

**LEGISLATIVE FISCAL OFFICE**  
**Fiscal Note**



Fiscal Note On: **HB 119** HLS 15RS 342  
 Bill Text Version: **ENGROSSED**  
 Opp. Chamb. Action:  
 Proposed Amd.:  
 Sub. Bill For.:

<b>Date:</b> April 29, 2015 10:57 AM	<b>Author:</b> RITCHIE
<b>Dept./Agy.:</b> Revenue	<b>Analyst:</b> Greg Albrecht
<b>Subject:</b> Tobacco Tax Increase	

TAX/TOBACCO TAX EG +\$68,000,000 SD RV See Note Page 1 of 2  
 Levies an additional tax on cigarettes

Current law imposes an excise tax on cigarettes of 36¢ per 20-pack.

Proposed law increases the tax on cigarettes by 32¢ per 20-pack, to a new tax rate of 68¢ per 20-pack. Taxes on all other tobacco products are unchanged. Inventories of stamps and stamped products are explicitly not subject to the tax increase proposed by this bill.

Proposed law also creates the Tobacco Tax Medicaid Match Fund to receive the avails of the tax increase levied by this bill. Monies in the fund are to be used to support the medicaid program, and shall not supplant existing general fund resources.

Effective for the period beginning July 1, 2015.

<b>EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>5 -YEAR TOTAL</b>
State Gen. Fd.	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	<b>\$350,000</b>
Agy. Self-Gen.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>
Ded./Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>
Local Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Annual Total</b>	<b>\$70,000</b>	<b>\$70,000</b>	<b>\$70,000</b>	<b>\$70,000</b>	<b>\$70,000</b>	<b>\$350,000</b>

  

<b>REVENUES</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>5 -YEAR TOTAL</b>
State Gen. Fd.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>
Agy. Self-Gen.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>
Ded./Other	\$68,000,000	\$78,000,000	\$78,000,000	\$78,000,000	\$78,000,000	<b>\$380,000,000</b>
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>
Local Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Annual Total</b>	<b>\$68,000,000</b>	<b>\$78,000,000</b>	<b>\$78,000,000</b>	<b>\$78,000,000</b>	<b>\$78,000,000</b>	<b>\$380,000,000</b>

**EXPENDITURE EXPLANATION**

In the past, the Department of Revenue has indicated that it will incur one-time costs to notify affected taxpayers of the tax rate increases, to revise tax forms, and make tax system programming changes. In addition, these relatively large tax rate increases may warrant enhancements of security features of tax stamps to deter counterfeiting, entailing a recurring cost increase for more expensive tax stamps. Security measures are estimated to be at least \$70,000 per year. Additional workload costs to modify the tax system and educate taxpayers will add costs in FY16.

**REVENUE EXPLANATION**

Tobacco taxes on cigarettes currently make up approximately 80% of total tobacco tax collections. The state cigarette tax was increased in 1990, 2000, and 2002, and the federal tax was increased in 2009. In each of those cases additional collections were less than the simple average yield of 1¢ of tax (prior to the tax rate increase) implied. In the last state episode (2002), the new collections level was only about 82% of what would be implied from the simple average yield, and only 54% with the last federal episode (2009). That is, total tax-paid sales decline when prices increase (in these cases from a tax increase) as consumers avoid the tax by purchasing the product in lower tax locales and reduce real consumption of the product altogether.

A simple calculation of revenue gain based on the current average yield of 1¢ of existing tax would result in an anticipated annual gain of some \$98 million in FY16 from the cigarette tax increase proposed in this bill. However, this assumes no purchase response on the part of consumers. A somewhat more complicated calculation encompassing average prices, state & local sales taxes, industry markups, and a cross-border/single-state rate change purchaser response results in an anticipated annual gain of some \$90 million in FY16. Adjusting the simple average yield calculation above for what has actually happened with past state tax increases compared to the simple average yield expectation at the time can result in a revenue gain of \$66 million (with considerable variation, actual gains from past state tax increases have averaged 33% less than an average yield would suggest, and incorporating the federal tax increase, 36% less).

Previous state tax increases were individually relatively small (4¢, 4¢, and 12¢, respectively; percent increases of 25%, 20%, and 50%) compared to the \$0.32 increase of this bill (nearly doubling the current tax), while the federal increase was relatively large at 61.66¢ (158%). Texas, Arkansas, and Mississippi all have higher current tax rates of \$1.41/pack, \$1.15/pack, and 68¢/pack, respectively. These tax rate differentials may have generated sales and tax receipts in Louisiana from neighboring state residents. The tax rate increase proposed by this bill may work to negate this effect somewhat with respect to all three neighboring states. Additional remote sales and other tax avoidance behaviors may also reduce the revenue gain potential from the bill. With less than certainty as to the magnitude of these effects under this bill's tax increase, an average of the two calculations above that attempt to account for tax-paid purchase response is utilized for the bill's base cigarette tax increase of \$78 million per full year. Given the exemption for inventories and an effective date of July 1, 2015, a reduction for FY16 is imposed for the possible stockpiling and work-off behavior of tobacco wholesalers (explained on page 2) for a final FY16 estimate of \$68 million, and \$78 million in subsequent fiscal years.

- Senate Dual Referral Rules House
- 13.5.1 >= \$100,000 Annual Fiscal Cost {S&H}
- 13.5.2 >= \$500,000 Annual Tax or Fee Change {S&H}
- 6.8(F)(1) >= \$100,000 SGF Fiscal Cost {H & S}
- 6.8(F)(2) >= \$500,000 Rev. Red. to State {H & S}
- 6.8(G) >= \$500,000 Tax or Fee Increase or a Net Fee Decrease {S}

*John D. Carpenter*  
**John D. Carpenter**  
**Legislative Fiscal Officer**

**LEGISLATIVE FISCAL OFFICE**  
**Fiscal Note**



Fiscal Note On: **HB 119** HLS 15RS 342  
 Bill Text Version: **ENGROSSED**  
 Opp. Chamb. Action:  
 Proposed Amd.:  
 Sub. Bill For.:

<b>Date:</b> April 29, 2015 10:57 AM	<b>Author:</b> RITCHIE
<b>Dept./Agy.:</b> Revenue	<b>Analyst:</b> Greg Albrecht
<b>Subject:</b> Tobacco Tax Increase	

**CONTINUED EXPLANATION from page one:**

A complicating factor here is the stockpiling and work-off behavior of tobacco wholesalers. In the months leading up to the tax increases of 2000 and 2002 (and even in 2005 when a tax increase was proposed by the Governor but ultimately not enacted) wholesalers purchased substantial amounts of tax stamps in advance of the tax rate increases (stockpiling). These stamps were then "worked off" in the months after the tax increases before new stamps were purchased at the higher tax rates. This behavior can effectively shift more than \$10 million of tax increase receipts into the fiscal year prior to the effectiveness of the tax increases and out of the fiscal year within which the tax increase becomes effective, even with tax rate increases smaller than the one imposed by this bill. This is possible because state tax increases are not typically imposed on tax stamp inventories, and this bill explicitly excepts inventories from the tax rate increase it imposes (federal tax increases are imposed on inventories). This effect reduces the estimate above to \$68 million in FY16, but may reduce it somewhat less since this bill's rate increase is moderate (FY15 receipts would increase by a like amount).

The stockpiling and work-off behavior of wholesalers may be even more complicated than discussed above. While this behavior was exhibited with respect to the tax increase proposals of 2000, 2002, and 2005, it was not exhibited during the debate regarding a tax increase proposal in 2009, even though that proposed increase was as much as \$1.00 per pack. That proposed tax increase was not supported by the governor, and wholesalers apparently did not perceive the proposal as likely enough to be enacted to warrant stockpiling. It is not clear if the tax increase proposed by this bill will be supported by the governor. Thus, the stockpiling and work-off behavior built into this fiscal note may not occur. If not, the estimated revenue gain for FY16 may be some \$10 million greater than shown in the table above, and FY15 collections would likewise not be benefited by the timing shift of receipts that results from this behavior.

- |  |                            |              |  |
|--|----------------------------|--------------|--|
| <u>Senate</u>  | <u>Dual Referral Rules</u> | <u>House</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> 6.8(F)(1) >= \$100,000 SGF Fiscal Cost {H & S}                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 13.5.1 >= \$100,000 Annual Fiscal Cost {S&H}                  |                            |              | <input type="checkbox"/> 6.8(F)(2) >= \$500,000 Rev. Red. to State {H & S}                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 13.5.2 >= \$500,000 Annual Tax or Fee Change {S&H} |                            |              | <input type="checkbox"/> 6.8(G) >= \$500,000 Tax or Fee Increase or a Net Fee Decrease {S} |

  
**John D. Carpenter**  
**Legislative Fiscal Officer**