondents
- M. Chase: Be sure to include education and early learning groups in the list of contacts
- A. Ali: can share contact for the coalition of health boards
- J. Krieger: volunteered to review the questions; recommends 1:1 interviews or focus groups for non-English speaking groups
- B. Igoe will see about getting City support for translation

Bylaws

- Board approved the bylaws by consensus
- B. Igoe will post document on the Board webpage

2018 Unallocated funds

Process Overview

- J. Krieger provided context, referring to handouts:
 - Work groups have been developing tools that can help Board with its budget recommendations
 - Budget parameters and principles can help Board develop a budget framework
 - Criteria can be used to systematically select issues, activities, and (eventually) proposals

Budget Parameters – which parameters would people recommendation adding, dropping, or modifying?

- Lots of discussion on Parameter “D”:

D. Evidence-based and Innovative	What should be the balance of spending on approaches backed by strong evidence of effectiveness versus innovative ideas?
----------------------------------	--

- Several recommended removing Parameter D
 - Often, evidence-based data doesn’t show the whole picture for communities
 - We should prioritize community-led solutions; if it happens to be evidence-based, that’s a bonus
 - Evidence-based solutions usually imply solutions backed by rigorous, scientific evidence of effectiveness – this definition unfairly benefits large organizations since smaller, community-based organizations usually cannot meet this standard
 - Requiring evidence-based strategies is inherently racist
 - Since a large chunk of the funding is already going to evidence-based programming, this \$2.8 million should be entirely reserved for community-led solutions
- Comments in favor of keeping Parameter D
 - Evidence-based and community-led are not mutually exclusive
 - If the goal is to have an impact, have to know if activities are going to be effective
 - We should invest in a balanced way between evidence-based and innovative
 - City decision-makers may favor recommendations backed by evidence
 - Another person asked: Is this true that Council would strongly prefer evidence-based solutions over community-led solutions?
 - Not comfortable with dropping D entirely, suggest redefining evidence-based in an equitable way, e.g. *promising practices as defined by the affected*
- Other points
 - There should be a balance between data and methods used for large organizations and small organizations
 - Equity should be embedded throughout all the parameters, including D (if we even keep this parameter). There are two ways of looking at equity – internally and externally. E.g. external equity assesses whether the strategy addresses disparities in the community. Internal equity assesses whether the strategy is led by communities impacted by disparities.
 - There needs to be a parameter that explicitly addresses community-led
 - Evidence-based and community-led are not mutually exclusive
 - Recommendation to include “equitable distribution” as a parameter

- Comment that some of the equitable distribution language is included in Parameter G
 - When considering parameter G, this should address not only who is being served, but who is leading the work (again, internal and external equity).
 - RFP processes are inequitable. Small groups do not have the capacity to access these grants.
- The conversation turned towards understanding how parameters and criteria interact, and which budget recommendations these parameters and criteria would be for
 - Parameters set targets for allocating funds, they help to establish a framework for the budget (e.g. what percentage of money will focus on food access versus early learning)
 - Criteria are standards that can be used to actually rank and select food access and early learning strategies and activities
 - → For next meeting, clarify how parameters and criteria interact
- Agreement points on parameters:
 - Will focus on the 2018 process (i.e. \$2.8 million in reserve)
 - Will not include parameter “D” (*Evidence-based versus innovative*)
 - Will reconsider parameter “D” for the 2019 budget process
 - Recognize there is more work that needs to be done to define “evidence-based”, or to determine if that’s the right term
 - Will consider “evidence-based” in criteria

Criteria

- J. Krieger provided context about the criteria handout and the previous work completed to draft definitions of criteria
- These 3 threshold criteria were proposed:
 - **Equity**
 - **Within scope of ordinance**
 - **Feasibility**
- Comments on these 3 threshold criteria:
 - Need to further define **Equity** and **Feasibility**
 - Need to determine if physical activity would pass the **Within the scope of ordinance** threshold criteria. Increasing access to opportunities for physical activity is a priority for some CAB members.
 - Want clarification on whether an activity is allowable vs. specifically called out in the ordinance
 - Suggestion: threshold criteria could be broad whereas ranking criteria could be more narrow. Therefore, could define **Within Scope of Ordinance** threshold criteria as “The issue or activity **broadly** aligns with the intent of the SBT or ordinance”.

Meeting adjourned

- There was not enough time to finish reviewing the criteria
- There was not enough time to review outcomes and strategies and test one criterion