

## **SMOKING RATES AND RELATED TRENDS IN TOBACCO PREVENTION AND CONTROL SPENDING, CIGARETTE TAX RATES, AND SMOKE-FREE ENVIRONMENT LAWS**

This memorandum provides information regarding changes in the smoking rates of various states, including North Dakota, and related trends in tobacco prevention and control spending, cigarette tax rates, and smoke-free environment laws during the period 2000 through 2010. The federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) through its State Tobacco Activities Tracking and Evaluation (STATE) System provides the ability to generate trend reports for various behaviors, including cigarette use, in each state and the District of Columbia. Cigarette use is measured based on data from the CDC behavioral risk factor surveillance survey. A STATE System report of annual cigarette use among adults from 2000 through 2010 lists the percentage of overall adult cigarette use in each state for each year and is provided as [Appendix A](#). The list also includes the change in the percentage of adult cigarette use from 2000 to 2010 and ranks states based on the decrease in adult smoking over this period. Based on the STATE System report, New Hampshire, Nevada, Rhode Island, Iowa, and Connecticut experienced the largest declines in adult cigarette use from 2000 to 2010. Conversely, Oklahoma and West Virginia experienced increases in adult cigarette use during the 10-year period. Overall adult cigarette use in North Dakota declined from 23.2 percent in 2000 to 17.4 percent in 2010. The reduction of 5.8 percent in adult cigarette use from 2000 to 2010 in the state ranked North Dakota 18<sup>th</sup> among the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

The states selected for comparative analysis are the five states that had the most significant decreases in adult cigarette use from 2000 to 2010, the five states that had the least change or an increase in adult cigarette use during the same period, and selected other states based on proximity to North Dakota or other factors, including similarities in population and smoking rate reductions. Tobacco prevention and control spending and policies vary widely from state to state. These differences make comparisons between the states difficult, and other factors not considered in these comparisons may also affect cigarette use by adults in these states. For example, at the same time the smoking rate in New Hampshire decreased from 17.1 percent in 2008 to 15.8 percent in 2009, tobacco prevention and control spending in the state was reduced from \$2.5 million to \$1.1 million, and the cigarette tax rate increased by \$.45 per package in 2009.

### **TOBACCO PREVENTION AND CONTROL SPENDING**

Tobacco prevention and control appropriation information for each state is published annually by the American Lung Association and is available from 2003 through 2010. Appropriation information compared to adult cigarette use for the selected states is provided in [Appendix B](#). Of the five states that had the most significant decrease in adult cigarette use from 2000 to 2010, three--New Hampshire, Nevada, and Rhode Island--decreased funding for tobacco prevention and control from 2003 to 2010, while two--Iowa and Connecticut--increased funding. Of the five states that had the least change or an increase in adult cigarette use, three--Louisiana, Montana, and Oklahoma--increased funding, Mississippi decreased funding, and West Virginia had minimal funding changes over the eight-year period.

From 2003 through 2009, funding for tobacco prevention and control in North Dakota ranged from \$3.4 million to \$4.5 million annually, while the adult smoking rate decreased from 20.5 percent to 18.6 percent during the same period. Funding for tobacco prevention and control in North Dakota increased to \$9.4 million in 2010, and the smoking rate decreased to 17.4 percent. South Dakota provided funding for tobacco prevention and control at levels varying from \$1.6 million to \$6.1 million from 2003 through 2010, and the adult smoking rate decreased from 22.7 percent to 15.4 percent. Minnesota reduced funding for tobacco prevention and control from \$30.1 million in 2003 to an average of approximately \$22 million per year from 2004 through 2010. Smoking rates in Minnesota decreased from 21.1 percent in 2003 to 14.9 percent in 2010.

### **CIGARETTE TAX RATES**

The federal CDC STATE System identifies cigarette tax rates by state. In 2000 cigarette tax rates ranged from \$.025 per package in Virginia to \$1.11 per package in New York. In 2010 cigarette tax rates ranged from \$.17 per package in Missouri to \$4.35 per package in New York. These tax rates do not include taxes levied by local governments. A summary of cigarette tax rates compared to adult cigarette use for the selected states from 2000 through 2010 is provided in [Appendix C](#). The appendix also includes cigarette tax rate increases from 2001 through 2011 for the states identified.

Of the five states that had the most significant decrease in adult cigarette use from 2000 to 2010, three--New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Connecticut--increased cigarette tax rates several times over the 10-year period. Of the five states that had the least change or an increase in adult cigarette use, four--Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and West Virginia--increased cigarette tax rates once, while Montana increased its cigarette tax rate twice over the 10-year period. Montana currently charges a cigarette tax rate of \$1.70 per package.

In North Dakota the cigarette tax rate remains unchanged from 2000 at \$.44 per package. In South Dakota the cigarette tax rate was increased twice over the 10-year period and is currently \$1.53 per package. Minnesota has increased its cigarette tax annually since 2005 and currently charges \$1.586 per package.

### **SMOKE-FREE ENVIRONMENT LAWS**

A federal CDC STATE System report identifying smoke-free environment laws by state as of December 31, 2009, indicates 21 states and the District of Columbia had smoke-free environment laws enacted for worksites, restaurants, and bars. Nineteen states had no smoke-free environment laws, and the remaining 10 states had laws providing partial coverage. Areas covered by smoke-free indoor air

laws as of December 31, 2009, compared to adult cigarette use for the selected states are provided in [Appendix D](#).

Of the five states that had the most significant decrease in adult cigarette use from 2000 to 2010, two--Rhode Island and Iowa--covered worksites, restaurants, and bars in their smoke-free indoor air laws. Nevada covered worksites and restaurants, New Hampshire covered just restaurants, and Connecticut had no smoke-free indoor air coverage. Of the five states that had the least change or an increase in adult cigarette use, three--Mississippi, Oklahoma, and West Virginia--had no laws for smoke-free indoor air. Montana covered worksites, restaurants, and bars in their smoke-free indoor air laws, and Louisiana covered worksites and restaurants.

For the remaining selected states, South Dakota smoke-free indoor air laws covered worksites and restaurants, and Minnesota smoke-free indoor air laws covered worksites, restaurants, and bars.

North Dakota prohibits smoking in all enclosed areas of public places and places of employment but provides exemptions for other areas, including bars. Local governments may enact more stringent tobacco control laws.

ATTACH:4