

Council Questions/Comments and Staff Responses Report for November 26, 2012

as of November 26, 2012 at 1:58am

Consent Agenda

Alderman: Rob Fazzini

Item 6D: Purchase of Desktop and Notebook Computers

Questions/Comment: Why are we replacing only 25% rather than 50% or more at this time? Are there not efficiencies being lost every day by our employees using antiquated equipment?

Staff Response: The choice to replace only 25% of desktops and laptops were driven by the following:

1. The number being requested will definitely allow staff to replace the City's most under-performing desktop and laptop computers.
2. Due to the effects of the recession, no desktops or laptops were replaced in FY2008 and FY2009. Information Services (IS) staff's goal is eventually to get to a four year replacement schedule, where 25% of the end user's computers would be replaced each year. Typical industry best practices replace desktop computers after approximately four (4) years. Staff will be recommending in FY2014 a similar request for the next round of replacements.
3. With current workload, staff believes that 25% replacement of the computers in 2013 will take close to the end of the year to implement. Staff plans to start the next round of replacements, if approved by City Council, shortly after the start of FY2014.
4. Another big factor is staff's continuing research into "virtualizing" many of the City's desktops. In the case of virtualization, the actual processing is done on centralized servers. The desktop computer is used simply to initially connect to the server to create the desktop session. This makes the performance characteristics of the desktop much less important, allowing staff to use old hardware or to replace the desktops with less expensive "terminals" when they do fail.

Staff is not recommending purchasing too many of the high performance desktops at one time because of the possibility of virtualization, which would increase performance for the user. If used, this approach could almost eliminate the need to replace desktops unless they fail. Currently, however, the cost of deployment is still relatively high. There are also a few small pockets of current computers that staff is trying to change out this year. However, these computers will most likely be a different configuration than the "standard configuration" of desktops and notebooks that would be replaced with this request.

Regular Agenda

Alderman: Karen Schmidt

Comment: The vote on the downtown license moratorium comes after the vote for Laugh. It seems it would make more sense to have these 2 items addressed the other way around (moratorium first and then Laugh)? I appreciate these different moratorium options available to us.

Alderman: Rob Fazzini:

Comment: I think the voting order was purposeful and appropriate. Laugh vote after Moratorium might negate it having a vote at all if we were to adopt option 1.

Staff Response: There has been a practice in the past (which has never been objected to) of changing the order of items on the regular agenda, either to place them in a more logical order or to accommodate persons in the audience who may only be interested in one item on the agenda which was inadvertently placed at a later order on the agenda. The Mayor, as chair of the meeting, almost certainly has the ability to change the order of items on the agenda, subject to a point of order if an Alderman objects to the change (the point of order would need to be seconded and then voted on in order to overrule the chairman). If an individual Alderman desires to change the order of the agenda, he or she may informally request the chair to do so, or he or she may make a motion at the beginning of the regular agenda to change the order of proceedings, which would need to be seconded and voted on to accomplish the change.

Council Questions/Comments and Staff Responses Report for November 26, 2012

as of November 26, 2012 at 1:58am

In the particular issue of Item 7B coming before 7C, if option one of 7C (the “total” moratorium) were to be passed, it would negate the approval of the license at issue in 7B in the event the Council had approved the license. If 7C was debated prior to 7B, and the Council chooses to not approve option one, a consideration of the 7B liquor license makes sense. If the “total” moratorium is approved, 7B is moot.

Alderman: Rob Fazzini

Item 7A: Memorandum of Understanding with Miller Park Zoo Zoological Society

Questions/Comments:

1. What was the City of Bloomington portion of the cost of the Miller Park Zoo Master Plan process?
 - a. **Staff Response:** The City of Bloomington’s portion was \$10,000. The Zoological Society paid \$110,280.
2. MOU page 2 last paragraph. Why does the City of Bloomington not receive a \$7 portion of upper level membership revenues?
 - a. **Staff Response:** During the Master Plan process, an opportunity was recognized for the Miller Park Zoological Society (MPZS) to focus on larger dollar fundraising efforts. The option for the City not receiving a portion of upper level membership revenue (memberships sold at \$100 or higher) is an incentive for the MPZS to cultivate larger dollar amount donations and higher level donors. The set rate payments of \$50,000 annually along with the City taking over the gift shop profits (and receiving \$7 of each lower membership) is projected to produce at least the minimum revenue of \$115,000 previously provided by the MPZS.
3. MOU page 4 section D. The word “their” should be “its” in first sentence.
 - a. **Staff Response:** Wording will be change accordingly.
4. There needs to be more definitive explanation of “right” to adjust funding” in the second to last sentence. My questions/suggestions to better present the recommendation and MOU should not be construed as being in favor of the recommendation.
 - a. **Staff Response:** The MOU is being created to capture, in writing, arrangements with a known entity in the Miller Park Zoological Society. This has been a long-term, strong and very successful partnership and staff is recommending the current language that is in this original recommended MOU. If the City decided that the office space currently occupied by the MPZS employee was needed for City business, it would only be fair to allow the MPZS to adjust their funding level to balance the budgeting needs in finding new office space and the expenses that go along with that. With that being said, the length of this MOU is for one year during which City staff is recommending committing to continue to allow office space to the MPZS employee as stated in the recommended MOU. As the MOU is analyzed after this one- year agreement the “right to adjust funding” could then be further refined.

Alderman: Jim Fruin

Item 7C: Ordinance Imposing a Moratorium until May 13, 2013 on the Creation of Licenses to sell Alcoholic Liquor for Consumption on the Premises within the Central Business District

Question/Comment: The Farr Report dated 02-23-2010 which addressed a Downtown Bloomington Strategy contains a recommendation that the Liquor Commission should restrict new Taverns to designated Tavern Districts. One being located in the 500 and 600 blocks of North Main. The other being on Front Street between Madison and Center, and the block bordered by Front/Main/Washington/Center. The report indicates that new nightclubs, bars, and other drinking establishments should be concentrated in these two areas to minimize potential impacts such as noise, litter and crime on the surrounding neighborhoods. The report goes on to recommend a policy to restrict new

Council Questions/Comments and Staff Responses Report for November 26, 2012

as of November 26, 2012 at 1:58am

class “TA” and “TB” liquor licenses to the two specific, designated areas. It further states that this restriction should only apply to New taverns, such that existing taverns with valid liquor licenses located outside of the designated areas are able to operate in perpetuity, barring a change in location. The Farr Report recommends that this restriction should not include liquor licenses related to the sale of liquor at restaurants, convenience stores, specialty shops, wholesalers, etc.

The recent Downtown Entertainment Task Force Report on Management of Liquor Licenses is dated October 2012. The report recommends that no new tavern licenses be created until the licenses we have in our Downtown are adequately controlled. It goes to say that Tavern licenses should be contained in the town areas designated by the Downtown Strategy Report.

Staff Response: See the attached report written by Mark Huber.

General Comments

Alderman: Bernie Anderson

Comment: I have no questions for the current council agenda at this time.

Prepared by Barbara J. Adkins, Deputy City Manager

Memo

To: David Hales, City Manager
From: Mark Huber, Director, Planning and Code Enforcement
Date: October 30, 2012
Subject: Liquor Application of KTPS, Inc., d/b/a Six Strings, Located at 301 & 303 N. Main St. and 110 E. Jefferson St.

In February, 2010, a draft report entitled *Downtown Bloomington Strategy* was presented to the City of Bloomington for consideration. Authored by Farr Associates of Chicago, and commissioned by the Downtown Bloomington Association, this report examined the existing conditions of Downtown Bloomington with the intent of providing recommendations and a strategy to improve the vibrancy and preserve the heritage of Downtown.

As part of the plan's strategy for improving the retail climate, recommendations were made to concentrate retail to three (3) major nodes of activity, followed by limiting appropriate uses in each area¹.

Retail mix area #1 consisted of Main Street, north of Jefferson. Recommended uses generally included small scale retail and service. This area is considered by the report as the retail core of Downtown.

Retail mix area #2 primarily includes the area surrounding the Square. This area includes the uses permitted in retail mix #1 and flexibility by also including additional service and office type uses.

Retail mix area #3 mainly includes the area along E. Front Street from East St. to Prairie. This area not only includes the uses permitted in areas #1 and #2 it adds "destination retail" (larger foot print) stores.

The fourth recommendation by the study was to establish a restriction or elimination of certain liquor licenses outside of designated "Tavern Districts". Primarily the plan recommended new nightclubs, bars, and other drinking establishments be limited to the two (2) Tavern Districts². The first tavern district includes the 500 and 600 blocks of North Main Street. The second district includes the south block of the square and the 100 blocks of East and West Front Street. The primary reasons for limiting or confining these occupancies as stated by the Downtown

¹ See schedule of appropriate uses for each retail mix, *Downtown Bloomington Strategy*, page 28.

² Language from the Plan and associated map are included at the end of this memo.

Strategy: "...drinking establishments should be concentrated in these two areas to minimize potential negative impacts, such as noise, litter, and crime, on the surrounding neighborhoods."

Upon review of the proposal of KTPS, staff finds: the relocation of Six Strings (a tavern) to the 300 block of North Main Street with the intent provide multiple bar locations in the building and to serve alcohol only after 11:00 p.m., to be inconsistent with the Downtown Strategy; due to a proposed location outside the "Tavern Districts" as described.

From the Downtown Bloomington Strategy, starting on page 27

4. Recommendation: Liquor Commission should restrict new taverns to designated Tavern Districts Two New Tavern Districts, outlined in orange on Figure II-3, are designated to concentrate the drinking establishments within Downtown. New nightclubs, bars, and other drinking establishments should be concentrated in these two areas to minimize potential negative impacts, such as noise, litter, and crime, on the surrounding neighborhoods. These negative impacts were frequently cited as an issue during the public input process of this project. This recommendation should not be read to suggest that additional taverns are needed or desired, or as an invitation for the expansion of such establishments. The two New Tavern District areas were chosen due to their existing concentrations of drinking establishments and the two locations' distance from existing residential neighborhoods. The taverns are an important asset within Downtown that attract visitors and help move Downtown toward becoming a 24-hour destination. It must be understood that, while many negative impacts from the taverns can be mitigated, some, especially noise, will likely remain to a certain extent. It is recommended that the Bloomington Liquor Commission adopt a policy to restrict new Class "TA" and "TB" liquor licenses issued in the Downtown study area to those approximate locations indicated on Figure II-3. It is critical that this restriction apply only to *new* taverns, such that existing taverns with valid liquor licenses located outside the designated New Tavern District boundary are able to operate in perpetuity (barring a change in location). The restriction should not include liquor licenses related to the sale of liquor at restaurants, convenience stores, specialty shops, wholesalers, etc.

II. Illustrative Master Plan

Proposed Retail Plan

