



Vote Yes on Proposition 31 to Protect California from the High Costs of Candy-Flavored Tobacco.

Candy flavored tobacco products play a large role in hooking new, young smokers because their flavors and packaging appeal to children. Each year, 6,800 California kids become new daily smokersⁱ and 4 out of 5 kids who have used tobacco started with a flavored product.ⁱⁱ More than 70% of e-cigarette users ages 12-17 say they use e-cigarettes because they “come in flavors I like.”ⁱⁱⁱ

California recently enacted a bipartisan law (SB 793) to protect children from getting hooked on candy-flavored e-cigarettes, sweet cigars and minty-menthol cigarettes. A “yes” vote on Proposition 31 would uphold this law, protecting kids from a lifetime of nicotine addiction and resulting in savings for taxpayers and businesses.

Yes = Millions in Health Care Cost Savings for Businesses and Taxpayers

The thousands of new smokers who become addicted to flavored tobacco products are adding billions in health care costs each year for California businesses and taxpayers.

- The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates that in California, tobacco use costs approximately \$13.3 billion in health care costs each year, including \$3.6 billion in Medi-Cal expenditures.^{iv}
- Ending the sale of candy-flavored tobacco would result in more than \$800 million in annual health care cost savings, including \$283.6 million in Medi-Cal savings.^v

Yes = \$6,000 Saved Annually Per Employee Who Never Starts Smoking

- A study from the [Ohio State University](#) estimated that employers pay an extra \$6,000 per year for each employee who smokes compared to an employee who never smoked. This estimate takes into account the costs of absenteeism, lost productivity, smoke breaks and health care costs.^{vi}

Yes = Keeping Future California Workforce Healthy and Productive

- California kids are the future of our state and the key to California’s economic engine for decades to come. Almost 90% of adult smokers started smoking by the age of 18.^{vii} Ending the sale of candy-flavored tobacco will help youth avoid a lifelong addiction to smoking. Employers will benefit by having a healthier and more productive workforce.

Yes = More Money in California’s Economy

- Today, most of the money spent on flavored tobacco products (80.4%) is exported from California to out-of-state tobacco manufacturers and farmers. Keeping these revenues in state will result in \$580 million in economic activity and a net increase of more than 3,000 jobs.^{viii}

Ad paid for by Committee to Protect California Kids sponsored by Nonprofit Health Organizations.

Committee major funding from:

Michael R. Bloomberg

Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. and the Hospitals

American Heart Association

Funding Details at www.fppc.ca.gov

Yes = More Clarity for California Businesses

- California currently has more than 100 local jurisdictions that have passed policies to end the sale of candy-flavored tobacco. SB 793 consolidates what is currently a patchwork system of city and county ordinances into a statewide policy dealing with most flavored products. Passing Proposition 31 will create a more level playing field for businesses selling tobacco products.

ⁱ Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids, April 2021, <https://www.tobaccofreekids.org/problem/toll-us/california>

ⁱⁱ Ambrose, BK, et al., "Flavored Tobacco Product Use Among US Youth Aged 12-17 Years, 2013-2014," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, published online October 26, 2015.

ⁱⁱⁱ FDA, "Modifications to Compliance Policy for Certain Deemed Products: Guidance for Industry, Draft Guidance," March 13, 2019, <https://www.fda.gov/media/121384/download>.

^{iv} Chaloupka, F. J. and Glantz, S.A. Potential Effects of a Ban on the Sale of Flavored Tobacco Products in California, University of Illinois at Chicago, 2021. <https://tobacconomics.org/files/research/671/ca-flavor-ban-and-revenues-3-29-21.pdf>.

^v Chaloupka, F. J. and Glantz, S.A. Potential Effects of a Ban on the Sale of Flavored Tobacco Products in California, University of Illinois at Chicago, 2021. <https://tobacconomics.org/files/research/671/ca-flavor-ban-and-revenues-3-29-21.pdf>.

^{vi} Ohio State University, 2013, <https://tobaccofree.osu.edu/research/study-companies-pay.html>

^{vii} FDA, Youth and Tobacco, <https://www.fda.gov/tobacco-products/public-health-education/youth-and-tobacco>

^{viii} Chaloupka, F. J. and Glantz, S.A. Potential Effects of a Ban on the Sale of Flavored Tobacco Products in California, University of Illinois at Chicago, 2021. <https://tobacconomics.org/files/research/671/ca-flavor-ban-and-revenues-3-29-21.pdf>.