False Alarm Cost Recovery Option #1 – Verified Response

Description of Option

An internal protocol that establishes the criteria under which law enforcement will respond to an alarm call, requiring some level of verification that the alarm activation is not due to a faulty system or accidental trigger. There are three primary levels of verified response:

- Audible Monitoring – An audio system is installed at the property, and monitored by a person who may or may not be on the scene, who is able to hear activity which leads one to believe a break-in is in progress.
- Visual Monitoring – A video system is installed at the property, and monitored by a person who may or may not be on the scene, who is able to view evidence of a break-in or burglary in progress.
- Personal – requires an individual to be on scene witnessing evidence of a break-in or burglary in progress. Could be the owner, a witness, a private security guard, etc.

Steps to Implement

- Research existing policies in other jurisdictions for one suitable to adapt for local needs.
- Draft policy.
- Conduct internal education and training, as well as outreach to public and contract cities.
- Implement and track results.

Cost Analysis

	One-time	Ongoing
Cost to Implement	$70,000	
Cost to Administer		$8,000
Potential Revenue		$0
Total	**$70,000**	**$8,000**

Description of Costs

The costs above are estimates of the value of the staff time spent implementing and administering a Verified Response protocol. Because existing staff would be utilized, no incremental costs will be incurred. The total cost to implement could be up to $70,000, with the bulk of that cost being the time spent training staff on the new protocol. Other costs would be time spent developing the protocol, performing public outreach, and developing the reports that will be used to track the results. The ongoing cost is the staff time spent running the reports and compiling data.

Pros and Cons

Pros
- Minimal staff time needed to implement
- Relatively quick to implement
- Potentially significant reduction in staff time spent on false alarms
- Easier to implement throughout unincorporated area *and* contract cities
- Implementation does not require additional budgetary resources

Cons
- Doesn't generate revenue
- Potential for public concern