## **Department of Legislative Services**

Maryland General Assembly 2005 Session

### FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE Revised

House Bill 1133

(Prince George's County Delegation)

**Economic Matters** 

Education, Health, and Environmental Affairs

# Prince George's County - Alcoholic Beverages Licenses - Nudity and Sexual Displays PG 300-05

This bill adds Prince George's County to the list of those jurisdictions which prohibit nudity and sexual displays in establishments with alcoholic beverages licenses. A violator's alcoholic beverages license must be revoked by the Prince George's County Board of License Commissioners. The bill exempts license holders that currently conduct such activity if they received permission from the Board of License Commissioners to do so on or before August 15, 1981 and have continuously owned the premises since September 1, 1981.

#### **Fiscal Summary**

State Effect: None.

**Local Effect:** Enforcement of the bill's provisions and conducting license revocation hearings should not materially impact Prince George's County finances.

**Small Business Effect:** Minimal.

### **Analysis**

**Current Law:** In Allegany, Anne Arundel, Calvert, Caroline, Carroll, Cecil, Charles, Dorchester, Frederick, Garrett, Harford, Kent, Queen Anne's, St. Mary's, Washington (with a limited exception), Wicomico, and Worcester counties, an alcoholic beverages

licensee is subject to having its alcoholic beverages license revoked it if permits nudity and sexual displays on its premises.

Background: Prince George's County advises that six licensed establishments with exotic dancing have the board of license commissioners' permission for such activity and meet the other criteria specified in the bill.

Small Business Effect: Current alcoholic beverages licensees that have received permission from the Prince George's County Board of License Commissioners to conduct exotic dancing would be positively impacted by the exemption to the prohibition against exotic dancing. Those licensees that have not received permission to conduct exotic dancing would be negatively impacted by the prohibition.

#### **Additional Information**

**Prior Introductions:** HB 591 of 2004 and HB 517 of 2003, substantially similar bills, received favorable reports by the Economic Matters Committee (HB 591 with amendments), and passed the House. HB 591 received a favorable report from the Education, Health, and Environmental Affairs Committee but was never voted on by the full Senate. HB 517, as amended by the Senate Committee, passed the Senate. A conference committee was not able to reach final agreement on the bill.

**Cross File:** None.

**Information Source(s):** Prince George's County, Department of Legislative Services

**Fiscal Note History:** First Reader - March 18, 2005

ncs/ljm Revised - House Third Reader - March 31, 2005

Revised - Enrolled Bill - May 5, 2005

Analysis by: Joshua A. Watters Direct Inquiries to:

(410) 946-5510

(301) 970-5510