## COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

#### FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 1910-01 <u>Bill No.</u>: HB 672

<u>Subject</u>: Business and Commerce; Revenue Dept.; Taxation and Revenue – General;

**Tobacco Products** 

<u>Type</u>: Original

<u>Date</u>: March 10, 2005

### **FISCAL SUMMARY**

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 4 pages.

L.R. No. 1910-01 Bill No. HB 672 Page 2 of 4 March 10, 2005

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	
<b>Local Government</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	

#### FISCAL ANALYSIS

#### **ASSUMPTION**

Officials with the **Department of Public Safety** assume this proposal would have no fiscal impact on their agency.

Officials with the **Attorney General's Office (AGO)** assume this proposal would create new responsibilities for its agency. AGO assumes it would be required to make determinations concerning compliance, sue for purposes of discovery and enter into proceedings in foreign jurisdictions under these provisions. AGO assumes it would need 3 Assistant Attorneys General IV, 3 Investigators, and 1 Paralegal to enforce the provisions of this proposal in litigation. These employees would also investigate, monitor compliance, collect and maintain data.

**Oversight** assumes that any additional caseload at AGO resulting from this proposal could be absorbed by its existing enforcement infrastructure, including personnel and resources.

Officials with the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assume this legislation provides additional regulations for tobacco product manufacturers. DOR anticipates being able to cover any costs resulting from this proposal through its core budget.

L.R. No. 1910-01 Bill No. HB 672 Page 3 of 4 March 10, 2005

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2006 (10 Mo.)	FY 2007	FY 2008
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2006 (10 Mo.)	FY 2007	FY 2008
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

#### FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small business would be expected as a result of this proposal.

#### DESCRIPTION

This bill clarifies that individuals licensed and required to affix a tax stamp on cigarette packages and retailers who in good faith sell cigarettes that do not comply with state law are not subject to administrative, civil, or criminal seizures; forfeitures; suspensions; fines; or punishments for noncompliant cigarettes. Wholesalers and retailers are not relieved of any penalty imposed for the sale of cigarettes where a tax stamp has not been applied.

Wholesalers have 30 days to stamp and sell noncompliant cigarettes, and retailers have 60 days to purchase from wholesalers and sell noncompliant cigarettes once the noncompliance has been declared by the Department of Revenue and the Attorney General.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

L.R. No. 1910-01 Bill No. HB 672 Page 4 of 4 March 10, 2005

# **SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

Attorney General's Office Department of Revenue Department of Public Safety

Mickey Wilson, CPA

Mickey Wilen

Director

March 10, 2005