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Local beverage taxes
United States

- **Implemented**: Albany, Berkeley, San Francisco, Oakland, Seattle, Boulder, Cook County, Philadelphia, Navajo Nation
- **Enacted**: San Francisco, Oakland, Albany, Berkeley, Seattle, Navajo Nation
- **Repealed**: Philadelphia

- **3.8 million people benefitting**
- **$135 million per year**
## Local beverage taxes
### United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Effective date</th>
<th>Tax rate per ounce (cents)</th>
<th>Type of beverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA Council</td>
<td>1,584,130</td>
<td>1/1/2017</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Sweetened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley, CA Measure D</td>
<td>122,324</td>
<td>1/1/2015</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Sugary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany, CA Measure O1</td>
<td>20,143</td>
<td>4/1/2017</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Sugary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, CA Measure HH</td>
<td>425,195</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Sugary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA Measure V</td>
<td>884,363</td>
<td>1/1/2018</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Sugary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder, CO Measure 2H</td>
<td>107,125</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Sugary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA Council</td>
<td>724,745</td>
<td>1/1/2018</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>Sugary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sugary drink taxes around the world

Americas:
USA (local)
Bermuda
Mexico
Dominica
Barbados
Panama
Colombia
Peru
Chile

Europe:
Norway
Finland
Estonia
Latvia
United Kingdom
Ireland
Belgium
France
Hungary
Spain (Catalonia)
Portugal
Morocco
St Helena

Western Pacific:
Philippines
Brunei
Cook Islands
Fiji
Palau
French Polynesia
Kiribati
Nauru
Samoa
Tonga
Vanuatu

Africa, Eastern Mediterranean and Southeast Asia:
Saudi Arabia
Bahrain
Qatar
United Arab Emirates
India
Sri Lanka
Thailand
Malaysia
Maldives
Mauritius
South Africa

IMPLEMENTED
PASSED

Updated May 20, 2019
© Copyright 2019 Globel Food Research Program UNC
Next up

The District may approve one of the nation’s highest taxes on sugary drinks

A successful ballot initiative that would tax sugary drinks in Philadelphia has inspired D.C. lawmakers to also propose a tax on sugary drinks. The measure was introduced by the council’s Committee on Finance and Revenue.

A majority of the D.C. Council wants to impose one of the highest taxes on sugary drinks in the nation, driving up the cost of a soda in the capital city.

A bill announced Monday would levy a 1.5 cents-per-ounce excise tax on sweetened beverages, adding

Massachusetts considering taxing sugary drinks to fight childhood obesity

Massachusetts considering taxing sugary drinks to fight childhood obesity

2 minutes left
Tax Design
What to tax – volume or sugar?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Base</th>
<th>Sugar content (per gram)</th>
<th>Volume (per ounce, per liter)</th>
<th>Sales value (percent of retail price)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumers cut back on sugary drinks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses develop and promote zero-sugar drinks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumers cannot avoid tax by buying cheaper drinks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumers shift to lower-sugar drinks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses develop and promote lower-sugar drinks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does a volume tax make sense?

Drinks that contain more sugar per 100ml will attract a lower tax per gram of sugar.

- Coca Cola (10.6g sugar/100ml)
  - Tax per 1 litre: 24p
  - Tax per 100 gram of sugar: 23p

- Sainsbury’s Orange Energy Drink (15.9g sugar/100ml)
  - Tax per 1 litre: 24p
  - Tax per 100 gram of sugar: 15p
“When the main objective of an SSB tax is to improve public health, we show that a calorie-based SSB tax is more efficient than an ounce-based SSB tax in the sense that the former is able to achieve a given calorie reduction target with smaller loss in consumer surplus.” (Zhen 2014)
Optimal tax rate

1.42 cents per ounce* (39%)

* Lower as cross-border shopping increases

Tax evaluation:
Sales or consumption?
Sales: Berkeley

Impact of a 1 cent per ounce tax (15%) in Berkeley

Sales: Philadelphia

38% net reduction accounting for cross-border shopping
Do taxes decrease consumption—Less certain and harder to measure

**Berkeley**: DID repeated cross-sectional street intercept surveys

- **Lee 2019**
  - 51% decrease

**Berkeley**: Single group repeated cross-sectional phone survey 1 year after tax:
- Kcal/per capita/day: -19.8%, p = 0.56
- Grams/per capita/day: -13.3%, p = 0.49

**Philadelphia**: DID repeated cross-sectional phone survey 2 months after tax:
- Odds daily soda consumption: 40% lower
- Regular soda consumption frequency: 38% lower

**Silver 2017**

**Zhong 2018**
Evaluation challenges

- Consumption data are messy and inconsistent
- Limited information on substitution effects
- Data on revenue collection, allocation and impacts of funded programs not readily available
- Limited information on jobs and business impacts
- Models show health benefits but developing empirical evidence demonstrating tax-specific changes in population health metrics will be difficult
- No data on reformulation in US
Tax revenue
Taxes are generating substantial revenues to meet community needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Annual revenue ($$1,000,000$)</th>
<th>Use of Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>$77.3</td>
<td>Pre-k, parks, community schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany, CA</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>$10.6</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$15.3</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder, CO</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>Food access, health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>$24.0</td>
<td>Food access, health, early childhood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$135$ million per year
Revenue allocations across all sites

- Healthy food access programs
- School-based nutrition education and gardens
- Community gardens
- Diabetes Prevention Program
- Healthy beverage & water promotion
- Hydration stations
- Oral health access
- Community education and public awareness/counter-messaging campaigns
- Pre-school and early childhood programs
- Parks and recreation site repairs and upgrades
- Active transportation, physical activity and rec programs
- Community schools
- High school completion and college matriculation
Philly Bev Tax

- Spent $68M of $154M collected
- Increased community schools from 12 to 17
- Added 1050 preschool seats to total of 3300
- Started 41 Rebuild projects
# Boulder 2019 allocations

## Healthy Food
- Meal programs
- Preschool/childcare farm to table
- Fresh connect
- Healthy food vouchers (WIC)
- Healthy food for food pantries
- Breast feeding support
- School gardens

## Physical Activity
- Parks and rec programs
- Soccer programs
- PA education
- Vouchers
- Bike program

## Health services
- Weight loss program
- Dental care/education
- Opioid addiction

## Early Childhood
- Subsidies
- Support for healthy eating and physical activity

$7.3 million to non-profit agencies for health equity programs in 2017-18
# Seattle 2019 Adopted Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Access Programming</th>
<th>2019 Adopted Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Bucks Program</td>
<td>$9.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Banks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Access Opportunity Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm-to-Table program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based Meal Providers and Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies to Schools to provide more fruits and vegetables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Congregate Meals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Meal Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-School Nutrition Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education and Early Learning</th>
<th>$7.8 million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Learning Programs, e.g.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Consultation, Coaching and Training for 0-3 Providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Child Care Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Child Home Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Bridge Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Assistance Program (CCAP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Child Home Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse and Family Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>$1.4 million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation – of the SBT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation – of SBT funded programs such as Food Access Opportunity Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness and Counter-marking Campaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Activity programming at Seattle Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Tax revenues decline over time - they are not a stable funding source”

- Tax revenues appear to be stable
- Even if they do decrease, they raise new revenue now to meet important community needs.

### Berkeley Tax Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,757,271</td>
<td>$1,578,389</td>
<td>$1,680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Seattle Sugary Beverage Tax Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018 Q1</th>
<th>2018 Q2</th>
<th>2018 Q3</th>
<th>2018 Q4</th>
<th>2019 Q1</th>
<th>2019 Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$4,857,873</td>
<td>$5,964,942</td>
<td>$6,232,578</td>
<td>$5,939,563</td>
<td>$4,794,913</td>
<td>$5,670,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sugar Sweetened Beverage Tax Revenue

The Sugar Sweetened Beverage Product Distribution Tax is a voter-initiated tax that was adopted by Boulder voters in the November 2016 election and went into effect on July 1, 2017. It places a 2 cent per ounce excise tax on the distribution of beverages with added sugar and other sweeteners.

Note: October 2018 Sugar Sweetened Beverage Revenue is lower than average due to several accounts that did not file and pay taxes. These collections were recorded in February 2019 and are reflected in the chart above.
Synergies with taxes:
Healthy food subsidies and communications campaigns
Healthy food subsidies

“You take the bad sugar in pop and turn it into good nutrition at the markets. That’s a job well done. Thank you.”
- Fresh Bucks customer who called the program office to say thanks

“I am a diabetic and with Fresh Bucks I can eat a lot of vegetables, and I see improvements in my health. Now, I am telling others to also eat more fresh produce.’
Trunesh,
Fresh Bucks Customer

‘Fresh Bucks has helped me a lot. It’s easier for me to cook, it’s healthier and it tastes better than other foods. Without Fresh Bucks, fresh produce would be more expensive.’
Muna
Fresh Bucks Customer

Seattle investing close to $6 million/year – the USDA budget for entire US is $50 million

Photos used with permission of the Fresh Bucks program
Rethink your drink - Australia
Fruit drink countermarketing

Consuming fruit drinks contributes to obesity, type 2 diabetes and tooth decay.

Sugary fruit drinks are "naturally" rotting your kid’s teeth.
Seattle campaign (2020): $750,000

- A public awareness campaign: healthier alternatives to SSBs.
- A counter-marketing campaign: deceptive and manipulative marketing of SSBs to people of color and low-income communities to generate action and resistance.
- Raise awareness of Seattle’s SBT (how it works, revenue raised, how revenue is being used) to build support for the SBT.
- Priority population:
  - Youth and young adults (12-39 yo)
  - People with low incomes
  - Families
- Focus population:
  - Black
  - Latinx
Subsidies and media campaigns

Fig 1. Cumulative deaths prevented or postponed from 2015 to 2030 under each policy modelled, by sex. Error bars indicate 95% uncertainty intervals. DPPs, deaths prevented or postponed; F&V, fruit and vegetable; MMC, mass media campaign; SNAP, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program; SSB, sugar-sweetened beverage.

Community Advisory Boards
Seattle: Community Advisory Board

- Recommends how to allocate revenues to benefit people who experience the greatest education and health inequities
- Members
  - 3 with experience in healthy food access and food security
  - 2 representing populations disproportionately impacted by SSB-related diseases
  - 4 with expertise in public health and nutrition
  - 2 with expertise in education and early learning
Budget Principles

- Priority populations
- Place-based
- Community-driven
- Culturally-responsive
- Prevention-oriented

“Investments supported by the beverage tax revenues should prioritize allocation of funds to communities disproportionately affected by health and education inequities, especially those related to the adverse health effects of sugary drinks.”
Community Engagement

COMMUNITY INPUT SURVEY
- Online survey
- April – June, 2018
- 167 respondents

COMMUNITY FORUMS
- May 2019
- 90+ participants

Support community-led work
Focus on race and social justice
Prioritize healthy food access outcomes
Boulder: Health Equity Advisory Committee

- Nine-member committee appointed by the city manager
- Reviews proposals from community and city agencies
- Makes recommendations to city staff and manager
- Roles:
  - Help define desired outcomes and key indicators of success;
  - Provide recommendations on expansion of existing city and community programs and on new programs
  - Provide input on strategies and programs to engage residents most affected by health disparities and lack of access to health services.

HEALTH EQUITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (HEAC)
Thank you

http://www.healthyfoodamerica.org/
Extra slides
LiveSugarfreed
Appalachia and New Jersey
“Taxes are regressive”
“Taxes are regressive” - countermessages

- Tax revenues are being invested in low-income communities to meet community needs and address social and health inequities.

- Consumption is higher in low-income communities, in part due to predatory marketing, and may decrease more as result of tax.

- Low-income communities have the highest rates of SSB-related diseases and may reap the greatest health benefits.

- No one has to pay the tax.

- Low income people now spend more on sugary drinks – the tax may reduce the spending gap between rich and poor.
Regressivity - the evidence
Analyzing the progressive and regressive impacts of taxes on sugar-sweetened beverages (Jesse Jones-Smith, PI)

Quantify magnitude of tax regressivity

1. Sum annual spending on beverages for each household

\[ \text{Annual Household} + \text{beverage spending} \]

2. Estimate spending on tax for each household

\[ \text{Annual Spending} = \text{$X$} \]

3. Calculate proportion of household income spent on the tax and annual absolute spending per capita

\[ \text{Annual Household} \rightarrow \text{$XX.XX$} \rightarrow \text{tax} \]

4. Using regression models, test whether tax burden (absolutely and as proportion of HH income) differs by household income and race

Tax Payments & Redistributions (Benefits)
“Taxes cause job loss”

“A tax hike on beverages would hit working families not only at the cash register but could also put good-paying jobs at risk. One needs to look no further than Philadelphia, where business owners have seen sales drop by as much as 50 percent because of the beverage tax as Philadelphians shop in the suburbs to avoid the tax.”

Ellen Valentino, executive vice president of the Maryland-Delaware-D.C. Beverage Association
“Taxes cause job loss” - countermessages

- The research is clear: There is no evidence that taxes have a negative impact on jobs.
- Scientific and government studies show no lost jobs and even increases in SSB-related businesses.
  - In Berkeley, jobs and revenues in the food sector increased after the tax was implemented.
  - In Philadelphia, new data show increases in wages and no increases in unemployment claims.
  - In Mexico, beverage sector employment has been stable while food sector employment has increased.
- Only industry-funded studies claim to show job loss.
“Taxes cause job loss” – the evidence

Berkeley – 2 years after

469 Jobs Added

Mexico – 2 years after

Tax implemented

Silver 2017. Colchero 2018
“Taxes cause job loss” – the evidence

Philadelphia wage tax collections: increasing

Philadelphia unemployment claims: no change

Philadelphia Department of Revenue 2019

Lawman et al 2019
“Consumers will shop across the border to avoid the tax”
“Cross-border shopping” – countermessages

- Cross-border shopping does occur, although the amount varies from city to city.
- Despite cross-border shopping, taxes are reducing sales in cities with taxes.
- The extent of cross-border shopping may be determined by geography, transportation and other factors.
- No objective evidence that stores near the border are harmed.
- Implementing taxes at the state level will likely reduce cross-border shopping.
- We know from studies of tobacco taxes that cross-border shopping for tobacco products is limited and decreases once taxes are in place for a while.
“Cross-border shopping” – the evidence

24% of sales decrease offset by cross border

Philadelphia

Berkeley

Roberto 2019, Silver 2017
“We are doing our part...” – the evidence

"This is the single largest voluntary effort by an industry to help fight obesity and leverages our companies' greatest strengths in marketing, innovation and distribution."

Susan Neely, CEO of the American Beverage Association
Taxes may induce product reformulation: Early effects of UK tax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British soda-makers are slashing sugar</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fanta Orange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous sugar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.4 grams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current sugar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9 grams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous sugar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 grams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current sugar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9 grams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irn-Bru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous sugar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.4 grams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current sugar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1 grams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pellegrino Limonata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous sugar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.1 grams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current sugar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5 grams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucozade Energy Original</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous sugar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.6 grams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current sugar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.6 grams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Media and company reports; all numbers converted from metric

THE WASHINGTON POST
Taxes may induce product reformulation: Early effects of UK tax

Overall sales (of soft drinks have increased by 10.2% after the levy’s introduction, and total sugar content within the soft drinks sold decreased by 21.6% Great Britain.

Figure 4. Changes in volume of soft drinks sold and in the total sugar in soft drinks sold by socio-economic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Economic Group</th>
<th>Total Sugar Sales</th>
<th>Total Sales Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preemption

THE SACRAMENTO BEE

Big Soda’s sweet deal to ban soda taxes is a California shakedown
BY THE SACRAMENTO BEE EDITORIAL BOARD

Don’t let politicians add taxes to our grocery list.

$20 million
SSB tax preemption: November 2018
13 states preempt local food and nutrition policies

- Nutrition labeling
- Consumer incentives (toys)
- Portion size
- Taxes
- Food safety
- Food deserts
Seattle 2020 Mayor’s Proposed Budget

Sweetened Beverage Tax – Resources for Early Education and Food Access

**Available Resources**
- Approximately $10.1 million in “new” ongoing Sweetened Beverage Tax (SBT) Resources
  - Budget eliminates ~$6.3 million in general fund “swaps”
  - Revenue forecast update adds ~$3.8 million in annual, on-going revenues.
- Additional $4.3 million of unspent fund balance from 2018 and 2019

**Proposed Uses - Ongoing**
- $3 million per year to expand Child Care Assistance Program (CCAP)
  - Expand income eligibility to 350% of federal poverty (approx. $90K for a family of four)
  - Increase minimum subsidy from 10% to 25%
  - Provide financial incentives for providers to participate in CCAP, and also invest ~$2 million from other sources to provide one-time capital funding to help further expand supply
  - Expect to provide vouchers to 600 additional children

**Proposed Uses - Ongoing**
- $2.5 million per year for an “Healthy Food Fund” grant program to support food access
  - Administered by the Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
  - Fund will invest in community-led activities to increase access to healthy food
- $2+ million to expand the City’s Fresh Bucks program
- Approximately $1.1 million to expand support to food banks and additional staff at HSD to administer the program expansions funded by the Department’s SBT allocations
- $150,000 to expand summer recreational programming for youth at the Parks Department

**Proposed Uses – One-time**
- $3 million one-time grant fund to support capital investments in P-patches and community gardens
- $2 million for a financial reserve in the newly created Sweetened Beverage Tax Fund
Tiered tax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIERS</th>
<th>FIRST (LOWEST)</th>
<th>SECOND</th>
<th>THIRD</th>
<th>FOURTH (HIGHEST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sugar (g) per 8-oz</td>
<td>0 to &lt;5</td>
<td>5 to &lt;10</td>
<td>10 to &lt;20</td>
<td>More than 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar (g) per 12-oz</td>
<td>0 to &lt;7.5</td>
<td>7.5 to &lt;15</td>
<td>15 to &lt;30</td>
<td>More than 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calories from sugar per 8-oz</td>
<td>0 to &lt;20</td>
<td>20 to &lt;40</td>
<td>40 to &lt;80</td>
<td>More than 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calories from sugar per 12-oz</td>
<td>0 to &lt;30</td>
<td>30 to &lt;60</td>
<td>60 to &lt;120</td>
<td>More than 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage Examples</td>
<td>Unsweetened or Diet Tea, Water and Sparkling Water, Unsweetened (black) Coffee, Diet or Very Low Sugar sodas</td>
<td>Lightly Sweetened Coffees, Kombucha, Some lightly Sweetened Juices, Teas, and Energy Drinks</td>
<td>Lightly Sweetened Teas, Lightly Sweetened Sodas, Sports Drinks</td>
<td>Fruit-Flavored Drinks, Regular Sodas, Energy Drinks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Second and third tiers may be combined to create a three-tiered taxation strategy*

Ideally, campaigns choosing a three-tiered taxation strategy will use a cut-off for the lowest tax bracket at 5 g of sugar per 8-ounce serving, keeping the middle bracket at 5 to 20 g per 8-ounce serving and the higher bracket for drinks greater than 20 g per 8-ounce serving. By implementing these brackets, disincentives within the top bracket could yield effective behavioral changes among consumers and encourage manufacturers to reduce added sugar and drink size to move their products out of the high tax brackets.
# Seattle CAB 2019 recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>% of all ongoing funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Food and Beverage Access</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth-to-Three Services and Kindergarten Readiness</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based programs and activities to support food nutrition and physical activity</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness campaign about sugary drinks</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for people with obesity and diabetes</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation support for community-based organizations</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAB - Process

Foundational Work
Dec 2017 – Mar 2018

Information Gathering
Feb 2018 – May 2018

Prioritization Process
May 2018 – June 2018
Boulder

- Farmers markets vouchers - WIC recipients
- Healthy cooking classes - older adults
- Fresh Food Connect – distribute free local produce to low income residents
- No Student Hungry – food bags for weekends & holidays
- YWCA Children’s Alley – physical activity, wellness and nutrition at childcare