

## This section

- Examine in detail general topic of externalities
- Define them
- Why they are 'bad' from an economic sense
- How can we measure the size of welfare loss
- Show how taxes can be used to limit the social costs of an externality
- Heart disease 652K
- Cancer 553K
- Stroke 150K
- Chronic resp. diease 122K
- Accidents 112K
- Diabetes 73K
- Alzhimers 66K
- Influenza/pneumonia 60K
- Nephritis 42K


## This section

- Extended example: Do smokers and drinkers pay their way?
- Alcohol and cigarette consumption generates externalities
- They are also taxed at the local, state and federal level
- Sum up the external costs of smoking/drinking
- Compare to the revenues raised by taxes
- Surprising results
- Excellent example of how economists look at problems

Actual Causes of Death

|  | $\#(\%$ of deaths) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Cause of death | 1990 | \# (\% of deaths) <br> 2000 |
| Tobacco | $400,000(19 \%)$ | $435,000(18 \%)$ |
| Diet/inactivity | $300,000(15 \%)$ | $400,000(17 \%)$ |
| Alcohol | $100,000(5 \%)$ | $85,000(5 \%)$ |
| Micorbial agents | $90,000(4 \%)$ | $75,000(4 \%)$ |
| Toxic agents | $60,000(3 \%)$ | $66,000(3 \%)$ |
| Motor Vehicles | $25,000(1 \%)$ | $43,000(2 \%)$ |
| Firearms | $35,000(2 \%)$ | $29,000(1 \%)$ |
| Sexual Behavior | $30,000(1 \%)$ | $20,000(<1 \%)$ |
| Illegal drugs | $20,000(<1 \%)$ | $17,000(<1 \%)$ |
| Total | $1,060,000(50 \%)$ | $1,060,000(48 \%) 6$ |



## Negative Externalities

- Pollution from a production process
- Noise from a nightclub near a residential neighborhood
- The person next to you during an exam has a cold
- Second hand smoke


## Positive Externalities

- You get a flu shot. This reduces the probability others will get the flu. They benefit, you paid the costs
- Your beautiful garden raises the value of your neighbor's house
- Lojak:
- Transmitted on car that can be used to locate a stolen vehicle
- Reduced auto thefts in areas where it was introduced
- Only a small fraction had Lojak. As a result, non-Lojak users benefited


## Excess production and negative externalities

- Suppose production of the good generates externalities that are not reflected in costs of inputs (e.g., pollution)
- The true cost of producing the good is above the costs firms pay to produce


## Before we start

- Basic review of the dead weight loss from externalities
- How taxes can internalize the costs of externalities
- Since firms are not paying all the costs of production, the 'wedge' between private costs and social costs encourages overproduction

| Demand curve |
| :--- |
| - $Q_{d}=f(P)$ |
| - Slopes down due to declining marginal utility |
| - Height of demand represents the value |
| placed on the last product consumed |
| - We will always use inverse demand curves - |
| easier to graph |
| - $P=f^{-1}(\mathbf{Q})$ |
|  |



## Consumer's Surplus

- Consumers continue to purchase so long as the value of the next unit is greater than price
- But all units priced the same
- Consumer's value the last unit at $P_{1}$
- For all units consumed up to $Q_{1}$, the value to the consumer exceeded price
- Area A represents consumer's surplus


## Producer's Surplus

- In competitive market, market supply curve is the horizontal summation of firm's marginal cost curve
- Height represents the amount firms must receive to sell the last unit
- Since this is the marginal cost curve, it also represents what it costs society to produce the last unit
- Difference between price received and the marginal cost of production is Producer's Surplus



## Production externalities

- Perfectly competitive market. Supply Curve = marginal cost curve (MC)
- Not all costs of production are borne by the firm, e.g., pollution
- PMC = private marginal cost, the firm's costs, therefore, the industry supply
- SMC = social marginal cost
- SMC > PMC for all Q





## Social Costs of Overproduction

- Notice that as one moves from $Q_{2}$ to $Q_{1}$
- Society is spending an extra $d+b+c$ on additional resources
- Consumers are however enjoying $\mathbf{b}+\mathbf{c}$ in additional welfare
- The difference is area d, the deadweight loss of overproduction
- If there ever is a 'wedge' between what it costs to produce a good and what people are paying for it, there will be a deadweight loss


## What about consumption externalities?

- Standard downward sloping demand for a good
- Consumption of the good however has health/financial costs to others (e.g., second hand smoke or drunk driving)
- Private Marginal Benefit > Social Marginal Benefit

- At $Q_{1}$, people value the last unit at $P_{1}$
- However, not all costs of the good are paid by the consumers
- The SMB is SMB $_{1}$ which is lower than price
- If people had to pay all the costs of the good (forget how they will do it for now), they would consume a lot less
- Therefore, there is over-consumption of the good


## Internalize the Externality

- Per unit tax on output - Pigouvian taxes
- "Excise tax"
- For every unit sold, charge consumers $\$$ t in a tax
- The excise tax will shift down the demand curve by an amount equal to the tax
- Remember, the Y (price) axis is the price transacted between buyers and sellers, does not reflect true cost

- Vertical axis, amount transacted between buyers and sellers
- Without excise tax, at price $P_{1}$, people willing to consume $Q_{1}$
- With a tax of $\$ \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{unit}$, price paid to sellers would have to fall to $P$-t in order to demand $Q_{1}$
- Pay $\mathrm{P}_{1}-\mathrm{t}$ to firm
- Pay to government
- Pay $P_{1}-t+t=P_{1}$ in total


Can show a per unit tax on suppliers can also solve externality problem

- Per unit tax will shift up supply curve by an amount t
- Verticle axis is amount transacted between buyers/sellers
- Without tax, at price $P_{1}$ producers willing to supply $Q_{1}$.
- When tax is imposed, suppliers receive a price, then pay $t$ back to the government
- In order fir supply to stay at $Q_{1}$ with a tax, their price must rise to $P_{1}+t$

- At $P_{1}$, firms were willing to supply $Q_{1}$
- With an excise tax, in order for firms to supply $Q_{1}$, the price must increase to $P_{1}+t$
- Firm receives $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}+\mathrm{t}$
- Pay the government $t$ in taxes
- Net $\mathrm{P}_{1}$
- Therefore, an excise tax will shift the supply curve up by the amount of the tax



## Excises taxes on poor health

- Alcohol and cigarettes are taxed at the federal, state and local level
- Some states sell liquor rather than tax it (VA, PA, etc.)
- Most of these taxes are excise taxes -- the tax is per unit
- Rates differ by type of alcohol, alcohol content
- Nearly all cigarettes taxed the same


## Current excise tax rates

- http://www.taxfoundation.org/publications/sh ow/245.html
- Cigarettes
- Low: KY (\$0.30/pack), VA (\$0.30), SC(\$0.07)
- High: RI (\$2.46), NJ (\$2.58)
- Average of \$1.07 across states
- Beer
- Low (WY, \$0.02/gallon)
- High (SC, \$0.77/gallon)



## Federal taxes

- Cigarettes, \$0.39/pack
- Wine
- \$0.21/750ml bottle for $14 \%$ alcohol or less
- \$0.31/750ml bottle for $14-21 \%$ alcohol
- Beer, \$0.02 a can
- Liquor, \$13.50 per 100 proof gallon (50\% alcohol), or, $\$ 2.14 / 750 \mathrm{ml}$ bottle of 80 proof liquor
- Total taxes on cigarettes are such that in NYC, you spend more in taxes buying one case of cigarettes than if you buy 33 cases of wine.


## Do taxes reduce consumption?

- Law of demand
- Fundamental result of micro economic theory
- Consumption should fall as prices rise
- Generated from a theoretical model of consumer choice
- Thought by economists to be fairly universal in application
- Medical/psychological view - certain goods not subject to these laws
- Starting in 1970s, several authors began to examine link between cigarette prices and consumption
- Simple research design
- Prices typically changed due to state/federal tax hikes
- States with changes are 'treatment'
- States without changes are control
- Near universal agreement in results
- 10\% increase in price reduces demand by $4 \%$
- Change in smoking evenly split between
- Reductions in number of smokers
- Reductions in cigs/day among remaining smokers
- Results have been replicated
- in other countries/time periods, variety of statistical models, subgroups
- For other addictive goods: alcohol, cocaine, marijuana, heroin, gambling





## Taxes now an integral part of antismoking campaigns

- Key component of 'Master Settlement'
- Surgeon General's report
- "raising tobacco excise taxes is widely regarded as one of the most effective tobacco prevention and control strategies."
- Tax hikes are now designed to reduce smoking
smoking are now designed to reduce

| - By the end of 1996 <br> - 9 states with cigarette excise taxes of $\$ 0.50$ <br> - only 3 states with taxes in excess of $\$ 0.75 /$ pack. <br> - By the end of 2002 <br> - 24 states had taxes of $\$ 0.50$ or more <br> - 13 states having a tax of a dollar per pack or more. <br> - Today <br> - 8 states with taxes >= $\$ 2 /$ pack <br> - 25 states with taxes >= \$1/pack <br> - 40 states with taxes $>=\$ 0.5 /$ pack |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 53 |

## External costs of poor health

- Manning et al. paper
- Accounting exericise

What are the external costs of alcohol, tobacco, sedentary lifestyle

- Will focus on the $1^{\text {st }}$ two in class
- Consider three sets of costs
- Direct costs
- Lives lost, fires, criminal justice
- Collectively financed programs
- Sick/medical leave, all types of insurance, retirement, federal transfer programs
- Taxes on earnings


## Direct costs

- Lives lost due to poor health
- Drunk driving deaths
- Fires from smoking
- Does not include
- Death of the person
- Any other family member (why is this? Is this a good assumption?)
- Criminal justice costs


## Collectively financed programs

## - Health/life insurance

- Costs of a smoker are paid collectively by those enrolled in an insurance program
- Externalities can be reduced if premiums are correlated with smoking
- Gov't transfer programs tricky
- Smoking/drinking increases current costs in Medicare/Medicaid
- May decrease costs in the future


## Taxes on Earnings

- Smokers and heavy drinkers
- Are less productive during working years (do not know whether this is causal)
- If die prematurely, pay less in state/local income taxes


## What is NOT an external cost

- The smoker/drinkers diminished health or the health of their family members
- The lost earnings of these activities
- Why?


## Special case of Federal Programs

- Expenditures are correlated with longevity
- Social security, Medicare/Medicaid costs increase for older people
- Because smoking kills people early
- Prevents people from getting to the age when medical costs are very high
- Reduces payment of Social Security benefits
- From the perspective of the other taxpayers, these are positive externalities
- Smokers pay \$ to Federal and states
- They do not take as much out (SS, Medicare/caid) because they die early

| External costs of smoking/drinking |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cigarettes <br> (per pack) | Heavy drinking <br> (per ounce) |
| Collectively <br> financed <br> Direct costs | $\$ 0.05$ |
| Taxes on <br> earnings <br> Total | $\$ 0.02$ | | $\$ 0.23$ |
| :--- |

External costs of smoking/drinking

|  | Cigarettes <br> (per pack) | Heavy drinking <br> (per ounce) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| External costs | $\$ 0.16$ | $\$ 1.19$ |
| Total taxes | $\$ 0.37$ | $\$ 0.20$ |
|  |  |  |

- Dollars values are in real 1986 dollars
- Between 1986 and now, prices have increased by about 75\%
- If assume all deaths due to fires and passive smoke are external costs
- Smoking cost rises to about $\$ 0.38 /$ pack
- Results
- Smokers pay their way
- Drinkers do not


## Value of a statistical life

- People trade off \$ for job characteristics
- Jobs with nice characteristics paid less
- Jobs with unattractive characteristics paid more
- Hold ALL ELSE CONSTANT
- One characteristic is job risk
- Workers in higher risk jobs get paid more
- Can use the willingness to accept risk to calculate a 'statistical value of life'
- Among blue collar workers, there is a 1 in 10,000 chance of dying on the job during the year.
- People in jobs with twice the average risk are estimated to make $\$ 500$ more than identical people in average risk jobs.
- For every additional 10,000 workers in highrisk jobs, they will receive and extra $\$ 500 \mathrm{x}$ $10,000=\$ 5$ million in income
- But among these additional workers, on average, 1 will die.
- VSL=value of a statistical life
- VSL = additional income people are willing to take for additional risk/expected additional deaths
- Example: Suppose that a group of workers requires an additional $\$ 350$ to accept an additional risk of death of 0.000152
- Just divide \$350/0.000152 = \$2.3 million
- Suppose there are an addition 50000 workers
- Take home an additional $50000^{*} 350=\$ 17.5$ million
- But an additional $50000 * 0.000152=7.6$ will die
- 17.5/7.6=\$2.3 million


## Drunk Driving Facts

- 17,000 MV deaths due to drunk drivers in 2003
- down from 26K in 1981
- 40\% of all MV deaths in 2003
- The drunk drivers themselves are $2 / 3$ rds of the alcohol-related MV fatalities, so you only count the $1 / 3$ left over
- External costs of alcohol are now much lower -- probably too high by 34\%


## Tax facts for 2006

- 18.6 billion packs
- At federal/state/local level, taxes generate $\mathbf{\$ 2 2}$ billion in revenue
- Average tax per pack is $\$ 1.18 /$ pack
- Can argue this vastly understate actual taxes on cigarettes
- In settlement of state Medicaid, tobacco companies agreed to
- Pay \$206billion over 25 years
- Paid for by raising price of cigarettes by 45 cents/pack

What is not included in these numbers?



What are some other justifications for higher cigarette taxes

- Recall the market graph. The problem w/ external costs is that people consume above a socially optimal level
- Can be other reasons why people 'over consumer' smoking
- Maybe people do not understand the health risks. If they did, they would not smoke


## Viscusi

- Survey, "of 100 smokers, how many will get lung cancer because they smoke?"
- Survey responses
- Smokers
- Non smokers $\square$
- The true risk level is
$-\square$
- People over state the risk of smoking

Do smokers underestimate the addictiveness of smoking?

- $82 \%$ of smokers say the would like to quit
- About $50 \%$ of ever smokers eventually quit
- What does this measure?
- Survey of HS smokers
- $56 \%$ say they will NOT be smoking in 5 years
- Only $31 \%$ actually quit
- Among pack a day smokers
- 72\% who say they will quit in 5 yrs are still smoking
- $74 \%$ who say they will not quit in 5 yrs are still smoking

