



San Francisco Department of Public Health

Grant Colfax, MD
Director of Health

City and County of San Francisco
London N. Breed
Mayor

Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee Infrastructure Subcommittee

MINUTES

August 3, 2021 – 9:00AM

Join Online Via Zoom

<https://sfdph.zoom.us/j/95788949256?pwd=TkdjdUxQeWI5Qko0UUVJYzNmQTQyQT09>

Meeting ID: 957 8894 9256 Passcode: 851890

Join via mobile: +1(669) 900- 6833

*Please note that public comment will be held after every agenda item. If a member of the public would like to comment on a topic that is *not* on the agenda, they may do so during general public comment at the start of the meeting. Please see the *Notes* section of this document for additional information.

Order of Business:

1. Call to Order / Roll Call [discussion and action] Meeting called to order at: 9:02am

Present: Maureen Guerrero, Linda Barnard, Larry McClendon, Michelle Kim, Christina Goette, Melinda Martin

Absent: Rita Nguyen

2. Approval of June Meeting Minutes [discussion and action]

Edits: Page 2 "co-chairs" typo

Michelle motions to approve minutes with edits. Linda seconds. Minutes are approved.

3. Approval of Agenda- [discussion and action]

Linda motions to approve agenda. Maureen seconds. Agenda is approved.

4. General Public Comment – No Public Comment
5. House Keeping [discussion and possible action]

- a. In-Person Meeting Transition

In person meeting transition, aware of Delta variant and we have had zero communication from DPH about going to in person meeting.

Staff shares that additional information was received from city attorney regarding SDDTAC legislation changes, it was determined after much review it has to go to voters for any changes and the only thing that the Board of Supervisors can do is extend life of SDDTAC. The city attorney is continuing to do research to identify if it possible to support youth members for their participation on the SDDTAC.

Member notes that the legislation update is not on the agenda and should be kept in future discussions, as it was community that came voiced their strong opinion and visibility and diversity among members who sat

in SDDTAC seats. The SDDTAC concluded that as a way to solve that issue, SDDTAC decided to take a look at the SDDTAC legislation so that it encompasses and reflects what the community said as a body. The SDDTAC has not done a good enough job in bringing that information back to the public and explaining to the community that the SDDTAC had one solution and it is no longer feasible and to seek feedback on other ways for solutions. This should continue to live on our agendas.

Member suggested planning for the future regarding transition of in person meetings. He suggests that can be the responsibility of this subcommittee to review and discuss planning of technology, social distancing, amplified sound, indoors, masking etc. Member adds that that it is important to discuss mechanisms in which the public can comment in person and via technology, knowing that there is value for community to participate virtually. There was strong indication as city as an infrastructure to integrate meetings and plan to what that transition looks like despite no definitive date. Member agrees to suggestion in order to be ready when in person meeting transition happens. Member added to work with DPH staff to discuss plans of room selection, technology, social distancing, masking, etc. Member suggested to look at various recreation centers where there is enough space to social distance. Member added that there would be value to have meetings at recreation sites and it would provide value and appreciation of the work of RPD.

Member offered assistance if needed to discuss with city attorney regarding legislation amendments so that attorney can understand what SDDTAC is trying to solve for.

6. Budget Training/Refresher Outline Development [discussion and possible action]

Member asks staff based on timeline to include elements of using meetings to build members' capacity and understanding of the budget process and improve their skill set over time. Based on last meeting when Shalini Rana was present was part of that building capacity process and a lot was a lot learned, though surprised that there were not a lot of questions regarding the budget especially since there were a lot of questions previously. It could have been fatigue in discussing numbers or that members were not prepared. Are there other impressions that members had? Member asked if the budget timeline on track with the budget's fiscal year track, not aware of any changes or shifts? Member responds and reviews timeline and notes that was provided by Shalini and added that there could be some surplus in areas they are seeing overlap from and working with notes departments to identify surplus. It highlights the issue of members of the SDDTAC may not be invited to those department wide meetings and how does a SDDTAC member get invited into those meetings to note that there is a surplus, etc? There were numbers were not included in Mayor's Office budget which is the reason why there wasn't a need for SDDT dollars to pay for. Sometimes being a city staff member and understanding how the budget mechanisms equal programming and thus not educating our colleagues and the community about how the budget is determined, and then can hinder and create barriers to fully comprehend, with our responsibilities and investigate what that surplus is for and to if there is access to it. Member adds that due to the lack of budget information, it also can cause animosity and confusion. There are often times things that happen what we as members are not in the meetings were these types of budget priority settings are discussed but are in meetings that only discuss what is happening programmatically.

Member adds that city department representatives should be included in those key discussions to be informed. There was another element that Shalini highlighted that she met with the co-chairs and reviewed the budget. But with new co-chairs, the chairs should have a check in and to note to be in the operational procedures. Member responded that that there was a delay in orientation with new co-chairs and by the time discussions with Shalini regarding budget it was delayed, especially with the educational meeting with Board of Supervisors with Friends of the Soda Tax and SPUR. For operationally, not sure if in the by laws but at least having one co-chair have at least 1 year experience with chair transitions. Part of this year if unique due to COVID 10 and hopefully next year it will not be as complicated. Member asked co-chair if Shalini's comments of meeting with co-chairs is enough and are you ok with being responsible for giving that information to the SDDTAC. Chair responds that she understands Shalini's response of meeting with chairs which may also be difficult to meet with the SDDTAC including the public and by doing so, with the co-chairs

it may be more efficient.

Member shares that September may not be feasible to get the Mayor's Office budget priorities then since it would have already been shared and don't think they would come in September to present that. Since Shalini used key words such as carry forward, terms and wording should be defined with the mechanisms associated with it would help members to better understand the budget process. Member suggests to reach out to Mayor's Office if they can come in September but don't think they will and there is a document that notes budget priorities and maybe we can invite them to an infrastructure subcommittee meeting to narrow down areas of focus but in the future maybe the infrastructure subcommittee can make known the budget priorities.

Member reviews draft budget timeline, October looks good. Staff shared that the Controller's Office had been invited in the past however it is strongly suggested to download their quarterly updates that are published. The Controller's Office hasn't been asked lately to come and present the SDDT revenue but we can ask them to come and last time we asked we were pointed to their published report. Member added it would be good for Controller's Office to come in October, especially to hear about the economic retail, and to identify if more revenue is collected and to be more accurate and for SDDTAC to have discussion, it sets our budget recommendations and as a body the SDDTAC can make recommendations on lesser amount if because the assumption and projection that is told to us is a lesser amount which SDDTAC did not include a surplus. There is funding that we didn't recommend because we had not planned for it.

Member asks if reaching out to Mayor's Office in September is too early, which could potentially cause frustration by asking the Mayor's Office to come monthly so what is the best timeline to reach out to the Mayor's Office. Member responded that based on feedback we can push Mayor's Office priorities and invite them to the infrastructure subcommittee to help narrow down priorities for presentation in September, in order to give SDDTAC a clear plan for October and November in regards to budget. By October Mayor's Office priorities and community needs will be clearer especially of issues related to COVID and there maybe COVID focused requests eventually. Member asked if the timeline will be just for the current year or standard timeline for every year. Member responded that the timeline and training should be robust and clear for new SDDTAC members can understand what is trying to be solved for. Delete September from timeline, invite Mayor's Office in October meeting to present and invite to Infrastructure subcommittee in September to talk about presentation of Mayor's budget priorities. This timeline can support how SDDTAC recommendations can support Mayor's priorities. Member suggested to add training in December annually regarding the budget template. Member added that it will orient ourselves of the budget template. Member responded yes, especially since new SDDTAC expressed that they did not understand the flow of the document. It is recommended to have the entire document open and to have quick review without making the assumption that everyone understands it, the intent and goal it to build capacity in the fundamentals of the budget, source of the revenue and how the template works that we can have a normal budget meeting without extended hours. November and December training on the budget template looks good for the timeline.

Member notes that it is also important that if and when educate Board of Supervisors and find allies, it should be added so that members can be prepped, etc especially since in the past it seemed as if we fall behind on that and should be conscious of it and plan accordingly. Member agrees. Staff adds that it may make sense that once the SDDTAC votes on budget recommendations that there can be a request made to for a budget hearing to present to Board of Supervisors or present to individual Supervisors. Member adds that there are different ways to do so: 1) strategically have one on one meetings, either go to co-chairs or SDDTAC and/or at subcommittee meetings to take on different district offices during recess, in December. Strategically meetings can be set now and plan, which would need to be presented to SDDTAC, where one chair of subcommittee partners with community person to educate and articulate what the SDDTAC recommends and flag anything for the Supervisors. Or to meet with Supervisors at one of their budget committee meetings or strategically request to present at a full Board of Supervisors meeting. It can be

scheduled in December or January and added as a bullet point in December to review proposed budget allotments with Board of Supervisors. Budget meetings usually are discussed in January and so discussion becomes an outline and in March it becomes a budget foundation, which can be too late in March. January would be the ideal month, since the Board of Supervisors are forming principles and ideas for the next budget year. SDDTAC will not have anything to present till March. Member adds that Board of Supervisors do not vote until June. Member adds that March is okay since conversations are happening.

Member suggests to having two pronged approach and where we educate on why we made the decisions regarding SDDTAC budget recommendations. March to be added for SDDTAC meeting with Board of Supervisors. February to be prep month for meeting with Board of Supervisors. Member adds to include January to make request/scheduling with Board of Supervisors and to be determined either presentation to full Board of Supervisors or individual Supervisors.

7. Discussions on Draft SDDTAC Protocol for Received Community Requests [discussion and possible action]

Chair provides context to members regarding agenda item to identify things to consider when community requests to SDDTAC for letters of support. He said that there was a community group asking for a letter of support and discussion moved onto on to thinking of agreeing to write letters of support. There was additional suggestions that letters of support should go towards policy change and infrastructure subcommittee to create protocol for letters of support. It was brought up that if an organization that is receiving funding from SDDT, the organization should automatically receive a letter from SDDTAC without much reservation. Member adds that it may be on a case by case basis, if receiving request within the grantee's budget period. There is no mechanism in place currently that allows the SDDTAC to identify if the request or program is aligned with SDDTAC goals and if program has been effective.

Member suggests to add universal statement to letters of support. If letters are requested it should be very specific on what the letter of support is for. Chair will draft universal statement and send to members for review. Member suggests adding process and timeline, although knowing that some letters of support are requested at the last minute of writing a proposal. Member added that it can be difficult for timing of requests but to have protocol of letters of support to go to co-chairs and chairs will share at subcommittee meetings, in order for it to be part of the SDDTAC monthly meetings. Letters of request should start at any committees and then go to SDDTAC meeting within the two week timeframe. Staff shares that grantees can request reference letters such as from health department. It could be that health departments provide letters of support. If someone wants to get letter of support from DPH which may be easier to get within two weeks but to receive letter from SDDTAC it may take longer especially if proposed work is towards policy change and alignment with SDDTAC.

Chair will work on general statement for letters of support, would make sense that letter of support request is made at SDDTAC meeting and/or subcommittee and to be presented to full committee for their recommendation and approval. At September meeting infrastructure will review language to present to SDDTAC for alignment for moving policy forward. For those SDDT grantees letters of support can be requested to DPH.

8. Discuss possible agenda items for September 7, 2021 Meeting [discussion and possible action]

- Review of language for support letter, timeline
- Under Housekeeping: SDDTAC legislation amendments - future committee make up; meeting in person
- Review new budget timeline with edits and outline for budget training

9. Announcements

- Recreation centers opening on 9/7/2021 but it can be pushed back due to COVID surge; currently 8 recreation centers have opened up on Saturdays.

10. Adjourn

Linda motions to adjourn meeting. Michelle seconds. Meeting is adjourned at 10:23am.

General Public Comment: At this time, members of the public may address the SDDTAC Advisory Committee on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee but do not appear on the agenda.

With respect to agenda items, the public will be given an opportunity to address the Committee when the item is reached in the meeting. Each member of the public may address the Committee for up to three minutes.

The Brown Act forbids a Committee from taking action or discussing any item not appearing on the posted agenda, including those items raised at Public Comment. In response to public comment on an item that is not on the agenda, the Committee is limited to:

- Briefly responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, or
- Requesting staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting, or
- Directing staff to place the item on a future agenda. (Government Code Section 54954.2(a).) 10.

Each action item will hold public comment before a vote is made.

Explanatory documents are available at the 25 Van Ness Ave, Suite 500 during regular business hours. If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the SDDTAC after distribution of the agenda packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the address above during normal business hours.

RINGING AND THE USE OF CELLPHONES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapters 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, please contact: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator
City Hall – Room 244 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4683,
415-554-7724 (Office); 415-554-7854 (Fax), E-mail: SOTF@sfgov.org

Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library and on the City's website at www.sfgov.org. Copies of explanatory documents are available to the public online at <http://www.sfbos.org/sunshine> or, upon request to the Commission Secretary, at the above address or phone number.

LANGUAGE ACCESS

Per the Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code), Chinese, Spanish and or Filipino (Tagalog) interpreters will be available upon requests. Meeting Minutes may be translated, if requested, after they have been adopted by the Family Violence Council/Mayor's Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking. Assistance in additional languages may be honored whenever possible. To request assistance with these services please contact the Minouche Kandel 415-252-3203, or minouche.kandel@sfgov.org at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting. Late requests will be honored if possible.

DISABILITY ACCESS

Family Violence Council meetings are held in room 617 at 400 McAllister Street in San Francisco. This building is accessible to persons using wheelchairs and other assistive mobility devices.

Mayor's Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking meetings are held in Room 305 at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place in San Francisco. City Hall is accessible to persons using wheelchairs and other assistive mobility devices. Ramps are available at the Grove, Van Ness and McAllister entrances.

Assistive listening devices, American Sign Language interpreters, readers, large print agendas or other accommodations are available upon request. Please make your requests for accommodations to Minouche Kandel (415) 252-3203, or minouche.kandel@sfgov.org. Requesting accommodations at least 72 hours prior to the meeting will help to ensure availability.

LOBBYIST ORDINANCE

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code 2.100] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102, (415) 252-3100, FAX (415) 252-3112, website: sfgov.org/ethics.

SDDTAC Recommendations and Mayor's Allocations FY 19-20

Item	SDDTAC Rx Amount	SDDTAC Rx %	SDDTAC Rx Agency	Mayor's Budget	% of Mayor's Budget	Mayor's Proposed Agency	Variance
Community-Based Grants	\$4,290,000	41.25%	DPH/CHEP	\$2,995,000	26.76%	DPH	
				\$300,000	2.68%	SFUSD via DCYF	
			Comm Engage	\$50,000	.45%	Total	-\$345,000
School Food, Nutrition Education, Student Led Action	\$1,000,000	14.42%	SFUSD	\$1,500,000	14%	SFUSD via DCYF	\$0
	\$500,000		SFUSD	\$500,000		SFUSD via DCYF	
Food Access	\$1,000,000	9.62%	DPH	\$1,000,000	10%	DPH	\$35,000
Healthy Retail SF	\$150,000	1.44%	OEWD	\$150,000	1%	OEWD	\$0
Oral Health	\$1,000,000	9.62%	DPH – Task Force	\$450,000	4.02%	SFUSD via DCYF	
			Sealant Pgm	\$450,000	3.13%	DPH	
			Edu/Case Mg	\$1,000,000	8%	Total	\$0
Infrastructure	\$1,000,000	11.92%	DPH/CHEP	\$1,000,000	8%	DPH	-\$240,000
Water Access – SFUSD	\$0	2.88%	SFUSD	\$0	4%	SFUSD via DCYF	\$0
Water Access - Public Spaces	\$300,000		PUC/DPH	\$300,000	2.68%		
SF Recreation & Parks	\$520,000	5%	RPD	\$2,895,000	5%		\$2,375,000
HOPE SF Peer Enhancements	\$400,000	3.85%	N/A	\$400,000	0%	DPH	\$400,000
Total	\$10,400,000	100.0%		\$11,190,000	100%		

Description of intended purpose from Mayor's Budget
Community-Based Grants: Funding to issue grants to CBOs for programs and services in the following areas (1) Health Education, (2) Physical Activity, (3) Food Access, and (4) a Media/Awareness Campaign.
School Food, Nutrition Education, student-led action: Funding to (1) improve the quality of school meals, (2) support nutrition education, and (3) support student-led efforts to decrease consumption of SSBs and increase awareness around students.
Food Access: Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement
Healthy Retail: Will provide Healthy Store makeovers to 2 additional stores and continue ongoing providing support to 10 stores.
Oral Health school-based: Funding to support oral health in schools, including the cost of sealants.
Oral Health: Funding for Community Task Forces
Infrastructure: To fund a contract through DPH for facilitation and strategic support for the SDDTAC. Will also support research needs, including purchasing of data, and costs at DPH related to the administration of CBO grant program.
Water Access: One-time for the installation of water refilling stations in schools. Also can be used to purchase refillable water bottles for students.

SFRPD: Funding to Rec Park to provide continued support of the Peace Parks program.

Hope SF Peer Enhancements: Fund training and peer wage increases.

SDDTAC Recommendations FY 21-22 and FY 22-23

	FY 21-22	%	FY 22-23	%	Department
COMMUNITY-BASED GRANTS					
Health education, food security, physical activity	\$3,500,000	36.84%	\$3,500,000	32.11%	DPH/CHEP
CBOs working with SFUSD	\$300,000	31.6%	\$300,000	2.75%	DPH/CHEP
TOTAL COMMUNITY BASED GRANTS	\$3,800,000	40%	\$3,800,000	34.86%	
SFUSD					
School Food, Nutrition Ed	\$1,000,000	10.53%	\$1,000,000	9.17%	SFUSD via DCYF
Student Led Action	\$500,000	5.26%	\$500,000	4.59%	SFUSD via DCYF
Educational Investments	-	0%	\$150,000	1.38%	SFUSD via DCYF
TOTAL SFUSD	\$1,500,000	15.79%	\$1,650,000	15.14%	
FOOD ACCESS					
Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement	\$1,200,000	12.63%	\$1,500,000	13.76%	DPH/PHD
Healthy Retail	\$150,000	1.58%	\$150,000	1.38%	OEWD
TOTAL FOOD ACCESS	\$1,250,000	14.21%	\$1,150,000	15.14%	
ORAL HEALTH					
Community task forces	\$450,000	4.74%	\$450,000	4.13%	DPH/MCAH
School-based sealant application	\$350,000	3.68%	\$350,000	3.21%	DPH/SF Health Network
School-based education and case management	\$200,000	2.11%	\$200,000	1.83%	SFUSD via DCYF
TOTAL ORAL HEALTH	\$1,000,000	10.53%	\$1,000,000	9.17%	
INFRASTRUCTURE					
DPH Infrastructure	\$800,000	8.42%	\$450,000	4.13%	DPH/CHEP
TOTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	\$800,000	8.42%	\$450,000	4.13%	
WATER ACCESS					
Water Access - SFUSD	-	-	\$400,000	3.67%	SFUSD via DCYF
Water Access - Public Spaces	\$95,000	1%	-	-	PUC via RPD
TOTAL WATER ACCESS	\$95,000	1%	\$400,000	3.67%	
SF RECREATION & PARKS					
Peace Parks	-	-	\$650,000	5.96%	RPD
SVIP Funding – Peace Parks Transportation	-	-	\$225,000	2.06%	RPD
REQUITY: Outreach, Scholarships, Equity in Recreation	-	-	\$900,000	8.26%	
TOTAL SF RECREATION & PARKS	\$780,000	8.21%	\$1,775,000	16.28%	
BREASTFEEDING	\$175,000	1.84%	\$175,000	1.61%	DPH/MCAH

Total Proposed	\$9,500,000	100%	\$10,900,000	100%
----------------	-------------	------	--------------	------

	Budget Descriptions: SDDTAC recommends investing in strategies that support mental health and wellbeing and workforce pathways for impacted/priority populations.
COMMUNITY-BASED GRANTS	City Departments should contract directly with CBOs through an RFP process managed through the Community Health Equity and Promotion (CHEP) Branch of the Department of Public Health. CBG should support community-based programs and services that address the health inequities of those most targeted by the beverage industry. Funding should go to Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and Faith Based Organizations (FBOs) for the following strategies:
Health education, food security, physical activity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Health Education activities including, chronic disease prevention, healthy eating and active living, tap water promotion, oral/dental health 2. Physical Activity opportunities, including: a) Dance and movement, sports, yoga, walking groups, biking, etc.; b) Efforts to influence changes to the built environment (ie sidewalks, streets, parks, buildings, etc) or safety of the built environment that facilitates increased physical activity and walking and biking for utilitarian trips, sometimes referred to as active transportation); and c) pursuit of institutional or local policies that facilitate physical activity and active transportation (such as adequate PE time and instructors, commuter benefits for active transportation, etc) 3. Healthy Eating/Food Security*, including: a) Community-based pantries, community-based hot meals, community kitchens and community home delivery services; b) Increased financial resources (i.e. wages, income, government nutrition supplements, vouchers, etc.); c) Changes to the built environment that facilitate food security; and d) Pursuit of institutional or local policies that facilitate food security. 4. Water Promotion, such as support for Spa Water Supplies, station maintenance/beautification, refillable water bottles to distribute to communities, water testing 5. Community Based Participatory Research
CBOs working with SFUSD	7% of all CBO funding (eg 7% of approximately \$4.3 million) should go towards CBOs implementing programs/initiatives that take place in school settings. Funding to issue grants to CBOs should follow the guidelines above.
SFUSD	
School Food, Nutrition Ed	To improve the quality and appeal of school meals and support nutrition education to increase participation in school meal programs (for example: cooking and serving equipment, staff professional development, and innovative procurement and menu strategies to increase freshly prepared food). Funding will target schools with the largest populations of high-risk students that are disproportionately targeted by the sugary drinks industry.
Student Led Action	Support student led efforts to decrease consumption of sugary drinks and increase awareness of sugary drinks consumption among students, with focus on schools with the largest populations of high-risk students that are disproportionately targeted by the sugary drinks industry. SFUSD should provide to SDDTAC a proposal of how funding will be spent through student led action.
Educational Investments	Educational investments that support and strive for professional development in health and wellness across lifespan. Scholarships and other supports in higher education in medical technology and health field careers for Priority Populations and including para professionals.
FOOD ACCESS	
Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement	Support programs that increase financial resources to purchase healthy food such as vouchers and food purchasing incentives. This investment is meant to support both the communities most impacted by the health consequences of sugary beverage consumption and to support the local economy including local merchants. These funds should be RFPed out to CBOs and FBOs according to the Community Based Grants guidelines.
Healthy Retail	Supporting small business to increase healthy food access in high risk and impacted communities and neighborhoods by: 1) supporting business operations; 2) promoting community engagement; and 3) improving the retail environment.
ORAL HEALTH	

Community task forces	Support development of community infrastructure such as oral health community task forces that incorporate diverse stakeholders for outreach, education, and interventions to address the oral health needs of children in high risk populations.
School-based sealant application	Support school-based and school-linked preventive oral health programs within SFUSD schools serving high risk target populations. This should also support SFUSD dedicated oral health staffing.
School-based education and case management	
INFRASTRUCTURE	
DPH Infrastructure	<p>A. Personnel</p> <p>1) Backbone staffing to support SDDTAC a. A program manager to provide backbone staffing to the SDDTAC, including: i) Staffing full committee and 3 subcommittees in compliance with Sunshine and Brown Acts; ii) Coordinating among city agencies and funded CBOs to promote collective impact; iii) Help guide vision and strategy of SDDTAC, support aligned activities; manage SDDTAC work and timeline; and iv) Working with evaluation team to establish shared measurement practices b. As necessary, manage citywide/soda tax impact media c. Develop/Compile and Manage completion of SDDTAC Annual Report d. Manage SDDTAC biennial nominations process</p> <p>2) Staffing to support DPH SDDT implementation of community based grants a. Manage work of contractors, including: i) develop and implement CBO RFP process; ii) provide technical assistance for CBOs and merchants; iii) promote collective impact in coordination with SDDTAC backbone staff and City Agencies; and iv) work with evaluator and SDDTAC backbone staff to develop and implement evaluation plan and evaluation technical assistance.</p> <p>3) Staffing to support research and evaluation of SDDT impact, including data purchases as necessary a. At least 1.0 FTE epidemiologist; b. Support data analysis for annual report; c. Manage data purchases; d. participate in development and implementation of SDDT evaluation</p> <p>B. Professional services including: i) technical assistance for funded CBO and FBO; ii) evaluation - to implement evaluation framework and evaluate funded city agencies, CBO and FBO, and process evaluations from applicants, and provide evaluation technical assistance; iii) city attorney to provide ongoing technical consultation</p> <p>C. Materials/Supplies for meetings and printing costs</p> <p>D. Training to support staff development</p> <p>E. Data for collection (pricing), analysis (Nielsen) and purchase (IRI)</p>
Evaluation	<p>Additional funds for evaluation may:</p> <p>a. support community based participatory research (ex. street intercept, merchant interview, focus groups)</p> <p>b. develop a system to collect data</p> <p>c. expand technical assistance</p> <p>d. conduct more qualitative evaluation that can help develop stories that describe impact of tax</p>
WATER ACCESS	
Water Access - SFUSD	To install hydration stations at low income schools serving students with health disparities (ex. Bayview, Chinatown, Mission), to elevate the schools to the Silver or Gold standard for hydration stations (i.e. one on each floor, centrally located, and conduct water education). Funds may support purchase of Spa Water Supplies, station maintenance and beautification, refillable water bottles to distribute to students, water testing.
Water Access - Public Spaces	To install or upgrade existing hydration station(s) in public spaces that target high-risk populations that are disproportionately targeted by the sugary drink industry (community identified public spaces). This funding should support high-quality, visually appealing, stations that can serve as a highlighted example of the potential for hydration stations. This can include beautifying and optimizing current station(s) or creating new one(s).
SF RECREATION & PARKS	
Peace Parks	Peace Parks programming to serve priority populations
SVIP: Peace Parks Transportation	Transportation for Peace Parks participants

REQUITY: Outreach, Scholarships, recreation equity	Scholarships and programming for priority populations
BREASTFEEDING	To fund a breastfeeding coalition to organize collective efforts across San Francisco to enable increased breastfeeding among Priority Populations. This coalition will mobilize action on policy, systems and environmental (PSE) changes to increase breastfeeding rates and duration, leveraging community strengths, and tackling structural barriers to reduce inequities to breastfeeding support. This would include funding for backbone support to: engage community stakeholders in a strategic planning and engagement process to develop a framework for short and long term goals embedding in principles of equity; help align breastfeeding support services in San Francisco including hospital, outpatient, and community based services to improve access to breastfeeding support; and provide technical assistance to partnering agencies (such as child care centers and businesses with less than 50 employees) to operationalize and implement breastfeeding friendly policies and practices.

* Funding should support programs and services that increase financial resources to purchase healthy food; access to healthy fruits and vegetables while minimizing processed foods for high-risk communities; foods that are affordable and convenient; and programs that support the consumption of healthy foods including the ability to prepare and store meals and the knowledge of basic nutrition, food safety and cooking. Priority programs should incorporate a community-based food security perspective and have demonstrated increased ability of food insecure residents to purchase, access, and consume consumption of healthy, fresh, low-to-no cost and culturally appropriate foods, including but not limited to food vouchers/incentives, transportation and delivery and prepared foods.

ONGOING ADBACKS FROM FY 2017-2018

PROGRAM	DEPARTMENT	DESCRIPTION	
Food Security – Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement	DPH	Maintain current service levels: Vouchers and education to increase consumption and access to nutritious foods by increasing the ability of low income residents to purchase fruits and vegetables at neighborhood vendors and farmers’ markets in collaboration with DPH Healthy Retail Program.	50,000
Healthy Corner Store Retail	ECN	Promoting corner stores and markets to sell healthy products as opposed to sugary beverages, etc.	60,000
Food Security – Home Delivered Meals (HDM)	HSA	Address current waitlist: Delivery of nutritious meals, a daily-safety check/friendly interaction to homebound seniors/adults with disabilities who cannot shop or prepare meals themselves. Many providers offer home assessments/nutrition education/counseling.	477,000
Food Security – Congregate Lunch Meals	HSA	Address current waitlist: Daily, hot, nutritious meals for seniors/adults with disabilities	220,000
Senior Fitness	HSA	Senior fitness programming at IT Bookman and George Davis	200,000
Congregate Meal Program	HSA	Congregate Meal Program A	75,000
Congregate Meal Program	HSA	Congregate Meal Program B	75,000
		TOTAL	1,157,000

*The Board of Supervisor’s made a series of adbacks in the FY 17-18 budget. When the Board of Supervisors makes changes to the Mayor’s budget, some of these changes are “adbacks” denoting the Board’s decision to add funds back for a particular service. Adbacks become part of an agency’s baseline budget.