



NORTH BAY POLICE SERVICE

2010 Annual Report ALARM MONITORING

Report Date: 2011/02/18
Author: Acting Sergeant Jim Kilroy

A. Mandate of the Unit

It is the policy of the North Bay Police Service that response to intrusion alarms shall be coordinated to provide optimum security to alarm owner/operators recognizing the responsibility they assume with alarm operation and/or ownership.

The Alarm Coordinator is responsible for the efficient and equitable implementation of the North Bay Police Service policy, "Responding to Intrusion Alarms". This includes coordination with members of the Service, the alarm industry and alarm holders.

B. Executive Summary

In 2009, in accordance with Service policy, the Traffic Sergeant was designated by the Chief of Police as the member responsible to monitor alarms received by the North Bay Police Service. The duties included screening and documenting the number of false alarms attended by uniformed patrol officers for each address. Repeat false alarms attended by police to specific addresses were documented to ensure compliance with the provisions of the alarm policy. Panic and hold-up alarms continue to be exempt from the provisions of the policy.

Owners of residences and businesses who experienced multiple false alarms, where officers attended to the report of the alarm, were levied a fee of \$63.36 in order to offset costs of the Service to responding to repeated false alarms.

C. Activities

Activity Directly Related to Mandate:

The Alarm Coordinator's duties include:

- Monitoring all alarm requests received by the North Bay Police Service;
- Being responsible for the indexing of all persons / premises requesting police response to intrusion alarms;
- Except when the applicable alarm response has been paid, being responsible for ensuring that the Suspension Notices are served in accordance with Service policy;
- Being responsible for coordinating the payment of the Alarm Response Fees; and
- Being responsible for advising the Communications Centre Manager and the Inspector Operations, of the issuance of Suspension Notices and reinstatements due to payment of the alarm response fee.

The Alarm Coordinator, with the authorization of the Inspector Administration, may give consideration to situations that result in numerous false alarms being reported to the Communications Center due to one specific external cause, as it

relates to suspending alarm service (e.g. an electrical storm causing multiple alarms).

D Performance Indicators

The number of calls for service received in 2010, in response to intrusion alarms, decreased for the third year in a row. In the calendar year the NBPS received 1169 reports of alarms, through communications personnel, in comparison with the 1209 received in 2009.

The number of alarm calls that were cancelled by keyholders and/or alarm monitoring agencies, prior to police attendance at the scene of the alarm has continued to increase. In 2010, 919 of the 1169 alarm calls were cancelled prior to police arrival, or a 77% cancellation rate. This compares to a cancellation rate of only 60% in 2009 and of 63% in 2008.

In 2010 officers responded to 250 alarms. In thirty-one of these calls for service officers found that the alarm was false and this had occurred on at least one prior occasion within the year. Total revenues from false alarms fees in 2010 were \$1964.16.

The policy is having a significant effect on the level of responsibility being placed on alarm owner/operators. Increased diligence being undertaken by those with alarms is allowing for uniform patrol personnel to attend to other duties that are of public concern. The consequential attention being paid by property owners to alarm maintenance, lockup policies and housekeeping issues, that are a usual result in false alarms occurring, has also had a significant impact on the number of invoices being issued for alarm response fees and, ultimately, alarm suspensions. Alarm suspensions have significantly decreased from a high of 32 in 2004 to low of 6 in 2008; there were 8 suspensions in 2010.

E. Anticipated Issues for the Future

There will be a requirement for continued diligence in the enforcement and administration of the Standard Operating Procedure governing the Service's response to intrusion alarms. Through the standardized reporting procedure, a determination must be made annually in regard to the benefits of continuation with the status quo or whether amendments to the policy will be necessary.

There remains a demonstrated need to communicate with the Provincial Alarm Coordinating Committee in order to explore the viability of benchmarking to determine whether there are may be best practices within the industry that can be adopted by this Service.

F. Performance Objectives for the Next Year

To maintain the Service's monitoring of intrusion alarms policy in order to determine whether the said policy continues to result in fewer alarms and more alarm cancellations.