

Tax & Price Policies

- Aim 1 – develop comprehensive policy database
 - initial pilot in 8 states to identify range of tax/price policies
 - policies collected for 50 states and DC
 - developed detailed coding schemes for:
 - Cigarette and OTP taxes: tax rates, special tax zones, enabling/pre-emption policies, tax stamps, penalties
 - Minimum pricing/markup policies: type of policy, amount of markups, inclusion of trade discounts and other price promotions, where markups are applied
 - developing coding schemes for policies regarding reservation sales, direct sales policies, and MSA related policies
 - developing plan for collecting tribal policies
- Aim 2 – tobacco pricing & promotion
 - 2012 POS observations in 161 communities, 2,644 stores
 - Nielsen scanner data obtained, cleaned, being analyzed
 - new price elasticity estimates
 - BTG Research brief on differences in cigarette prices by neighborhood characteristics; presentations on BTG-COMP and Nielsen scanner data

Tax & Price Policies

- Aim 3 – impact on purchasing behavior (also tax avoidance – Aim 4)
 - Completed Adult Tobacco Survey in 161 communities where POS observations were conducted; 1,442 completed surveys

Products	Current Users	Former Users
Cigarettes	1013 (70.2%)	86 (6.0%)
E-cigarettes	98 (6.8%)	85 (5.9%)
Regular Cigars	131 (9.1%)	43 (3.0%)
Cigarillos	128 (8.9%)	64 (4.4%)
Little Filtered Cigars	69 (4.8%)	38 (2.6%)
Pipe	45 (3.1%)	11 (0.8%)
Hookah	37 (2.6%)	15 (1.0%)
Snus	19 (1.3%)	9 (0.6%)
Smokess Tobacco	96 (6.7%)	25 (1.7%)
Dissolvable Tobacco	4 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)

- Data being cleaned and prepared for analysis
- Aim 4 – tax avoidance & evasion
 - BTG-COMP littered pack collection in 161 communities
 - 81.9% of packs with cellophane had tax stamp from state where pack found
 - 15% of sites with less than 50% compliance; 25 with 100% compliance
 - finalizing data for analysis

bridging the gap

Tax & Price Policies

- Aim 5 – impact of tax/price on tobacco use
 - Impact of 2009 federal tax increases on youth tobacco use (MTF)
 - 9.7-13.3% drop in smoking prevalence; 16.0-24.0% drop in smokeless use
 - NBER working paper released; currently under review
 - New estimates of price elasticity for different products (Nielsen data)
 - strong own-price effects; most OTP estimates 1.5-2 times cigarette elasticity
 - negative impact SFA policies on smoked products; positive for moist snuff/snus
 - Compiling variety of other survey, aggregate data
- Aim 6 – impact on household spending
 - On hold for now; analyses to begin 2014
- Aim 7 – dissemination & communication
 - BTG research briefs – 1 completed; several others in progress
 - Papers – 2 completed; several in progress
 - press release on impact of 2009 tax increase widely picked up
 - “Tobacconomics.org” website in development, social media, testimony, presentations, webinars, work with partners, meetings/briefings, more

bridging the gap

FDA – Littered Pack Inspection

- Uses littered packs collected as part of UIC/Chaloupka UO1 and project with NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene
 - 2012, national sample of 161 secondary public school catchment areas (BTG-COMP)
 - Late 2011, 5 East Coast cities (New York, Providence, Boston, Philadelphia and Washington DC) (NYC DOHMH)
 - 30 census tracts in each city sample
 - Focus of initial data collections on tax evasion and tax avoidance
 - Focus of FDA collaborative project on cigarette packaging and compliance with FDA policies
 - Use of flavors, descriptors, and warning labels

FDA – Littered Pack Inspection

- UO1/BTG-COMP Sample
 - 3,840 packs collected in 139 catchment areas located in 36 states
 - 55.5% with cellophane
 - Generally high compliance with ban on flavors

Flavor	# of Packs	Percentage
No Flavor	3,073	80.0%
Menthol	755	19.7%
Fruit (illegal)	6	0.2%

- Still coding descriptors, warning labels

FDA – Littered Pack Inspection

- NYC DOHMH Sample
 - Completed coding for 633 cigarette packs from Providence and New York City
 - additional 12 packs in too poor condition to code
 - another 38 packs for little cigars
 - All pack in compliance with bans on flavors and descriptors
 - All packs included warning labels
 - 10 with non-US warning labels
 - Still coding packs from Boston, Philadelphia, and DC

ANRF – Local Tobacco Taxes

- ANRF Local Tobacco Ordinance data
 - Relatively comprehensive data on variety of local tobacco control policies collected from local departments of health and tobacco control advocacy groups; includes
 - smoke-free air policies
 - advertising restrictions
 - conditional use permits
 - Less complete data on local excise taxes
 - 59 localities included in ANRF database as of 12/31/12
 - CTFK reports 39 top local taxes (20 cents per pack and higher)
 - TBOT reports 594 city and county taxes in FY2012
 - only identifies states and number of cities/counties
 - Considerable variability in local taxes
 - From a few cents per pack in many AL, MO, and VA cities to \$3.00 per pack in Cook County IL

ANRF – Local Tobacco Taxes

- Collaborative project aims:
 - Compile local tax and fee data from communities nationwide for inclusion in ANRF local ordinance databases
 - Examine variation in local taxes and fees and construct measures that include both state and local taxes on cigarettes and other tobacco products
 - Use state and local tax measures in analyses linked to tobacco product prices and tobacco use
- 2 Phase project
 - Phase 1 (current phase)
 - collect copies of local tax laws (also requesting licensing laws)
 - Phase 2 (grant year 3)
 - coding and entry of local tax laws collected in Phase 1

ANRF – Local Tobacco Taxes

- Phase 1:
 - 13 target states based on ANRF, CTFK, and TBOT databases
 - States called to identify sources of hard copies of local tax laws
 - Electronic mailing lists obtained from the National League of Cities and National Association of Counties; supplemented with information from Municipal Yellow Pages and news reports
 - Copies of local tax laws requested from city/county clerks and from local tax administrators
 - Second e-mail solicitation, calls to follow up with:
 - non-respondents in jurisdictions known to have local taxes/fees
 - respondents who provided incomplete information
 - random sample of other non-respondents
- Limited success to date:
 - effort will continue through summer