

CONFIDENTIAL
LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2014

Bill Number: S.181 Name of Bill: Act Relating to the Services of Malt Beverages by the Glass

Agency/ Dept: Vermont State Police Author of Bill Review: LT Russell F. Robinson

Date of Bill Review: January 14, 2014 Status of Bill: (check one):

☒ Upon Introduction ☐ As passed by 1st body ☐ As passed by both bodies

Recommended Position:

☐ Support ☐ Oppose ☒ Remain Neutral ☐ Support with modifications identified in #8 below

Analysis of Bill

1. Summary of bill and issue it addresses. *Describe what the bill is intended to accomplish and why.*

Allows the holder of a first class license to serve up to four glasses of malt beverages to a customer at a single time.

2. Is there a need for this bill? *Please explain why or why not.*

No. Currently a patron is allowed to serve two glasses of malt beverages to a customer which can be problematic for bartenders and servers. By allowing four malt beverages to be handled by a patron would compound the problem that already exists.

3. What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?

During busy times bartenders, servers and business owners become distracted by their duties and do not have the time to follow a patron back to a table to be assured that all beverages are arriving to that particular table, and that everyone at the table is of legal age to be served.

4. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for other departments in state government, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?

State government liquor control would be inundated with calls for service. The tracking would be a problem as it would not be reasonable for servers or management to be expected to follow Patrons back to tables, insuring that the proper patrons are served.

5. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for others, and what is likely to be their perspective on it? (for example, public, municipalities, organizations, business, regulated entities, etc)

The patron would feel that they are being targeted if followed back to the table to insure proper patrons served. Municipal/State government would see an increase in calls for service and prosecution would be difficult unless patron actually observed consuming and is in violation of existing laws.

6. Other Stakeholders:

6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why?

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word or PDF document to laura.gray@state.vt.us

Support of certain patrons, customers that follow the letter of the law.

6.2 Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why?

Restaurant owners, bartenders, servers oppose the bill.

7. Rationale for recommendation: *Justify recommendation stated above.*

Business owners, bartenders, servers feel that they would be scrutinized more than they already are. When business is busy there is no time to adequately ensure that the malt beverages are arriving at the table intended.

Once arriving at the table the beverages must be distributed to the correct patrons which would result in having to re-check certain patrons causing a nightmare for the establishment.

8. Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill: *Not meant to rewrite bill, but rather, an opportunity to identify simple modifications that would change recommended position.*



Secretary/Commissioner has reviewed this document: _____ **Date:** 01/19/14