



Letter to the Editor

Sugar-sweetened beverage taxation in the USA, state preemption of local efforts

Madam

We read with interest the Commentary by Hagenaars *et al.* on sugar-sweetened beverage (SSB) taxation in 2017⁽¹⁾ published in this journal. The authors provided an insightful perspective on reasons behind the quick spread of SSB taxes in the EU compared with the USA. While SSB tax efforts are moving forward at the state and local levels in the USA, the authors are correct that a direct threat to the progression of SSB taxes (among other public health policies) is the concurrent spread of state preemption⁽²⁾. Preemption eliminates the ability of community members to decide which public health measures are appropriate for their communities, despite the long and successful history of grassroots public health advocacy in the USA, as in the case of tobacco control. The authors noted that California preempted, or withdrew, the ability of locales within the state to enact new SSB taxes for the next 12 years⁽¹⁾. It is important to note that prior to California's action, Michigan and Arizona also preempted the ability of locales to enact SSB taxes in those states^(3,4). However, unlike California, where several locales previously enacted SSB taxes, Michigan and Arizona seemed to have preempted local action solely in response to the spread of SSB taxes nationally and not in response to any local efforts to pass such a tax within these states⁽⁵⁾. This highlights an additional reason why SSB tax efforts have been stalled in the USA. The food and beverage industries successfully lobby state legislatures for preemption and against public health regulations including taxes, and simultaneously engage in public campaigns using front groups that, among other actions, characterize SSB taxes as 'grocery taxes'⁽⁶⁾. Public health nutrition stakeholders in the USA are at a disadvantage compared with their European counterparts because they must simultaneously advocate for SSB taxes while working to counter industry tactics including the use of preemption, misleading advertising campaigns and well-funded opposition efforts.

Acknowledgements

Financial support: This letter received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors. *Conflict of interest:* None. *Authorship:* Both authors conceived of and contributed to the writing of the letter. J.L.P. wrote the first draft and M.P. reviewed and edited the letter. *Ethics of human subject participation:* Not applicable.

Jennifer L Pomeranz¹ and Mark Pertschuk²

¹College of Global Public Health
New York University
715 Broadway, 10th Floor
New York, NY 10003, USA
Email: jlp284@nyu.edu

²Grassroots Change | Preemption Watch
Oakland, CA, USA

References

1. Hagenaars LL, Jeurissen PP & Klazinga NS (2018) Sugar-sweetened beverage taxation in 2017: a commentary on the reasons behind their quick spread in the EU compared with the USA. *Public Health Nutr.* Published online: 31 August 2019. doi: 10.1017/S1368980018002008.
2. Pomeranz JL & Pertschuk M (2017) State preemption: a significant and quiet threat to public health in the United States. *Am J Public Health* **107**, 900–902.
3. Michigan Legislature (2017) Michigan Public Act 135 of 2017. Tax on Manufacture, Distribution, or Sale of Food. [http://www.legislature.mi.gov/\(S\(10oociejgp13v1bgn13qji0k\)\)/mileg.aspx?page=getObject&objectName=mcl-Act-135-of-2017](http://www.legislature.mi.gov/(S(10oociejgp13v1bgn13qji0k))/mileg.aspx?page=getObject&objectName=mcl-Act-135-of-2017) (accessed October 2018).
4. Arizona State Legislature (2018) Arizona Revised Statutes. 42.42-6015. Municipal transaction privilege tax; food; exemption. <https://www.azleg.gov/viewdocument?docName=https://www.azleg.gov/ars/42/06015.htm> (accessed November 2018).
5. Pomeranz JL, Zellers L, Bare M *et al.* (2018) State preemption of food and nutrition policies and litigation: undermining government's role in public health. *Am J Prev Med* (In the Press).
6. Center for Media and Democracy's PR Watch (2018) Initiative 1634 misleads on grocery taxes, preempts soda taxes and tramples local control. <https://www.prwatch.org/news/2018/09/13395/initiative-1634-misleads-grocery-taxes-preempts-soda-taxes-and-tramples-local?qt-more=1> (accessed September 2018).