

Mary F Redden

From: Mary F Redden
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2009 3:50 PM
To: cristinabroomfield@yahoo.com; david@eisenbacher.org; John M Lamerato; Mark F Miller; Lori G Bluhm; 000schilling@ameritech.net; Dane Slater (djlkslater@aol.com); Mary Kerwin (marykerwin5@hotmail.com); Maureen M. McGinnis (mcginnismo78@aol.com); mfhowryl@umich.edu; rbeltram@wideopenwest.com; wade.fleming@proforma.com
Subject: Council Questions on the November 9, 2009 City Council Meeting Agenda
Attachments: 20091019 AMENDED Student appt..pdf

Good afternoon.

Attached are staff's answer to Council Member Robin Beltramini's questions on tonight's agenda.

E-03 Adoption of Chapter 103, Amendments to Chapter 60 and Chapter 88

In the new ordinance, section 5.A., Shut-off devices, I have a concern. First, the 10 minute rule—in some neighborhoods it can take neighbors almost 10 minutes to realize it's a house alarm and call the police. Additionally, for those of us with older systems, this 10 minute rule will require a service call to add such a device, or to replace parts (maybe all) of the system if such a device cannot be added to the current alarm system. Is there a way to grandfather existing systems at least until a service call is needed for another reason? Second, in section 14.B.—False alarm penalties, the paragraph states that notice will be sent to the owner of record on the last tax roll. If ownership has changed since the last tax roll was assembled, there is no provision in ordinance to send the notice to the actual, current owner. Is there a way to fix this small omission?

Staff Response:

Section #5A of Chapter #103 requires an alarm system with an audible signal to be equipped with a shut off device that silences the alarm within 10 minutes. Section #5B gives the Police Department the authority to deactivate audible alarms that do not reset and charge a shut off fee. This language is copied from Chapter #88, Nuisances, with only minor changes. Chapter #88 requires audible alarms to be equipped with shut off devices to silence the alarm within 10 minutes. It also grants the Police Department authority to deactivate the alarms and charge a shut off fee. This language has been in effect since at least 1997, therefore we see no need for grandfather language in the new ordinance.

These audible alarms are a nuisance. The complaints usually come from neighbors. The Police Department needs the authority to abate these nuisances. In addition, it usually is about an hour or so after an alarm sounds, and does not reset, before Police Officers can cause it to be deactivated.

Section # 14B allows the Police and Fire Departments to send invoices for false alarm activations to the City Treasurer. The Treasurer shall forward the invoices to the "owner on the last local assessment or tax roll." There is a question as to if there is another method of identifying the current owner of the property. According to Assistant City Attorney Susan Lancaster and City Assessor Nino Licari, there is no other way for the City to identify the property owner other than through the "owner on the last local assessment or tax roll." Therefore, this is appropriate language for the new ordinance.

F-02 City Council Minutes – Draft -10.19.09

In E-02 (Nominations for Appointments to Boards and Committees) the minutes show an “amended” motion to appoint Lauren Harden as student rep to the Liquor Advisory Committee. I don’t understand how this is amended at that point in the minutes when it was actually voted one way and then reconsidered later in the meeting and then settled as actually stated in the amended motion. I just need a clarification as to why/how this gets recorded in this manner.

Staff Response:

A corrected copy of the Minutes from October 19 is attached.

F-07 MDOT Subcontract with Hubbell, Roth and Clark, Inc. – Reconstruction of Wattles; and F-08 MDOT Subcontract with Hubbell, Roth and Clark, Inc. – Reconstruction of Rochester Road

Is it really possible that “Exhibit 3” in those items is identical? How does it happen that two projects are independently evaluated and all seven vendors come out with the same, exact scores for each project?

Staff Response:

The proposals were rated as one project since they will be bid and constructed as one contract/project through MDOT. The only reason that there are two subcontracts is that each project has its own separate federal funding in place.

F-11 Application for New SDM License by Walgreen Co – 2932 East Long lake Road; and F-12 Application for New SDM License by Walgreen Co – 1965 East Big Beaver

Part of the reason Walgreen’s drugs were approved for those locations was that the Walgreen’s representative stated that Walgreen’s did not sell liquor (Planning Commission minutes, May 13, 1997). I understand that times have changed, but how many liquor licenses do drugstores need? Has Walgreen’s explained the change in their corporate philosophy?

Staff Response:

The two attached Chicago Tribune articles address the issue. Walgreen plans to introduce liquor sales at 7,000 stores nationwide. A decade ago Walgreen stopped selling liquor at most locations.

Walgreens takes steps toward selling liquor

By [Sandra M Jones](#)

[June 22, 2009](#)

Walgreen Co. is in the early stages of bringing liquor back to its stores.

The Deerfield-based drugstore chain exited the liquor business in the early 1990s at most of its stores except for a few markets in the Southeast and Southwest, the company said during its fiscal third-quarter conference call with analysts Monday.

Walgreens is in the midst of applying for the local government licenses needed to reintroduce beer and wine to its national chain of more than 7,000 stores, according to company spokeswoman Tiffani Washington.

The retailer had been selling liquor since the end of Prohibition, but stopped at most of its stores more than a decade ago because of the cost of managing the business, she said. New computer systems will make it easier to manage now, Washington said.

Walgreens to bring liquor back to stores

By [Sandra M Jones](#)

[September 29, 2009](#)

Walgreen Co. plans to add beer and wine to its stores, marking a return to the liquor business.

The Deerfield-based drugstore chain expects to rollout the liquor category to stores in the next 12 to 18 months, said Walgreen Chief Executive Gregory Wasson in an earnings conference call Tuesday.

Although the category is expected to account for less than 1 percent of store shelf space, the hope is that beer and wine will drive traffic to the stores and that shoppers will buy other items once they are there, Wasson said.

Walgreens had been selling liquor since the end of Prohibition, but exited the business at most stores in the early 1990s. The company disclosed in June that it was applying for the local government licenses needed to reintroduce beer and wine to its national chain of more than 7,000 stores.

The announcement came as the nation's largest drug store chain posted fiscal fourth-quarter profits that beat Wall Street expectations as the company starts to reap the benefits of making over stores and cutting costs.

If you have any questions, please let us know.

Have a good meeting,

Mary Redden, Administrative Assistant to the City Manager