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"Sugar, rum, and tobacco, are commodities which are nowhere necessities of life, which have become objects of almost universal consumption, and which are therefore extremely proper subjects of taxation."

Overview

- Overview of tobacco and alcohol taxation
- Impact of taxes/prices on tobacco and alcohol use, consequences of use
- Earmarking revenues for control programs
- Industry price marketing & policy options
- Counterarguments – Myths & Facts
- Implications for obesity prevention
Overview of Tobacco and Alcohol Taxation
Why Tax?

- **Efficient revenue generation**
  - Primary motive historically and still true in many countries today
  - Very efficient sources of revenue given:
    - Historically low share of tax in price in many countries
    - Relatively inelastic demand for tobacco products, alcoholic beverages
    - Few producers and few close substitutes
    - One of many goods/services that satisfies the “Ramsey Rule”

- “This vice brings in one hundred million francs in taxes every year. I will certainly forbid it at once – as soon as you can name a virtue that brings in as much revenue” – Napoleon III on tobacco tax
Federal Cigarette Tax and Tax Revenues
Inflation Adjusted, 1955-2009

Source: Tax Burden on Tobacco, 2010, and author’s calculations
Cigarette Tax and Tax Revenues
Inflation Adjusted, Idaho, 1965-2010

Source: Tax Burden on Tobacco, 2011, and author’s calculations
Federal Beer Tax and Tax Revenues
Inflation Adjusted, 1940-2009

Source: Brewers Almanac, 2010, and author’s calculations
Why Tax?

- **Promote public health**
  - Increasingly important motive for higher tobacco taxes in many high income countries
    - Less so for alcoholic beverage taxes
  - Based on substantial and growing evidence on the effects of tobacco taxes and prices on tobacco use
    - Particularly among young, less educated, and low income populations

- “... We [...] have a package of six policy measures, known as MPOWER, that can help countries implement the provisions in the Convention. All six measures have a proven ability to reduce tobacco use in any resource setting. **But tobacco taxes are by far the most effective.**” Director General Dr. Margaret Chan, WHO, 2008

Lung Cancer Deaths: males age 35-44/4
Number cigarettes/adult/day
Relative Price

Source: Jha, 2009
Why Tax Tobacco?

- Cover the external costs of tobacco and excessive alcohol use
  - “Pigouvian” tax
  - Less frequently used motive
  - Account for costs resulting from tobacco use imposed on non-users
    - Increased health care costs, lost productivity, property damage, criminal justice costs, etc. caused by exposure to tobacco smoke among non-smokers, harms incurred by non/moderate drinkers
  - Can also include “internalities” that result from addiction, imperfect information, and time inconsistent preferences
Types of Taxes

- **Variety of tobacco, alcohol taxes**
  - Taxes on value of tobacco crop
  - Customs duties on tobacco leaf, tobacco products, alcoholic beverage imports and/or exports
  - Sales taxes/Value added taxes
  - Implicit taxes when government monopolizes production and/or distribution
  - Excise taxes (or similar taxes)
    - Many of these are applied to variety of agricultural and/or consumer goods and services
    - Excise taxes are of most interest given specificity to tobacco products, alcoholic beverages
Types of Taxes

- **Excise Taxes**
  - Two types of excises
    - **Specific Taxes**: excises based on quantity or weight (e.g. tax per pack of 20 cigarettes, wine gallons)
    - **Ad Valorem taxes**: excises based on value of products (e.g. a specific percentage of manufacturer’s prices for tobacco products, alcoholic beverages)
  - Federal, state, and local cigarette taxes and federal alcoholic beverage taxes all specific taxes
  - State taxes on other tobacco products, alcoholic beverages are mix of specific and *ad valorem*
Federal Tobacco Taxes

- Federal cigarette tax
  - Specific (per unit) excise tax
  - Initially adopted in 1864
  - Raised during war time/lowered during peace time
  - Set at 8 cents per pack in 1951
  - Doubled to 16 cents per pack in 1983
  - Eventually raised to 39 cents per pack in 2002
    - Less than 60% of inflation adjusted value of 1951 tax
  - Significant increase – 61.66 cents – April 1, 2009
    - Earmarked for S-CHIP expansion
Federal Tobacco Taxes

- Specific federal excise taxes on most other tobacco products, including:
  - cigars: $1.0066 per pack on small cigars; 52.75% of price for low priced cigars; cap of 40.26 cents per cigar for high priced cigars
  - chewing tobacco: 3.1 cents per ounce
  - moist snuff: $1.51 per pound
  - roll-your-own tobacco $24.78 per pound
  - pipe tobacco: $2.83 per pound
  - rolling papers: 1.26 cents per pack

- Until latest increases, most were lower than cigarette tax; more equivalent now
- Similarly infrequent increases in taxes
Federal Alcohol Taxes

- Specific (per unit) excise taxes
- Beer, spirits taxes adopted in 1862; wine 1916
- Raised during war time/lowered during peace time
- Spirits tax: $10.50 per proof gallon in 1951
  - $12.50 in 1985; $13.50 in 1991
- Table wine tax: $0.17 per wine gallon in 1951
  - $1.07 in 1991
- Beer tax: $9.00 per barrel in 1951
  - $16.00 in 1991
- Tax per ounce of ethanol varies by type of alcoholic beverage
State Tobacco Taxation

• State cigarette taxes
  – First adopted by IA in 1921; NC last to adopt in 1969
  – Specific excise tax in all states
  – Currently: 17.0 cents/pack (MO) to $4.35/pack (NY)
  – Average $1.45 per pack (48.5 cents in tobacco growing states; $1.57 in other states)

• Several proposing additional increases
State Cigarette Excise Tax Rates – 2001

CDC, Office on Smoking and Health. State Tobacco Activities Tracking and Evaluation (STATE) System.
State Cigarette Excise Tax Rates – 2003

CDC, Office on Smoking and Health. State Tobacco Activities Tracking and Evaluation (STATE) System.
State Cigarette Excise Tax Rates – 2004

CDC, Office on Smoking and Health. State Tobacco Activities Tracking and Evaluation (STATE) System.
State Cigarette Excise Tax Rates – 2005

CDC, Office on Smoking and Health. State Tobacco Activities Tracking and Evaluation (STATE) System.
State Cigarette Excise Tax Rates – 2006

CDC, Office on Smoking and Health. State Tobacco Activities Tracking and Evaluation (STATE) System.
State Cigarette Excise Tax Rates – 2007

CDC, Office on Smoking and Health. State Tobacco Activities Tracking and Evaluation (STATE) System.
State Cigarette Excise Tax Rates – 2008

CDC, Office on Smoking and Health. State Tobacco Activities Tracking and Evaluation (STATE) System.
State Cigarette Excise Tax Rates – 2009

CDC, Office on Smoking and Health. State Tobacco Activities Tracking and Evaluation (STATE) System.
State Cigarette Excise Tax Rates – 2010

CDC, Office on Smoking and Health. State Tobacco Activities Tracking and Evaluation (STATE) System.
State Tobacco Taxation

- **State taxes on other tobacco products**
  - All but PA tax other tobacco products
  - Mostly *ad valorem* taxes, but increasing movement towards specific taxes
    - Typically applied to wholesaler/distributor price
    - Highest taxes include:
      - Wisconsin – 100%; Washington - 95%
    - Lowest taxes include:
      - South Carolina – 5%; Tennessee 6.6%
    - Average about 35%
    - Generally below equivalent rate on cigarettes
State Alcohol Taxation

- Generally adopted following repeal of Prohibition
  - Follow 3-tier system with excises on licensed products
  - Some excises in control states; mark-ups as/more important

- Mostly specific taxes, but many states include *ad valorem component*
  - Different taxes for on- and off-premise sales

- Tend to tax beer lowest, spirits highest

- Considerable variation across states
  - Beer: $0.02 (WY) - $1.07 (AK); $0.19/gallon median
  - Wine: $0.20 (CA, TX) - $2.50 (AK); $0.67/gallon median
  - Spirits: $1.50 (DC, MD) - $12.80 (AK); $3.75/gallon median
Number of State Cigarette and Beer Excise Tax Increases, 2000-2009

- **Cigarettes**
- **Alcohol**

The chart shows the number of state cigarette and beer excise tax increases from 2000 to 2009. The data is represented by bars, with each bar indicating the number of tax increases for cigarettes and alcohol in each year from 2000 to 2009.
Decade of Last Change in Beer Excise Tax

Source: CSPI Factbook on State Beer Taxes
Local Taxation in the U.S.

- Many localities add additional cigarette tax
  - Typically a few cents/pack; some exceptions:
    - $1.50 in New York City
    - $2.68 in Chicago/Cook county
- Some local alcoholic beverage taxes
  - Generally modest

- Sales tax applied to tobacco products, alcoholic beverages in most states
  - Usually, but not always, applies to price inclusive of excise taxes
Average State and Federal Cigarette and Beer Taxes
Inflation Adjusted, 1973-2010

Source: Tax Burden on Tobacco (2010), Brewers Almanac (2010) and author’s calculations
Alcoholic Beverage & Tobacco Product Prices Relative to CPI, 1953-2010

Source: *Tax Burden on Tobacco*, 2011, and author’s calculations
Best Practices in Tobacco Taxation

• Simpler is better
• Favor specific taxes over *ad valorem* taxes
• Adjust specific taxes to outpace inflation, income growth
• Excise taxes account for ≥ 70% of retail prices
• Much more……
• Same applies to alcohol
Tobacco Taxes

• Federal excise taxes
  • Specific excise taxes on nearly all tobacco products
    • Cigarettes: $1.0066 per pack of 20 cigarettes
    • Roughly equivalent across products

• State excise taxes
  • Specific excise taxes on cigarettes in all states
  • All but PA tax other tobacco products
    • Often lower than cigarette tax rate
  • Most use ad valorem excise tax (based on value)
  • Small but growing number use specific taxes

- Increased frequently and by enough in most states to outpace inflation and income growth in recent years
Alcohol Taxes

- **Federal excise taxes**
  - Specific excise taxes on all beverages
  - *Different taxes on ethanol and by alcohol content*

- **State excise taxes**
  - *Mix of specific and ad valorem excise taxes*
  - *Different taxes on ethanol content*
  - Generally highest for spirits, lowest for beer
  - Differ within beverage type as well, based on alcohol content
  - *Different taxes based on where purchased*
    - Higher for on-premise vs. consumption than for off-premise
  - *Exceptions galore*
    - e.g. based on volume produced
    - *Implicit taxation through state monopoly control & price setting*

- **Stagnant over time; significantly eroded by inflation**
Impact of Tax and Price on Tobacco Use
Prices and Tobacco Use

- **Increases in tobacco product prices:**
  - Induce current users to try to quit
    - Many will be successful in long term
  - Keep former users from restarting
  - Prevent potential users from starting
    - Particularly effective in preventing transition from experimentation to regular use
  - Reduce consumption among those who continue to use
  - Lead to other changes in tobacco use behavior, including substitution to cheaper products or brands, changes in buying behavior, and compensation
Prices and Tobacco Use

- Increases in tobacco product prices:
  - 10% price increase reduces consumption by 4%
Cigarette Prices and Cigarette Sales, United States, 1970-2009

Source: Tax Burden on Tobacco, 2009, and author’s calculations
Prices and Tobacco Use

- Increases in tobacco product prices:
  - About half of impact on smoking prevalence
    - 10% price increase reduces prevalence by 2%
Cigarette and Adult Smoking Prevalence
US States & DC, 2009

\[ y = -0.0132x + 25.518 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.1729 \]

Source: BRFSS, *Tax Burden on Tobacco*, 2010, and author’s calculations
Cigarette Prices and Adult Smoking Prevalence, United States, 1970-2008

Source: NHIS, *Tax Burden on Tobacco*, 2009, and author’s calculations

Note: green data points for prevalence are interpolated assuming linear trend.
Prices and Tobacco Use

- Increases in tobacco product prices:
  - Prevalence reductions result of adult users quitting
    - 10% price increase leads about 10% of smokers to try to quit
    - About 1 in 5 successfully quit
Cigarette Prices and Cessation
US States & DC, 2009

Source: BRFSS, Tax Burden on Tobacco, 2010, and author’s calculations
Prices and Tobacco Use

- Increases in tobacco product prices:
  - Reductions in smoking intensity among those who continue to smoke
    - Smoke fewer days
    - Smoke fewer cigarettes on smoking days

Source: BRFSS, *Tax Burden on Tobacco*, 2010, and author’s calculations

\[ y = 0.0219x + 16.737 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.2306 \]
Prices and Tobacco Use

- **Increases in tobacco product prices:**
  - Prevent youth from taking up tobacco use
    - Youth 2-3 times more responsive to price than adults
      - Lower incomes, peer influences, shorter smoking histories, greater emphasis on present costs
    - Greatest impact in preventing youth from moving beyond experimentation into more regular smoking
Cigarette Prices and Youth Smoking Prevalence US States & DC, 2009

Source: YRBS, Tax Burden on Tobacco, 2010, and author’s calculations

\[ y = -0.0129x + 25.34 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.1721 \]
Cigarette Price and Youth Smoking Prevalence, United States, 1991-2008

Source: MTF, *Tax Burden on Tobacco*, 2009, and author’s calculations
Prices and Tobacco Use

- Increases in tobacco product prices:
  - Reduce death and disease caused by tobacco use
Taxes, Prices and Health: US, 1980-2005

Medscape

Cigarettes per adult per day

Lung cancer death rates per 100,000 (divided by 4): men age 35–44

Relative price

Source: Nat Rev Cancer © 2009 Nature Publishing Group
Impact of Tax and Price on Alcohol Use
Alcohol Prices and Drinking

Extensive econometric and other research shows that higher prices for alcoholic beverages significantly reduce drinking:

- 10 percent price increase would reduce:
  - Beer consumption by 1.7 to 4.6 percent
  - Wine consumption by 3.0 to 6.9 percent
  - Spirits consumption by 2.9 to 8.0 percent
  - Overall consumption by 4.4 percent
  - Heavy drinking by 2.8 percent
  - Generally larger effects on youth and young adults

Source: Wagenaar et al., 2009; Xu & Chaloupka, in press
Beer Taxes and Binge Drinking

Source: CSPI Factbook on State Beer Taxes
Extensive econometric and other research shows that higher prices for alcoholic beverages significantly reduce:

- Drinking and driving, traffic crashes, and motor-vehicle accident fatalities

- Deaths from liver cirrhosis, acute alcohol poisoning, alcohol-related cancers, cardiovascular diseases, and other health consequences of excessive drinking

- Violence, including spouse abuse, child abuse, and suicides

- Other consequences of drinking, including work-place accidents, teenage pregnancy, and incidence of sexually transmitted diseases
Earmarking Tobacco Tax Revenues for Tobacco Control
Comprehensive Programs

- General aims:
  - Prevent initiation of tobacco use among young
    - Increased prices, reduced access
    - Increased antitobacco messages, reduced protobacco
  - Promote cessation among young adults, adults
    - Better access to cessation services
    - Increased prices and strong smoke-free policies
    - Increased antitobacco messages, reduced protobacco
  - Eliminate exposure to secondhand smoke
    - Strong smoke-free policies
    - Strengthened anti-smoking norms
  - Identify and eliminate disparities
    - Intertwined with others; need for targeted approaches

Source: USDHHS, 2000; CDC 2007
Comprehensive Programs

Components of a comprehensive program:

- **State and community interventions**
  - Support for policy development and implementation
  - Efforts to strengthen norms against tobacco
  - Targeted efforts to reduce youth tobacco use, disparities

- **Health communication interventions**
  - Mass-media countermarketing campaigns
  - Efforts to replace tobacco industry sponsorship/promotion
  - Targeted messaging/delivery

- **Cessation interventions**
  - Array of policy, health system, and population-based measures

- **Surveillance and Evaluation**

- **Administration and Management**

Source: USDHHS, 2000; CDC 2007
Tobacco Industry is Outspending Prevention Efforts 24:1 — FY2011

State Tobacco Revenue (taxes and settlement funds) $25.3 billion

Tobacco Industry Marketing & Promotion Expenditures (2006) $12.5 billion

Total CDC-Recommended Spending Level $3.7 billion

State Tobacco Program Budgets $0.5 billion

Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids, Federal Trade Commission, American Heart Association, American Cancer Society, American Lung Association, SmokeLess States National Tobacco Policy Initiative
Program Funding

Source: Tobacco Free Kids, 2010
Comprehensive Programs

- Impact of state program funding
  - Increased funding associated with:
    - Reductions in overall cigarette sales
    - Lower youth smoking prevalence
    - Lower adult smoking prevalence
    - Increased interest in quitting, successful quitting
  - Much of impact results from large scale mass-media anti-smoking campaigns
State Tobacco Control Program Funding and Youth Smoking Prevalence

Year


Percent Current Smoking

Total Funding $Millions (FY10 dollars)
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Source: ImpacTeen Project, UIC; YRBS
Earmarking Alcohol Tax Revenues for Alcohol Control
Earmarked Alcohol Taxes

Source: CSPI Factbook on State Beer Taxes
Earmarked Alcohol Taxes

• Small share of tax revenues earmarked
• Fund variety of alcohol prevention, treatment and enforcement efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Drug and Alcohol Treatment Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Alcoholism Treatment Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Community Alcoholism and Intoxication Programs Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Alcoholism Treatment and Rehabilitation Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Treatment, rehabilitation, and prevention of alcoholism and chemical dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Alcohol Education, Rehabilitation and Enforcement Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Increase services for prevention and treatment of alcoholism and alcohol abuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Mental Health Alcoholism and Drug Services Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>To assist municipalities and counties in carrying out the provisions of the state’s 1973 Comprehensive Alcohol and Drug Treatment Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Programs or projects related to prevention, treatment, detection, and prosecution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• No research linking funding to reduced alcohol use, problems
  • research demonstrates cost-effectiveness of interventions that could be funded by earmarked taxes

Source: CSPI Factbook on State Beer Taxes
Popular Support for Tobacco & Alcohol Taxes
Popular with Voters

• Tobacco Excise Tax Increases:
  • Generally supported by voters
  • Supported by those likely to vote for either party
  • More support when framed in terms of impact on youth tobacco use
  • More support when some of new revenues are used to support tobacco control and/or other health-related activities
    • Comprehensive state tobacco control programs
    • Expanded public health insurance programs (e.g. S-CHIP; Arkansas)
  • Greater support than for other revenue sources
Earmarking for Youth Smoking Prevention Increases Support For Tobacco Tax Hikes

Would you favor or oppose an increase in the state tobacco tax?

- Favor: 52% (strong)
- Oppose: 27% (strong)
- No Opin: 14%

...as part of an effort to help reduce smoking, particularly among kids

- Favor: 69% (strong)
- Oppose: 24% (strong)
- No Opin: 7%

...if part of the money is used to fund programs to reduce tobacco use, particularly among kids

- Favor: 70% (strong)
- Oppose: 22% (strong)
- No Opin: 8%

RWJF, National survey of registered Voters - June 2002
The Mellman Group/Market Strategies; from McGoldrick 2010
Increasing The Tobacco Tax Supported as Way To Address State Budget Deficits

As you may have heard, virtually all states are currently facing severe budget deficits. I am going to read you a list of proposals that have been suggested as a way to address the state budget deficit. After I read each one, please tell me if you FAVOR or OPPOSE that proposal.

- **Increase the state tobacco tax**
- **Reduce funding for road maintenance and construction**
- **Increase the state sales tax**
- **Reduce funding for health care programs**
- **Reduce funding for state law enforcement**
- **Increase the state income tax**
- **Increase the state gasoline tax**
- **Reduce funding for education**
- **Reduce funding for Medicaid services**

---

**International Communications Research Survey**

January 2010; from McGoldrick 2010
A Majority Also Supports Increasing the Tax on Alcohol, and 4 in 10 Voters Strongly Favor the Increase

Some leaders in New York State are considering increasing the tax to 10 cents per drink on alcoholic beverages, including beer, wine and liquor, and using a portion of the money to prevent youth alcohol use and provide for the treatment of alcohol abuse. Based on what you know, would you support or oppose this new tax?
Industry Price Marketing
2006 Cigarette Marketing Expenditures by Category, United States

Source: author’s calculations from data reported in FTC (2009)
Cigarette Company Marketing Expenditures, by Category, 1975-2006

Source: author’s calculations from data reported in FTC (2009)
Price-Related Marketing: Price Discounts
Price-Related Marketing:
Retail Value Added - product
Price-Related Marketing: Coupons
Price-Related Marketing: Other Value Added
Tobacco Industry Efforts to Offset Tax Increase

On February 4th, 2009, the Federal Government enacted legislation to fund the expansion of the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) that increases excise taxes on cigarettes by 158%.

As a result, you will see the price of all cigarettes, including ours, increase in retail stores.

We know times are tough, so we'd like to help. We invite you to register at Marlboro.com to become eligible for cigarette coupons and special offers using this code: MAR1558

Thank You,

Philip Morris USA
Price-Related Cigarette Marketing and Tobacco Control

- Greater price-related marketing since the Master Settlement Agreement and related price increases (Ruel, et al., 2004; Loomis et al., 2006; FTC, 2007)
- More price-related marketing in states with greater spending on comprehensive tobacco control programs (Loomis, et al., 2006; Slater et al., 2001)
- Growing use of point-of-sale ads to highlight sales promotions (e.g. special price, special offer, cents off, reduced price, multi-pack special) (Feighery et al., 2008)
Sufficient Evidence that:

Tobacco industry price discounting strategies, price-reducing marketing activities, and lobbying efforts mitigate the impact of tobacco excise tax increases.
Restricting Marketing?

- Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act, 2009
  - Eliminates federal pre-emption of stronger state, local restrictions on tobacco company marketing
    - Allows limits on time, place or manner of tobacco company marketing
    - Comprehensive state and/or local marketing bans possible?
Minimum Pricing Policies

• 25 states with minimum pricing policies

• Typically mix of minimum markups to wholesale and retail prices
  ■ Median wholesale markup 4%
  ■ Median retail markup 8%

• 7 states prohibit use of price promotions in minimum price calculation

• Little impact on actual retail prices
  ■ Greater impact where promotions excluded

Sources: CDC, 2010; Feighery, et al., 2005
Common Oppositional Arguments

Myths & Facts
Impact on Revenues

By J Scott Moody, 4/2/08, from an AP story:

AUGUSTA — “A coalition of health groups today urged lawmakers to increase the cigarette tax by a $1 per pack, saying the increase will encourage more people to quit smoking and generate more money for health programs.

Translation: Fewer people smoking equals more cigarette tax revenue? Someone needs a math lesson.”
Cigarette Tax and Tax Revenues
Georgia, 1965-2009

Tax Revenues (Millions)

Tax per Pack

Tax Revenues (Millions)  Tax per Pack
Positive Effect of Tax Increase on Revenue Results from:

Low share of tax in price:

- state taxes account for about 25% of price
- total taxes account for less than half of price
- *Implies large tax increase has much smaller impact on price*

Less than proportionate decline in consumption:

- 10% price increase reduces consumption by 4%
Positive Effect of Tax Increase on Revenues

Example

- Price $4.00, State tax $1.00, Sales 500 million packs
  - Revenues: = $500 million
- Double tax to $2.00; price rises to $5.00
  - 100% tax increase; 25% price increase
  - 25% price increase reduces sales by 10%
  - new sales 450 million packs
  - 90% of original sales at double the tax increases revenues by 80%
- new revenues = $900 million
Positive Effect of Tax Increase on Revenues

Example – with significant tax avoidance

- Price $4.00, State tax $1.00, Sales 500 million packs
  - Revenues: = $500 million
- Double tax to $2.00; price rises to $5.00
  - 100% tax increase; 25% price increase
  - 25% price increase reduces sales by 20% (reduced consumption plus tax avoidance)
    - new sales 400 million packs
    - 80% of original sales at double the tax increases revenues by 60%
    - new revenues = $800 million
Sustainability of Cigarette Tax Revenues

Some suggest increases in revenues won’t be sustained over time

- Looked at significant state tax increases over past 20 years where increase was maintained for at least 5 years
- Separately for states with major tobacco control programs
Sustainability of Cigarette Tax Revenues

**Conclusion:**

- All significant state tax increases resulted in significant increases in state tax revenues

- Nominal increases in revenues sustained over time in states without tobacco control programs

- Nominal revenues decline in states with tobacco control programs, but are significantly higher than before tax increase

- Tobacco tax revenues more predictable than other revenues
Revenue Impact

**Increases in alcoholic beverage taxes:**

- **Increase government tax revenues**
  - Even smaller share of tax in price
  - Less than proportionate reductions in consumption in response to price increase
  - Broader tax base implies greater potential revenues

- Revenue increases sustained over time

- Changes in revenues gradual and predictable

Source: Brewers’ Almanac, 2009, and author’s calculations
RICHMOND, Va. — The tobacco industry is running a full-court press ahead of a federal scientific panel's meeting to discuss how to regulate menthol cigarettes, a still-growing part of the shrinking cigarette market.

The union representing nearly 4,000 tobacco workers sent a letter to the Food and Drug Administration committee examining the public health effects of the minty smokes, warning that a ban could lead to "severe jobs loss" and black market cigarettes.
Impact on Jobs

- Tobacco excise tax will lead to decreased consumption of tobacco products
  - Small loss of jobs in tobacco sector

- Money not spent on tobacco products will be spent on other goods and services
  - Gains in jobs in other sectors

- Increase in tax revenues will be spent by government
  - Additional job gains in other sectors

- Net increase in jobs in most states
Impact on Businesses

- More recent argument that higher taxes will harm convenience stores

- New analysis
  - Number of convenience stores (convenience only, gas stations, both), by state, 1997-2009
  - State cigarette tax rates and smoke-free air policies
  - Economic conditions (income, unemployment, gas prices)
  - Multivariate, fixed effects econometric models
Impact on Businesses

Results:

- Positive association between state cigarette tax and number of convenience stores
  - “overshifting” of cigarette tax in retail price
  - Substitution of spending on cigarettes to spending on other products
  - $1.00 tax increase associated with increase of 11 stores per million population
- No impact of smoke-free policies
- Robust to alternative specifications and empirical methods
A pack of premium cigarettes in New York City now costs $7 or $8; prices would rise to above $9. Opponents of the tax increase argue that higher prices would drive smokers to seek ways to evade the law and purchase cheaper cigarettes from smugglers or in neighboring states, blunting potential revenue gains for the state. "It's a black market gold mine," a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, E.J. McMahon, said of the proposed tax.

Source, ITC project, US survey, Waves 1-5
Tax Avoidance & Evasion Do NOT Eliminate Health Impact of Higher Taxes

Cigarette Prices and Adult Prevalence, New York, 1995-2007

Source: Tax Burden on Tobacco, 2008 and BRFSS
Tax Avoidance & Evasion Do NOT Eliminate Revenue Impact of Higher Taxes

Cook County Cigarette Tax and Tax Revenues - FY01-FY06

- Chicago tax rises from 16 to 48 cents
- Chicago tax up to 68 cents, 1/1/06
- Chicago smoking ban, 1/16/06

Fiscal Year: 2001-2006

Tax per Pack: $0.15 to $1.75

Tax Revenues: $25,000,000 to $225,000,000

Chicago tax rises from 16 to 48 cents, 1/1/06
Chicago tax up to 68 cents, 1/1/06
Chicago smoking ban, 1/16/06
Combating Tax Evasion

- High-tech tax stamps
- Licensing of all involved in distribution and sale
- Strong enforcement
- Swift, severe penalties
- Focus on large scale, criminal activity
- Coordinated efforts
  - NAAG efforts targeting Internet
  - Agreements with tribes
Impact on the Poor

July 23, 2010 – San Francisco Examiner

• “Democrats are relying more heavily in their midterm 2010 election message that Republicans care nothing about the poor. Conveniently absent from this analysis is Republican opposition to President Barack Obama’s cigarette tax increase...... While higher cigarette taxes do discourage smoking, they are highly regressive. Analyzing a slightly less severe proposal in 2007, the Tax Foundation noted that ‘no other tax hurts the poor more than the cigarette tax.’” Peyton R. Miller, special to the Examiner.
Impact on the Poor

- Concerns about the regressivity of higher tobacco taxes
  
  - Tobacco taxes are regressive, but tax increases can be progressive
    
    - Greater price sensitivity of poor – relatively large reductions in tobacco use among lowest income populations, small reductions among higher income populations
    
    - Health benefits that result from tax increase are progressive
Who Pays & Who Benefits
Impact of Federal Tax Increase, U.S., 2009

Source: Chaloupka et al., in progress; assumes higher income smokers smoke more expensive brands
Impact on the Poor

- Need to consider overall fiscal system
  - Key issue with tobacco taxes is what’s done with the revenues generated by the tax
  - Greater public support for tobacco tax increases when revenues are used for tobacco control and/or other health programs
  - Net financial impact on low income households can be positive when taxes are used to support programs targeting the poor
  - Concerns about regressivity offset by use of revenues for programs directed to poor
Taxation and Obesity?
Selected Food Price & Adult Weight Trends
1961-2009, Inflation Adjusted

Selected Food Price & Youth Weight Trends
1971-2009, Inflation Adjusted

Selected Food Price & Adult Weight Trends
1961-2009, Inflation Adjusted

Selected Food Price & Youth Weight Trends
1971-2009, Inflation Adjusted

Selected Food Price & Adult Weight Trends

1995-2009, Inflation Adjusted

Source: BLS; BRFSS
Selected Food Price & Youth Weight Trends
1995-2009, Inflation Adjusted

Source: BLS; YRBS
Selected Food Price & Adult Weight Trends
1995-2009, Inflation Adjusted

Source: BLS; BRFSS
Selected Food Price & Youth Weight Trends
1995-2009, Inflation Adjusted

Source: BLS; YRBS
Extensive economic research on the impact of food and beverage prices on consumption of various products; estimates suggest 10% own-price increase would reduce:

- Cereal consumption by 5.2%
- Fruit consumption by 7.0%
- Vegetable consumption by 5.9%
- Soft drink consumption by 7.8%
- Sweets consumption by 3.5%
- Food away from home consumption by 8.1%

Source: Andreyeva, et al., 2010
Food Prices and Weight Outcomes

Relatively limited research to date on impact of food and beverage prices and weight outcomes:

- Higher prices for sugary foods would significantly reduce prevalence of overweight and obesity among adults (Miljkovic et al., 2008)

- 10% increase in fast food prices would reduce prevalence of adolescent obesity by almost 6% (Powell, et al., 2007)

- Weight outcomes among low-income populations and those with higher BMI more responsive to prices
  - BMI of kids in families below poverty level about 50% more responsive to F&V prices
  - BMI for kids at unhealthy weight levels 39% more responsive to F&V prices
  - BMI of adolescents at unhealthy weight levels about 4 times more responsive to F&V and fast food prices.

Source: Powell and Chaloupka, 2009; Chaloupka et al., 2009
Emerging evidence on prices suggests that significant changes in relative prices of healthy and unhealthy foods could reduce BMI and likelihood of obesity

- Increases in prices of less healthy foods and beverages
  - taxes
  - elimination of corn subsidies
  - disallow purchases under food assistance programs

- Reductions in prices of more healthy foods and beverages
  - subsidies
  - expanded or favored treatment under food assistance programs

Source: Powell and Chaloupka, 2009; Chaloupka et al., 2009
Sugar Sweetened Beverage Taxes
Public Health Rationale for SSB Taxes

- **Link to obesity**
  - Several meta-analyses conclude that increased SSB consumption causes increased weight, obesity
  - Increased calories from SSBs not offset by reductions in calories from other sources

- **Other health consequences**
  - type 2 diabetes, lower bone density, dental problems, headaches, anxiety and sleep disorders
Soda Consumption & Obesity
California Counties, 2005

Source: Babey, et al., 2009 and authors' calculations.

\[ y = 16.44\ln(x) + 6.1142 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.6656 \]
Economic Rationale for SSB Taxes

In addition to public health rationale, government intervention warranted when ‘market failures’ exist

- ‘Negative Externalities’
  - *Situation where consumer or producer does not bear the full cost of their consumption or production*
  - With SSBs, clearest negative externality is the significant health care costs paid for by public health insurance programs
    - Estimated at $147 billion in 2006 (Finkelstein, et al., 2009)
    - 9.1% of overall health care spending in US
    - About half paid for through Medicaid and Medicare
    - Rising rapidly
  - Additional costs borne by employers
Economic Rationale for SSB Taxes

• ‘Imperfect Information’
  • *Consumers do not fully understand the costs and benefits of their consumption decisions*
    • Less than complete information about the caloric content of beverages consumed
    • Imperfect understanding about impact of consumption on weight, health
    • Distorted by pervasive marketing
    • Compounded by early age at which consumption begins and habit formation

• ‘Time Inconsistent Preferences’
  • *Tradeoffs between immediate gratification and long-term impact*
    • Leads many to later regret consumption choices
    • Particularly true for younger, less educated populations who tend to have greater preference for the present
Economic Rationale for SSB Taxes

• ‘First-Best’ Interventions
  • *Those that deal directly with the market failure at issue*
    • Menu-labeling to provide information on caloric content
    • School-based and mass-media education efforts to inform about the role of SSB consumption in weight outcomes, health consequences
    • Often costly and at times ineffective in reaching most at-risk populations

• ‘Second-Best’ Interventions
  • *Blunter instruments that address market failure but have broader impact*
    • Taxes/subsidies that alter the relative prices of healthier, less healthy options can target financial externalities
    • Influence prices for all consumers, not just those who generate the external costs
Carbonated Beverage Prices & Youth Obesity
1995-2009, Inflation Adjusted

Source: BLS; YRBS
Current SSB Taxation
Sales Taxes on Selected Beverages, All States, July 1, 2010

Mean State Sales Tax (All States=5.04%)

Mean State Food Tax (All States=1.02%)

Note: Three states also impose a mandatory statewide local tax that is not reflected in the above data: CA (1%), UT (1.25%), VA (1%).
## Sales Taxes on Selected Beverages, Taxing States, July 1, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drink Type</th>
<th># States</th>
<th>Sales Tax Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soda</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diet Soda</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;50% Juice</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diet Sod-like Bev.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isotonic Bevs.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetened Tea</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-99% Juice</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% Juice</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Three states also impose a mandatory statewide local tax that is not reflected in the above data: CA (1%), UT (1.25%), VA (1%).
## Sales taxes applied to vending machines sales

**Selected Beverages, July 1, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beverage</th>
<th>Mean all states (%)</th>
<th>Max (%)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean taxing states (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soda</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diet Soda</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 50% fruit juice</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isotonic beverages</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetened teas (bottle/can)</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottled water</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;51% fruit juice, but &lt; 100% fruit juice</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% fruit juice</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State Sales Taxes on Regular and Diet Soda
July 1, 2010

Note: Three states also impose a mandatory statewide local tax that is not reflected in the above data: CA (1%), UT (1.25%), VA (1%).
SSB Taxes & Prices

Consumption and Weight
Existing evidence

- Growing literature demonstrating the higher prices for SSBs lead to reductions in SSB consumption
- Andreyeva, et al.’s (2010) comprehensive review concluded that price elasticity of soft drink consumption was -0.78
  - Price elasticity: % change in consumption resulting from 1% price change
  - 10% increase in soft drink prices would reduce consumption by nearly 8%
- Limited, mixed evidence on impact of taxes/prices on weight outcomes
Bridging the Gap Research

- Empirically examine associations between state-level soda taxes and consumption and weight outcomes, using nationally representative data sets including:
  - A.C. Nielsen Homescan Data
  - Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten Cohort (ECLS-K)
  - Monitoring the Future (MTF)
  - National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 (NLSY97)
Objective

To examine the association of soda taxes with household soda purchases

Data Description

Cross-section of household purchase information based on scanner data from a variety of stores, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Q 2007

Household demographic data

Final sample includes 66,211 non-military households

Outcome variable: soda volume in ounces of carbonated beverages purchased per household over the sample period (m=566 ounces \(\sim\) 2 cases of 12 oz cans)

Control variables: household income, size, race, educational attainment, presence of children/age, female head of household employment status, and census regions

AC Nielsen HomeScan
## Preliminary Results

### OLS Regression Results: Soda Volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disfavored Soda Tax Amount</th>
<th>All Households</th>
<th>Households with Children</th>
<th>Households without Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-9.352**</td>
<td>-10.983**</td>
<td>-8.417**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy Simulations

- Results imply small tax elasticities for purchases of -0.06.

- If all states increased sales taxes to the maximum tax rate of 7% (an increase of 60.6% from the current sample mean of 4.36%), household purchases of regular soda are estimated to be 3.6% lower.

- Consider the imposition of a new 20% tax → assuming constant elasticity, household regular soda purchases are estimated to be 33% lower.
  - The extent to which this applies to all regular soda consumption depends on constant elasticity noted above, and whether regular soda consumed away-from-home is similarly price/tax responsive.
ECLS-K

• **Objective**
  
  To examine association between soda taxes, consumption and weight of children

• **Data Description**

  • Nationally representative panel of elementary school students.
  
  • Food consumption 5th grade; measured height and weight
  
  • Final sample: 7,414 children who reported their food consumption and 7,300 children for which height and weight information exists

  • **Outcome variables**: soda consumption in last week (m=6), soda purchases at school (m=0.4), and weight change 3rd to 5th grade (m=1.9)
  
  • **Control variables**: age in months, race/ethnicity, family income, mother’s education level, physical activity, TV watching, parent-child interactions.
### Associations by Sub-populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Total Consumption</th>
<th>School Consumption</th>
<th>BMI Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Soda Tax Amount</td>
<td>Higher Soda Tax Indicator</td>
<td>Higher Soda Tax Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Sample</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Risk of Overweight</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income</td>
<td>-0.142*</td>
<td>-0.811</td>
<td>-0.039**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>-0.767</td>
<td>-0.103**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9+ Hrs TV</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>-0.376</td>
<td>-0.029**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sturm, Powell, Chriqui, and Chaloupka, *Health Affairs*, 2010
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Policy Simulations

- Assuming a constant elasticity, an 18% differential soda tax would correspond to a -0.23 BMI units in the change in BMI between 3rd and 5th grade, or a 20% reduction in the excess BMI gain.
Objective

To examine association of soda taxes with youths’ BMI using cross-sectional and longitudinal models.

Data Description


Estimation sample includes 11,900 person-year observations living at home.

Information on parental characteristics available from parental questionnaire and annual household roster data.

Outcome variable: weight status: BMI and overweight prevalence.

Control variables: age, gender, race, ethnicity, income, mother’s education, mother’s employment status.

Neighborhood controls: median household income.
## Preliminary Regressions Results - Cross Sectional Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>Overweight</td>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>Overweight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0&lt;tax≤4%</td>
<td>0.0552</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>-0.0337</td>
<td>-0.0055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%&lt;tax≤5%</td>
<td>0.1339</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>-0.1457</td>
<td>-0.0160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%&lt;tax≤6%</td>
<td>-0.0797</td>
<td>-0.0105</td>
<td>0.2203</td>
<td>0.1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tax&gt;6%</td>
<td>-0.0548</td>
<td>-0.0053</td>
<td>0.5410*</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0&lt;tax≤4%</td>
<td>-0.5963</td>
<td>-0.0371*</td>
<td>-0.5030</td>
<td>-0.0556**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%&lt;tax≤5%</td>
<td>0.2401</td>
<td>-0.0094</td>
<td>-0.2245</td>
<td>-0.0073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%&lt;tax≤6%</td>
<td>-0.3359</td>
<td>-0.0436**</td>
<td>-0.1683</td>
<td>-0.0470**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tax&gt;6%</td>
<td>-0.4483</td>
<td>-0.0369*</td>
<td>-0.4099</td>
<td>-0.0435**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Powell, et al., in progress
## Preliminary Regressions Results - Longitudinal Analysis (FE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>Overweight</td>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>Overweight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0&lt;tax\leq4%</td>
<td>-0.7805**</td>
<td>-0.0078</td>
<td>-0.4054***</td>
<td>-0.0503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%&lt;tax\leq5%</td>
<td>-0.7938**</td>
<td>-0.0153</td>
<td>-0.0942</td>
<td>-0.0369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%&lt;tax\leq6%</td>
<td>-0.2033</td>
<td>0.0308*</td>
<td>-0.2297</td>
<td>-0.0591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tax&gt;6%</td>
<td>-0.5647</td>
<td>0.0667*</td>
<td>0.4693</td>
<td>-0.0212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0&lt;tax\leq4%</td>
<td>-2.1950***</td>
<td>-0.0628***</td>
<td>-1.0196***</td>
<td>-0.0922***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%&lt;tax\leq5%</td>
<td>-2.3600***</td>
<td>-0.0737**</td>
<td>-0.5907*</td>
<td>-0.0732***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%&lt;tax\leq6%</td>
<td>-1.1818</td>
<td>-0.0162</td>
<td>-1.5229***</td>
<td>-0.0879***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tax&gt;6%</td>
<td>-0.2139</td>
<td>0.0847</td>
<td>0.5069</td>
<td>-0.0969**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Powell et al., *in progress*, 2010
Policy Implications of Empirical Results

• Generally very small associations between soda taxes and consumption or weight outcomes based on the existing low tax rates which range up to just 7% in the study samples.

• Larger associations for populations at greater risk for obesity.

• Substantial increases in soda tax rates may have some measureable effects on outcomes and even greater effects at the population level.
SSB Tax Structure
# Alternative SSB Tax Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Specific Tax/Fee on Quantity of Sugar or Bev. Volume</th>
<th>Ad Valorem (% of price)</th>
<th>Upon Whom Tax Imposed</th>
<th>Where Tax Presented to Consumer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Sales (Excise) Taxes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax all SSBs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Manufacturer Distributor Wholesaler Retailer</td>
<td>Shelf-price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax all Beverages (or selected including non-SSBs)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Manufacturer Distributor Wholesaler Retailer</td>
<td>Shelf-price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sales Taxes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax all SSBs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer</td>
<td>Point of purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax all/selected Beverages</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer</td>
<td>Point of purchase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SSB Tax Structure**

**Examples: 20 oz. soda at $1/bottle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Tax</th>
<th>Taxable Beverage(s)</th>
<th>Tax Approach</th>
<th>Where Tax Presented to Consumer</th>
<th>Tax Amount</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excise</td>
<td>All SSB bottles/syrups/powders</td>
<td>Excise tax -- $0.01 per gram* sugar</td>
<td>Shelf price</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
<td>$1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excise</td>
<td>All SSB and ASB bottles/syrups/powders</td>
<td>Ad valorem – 20% of Retail price</td>
<td>Shelf price</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>$1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales tax</td>
<td>All SSBs and ASBs</td>
<td>Ad valorem – 6% of price</td>
<td>Check out</td>
<td>$0.06</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*According to the USDA National Nutrient database, there are 55.08 grams of sugar per 20 oz. bottle of sugar-sweetened soda*
Alternative SSB Tax Structures

- From a public health perspective, specific excise tax preferable to sales tax or ad valorem excise tax for several reasons:
  - More apparent to consumer
  - Easier administratively
  - Reduces incentives for switching to cheaper brands, larger quantities
  - Revenues more stable, not subject to industry price manipulation
  - Greater impact on consumption; more likely impact on weight outcomes
  - Disadvantage: need to be adjusted for inflation
SSB Taxation & Revenues

- Revenue generating potential of tax is considerable
  - SSB Tax calculator at:
  - Tax of one cent per ounce could generate:
    - $14.9 billion nationally if on SSBs only
    - $24.0 billion if diet included
  - Tax of two cents per ounce:
    - $21.0 billion nationally, SSBs only
    - $39.0 billion if diet included
  - Earmarking tax revenues for obesity prevention efforts would add to impact of tax
Voters Prefer Taxes on Alcohol and Sugar-Sweetened Beverages over Cuts in Government Services by Margins of More than 3 to 1

- As you may know, New York state faces a $14 billion budget shortfall. Let me read you some statements about possible new taxes to generate revenue and proposed cut-backs to deal with this crisis. Please tell me which statement comes closer to your view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Sugar-Sweetened Beverages</th>
<th>Cut Govt Services &amp; Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase Alcohol Tax</th>
<th>Cut Govt Services &amp; Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would prefer to tax sugar-sweetened beverages. / I would prefer to cut government services and programs.

I would prefer to increase the alcohol tax. / I would prefer to cut government services and programs.
Voters Prefer Taxes on Alcohol and Sugar-Sweetened Beverages over Increased Property or Sales Taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Property Tax</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweetened Beverages</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As you may know, New York state faces a $14 billion budget shortfall. Let me read you some statements about possible new taxes to generate revenue and proposed cut-backs to deal with this crisis. Please tell me which statement comes closer to your view.*
Counterarguments

- Same as have been raised against tobacco and alcohol taxes
  - Employment impact
    - Ongoing research assessing impact of reduced SSB consumption on employment
  - Impact on the poor
  - Tax avoidance/evasion
For more information:
http://www.bridgingthegapresearch.org/research/sodasnack_taxes/

Soda/Snack Taxes
This page highlights our research around state-level taxes on snack foods, soda, and other sweetened beverages. To see products from other BTG research activities, click on the "Research" tab above.

Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Taxes and Public Health: Research Brief
This 2009 research brief provides an overview of the current research on the health impacts of sugar-sweetened beverage (SSB) consumption, how food and beverage prices affect consumption and related weight outcomes, and the potential impact of both large and small SSB taxes.

State Sales Taxes on Soda and Snack Foods
This file contains annual data on sales tax rates for each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia for sodas and selected snack products sold...
Summary
Summary

- Tobacco tax increases have significantly reduced tobacco use in the US

- Similar evidence for effectiveness of higher alcoholic beverage taxes to reduce alcohol use and its consequences
  - Few governments have done so

- Potential for using excise taxes on sugar-sweetened beverages to curb SSB consumption and reduce obesity
Summary

- Taxes generate significant revenues and revenues increase when tax increases
  - Added reductions in use/consequences when revenues earmarked for prevention/control efforts

- Generally more public support than for other taxes or budget cuts
  - Particularly when revenues earmarked for prevention and control

- Adverse economic impact false or overstated
For more information:

www.bridgingthegapresearch.org
www.impacteen.org
fjc@uic.edu