Amendment 35 Tobacco Tax Increase for Health-Related Purposes Legislative Council Staff Responses to Public Comments

The revisions requested by interested persons are provided below in the following format:

ALL CAPS = Proposed new language
Strike Type = Proposed deletions
Standard Type = Current language
All page and line references are to the Final Draft version

1		BULLET SECTION
2	1.	Responder: Maria Coe — Office of State Planning and Budgeting
3		Suggested change: Page 1, line 2:
4 5		• increases the tax on a pack of cigarettes by 64 cents TO 84 CENTS PER PACK;
6 7		Basis for suggested change: Change will make first bullet consistent with second bullet.
8 9		Staff comment: Agree in part. The revised staff language makes the bullets parallel.
10		Revised staff language: Page 1, line 2:
11 12		♦ increases the tax on a pack of cigarettes by 64 cents; FROM 20 CENTS TO 84 CENTS;
13		************
14		ARGUMENTS AGAINST
15	2.	Responder: Staff
16		Suggested change: Page 3, line 37:
17		If this is THE case,
18		Staff comment: Corrects technical error.
19		**********

3. Responder: Wilson Croom — Colorado Association of Distributors

Suggested change: Add a fourth argument in opposition to the initiative.

2.0

- 4) The state currently has budget problems created by taxes either imposed or restricted by constitutional amendment (Gallagher and Amendment 23 being the prime examples). The elected legislature cannot fix problems caused by constitutional amendments. The tax would fund healthcare programs and organizations and would continue even if the need for those programs or organizations no longer existed. There would be no legislative oversight of how this money is administered or spent.
- **Basis for suggested change:** The voters need to understand that this is a binding constitutional amendment that locks, in perpetuity, a revenue stream for programs that may not require future funds. The legislature cannot fix the problems caused by constitutional amendments. The measure also creates an unsupervised bureaucracy with no legislative oversight on how the new revenues are administered and spent.
 - **Staff comment:** Agree in part. The proposed constitutional amendment establishes a dedicated tax on specified products. If approved, the legislature will have no control over the distribution of this new tax revenue but it will have oversight on how the moneys are administered. An unsupervised bureaucracy will not result from the measure. Staff recommends incorporating the valid points of the proposed argument into argument 3 against.

Revised staff language: Page 3, line 35:

3) Funding for health care may not increase very much. Current law may result in a large portion of the new tax money being spent on existing programs, rather than expanded programs. If this is the case, smokers would be paying much higher taxes, but few would receive additional health care services. Further, the proposal aims to reduce tobacco use, while at the same time relying on smokers to fund its health care programs. Over time, tax revenue may be inadequate to maintain the proposal's health care programs if more and more people quit smoking. In Addition, this new tax money may be inadequate over time to maintain some of the proposal's programs while others may have more money than they require. The legislature will not be able to fix these problems because it will have no control over the distribution of this money.

37 ********************************