Sweetened Beverage Tax Community Advisory Board (CAB) Meeting Notes

	Date:	August 18, 2023		
MEETING SUMMARY	Time:	9am – 11am		
SUMMARY	Location:	Virtual		
MEMBERS PRESENT:	Barbara Baquero, Bilan Aden, Christina Wong, Dan Torres, Jaimée Marsh, Jen Moss, Munira Mohamed, Rebecca Finkel, Tanika Thompson Bird			
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Barbara Rockey, Kristin Sukys			
GUESTS:	 Office of Sustainability & Environment: Bridget Igoe, Gurdeep Gill, Chris Iberle Human Services Department: Seán Walsh 			

DECISIONS MADE	The CAB unanimously decided to replace the "Fist to Five" method of testing for
DECISIONS IVIADE	agreement and making decisions with a simplified "Stoplight" tool.

Meeting Materials:

Welcome and Introductions

T. Thompson Bird, CAB Co-Chair, opened the meeting.

CAB members and City staff introduced themselves and responded to a light check-in question.

There was no public comment.

Briefing from the Healthy Food in Schools Initiative

Presentation by Chris Iberle and Gurdeep Gill from City of Seattle Office of Sustainability & Environment (OSE)

Click here for the slide deck.

C. Iberle and Gurdeep Gill presented updates from the Healthy Food in Schools Initiative managed by OSE and funded by SBT. Their presentation included key findings from the Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Program (FFVP) evaluation.

CAB Discussion:

Question: Can you add an SBT acknowledgement in the FFVP promotional materials

Response: Yes, that's the plan! What we showed today were first round design mockups.

Question: Are Seattle Public Preschools included in the FFVP?

Response: No. The program is only offered at elementary and middle schools.

Question: Have you studied plate waste associated with FFVP?

Response: Not specifically, but we know the kitchen staff have some tactics when there is extra food to prevent plate waste. This includes serving the fruits and vegetables the next day or incorporating it into the meal that is being served for lunch. Seattle Public Schools also does a lot of adjustments to their ordering volumes, so they order based on how many students are actually taking the snack.

Question: Does FFVP have any take home models?

Response: Some schools will let students take home the fruit and vegetable snack, but this depends on individual school practices. It is hard to predict the supplies needed for a take home program.

Question: Can FFVP be delivered in the classroom?

Response: That was the goal initially, but there were several custodial issues, limitations, and concerns. Most schools moved away from this model, but implementation is up to the school. Schools are certainly permitted to offer the snack in the classroom, but most (if not all) provide it in the cafeteria.

Question: Any plans to continue this evaluation over time? More information that could disaggregate changes in food security for students would be great. I love that City is trying to reach students in that eligibility gap, i.e. the City's FFVP program allows schools with 35% Free- and Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) to participate whereas the eligible cutoff for the federal FFVP is 70% FRPL. Produce is THE biggest price barrier for families on a tight budget.

Response: We don't have future evaluations planned but we agree it would be worthwhile.

Comment: These schools you evaluated are the early adopters. It would great if your data could answer What is it about these schools that got them to participate? I encourage you to look at that in your data – it could help recruit additional schools. Love how you engaged with students and kitchen staff!

Question: We know that labor shortages in school culinary programs is a challenge. Any plans to reach out to any of the other 9 schools that have surpassed WA with universal meals to see how they have address labor?

Response: The labor shortage issue really is a "wicked problem". SPS has open positions but there has not been enough hiring. Students are interested in these issues as well. We have started a culinary staff advisory committee (also funded by SBT) to explore some of these issues and more.

Internal CAB Business

CAB member appointments:

The CAB discussed the slate of seven CAB members who are in seats with expiring or expired terms. All seven CAB members are eligible for reappointment. CAB members are considering whether they would

like to seek reappointment. The Office of Sustainability & Environment (OSE) will run an application process for any CAB seats that need to be filled.

Engagement with City officials and community (near term)

The CAB discussed future engagement with City officials and community, building on discussion from previous meetings its February retreat. Its working plan is outlined below.

<u>Audience(s)</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	Potential Format(s)	Timing
City officials: E.g. CM Mosqueda and Mayor Harrell	Share CAB's concerns about SBT revenue and request they share this information with the Revenue Stabilization Workgroup	Letter Meeting	Early September (<u>Before</u> 2024 Proposed Budget is released)
General Public and Community Stakeholders/Advocates	Acknowledge the 5 th year of SBT implementation; advocate for no cuts	Op Ed	Early September (<u>Before</u> 2024 Proposed Budget is released)
Community: E.g. SBT-funded organizations, aligned community coalitions and advocates	If there are cuts to SBT-funded programs, raise awareness with community stakeholders and advocates and encourage action	Action Alert email One-pager with key points	Late September/Early October (After the 2024 Proposed Budget is released and before Council holds public comment on the budget)

Proposed updates to CAB vision, values, bylaws, etc.

With only 10 minutes left in the meeting, the CAB prioritized a discussion on a proposal (see next page) to update its voting and decision-making process. Other topics like updates to the vision, values, and bylaws will be discussed at a future CAB meeting.

**DECISION POINT: The CAB unanimously agreed to replace the "Fist to Five" method of testing for agreement and voting with the simpler Stoplight method.

Proposal: Replace Fist to Five with the Stoplight Method

	Fist to Five (current method)	Stoplight (proposed method)			
Definitions	A fist means, "I vote NO." In consensus, this is the same as a block.				
	1 finger means, "I'll just barely go along." Or, "I don't like this but it's not quite a no." Or, "I think there is lots more work to do on this proposal." In consensus, this indicates standing aside, or not being in agreement but not blocking the consensus.	I do not agree with this plan. This is the same as a block. I need more information/I have a question before proceeding.			
	2 fingers means "I don't much like this but I'll go along."				
	3 fingers means , "I'm in the middle somewhere. Like some of it, but not all."	I like some of this proposal, but not all of it, but I will go along.			
	4 fingers means, "This is fine."				
	5 fingers means , "I like this a lot, I think it's the best possible decision."	I agree with this plan.			
Interpretation	If there are any fists or 1s, the Co-Chairs or meeting facilitator will ensure these concerns are heard. If there are many 2s and 3s, this should signal	If there are any Reds or Yellows, the Co-Chairs or meeting facilitator will ensure these concerns are heard.			
	to the Co-Chairs that the issue or proposal would benefit from further discussion, clarification or amendments.	If there are many Yellows, this should signal to the Co-Chairs that the issue or proposal would benefit from further discussion, clarification or amendments.			
Modified Consensus (takes	Two or more blocking votes [Fist or Red] indicates that consensus has not been attained.				
two to block)	If the CAB is ultimately paralyzed by the modified consensus process, then action will be approved by majority vote. There will be a minimum of two attempts at reaching consensus. After two attempts, it is up to the Co-Chairs to decide if the consensus process should continue or transition to majority vote.				