

Memorandum



CITY OF DALLAS

DATE: August 30, 2007

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

SUBJECT: Verified Alarm Response Presentation

Attached is the Verified Alarm Response Review presentation to be presented by the Police Department at the September 5, 2007 meeting of the Dallas City Council.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ryan S. Evans'.

Ryan S. Evans
First Assistant City Manager

cc: Mary K. Suhm, City Manager
Deborah Watkins, City Secretary
Tom Perkins, City Attorney
Craig Kinton, City Auditor
Ramon F. Miguez, P.E., Assistant City Manager
Charles W. Daniels, Assistant City Manager
Jill A. Jordan, P.E., Assistant City Manager
A.C. Gonzales, Assistant City Manager
Dave K. Cook, Chief Financial Officer
Chandra Marshall-Henson, Assistant to the City Manager

Verified Alarm Response Review

Dallas Police Department



September 5, 2007

Overview

- The Commission on Productivity and Innovation examined police response to burglar alarms and briefed the Public Safety Committee on August 16, 2005. Their review identified issues that included:
 - In 2004 the Police Department received almost 62,000 burglar alarms
 - Of these, 97.2% or about 60,100 were false
 - Responding to these alarms required the time of approximately 45 Dallas Police officers
 - This false alarm rate was consistent with findings across the nation
 - In Dallas, 86% of the citizens and businesses without alarms are subsidizing alarm responses for 14% who have alarms
 - False alarm dispatches are the single greatest waste of law enforcement resources in the U.S.
 - 2004 police response time for priority 3 calls was about 32 minutes

Overview

- Initial proposal included verified response to **both** residential and commercial burglar alarms
 - The initial estimate for personnel efficiencies to be gained under this proposal was 45 officers.
- The City Council adopted a verified response to commercial burglar alarms ordinance effective February 1, 2006.
 - Under this adopted compromise proposal, the initial estimate for personnel efficiencies to be gained was 20 officers.
- Implementation delayed one month (March 1, 2006) to assist alarm companies with their preparations.
- Program was phased in over a 12 month period.

Overview

■ Verified response

- Police do not routinely respond to a burglar alarm signal from a commercial location.
- Police will respond after receiving verification from an alarm company, private security, or other responder that a crime has occurred or is occurring.
- Alarm companies may use their own resources or private guard responders to verify.
- Police Department continues responding to all human activated alarms, such as hold-up, panic, and duress, as well as residential burglar alarms.
- Broadcast and File – Police Department broadcasts unverified alarms reported by alarm companies over the radio, but do not dispatch an officer.

Examples of Verified Response Cities With Implementation Year

- Las Vegas Metro (1991)
 - Pop. 1.3 million
- Modesto, CA (2006)
 - Pop. 209,258
- West Valley City, UT (2000)
 - Pop. 100,330
- Salt Lake City, UT (2000)
 - Pop. 184,000
- Henderson, NV (2001)
 - Pop. 145,000
- Fremont, CA (2005)
 - Pop. 200,000
- Lakewood, CA (2004)
 - Pop. 135,000
- Milwaukee, WI (2004)
 - Pop. 629,296
- Aurora, CO (2004)
 - Pop. 223,103
- Madison, WI (2007)
 - Pop. 221,419

Advantages

- Allows the Police Department to more efficiently allocate staffing to crime suppression functions
- Frees personnel resources to respond to citizens calls for true emergency service
- Empowers the Police Department to employ a successful business model of utilizing resources in a manner most likely to result in a positive return on investment
- Eliminates the need to dispatch officers to a call that is false over 97% of the time
- Helps contribute to reduced response times

Results

- From March 1, 2005 through February 28, 2006 Dallas experienced 7,054 business burglaries.
- From March 1, 2006 through February 28, 2007 there were 7,012 business burglaries.
- This represents a 0.6% decrease during the first 12 months of implementation.

Incidence of Business Burglary- Surrounding Cities

<u>City</u>	<u>05</u>	<u>06</u>	<u>Percent Change</u>
Grand Prairie	350	753	115.0%
Plano	406	478	17.7%
Arlington	1179	1298	10.0%
Garland	419	438	4.5%
Richardson	250	195	-22.0%
McKinney	106	78	-26.4%
Irving	735	402	-45.0%

Reduction in Alarm Calls Answered

- From 3/1/05 - 2/28/06 - **57,307** alarm calls.
- From 3/1/06 - 2/28/07 - **31,358** alarm calls.
- **25,949** fewer alarm calls (45% reduction).
- Equivalent manpower savings of **24 officers** (\$1,560,000).
- 9.5% decrease in response time for calendar year 2006.

The Continuing Issue

- Burglar alarms continue to be false over 97% of the time.

Year	Total Alarms	False Alarms	% False
2005	58,419	56,732	97.1%
2006	35,316	34,300	97.1%
2007(YTD)	14,707	14,358	97.6%

Revenue Impact False Alarm Fees

- | | |
|--------------------|--------------|
| ■ 3/1/05 – 2/28/06 | \$4,108,000 |
| ■ 3/1/06 – 2/28/07 | \$2,915,000 |
| ■ Change | -\$1,193,000 |
- State law governs what municipalities may charge for false alarms
 - \$50 for 4th and 5th, \$75 for 6th and 7th, \$100 for 8th and subsequent
 - Reverting to the previous city policy regarding false alarms would potentially restore the \$1.1 million reduction in alarm fees

Alarm Companies Offering Option of Security Response

- ADT
- Brinks
- Sonitrol
- ASG / Prostar

Security Companies Providing Alarm Response

- Able Security & Investigations Inc.
- Ameripro Security
- Eagle Protective Group
- First Watch, Inc.
- Heartland Services
- Paramount Alarm Systems
- Security & Investigations Group, Inc.
- Smith Protective Service
- State Wide Security
- VIP Investigations & Protective Services

Questions?