

**2008 Responsible Hospitality Institute  
Innovation in Planning, Managing, and Policing Hospitality Zones  
Jeanna Mastrodicasa**

- A New York City study in 2004 showed that \$9B in economic impact from nighttime economy. California will be mandating training for security in 2009.
- Repeated reference to have constant networking and maintenance within hospitality zones to balance uses.
- Must work to use technology such as soundproofing when you mix residential and nighttime economy.

Hospitality groups should meet regularly (monthly) to review problems, upcoming laws and events, and have an open forum. Need fewer officers when have these meetings. In Chicago, if they have to deploy a bunch of resources, the city will itemize a bill and send it over. Reiterated that licensee holds the ultimate control and needs to manage it.

Noise issues: Edmonton had a giveaway of ear plugs “a gift to help you sleep at night” with the message “when you are out downtown, please consider how noise affects your neighbors in the community. We also need to sleep at night.” It is recommended that in zoning codes, don’t have noise code the same in your residential area as in mixed use districts.

**Regulating Promoters**

Promoter ordinance: both in San Jose and Chicago attempting to try this; Hollywood doing away with it. The hardest part has been defining it. “A person who rents a licensed private event space for a private group or brings a group to public spaces in a licensed establishment.”

Need to educate promoters on safety and security, occupancy, alcohol responsibility. Goal is to protect city, increase responsibility, decrease incidents, need to have a contract with licensed establishment with promoter, license still belongs to owner, owners and management need to be on hand, not just turn it over to a promoter. Challenge is that most insurers will not insure a promoter but will a business; if doing it as a business, need a business license.

**Current issues:**

- Alcohol outlet density issues (rapid overconcentration of bars)
- Transformation of “restaurants” into “bars”: “Morphing”—turning from restaurant into bar; more likely if liquor is served, not just beer and wine. In Fullerton, used conditional use permits for restaurants that switch to bars. You can also redefine “restaurant” in local codes zoning related to food v. alcohol sales; need to increase required reporting of food/alcohol sales.
- Outlet operations with high incidents of police events: Suggests using local permitting process to abate or revoke permits for persistently troublesome outlets, and possibly re-planning for more uses. Look at patterns and work with outlet operators. Recommend using permit process not nuisance abatement.
- Extended hours of operation past “last call”—a soft closing is the best deterrent for crime. Pro: less inebriated departures; Con: problems in the districts last longer.
- Bottle service is the new profit center for bars—you need to finish the bottle, as you paid for the whole thing!

**Resource:** Prevention Research Center at Berkeley: <http://www.prev.org/>

Have focused on “server intervention” and made recommendations to assist servers in intervening when someone has had too much to drink. Focus on community interventions as well; the strategy and implementation matters. Currently working on a project with California universities about community interventions.

**Boulder, Colorado (University community)**

Problems sought to solve: alcohol deaths and DUI, party school image, out of control house parties, lines were blurred as all alcohol issues blamed on bars, chaos at closing at Pearl and Broadway, transportation issues with 1 hour taxi waits, vandalism, fights. Wanted to change image, reduce deaths, identify and repair broken points.

Has three hospitality zones. They have a well-organized responsible hospitality group (41 licenses participating) and they created a “Best Practices” list. They have a 3 strikes with alcohol offenses at Colorado University—they do monitor off-campus judicial activities, and get expelled after 3 offenses.

Their partnership: Licensees, Regulatory (police, fire, liquor licenses), University/student affairs/judicial affairs, neighborhoods, city (has a full-time student city liaison under the city management).

Get organized (had a liquor license summit); Get informed (last drink data, best practices); Get trained (server and door security).

Did door-to-door education about zero tolerance for fake ID’s. CRA funded unit set up one person to call regarding bars.

**Lincoln, Nebraska (University community)**

Have about 130 liquor licenses within a 1-mile radius (total 400 in community). They have an online server education program and use students for voluntary compliance checks. They used a marketing class to figure out a new marketing plan.

Need to have good data about police problems about all establishments to help build a case for effective local oversight. Need to give incentives to not rent to bars or to regulate licenses in an area. Nebraska: if you violate 1 of 3 alcohol-related ordinances off-campus, gets you to on-campus judicial process.

**Berkeley** is focusing on social host ordinance.