

## Sweetened Beverage Tax Community Advisory Board (CAB) Meeting Notes -

<b>MEETING SUMMARY</b>	<b>Date:</b> Thursday – June 13, 2019
	<b>Time:</b> 9-11am (ended at 11:25am)
	<b>Location:</b> El Centro de la Raza (2524 16 <sup>th</sup> Avenue South, Seattle, WA 98144)
<b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b>	Christina Wong, Dila Perera, Jen Hey, Jim Krieger, Leika Suzumura, Paul Sherman, Yolanda Matthews,
<b>MEMBERS ABSENT:</b>	Laura Flores Cantrell, Lisa Chen <i>Seat 4 – Vacant since May 2019 (Community Representative)</i> <i>Seat 10 – Vacant since Dec 2018 (Early Learning Representative)</i>
<b>CITY GUESTS:</b>	Office of Sustainability & Environment: Bridget Igoe & Suzy Knutson City Budget Office: Aaron Blumenthal DEEL: Cameron Clark Facilitator: Maketa Wilborn

<b>DECISIONS MADE</b>	1. The CAB unanimously accepted the proposed second quarter supplemental budget changes, as presented by A. Blumenthal, City Budget Office.	
	2. The CAB unanimously agreed to recommend the following one-time allocations:	
	<i>In order of priority:</i>	
	Scratch cooking in Seattle Public Schools	\$75,000
	Water filling stations (at schools, community centers)	\$275,000
	Evaluation infrastructure and capacity building	\$300,000
	Public Awareness/Countermarketing*	\$250,000
	Food and meals micro-grant program to purchase equipment and supplies	\$500,000
	Support for the CAB	\$250,000
	Scratch cooking in Seattle Public Schools	\$75,000
3. The CAB unanimously approved the following, with amendments noted in the meeting notes:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The budget description and rationale for the ongoing food access funding</li> <li>• The budget description and rationale for the ongoing evaluation support</li> <li>• The budget description and rationale for the ongoing birth-to-three and kindergarten readiness funding</li> <li>• The cover letter from the co-chairs</li> </ul>		
<b>ISSUES IDENTIFIED</b>	<b>DISCLOSURE of Appearance of Conflict or Impaired Judgement (SMB 4.16.070.6.b):</b> C. Wong disclosed herself as an employee of Northwest Harvest and recused herself from CAB decision making and deliberation on the City’s proposed Food Bank Facilities Improvement appropriation in the second quarter supplemental budget.	

FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS			
#	ITEM	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	TARGET DATE
1	Finalize budget recommendations document, integrating and final decisions and approved amendments	Executive Committee (C. Wong, J. Krieger, L. Suzumura) with support from CAB staff (B. Igoe)	ASAP

## Meeting Notes

### Welcome & Introductions

Community Advisory Board (CAB) members, City staff, and public guests introduced themselves.

Maketa Wilborn, meeting facilitator, reviewed the agenda, noting key decisions points for the CAB. The goal of the meeting was to finalize and approve the CAB's 2020 Budget Recommendations.

A draft memo of the budget recommendations was distributed; it was prepared by the Executive Committee and B. Igoe and based on decisions approved at the [May CAB meeting](#). Sections of the memo requiring further discussion, clarification, and CAB approval were highlighted, including:

- Cover letter – *Does the draft touch on all the key points? What's missing?*
- CAB support – *In 2019, the CAB was allocated \$140K for community engagement, SBT communications, and meeting support. Does the CAB want to recommend 2020 revenue be allocated for these purposes?*
- RFP Recommendations – *Does the CAB reaffirm its [August 2018 RFP recommendations](#) and, if so, does it agree to reference them in its 2020 Budget Recommendations?*
- Description of community-led food access programming – *Does the draft description and rationale adequately reflect the CAB's views and voice? What edits are needed?*
- Description of community-led birth-to-three programming – *Does the draft description and rationale adequately reflect the CAB's views and voice? What edits are needed?*
- Description of evaluation support in the one-time and ongoing allocation sections – *Do the draft descriptions and rationales adequately reflect the CAB's views and voice? What edits are needed?*
- Recommendations for one-time funds – *How does the CAB want to handle the budget recommendations for this section, given that more information is needed to scope out the work and budget for the identified activities?*

### Public Comment

None.

### Budget Update

*Presented by Aaron Blumenthal, City Budget Office*

A. Blumenthal provided an update on the 2020 SBT revenue projections (see handouts on page 4 for details), which would be impacted by a proposed change to the 2019 financial plan, if adopted by Council. The proposed changes were introduced to Council during the second quarter supplemental budget process and include the following:

**Fresh Bucks Eligibility Pilots - \$489,000**

This item increases appropriation in the Office of Sustainability & Environment Budget Summary Level (BSL) by \$489,000 to support piloted strategies for expanding Fresh Bucks program eligibility, using Sweetened Beverage Tax General Fund revenue. These pilot strategies were designed to test expansion opportunities for Fresh Bucks and were identified as a success. The pilot strategies have been paused to evaluate appropriate service levels for Fresh Bucks. Funding is available as one-time resource from unspent 2018 Sweetened Beverage Tax.

**Fresh Bucks Increased Utilization - \$680,000**

This item increases appropriation authority by \$680,000 in the Office of Sustainability & Environment BSL to support increased demand for the Fresh Bucks program and is supported by Sweetened Beverage Tax General Fund revenues. This funding is required to maintain current service levels within the Fresh Bucks program resulting from increased demand realized in 2019.

**Food Bank Facility Improvements - \$1,200,000**

This item increases appropriation authority by \$1,200,000 in the Supporting Affordability and Livability BSL in the Human Services Department. Funds will support critical facility improvements at food banks and food & nutrition services. Funds will be contracted to community-based agencies. This item uses one-time Sweetened Beverage Tax revenue underspend remaining from 2018.

Only the Food Bank improvements would modify the financial projections shared at the CAB (reducing the financial reserve one-time balance in 2019, increasing the HSD/Food Access lines by 1.2M in expenditures, and that flows through to the 2020 Starting balance for both tables). The other two items were already accounted for in the previous projections.

CAB questions and discussion:

- Q: Are there specific food bank organizations that have been identified to receive the \$1.2 million in facility improvements?
  - Response: While not confirmed as recipients, a food bank in Ballard and Northwest Harvest have both identified needs. It's possible the RFP will open the opportunity for other food banks to apply.
- **\*\*\*Christina Wong, CAB co-chair and a Food Access Representative, announced herself as an employee of Northwest Harvest and recused herself from discussion and decision making on the Food Bank Facility Improvements.**
- There was brief discussion focused on the budget handouts and some confusion about how the proposed 2Q supplemental budget appropriations impacted the bottom lines.

**\*\*\*J. Krieger summarized the decision point for the CAB: Does the CAB accept these proposed 2Q supplemental budget changes, which reduce the amount unallocated revenue available by \$1.2 million. Using five to five to test agreement, the CAB unanimously accepted the proposal. C. Wong recused herself and did not participate in the decision making.**

Handout provided by A. Blumenthal:

<b>ALL 2019 and 2020 Data Reflects PROJECTIONS and best known budget as of 6/12/2019</b>				
<b>Sweetened Beverage Tax Financial Plan - Department</b>	<b>2018 Actual Expenditures</b>	<b>2019 Adopted Budget</b>	<b>2019 Revised Budget</b>	<b>2020 Endorsed Budget</b>
Starting Balance <sup>1</sup>	\$ (484,710)	\$ 11,035,872	\$ 11,035,872	\$ 4,383,799
<b>Revenue<sup>2</sup></b>	\$ 22,254,493	\$ 21,386,205	\$ 23,970,000	\$ 24,329,000
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Department of Education and Early Learning	\$ 3,833,306	9,984,798	\$ 14,037,880	\$ 9,885,538
Department of Parks and Recreation	\$ -	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000
Finance and Administrative Department	\$ 779,259	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Human Services Department	\$ 3,477,021	\$ 5,910,650	\$ 8,129,436	\$ 5,641,150
Office of City Auditor	\$ 360,000	749,764	\$ 1,519,528	\$ 749,764
Office of Sustainability and Environment	\$ 2,284,324	\$ 3,697,186	\$ 5,785,229	\$ 4,557,186
Other <sup>3</sup>	\$ -	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 500,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 10,733,911</b>	<b>\$ 20,992,398</b>	<b>\$ 30,622,073</b>	<b>\$ 21,483,638</b>
<b>Ending Unreserved Balance</b>	<b>\$ 11,035,872</b>	<b>\$ 11,429,679</b>	<b>\$ 4,383,799</b>	<b>\$ 7,229,162</b>
<b>Revenue Reserve and Availability</b>			<b>\$ 4,383,799</b>	<b>\$ 7,229,162</b>
Financial Reserve			\$ 1,197,000	\$ 2,432,900
Administrative/One-Time per Ordinance			\$ 638,872	\$ 1,950,899
Available for Ongoing			\$ 1,347,927	\$ 2,845,362
<sup>1</sup> Tax implementation spending was recorded against SBT before revenue was collected in 2018.				
<sup>2</sup> Revenue reflects actual receipts for 2018, and projected receipts for 2019, 2020				
<sup>3</sup> Reserve budgeted for worker retraining program				
				Side 1

<b>ALL 2019 and 2020 Data Reflects PROJECTIONS and best known budget as of 6/12/2019</b>				
<b>Sweetened Beverage Tax Financial Plan - Priority</b>	<b>2018 Actual Expenditures</b>	<b>2019 Adopted Budget</b>	<b>2019 Revised Budget</b>	<b>2020 Endorsed Budget</b>
Starting Balance <sup>1</sup>	\$ (484,710)	\$ 11,035,872	\$ 11,035,872	\$ 4,383,799
<b>Revenue<sup>2</sup></b>	\$ 22,254,493	\$ 21,386,205	\$ 23,970,000	\$ 24,329,000
<b>Expenditures<sup>3</sup></b>				
Implementation Costs	\$ 779,259	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Education and Early Learning	\$ 3,833,306	\$ 7,817,216	\$ 10,488,413	\$ 8,435,005
Seattle Promise Endowment	\$ -	\$ 2,167,582	\$ 3,549,467	\$ 1,450,533
Food Access Programming	\$ 5,761,345	\$ 9,357,836	\$ 13,414,665	\$ 9,948,336
<b>Other Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 360,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,149,764</b>	<b>\$ 3,169,528</b>	<b>\$ 1,649,764</b>
<i>Evaluation</i>	\$ 360,000	\$ 749,764	\$ 1,519,528	\$ 749,764
<i>Media</i>	\$ -	\$ 250,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 250,000
<i>Worker Retraining</i>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 500,000
<i>Parks programs</i>	\$ -	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 10,733,911</b>	<b>\$ 20,492,398</b>	<b>\$ 30,622,073</b>	<b>\$ 21,483,638</b>
<b>Ending Unreserved Balance</b>	<b>\$ 11,035,872</b>	<b>\$ 11,929,679</b>	<b>\$ 4,383,799</b>	<b>\$ 7,229,162</b>
<b>Revenue Reserve and Availability</b>			<b>\$ 4,383,799</b>	<b>\$ 7,229,162</b>
Financial Reserve			\$ 1,197,000	\$ 2,432,900
Administrative/One-Time per Ordinance			\$ 638,872	\$ 1,950,899
Available for Ongoing			\$ 1,347,927	\$ 2,845,362
<sup>1</sup> Tax implementation spending was recorded against SBT before revenue was collected in 2018.				
<sup>2</sup> Revenue reflects actual receipts for 2018, and projected receipts for 2019, 2020				
				Side 2

## Finalize 2020 Budget Recommendation

Facilitated by Maketa Wilborn

The CAB reviewed a draft of its 2020 budget recommendations, developed based on discussion and decisions made at the [May meeting](#). Several sections of the draft were highlighted as needing additional discussion and/or CAB approval, including:

1. Allocations for projects and topics recommended for one-time funding
2. The budget description and rationale for the ongoing food access funding
3. The budget description and rationale for the ongoing evaluation support
4. The budget description and rationale for the ongoing birth-to-three and kindergarten readiness funding
5. The cover letter from the co-chairs

CAB discussion and decision points on these items are summarized below.

### 1. One-time funding allocations

- *Water bottle filling stations*: The CAB reviewed information gathered on the cost and need/demand for water filling stations at Seattle Public Schools and community centers (see Appendix A). Recognizing that more information is needed, the CAB used the following assumptions to estimate \$275,000 total for this line item:
  - For schools: 5 modern water filling stations at \$1250/station at 12 priority schools = \$75,000
  - For community centers: 40 water filling stations at \$5000/station in community centers located in communities where people of color and low-income people live = \$200,000
- *Cold storage and other infrastructure needs at meal sites*: The CAB reviewed information gathered on cold storage and other infrastructure needs at meal sites (see Appendix B). The topline takeaway was that a microgrant program for one-time equipment/supplies purchases and that is flexible to meet the diverse and unique needs of individual meal programs might be a reasonable approach. \$500,000 was proposed as a starting place for decision making.
- *Scratch cooking at Seattle Public Schools*: The CAB reviewed a memo from the Nutrition Director at Seattle Public Schools regarding scratch cooking. The first step would be to hire a commercial kitchen management consultant to identify the full range of operational and redesign needs. There was general support for investing in this work.
- *Sugary drinks public awareness/countermarketing campaign*: Based on previous information compiled by J. Krieger and summarized in the CAB's [April 2019 recommendations for sugary drinks public awareness/countermarketing campaign](#), approximately \$600,000-\$850,000 is needed to develop and launch a campaign that aligns with the CAB's vision. Meanwhile, \$500,000 is in reserve for this work (\$250,000 allocated in 2018 and \$250,000 allocated in 2019). As a starting place for discussion, \$250,000 was proposed to be added to this work. Several CAB members noted a desire to see at least half of the overall investment dedicated to supporting contracts with community-based organizations.
- *Evaluation infrastructure and capacity building*: \$300,000 was proposed as a starting place for decision making, based on previous experience with evaluation consultants and data management system set-up.

**\*\*\*Using fist to five to test for agreement, the CAB unanimously agreed to recommend the following one-time allocations:**

<i>In order of priority:</i>	
Scratch cooking in Seattle Public Schools	\$75,000
Water filling stations (at schools, community centers)	\$275,000
Evaluation infrastructure and capacity building	\$300,000
Public Awareness/Countermarketing*	\$250,000
Food and meals micro-grant program to purchase equipment and supplies	\$500,000
Support for the CAB	\$250,000
Scratch cooking in Seattle Public Schools	\$75,000

2. Budget descriptions and rational for the ongoing food access funding

**\*\*\*Using fist to five to test for agreement, the CAB approved this section of the budget recommendations.** It also agreed to reference and affirm the CAB’s [August 2018 RFP recommendations](#) which specify that organizations led by people of color and serving communities of color and/or low-income communities should be prioritized.

3. Budget description and rational for the ongoing evaluation support

**\*\*\*Using fist to five to test for agreement, the CAB approved this section of the budget recommendations, with the following amendments:**

- Provide a range for evaluation funds, i.e. 5-10% of the award, and make it clear these funds should be *additive* to the baseline award so they do not otherwise supplant vital funds needed to support an organization’s operations and provision of direct services.
- State an expectation that the City departments dedicate 5-10% of their existing allocations to conduct evaluations of their programs and services and make the results of these evaluations publicly available.

4. Budget description and rational for the ongoing birth-to-three and kindergarten readiness funding

CAB comments:

- The CAB always ends its meeting with early learning topics, when time is running short. Would like to early learning topics shifted so they appear earlier on the agenda.

**\*\*\*Using fist to five to test for agreement, the CAB approved this section of the budget recommendations, with the following amendments:**

- To strengthen the justification for birth-to-three investments made available to community-based organizations, make that point that DEEL is offering zero funding opportunities/RFPs related to its birth-to-three investment portfolio.
- Lead with a strong opening statement like, *In 2020, the CAB recommends \$1,375,000 be made available to community-based organizations via an RFP focused on the birth-to-three priorities [as listed].*

5. Cover letter

**\*\*\*Using fist to five to test for agreement, the CAB approved the cover letter with the following amendments/comments:**

- Make it clear that public awareness campaign is countermarketing sugary drinks (not the tax)
- In the bullet: *More investment in community-led activities, such as through grants to community-based organizations and an RFP process that invites community-identified approaches to increase access to healthy food and support the birth-to-three population*, flip the order of birth-to-three and healthy food.

**Wrap-up**

B. Igoe will support Executive Committee in revising the draft to reflect decisions and amendment discussed at this meeting. The goal is to transmit the final budget recommendations ASAP.

-END-

## Appendix A: Water Bottle Filling Stations

### Water Bottle Filling Stations at SPS

*Information provided is based on high-level research and data received from select Seattle Public School District staff. It is possible that timely or other relevant information was not shared through these requests.*

- OSE is not aware of a comprehensive evaluation of water quality in Seattle Public Schools (SPS) to assess temperature, color, clarity, smell, and appearance. The closest thing was an analysis done by the University of Washington Center for Public Health Nutrition where researchers assessed water quality at 19 public schools in 9 school districts, including SPS. The assessment found only 4% of water fountains met the high-quality criteria. More information is needed to evaluate water quality problems in terms of flow, color, temperature, and appearance throughout the district, as well as student and faculty demand for additional bottle fillers. This could be done through a simple survey; however, further conversations with the District are needed determine the exact scope and cost.
- Installing water bottle fillers could provide an opportunity to increase water quality and improve students' perception of school water. Recently, SPS installed goosenecks at every school and installed modern water bottle filling stations at a few. (See below for images of both bottle fillers.) Evidently, some schools have asked for additional bottle fillers since one or two won't serve an entire school. More information is needed to evaluate which schools want/need additional goosenecks and which want/need modern bottle filling stations.
- Including equipment and installation, it costs roughly \$400 to install a gooseneck and \$1,250 to install a modern bottle filling station. At this point, the District has no plans to install additional bottle fillers.

Drinking Fountain w/ Gooseneck



Modern Bottle Filling Station





## Water Bottle Filling Stations at Community Centers

*The following information was originally provided to the CAB on June 2018, to inform its 2018-2019 budget recommendations. It has not been updated since.*

As of June 2018, Seattle Parks and Recreation was installing a water filling station at Ballard Community Center, but otherwise the community centers don't have stations. Sites that don't already have ADA-compliant drinking fountains would require new fountains first before doing the electrical upgrade for chilled water. We estimate that 10 centers would need an initial full replacement at a cost of \$9,000 per site or \$90,000. Then, to add the filling stations at 25 sites (Ballard already has one), we estimate a cost of \$5,000 per site or \$125,000. Adding in administrative/contingency would bring the total to about \$258,000.

## Appendix B: Refrigeration/Cold Storage and Other Infrastructure Needs at Meal Sites

*The following information was compiled during a meeting with OSE CAB staff and HSD contract managers and planners who work on a variety of food access and meal programs*

### Topline Takeaways

- Equipment needs among the City's *existing* meal program contractors are partially satisfied, thanks to a recent infusion of SBT funds into existing SBT-funded meal program contracts for one-time equipment purchases (details below). However, *new* contractors and grantees (e.g. from HSD's Food Access Opportunity Fund or the 2019 Food and Nutrition RFP) are expected to have unmet equipment needs, and meal and emergency feeding contractors supported by general funds have unmet equipment needs.
- A rebate or microgrant program for one-time equipment purchases and that is flexible to meet the diverse and unique needs of individual meal programs might be a reasonable approach. Do not underestimate the resources needed to administer a rebate program, which requires collecting receipts and cutting checks.
- There are opportunities to support Family Child Care (FCC) providers with supplies and onsite training on topics related to nutritious food and healthy eating environments, including family-style dining and support for breastfeeding moms. In the case of FCC providers, a microgrant program, rather than a rebate program, would be most appropriate since FCC providers would not have the upfront cash to make purchases.
- More information is needed to understand if there are refrigeration/cold storage and other equipment needs in summer meals and CACFP sites.

### Community-based Meal Programs

#### Key Takeaways

- The need for equipment among *existing* SBT-funded meal contractors appears to be satisfied, thanks to a recent infusion of SBT funds into the existing contracts for one-time equipment purchases (see Additional Notes below). However, there could be future equipment needs with *new* contractors who are awarded the Food Access Opportunity Fund or 2019 Food and Nutrition RFP (award announcements pending). Among existing meal and emergency contractors supported by general funds (not SBT), there is documented need for equipment, including commercial grade ovens, tilting skillets, and dishwashers. Additionally, agencies are often being displaced and forced to move locations. When this happens, new equipment is often a need.
- At a recent meeting attended by 10-12 food banks representatives, HSD asked if there were unmet capital needs in food banks (purchases over \$5,000). HSD staff reported that not a single food bank representative responded yes. (According to staff, a potential factor influencing this response is that any capital investment/asset over \$5,000 is technically owned by the City until the assets depreciates. Capital investments also require more paperwork.)

#### Additional Notes

- SBT funds were used for one-time equipment purchases for existing meal program contractors. In a recent contractor survey conducted by HSD, six out of seven meal program contractors responded they needed additional equipment in order to run the programs at full capacity or more effectively. Equipment needs identified and purchased included overhead rack for equipment storage; kitchen and meal equipment (dishware, flatware, commercial grade cookware); small countertop appliances (coffee makers, blenders, juicers); large freezer chest; commercial ranges (x2); commercial refrigerators (x3); commercial grade icemaker; dishwasher. Of \$167,000 HSD set-aside for these one-time purchases, \$74,000 was spent, suggesting there is no unmet need for equipment purchases, including cold storage.

## Child Nutrition

### Key Takeaways

- There are some opportunities to support Family Child Care providers with equipment and supplies, such as kitchen equipment and meal service/dining equipment to support family-style dining, a best practice in feeding young children but a practice where there is also a lot of resistance. Other supplies needed would support breastfeeding moms in FCC settings, such as nursing chairs, pumping stations, and privacy partitions.
- A microgrant program, rather than rebate program would be more appropriate for FCC providers, who would otherwise not have the upfront cash to make purchases.
- One-time funds could support additional onsite training and coaching for FCC providers on optimal nutrition practices and healthy eating environments for young children.

### Additional Notes

- There is an interest and need to provide more hands-on cooking classes for FCC providers on preparing nutritious and kid friendly meals and snacks.
- Cash subsidies to FCC providers to increase their offerings of nutritious food is another opportunity.
- Expanding the Good Food Bag program to FCC settings is another opportunity.

## Senior Congregate Meals (50 sites throughout King County, 27 sites in Seattle)

### Key Takeaways

- Refrigeration/cold storage does not appear to be a need at this time.
- A bigger need is for participant transportation to get people to the meal sites. About 11 sites have transportation support through a partnership with Sound Generations, but more sites would benefit from this type of resource support.

### Additional Notes

- Congregate meal sites received funding last year from HSD to address equipment and other identified needs – most sites needed kitchen equipment, technology, a few freezers. A few sites wanted funding to do field trips.

- An emerging need is for utensils. All utensils (for serving or individual use) needs to be compostable. Investing in flatware is a possibility, but this introduces new work for staff to clean and sanitize flatware for reuse.
- Senior Congregate Meals has about \$10,000 to incorporate Farm to Table programming into the 12 Seattle sites. Would love to be able to expand this to all 50 sites or at least to the 15 remaining Seattle sites.
- There is also an interest to expand the distribution of Good Food Bags.

## Home Delivered Meals/Meals on Wheels

### Key Takeaways

- Space is an issue for Lifelong, one of the contractors. However, even once space is added, this could raise additional infrastructure and capacity needs related to scale up services, including staffing.

## Out of School Time (OST) Nutrition

### Key Takeaways

- More information is needed to know if there are widespread refrigeration and cold storage needs in Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) and summer meal sites. However, at least one potential CACFP site said it would need a refrigerator in order to participate.
- While not related to equipment, staff mentioned that **weekend food and meal programming for kids** is a big gap in overall food security programming. One strategy to address this is a weekend mobile / “pop-up” food truck in targeted areas, e.g. a neighborhood like South Park or targeted location like near an affordable housing site.

### Additional Notes

- Concerning summer meals, very few sites rely on shelf-stable meals; most serve fresh.
- OST has a need for more staff capacity in order to expand programs site and monitor them.
- Some summer meal sites are working on ways to increase participation by teens, such as by offering teen programming and perks like wifi hotspots.

## Appendix C: Memo from Seattle Public Schools Re: Scratch Cooking

To: Sweetened Beverage Tax Community Advisory Board  
From: Aaron Smith, Nutrition Services Director, Seattle Public Schools  
Re: Recommendations to increase scratch cooking  
Date: June 10, 2019

---

### Background:

In 2008, Seattle Public Schools moved from school-based meal preparation to central kitchen preparation to reduce costs. The department currently uses 2 modes of production: bulk and pre-pack. Bulk schools receive food prepared in the central kitchen in bulk form, while pre-pack schools receive meals that have been divided into single servings. Regardless of the production mode, entrees are primarily heat and serve foods that are highly processed.

Student satisfaction and meal participation rates remain low with students citing a lack of culturally acceptable options as well as challenges related to freshness, taste, quality, and variety of the food served. Increasing scratch cooking would address many of these concerns since it allows for greater control over ingredients and the opportunity to diversify offerings, reduce sugar and sodium content, incorporate fresh fruits and vegetables, and offer more culturally appropriate meal options.

Increasing scratch cooking at the central kitchen and resuming onsite preparation through speed scratch at school kitchens requires an overhaul of the current production system. This memo includes high-level recommendations to transition to scratch cooking.

### Recommendations:

#### [Commercial Kitchen Management Consultant for Central Kitchen and School Kitchen Renovations](#)

Description: The Central Kitchen supports a dual production system (bulk and pre-pack) and currently does not have the capacity to provide complete scratch cooking. This would require an overhaul of the current production system as well as significant renovations and equipment upgrades at the central kitchen and at school kitchens. The Nutrition Services Department recommends hiring a commercial kitchen management consultant to identify the full range of operational and redesign needs. Consulting services would include, but not be limited to, the following:

- inventory and analysis of kitchen capacity (central kitchen and school kitchens), layout, and equipment (including equipment condition) with recommendations on equipment purchase and/or replacement based on the new model of scratch cooking;

### Definitions

**Scratch Cooking:** preparing foods using basic, whole ingredients rather than buying meals that have already been prepared.

**Speed Scratch Cooking:** combining high-quality prepared food products with those made from scratch, saving time and labor while maintaining flavor, appearance, and consistency.

- inventory of serving line equipment and operations needs at school kitchens with recommended reconfigurations that support scratch cooked meals and healthy food consumption;
- required changes in kitchen staffing and staff training;
- review of current supply chain and production schedules with recommendations to accommodate changes in food orders; and
- analysis of current distribution and packaging systems and recommended modifications to support scratch cooking at the central kitchen and speed scratch cooking at school sites.

Anticipated Costs: \$75,000

Anticipated Deliverable: Consultant redesign report and recommendations that the Nutrition Services can use to develop a final proposal and cost estimate for the Central Kitchen and school kitchen renovations and process changes.

### Conversion of Pre-Pack Schools to Bulk Schools

Description: Pre-pack production presents several challenges. As noted in the 2016 Study of the Nutrition Services Department for Seattle Public Schools by Prismatic Services, pre-pack meals “limit menu variety and do not optimize the flavor, freshness, or eye appeal of the meals”. They also have a negative impact on meal participation rates. In comparison to bulk schools, pre-pack schools have a statistically significant lower level of student lunch participation than bulk schools<sup>1</sup>.

The Nutrition Services Department recommends converting 18 pre-pack schools to bulk schools, a recommendation that was also supported by the Prismatic Services report. Conversions require equipment upgrades (reconfiguration, relocations, and replacements) to accommodate bulk food receipt and meal preparation and well as staff training. Of the 18 schools, 6 would require a modest investment since prior to 2008 they were full cooking kitchens and already have the necessary space and require fewer equipment upgrades. With a modest investment, the following schools would be able to deliver higher quality meals in the near-term. The following chart provides the anticipated budget for each of the 6 schools.

School	Budget	Enrolled	% FRL
<b>Lowell Elementary</b>	\$100,000 - \$153,00 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serving Line: \$50-70,000</li> <li>• Steamers: \$15-18,000</li> <li>• Tilt Skillet: \$15,000</li> <li>• Dish Machine: \$10-30,000 (depending on size of school)</li> <li>• Reach-In Freezer: \$5,000 (# depending on school)</li> <li>• Reach-In Refrigerator: \$5,000 (# depending on school)</li> <li>• Hood Ventilation: ~\$10,000</li> </ul>	364	66%

---

<sup>1</sup> Study of the Nutrition Services Department for Seattle Public Schools. Prismatic Services, Inc. April 2016.

<b>Cedar Park</b>	\$40,000 - \$43,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steamers: \$15-18,000</li> <li>• Tilt Skillet: \$15,000</li> <li>• Reach-In Freezer: \$5,000 (1)</li> <li>• Reach-In Refrigerator: \$5,000 (1)</li> </ul>	91	22%
<b>Fairmont Park</b>	\$25,000 - \$28,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steamers: \$15-18,000</li> <li>• Reach-In Freezer: \$5,000 (1)</li> <li>• Reach-In Refrigerator: \$5,000 (1)</li> </ul>	567	12%
<b>McGilvra Elementary</b>	25,000 - \$28,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steamers: \$15-18,000</li> <li>• Reach-In Freezer: \$5,000 (1)</li> </ul>	247	8.5%
<b>Lawton Elementary</b>	\$15,000 - \$18,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steamers: \$15-18,000</li> <li>• Tilt Skillet: \$15,000</li> <li>• Reach-In Freezer: \$5,000 (1)</li> <li>• Reach-In Refrigerator: \$5,000 (1)</li> </ul>	467	6%

**Other Recommendations to Increase Meal Participation and Reduce Food Insecurity**

Staffing

Description: Moving to scratch cooking will require new recipe development, additional kitchen staff, and staff training. Currently, 47 schools are 1-person kitchen operations. The Nutrition Services Department would like to add the following members to our team - District Chef, Kitchen Supervisors, Kitchen Staff, Community Outreach Specialist and Training Consultants - to provide oversight and ensure meals are high-quality and consistent across schools.

Anticipated Costs: District Chef (Contract); Kitchen Supervisor (~\$77,000); Kitchen Staff (~\$16,000); Community Outreach Specialist (~\$70,000); and Training Consultant (\$75-80,000).

Implement and After School Supper Program

Description: The Nutrition Services Department would like to implement an afterschool supper program that serves nutritious meals and snacks after school, on weekends, and during school holidays. We have twenty-five (25) secondary schools that currently are unable to participate in the afterschool snack program with at least 20 sites where 50% or more students qualify for free and reduced-price meals. Implementation of an afterschool supper program will guarantee a third meal/dinner for our students who are in need and help reduce child hunger in schools.