



## MEMORANDUM

TO: BURGLAR ALARM TASK FORCE

FROM: GEORGE GUNNING

DATE: MARCH 21, 2003

RE: ALARM INDUSTRY RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS ASKED AT LAST  
WEEK'S BURGLAR ALARM TASK FORCE MEETING

---

Last week, we were asked the following questions regarding the March 12, 2003 letter from GLASAA's law firm, Mitchell Silverberg & Knupp LLP. The letter stated: "A local ordinance covering a non-response after five activations in a year is permitted by the Act." We were asked whom the ordinance would be applicable to? Would the ordinance apply to alarm companies? The LAPD? The Customer? All Three? Please clarify.

GLASAA's recommend ordinance change impacting chronic abusers would be applicable to the LAPD, alarm companies and alarm dispatch centers (central stations) and, ultimately, the consumer/customer. The alarm industry, through central stations, can count the number of dispatches for a given address, but the dispatch centers will not know whether an alarm is true or false. This fact necessitates that the LAPD cooperate with the alarm industry to inform alarm companies whether alarms for a given address are true or false. Once a given residence or business is identified as a chronic abuser, the alarm industry will notify the customer of their new status and inform them of required verification activities that must occur before any LAPD dispatch can occur.

We were also asked to respond to how GLASAA plans to implement its six-point plan recommendation relative to not responding to locations with more than five false alarms per year. Specifically, how will alarm companies know which locations have more than five alarms and what will the monitoring office do when alarms go off at these locations?

Currently Municipal Code Section 103.206(c) deals with suspension or revocation of alarm permits for excessive false alarms. Although that section should also be amended, we will not discuss it here.

**CLA Question Response**

**March 21, 2003**

**Page Two**

Specific question should be dealt with in section 103.206(f)(6), by adding the following language to the end of the section. "If an alarm user, whose alarm has experienced within a twelve (12) month period more than five (5) responses by the Department, which did not require police services, for any purpose, other than deactivation of the alarm, then no 'person' shall cause a request for service by the Police Department, prior to a physical inspection of the scene, to verify the need for service."

Finally, consensus will need to be reached about the start time for a 12-month period. This timing would have to be negotiated between both the LAPD and the industry. At present, we believe the LAPD uses a rolling 12 months to keep track of false alarms, but other options exist.

Should you have any additional questions, please let us know.