Bill as Introduced

HB 333-FN - AS INTRODUCED

2013 SESSION

13-0534 03/04

HOUSE BILL

333-FN

AN ACT

relative to advertising of New Hampshire products by the liquor commission.

SPONSORS:

Rep. M. Mann, Rock 32; Rep. Duarte, Rock 2; Rep. Danais, Rock 2; Rep. Tasker,

Rock 2

COMMITTEE:

Commerce and Consumer Affairs

ANALYSIS

This bill establishes expenditure requirements for advertising of New Hampshire products by the liquor commission.

Explanation:

Matter added to current law appears in bold italics.

Matter removed from current law appears [in brackets and struckthrough.]

Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Thirteen

AN ACT

relative to advertising of New Hampshire products by the liquor commission.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

- 1 Advertising Expenditures. RSA 175:4, III is repealed and reenacted to read as follows:
- 2 III. Any funds appropriated to the commission for the purposes of paragraph II shall be
- 3 expended to optimize the profitability of the commission and to benefit the state of New Hampshire.
- 4 At least 5 percent of such funds shall be spent to showcase New Hampshire liquor and beverages and
- 5 their manufacture.
- 6 2 Effective Date. This act shall take effect July 1, 2013.

HB 333-FN - FISCAL NOTE

AN ACT

relative to advertising of New Hampshire products by the liquor commission.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Due to time constraints, the Office of Legislative Budget Assistant is unable to provide a fiscal note for this bill, <u>as introduced</u>, at this time. When completed, the fiscal note will be forwarded to the House Clerk's Office.

HB 333 FISCAL NOTE

AN ACT

relative to advertising of New Hampshire products by the liquor commission.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The Liquor Commission states this bill, <u>as introduced</u>, will have an indeterminable impact on state revenue in FY 2014 and each year thereafter. There will be no impact on state, county, and local expenditures, or county and local revenue.

METHODOLOGY:

The Liquor Commission states this bill requires the Commission to dedicate five percent of its advertising budget to the promotion of New Hampshire liquor and beverages. The Commission states that its advertising budget in FY 2013 was \$2,100,000 per year; assuming total advertising expenditures remain the same in future years, the bill will require the Commission to devote \$105,000 per year to promoting New Hampshire products. The bill does not require a change to the Commission's overall advertising budget, and so there is no overall impact on state expenditures. The Commission states that by changing the way a portion of advertising dollars is spent, the bill may affect sales and, by so doing, have an indeterminable impact on state revenue.

Speakers

SIGN UP SHEET

To Register Opinion If Not Speaking

| Bill # HB 333-FN | Date 1-39-13 |
|-------------------------|--------------|
| Committee Commerce à CA | |
| | |

** Please Print All Information **

| | | | | (chec | (check one) | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------|--|
| Name | Address | Phone | Representing | Pro | Con | |
| | • | | | | 1 | |
| | · | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | i | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | - - | 1 | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | ** | | | | |
| | | | | - | | |
| | · | | | | | |
| • | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | • | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | <u></u> | <u> </u> | + | | |
| · | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | - | |
| | · | | · | | | |
| | ¥ | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| · , | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | _ | <u> </u> | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | - | ļ | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | + | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | <i>;</i> | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | 4 | | | | |
| | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | · | | | 1 | | |

Hearing Minutes

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 333-FN

BILL TITLE:

relative to advertising of New Hampshire products by the liquor

commission.

DATE:

1-29-13

LOB ROOM:

302

Time Public Hearing Called to Order:

1:30 pm

Time Adjourned:

2·PM

(please circle if present)

Committee Members: Reps. Butler Schlachman Kopka Hammond Mulholland Gidge Muns K. Williams Heder Scarlotto McNamara, John Hunt Flanders Doolan Keith Murphy Sandblade, Jones F. Rice Tucker and R. Belanger.

Bill Sponsors: Reps. M. Mann, Duarte, Danais, Tasker

TESTIMONY

* Use asterisk if written testimony and/or amendments are submitted.

Rep. Maureen Mann-prime sponsor - Goal is to provide some incentive to NH products. Need to find tradeoff between profit optimization and promoting NH wine and products.

Q: Rep. Fred Rice - How did you arrive at the 5%

A: Small wineries felt that that was an appropriate amount and fair tradeoff.

Q: Any objection to rolling this into discussion of displaying wines?

A: Chairman Ed Butler - Not appropriate to discuss at this time.

Q: Rep. Chris Muns - Was intent to eliminate requirement for 80% to be spent on out of state media and 20% on in state media?

A: No that was not the intent.

<u>Craig Bulkley, Liquor Commission</u>- Opposed to the bill. Marketing team has best handle on where money should go. Problem if legislature starts dictating where money needs to be spent. They need flexibility to decide how best to optimize their goals and objections. This bill does not address wine, only addresses spirits. If intent is to address wine, then that needs to be addressed.

Q: Chairman Butler - Any sense of how much you are currently devoting to NH product promotion?

A: Yes, over the years amount has been increased. Local businesses and restaurants are promoted.

Q: Rep. Kermit Williams - Is it true that right now there is nothing that specifically tells the liquor commission to promote state products?

A: They do provide free storage for NH sprits and wines; everyone else has to pay for it.

Q: Rep. Pam Tucker - How much do storage or bailment fees add to a bottle of wine?

A: Don't know for sure, but it does depend on how long it is in storage.

Q: Rep. Shaffer Hammond - What percentage of total sales are NH wines?

A: Spirit sales. .0002; wine sales .002

*Per Garp, of Loudon, NH - Supporting the bill; see written testimony. Way to encourage liquor commission to promote is to give them a goal; let them know that it's OK. Ridiculous that we are selling just small percentages when we have 32 producers.

Q: Chairman Butler - Where else do you sell wines?

A: Grocery stores and wineries. NH Products get excluded from shelves in stores first.

Q: Chairman Butler - Could you sell more product if you had more outlets?

A. Yes. Liquor Commission is deliberately trying NOT to sell NH products so that they can use that as a justification for throwing them out.

*Bob Blaisdell, NH Wine & Spsirits Brokers Assn. – Opposed to the bill. See written testimony. Violates Commerce Clause. Math does not make sense-allocating 5% to sales that are low. 5% of ad budget would be \$107,000 for less than 1% of sales. There are also non-NH producers that can't get their products on the shelf and to do so takes a lot and they don't get assistance.

Q: Rep. Rice - Is there a ramp up in required advertising costs that justifies spending up to 5%?

A: Doesn't seem appropriate to take \$107,000 of taxpayer money to promote specific products.

Q: Is it true that when sales are low you need to advertise.

A: Yes. But it shouldn't be paid for by the state.

Subcommittee appointed: No action taken

Respectfully Submitted:

Chris Muns, Clerk

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

PUBLIC HEARING ON Hb 333-FN

BILL TITLE:

relative to advertising of New Hampshire products by the liquor

commission.

DATE:

1-29-13

LOB ROOM:

302

Time Public Hearing Called to Order: 130 pm Time Adjourned: 2 pm

(please circle if present)

Committee Members: Reps Butley Schlachman, Kopka Hammond Mulholland Gidge, Muns, K. Williams, Heden Scarlotto McNamara, John Hunt, Flanders, Doolan, Keith Murphy, Sandblade, Jones, B. Rice, Tucker and R. Belanger.

Bill Sponsors: Reps. M. Mann, Duarte, Danais, Tasker

TESTIMONY

Use asterisk if written testimony and/or amendments are submitted.

HB333-FN

Hearing on January 29, 2013

<u>Speaker</u>

Rep Mann-Prime Sponsor

Goal is to provide some incentive to NH products. Need to find tradeoff between profit optimization and promoting NH wine and products.

Questions

- Q. Rep Rice: How did you arrive at the 5%
- A. Small wineries felt that that was an appropriate amount and fair tradeoff
- Q. Rep Rice: Any objection to rolling this into discussion of displaying wines
- A. Rep Butler: Not appropriate to discuss at this time.
- Q. Rep Muns: Was intent to eliminate requirement for 80% to be spent on out of state media and 20% on in state media.
- A. No that was not the intent

Speaker

Craig Bulkley – Liquor Commission is opposed to this.

Marketing team has best handle on where money should go. Problem if legislature starts dictating where money needs to be spent. They need flexibility to decide how best to optimize their goals and objections. This bill does not address wine, only addresses spirits. If intent is to address wine, then that needs to be addressed.

Questions

- Q. Rep Butler: Any sense of how much you are currently devoting to NH product promotion.
- A. Yes, over the years amount has been increased. Local businesses and restaurants are promoted.
- Q. Rep Williams: Is it true that right now there is nothing that specifically tells the liquor commission to promote state products?
- A. They do provide free storage for NH sprits and wines; everyone else has to pay for it.
- Q. Rep Tucker: How much do storage or bailment fees add to a bottle of wine?
- A. Don't know for sure, but it does depend on how long it is in storage
- Q. Rep Hammond: What percentage of total sales are NH wines
- A. Spirit sales. .0002; wine sales .002

<u>Speaker</u>

Per Garp-supporting the bill (written testimony)

Way to encourage liquor commission to promote is to give them a goal; let them know that it's OK. Ridiculous that we are selling just small percentages when we have 32 producers.

Ouestions

- Q. Rep Butler: Where else do you sell wines.
- A. Grocery stores and wineries. NH Products get excluded from shelves in stores first.
- Q. Rep Butler: Could you sell more product if you had more outlets.
- A. Yes. Liquor Commission is deliberately trying NOT to sell NH products so that they can just that a justification for throwing them out.

<u>Speaker</u>

Bob Blaisdell (against) - written testimony

Opposed to bill. Violates Commerce Clause. Math does not make sense-allocating 5% to sales that are low. 5% of ad budget would be \$107,000 for less than 1% of sales. There are also non-NH producers that can't get their products on the shelf and to do so takes a lot and they don't get assistance.

Questions

- Q. Rep Rice: Is there a ramp up in required advertising costs that justifies spending up to 5%
- A. Doesn't seem appropriate to take \$107,000 of taxpayer money to promote specific products.
- Q. Rep Rice: Is it true that when sales are low you need to advertise.
- A. Yes. But it shouldn't be paid for by the state.

Subcommitee appointed: No action taken

Sub-Committee Actions

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

SUBCOMMITTEE WORK SESSION ON HB 333-FN

BILL TITLE: relative to advertising of New Hampshire products by the liquor

commission.

DATE: 2-5-13

Subcommittee Members: Reps. Hunt, Schlachman, Williams, Rice, Tucker, Scarlotto

Comments and Recommendations:

Amendments:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Motions: OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Retained (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep.

Seconded by Rep.

Vote:

Motions: OTP, OTP/A, ITI, Retained (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep. Schlachman

Seconded by Rep. Hunt

Vote: 6-0

Respectfully submitted,

Rep. Frederick C. Rice Subcommittee Chairman/Clerk

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

SUBCOMMITTEE WORK SESSION ON HB 333-FN

BILL TITLE: relative to advertising of New Hampshire products by the liquor

commission.

DATE: 2-5-13

Subcommittee Members:

Comments and Recommendations:

Amendments:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

OTP, OTP/A,(ITL)Retained (Please circle one.)
by Rep. Schlachman **Motions:**

Moved by Rep.

Seconded by Rep. Hunt,

Vote:

Motions: OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Retained (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep.

Seconded by Rep.

Vote:

Respectfully submitted,

Rep. {Type NAME} Frederick C. Rice Subcommittee Chairman/Clerk

Testimony

HB 333 - repeals and reenacts III

175:4 Advertising. –

- I. All advertising of liquor and beverages is lawful, unless specifically prohibited by statute or administrative rule.
- II. The commission is authorized to advertise and regulate the advertisement of liquor and beverages through the medium of newspapers, magazines, periodicals, television and radio broadcasting, sports films, travelogs, electronic or computer media, or other commercially acceptable promotional means and methods which may become available. All advertising of liquor and beverages within the state through the medium of billboards is hereby prohibited.
- III. Any funds appropriated to the commission for the purposes of paragraph II shall be expended to optimize the profitability of the commission.
 - (a) Eighty percent for liquor advertising with out-of-state media; and
 - (b) Twenty percent for liquor advertising with media in the state.
- IV. The following statement shall be posted on the premises of all on-premises and offpremises licensees and at state liquor stores: "According to the Surgeon General, women should not drink alcoholic beverages during pregnancy because of the risk of birth defects." Such statement shall be located in a conspicuous and prominent place within the establishment and shall appear on a contrasting background.

| HB 0001 | 06/16/2011 | VERSION NO: | 04 | FISCAL YEAR 2012 | FISCAL YEAR 2013 PAGE 214 |
|---|---------------|---------------|---|---|---|
| 02 ADMIN OF JUSTICE AND PUBLIC PRTN 77 LIQUOR COMMISSION 77 LIQUOR COMMISSION 771512 MARKETING AND MERCHANDISIN 1030 STORE OPERATIONS | | | (CONT.) (CONT.) (CONT.) (CONT.) (CONT.) | | · |
| CLASS NOTES | | | | | |
| 024 D. THE FUNDS IN THIS APPROPRIA | TION SHALL NO | OT BE TRANSFE | RRED OR E | XPENDED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE. | |
| 043 G. THE FUNDS IN THIS APPROPRIA 30, 2013. | TION SHALL N | OT BE TRANSFI | ERRED OR E | EXPENDED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE AND SHA | LL NOT LAPSE UNTIL JUNE |
| 02 ADMIN OF JUSTICE AND PUBLIC PRTN 77 LIQUOR COMMISSION 77 LIQUOR COMMISSION 771512 MARKETING AND MERCHANDISIN 1031 MERCHANDISING-ADVERTISING? | | | | 5% = \$1 | 07,122.85 |
| O20 Current Expenses TOTAL | | | | 2,142,457 2,142,457 | 2,142,457 2,142,457 |
| ESTIMATED SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR MERCHANDISING-ADVERTISING LIQUOR FUND TOTAL SOURCE OF FUNDS | | | | 2,142,457 2,142,457 | 2,142,457 2,142,457 |
| 02 ADMIN OF JUSTICE AND PUBLIC PRTN 77 LIQUOR COMMISSION 77 LIQUOR COMMISSION 771512 MARKETING AND MERCHANDISIN 1040 WAREHOUSE - TRANSPORTATION | | | | | |
| 010 Personal Services-Perm. Classi 018 Overtime 020 Current Expenses 022 Rents-Leases Other Than State 024 Maint.Other Than Build Grnds 030 Equipment New/Replacement | | | | 491,137 4,400 31,500 1,250 15,000 28,000 52,000 | 477,146 4,400 33,500 1,250 15,000 28,000 53,500 |
| O48 Contractual MaintBuild-GrndsO50 Personal Service-Temp/AppointeO60 Benefits | | | | 126,000 1280,964 | 132,000 296,964 |

| HB 0001 | 06/16/2011 | VERSION NO: | 04 | FISCAL YEAR 2012 | FISCAL YEAR 2013 | PAGE 215 |
|--|-------------|---------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| 02 ADMIN OF JUSTICE AND PUBLIC PRTI 77 LIQUOR COMMISSION 77 LIQUOR COMMISSION 771512 MARKETING AND MERCHANDISIN 1040 WAREHOUSE - TRANSPORTATION | | | (CONT.) (CONT.) (CONT.) (CONT.) (CONT.) | | | |
| 070 In-State Travel Reimbursement TOTAL | | | | 300 1,030,551 | 300 1,042,060 | |
| ESTIMATED SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR WAREHOUSE - TRANSPORTATION LIQUOR FUND TOTAL SOURCE OF FUNDS | | | | 1,030,551 1,030,551 | 1,042,060 1,042,060 | |
| 02 ADMIN OF JUSTICE AND PUBLIC PRTN 77 LIQUOR COMMISSION 77 LIQUOR COMMISSION 771512 MARKETING AND MERCHANDISIN 1034 SWEEPSTAKES INCENTIVE AWARD | IG | | • | | | |
| 017 FT Employees Special Payments050 Personal Service-Temp/Appointe060 BenefitsTOTAL | | | | 18,000 12,000 4,510 34,510 | 18,000 12,000 4,503 34,503 | |
| ESTIMATED SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR SWEEPSTAKES INCENTIVE AWARDS 009 Agency Income | | | | 34,510 | 34,503 | |
| TOTAL SOURCE OF FUNDS | | | | 34,510 | 34,503 | |
| EXPENDITURE TOTAL FOR MARKETING A | ND MERCHAN | DISING | | 36,262,538 | 37,771,350 | |
| LIQUOR FUND OTHER FUNDS TOTAL ESTIMATED SOURCE OF FUNDS FO | OR MARKETIN | G AND MERCHAN | NDISING | 36,228,028 34,510 36,262,538 | 37,736,847 34,503 37,771,350 | |



January 29, 2013

Good afternoon Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

For the record my name is Bob Blaisdell and I am with Demers & Blaisdell located here in Concord. I represent the NH Wine & Spirits Brokers Association.

The association's membership is comprised of 4 NH businesses that are associated with out of state liquor and wine products. The members are as follows: Southern Wine & Spirits of America, Horizon Beverage, Martignetti Companies of NH, and MS Walker NH.

We are here today to express our opposition to HB 333 - relative to advertising of New Hampshire products by the liquor commission.

You heard me last week testify in opposition to a bill that mandated in law special treatment to NH businesses that provide domestic products over other NH businesses that provide non-domestic products.

This bill continues the theme we are seeing this session of mandating in NH law special treatment for domestic wine & liquor by requiring the NHLC to spend 5% of their advertising budget on NH wine and liquor.

I see a few things wrong with this bill:

1. The United States Supreme Court in 2005 stated in the Granholm decision the following:

Time and again this Court has held that, in all but the narrowest circumstances, state laws violate the Commerce Clause if they mandate "differential treatment of in-state and out-of-state economic interests that benefits the former and burdens the latter."

States may not enact laws that burden out-of-state producers or shippers simply to give a competitive advantage to in-state businesses.

"When a state statute directly regulates or discriminates against interstate commerce, or when its effect is to favor in-state economic interests over out-of-state interests, we have generally struck down the statute without further inquiry."

I believe this bill and other bills that are requesting special treatment violate our Commerce Clause and would fly in the face of the US Supreme Court's Granholm decision.

2. The math doesn't make sense.

You have domestic products accounting for roughly .002% of the overall revenue.

This bill wants to mandate that 5% of the amount allocated for advertising be used for showcasing those domestic products.

On page 214 of HB1 2011 you will see the advertising budget. In both 2012 & 2013 the advertising budget was \$2,142,457 each year. 5% of that I believe is \$107,122.85.

The bill mandates that you spend 5% of your advertising budget on products that produce less than 1% of your revenue. It simply does not make sense.

I respectfully urge you all to vote in favor of an ITL motion based on the US Supreme Court's comments regarding the Commerce Clause and on the basic principals of math and business 101.

I appreciate your time and consideration of this matter. I will try and answer any questions you may have.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Bob Blaisdell

Testimony by Per Garp (NH vineyard owner) for HB175, HB-275, HB 331, HB-333

Tuesday, 1/29/2013

I'm including some of my comments together regarding HB 175, HB-275, HB 331, and HB-333 as they are complimentary - they all promote NH products, stimulate economic growth throughout the state, and across several industries, or encourage agriculture.

- HB 175 is pro-NH, although it seeks a pilot program for what has already been proven in ALL prior tests of NH products. For instance, the sales of NH wines at the Manchester airport sales are +500% over forecast by merely moving the wines to the front traffic area of the store. I strongly urge that its language be amended to demand immediate implementation of increased NH product sales. The endless stream of studies, delays, and hearings is misplaced time given the stellar history and 2 years of testimony on this issue. (this bill continues on HB328 which this committee heard enormous testimony on)
- HB 175 should be amended to remove the words "special shelving" replaced with "free standing displays in high traffic areas". Alternatively, it could simply be worded to say "display space shall be given the first right of refusal to NH producers".

This is critical. One must remember how incredulous this very committee was when they uncovered that most SLC stores had moved NH wines to poorly placed shelves, or hidden behind exceedingly tall signage of foreign wines, or completely out of the customer traffic areas. ***it all happened while this committee heard sworn SLC testimony that it was so great to "move them to the front of the store"***.

- HB275, should have all of our support, though a pilot program is not necessary as the NHSLC has already spent \$30,000 of taxpayer money on study (and widely acclaimed as a superior), which admits even in a worst case scenario with only 13 beer SKU's and ice sales that the SLC stores... "will generate over \$1,000,000 in gross margin per year" in its second year, and further states that beer will be priced "3-7% higher" than surrounding stores because of their superior locations. If one knew nothing more that this, it would be more than enough to pass HB275.
- HB331, in a pro-NH spirit, seeks only to enhance the sale of NH products. Since California wines were sold at a NH winery as part of Wine Week, it surely must be OK for NH products to be sold at NH wineries. It's undeniable.

Testimony by Per Garp (NH vineyard owner) for HB175, HB-275, HB 331, HB-333

Tuesday, 1/29/2013

• HB333 increases the sale of NH products through a very modest advertising initiative, and leaves 95% of their advertising budget in place for the NHSLC's stunning promotion of foreign wines. How much more than 95% do the foreign wineries have a right to?

From an overall perspective, we need a penalty structure sufficiently strong enough so that RSA 176:12, or any other stature or rule that promotes NH MADE alcohols, will no longer be ignored. HB175 is a perfect example, where it adds significant and important text to RSA 176:12 - even under questioning the SLC has admitted to this committee that they "don't feel obligated" to follow the law! SLC commissioner Sweeney similarly admitted in a Senate hearing that the pro-NH rules should never have been illegally wiped out.

As this committee well knows, for many years SLC rules were in place to compel its staff to uphold RSA 176:12 - many have long since been wiped out, including:

- "(8) Preferential treatment shall be given to products manufactured of bottled in NH, as provided by RSA 176:12"
- "(a) Priority shall be given to NH products as per RSA 176:12"
 And almost fortuitously, there was a rule which referenced special consideration for "(4) NH produced products which satisfy the special needs of tourists" And what happened to the MHSLC's Ethic's rules as they can use some guidance.

In December, 2010, I had a meeting with SLC chairman Sweeney who confirmed that all of those rules are still in effect because they were never repealed as per NH Statue and our Constitution.

Senate Finance Committee Chairman Lou D'Allesandro ordered the SLC in 2010 to produce documents regarding these missing rules - to this day the SLC has refused.

And finally, even Rep. Menuse forcefully stated at the 2012 Commerce Committee hearings..."the SLC is under special obligation to improve their sales of NH products because of their monopoly of the industry in NH".

The stern words of this committee, and their own personal investigation and reports during the 2012 hearings must finally now be honored with these bills.

NEW HAMPSHIRE LIQUOR COMMISSION, Minutes of January 9, 2013 Meeting

Find the original on http://ice.liquor.nh.gov/minutes/comm_minutes_2013_01_09.pdf
this is a copy == >>

NEW HAMPSHIRE LIQUOR COMMISSION

Minutes of January 9, 2013 Meeting

on January 23, 2013, as submitted by Nicole Brassard, memo dated January 7th.

NHSLC and East and West Coast Women in Wine Dinner, Wine Tasting and **Off Site Wine Shop** Approved the recommended East and West Coast Women in Wine dinner, wine tasting and **off-site wine shop at LaBelle Winery in Amherst**, from 8:00 to 10:30 pm on January 23, 2013, as submitted by Nicole Brassard, memo dated January 7th

After review of each of the following items, Commissioner Milligan made a motion to **approve the recommendations** as presented by Mr. Roy and recommended by Mr. Gerrish for the Spirit items listed below. Chairman Mollica seconded the motions. The motions were unanimously adopted

VI)
PUBLIC COMMENT No public comments at this time.

Commissioner Milligan stated that last evening, on January 8 the Nashua store 69 hosted a reception for the artists that now have their work permanently displayed in the store. The artwork is displayed through the grant for Percent for Art. Commissioner Milligan stated the reception event was a huge success and the store looked absolutely beautiful. It is a perfect arena for hosting such events. Thanks went to Anne Bogart for her hard work and preparation for the event

APARENTLY IT IS LEAGAL TO SELL CALIFORNIA MANUFACTURED WINE AT this NHWINERY AS IS EVEDENT OF THIS APROVAL FROM NHSLC NOTES.

(but not LEAGAL if THE WINE is made in NH)

- WHO GAVE THE NHSLC APROVAL ? Did you ?
- NH small producers need's your help, please support your neighborhood winery and brewery

Voting Sheets

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

EXECUTIVE SESSION on HB 333-FN{Type BILL NO.}

BILL TITLE: relative to advertising of New Hampshire products by the liquor

commission.

DATE:

2-19-13

LOB ROOM:

302

Amendments:

Sponsor: Rep.

OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep.

OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep.

OLS Document #:

Motions:

OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Retained (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep.

Seconded by Rep.

Vote:

(Please attach record of roll call vote.)

Motions:

OTP, OTP/A, ITI) Retained (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep. Tucker

Seconded by Rep. Gidge

Vote: 18-0 (Please attach record of roll call vote.)

CONSENT CALENDAR VOTE: Consent or Regular (Circle One)

(Vote to place on Consent Calendar must be unanimous.)

Statement of Intent:

Refer to Committee Report

Respectfully submitted,

Rep. Chris Muns, Clerk

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

EXECUTIVE SESSION on HB 333-FN(Type-BILL NO.)

BILL TITLE:

relative to advertising of New Hampshire products by the liquor

commission

DATE:

2/19/15

LOB ROOM:

302

Amendments:

Sponsor: Rep.

OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep.

OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep.

OLS Document #:

Motions:

OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Retained (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep.

TUCKER

Seconded by Rep. /

Rep. Cellul

Vote:

(Please attach record of roll call vote.)

18 Y-0~N/

Motions:

OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Retained (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep.

Seconded by Rep.

Vote:

(Please attach record of roll call vote.)

CONSENT CALENDAR VOTE: Consent or Regular (Circle One)

(Vote to place on Consent Calendar must be unanimous.)

Statement of Intent:

Refer to Committee Report

Respectfully submitted,

Rep. Chris Muns, Clerk



STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE OFFICE OF THE HOUSE CLERK

1/10/2013 11:26:06 AM Roll Call Committee Registers Report

2013 SESSION

| COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS | | 1. Decolects |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS Bill #: #B 333-FN Title: NECATIVE TO | ADVINTISING OF R | y thoracts |
| PH Date:/ | Exec Session Date: 2/1 | 9 .13. |
| Motion: TTC. | Amendment #: | |
| <u>MEMBER</u> | YEAS | NAYS |
| Butler, Edward A, Chairman | | |
| Schlachman, Donna L, V Chairman | | |
| Kopka, Angeline A | | |
| Gidge, Kenneth N | | |
| Hammond, Jill S, | | |
| Mulholland, Catherine | | |
| Heden, Ruth S | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| McNamara, Richard D | | <u></u> |
| Muns, Chris , Clerk | | |
| Scarlotto, Joe W | | |
| Williams, Kermit R | | |
| Hunt, John B | | |
| Flanders, Donald H | | |
| Belanger, Ronald J | | |
| Rice, Frederick C | | |
| Tucker, Pamela Z | | |
| Jones, Laura M | | |
| Murphy, Keith | | |
| Doolan, Ralph J | | |
| Sandblade, Emily C | | |
| TOTAL VOTE: | | |
| CAMBENT MANCRY | | |
| | 18 | \mathcal{O} |

Committee Report

CONSENT CALENDAR

February 27, 2013

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The Committee on <u>COMMERCE AND CONSUMER</u>

<u>AFFAIRS</u> to which was referred HB333-FN,

AN ACT relative to advertising of New Hampshire products by the liquor commission. Having considered the same, report the same with the following Resolution: RESOLVED, That it is INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE.

Rep. Pamela Z Tucker

FOR THE COMMITTEE

Original: House Clerk

Cc: Committee Bill File

COMMITTEE REPORT

| Committee: | COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS |
|-------------------|---|
| Bill Number: | HB333-FN |
| Title: | relative to advertising of New Hampshire products by the liquor commission. |
| Date: | February 20, 2013 |
| Consent Calendar: | YES |
| Recommendation: | INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE |

STATEMENT OF INTENT

The purpose of this bill is to direct the liquor commission to spend advertising money on our New Hampshire made liquor and beverages sold in the state liquor stores. While the committee wants to help our local businesses, it is not the legislature's responsibility to manage the liquor commission's advertising dollars. Additionally, the 5% of advertising money suggested in the bill to be allocated is arbitrary with no rationale for the amount.

Vote 18-0.

Rep. Pamela Z Tucker FOR THE COMMITTEE

Original: House Clerk

Cc: Committee Bill File

CONSENT CALENDAR

COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

HB333-FN, relative to advertising of New Hampshire products by the liquor commission. INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE.

Rep. Pamela Z Tucker for COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS. The purpose of this bill is to direct the liquor commission to spend advertising money on our New Hampshire made liquor and beverages sold in the state liquor stores. While the committee wants to help our local businesses, it is not the legislature's responsibility to manage the liquor commission's advertising dollars. Additionally, the 5% of advertising money suggested in the bill to be allocated is arbitrary with no rationale for the amount. Vote 18-0.

Original: House Clerk

Cc: Committee Bill File

Stapler, Carol

From:

Schlachman, Donna

Sent:

Tuesday, February 19, 2013 4:39 PM

To:

Stapler, Carol

Subject: FW: HB333 Maj blurb

OK! Donna

From: pamzt@comcast.net [mailto:pamzt@comcast.net]

Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 12:43 PM

To: Stapler, Carol

Subject: HB333 Maj blurb

The purpose of this bill is to direct the liquor commission to spend advertising money on our New Hampshire made liquor and beverages sold in the state liquor stores. While the committee wants to help our local businesses, it is not the legislature's responsibility to manage the liquor commission's advertising dollars. Additionally, the 5% of advertising money suggested in the bill to be allocated is arbitrary with no rationale for the amount.

Take Care,

Pamela Tucker

"Liberty, as well as honor, man ought to preserve at the hazard of his life, for without it life is insupportable."- Miguel de Cervantes