



City of Milwaukee

200 E. Wells Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
53202

Meeting Minutes PRIVATE ALARM SYSTEMS TASK FORCE

ALD. ROBERT PUENTE, CHAIR

Ald. Willie L. Hines, Jr.; Ann McCarthy, Richard Pfaff, Dave Stanosz, Raymond Statis, and Christopher Utter

*Staff Assistant: Linda Elmer, 286-2232, Fax: 286-3456,
lelmer@milwaukee.gov*

*Legislative Liaison: Richard Withers, 286-8532,
rwith@milwaukee.gov*

Tuesday, July 13, 2010

10:00 AM

Room 301-B, City Hall

Meeting convened: 10:02 A.M.

Ed Ehrlich present for the City Attorney's Office.

Present 5 - Puente, Pfaff, Statis, Utter and McCarthy

Excused 2 - Hines Jr. and Stanosz

1. Review and approval of the minutes of the July 8th meeting.

Ms. McCarthy moved, seconded by Mr. Statis, for approval of the minutes. There were no objections.

Roll call taken at 10:10 A.M.

Alex Runner present for Ald. Hines.

Present 6 - Puente, Hines Jr., Pfaff, Statis, Utter and McCarthy

Excused 1 - Stanosz

2. Discussion relating to first responders.

Mr. Pfaff said that the intent of the Task Force was to primarily safeguard homeowners from unscrupulous alarm companies, rather than to protect commercial entities. He feels that commercial companies can protect themselves with in-house security as they do have hiring/firing control. Mr. Statis would like to see text relating to in-house security included in the recommendations. Atty. Brian Randall said that the current ordinance does require that larger users obtain alarm system licenses. Atty. Ehrlich noted that the thrust of the task force was the protection of consumers. Atty. Randall sees the issue as the interpretation of the current ordinance as to whether large companies that provide their own security must be licensed. Mr. Pfaff thinks that the solution is to add the words, "in the business of" in the definition of "private alarm business" so that only companies that do this as a primary business

are covered by the ordinance; this would codify the current practice. The consensus of the Task Force is that those large companies do not need to be licensed. Mr. Utter is concerned that the recommendations of the task force, as approved by the Council, will not be drafted as requested since many of the changes hinge on subtle language changes.

3. Discussion and possible approval of the final report of the Task Force.

Throughout the entire document, "shall" will be changed to "should" or another appropriate word.

In the introductory text, add that attachments relating to the Task Force are contained in file 091420 and also list who the members represent.

Under A. Sales of Alarm Systems:

Under 1 or 5, documentation must be provided that the police do not respond to non-verified alarms (whether it be noted in the contract or in the brochure). The Task Force approved having that language included in the brochure.

Under A-3, at the end of the last line add the words "and registered" after "fully trained personnel".

Under A-5, the second sentence, change it to read, "These Costs shall include the cost of installation and the cost of alarm system monitoring" and delete the rest of the sentence (when not included in the contract).

Under A-6, include a copy of the brochure created by the City Clerk, not issued by the City Clerk. Mr. D'Amato noted that companies may want to use these brochures as marketing tools. The brochure distributed must be the one created by the City.

Move C-3 to create A-7 and add "Require clear disclosure of subcontractors to customers". Under the current A-7, additional information shall be provided TO prospective alarm users and agencies customers subcontracting monitoring agencies and responders, if any."

Under B. Alarm Sales Installation:

1. Add a cross reference from ch. 105 to ch. 222.

B-1. In the last sentence, delete "and not fire" and put "separate from fire alarms or other low-voltage systems".

B-3. Add a sentence at the end of the paragraph, "and the alarm company which will monitor the alarm, if different."

Under D. Verified Response,...:

D-5. Move the last sentence to the last sentence to D-1. Under D-5, "video verification" should be "video monitoring" and change "was" to "is" so reads, "It is further .." now as the last sentence in D-1.

D-6. Delete D-6 and the remaining text of D-5 that wasn't moved to D-1 because the police dept. and the industry agreed to Appendix A (yesterday's attachment from Ms. McCarthy). Copy text from B-1, with the electrical license and then reference Appendix A. Appendix A will be solely the code text, not the text above it.

D-2. change "shall include" to "should dedicate sufficient funds for service of process"

for out-of-area companies" and the funds will be for 2012, not 2011. They'll be seeking approval in 2012. There are some funds in a contingent fund that can be used in 2011 for some charges. Mr. Utter is concerned that one of the main issues with alarm companies licenses is that many of them were unaware of problems and this basic problem has still not been addressed.

Amend D-3 to reword to note that there should maintain weekly contact with alarm companies, as problems occur, and add text noting that contacts need to be documented. Ms. McCarthy will be able to e-mail out templates to the contacts and a history line will be automatically be generated showing that this contact was made.

Under E. General licensing provisions:

E-1. The contact information should be in the form of e-mail addresses.

E-2. Any subcontracting services providing monitoring or private first responder services (and change title to "Certain" subcontractors)

Create E-3 relating to voluntary acceptance of service of process on the application.

4. Set next meeting date and agenda, if needed.

The Task Force completed its work at this meeting, so no additional meetings are needed.

*Meeting adjourned: 12:43 P.M.
Linda M. Elmer
Staff Assistant*