

Submitter:

Phyllis Klein

On Behalf Of:

Committee:

House Committee On Revenue

Measure, Appointment or Topic:

HB3940

As a consumer and homeowner, I oppose this surcharge on beverages as a solution to fund wildfire protection. The argument that sugary drinks are bad for you and this will, what, discourage those who drink them from buying them, feels like a stretch. Placing the burden of wildfire funding on those who opt to buy sugary beverages is baseless and unfair.

Using lottery funds doesn't bother me , while I agree there is no correlation between expense and revenue here either.

Sugary beverages are likely purchased more by families in my mind and grocery bills are already too much and include the deposit fee already.

I suggest further creativity is needed for wildfire funding. A premium on lumber purchases makes the most sense to me!