

Privatization of State-Run Alcohol Sales



The Problem

Privatization of state-run alcohol sales is a shortsighted proposal that comes at the expense of the state's finances and the health of its residents. Any immediate economic influx realized from privatization will be offset by increased consumption, increased costs from the resulting harm, and reduced state revenues over time. In short, the proponents of privatization seek to put their own financial self-interests before that of the public's physical well being and their state's economic stability.

Loss of Alcohol Revenues

- States that control the sale of alcoholic beverages stand to lose significant revenue as a result of privatization. On average, control states generate at least \$10 more per gallon of alcohol sold compared to license states. States that control only sales of spirits receive nearly \$38 more per gallon than license states.¹
- Over the long term, the sale of state-run alcohol stores will result in declining alcohol revenue for control states. Taxes and license fees in the short run are supposed to offset the revenue lost as a result of privatized alcohol sales. However, the one-time windfall realized from the sale of the state stores will not offset the long term loss of revenue.
- It is rare for states to raise excise tax rates on alcoholic beverages because the alcohol industry powerfully lobbies against any such increases.² As effective tax rates on alcohol lose value over time, states that privatize alcohol sales will find it difficult to match the revenue they previously realized from state-run stores by raising state alcohol tax rates.
- Because the prices on state-controlled alcohol sales can be increased, and tax rates on privatized sales are rarely increased, the prices of alcoholic beverages will fall and effectively function as a subsidy for the alcohol industry.

Increasing Societal Costs from Alcohol Harm

- Proponents of privatization argue that it will benefit drinkers by improving the price and availability of alcohol. However, these two factors are directly correlated with increased consumption and the accompanying increased harm and societal costs.
- Privatizing a control state's liquor sales could mean an increase in the volume of liter sales of alcohol by as much as 14.7% – the average percentage difference in consumption between control and license states.³
- Increased availability of alcohol is generally associated with increases in consumption. States that license alcohol retailers generally have higher alcohol density, greater physical availability, and longer and later hours of sale,¹ all of which are factors that contribute to the increased availability of alcoholic beverages.⁴
- Increased consumption of alcohol is associated with a range of health problems as well as increased rates of traffic injuries and fatalities, crime, domestic violence and child abuse.⁵
- States with tighter control over the sale and distribution of alcohol have lower rates of alcohol-related traffic deaths than states that take a more hands-off approach.⁶

Less Control, More Problems with Alcohol Sales

- State-run store employees are likely to have better oversight and experience with alcohol sales, thus reducing the number of sales to minors and intoxicated drinkers.⁷
- Because the state directly oversees the products that are sold in state-run stores it can quickly remove a product that it considers to be deceptive, dangerous, or has inappropriate packaging or marketing.
- Because state-run stores are state property, states more easily regulate the on-site marketing of alcoholic beverages, including the promotion of products within the stores and display of window or exterior advertising for alcoholic beverage products.⁸
- Once a state privatizes the sale of alcohol within its borders, it is extremely unlikely that it will be able to go back to a control system in the future.¹

Bottom Line

Privatization of state-run alcohol sales is a costly mistake. Any short-term economic benefits realized from privatization will be offset by the long term financial and societal costs associated with alcohol over-consumption.

References

1. National Alcohol Beverage Control Association. The Effects of Privatization of Alcohol Control Systems. Third edition. Available at: <http://www.nabca.org/Resources/Files/2012131124314.pdf>. Accessed December 10, 2013.
2. Alcohol Justice. In The Red: Alcohol Revenue and State Budgets in Crisis. November 2009.
3. Washington State Auditor. State Government Performance Review: Opportunities for Washington. 2010. Available at: <http://www.sao.wa.gov/AuditReports/AuditReportFiles/ar1002726.pdf>. Accessed June 22, 2011.
4. The Task Force on Community Preventive Services. Preventing Excessive Alcohol Consumption: Privatization of Retail Alcohol Sales. 2011. Available at: <http://www.thecommunityguide.org/alcohol/privatization.html>. Accessed December 10, 2013.
5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Alcohol use and health. Immediate health risks. Long-term health risks. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/alcohol/fact-sheets/alcohol-use.htm>. Accessed on December 10, 2013.
6. Wang J, Price M, Herzenberg S. The road less traveled: States that more tightly control the sale and distribution of alcohol have lower alcohol-related fatalities. Harrisberg: Keystone Research Center. Available at: <http://keystoneresearch.org/publications/research/road-less-traveled>. Accessed December 10, 2013.
7. Kerr W. Alcohol Control Systems and The Potential Effects of Privatization. Alcohol Research Group: Emeryville.
8. Alcohol Justice. Out-of-Home Alcohol Advertising: A 21st-Century Guide to Effective Regulation. March 2009. Available at: <http://alcoholjustice.org/images/stories/pdfs/miadguide.pdf>. Accessed December 8, 2013.