



City Council Memorandum

City of Arts & Innovation

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL **DATE: JULY 14, 2026**

FROM: FIRE AND POLICE DEPARTMENT **WARDS: ALL**

**SUBJECT: UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL CODE
CHAPTER 9.60 – EXTRAORDINARY RESPONSES TO CERTAIN EMERGENCY
INCIDENTS AND DANGEROUS PROPERTIES**

ISSUE:

Receive an update on the implementation of the recently adopted amendments to Chapter 9.60 of the Riverside Municipal Code, which establishes liability for extraordinary Police and Fire Department responses to certain emergency incidents and dangerous properties. The report also provides an overview of how properties are currently identified for review under the program.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the City Council:

1. Receive an update and provide input on the implementation of the amendments to Chapter 9.60 of the Riverside Municipal Code related to extraordinary responses to certain emergency incidents and dangerous properties.

BACKGROUND:

City departments are frequently required to respond to incidents that demand a significantly greater level of service than what is typically provided during routine emergency responses. These responses may involve repeated emergency calls to the same property, large-scale incidents, dangerous conditions, or circumstances that require multiple departments and extended operational resources.

When certain properties or businesses repeatedly generate emergency calls for service, those responses can exceed what Riverside taxpayers reasonably expect as part of normal public safety operations. In these situations, public safety resources—including police, fire, ambulance, code enforcement, and building department services—may be diverted from other critical emergency’s in the City to address recurring issues at a single location.

To address these circumstances, the City Council adopted amendments to Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 9.60 to establish a mechanism for the City to recover costs associated with extraordinary responses to certain emergency incidents and dangerous properties.

The intent of the ordinance is to promote accountability for property owners and occupants who utilize a disproportionate amount of public safety resources, while ensuring that the City maintains

its ability to respond timely and effectively to emergencies throughout the community.

DISCUSSION:

The Riverside Fire Department and Riverside Police Department administer Chapter 9.60 of the Municipal Code in coordination with other City departments when incidents occur that may qualify as extraordinary responses or involve dangerous properties.

Under the ordinance, the City may recover costs associated with emergency responses that significantly exceed the scope of routine public safety services.

Riverside Fire Department Response Data

Under Chapter 9.60, the Riverside Fire Department is responsible for:

- Tracking repeated Fire and EMS responses to properties
- Identifying incidents that meet the “extraordinary fire service” threshold
- Providing incident data and operational analysis
- Assisting with determining response costs
- Supporting the City in addressing properties that repeatedly require emergency services

The Riverside Fire Department currently tracks these incidents through its data management software (FirstWatch), utilizing two primary indicators to identify potential extraordinary responses. This process is still under development and does not yet automatically generate the necessary information.

Even after automation is implemented, the process will require significant staff time and ongoing review of incident data and call closing codes to ensure accuracy and consistent alignment with the requirements outlined in the Riverside Municipal Code (RMC). To effectively implement and maintain this program, dedicated personnel will be necessary to perform data analysis, monitor system outputs, and adjudicate incidents in accordance with RMC 9.60.

Additionally, the Department recognizes the importance of distinguishing between locations generating “extraordinary” emergency responses, as defined under the ordinance, and properties that legitimately require a high level of Fire and EMS services due to the nature of their operations. Facilities such as hospitals, shelters, dialysis centers, schools, and large commercial occupancies may naturally generate elevated call volumes that are not necessarily associated with nuisance activity, dangerous property conditions, or misuse of emergency resources. As implementation moves forward, additional review criteria and adjudication standards may be necessary to ensure equitable and consistent application of the ordinance.

To assist Council in understanding the operational and financial impacts associated with repeated emergency responses, this report includes sample response cost calculations based on actual incident activity. These calculations demonstrate the cumulative impact associated with apparatus commitment time, staffing costs, and dispatch expenditures related to repeated Fire and EMS responses.

1. Excessive False Medical Alarm Responses

The response of Fire/EMS crews to five or more false medical alarms within a one-year period

Incident Type	Address	Number of Responses
Unintentional Transmission of Alarm	3993 10 th Street	54

*Data Set 6/11/25-12/31/25

The table below summarizes the cumulative operational impact associated with repeated false medical alarm responses at a **single location**. While the average incident duration for each response was relatively short, the total time commitment exceeded eleven hours of frontline emergency resource availability over the one-year period for this one location.

Excessive False Medical Alarm Responses Operational Impact

Number of Responses	Average Incident Time	Total Time Impact
54	12 min 33 sec	11 hours 17 min 18 sec

The table below provides an estimated cost analysis associated with repeated false medical alarm responses. The calculation includes apparatus staffing costs, unit commitment time, and dispatch expenditures, illustrating the cumulative financial impact repeated responses can have on public safety resources.

Excessive False Medical Alarm Responses Cost Per Hour Impact

Unit	Time on Call	Cost per Hour	Total
Squad 1	7:31:31	\$205.00	\$1,542.69
Engine 1	2:48:33	\$526.00	\$1,477.64
Truck 1	0:57:14	\$574.00	\$547.54
Dispatch Cost (\$26.48 per call) @ 54 calls			\$1,429.92
Total			\$4,997.79
Estimated False Medical Alarm Cost (1 year @1 location)			\$8,942.12

2. Repeated Emergency Responses to a Single Location

The response of Fire/EMS crews to the same property or business five or more times within a 30-day period

Location	Address	Number of Responses
Path of Life Shelter	2840 Hulen Place	18
Illumination Foundation	3024 Franklin Avenue	14
Family Services	9890 County Farm Road	13
Riverside City College	4800 Magnolia Avenue	11
Galleria at Tyler	1299 Galleria at Tyler	10
County of Riverside	4000 Orange Street	10
Sobering Center	10003 County Farm Road	9
Pacific Grove Hospital	5900 Brockton Avenue	8
California Baptist University	8432 Magnolia Avenue	8
University California Riverside	900 University Avenue	8

Franklin Residential Care Facility	3021 Franklin Avenue	7
Jefferson Point Apartments	3758 Jefferson Street Apt 25	6
Riverside Community Hospital	4445 Magnolia Avenue	6
Poly High School	5450 Victoria Avenue	6
ETS	9990 County Farm Road	6
Target	3520 Tyler Street	5
DaVita Dialysis	4361 Latham Street	5
Sierra Villa Apartments	5350 La Sierra Avenue Apt 2	5
Neighborhood Health Clinic	7140 Indiana Avenue	5

* Data Set 30-day period – 1/29/26-2/28/26

The table below illustrates the distribution of incident types associated with the analyzed responses. Medical aid calls represent the majority of incidents (70%), demonstrating that emergency medical responses are the primary driver of Fire Department service demand and a significant factor in repeated responses evaluated under Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 9.60.

Top Individual Problems

Problem Type	Calls	Percent
Medical Aids	117	70%
Fire Alarm	16	10%
Public Assist	10	6%
Fire	2	1%
Others	21	13%

The table below shows the units most frequently dispatched to the identified incidents. Squad 2, Squad 1, and Engine 4 experienced the highest number of responses, demonstrating how repeated calls can disproportionately impact specific frontline resources and affect overall system availability.

Most Impacted Units

Unit	Number of Responses
S2	27
S1	26
E4	23
E3	13
E1	12

The table below illustrates the total time units were committed to these incidents. Squad 1, Engine 4, and Squad 2 recorded the highest operational time, highlighting the cumulative resource commitment associated with repeated emergency responses and the potential system impacts consistent with the intent of Chapter 9.60.

Total Time Committed by Unit

Unit	Total Minutes Committed
S1	528
E4	518
S2	515
E3	297
E12	204

The table below provides an estimated cost analysis associated with repeated emergency responses to a **single location** during the one-month study period. The calculation includes staffing costs, apparatus commitment time, and dispatch expenditures to demonstrate the operational and financial impacts associated with recurring emergency incidents.

Repeated Emergency Responses to a Single Location Cost Impact

Unit	Time on Call	Cost per Hour	Total
Squads	18:41:53	\$205.00	\$3,833.10
Engines	33:31:57	\$526.00	\$17,638.10
Trucks	6:21:01	\$574.00	\$3,644.43
Dispatch Cost (\$26.48 per call)			\$4,395.68
Repeated Emergency Responses to a Single Location Cost (1 month)			\$29,511.31

Prior to initiating any formal cost recovery process, the City must ensure compliance with the notification, administrative review, and appeal procedures required under Chapter 9.60. Development of consistent procedures and documentation standards will be necessary to ensure due process and uniform application across departments.

Additionally, staff continues to evaluate whether current data collection and records management systems can adequately distinguish nuisance properties and extraordinary responses from legitimate high-service locations. As implementation progresses, additional performance metrics, analytical tools, or software enhancements may be necessary to ensure the ordinance is administered consistently and in alignment with Council intent.

Riverside Police Department Response Data

Under Chapter 9.60, the Riverside Police Department is responsible for:

- Tracking repeated police responses to properties
- Identifying incidents that meet the “extraordinary police service or response” threshold
- Providing incident data and operational analysis
- Assisting with determining response costs
- Supporting the City in addressing properties that repeatedly require emergency services

The Riverside Police Department has developed a method to track these incidents through its Records Management System (RMS) called Motorola Premier One. This data, while captured, is not automatically tracked and requires an analyst to extract, compile, and analyze the data upon request. The data provided herein is based upon the excessive police response criteria identified in RMC 9.60:

- The response of three or more police officers and a supervisor to a single emergency response; or
- The second emergency response to the same business or property within a 30-day period; or
- The third emergency response to the same business or property within a 90-day period.

If automation could be implemented, the process would still require significant staff time and ongoing review of incident data and call closing codes to ensure accuracy and consistent

alignment with the requirements outlined in the Riverside Municipal Code (RMC). Most of the locations that, based on response numbers alone, would fall within the criteria in RMC 9.60, are businesses or residences calling for legitimate police assistance and do not fall within the RMC’s findings regarding nuisance activity or misuse of police resources. Currently, this analysis is done on a case-by-case basis for particular addresses when the police department receives complaints of nuisance activity at a location.

To effectively implement and maintain an automated and recurring analysis of police response data, dedicated personnel will be necessary to perform data analysis, monitor system outputs, and adjudicate incidents in accordance with RMC 9.60.

1. The response of three or more police officers and a supervisor to a single emergency response

Month	Total Responses
January 2026	173
February 2026	146
March 2026	155
3-MONTH TOTAL	474

Of those 474 incidents, 39 locations had two or more such responses, and 11 locations had three or more such responses within the 3-month period analyzed. Among those were:

Location	Common Place	Total Responses	Call Types
7600 AMBERGATE	THE JAMES APTS.	5	3 DV, Assist CPS, Welfare Ck.
1299 GALLERIA AT TYLER	GALLERIA AT TYLER	4	Assault, Shoplifting, 2 Robberies
4747 JURUPA	JURUPA ROYALE APTS.	4	Assist RFD, Assist CPS, DV
11711 COLLETT	ESPLANADE AT RIVERWALK	3	911 Open Line, 2 DV
3865 JACKSON ST	PCH	3	3 Subject Bothering
3 RD ST	RESIDENCE ON 3 RD ST.	3	5150, Subj w/knife, Welfare Check
4250 VAN BUREN BLVD	IOWA GARDENS APTS.	3	2 Assault, Supplemental Rpt
MANX CT.	RESIDENCE ON MANX	3	Assault, Welfare Ck, AOD
4445 MAGNOLIA AVE.	RCH	3	Assist RFD, Subj Bother, Susp Subj
9225 MAGNOLIA AVE.	STATER BROS.	3	Assault, Resist/obstruct Ofc, Injury
3993 IOWA AVE.	IOWA GARDENS APTS.	3	2 Assault, Supp Rpt.

2. The second emergency response to the same business or property within a 30-day period

Analysis showed 3,028 total calls matching this criterion for the months of January through March 2026. Monthly totals were as follows:

- January 1,036 responses
- February 922 responses
- March 1,070 responses

Locations with 20 or more responses matching this criterion were as follows:

Response Month	Location	Common Place	Monthly Responses
Jan-26	1299 GALLERIA AT TYLER	GALLERIA AT TYLER	38
Jan-26	4445 MAGNOLIA AVE	RCH	35
Jan-26	10357 MAGNOLIA AVE	WSS	30
Jan-26	4250 VAN BUREN BLVD	FOOD 4 LESS	27
Jan-26	10725 MAGNOLIA AVE	ALTURA CREDIT UNION	25
Jan-26	10540 MAGNOLIA AVE	RPD MAGNOLIA STATION	24
Jan-26	3865 JACKSON ST	PCH	23
Jan-26	4102 ORANGE ST	RPD ORANGE ST STATION	23
Feb-26	3865 JACKSON ST	PCH	34
Feb-26	4445 MAGNOLIA AVE	RCH	31
Feb-26	10540 MAGNOLIA AVE	RPD MAGNOLIA STATION	28
Feb-26	10725 MAGNOLIA AVE	ALTURA CREDIT UNION	23
Feb-26	1299 GALLERIA AT TYLER	GALLERIA AT TYLER	23
Feb-26	4250 VAN BUREN BLVD	FOOD 4 LESS	22
Feb-26	6250 VALLEY SPRINGS PKWY	WALMART SUPERCENTER	20
Mar-26	3520 TYLER ST	TARGET	43
Mar-26	4445 MAGNOLIA AVE	RCH	36
Mar-26	10725 MAGNOLIA AVE	ALTURA CREDIT UNION	31
Mar-26	10540 MAGNOLIA AVE	RPD MAGNOLIA STATION	25
Mar-26	1299 GALLERIA AT TYLER	GALLERIA AT TYLER	24
Mar-26	6250 VALLEY SPRINGS PKWY	WALMART SUPERCENTER	24
Mar-26	5225 CANYON CREST DR	STARBUCKS	23
Mar-26	2335 14TH ST	OASIS SENIOR VILLAS	22
Mar-26	4661 TYLER ST	STONEBROOK APTS	22
Mar-26	5130 ARLINGTON AVE	YUM YUM DONUTS	22
Mar-26	10800 MAGNOLIA AVE	KAISER URGENT CARE	21
Mar-26	1745 UNIVERSITY AVE	WALGREENS	21

Mar-26	4102 ORANGE ST	RPD ORANGE ST STATION	21
Mar-26	4250 VAN BUREN BLVD	FOOD 4 LESS	21
Mar-26	3865 JACKSON ST	PCH	20

*Omitted from these addresses is a single-family residence with frequent responses related to a habitual runaway juvenile.

3. The third emergency response to the same business or property within a 90-day period

Analysis showed 1,489 total calls matching this criterion for the months of January through March 2026.

Locations with 40 or more responses matching this criterion are as follows:

Location	Common Place	Total Responses
4445 MAGNOLIA AVE	RCH	102
1299 GALLERIA AT TYLER	GALLERIA AT TYLER	85
10725 MAGNOLIA AVE	ALTURA CREDIT UNION	79
10540 MAGNOLIA AVE	RPD MAGNOLIA STATION	77
3865 JACKSON ST	PCH	77
3520 TYLER ST	TARGET	76
4250 VAN BUREN BLVD	FOOD 4 LESS	70
4102 ORANGE ST	RPD ORANGE STATION	63
5130 ARLINGTON AVE	YUM YUM DONUTS	58
6250 VALLEY SPRINGS PKWY	WALMART SUPERCENTER	56
5225 CANYON CREST DR	STARBUCKS	55
2335 14TH ST	OASIS APTS	50
4790 JACKSON ST	WHISPERING FOUNTAINS	49
10357 MAGNOLIA AVE	WSS	48
10800 MAGNOLIA AVE	KAISER URGENT CARE	45
4747 JURUPA AVE	JURUPA ROYALE APTS	45
10391 MAGNOLIA AVE	NORTHGATE MARKET	43
2755 CANYON SPRINGS PKWY	TARGET	43
3990 REYNOLDS RD	GEEL PLACE APTS	42

*Omitted from these addresses is a single-family residence with frequent responses related to a habitual runaway juvenile.

Police Processes for Implementing RMC 9.60:

The City of Riverside is currently divided geographically into four area commands, known as “Neighborhood Policing Centers” (NPC). Each NPC is overseen by an Area Commander with the rank of Lieutenant. Currently, properties reported or suspected of falling within the RMC 9.60 criteria are identified by police personnel due to high numbers of police responses for nuisance activity, or by residents who call to complain of nuisance activity at a particular location in their community. That information is analyzed by the Area Commander, who pulls historical call activity for the location and verifies whether it fits the criteria in RMC 9.60. If the activity at a reported location doesn’t meet the RMC 9.60 criteria for Extraordinary Police Service, the Area Commander informs the reporting party.

If the calls for service at the reported location meet the RMC 9.60 criteria, the Area Commander attempts to resolve underlying issues by meeting with the property owner or occupant to discuss

potential solutions or mitigations. This may include the implementation of a safety plan devised in accordance with RMC 9.60.050, the execution of a Trespass Arrest Authorization, or other mitigation measures.

If nuisance activity persists at a location, despite efforts to mitigate or resolve the conditions causing such activity, the property owner and/or occupant may be liable for the cost of public safety responses to address ongoing nuisances. Those costs vary greatly according to the type and number of personnel and equipment involved as well as duration of the incident, but are estimated below as follows:

Personnel and Assets	Hourly Rate	Total Comp
Police Lieutenant	\$115.72	\$253.37
Police Sergeant	\$79.04	\$173.42
Police Detective	\$68.30	\$143.18
Police Officer	\$61.94	\$146.77
Community Svc Ofc	\$35.58	\$58.68
Dispatcher II	\$43.74	\$79.26
Police Pilot	\$75.32	\$143.63
Police Helicopter Operating Cost	\$1,000.00	\$1,290.40

*Personnel hourly rate based on top-step salary without potential salary premiums. Total compensation includes fringe benefits, based on exemplar employees. Helicopter hourly rate based on fuel and amortized maintenance costs. Total compensation includes operating costs, along with total compensation for one police pilot and one tactical flight officer.

Considering the minimum deployment of personnel to a single incident, triggering RMC 9.60 criteria, one sergeant and three or more officers, the minimum charge for a single hour-long incident would be as follows:

Minimum 9.60 Single Response	Hourly Cost (Total Comp)
Police Sergeant	\$173.42
3 Police Officers	\$440.31
Dispatcher II	\$79.26
Total	\$692.99

A large-scale response requiring a significant number of personnel and equipment over an extended period of time could result in costs incurred equaling up to \$10,000 or more.

Assessable costs are calculated based upon the total compensation of employees involved in responding to an extraordinary emergency incident at the location, as well as both direct and indirect costs of providing extraordinary response. Costs are levied by the City as a civil assessment and are due within 30 days of billing. A ten percent penalty, as well as interest are assessed for delinquent amounts.

Any assessments for extraordinary emergency responses are appealable in accordance with RMC 1.17.400.

As noted above, many of the locations which would fall within a plain reading of the RMC 9.60 criteria are businesses, hospitals, and public facilities which understandably generate a high number of calls for service. Others are private properties where the owners or occupants initiate a higher-than-usual number of calls for legitimate police services. Current data collection and

retention methods can be partially automated to retrieve all data meeting the excessive police response criteria in RMC 9.60. However, the software is unable to distinguish between legitimate users of police services, and nuisance properties which are generating extraordinary responses as contemplated by RMC 9.60 and intended by Council when the RMC was passed into law.

An employee would be required to initiate the search on a regular basis, which is estimated to be around three hours of work. The employee would then be required to manually search through thousands of incidents, opening and reviewing individual call records to verify what happened on each incident, whether the reporting party was the owner or occupant calling for assistance, and whether the incident met the criteria in RMC 9.60. This process would take multiple days or weeks to verify details of individual incidents for a blanket search and compare each against the RMC 9.60 criteria. Any properties identified through such a process would still be referred to an Area Commander for further vetting and attempts to achieve voluntary cooperation with the owner or occupant.

Currently, the RMC is administered in alignment with the intent of the ordinance and Council's priorities in passing it. The Lieutenant Area Commander responsible for the area where a reported nuisance property is located, is responsible for vetting the information and personally working with the owner/ occupant to resolve issues causing excessive responses, as they are reported. Property owners who eventually fall within the cost recovery provisions of RMC 9.60 have had ample time and opportunity, as well as the ability to collaborate with the Area Commander on solutions before any cost recovery efforts are contemplated.

The current process has successfully resulted in resolving most issues successfully and has created positive experience for affected residents. In those cases where cost recovery efforts have become necessary, the owner or occupant can't say they were unaware, caught off-guard, or that no one tried to help them mitigate the problem.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no financial impact associated with this report. Should the Public Safety group be directed to fully implement Chapter 9.60 of the Riverside Municipal Code a significant investment in the form of additional software and personnel costs would be required for ongoing automated data retrieval and analysis. Staff would return at a future date with additional budget impacts.

Prepared by:	Brian Guzzetta, Deputy Fire Chief Charles Payne, Deputy Police Chief
Approved by:	Steve McKinster, Fire Chief Larry V. Gonzalez, Police Chief
Certified as to availability of funds:	Julie Nemes, Interim Finance Director
Approved by:	Edward Enriquez, Acting City Manager
Approved as to form:	Rebecca McKee-Reimbold, Interim City Attorney

Attachments:
1. Presentation