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Longer hours for bars, more civilised drinking?

Well controlled studies show this to be a myth
My favourite case study: Change from 1am to 6am bar closing in Iceland

Influential reviews downplay importance of bar trading hours

- Hahn et al (2010), US CDC systematic review concludes consistent effects only if 2+ hours and for extensions not reductions of hours
- OECD (2015) concludes inconsistent evidence for any effects

**KEY**: Basic study quality
Impact of changes to trading hours of bars and restaurants

Update to Stockwell and Chikritzhs (2009), Crime Prevention and Community Safety

- 51 studies over four decades, mostly from the UK, USA, Australia and Canada
- Only 16 included both baseline and control measures, all peer-reviewed
- Of these 13 reported significant impacts on at least one outcome in predicted direction
- 6 of these high-quality studies focused on violence – all found significant impacts
Chikritzhs & Stockwell (2002): Bars allowed to trade after midnight doubled rates of violent incidents vs controls, Perth, Australia

Kypri et al (2009): 37% reduction in assaults following restricted trading hours in Newcastle, NSW compared with control area. See also: Kypri et al (2014)

Rossow & Norstrom (2011): 5% reduction in assaults for each extra hour of trading in Norwegian bars in 18 cities compared with neighbourhood controls with no extra hour.
Hours and days of sales: some specifics

- Adding or removing a day of trading usually has a big impact on consumption and harm.
- Even an hour or two of extra trading late at night, when people are drinking heavily, can significantly increase consumption and harm (NB Chikritzhs et al (2006) found higher BACs from customers at late trading bars).
- There can be extra problems on the streets if all bars close at the same time – but “staggered” trading hours don’t have to mean longer hours...
More recent contributions

- Sherk et al (2018) Systematic Review. *JSAD:* The addition of one extra day of trading per week for liquor stores results in a 3.4% increase in per capita consumption.

- Atkinson et al (2018) Agent-based modelling, *Addiction:* A 2 hour reduction in bar hours in NSW, Australia would lead to a 7.9% (±0.9%) reduction in violence.
Thank you!
California Alcohol Policy Alliance

Mission Statement

CAPA shall unite diverse organizations and communities in California to protect health and safety, and prevent alcohol-related harm through statewide action.
CAPA Platform

• “Charge for Harm” – Higher taxes; higher prices
• Limit alcohol advertising in all media, especially on government-controlled property
• Make ABC effective, efficient, transparent, and accountable to public health and safety
• Eliminate products oriented to underage youth and vulnerable populations like powdered alcohol, alcopops, and malt liquor
• “Point .05 Saves Lives”
## CAPA Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol Justice</th>
<th>Friday Night Live Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-Narcotics Education</td>
<td>Koreatown Youth and Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Laytonville Healthy Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AADAP, Inc.</td>
<td>L.A. County Friday Night Live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPT San Ramon Valley</td>
<td>L.A. Drug &amp; Alcohol Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Community Resources</td>
<td>Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Health Services, Inc.</td>
<td>Lutheran Office of Public Policy – California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Council on Alcohol Problems</td>
<td>MFI Recovery Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASA for Safe &amp; Healthy</td>
<td>Mountain Communities Family Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>National Asian Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Human Development</td>
<td>American Families Against Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Open Recovery</td>
<td>Partnership for a Positive Pomona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden Youth and Family Center</td>
<td>Paso por Paso, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Public Strategies</td>
<td>Project SAFER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FASD Network of Southern CA</td>
<td>Pueblo y Salud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FreeMUNI – SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos Prevention Coalition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Rafael Alcohol &amp; Drug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF DogPAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAY San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving Lives Drug &amp; Alcohol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran Office of Public Policy – California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Orange County Coalition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarzana Treatment Centers, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wall Las Memorias Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCEPP Social Model Recovery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Against Gun Violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth for Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alcohol harms in CA

- 10,572 death a year
- One person dies every hour
- 503 youth die (410 males, 87 females)
- 40% of convicted homicides and half of assaults are alcohol-related

- General state and local government cost: $14.5 billion annually
- Youth drinking costs: $3.5 Billion annually
  - Youth traffic collisions cost $1.2 Billion
  - Youth violence costs $3.5 Billion

California Alcohol Policy Alliance
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STOP Wiener’s 4 a.m. Bar Bill

We did

California Alcohol Policy Alliance
A little bit more about the research
Effectiveness of Policies Restricting Hours of Alcohol Sales in Preventing Excessive Alcohol Consumption and Related Harms

Robert A. Hahn, PhD, MPH, Jennifer L. Kuzara, MA, MPH, Randy Elder, PhD, Robert Brewer, MD, MSPH, Sajal Chattopadhyay, PhD, Jonathan Fielding, MD, MPH, MBA, Timothy S. Naimi, MD, MPH, Traci Toomey, PhD, Jennifer Cook Middleton, PhD, Briana Lawrence, MPH, the Task Force on Community Preventive Services

Abstract: Local, state, and national policies that limit the hours that alcoholic beverages may be available for sale might be a means of reducing excessive alcohol consumption and related harms. The methods of the Guide to Community Preventive Services were used to synthesize scientific evidence on the effectiveness of such policies. All of the studies included in this review assessed the effects of increasing hours of sale in on-premises settings (in which alcoholic beverages are consumed where purchased) in high-income nations. None of the studies was conducted in the U.S. The review team’s initial assessment of this evidence suggested that changes of less than 2 hours were unlikely to significantly affect excessive alcohol consumption and related harms; to explore this hypothesis, studies assessing the effects of changing hours of sale by less than 2 hours and by 2 or more hours were assessed separately.

There was sufficient evidence in ten qualifying studies to conclude that increasing hours of sale by 2 or more hours increases alcohol-related harms. Thus, disallowing extensions of hours of alcohol sales by 2 or more should be expected to prevent alcohol-related harms, while policies decreasing hours of sale by 2 hours or more at on-premises alcohol outlets may be an effective strategy for preventing alcohol-related harms. The evidence from six qualifying studies was insufficient to determine whether increasing hours of sale by less than 2 hours increases excessive alcohol consumption and related harms.

CDC Releases Two Reports on Excessive Alcohol Use and Related Harms

CDC's Guide to Community Preventive Services has released two reports on "Maintaining Limits on Days and Hours of Sale of Alcoholic Beverages to Prevent Excessive Alcohol Consumption and Related Harms". These reports were posted online today by the American Journal of Preventive Medicine and will be published in their December 2010 issue.

The reports show that increasing the number of hours and days when alcohol can be sold in bars, restaurants, and liquor stores leads to greater alcohol use and related harms, especially motor-vehicle crashes. National, state, and local policies that remove previously banned alcohol sales on weekend days (usually Sundays) or that increase the hours of sale by 2 or more hours contribute to excessive drinking and many dangerous outcomes, including driving after drinking and alcohol-related assault and injury.

The Task Force on Community Preventive Services, an independent, nonfederal body of public health experts, recommends maintaining limits on the days or hours during which alcohol can legally be sold, based upon a state-of-the-art systematic review process of all available studies on the topic.

Laws and policies regulating the availability of alcohol, including limits on the number of days of the week or hours when alcoholic beverages can be sold, are effective public health strategies to prevent the harms that result from drinking too much.

Excessive alcohol use causes more than 79,000 deaths in the U.S. each year and contributes to a wide range of health and social problems. For more information, see www.thecommunityguide.org
Preventing Excessive Alcohol Consumption: Maintaining Limits on Hours of Sale

Task Force Finding

Intervention Definition
One strategy to prevent excessive alcohol consumption and related harms is to limit access by regulating the hours during which alcohol can legally be sold. Approaches may include:

- Maintaining existing limits in response to efforts to expand hours of sale
- Expanding current limits on hours of sale

Policies limiting hours of sale may apply to outlets that sell alcohol for consumption at the place of purchase (on-premises outlets, such as bars or restaurants) or elsewhere (off-premises outlets, such as liquor stores). In the United States, policies may be made at the state level and, where not prohibited, by state pre-emption laws at local levels.

Task Force Finding (February 2009)*
On the basis of sufficient evidence of effectiveness, the Community Preventive Services Task Force recommends maintaining existing limits on the hours during which alcoholic beverages are sold at on-premises outlets as another strategy for preventing alcohol-related harms.

The studies in the review assessed the effectiveness of increasing hours of sale by either 2 or more hours or less than 2 hours in on-premises settings. Studies that examined increasing hours of sale by 2 or more hours found increases in vehicle crash injuries, emergency room admissions, and alcohol-related assault and injury. One study found a decrease in violent crime. Studies that assessed the effectiveness of increasing hours of sale by less than 2 hours showed inconsistent effects, suggesting that changes of less than 2 hours in the sale of alcohol in on-premise settings had no substantial effect on alcohol-related harms.

The Task Force found insufficient evidence to determine the effectiveness of increasing existing limits on hours of sale at off-premises outlets, because no studies were found that assessed such evidence.
Community Preventive Services Task Force Members

The Community Preventive Services Task Force (CPSTF) is an independent, nonfederal panel of public health and prevention experts that provides evidence-based findings and recommendations about community preventive services, programs, and other interventions aimed at improving population health. Its members represent a broad range of research, practice, and policy expertise in community preventive services, public health, health promotion, and disease prevention.

The fifteen CPSTF members are appointed by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). CPSTF members serve five year terms, with possible extensions to maintain a full scope of expertise, complete specific work, and ensure consistency of CPSTF recommendations.

FAQs about the Task Force

Learn more about this Task Force at
TheCommunityGuide.org

Task Force Members

- **Jonathan E. Fielding, MD, MPH, MBA (Chair)**
  Distinguished Professor of Health Policy and Management, UCLA Fielding School of Public Health and Distinguished Professor of Pediatrics, UCLA Geffen School of Medicine

- **Robert L. Johnson, MD, FAAP (Vice Chair)**
  Pediatrics and Director of the Division of Adolescent and Young Adult Medicine at the New Jersey Medical School of the Rutgers University

- **Bruce Nedrow (Ned) Calonge, MD, MPH (Vice Chair)**
  President and CEO, The Colorado Trust

- **Doug Campos-Outcalt, MD, MPA**
  Clinical Professor, University of Arizona College of Medicine, Phoenix; Senior Lecturer, University of Arizona College of Public Health

- **Marshall H. Chin, MD, MPH, FACP**
  Richard Parillo Family Professor, Healthcare Ethics, Department of Medicine, University of Chicago; Director, Chicago Center for Diabetes Translation Research; Director, RWJF Finding Answers: Disparities Research for Change; General Internist

- **Jamie F. Chriqui, PhD, MHS**
  Professor of Health Policy and Administration, School of Public Health, University of Illinois at Chicago

- **John M. Clymer**
  Executive Director, National Forum for Heart Disease & Stroke Prevention; Adjunct Assistant Professor, Loma Linda University School of Public Health

- **Alison Evans Cuellar**
  Professor, Health Administration and Policy, George Mason University
Alcohol-related crashes

- Fatal DUI is a chronic, worsening problem for California.
- Between 2014 and 2016, alcohol-related crash deaths rose 21%.

First-time DUls in New York State were more likely to be observed in counties with later trading hours (Schofield & Denson, 2013). Extended last call times both attract remote customers and encourage overconsumption.

Fatigue and alcohol

• Studies show that sleep deprivation can impair driving as severely as alcohol intoxication (Williamson & Feyer, 2000). However, the two can be cumulative (Arnedt et al. 2009).

• This means that sleep-impaired drivers can be severely impaired even with a BAC under .08.

• Because alcohol’s euphoric effects can create feelings of stimulation as BAC increases, the fatigue can be masked. Drivers can already be on the freeway before exhaustion sets in.
The Splash Effect

• There is no such thing as “local control” in alcohol policy. The harm from one city’s decision to change last-call times splashes over every surrounding community.

• Vingilis et al. (2006) observed that earlier last-call times in Canada led to Canadian drivers getting in crashes in bordering U.S. cities.

• Ventura County officials observed that drivers receiving a DUI had traveled an average of 7 miles before being arrested. (Maximum 150 miles; VCBH 2017.)

• In Ventura, plenty of drunk drivers cross county lines. 10% of underage DUI arrests were returning from Hollywood. Approximately 15% of 21-25 year olds were coming from Hollywood or Santa Barbara. (VCBH 2009.)

• With 4 a.m. last calls, these “drunk commuters” will still be on the road during morning rush hours. This puts workday drivers at risk and increases the economic damage from crashes.

• Late last calls are ostensibly aimed at hospitality industry, but there are no guarantee that tourists will remain in walking/ride-share distance of nightlife spots. For example, only 42% of tourists in SF spend the night in SF (San Francisco Travel Association, 2016).
We have created “Splash Zone” maps for the regions surrounding the cities that will enact last call times. The red circle is 7 miles, the average travel for a drunk driver according to Ventura County. The yellow circle is 40 miles, the approximate distance a driver could travel in 1 hour.
Violence, injury & emergency

• Across counties in New York State, each additional hour of permitted liquor sales was associated with 4.75 more violent crimes per 100,000 residents. (Schofield & Denson, 2013)

• Violence cost NY state nearly $200 million annually, not including New York City. (ibid.)

• In Australia, earlier last call times in entertainment districts reduced violence by up to 45%. (Menendez, Kypri & Weatherburn 2017). Conversely, later last calls were associated with a 50% rise. (Chikritzhs & Stockwell 2002).

• Later last calls move violence and injury further into the early morning hours (Humphreys, Eisner & Wiebe 2013), disrupting ERs and providing lower quality of care for all admission.
California public transit is insufficient to deal with late-night drinking. Although ride-sharing services are growing in popularity, their abilities to mitigate DUI are moderate at best.

The most optimistic estimates show that ride-sharing reduces alcohol-related vehicle fatalities by only 6%—and these benefits disappear during surge pricing. (Greenwood & Wattal, 2015)

More recent studies dispute any reduction in traffic deaths. (Brazil & Kirk, 2016)

Recent research on ride-sharing use shows Uber and Lyft will not help with the Splash Effect. Only 7% of suburban residents use ride-sharing to travel. (Clewlow & Mishra, 2017)
CAPA X THE NUMBERS
ADVOCACY & ACTIONS IN 2017

NINE
we took a position on

BILLS

DISTRICT MEETINGS

18
with Senate GO, Assembly GO & Assembly Approps members
42 letters of opposition submitted by CAPA members & allies

Members spoke eight at hearings for bills in Sacramento

100+ meetings with staff in Sacramento
CAPA X THE NUMBERS
ADVOCACY & ACTIONS IN 2017

THREE PRESS EVENTS
San Diego & Los Angeles

ARTICLES
482 online and in print with audience up to 500,000
54 RADIO & TV SPOTS on SB 384 alone across the state mentioning CAPA

EMAILS 114,000 sent to electeds via our Action Alerts

1200 FAXES GENERATED & SENT TO OFFICES
California Alcohol Policy Alliance
TOOK ACTION
CALL Local legislators’ district offices & Committee members
ACTION ALERTS WRITE Letters to, Committee & Postcards to Gov.
RALLY PARTNER With MADD and local prevention coalitions in SD & LA
VISITS
Immediate action in meetings
VETO SB 384

SB 384 will only benefit bar and restaurant owners at taxpayer expense for the public health and safety harms it will cause.

alcoholpolicyalliance.org
Dear Governor Jerry Brown:

Senator Wiener (D-San Francisco) introduced SB 384 for special interest groups seeking to extend drinking hours in California from 2 a.m. to 4 a.m.

California already suffers more annual alcohol-related harm than any other state:
~ 10,572 deaths  ~ 17,700 hospitalizations
~ $35 billion cost to public  ~ $14.5 billion cost to government

We cannot afford the physical, emotional, or financial costs for more alcohol-related violence, emergency room admissions, injuries, impaired driving, and motor vehicle crashes.

Name

Signature

Email

Zip code

PLEASE VETO SB 384 NOW!
early JUL  Amendments added in Assembly GO that addressed many concerns we’d raised

mid AUG  Placed in suspense file in Assembly Appropriations

first of SEP  Amended significantly $\rightarrow$ a Task Force to study impacts of alcohol service until 4 am

early SEP  Bill is “gutted & amended” by author to delete all mention of extended alcohol service hours. SB 384 now deals with a completely different topic. It’s dead for 2017!
What worked?

M E D I A

• Messages: This is NOT local control. (versus telling them local control does not work)
• Messages: The harms will impact all cities, even those who do not go until 4 a.m.
• Stories that describe ugly realities of closing time – from law enforcement and neighbors
• Engaged two of California’s largest media markets (Los Angeles and San Diego) at key times and in key committee members’ districts
What worked?

**LEGISLATURE**

- Presence in Sacramento and in the districts, before and during hearings. Got out way ahead of it.
- Let Committee members know that *people in their districts cared and were watching this*
- Over 35 letters from community organizations across the state, including MADD
- Provided *valuable data* to decision makers to give them an “out”
- Relationship with San Diego legislator in key committee position
What worked against us

• **Being right is not enough** – data and letter from Dr. Fielding

• **We live in a post-fact world** – author’s bogus data

• Law enforcement groups stayed off

• Context of “**alcoholification**” and “**modernization**” especially in Garcetti’s Los Angeles

• **Challenge to get large statewide groups on board** – MADD joined with letter but not full press
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>AUTHORITY</th>
<th>Saturday Last Call</th>
<th>Sunday Last Call</th>
<th>% of Drivers Involved in Fatal Crashes BAC .08+ 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>State Statute</td>
<td>6am - 1am</td>
<td>6am - 1am</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Maine State Statute</td>
<td>5am - 1am</td>
<td>9am - 1am</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Hours set in statute ma</td>
<td>6am - 2am</td>
<td>6am - 2am</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>State Law</td>
<td>M-Th 9am - 1am</td>
<td>11am - 1am</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>8am - 2am</td>
<td>12pm - 2am</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>State Law</td>
<td>8am - 5am</td>
<td>8am - 5am</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>State Statute</td>
<td>8am - 2am</td>
<td>8am - 2am</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>State Legislature</td>
<td>7am - 2am</td>
<td>7am - 2am</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>OLCC</td>
<td>7am - 2:30am</td>
<td>7am - 2:30am</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Liquor Commission</td>
<td>6am - 4am</td>
<td>6am - 4am</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>State Legislature &amp; Stat</td>
<td>10am - 1am, 2am</td>
<td>Local Control</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>State Legislature</td>
<td>7am - 2am</td>
<td>7am - 2am</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>State Legislature</td>
<td>7am - 2am</td>
<td>7am - 2am</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>No Rules</td>
<td>24 hrs</td>
<td>24 hrs</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2am</td>
<td>2am</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sun - Th 2am, Fri-Sat 2:30am</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>State Legislature</td>
<td>6am - 1am</td>
<td>6am - 1am</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>General Assembly</td>
<td>6am - 1am</td>
<td>6am - 1am</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Local Control</td>
<td>Sun - Fri 4am, Sat 5am</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>No Rules</td>
<td>24hrs</td>
<td>24hrs</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Local Control</td>
<td>2am</td>
<td>2am</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>State Legislature</td>
<td>State Legislature</td>
<td>State Legislature</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>PLCB &amp; State Legislature</td>
<td>7am - 3am</td>
<td>7am - 3am</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Vermont Department o</td>
<td>8am - 2am</td>
<td>8am - 2am</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>State Legislature</td>
<td>6am - 2am (unfinis 6am - 2am (unfinish)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sun - Th 2am, Fri-Sat 3am</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>State Legislature</td>
<td>2am</td>
<td>2am</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Local Control</td>
<td>4am</td>
<td>4am</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>State Legislature &amp; Loc</td>
<td>7am - 2:30am</td>
<td>12pm - Local Option</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It’s back as SB 905!
2006, 2013, 2017, 2018...

SIX TRIAL CITIES – 17% OF THE POPULATION OF CALIFORNIA

San Francisco
Oakland
Sacramento
West Hollywood
Los Angeles
Long Beach

California Alcohol Policy Alliance
This bill, beginning January 1, 2020, and before January 1, 2025, would require the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control to conduct a pilot program that would authorize the department to issue an additional hours license to an on-sale licensee located in a qualified city which would authorize, with or without conditions, the selling, giving, or purchasing of alcoholic beverages at the licensed premises between the hours of 2 a.m. and 4 a.m., upon completion of specified requirements by the qualified city in which the licensee is located. The bill would impose specified fees related to the license to be deposited in the Alcohol Beverage Control Fund. The bill would require the applicant to notify specified persons of the application for an additional hours license and would provide a procedure for protest and hearing regarding the application. The bill would require the Department of the California Highway Patrol and the qualified city to submit reports to the Legislature regarding the regional impact of the additional service hours areas. The bill would provide that any person under 21 years of age who enters and remains in the licensed public premises during the additional serving hours without lawful business therein is guilty of a misdemeanor, as provided.
For more information:
CAPA and Alcohol Justice

Sara Cooley Broschart
Advocacy Manager
(734) 646-4575 (cell)
SaraC@alcoholjustice.org
alcoholjustice.org
AlcoholPolicyAlliance.org