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## Background
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Daily SSB Consumption among Children \& Adolescents, 1999-2008


Source: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) 1999-2008, author's own calculations
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## Daily U.S. Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Consumption Calories, by Age 2007-2008
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## Pricing: Evidence

Mean Estimates of Price Elasticity of Demand for SSBs U.S. studies from 2007-2012

| Beverage Categories | Mean Price Elasticity <br> Estimate |
| :--- | :---: |
| SSBs Overalla | -1.21 |
| SSBs | -1.08 |
| Regular Carbonated Soft Drinks | -1.25 |
| Sports Drinks | -2.44 |
| Fruit Drinks | -1.41 |
| Soft Drinks (reg+diet) | -0.86 |

Notes: ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Overall mean (weighted mean based on SSB consumption shares) SSB elasticity estimate based on the estimates from the aggregated SSB category and the estimates from the various disaggregated (regular carbonated soda, sports drinks, and fruit drinks) categories within the beverage demand system.

## Data and Methods
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## Individual Level Data

## Monitoring the Future Study

- Study began in 1975
- Nationally representative sample of $8^{\text {th }}, 10^{\text {th }}$ and $12^{\text {th }}$ grade students
- Starting in 2010, study asks students about their soda consumption:
- How many (if any) 12-ounce cans or bottles (or the equivalent) of regular (non-diet) soft drinks do you drink per day, on average?
- None, Less than 1, One, Two, Three, Four, Five or six, 7 or more


## BTG - Community Obesity Measures Study

- Collection of local policy and environmental data in a national sample of catchment areas around MTF schools
- Systematic observation by trained data collectors
$>$ Food stores
> Fast food restaurants
> Parks
> Physical activity facilities
> Street segments
- Community sample defined by the catchment areas for schools participating in the University of Michigan's Monitoring the Future study
- Data collected in 154 communities in 2010, 157 communities in 2011, and 160 communities in 2012.
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## BTG-COMP Food Store Sample

- Food store sampling frame developed from two commercial sources
> Dun \& Bradstreet
> InfoUSA
- Phone screening conducted to confirm business name, location, and eligibility/classification
- Sampling frame supplemented with food store outlets discovered in the field
- Goals for \# of field-discovered businesses set based on sensitivity rates from a field validation study


## Food Store Observation Form

- Types of stores
- Store features/amenities
- Availability of food/beverage items
- Pricing of food/beverage items
- Marketing and signage


| F．BEVERAGES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IFF1 = NO, } \\ & \text { SKIP F2-F6 } \end{aligned}$ | F1． <br> AVAILABLE |  | F2．BRAND If None，SKIP F3－F6 |  | F3． QTY | F4．PACKAGE SIZE <br> If None，SKIP F5－F6 |  | F5．CURRENT PRICE If 77.77 （DK），SKIP F6 | F6．PRICE TYPE |  |
|  |  | No | YES |  |  | REG |  |  | SPECIAL |
|  | a．Orange Juice， 100\％juice | $\square$ 。 | $\square \square_{1}$ | Minute Maid | $\square{ }^{1}$ |  |  | 59－6402 |  | $\square 1$ | \＄ | $\square{ }^{1}$ | $\square{ }^{2}$ |
|  |  |  |  | Tropicana | $\square \square^{2}$ |  | 89 oz | $\square \square_{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | None of above | －8 |  | None of above | 口 ${ }^{8}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | b．Juice Drink， ＜50\％juice | $\square$－ | $\square 1$ | Minute Maid | $\begin{aligned} & \square_{1} \\ & \square_{2} \\ & \square_{8} \end{aligned}$ |  | 59－6402 | $\square^{1}$ | \＄ | $\square{ }^{1}$ | $\square \square^{2}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Tropicana |  |  | 12802 | $\square \square^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | None of above |  |  | None of above | $\square 8$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | c．Juice Box／Pouch $\leq 10 \%$ juice | $\square 0$ | $\square 1$ | Hi－C | $\square 1$ |  | Box of 10 | $\square{ }^{1}$ | \＄ | $\square{ }^{1}$ | $\square{ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capri Sun | $\square \square^{2}$ |  | Case of 40 | $\square \square^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | None of above | $\square^{8}$ |  | None of above | 口8 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | d．Soda，regular | $\square$－ | $\square 1$ | Coca－Cola | $\begin{aligned} & \square_{1} \\ & \square_{2} \\ & \square_{8} \end{aligned}$ |  | 2 Liter | $\square{ }^{1}$ |  | $\square{ }^{1}$ | $\square{ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pepsi |  |  | 12 can case | $\square \square_{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | None of above |  |  | None of above | $\square 8$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | e．Soda，diet | $\square 0$ | $\square 1$ | Coca－Cola | $\begin{aligned} & \square_{1} \\ & \square_{2} \\ & \square_{8} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 2 Liter | $\square{ }^{1}$ |  | $\square{ }^{1}$ | $\square{ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pepsi |  |  | 12 can case | $\square^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | None of above |  |  | None of above | $\square 8$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | f．Soda，least expensive regular cola | If NO SOdA AVAILABLE，SKIP ROW |  |  |  |  | 2 Liter | $\square{ }^{1}$ |  | $\square 1$ | $\square \square^{2}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 can case | $\square \square^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None of above | $\square 8$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | g．Orange Juice， 100\％juice | $\square$－ | $\square^{1}$ | Minute Maid | $\square 1$ |  | 15.202 | $\square{ }^{1}$ | \＄ | $\square 1$ | $\square{ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Tropicana | $\square^{2}$ |  | 1202 | $\square{ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | None of above | 口8 |  | None of above | $\square 8$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | h．Juice Drink， ＜50\％juice | $\square 0$ | $\square 1$ | Minute Maid | $\begin{aligned} & \square_{1} \\ & \square_{2} \\ & \square_{8} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 15.202 | $\square^{1}$ | \＄ | $\square{ }^{1}$ | $\square{ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Tropicana |  |  | 1202 | $\square^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | None of above |  |  | None of above | 口 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | i．Soda，regular | $\square 0$ | $\square 1$ | Coca－Cola | $\begin{aligned} & \square_{1}^{1} \\ & \square^{2} \\ & \square^{8} \end{aligned}$ |  | 2002 | $\square 1$ | \＄ $\qquad$ Asked？$\square$ n $\square$ | $\square{ }^{1}$ | $\square{ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pepsi |  |  | 1202 | $\square \square^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | None of above |  |  | None of above | $\square 8$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | j．Soda，diet | $\square 0$ | $\square^{1}$ | Coca－Cola | $\begin{aligned} & \square_{1} \\ & \square_{2} \\ & \square_{8} \end{aligned}$ |  | 20 oz | $\square{ }^{1}$ | \＄ $\qquad$ ． $\qquad$ | $\square^{1}$ | $\square{ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pepsi |  |  | 12 Oz | $\square \square^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | None of above |  |  | None of above | $\square 8$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | k．Energy Drink， regular | $\square 0$ | $\square 1$ | Red Bull | $\square 1$ |  | 8 －8．5 oz | $\square{ }^{1}$ | \＄ | $\square 1$ | $\square{ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Monster | $\square^{2}$ |  | 1602 | $\square{ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Rockstar | $\square \square^{3}$ |  | None of above | $\square 8$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | None of above | －8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I．Isotonic Sports Drink，regular | $\square 0$ | $\square 1$ | Gatorade | $\square \square^{1}$ |  | 20 oz | $\square{ }^{1}$ |  | $\square 1$ | $\square{ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Powerade | $\square^{2}$ |  | 3202 | $\square_{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | None of above | $\square 8$ |  | None of above | $\square 8$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | m．Enhanced Water， regular | $\square 0$ | $\square 1$ | Vitamin Water | $\square 1$ |  | 20 oz | $\square{ }^{1}$ |  | $\square{ }^{1}$ | $\square{ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Sobe Life | $\square^{2}$ |  | 16－17 oz | $\square \square^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Propel | $\square^{\square}$ |  | None of above | －8 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | None of above | 口8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | n．Bottled Water， plain | $\square$－ | $\square 1$ | Dasani | $\square{ }^{1}$ |  | 2002 | $\square{ }^{1}$ | \$ | $\square 1$ | $\square \square_{2}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Aquafina | $\square \square^{2}$ |  | 2402 | $\square \square^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | None of above | $\square 8$ |  | None of above | 口8 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Page 5 of 7 | Copyright © 2012 The Board of Trustees of the University of illinois |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9835584350 |  |  |  |
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## Key Exposure Measures

- Community exposure measures were weighted mean catchmentlevel food store observations.
- Key measures included:
- Price of regular individual size (20 ounces) soda (i.e. Coca-cola) in \$
- Number of regular soda ads found on building exterior and property.


## Estimation Models

- Regular Soda Consumption = f (price/ads, gender, grade, race, student income, student hours of work, mother hours of work, mother education, region, neighborhood income, year indicators)
- Estimations Models:

1. Ordinary least squares (OLS) consumption models
2. Probit consumption prevalence models
3. Probit heavy consumption prevalence models

- Estimation of partially- and fully-adjusted models and by subpopulations.
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## Results
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## Summary Statistics: Soda Consumption Outcomes

|  | Number of Drinks Per Day | Consumption Prevalence | Heavy Consumption Prevalence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Full Sample ( $\mathrm{n}=12,357$ ) | 1.17 | 73.5\% | 27.6\% |
| Female ( $\mathrm{n}=6,311$ ) | 1.02 | 69.4\% | 23.3\% |
| Male ( $\mathrm{n}=6,046$ ) | 1.33 | 77.8\% | 32.1\% |
| $8^{\text {th }}$ Grade ( $\mathrm{n}=5,129$ ) | 1.29 | 77.5\% | 30.9\% |
| $10^{\text {th }}$ Grade ( $\mathrm{n}=5,118$ ) | 1.10 | 71.3\% | 26.0\% |
| $12^{\text {th }}$ Grade ( $\mathrm{n}=2,110$ ) | 1.06 | 70.4\% | 24.6\% |
| White ( $\mathrm{n}=7,679$ ) | 1.10 | 72.6\% | 25.5\% |
| Black ( $\mathrm{n}=1,222$ ) | 1.58 | 78.7\% | 42.2\% |
| Hispanic ( $\mathrm{n}=1,749$ ) | 1.23 | 75.4\% | 29.8\% |
| Other race ( $\mathrm{n}=1,707$ ) | 1.10 | 71.8\% | 24.3\% |
| Mother no college ( $n=3,004$ ) | 1.48 | 78.7\% | 37.0\% |
| Mother some college or more ( $n=9,353$ ) | 1.06 | 71.8\% | 24.4\% |
| Live with one parents ( $\mathrm{n}=2,838$ ) | 1.38 | 75.2\% | 34.9\% |
| Live with both parent ( $\mathrm{n}=9,519$ ) | 1.10 | 73.0\% | 25.4\% |
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## Soda Consumption (Cans/day), by Year
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## Soda and Heavy Soda Consumption Prevalence, by Year
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Summary Statistics: Key Exposure and Selected Control Variables

|  |  | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Variables of Interest |  |
|  | Price of 20oz regular soda (\$) | 1.56 |
|  | Regular Soda Exterior <br> Beverage Ads | 1.02 |
|  | Selected Control Variables |  |
|  | Age (y) | 15.22 |
|  | White (\%) | 62.34 |
|  | Black (\%) | 10.10 |
|  | Hispanic (\%) | 14.26 |
|  | Other race (\%) | 13.30 |
|  | Mother some college or more (\%) | 74.68 |
|  | Live with both parents (\%) | 76.41 |
|  | Youth income (\$/wk) | 38.72 |
|  | Youth hours worked per week | 3.40 |
|  | Mother PT job (\%) | 17.19 |
|  | Mother FT job (\%) | 62.88 |

## Regression Results for Price on Consumption

|  | Number of Drinks Per Day | Consumption Prevalence | Heavy Consumption Prevalence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable of Interest |  |  |  |
| Price of $200 z$ regular soda | $\begin{aligned} & -0.329^{\star *} \\ & {[-0.44]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.114^{\star *} \\ & {[-0.24]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.139^{* *} \\ {[-0.84]} \end{gathered}$ |
| Selected Control Variables |  |  |  |
| Male | 0.273*** | $0.081^{* * *}$ | 0.085*** |
| $10^{\text {th }}$ Grade | -0.183*** | -0.061*** | $-0.044^{* * *}$ |
| $12^{\text {th }}$ Grade | -0.373*** | -0.085*** | -0.089*** |
| Black | $0.221^{* * *}$ | 0.027* | $0.085^{* * *}$ |
| Hispanic | 0.027 | 0.011 | 0.017 |
| Other race | 0.053 | 0.004 | 0.006 |
| Median Household Income | -0.072*** | -0.011*** | $-0.027^{* * *}$ |
| Mother Some College or More | -0.294*** | -0.053*** | -0.087*** |
| ${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<0.10,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{* * * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01$; [Elasticity] <br> bridging the gap |  |  |  |

## Price Elasticity of Consumption, Alternative Model Specifications

|  | Partially- <br> Adjusted <br> Model 1 | Partially- <br> Adjusted <br> Model 2 | Fully- <br> Adjusted <br> Model |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Drinks Per Day | $-1.77^{* * *}$ | $-0.87^{* * *}$ | $-0.44^{* *}$ |
| Consumption Prevalence | $-0.57^{* * *}$ | $-0.33^{\star * *}$ | $-0.24^{* *}$ |
| Heavy Consumption Prevalence | $-2.72^{* * *}$ | $-1.48^{* * *}$ | $-0.84^{* *}$ |

$$
{ }^{*} p<0.10,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01
$$

## Price Elasticity of Consumption, by subpopulations

|  | Number of Drinks Per Day | Consumption Prevalence | Heavy Consumption Prevalence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Full Sample | -0.44** | -0.24 ** | -0.84** |
| By Gender |  |  |  |
| Female | -0.67** | -0.47*** | -0.65 |
| Male | -0.24 | 0.00 | -0.98** |
| By Grade |  |  |  |
| Middle School | -0.10 | -0.21* | -0.37 |
| High School | -0.77** | -0.30** | -1.34** |
| By Race |  |  |  |
| White | -0.55** | $-0.28{ }^{\text {** }}$ | -0.98** |
| Black | -0.40 | 0.11 | -1.33* |
| Hispanic | -0.24 | -0.22 | -0.76 |
| By Mother's Education |  |  |  |
| Mother no college | -0.38 | -0.12 | -0.59 |
| Mother some college or more | -0.47** | -0.30** | -1.02*** |
| bridging the gap |  | ${ }^{*} p<0.10,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$ |  |

## Regression Results for Regular Soda Advertisements on Consumption

|  | Number of <br> Drinks Per <br> Day | Consumption <br> Prevalence | Heavy <br> Consumption <br> Prevalence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variables of Interest |  |  |  |
| Regular Soda Food Store Beverage Ads | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 0 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 9 *}$ |
|  | $[0.02]$ | $[-0.00]$ | $[0.05]$ |
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Impact of Regular Soda Advertisements on Heavy Consumption, Elasticities by Subpopulations

|  |  | Heavy Consumption |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Full Sample | 0.05* |
|  | By Gender |  |
|  | Female | 0.06 |
|  | Male | 0.05 |
|  | By Grade |  |
|  | Middle School | 0.09** |
|  | High School | 0.02 |
|  | By Race |  |
|  | White | 0.08** |
|  | Black | 0.13** |
|  | Hispanic | -0.08 |
|  | By Mother's Education |  |
|  | Mother no college | 0.02 |
|  | Mother some college or more | 0.08** |
| bridging the gap |  | p<0.05, *** p <0.01 |

## Elasticity for Price and Advertisement Data on Consumption

|  | Number of <br> Drinks Per <br> Day | Consumption <br> Prevalence | Heavy <br> Consumption <br> Prevalence |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variables of Interest |  |  |  |
| Price of 20oz regular soda | $-0.44^{\star *}$ | $-0.24^{\star *}$ | $-0.84^{\star *}$ |
| Regular Soda Food Store Beverage Ads | 0.02 | -0.00 | $0.05^{\star}$ |

* $p<0.10,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$
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## Summary of Results

- Preliminary results show significant associations between regular soda prices and consumption outcomes. A 10\% increase in price is associated with 4.4\% lower consumption, $2.4 \%$ lower consumption prevalence, and $8.4 \%$ lower heavy consumption prevalence.
- Future estimation: Count models of consumption and associations with body weight.
-Less consistent results found for associations between exterior regular soda ads and consumption; although significant for some populations (middle school, white, black, higher mother's education).


## bridging the gap

## Policy Implications

Tax Design, Revenue, Current Taxes, and Proposed Taxes

## Policy Landscape - Taxes

Food taxes have not generally been introduced with the aim of modifying consumption behavior as they have been used in other public health areas such as tobacco.

Food taxes are currently imposed on selected categories of food such as soft drinks, candy and snacks in grocery stores and vending machines but at quite low tax rates.
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## State Sales Taxes on Regular, Sugar-Sweetened Beverages, as of July 1, 2012
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Data Source: Bridging the Gap Program, University of Illinois at Chicago, 2012

## Sales Taxes on Selected Beverages, All States (as of July 1, 2012)



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\%).
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## Sales Taxes on Selected Beverages, Taxing States (as of July 1, 2012)



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\%).
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## Selected Examples of State SSB-related Legislative Activity 2011/12

California (\$0.01/ounce tax on distributors of SSBs; revenue to create Children's Health Promotion
Fund) - Failed to pass 3/1/2012
California (to authorize any county or city to propose to voters a \$0.01/ounce excise tax on SSBs)

- Failed to pass 3/1/2012

Hawaii (7 Bills introduced from 2011 through 2012) - All Died in Committee or Failed to pass
Illinois (\$0.01/ounce tax on SSBs; revenue to create Illinois Health Promotion Fund)
Nebraska (sales tax on SSBs; revenue to Obesity Prevention Fund) - Postponed 4/23/2012
Rhode Island (\$0.01/ounce, revenue for programs to reduce obesity) - Held for study 5/5/2011
Tennessee (\$0.01/ounce tax on bottled SSBs in exchange for $1 \%$ reduction in state sales tax on food - referred to as ‘swap legislation") - Died in Committee 9/12/2012

Vermont (\$0.01/ounce tax on SSBs; revenue to create Vermont oral health improvement fund) Died in Committee 9/14/2012

West Virginia (series of taxes on bottled soft drinks, syrups and dry mixtures; revenue for state parks) - Died in Committee 7/8/2011

Source: Rudd Center for Food Policy \& Obesity, Legislation Database
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## Global Beverage Taxes

Several countries recently adopted beverage taxes as part of effort to curb obesity

- Denmark: DKK 1.58/litre (US\$0.28) for beverages with >0.5 grams of sugar/100 ml; DKK 0.57 (US\$0.10) for $<0.5$ grams $/ \mathrm{ml}$
- France: €7.16/100 litres (US\$9.39) on beverages with added sugars and artificially sweetened beverages
- Hungary: 5 forints/litre (\$0.024) on soft drinks; 250 forints ( $\$ 1.18$ ) on energy drinks; 100 forints on pre-packaged sugar-sweetened products (>25-40g added sugar per 100 g ; varies by product)
- Nauru: $30 \%$ ad valorem tax on prices of imported carbonated soft drinks, cordials, flavored milks, and drink mixes containing sugar


## Tax Policy Design Implications

* Issues of applicability to SNAP (food stamp) purchases
* Excise tax rather than a sales tax
$>$ Incorporated at shelf price - more apparent to consumers
>Applicable regardless of where items are sold
>Applied on a per unit basis rather than a function of price so that quantity discounts are still taxed. Issue of zero marginal cost for free refills.
$>$ Reduces incentives to switch to cheaper brands
>Disadvantage: Need to be adjusted for inflation
* Dedication of tax revenue to nutrition and physical activity programs


## SSB Taxation \& Revenues

Revenue generating potential of tax is considerable

- SSB Tax calculator at:
http://www.yaleruddcenter.org/sodatax.aspx
- Tax of one cent per ounce could generate:
\$13.1 billion nationally in 2013
- Tax of one cent per ounce in Georgia $\$ 450.9$ million in 2013
- Earmarking tax revenues for obesity prevention efforts would add to impact of tax


## Example of PSA in New York City: Pour on the Pounds Campaign.
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## For more information: www.bridgingthegapresearch.org
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