

FARA ADOPTS POSITION ON VERIFIED RESPONSE

ROCKVILLE, Md.—On Tuesday, Feb. 4, 2003, the Board of Directors of the False Alarm Reduction Association (FARA) adopted a position on verified response.

The position reaffirms FARA's commitment to the involvement of all stakeholders in the development of local solutions to the false alarm problem. It also highlights many considerations and alternatives that should be examined as a jurisdiction evaluates the verified response option.

"The position was adopted because over the past few months the numbers of inquiries about our position have increased," said FARA President Norma Beaubien. "I have also been surprised by the number of people who assumed that we had endorsed verified response over other alternatives. I felt—and the Board agreed—that it was important to clarify our stance. To quote from the position paper, 'FARA believes that communities have a right to enact whatever false alarm solution best meets [their] needs. FARA also believes that communities benefit from a full exploration, conducted in the open with all stakeholders as participants, of the advantages and disadvantages of verified response before such a policy is implemented.'"

Verified response requires an independent eyewitness verification that a criminal act either is occurring or has occurred prior to requesting law enforcement dispatch. This usually applies only to burglar alarms and exempts human activated alarms such as robbery, duress and panic from the verification process.

According to FARA's position paper, when a verified response policy is considered, an open dialog between elected officials, law enforcement agencies, the alarm industry and citizens should take place to explore the following considerations:

- Public Safety
- Legal
- Impact on both the citizenry and law enforcement
- Financial considerations for municipalities and law enforcement
- Alternatives, including considerations of cost recovery and outsourcing

www.faraonline.org