DATE: January 30, 2009

TO: Members of the Public Safety Committee

SUBJECT: Surveillance Camera Protocol Proposal

Attached is briefing material on the "Surveillance Camera Protocol Proposal" to be presented to the Members of the Public Safety Committee on Monday, February 2, 2009.

Ryan S. Evans
First Assistant City Manager
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Attachment
Surveillance Camera Protocol Proposal

Public Safety Committee

February 2, 2009
Mission

- Detect and deter criminal activity
- Investigate criminal activities captured on video
- Increased quality of life
- Improved safety perception of Downtown and Jubilee Park areas
- Contribution to the overall revitalization of these areas
Partners

- The Meadows Foundation provided $840,000, for initial 40 Downtown cameras and is proposing to fund 40 cameras for Fair Park
- Downtown Dallas has pledged $600,000 to expand current operations by 42 cameras
- The Jubilee Park Association has funded 14 cameras in conjunction with many partners including the South Dallas/Fair Park Development Fund and is adding 2 more
- Equipment and maintenance are being funded by the private sector in special interest areas
- Personnel for monitoring purposes is provided with funding by the City of Dallas
# Crime Reduction Impact

**January 17 – December 31**
**2007 vs. 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Business District</th>
<th>Jubilee Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Violent</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>-29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Camera Activity Stats

Calls and Arrests
January 17, 2007 to December 31, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Business District</th>
<th>Jubilee Park</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calls</td>
<td>5751</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>6103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation

• Lessons learned from DPD’s experience with Downtown and Jubilee Park camera monitoring
  – The Department has a better understanding about the importance of proper camera placement for optimum results
  – Calls for assistance based on camera monitoring consistently compete with 911 calls for resources
  – Cameras have shown an effectiveness in addressing crime and public disorder issues
  – Personnel costs for camera monitoring are a particular challenge
Expansion of Current Program

Central Business District

• 42 cameras are being added to Downtown
  • 17 already operational for the King Tut exhibit
  • Five already operational in Downtown
  • Final 20 cameras to be installed by end of February 2009

• Total Cameras in Downtown area - 84
• Second Phase funding of $600,000.00 raised by the Downtown Dallas Association

Jubilee Park

• 7 cameras have been added to Jubilee Park with 2 more to be added by the end of February 2009

• Total Cameras in Jubilee Park - 16
• Second Phase funding of $107,000 raised by Jubilee Park neighborhood and business associations
Downtown

Existing Locations
Red
Future Locations
Blue
Jubilee Park

Camera Locations

Jubilee Park
Existing Locations
Red
Future Locations
Blue
Potential Camera Program
Monitoring Sites

Fair Park
• Meadows Foundation is installing 36 cameras in and around Fair Park

Uptown
• Uptown Improvement District is installing 20 cameras in the first phase of a project

White Rock Lake
• White Rock Association has proposed installing cameras in and around White Rock Lake

Jefferson Boulevard
• 11 cameras with record function only will be operable by the end of February 2009
Program Expansion Challenges

- DPD continues to receive requests from local associations and businesses to monitor additional public locations

- One employee at a single monitoring station can effectively monitor no more than 25 cameras at once
  - DPD utilizes a combination of less than full duty officers and part-time retirees for monitoring
  - Current staffing averages 2 employees per shift, limiting effective monitoring to 50 cameras
  - DPD currently has 3 monitoring stations allowing for monitoring of 75 cameras
  - DPD Communications Division has enough space for 10 monitoring stations, allowing for monitoring of up to 250 cameras
Program Expansion Challenges

• Existing cameras and projects currently proposed would bring the total number of cameras to approximately 145, requiring additional monitoring stations and personnel.

• DPD must increase the number of monitoring personnel incrementally as cameras are added:
  – Approximate cost of $250K per year to monitor one station 24/7 with part-time employees.
  – Less than full duty officers would be utilized as available.

• Any more than 250 cameras would dictate moving operations to a larger space and expanding the number of assigned personnel.
Recommended Monitoring Guidelines

• The Police Department requests the Public Safety Committee establish the following criteria for determining participation in the camera monitoring program

  • Public funding should be reserved for areas identified by the Department as having a high crime rate (see addendum for examples of possible locations)

  • Private funding locations identified by the Public Safety Committee as warranting monitoring for increased public confidence and safety, despite having a lower crime rate (see addendum for examples of possible locations)
Recommended
Monitoring Guidelines

• Criteria (continued)
  • Privately funded groups/associations requesting monitoring would be required to fund the cost of participating in the monitoring program
    • Camera systems would be required to comply with Bearcom requirements for seamless application
    • Maintenance agreements and repair of cameras would be the responsibility of the group requesting monitoring
    • The cost of adding monitoring stations would be borne by the group/association requesting monitoring
  • Groups/associations not meeting the criteria would be required to conduct their own camera monitoring
Pay Box Burglar/First Conviction
Questions?
Addendum

- Examples of possible camera locations that are crime driven
  - Vickory Meadows – various intersections
  - Forest Ln. @ Audelia Rd.
  - John West Rd. & Peavy Rd. @ N. Buckner Blvd.
  - Jim Miller Rd. @ Samuel Blvd.
  - 9600-9900 Scyene Rd.
  - Martin Luther King Corridor
  - S. Buckner Blvd. @ Lake June Rd.
  - Cockrell Hill Rd. @ Camp Wisdom Rd.
  - Webb Chapel Extension (various blocks)
  - Kit Ln. @ Maham Rd.
Addendum

• Examples of possible camera locations contributing to increased public confidence
  – White Rock Lake
  – Katy Trail
  – Lower Greenville
  – Fair Park
  – Trinity River Project
  – Bonnie View Rd. @ I-20
  – Uptown
City of Dallas
Targeted Action Area Grids ("TAAGs"), for 2009 Chronic Violent Crimes Study & Response
Year to Date as of 12/16/2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATIONS</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>MURDER</th>
<th>RAPE</th>
<th>ROBBERY-BUSINESS</th>
<th>ROBBERY-INDIVIDUAL</th>
<th>AGG ASSAULT</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Sq Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Five Points)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Forest Audelia)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.8125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (NW Hwy Harry Hines)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (Hatcher 2nd)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (Buckner Peavy)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Walnut Hill Harry Hines)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (Skillman Royal)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.6875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (Cedar Springs Wycliff)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.8125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (Jefferson Corridor)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1.0625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (Ft Wth Hampton)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1.3125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (Camp Wisdom Chaucer)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Bennett)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (Buckner Bruton)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1.1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (Maham Spring Valley)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.8125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 (Overton Illinois)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 (Columbia Fitzugh)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 (Jim Miller Loop 12)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 (MLK MalcomX)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Ackard Main)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 (Wickersham Walnut Hill)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 (Ledbetter Bonnieview)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 (Walton Walker Tech)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 (Lamar Hatcher)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.6875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 (Woodmeadow Ferguson)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 (Kiest Polk)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 (Monfort Spring Valley)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.5625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>2293</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>4155</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>22.3075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sam Houston Study = 37.1 Sq Miles/9.6% of City Total Miles/28 % of Pt1 Violent Crimes
City = 384.91 Sq Miles
2009 TAAG = 22.3 Sq Miles/5.8% of Total Miles/38 % of Pt1 Violent Crimes