

Taxing Sugar Sweetened Beverages: The Case for Public Health

February 2017

Issue:

Obesity and overweight in all age groups are at historically high levels in Canada (1-3). In 2014, 20% of adults were obese, while 40.0% of men and 27.5% of women were overweight (4). In this same year, 6.2% of Canadian children were obese and 17% were overweight (5). Being overweight or obese is a risk factor for cancer and other chronic diseases (6-8). Obesity in childhood is an especially serious concern as extra body weight over time further increases the risk for developing chronic diseases (9). In 2005, obesity and overweight was estimated to cost the province over \$1.27 billion (10, 11). In Canada, the direct and indirect economic costs of obesity in 2008 were estimated to total between \$4.6 and \$7.1 billion (12).

Although the causes of overweight and obesity are complex, dietary intake and food choices play an important role (13). Sugar sweetened beverages (SSBs) are one food product that provides calories, but virtually no nutrients. SSBs are defined as beverages that contain added sugar, corn syrup, or other caloric sweeteners, and include products such as soft drinks, sports and energy drinks, vitamin water, and sweetened tea and coffee beverages (14, 15).

Individuals who drink SSBs do not typically change their eating patterns to compensate for these liquid calories, which is one likely mechanism linking SSBs to weight gain (16-18). Regularly choosing water or other low-calorie beverages instead of SSBs is associated with lower dietary energy intake and weight gain over time, as well as lowered risk for type 2 diabetes and stroke (19). In a study of almost 125,000 adults in the United States, who were followed for 16-20 years, researchers estimated that replacing one serving of SSBs with one cup of water, coffee, tea, diet beverage, or low-fat milk every day, was associated with a 0.2 - 0.5 kg lower weight gain every four years (20). Similarly, a study of 9 to 15 year olds in Europe found that replacing daily intake of SSBs with water, coffee, tea, or milk was inversely related to increases in body mass index, waist circumference, and fat mass after 6 years (21).

SSBs are unique products because they are linked only to health risks and offer no benefits when consumed (21). In addition, SSBs may displace nutritionally superior beverages, such as milk (22-24), in daily diets (25, 26). According to 2014-2015 self-reported data from the Alberta Community Health Survey, among the adult population in Alberta, daily consumption of sweetened coffee and/or tea beverages was 12.7% and consumption of soda drinks was 10.9% (27). This survey also found that male's consumption of sugary drinks (14.7%) was twice that of females (7.3%) (27). Additional evidence from the Canadian context suggests that children aged 1-3 years old generally drink water, milk, and fruit juices. However, as children get older, both boys and girls are found to drink less milk and juice and consume more SSBs, such as soft drinks and fruit drinks (28).

Government public health policies, including taxation, have proven to be effective tools for facilitating a healthy lifestyle in Alberta. In the field of tobacco control, increasing taxes on tobacco products as part of a comprehensive strategy has contributed to a decrease in tobacco use in the province (29). Similarly, fiscal measures can encourage healthy eating by creating financial disincentives for purchasing and consuming unhealthy foods and beverages. In fact, over the past several years, there have been a number of calls to implement a general junk food tax (30-32). However, unlike tobacco products, which have no safe level of use, the challenge of defining what constitutes 'junk food' has often stalled public health efforts to tax unhealthy foods and beverages.

In contrast to other unhealthy foods, SSBs offer limited nutritional value other than calories, which are derived almost exclusively from simple sugars. Therefore, developing criteria for a tax on SSBs compared to other foods is a simpler and more feasible policy option.

To-date, many jurisdictions around the world, including Finland, France, Hungary, Mexico, the Cook Islands, St. Helena, India, Chile, Belgium, and the American cities of Berkley and Philadelphia, have already implemented some form of SSB tax (33, 34). A tax on SSBs has also been endorsed by the World Health Organization (35). Further, many Canadian civil society organizations, such as Chronic Disease Prevention Alliance of Canada (CDPAC), Dietitians of Canada, Heart and Stroke, Canadian Diabetes Association, Quebec Weight Coalition, Childhood Obesity Foundation, and the British Columbia Healthy Living Alliance (33, 36-41), are calling for government action to implement a tax on SSBs as a way to address obesity and chronic diseases in Canada.

There are a number of different taxation models for a levy on sugary drinks (e.g. sales taxes, excise taxes and special taxes). Sales taxes are applied as a percentage of the product's price and are reflected at the cash register (33). Excise taxes, on the other hand, tend to be levied on the manufacturer as a fixed amount per volume (33). Another policy option is implementation of a special tax (% of product price or per volume) at the retail level, similar to certain tobacco and alcohol special tax models in Canada (33).

Per volume taxes have a number of benefits over those applied as a percentage of the product price. For example, their impact does not fluctuate with price, they are easier to administer because the tax is based on volume and are less susceptible to industry manipulation (33, 42). In Canada, many organizations have recommended an excise tax at the federal level, while implementation of a special tax may be more feasible for provinces (33).

Benefits to Taking Action:

- Taxation has the potential to reduce consumption of SSBs in Alberta and increase intake of more nutritious beverages (43-48). Although taxation has not yet been implemented in a Canadian province, economic models suggest that a 10% increase in the price of SSBs would reduce consumption of these beverages by 12-13% (49). Findings from Mexico illustrate that, as a result of the 1 peso per liter excise SSB tax, in 2014-2015 per capita sales of sugary drinks decreased by 7.3% and sales of plain water increased by 5.2% compared to the pre-tax period (2007-2013) (50). Further, a study exploring the short-term impacts of the Berkley soda tax found that, in low-income neighbourhoods, SSB consumption declined by 21% over a 1-year period from before the tax to after the tax (51).
- Reviews have found that as the cost of soft drinks or SSBs increased, there was a tendency for population-level body weight to decline (46, 52). Some studies found no impact or small increases in body weight (46, 47), but this is hypothesized to be due to existing tax rates that are low and limited in scope (e.g. only cover soft drinks or are only applied at certain locations) (52).
- Taxation would be applied in the general retail environment in Alberta. Thus, the impact of taxation would be felt beyond specific food settings (e.g. schools, workplaces) and could achieve a greater effect on the overall consumption of SSBs at the population level. This broad-based policy intervention could create an environment where drinking water or healthier beverages becomes a relatively easier choice for Albertans, and the price of purchasing SSBs effectively becomes a barrier to consumption.
- Taxation is a cost-effective intervention for governments and taxpayers to reduce SSB consumption and the related costs from obesity and chronic disease, while providing new government revenue. According to the CHOICES project at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, an \$0.01/ounce excise tax in 15 American cities could raise over \$600 million in the first year of implementation, as well as prevent 115,000 cases of childhood and adult obesity in 2015 (53). University of Alberta researchers estimate that a national 50 cent per litre levy could generate up to \$1.8 billion each year within the Canadian context (43, 44).

- Government should invest a portion of revenue generated from a tax on sugary drinks in health promotion initiatives aimed at preventing obesity and chronic disease. Over time, investing in prevention will contribute to direct financial gain for government by helping to reduce future health-care costs. Evidence suggests that a \$1 investment in health promotion can be expected to result in a minimum of \$4-5 cost savings (54).

Considerations:

There are criticisms of using taxation as a policy tool. A common argument against SSB taxation is that such a policy intervention would be regressive, causing harm to vulnerable members in society, such as Albertans with the lowest incomes. However, experts have not found robust empirical evidence of this (49, 55). Further, SSBs provide no nutritional benefit while water, a generally accessible beverage for Albertans, would provide hydration without the negative health impact of consuming SSBs. In short, no one in Alberta physically needs to consume SSBs or experiences health benefits from their consumption (49).

It is also important to note that many studies exploring the impact of taxing or subsidizing food and beverages have indicated that a substantial difference in price is needed to have a significant impact on purchasing behaviours (52, 56-59). In fact, experts suggest a minimum tax of about 20% of the price, as a current tax of 7% in the US has not produced the desired effect on weight outcomes (60).

Finally, public opinion polling indicates that there is support for action on SSBs. According to a 2013 Ipsos Reid poll of Canadians, 88% agree that large servings of SSBs can lead to bad health and 94% consider over consumption of these drinks to be an important contributor to obesity among Canadians (61). Further, according to a 2016 survey administered to 1,200 people in Alberta, the majority of respondents (58%) would support a tax on soft drinks and energy drinks (62). When government revenue from taxes is reinvested in health, the general public appears to be even more supportive of taxation as a means to encourage healthy lifestyles. A poll in New York found that support for a soft drink tax increased from 52% to 72% when respondents were informed that the revenue would be directed to obesity prevention efforts (63).

APCCP Priorities for Action:

- Advocate for a 50 cent per litre levy on sugary drinks in Alberta. A portion of the revenue generated should be invested into health promotion initiatives aimed at keeping Albertans healthy and out of the hospital.

References:

1. Tjepkema M. Measured obesity - adult obesity in Canada: measured height and weight. Analytical Studies and Reports. Ottawa: Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 82-620-MWE2005001; 2005.
2. Navaneelan T, Janz T. Adjusting the scales: Obesity in the Canadian population after correcting for respondent bias, 2013. Health at a Glance. Ottawa: Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 82-624-X; May 2014.
3. Roberts K, Shields M, de Groh M, Aziz A, Gilbert J-A. Overweight and obesity in children and adolescents: results from the 2009 to 2011 Canadian health measures survey. Health Reports: Statistics Canada Catalogue No. 82-003-XPE; 2012.
4. Statistics Canada. Overweight and obese adults (self-reported), 2014. 2015 [cited 2017 January 20]; Available from: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/82-625-x/2015001/article/14185-eng.htm>.
5. Statistics Canada. Overweight and obese youth (self-reported), 2014. 2015 [cited 2017 January 20]; Available from: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/82-625-x/2015001/article/14186-eng.htm>.
6. Danaei G, Vander Hoorn S, Lopez AD, Murray CJ, Ezzati M. Causes of cancer in the world: comparative risk assessment of nine behavioural and environmental risk factors. Lancet. 2005;366(9499):1784-93.
7. World Cancer Research Fund, American Institute for Cancer Research. Policy and action for cancer prevention, food, nutrition, and physical activity: a global perspective. Washington 2009.

8. World Health Organization. Obesity and overweight. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2015 [cited 2015 April 8]; Available from: <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs311/en/>.
9. Singh AS, Mulder C, Twisk JWR, Van Mechelen W, Chinapaw MJM. Tracking of childhood overweight into adulthood: a systematic review of the literature. *Obesity reviews* : an official journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity. 2008;9(5):474-88.
10. Colman R, Hayward K. The cost of obesity in Alberta. Alberta Health Services, Research and Evaluation Unit; January 2010.
11. Sharma A. Obesity costs Albertans \$1.27 billion (or more). 2011 [cited 2011 May]; Available from: <http://www.drsharma.ca/obesity-costs-albertans-127-billion-or-more.html>.
12. Ogilvie K, Eggleton A. Obesity in Canada. A whole-of-society approach for a healthier Canada. 2016 [cited 2017 January 20]; Available from: http://www.parl.gc.ca/content/sen/committee/421/SOCI/Reports/2016-02-25_Revised_report_Obesity_in_Canada_e.pdf.
13. World Health Organization. Global strategy on diet, physical activity and health. France: World Health Organization; 2004. p. 18.
14. Brownell KD, Frieden TR. Ounces of prevention: the public policy case for taxes on sugared beverages. *The New England Journal of Medicine*. 2009 Apr 30;360(18):1805-8.
15. Bremer A, Lustig R. Effects of sugar-sweetened beverages on children. *Pediatr Ann*. 2012 January;41(1):26-30.
16. Flood JE, Roe LS, Rolls BJ. The effect of increased beverage portion size on energy intake at a meal. *J Am Diet Assoc*. 2006;106(12):1984-90.
17. Mourao DM, Bressan J, Campbell WW, Mattes RD. Effects of food form on appetite and energy intake in lean and obese young adults. *Int J Obes*. 2007;31(11):1688-95.
18. DiMeglio D, Mattes R. Liquid versus solid carbohydrate: effects on food intake and body weight. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord*. 2000;24(6):794-800.
19. Zheng M, Allman-Farinelli M, Heitmann BL, Rangan A. Substitution of sugar-sweetened beverages with other beverage alternatives: a review of long-term health outcomes. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2015 May;115(5):767-79.
20. Pan A, Malik VS, Hao T, Willett WC, Mozaffarian D, Hu FB. Changes in water and beverage intake and long-term weight changes: results from three prospective cohort studies. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. [Multicenter Study Research Support, N.I.H., Extramural]. 2013 Oct;37(10):1378-85.
21. Zheng M, Rangan A, Olsen NJ, Andersen LB, Wedderkopp N, Kristensen P, et al. Substituting sugar-sweetened beverages with water or milk is inversely associated with body fatness development from childhood to adolescence. *Nutrition*. 2015 Jan;31(1):38-44.
22. Nielsen SJ, Popkin BM. Changes in beverage intake between 1977 and 2001. *Am J Prev Med*. 2004;27(3):205-10.
23. Nelson MC, Neumark-Sztainer D, Hannan PJ, Story M. Five-year longitudinal and secular shifts in adolescent beverage intake: findings from Project EAT (Eating Among Teens)-II. *J Am Diet Assoc*. 2009;109(2):308-12.
24. Nikpartow N, Danyliw AD, Whiting SJ, Lim HJ, Vatanparast H. Beverage consumption patterns of Canadian adults aged 19 to 65 years. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2012;15(12):2175-84.
25. Garriguet D. Beverage consumption of Canadian adults. *Health Reports*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 82-003-X; 2008.
26. Vartanian LR, Schwartz MB, Brownell KD. Effects of soft drink consumption on nutrition and health: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Public Health*. 2007 Apr;97(4):667-75.
27. Alberta Health, Health System Accountability and Performance, Surveillance and Assessment Branch. Health trends Alberta: consumption of sugar sweetened beverages in Alberta 2015 [cited 2015 December]; Available from: <http://www.health.alberta.ca/documents/HTA-2015-11-17-Sugar-Sweetened-Beverages.pdf>.
28. Garriguet D. Beverage consumption of children and teens. *Health Reports*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 82-003-X; 2008.
29. Campaign for a Smoke-Free Alberta (CSFA). Reducing tobacco affordability to improve the health of Albertans. Edmonton, AB2008.
30. Canadian Cancer Society Manitoba Division. Evidence-based nutrition policies: Canadian Cancer Society Manitoba Division2008.

31. Connolly C. Interventions related to obesity - a state of the evidence review: Heart and Stroke Foundation of Canada 2005.
32. Thow AM, Jan S, Leeder S, Swinburn B. The effect of fiscal policy on diet, obesity and chronic disease: a systematic review. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 2010. p. 561-640.
33. Le Bodo Y, Paquette M-C, De Wals P. Taxing soda for public health: a Canadian perspective: Springer; 2016.
34. Erb KP. Judge dismisses soda tax lawsuit against City of Philadelphia. *Forbes*; 2016; Available from: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kellyphillipserb/2016/12/19/judge-dismisses-soda-tax-lawsuit-against-city-of-philadelphia/#56e3799156e6>.
35. World Health Organization. WHO urges global action to curtail consumption and health impacts of sugary drinks. 2016 [cited 2016 December]; Available from: <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2016/curtail-sugary-drinks/en/>.
36. Chronic Disease Prevention Alliance of Canada. Extra sugar, extra calories, extra weight, more chronic disease: the case for a sugar-sweetened beverage tax. CDPAC Position Statement. Ottawa, Canada: Chronic Disease Prevention Alliance of Canada; 2011.
37. Quebec Coalition on Weight-Related Problems. Position of the weight coalition. 2012 [cited 2012 August 14]; Available from: <http://www.cgpp.qc.ca/en/priorities/tax-on-soft-and-energy-drinks/position-of-the-weight-coalition>.
38. Dietitians of Canada. Sugar-sweetened beverages and taxation 2016 [cited 2017 January 20]; Available from: <http://www.dietitians.ca/Dietitians-Views/Sugar-sweetened-Beverages-and-Taxation.aspx>.
39. Canadian Diabetes Association. CDA's position on sugars. 2017 [cited 2017 January 21st]; Available from: <http://www.diabetes.ca/about-cda/public-policy-position-statements/sugars>.
40. British Columbia Healthy Living Alliance. Getting to the sweet spot –it's time to tax sugary drinks. 2015; Available from: <http://www.bchealthyliving.ca/getting-to-the-sweet-spot-its-time-to-tax-sugary-drinks/>.
41. Heart and Stroke Foundation. Sugar, heart disease and stroke 2014 [cited 2015 January 23]; Available from: <http://www.heartandstroke.com/atf/cf/%7B99452D8B-E7F1-4BD6-A57D-B136CE6C95BF%7D/Sugar-Eng.pdf>.
42. Chriqui JF, Chaloupka FJ, Powell LM, Eidson SS. A typology of beverage taxation: multiple approaches for obesity prevention and obesity prevention-related revenue generation. *Journal of public health policy*. 2013;34(3):403-23.
43. Buhler S, Raine KD, Arango M, Pellerin S, Neary NE. Building a strategy for obesity prevention one piece at a time: the case of sugar-sweetened beverage taxation. *Can J Diabetes*. 2013;37(2):97-102.
44. Erratum. Building a strategy for obesity prevention one piece at a time: the case of sugar-sweetened beverage taxation. *Canadian journal of diabetes*. 2014;38(4):285.
45. Mekonnen TA, Odden MC, Coxson PG, Guzman D, Lightwood J, Wang YC, et al. Health benefits of reducing sugar-sweetened beverage intake in high risk populations of California: results from the cardiovascular disease (CVD) policy model. *PloS one*. 2013;8(12):e81723.
46. Escobar MAC, Veerman JL, Tollman SM, Bertram MY, Hofman KJ. Evidence that a tax on sugar sweetened beverages reduces the obesity rate: a meta-analysis. *BMC public health*. 2013;13(1):1072.
47. Eyles H, Mhurchu CN, Nghiem N, Blakely T. Food pricing strategies, population diets, and non-communicable disease: a systematic review of simulation studies. *PLoS Med*. 2012;9(12):e1001353.
48. Powell LM, Chriqui JF, Khan T, Wada R, Chaloupka FJ. Assessing the potential effectiveness of food and beverage taxes and subsidies for improving public health: a systematic review of prices, demand and body weight outcomes. *Obesity reviews : an official journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity*. 2013;14(2):110-28.
49. Policy Opportunity Windows Enhancing Research Uptake in Practice (POWER UP!) Coalition Linking Action and Science for Prevention (CLASP). Evidence synthesis: the influence of taxing sugar sweetened beverages on beverage consumption and body weight. 2014; Available from <http://abpolicycoalitionforprevention.ca/evidence/>.
50. Colchero M, Guerrero-López CM, Molina M, Rivera JA. Beverages sales in Mexico before and after implementation of a sugar sweetened beverage tax. *PloS one*. 2016;11(9):e0163463.

51. Falbe J, Thompson HR, Becker CM, Rojas N, McCulloch CE, Madsen KA. Impact of the Berkeley excise tax on sugar-sweetened beverage consumption. *Journal Information*. 2016;106(10).
52. Powell LM, Chaloupka FJ. Food prices and obesity: evidence and policy implications for taxes and subsidies. *Milbank Q*. [Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't Review]. 2009 Mar;87(1):229-57.
53. CHOICES Project. Cost-effectiveness of a sugar-sweetened beverage excise tax in 15 US cities. Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health; 2016 [cited 2017 January].
54. Aldana SG. Financial impact of health promotion programs: a comprehensive review of the literature. *American journal of health promotion : AJHP*. 2001;15(5):296-320.
55. Faulkner G, Grootendorst P, Nguyen VH, Andreyeva T, Arbour-Nicitopoulos K, Auld MC, et al. Economic instruments for obesity prevention: results of a scoping review and modified delphi survey. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2011;8(1):109.
56. Caraher M, Cowburn G. Taxing food: implications for public health nutrition. *Public Health Nutrition*. [Meta-Analysis Review]. 2005 Dec;8(8):1242-9.
57. Cash SB, Lacañilao RD. Taxing food to improve health: economic evidence and arguments. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*. 2007;36(2).
58. Epstein LH, Dearing KK, Roba LG, Finkelstein E. The influence of taxes and subsidies on energy purchased in an experimental purchasing study. *Psychological Science*. 2010.
59. Sturm R, Powell LM, Chiqui JF, Chaloupka FJ. Soda taxes, soft drink consumption, and children's body mass index. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. [Research Support, N.I.H., Extramural Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't]. 2010 May;29(5):1052-8.
60. Faulkner G, Grootendorst P, Nguyen VH, Ferrence R, Mendelson R, Donnelly P, et al. Economic policy, obesity and health: a scoping review. *Heart and Stroke Foundation of Canada*; 2010.
61. Ipsos Reid. Sugary drinks poll: Commissioned by Heart and Stroke Foundation. 2013.
62. Policy Opportunity Windows Enhancing Research Uptake in Practice (POWER UP!) Coalition Linking Action and Science for Prevention (CLASP). Knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs (KAB) survey. Edmonton, AB: School fo Public Health, Unviersity of Alberta; 2016.
63. Beck Research LLC. Voter preferences for closing the New York State budget gap. New York: Citizen's Committee for Children of New York, Inc; 2008 [cited 2010 October 4]; Public Opinion Survey]. Available from: www.cccnewyork.org/publications/12-12-08CCCPoll.pdf.