

Sweetened Beverage Tax Community Advisory Board (CAB) Meeting Notes

MEETING SUMMARY	<p>Date: June 19, 2020</p> <p>Time: 11:00 AM – 1:00 PM</p> <p>Location: Virtual meeting</p>
MEMBERS PRESENT:	Adrián Lopez-Romero, Barbara Baquero, Christina Wong, Dila Perera, Jen Moss, Laura Flores Cantrell, Paul Sherman, Rebecca Finkle, Tanika Thompson
MEMBERS ABSENT:	<p><i>Seat 1 – Vacant (Food Access Representative, Council appointment)</i></p> <p><i>Seat 4 – Vacant (Community Representative, Mayor appointment)</i></p>
GUESTS:	<p>Office of Sustainability & Environment: Alyssa Patrick, Bridget Igoe</p> <p>City Budget Office: Akshay Iyengar and Miguel Jimenez</p> <p>Human Services Department: Seán Walsh</p>

DECISIONS MADE	<p>The CAB approved by consensus key features of its 2021 budget recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Finalized prioritization lists for food access and early learning programs. 2. Where to draw the “cut line”. 3. How to fund the prenatal-to-three grants program (re-direct \$1.5 million from DON to DEEL in 2021 only). 4. Which 2020 one-time investments it recommends are maintained (water bottle filling stations in schools, CAB support at a nominal amount). <p>(Post meeting update – the CAB’s final 2021 budget recommendations are available on the CAB webpage)</p>
-----------------------	--

Meeting Notes

The meeting was facilitated by CAB Co-Chairs T. Thompson and J. Moss, with staff facilitation from B. Igoe.

Welcome and Introductions (11-11:10)

CAB members introduced themselves. City staff and guests from the public introduced themselves.

- Acknowledge Juneteenth and movement in response to George Floyd’s death and other police violence.
- CAB members and city staff introduced themselves.

SBT Budget Update (11:10-11:20)

A. Iyengar

Regarding the 2020 rebalance budget:

- City Budget Office (CBO) planned to propose 2020 budget reductions to Council last week, but considering protests around SPD budget, there is an effort to rethink 2020 budget. Mayor is looking to identify \$100M for community support as a down payment on some initial changes

and is looking at SPD budget to see changes made within that. That will be a longer-term process.

- Not anticipating changes to the 2020 SBT spending plan beyond the programs/services that are currently on hold or already cut, which CAB has been briefed on. While CBO cannot announce the proposed reductions officially, there should be nothing that surprises the CAB.
- CBO will brief the CAB co-chairs before the final proposed 2020 rebalancing package for SBT is submitted to council.

Regarding 2021 budget:

- There are no official updates to the 2021-2022 budget forecasts.
- SBT-funded departments are in the process of submitting their 2021 budget proposals to CBO. When CAB submits its 2021 budget recommendations, CBO will consider these alongside the department recommendations.

2021 Budget Recommendations (11:20 – 1:00) – started at 11:20

B. Igoe facilitated the remainder of the meeting to allow the co-chairs to actively participate in the conversation.

The CAB reviewed discussion from its 6/5 meeting and key decision points for the current meeting:

Decision Point	Status	Next Step(s)
1. Review and discuss key features of the criteria for cuts , if needed in 2021	Completed (Approved 6/5)	Use criteria themes and notes to draft content for recommendations memo
2. Confirm how program prioritization will be used to shape budget recommendations	In progress	Finish ranking programs Discuss where to “draw the line” for which programs are maintained and which programs are considered for cuts, if needed
3. Rank programs in order of priority	In progress (Early learning list approved 6/5)	Review and approve list of food access programs
4. Discuss budget adjustments , based on prioritization	Not yet started	Review program lists and discuss recommendations for maintaining vs. reducing funding (if needed) Discuss approach for early learning grants program

Decision Point	Status	Next Step(s)
5. Discuss recommendations for 2020 one-time investments that were cut or are on hold	Not yet started	Review and prioritize program list Discuss recommendations for re-funding, if possible (or expanding existing programs)

Food Access

The CAB reviewed its initial prioritization of the food access programs to test for agreement on current order. The CAB was asked to consider if the order reflects its values, principles, and criteria.

Initial prioritization:

1. Fresh Bucks
2. Meal programs and home delivery for older adults and others
3. Food banks and systems support
4. Food Access Opportunity Fund
5. Healthy food in childcare
6. Healthy Food Fund
7. Healthy food in schools
8. After school and summer meals
9. Recreational programming
10. Counter-marketing/public awareness

Key discussion points

- **Re: Healthy Food Fund (HFF):** CAB agreed to move this to a higher position in the list. Like Food Access Opportunity Fund, HFF would invest in community-led projects and priorities and aligns with CAB values. This was cut in 2020 to support COVID relief and food assistance, but it is important to reinstate in 2021 and beyond. The CAB raised questions around (1) how much planning is underway at Department of Neighborhoods (DON) to develop this new HFF, given that its funding was cut in 2020, and (2) if the City continues to have a hiring freeze in 2021, how will this impact the development of the HFF

CBO staff responded that DON is experienced in managing community-facing grant programs and would use its institutional knowledge to develop the HFF. While one cannot anticipate what 2021 will look like, DON could leverage existing staff to get the planning work started while keeping administrative costs low.

- **Re: Fresh Bucks:** Brief discussion about whether this is priority #1. CAB confirmed that it is top priority since the program reaches people in the food security gap who don't qualify for SNAP, maximizes customer choice (relative to other food assistance formats, like food banks), produces co-benefits (re-invests SBT revenues into local farming economy), and includes complementary education provided by community partners.

- **Re: Healthy food in childcare and schools:** CAB discussed concerns that these activities were ranked relatively low priority, given the importance of these strategies. The CAB reasoned that these programs are largely supported by—and would continue to be supported by—federal dollars, and SBT revenue investments are relatively nominal.
- **Re: evaluation support for community projects:** HSD staff (S. Walsh) reviewed that this investment funds (1) Communities Rise to provide evaluation support for Food Access Opportunity Fund grantees and (2) Public Health and Solid Ground to develop core data metrics to assess food bank investments. The CAB agreed this investment should be ranked low this year (#9) given COVID.
- **Re: culturally relevant outreach:** CAB will include a statement in the recommendations emphasizing the important of culturally, linguistically relevant outreach. CAB also recommends inclusive outreach activities as an eligible activity for the HFF.

****Decision Point****

The CAB approved the rank ordered list of food access program.

Final prioritization, approved by consensus:

1. Fresh Bucks
2. Meal programs and home delivery for older adults and others
3. Food banks and systems support
4. Food Access Opportunity Fund
5. Healthy Food Fund
6. Healthy food in childcare (Farm to Preschool)
7. Healthy food in schools
8. After school and summer meals
9. Program evaluation support
10. Recreational programming
11. Counter-marketing

Early learning and child development

The CAB discussed key features it wants to see in the recommended prenatal-to-three grants program:

- Eligible activities are flexible to respond to emerging and changing needs and provide COVID relief
- Grant money can be used for operational support
- City should leverage existing infrastructure to administer grants, such as at the county or in departments

The CAB discussed three potential recommendations for how to fund a prenatal-to-three grants program:

- A. **Redirect all or a portion of the one-time job retraining funding to DEEL to create the grants program.** There is \$1.5 million set aside for job retraining for workers adversely impacted by the SBT. This funding is earmarked in the SBT ordinance. However, CAB is not aware of job losses due to SBT or any plans for using these funds.
- B. **In 2021 only, redirect some portion of DON’s HFF funding to DEEL to create the grants program.** \$2.5 million is a substantial amount of money to award in a single year given that DON

still must staff up and design the grants program. Additionally, Food Access Opportunity Fund is also supported community-led food access work whereas there is no funding to support community-led work in the prenatal-to-three space.

- C. **Allocate any new or unprogrammed revenue to create the grants program.** There is a lot of uncertainty in the SBT revenue projections. Currently, the 2021 SBT financial plan indicates there could be up to \$377,000 in unprogrammed revenue, or a shortfall of \$365,000. Also, any unallocated revenue up to \$2 million will go to the SBT reserve fund.

****Decision Point****

The CAB approved by consensus recommendation B.

The CAB also decided to include a recommendation for the City to be transparent in its plans for using the worker retraining set aside funds.

The “cut line”

The CAB discussed where to “draw the line” for which programs are maintained and which programs are considered for cuts, if needed.

****Decision Point****

The CAB approved by consensus the following:

- The food access cut line would be drawn between programs #6 and #7
- There would be no early learning cut line

One-time investments

The CAB reviewed the list of 2020 one-time investments that were cut and reallocated for COVID emergency grocery vouchers or are on hold. Since these were adopted as one-time investments, there is no funding allocated for them in 2021.

Program/Activity List

1. CAB administration (**on hold**)
2. Essential child/family supplies (**in progress**)
3. Water bottle filling stations at schools (**on hold**)
4. Water bottle filling stations at community centers (**cut**)
5. Food and meal infrastructure grants (**on hold**)
6. Scratch cooking assessment (**on hold**)
7. Snack pilot (**on hold**)
8. Evaluation infrastructure and capacity building (SBT eval plan) (**cut**)
9. P-Patch infrastructure (**cut**)

Key discussion points:

- **Re: water bottle filling stations in schools.** This investment gets at the heart of what this tax is about – reducing consumption of sugary drinks. Expanding access to healthy options is one way to do that. This is an equity-driven investment. It also dovetails with the counter-marketing campaign.
- **Re: scratch cooking assessment.** Concerned about studying and assessing something that SPS would never have the capacity to execute. This would also be really out of whack due to COVID.

- **Re: CAB administration.** This is largely an admin costs, though it would also support community engagement. CAB would like to see nominal support maintained.

****Decision Point****

The CAB approved by consensus to recommend that water bottle filling stations in schools and CAB support be maintained.

Finalizing the memo

The CAB discussed steps for writing the budget recommendations:

1. Co-chairs will draft memo based on decisions identified at CAB meetings
2. CAB will receive draft memo to review and can suggest edits to improve clarity, style, rationale
3. Co-chairs will incorporate edits into a final draft
4. Staff will finalize and transmit on behalf of CAB

-END-