ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (REGULATIONS AND ORDERS) STD. 399 (REV. 12/2013)

| | ECONOMIC IMPA | CISTATEMENT | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| AND THE RESIDENCE OF THE PARTY | ONTACT PERSON | EMAIL ADDRESS | TELEPHONE NUMBER |
| Justice, Office of the Attorney General DESCRIPTIVE TITLE FROM NOTICE REGISTER OR FORM 400 | Barry Alves | Barry.Alves@doj.ca.gov | (916) 210-7838 |
| Revised Tobacco Escrow Agreement | | | NOTICE FILE NUMBER |
| A. ESTIMATED PRIVATE SECTOR COST IMPACT | S Include calculations and | assumptions in the rulemaking record | |
| | | assumptions in the rule making record. | |
| Check the appropriate box(es) below to indicate to in | 450, | orting requirements | |
| b. Impacts small businesses | | criptive instead of performance | |
| c. Impacts jobs or occupations | g. Impacts indiv | | |
| d. Impacts California competitiveness | | above (Explain below): | |
| | Ш | | |
| | | uplete this Economic Impact Statement. | |
| If box in Item 1.h. is o | checked, complete the Fis | scal Impact Statement as appropriate. | |
| Justice, Office of the Attorney Ger 2. The | | nnomic immost of this year, that are fortish is also de- | - W - E I ! |
| (Agency/Department) | estimates that the eco | onomic impact of this regulation (which include | is the fiscal impact) is: |
| ── Below \$10 million ─────────────────────────────────── | | | |
| Between \$10 and \$25 million | | | |
| Between \$25 and \$50 million | | | |
| Over \$50 million [If the economic impact is a | ver \$50 million, agencies are re | equired to submit a <u>Standardized Regulatory Impa</u> | act Assessment |
| as specified in Government | Code Section 11346.3(c)] | | and the second s |
| 3. Enter the total number of businesses impacted: | Approx. 60 | | |
| Describe the types of businesses (Include nonpro | fits): Approximately 50 t | obacco companies and 10 escrow ba | nks |
| Enter the number or percentage of total businesses impacted that are small businesses: | Approx. 50% | | |
| | 9000 | | |
| 4. Enter the number of businesses that will be create | ed: 0 | eliminated: 0 | |
| Explain: The costs of reviewing and exe | cuting a revised escrow | v agreement should neither eliminate | e nor create businesses. |
| 5. Indicate the geographic extent of impacts: 💢 | Statewide | | |
| | | | |
| ш, | Local or regional (List areas): | | |
| 6. Enter the number of jobs created: 0 | and eliminated: 0 | | |
| Describe the types of jobs or occupations impacte | A NI/A | | |
| Describe the types of Jobs of occupations impacts | ed: IVA | | |
| | | | |
| Will the regulation affect the ability of California be other states by making it more costly to produce of | | YES X NO | |
| | | | |
| If YES, explain briefly: | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)

STD. 399 (REV. 12/2013)

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)

| В | . ESTIMATED COSTS Include calcula | ations and assumptions in t | he rulemaking record. | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | . What are the total statewide dollar co | sts that businesses and indi | viduals may incur to comply with this regul | lation over its lifetime? \$ 0 |
| | a. Initial costs for a small business: \$ | Approx. \$1,500 | Annual ongoing costs: \$ | Years: |
| | b. Initial costs for a typical business: \$ | Approx. \$1,500 | Annual ongoing costs: \$ | Years: |
| | c. Initial costs for an individual: \$ | \$ | Annual ongoing costs: \$ | Years: |
| | d. Describe other economic costs tha | it may occur: None | | |
| | | | | |
| 2 | . If multiple industries are impacted, en | nter the share of total costs f | for each industry: The anticipated cos | ts for both the escrow banks and |
| | tobacco companies are esse | entially the same. Base | ed upon market share, tobacco co | ompanies 80% and escrow banks 20%. |
| 3. | 3. If the regulation imposes reporting requirements, enter the annual costs a typical business may incur to comply with these requirements. Include the dollar costs to do programming, record keeping, reporting, and other paperwork, whether or not the paperwork must be submitted. \$ | | | |
| 4. | Will this regulation directly impact hou | using costs? YES | × NO | |
| | | If YES, enter t | he annual dollar cost per housing unit: \$_ | |
| | | | Number of units: | |
| 5. | Are there comparable Federal regulation | ions? YES [| × NO | |
| | Explain the need for State regulation g | jiven the existence or absen | ce of Federal regulations: California an | d almost all other states require some |
| | tobacco manufacturers to deposit funds into qualified escrow funds governed by state law. No similar federal law. | | | |
| | Enter any additional costs to businesses and/or individuals that may be due to State - Federal differences: \$ 0 | | | |
| | | | - | |
| | | | ts is not specifically required by rulemaking | law, but encouraged. |
| 1. | Briefly summarize the benefits of the r health and welfare of California reside | regulation, which may includents, worker safety and the S | de among others, the state's environment: The Office of the | Attorney General administers and |
| | enforces Health and Safety Code sections 104555-104557 to ensure that tobacco escrow deposits serve as reserve | | | scrow deposits serve as reserve |
| | funds to satisfy potential law | suits. Revised form an | nd regulations materially improve | s oversight and monitoring of funds. |
| 2. | Are the benefits the result of: \boxtimes spec | cific statutory requirements | , or goals developed by the agency b | ased on broad statutory authority? |
| | Explain: Under Rev. & Tax. Code | section 301.65.1, sub | d. (c)(2)(a), the Attorney General | must regulate the funds and form. |
| 3 | What are the total statewide benefits f | | 25-74 Ptg. 155 | |
| ٥, | what are the total statewide benefits i | rom this regulation over its | metime: 3 oriquaritmable | |
| 4. | Briefly describe any expansion of busin | nesses currently doing busir | ness within the State of California that would | ld result from this regulation: N/A |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| _ | | | | |
| D. | ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULATI specifically required by rulemaking la | | nd assumptions in the rulemaking record. | Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not |
| 1, | | | atives were considered, explain why not: | After considerable review, there is no |
| | reasonable alternative to ado | opting these regulatio | ns, and they are the least burden | some and most fair and equitable way |
| | | | ed, maintained, and monitored. | |
| | | The state of the s | | PAGE 2 |

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)

STD 399 (REV 12/2013)

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)

| _ | | |
|----|--|---|
| 2. | 2. Summarize the total statewide costs and benefits from this reg | ulation and each alternative considered: |
| | Regulation: Benefit: \$ See below Cost: \$ 0 | |
| | Alternative 1: Benefit: \$ Cost: \$ | |
| | Alternative 2: Benefit: \$ Cost: \$ | |
| 3. | 3. Briefly discuss any quantification issues that are relevant to a cor | nparison |
| | of estimated costs and benefits for this regulation or alterna | |
| | California's beneficial interest in escrowed funds | from premature release. |
| | Rulemaking law requires agencies to consider performance s regulation mandates the use of specific technologies or equi actions or procedures. Were performance standards consider | oment, or prescribes specific ed to lower compliance costs? YES NO |
| | _ w = | chnologies, equipment, or performance standards. This regulation and |
| | form address the permitted investments and du | rations of deposits for tobacco escrow funds at banks. |
| ε. | . MAJOR REGULATIONS Include calculations and assumptio | ns in the rulemaking record. |
| | 60 MOV | gency (Cal/EPA) boards, offices and departments are required to |
| | | th and Safety Code section 57005). Otherwise, skip to E4. |
| 1. | . Will the estimated costs of this regulation to California business | enterprises exceed \$10 million? YES X NO |
| | I, | f YES, complete E2. and E3 If NO, skip to E4 |
| 2. | 2. Briefly describe each alternative, or combination of alternatives | for which a cost-effectiveness analysis was performed: |
| | Alternative 1: | |
| | Alternative 2: | |
| | (Attach additional pages for other alternatives) | |
| | | |
| 3. | 8. For the regulation, and each alternative just described, enter th | |
| | | Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$ |
| | | Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$ |
| | Alternative 2: Total Cost \$ | Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$ |
| | I. Will the regulation subject to OAL review have an estimated ecc exceeding \$50 million in any 12-month period between the da after the major regulation is estimated to be fully implemented | nomic impact to business enterprises and individuals located in or doing business in California se the major regulation is estimated to be filed with the Secretary of State through 12 months? |
| | YES NO | |
| | If YES, agencies are required to submit a <u>Standardized Regulatory</u> Government Code Section 11346.3(c) and to include the SRIA in th | |
| 5. | 6. Briefly describe the following: | |
| | The increase or decrease of investment in the State: Th | is regulation will not impact whether businesses invest in the State. |
| | The incentive for innovation in products, materials or processes | This regulation neither incentives or disincentives any innovation in |
| | products, materials, or processes. | |
| | The benefits of the regulations, including, but not limited to, be residents, worker safety, and the state's environment and quali | |
| | addresses several issues that have emerged after | California's most recent revision in 2010. |
| | | PAGE 3 |

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)

STD. 399 (REV. 12/2013)

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

| | FISCAL EFFECT ON LOCAL GOVERNME current year and two subsequent Fiscal Ye | | hrough 6 and attach calculations ar | nd assumptions of fiscal impact for the |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| | Additional expenditures in the current (Pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B o | | | ent Code). |
| | \$ | | | |
| | a. Funding provided in | | | |
| | Budget Act of | | , Statutes of | |
| | b. Funding will be requested in the G | | | |
| | | Fiscal Year: | | |
| | Additional expenditures in the current (Pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B o | State Fiscal Year which are NOT rei f the California Constitution and Se | nbursable by the State. (Approximate) ctions 17500 et seg. of the Governm | re) ent Code). |
| | \$ | | | |
| | Check reason(s) this regulation is not reimb | • | information: | |
| | a. Implements the Federal mandate | contained in | | |
| | b. Implements the court mandate se | t forth by the | <u> </u> | Court. |
| | Case of: | | vs | |
| | c. Implements a mandate of the peo | ple of this State expressed in their a | pproval of Proposition No. | |
| | Date of Election: | | | |
| | d. Issued only in response to a speci | | | |
| | Local entity(s) affected: | | | |
| | e. Will be fully financed from the fee | s, revenue, etc. from: | | |
| | Authorized by Section: | | of the | Code; |
| | f. Provides for savings to each affect | ted unit of local government which | will, at a minimum, offset any addition | onal costs to each; |
| | g. Creates, eliminates, or changes th | e penalty for a new crime or infracti | on contained in | |
| | 3. Annual Savings. (approximate) | | | |
| | \$ | | | |
| X | 4. No additional costs or savings. This regu | | stantive or clarifying changes to curre | ent law regulations. |
| | 5. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation o | loes not affect any local entity or pro- | gram. | |
| | 6. Other. Explain | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | PAGE 4 |

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)

STD. 399 (REV. 12/2013)

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)

| B. FISCAL EFFECT ON STATE GOVERNMENT Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach call year and two subsequent Fiscal Years. | culations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the curren |
|--|---|
| 1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate) | |
| \$ | |
| It is anticipated that State agencies will: | |
| a. Absorb these additional costs within their existing budgets and resources. | |
| b. Increase the currently authorized budget level for theFiscal Year | č. |
| 2. Savings in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate) | |
| \$ | |
| 3. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any State agency or program. | |
| 4. Other. Explain | |
| | 284 |
| C. FISCAL EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF STATE PROGRAMS Indicate appropriate boxes 1 the impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years. | rough 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fisca |
| 1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate) | |
| s | |
| 2. Savings in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate) | |
| \$ | |
| 3. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any federally funded State agency or program. | |
| 4. Other. Explain | |
| | |
| FISCAL OFFICE SIGNATURE | DATE / |
| | hald |
| | 11/11/16 |
| The signature antests that the agency has completed the STD. 399 according to the instruction the impacts of the proposed rulemaking. State boards, offices, or departments not under an A | |
| nighest ranking official in the organization. | |
| AGENCY SEGRETARY | DATE |
| In hi Chi | 12-19-18 |
| Finance approval and signature is required when SAM sections 6601-6616 require completion | on of Fiscal Impact Statement in the STD. 399. |
| DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE PROGRAM BUDGET MANAGER | DATE |
| Z Z | |
| | |