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Surveillance Camera Protocol Proposal

Public Safety Committee

April 20, 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 1 – March 31  
2008 vs. 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Business District</th>
<th>Jubilee Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Violent</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Camera Activity Stats

### Calls and Arrests
January 17, 2007, to March 31, 2009

<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>6492</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>6895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1790</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
  - 17 already operational in Downtown
  - Final 8 cameras to be operational by end of April 2009
- Total Cameras in Downtown area - 82
- Second Phase funding of $600,000.00 raised by the Downtown Dallas Association

Jubilee Park

- 7 cameras have been added to Jubilee Park
- Total Cameras in Jubilee Park – 14 with two more slated to be added for a total of 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

Existing Locations
Red
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Map Legend

Phase I Camera Sites
1. Lindsley and Fitzhugh
2. East Grand and Fitzhugh
3. East Grand and Barry
4. East Grand and Haskell
5. Parry and Carroll
6. Carroll and Garland
7. Parry and Haskell

Phase II Camera Sites
1. Garland and Ann
2. Ash and Carroll
3. Lindsley and Bank
4. Gurley and Bank
5. Parry and Caldwell
6. Gurley and Fitzhugh
7. Barry and Phillip
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 have been installed
Program Expansion Challenges

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

• Industry standards indicate that 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, however, employees are regularly required to monitor approximately 100 cameras
  – DPD currently has 3 monitoring stations allowing for effective monitoring of 75 cameras
  – DPD Communications Division has enough space for 10 monitoring stations, allowing for effective 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 for monitoring should be reserved for TAAG (Targeted Action Area Grid) areas identified by the Department as having a high crime rate (see addendum for list of TAAG locations)
  • Privately funded groups/associations requesting monitoring in other than a TAAG location would be required to fund the complete cost of participating in the surveillance camera program
Pay Box Burglar/First Conviction
Questions?
## City of Dallas
### Targeted Action Area Grids ("TAAGs"), Part One Violent Crimes
#### Year to Date as of April 5, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>Orig Rank</th>
<th>Curr Rank</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Rob - Business</th>
<th>Rob - Individual</th>
<th>Agg Assault</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>Sq Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five Points</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest/Audelia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0.8125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Hwy/Harry Hines</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatcher/2nd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckner/Peavy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Hill/Harry Hines</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skillman/Royal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.6875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Springs/Wycliff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0.8125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Corridor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1.0625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Worth/ Hampton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.3125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Wisdom/Chaucer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross/Bennett</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckner/Bruton</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1.1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maham/Spring Valley</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.8125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overton/Illinois</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia/Fitzhugh</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Miller/Loop 12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLK/MalcomX</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akard/Main</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickersham/Walnut Hill</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledbetter/Bonnieview</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton Walker/Tech</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar/Hatcher</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.6875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodmeadow/Ferguson</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiest/Polk</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monfort/Spring Valley</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.5625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAAG Total Crimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>22.3075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Total Crimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>384.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### % of TAAG vs City Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TAAG</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared by COMPSTAT/Crime Analysis, 4/10/2009

Family Violence Related Offenses Were Excluded

Crimes Queried by Date of Offense

16