General Law Committee
JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: SB-230 / Bill Status / Public Hearing Testimony
Title: AN ACT CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER PROTECTION'S RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING LIQUOR CONTROL.
Vote Date: 3/11/2026
Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute
PH Date: 2/23/2026
File No.:

Disclaimer: *The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL

General Law Committee on behalf of the Department of Consumer Protection

REASONS FOR BILL

Per request of the Department of Consumer Protection (DCP), the committee raised SB 230 with the intent of streamlining operations in the Liquor Control Division. Other provisions aim to address various health and safety concerns DCP has encountered in this area. DCP's written testimony details the rationale for each section of the raised bill.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE

The substitute language (LCO 2923) responds to concerns raised in public hearing testimony. It removes language from Sections 1 and 2 of the raised bill that would have eliminated certain reporting requirements for out-of-state shipper permittees.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY

Department of Consumer Protection (DCP)–Bryan Cafferelli, Commissioner–DCP's testimony in support of SB 230 outlines the reasons for the raised bill's provisions.

- **Sections 1 and 2:** DCP argues that current reporting requirements for out-of-state shippers and out-of-state wineries are overly burdensome and do not make a positive contribution to public safety. These sections remove the requirement to send DCP annual reports, but they still allow DCP to request this information when necessary.
- **Section 4:** DCP states that there was a lack of clarity regarding on-premises applicants who amend live entertainment. This section states that applicants are still required to provide notice of live entertainment on their application and placard. The

intent is to ensure that towns are still able to approve or deny permit applications per local ordinances.
- **Section 5:** DCP included this section to close a loophole. This language clarifies that minors cannot have a direct ownership interest or be a permittee for any liquor permit.
- **Section 6:** DCP proposed several changes to age statement forms, which are used when an individual's age is in question. Their intent is to allow staff to engage with minors for a longer period of time while verifying the minor's age.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT

An anonymous individual submitted written testimony expressing generalized support for the bill.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION

Wine and Spirits Wholesalers of America–Colin Phillips, Senior Manager, State Affairs
Wine and Spirits Wholesalers of Connecticut–Larry Cafero, Executive Director
The above individuals submitted identical written testimony in opposition to the bill, with their primary focus on Sections 1 and 2. These sections would remove reporting requirements for direct wine shippers. Cafero also spoke at the public hearing. Philips and Cafero argue that the reporting requirements should continue because they ensure that wine shippers are complying with legal limits and paying taxes to the State of Connecticut. They cite a recent report from Maine which indicates that the state lost over $21,000 due to shippers not being properly licensed or not paying taxes. The testimony argues that instead of removing the reporting requirement, the committee should look to strengthen it.

Reported by: Betsy Francolino **Date: March 15, 2026**