

5. COMMUNICATIONS

None.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (UNFINISHED OR PENDING MATTERS)

6A. Liquor Ordinance Amendment

Committee members expressed positive responses to the draft of the proposed Liquor License Ordinance. Consensus was reached by all members present that the ordinance be returned to **City Attorney John Staran** for additional changes and modifications incorporating the following questions/suggestions:

- Are there legal ramifications associated with requiring that the license be returned to the City if it is not used for a certain period of time (i.e. ninety days)?
- Clarification of the requirement that fifty percent (50%) of business revenues be derived from food sales to state that this applies specifically to “on-site” food sales.
- Process should require that the license apply to all concerned business partners, and all partners should then be included in the screening process.
- Do State-mandated requirements (i.e. renewal process) need to be defined in the ordinance, or should they merely be referenced?
- Clarify language regarding owner’s financial stability.
- Requirement that premises meet all City and State occupancy codes.
- Should regulations be defined regarding a liquor license in conjunction with gambling (i.e. bingo) on the premises?

In addition to the above specific questions/suggestions, Committee members reiterated the need for “real flexibility” in the ordinance. It was also noted that the process should be more stringent in an effort to award licenses to those businesses that seem most likely to succeed, thus reducing the risk of the license changing hands or leaving the community.

The question arose repeatedly as to which specific items should be addressed in the ordinance and which should be addressed in the actual application for the license.

It was suggested by **Ms. Jasinski** that Committee members visit other local communities to observe their liquor license review process.

6B. City Council Appointee Performance Review Process

Ms. Holder noted that her original intention in bringing the issue of City Council appointed positions performance reviews before the AIS Committee was to “complete the circle” of the Council appointing the individuals and evaluating their performance.

After lengthy discussion, it was determined that **Ms. Lee** would prepare a draft policy to include a bi-annual review of the Council appointee, review of their performance appraisal as completed by the administration (Mayor), as well as additional feedback or self evaluation from the