

**Fact Sheet on Potential Cuts to the Montana Tobacco Use Prevention Program
Who loses in Gallatin County?**

Why cutting preventive health services doesn't add up to cost savings.

- The Montana Legislature is considering a budget cut that would effectively eliminate the Montana Tobacco Use Prevention Program, which is funded from dollars received through a lawsuit against tobacco companies. This is the only most meaningful and significant state funding dedicated to encouraging and helping Montanans avoid the terrible health effects of tobacco use.
- There is no alternative source of funding doing this work. The cut would mean an end to the Montana Quitline, as well as a statewide network of prevention specialists who work in schools and in communities to build awareness and resources to help people quit and help children say no to tobacco. These prevention specialists are also the main way the state enforces its Clean Indoor Air Act.
- Based on Montana's population, we can expect that a one percent rise in tobacco use in Montana would result in:
 - 7,500 additional smokers in Montana
 - 2,100 more children who will grow up addicted to tobacco
 - 2,000 additional smoking-related deaths
 - 670 more children who will grow up and die from smoking
 - \$108 million in additional long-term health care costs

(Please note that the above projections are based on only a 1 percent increase in smoking rates. This toll will climb proportionally higher as the tobacco use rate increases by more than one percent.)

- In Gallatin County, the reduction would mean the loss of roughly \$90,000 used by Bozeman Public Schools to build community awareness and support for health prevention and anti-smoking efforts. That funding also helps facilitate tobacco prevention groups among students in local schools, and provides funding to enforce rules against smoking in public places.
- These cuts leave our children more vulnerable to tobacco companies. Reductions such as the one being contemplated will make it even more difficult to counter the well-funded efforts by tobacco companies to sell cigarettes and tobacco products. By comparison, total marketing expenditures for the 5 major US cigarette companies in 2001 were \$11.2 billion, more than 13 times the total investment in state tobacco control efforts.ⁱⁱ
- Prevention efforts work. According to one recent study, evaluations of major individual state programs provide compelling evidence that these programs are correlated with reduced tobacco use. In California, for example, per capita cigarette sales were cut almost in half from 1988 to 1999, whereas the decline was only about 20% in the rest of the United States.ⁱⁱⁱ

(Please see other side)

ⁱ Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids; **STATE HARMS & COSTS FROM EACH ONE PERCENTAGE POINT INCREASE IN STATE SMOKING RATES** (copy attached)

ⁱⁱ *Cigarette Report for 2001*. Washington, DC: Federal Trade Commission; 2003.

ⁱⁱⁱ Taurus et al; February 2005, Vol 95, No. 2; American Journal of Public Health

Reducing Tobacco Use: A Report of the Surgeon General. Atlanta, Ga: US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health; 2000.

Wakefield M, Chaloupka FJ. Effectiveness of comprehensive tobacco control programmes in reducing teenage smoking in the USA. *Tob Control*. 2000;9: 177–186.

State Programs Can Reduce Tobacco Use. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences, Institute of Medicine, National Cancer Policy Board; 2000.