

Question: Experience agencies have had with Alarm Ordinances, specifically verified response?

Agency	Response
<p>City of Rocklin Sergeant Terry Roide Terry.roide@rocklin.ca.us</p>	<p>Alarm permit required. (Fee collected, permitted for 2 years. Excessive false alarm fee: Second alarm: \$50.00, if Holdup or Duress \$100.00. Third and more: \$100.00 Holdup duress \$150.00.</p> <p>Ordinance enacted April 2008, 28% decreases in alarms from December 2007 – December 2008.</p>
<p>City of Moraga Chief Robert Priebe priebe@moraga.ca.us</p>	<p>Our department used to charge a \$10 alarm registration fee, but we went away from it years ago. We also used to track false alarms and charged \$50 for the 4th false alarm within 90 days (the first 3 were free) and there was an escalating fee schedule for additional false alarms within the same period. It was very cumbersome to track and it never really was a deterrent to false alarms. A few years ago, we adopted a flat \$50 fee for every false alarm. It is easier to track and has generated a lot more revenue. Our 07-08 revenue on false alarm responses was \$8,800.</p> <p>Our community has accepted it with no problems and we have an appeal process for any disputes. I seem to recall a letter to our Council from an association of alarm companies during the adoption process, but nothing since the adoption of the ordinance.</p> <p>Prior to the flat rate, we never charged our school districts for false alarms and they have always been one of our biggest sources of repeated false alarms. Now they send us checks on a regular basis.</p> <p>I don't believe there has been a significant drop in alarm responses, but our staff workload is easier because the new system is less cumbersome and more efficient. There was no increase in burglary rates after the new system was implemented.</p>
<p>City of Newark Donna Shearn Donna.shearn@newark.org</p>	<p>Our community reacted well to the change in our Alarm Ordinance at the time of the change and even after the implementation in higher false alarm response fees and biennial permit fees. The Ordinance was designed to encourage alarm owners to be responsible, fine those who are irresponsible with their alarms, and to for alarm owners to keep their contact information current.</p> <p>The alarm companies were supportive even speaking in favor of the Ordinance at the City Council meeting adding they did not think our fees were high enough.</p> <p>Over the course of the year, we noticed an 8% reduction in false alarm activations.</p> <p>Our department still responds to alarm activations unless the residence or business has requested in writing we not respond or the Chief of Police has placed them on a suspended response list.</p> <p>I do not believe we can associate a reduction or increase in burglaries to our specific Ordinance changes.</p>

Agency	Response
City of Vallejo Robert Nichelini rnichelini@ci.vallejo.ca.us	Alarm fees for false alarm, only 1/3 of the penalties are actually collected. Verified response was opposed by the alarm industry. City Council opposed alarm registration fees.
City of Capitola Susan Speilmen	New False alarm ordinance established in August 2008. No application fee is being charged as of this time, but may change. False alarm fees are charged as follows: After Third alarms: \$100.00, after fifth alarm: \$150.00, after sixth: \$200.00.
City of San Bernardino Walt Goggin Goggin_wa@ci.san-bernardino.ca.us	A big resistance was from the alarm companies and politically we were unable to overcome it. For this reason we DO NOT have an alternative response policy despite months of work, reports and recommendations. However Fontana P.D. was able to move ahead and has seemed to survive a legal challenge brought by the Alarm Industry. Check with them.
City of Anaheim Lt. David Vangsness dvangsness@anaheim.net	A good contact will be Deputy Chief Alan Hostetter at Fontana PD. He successfully worked thru Verified Response there last year (including a lawsuit from the alarm industry). 909-350-7733. I have been working our agency toward VR for quite some time and we are now working off Fontana's model and hope to get it done this year via muni code. We adopted a strict alarm ordinance in 2000 and saw our alarms go from around 14,000 per year to around 10,000 where they have remained steady. We don't feel we can do anything more to reduce that number, so we are going to move towards Verified Response.

<p>City of Vacaville Ann Taglieri ataglieri@cityofvacaville.com</p>	<p>When we started our program we had about 16 alarm calls a day - we are down to 3. We use a program called Crywolf and it has made life easy. We did have some unhappy people, but we explained to them that if they did need Police response it might be delayed if an Officer was on another False Alarm. We also explain that it is an Officer Safety/Awareness problem when an Officer continues to respond to the same alarm.</p> <p>Our Ordinance requires that the alarm companies use two call verification prior to calling the Police Department on burg alarms and I think this has made a big difference since the home owner is (attempted) to be contacted prior to the Police being called. Our dispatch does take the call for service even if two call verification is not done, however they do not dispatch the call they enter notes and close the call so we can keep track.</p> <p>At the start up of our program we notified all alarm companies and they helped out with the registration portion. Our Ordinance states they can be cited for the C.O. if they do not register their customers. Almost all alarm companies send out a copy of the City Ordinance and registration form to call their customers and then provided us this a customer list as well.</p> <p>Here is a link to our site:http://www.cityofvacaville.com/departments/police/alarmordinance.php</p>
--	---

Agency	Response
<p>City of Ventura</p>	<p>Verified Response from 0700-1900, no increase in burglaries, 25% decrease in alarms. There has been some increase in officer initiated activity because of the free time.</p> <p>Alarm companies did fight the implementation said they would come up with an alternative but never did.</p> <p>City Council as briefed regarding the wasted use of city resources in the response to false alarms.</p> <p>The implementation was done as a policy not a change in the city ordinance, easier with less of a political impact on Council</p>

<p>City of Pasadena</p> <p>Eric Mills, Commander emills@cityofpasadena.net</p>	<p>Our department considered verified response a few years ago but did not move forward due to political concerns. We do have an alarm ordinance and we send invoices to problem locations (for multiple false alarms), thru our Finance Department not the PD. The PD does get calls to review a charge, and we have reversed some charges if we can demonstrate an error. A few of our Staff Assistants handle these calls.</p> <p>We are going to try to implement a verified/non response process again.</p>
<p>City of Modesto Captain Gary Watts</p>	<p>Modesto implemented verified response in 06. First implemented a fine increase did not obtain compliance. When the decision to move forward with verified response was made they worked closely with City Council to brief them on the need and to give them an understanding as to what the problem was, previous fixes that failed and what solutions were left. In order to move verified response along easier, Modesto implemented it with a “Dispatch Policy” this kept Council from having to vote on it for a City Ordinance change.</p> <p>Pushback was received from the smaller alarm companies, not much from the national chains. The smaller companies eventually started their own security response company to respond to alarms. This has been a financial plus for them. The larger companies sent letters and tried to get public outcry using scare tactics, but PD countered with the facts that officers like good alarms, they catch people.</p> <p>There has been no increase in 459’s. False alarms have been reduced by 90%, the alarm companies have reported that false alarms for them have not decreased.</p> <p>The POA was involved and have been supportive.</p>