

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**A. Regular Meeting – July 15, 2003**

**Resolution**

**MOTION** by Verschueren, seconded by Holder,

**Resolved** that the Minutes of the Regular Administration and Information Services Committee Meeting held on July 15, 2003 be approved as corrected to reflect that Bob Grace was not present.

Ayes: Hill, Holder, Dalton, Gwiazdowski, Verschueren  
Nays: None  
Absent: None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**6. COMMUNICATIONS**

None was offered.

**7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**A. Review of Class C Liquor License Criteria**

**Chairperson Hill** thanked the other members of staff and the city attorney for attending and opened the meeting to hear further discussion on Class C Liquor License review. She regretted that Capt. Smith could not be in attendance.

**DISCUSSION - Concerns/Questions/Suggestions:**

- Class C Liquor Licenses are approved at the city level and Club Licenses are approved at the state level.
- How does a liquor license mesh with the Planning Department as another license coming into the city?
- Presently, the city does not require a review by the Oakland County Sheriff's Department (OCSD), i.e. background checks. However, OCSD does perform background checks to complete forms for the Liquor Control Commission (LCC). The city does not see these forms.
- Transfer of ownership comes back to Council for review.
- Limited number of licenses could hinder new business growth (i.e. Olde Towne and M-59 and Adams corridor). Village of Rochester Hills received five (5) liquor licenses. Currently, six (6) licenses remain in the city.
- Hotels fall under a different license category.

- The goal is to strive for an objective review criteria (not a subjective review), while maintaining discretionary decision to issue licenses at the city level.
- The review criteria could list preferences of what the city is looking for in an applicant. Currently, the applicant does not know what the city is looking for.
- Tie the preference list to what the city is looking for in promoting redevelopment and economic development.
- Royal Oak’s ordinance is considered one of the strictest in the area.
- The fee charged is for collective work that is performed by city departments.
- The applicant for a new license should get a packet explaining the process and inspections, etc.
- The city makes the recommendations in favor or against an applicant for a license and inspects them on an annual basis. The state issues, revokes and renews them on an annual basis.
- Could the city “buy back” a revoked license (for one dollar)?

**ACTION:**

The committee recommended that Administrative members of Building, Planning and Fire review the bulleted items listed in the July 15, 2003 minutes and give feedback to Mr. Staran so that he may proceed with a draft document.

---

**8. NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS**

**A. Appointment of Youth Representatives:**

**Resolution**

**MOTION** by Dalton, seconded by Verschueren,

**Resolved**, that the Administration and Information Services Committee (AIS) concur with the recommendation of the Community Development Viability Committee and appoint Andrew Kenzie and Katie Harwirth as the two Youth Representatives to the AIS Committee, term to expire August 31, 2004.

Ayes: Hill, Holder, Dalton, Gwiazdowski, Verschueren

Nays: None

Absent: None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**B. Proposed Amendment to the Fee Schedule for Vital Statistics:**

**Ms. Jasinski** reviewed her memorandum dated July 29, 2003 regarding amendments to the Fee Schedule for Vital Statistics including current fees, proposed fees and fees charged by neighboring municipalities of similar size.