



NEW REALITIES

Law Enforcement in the Post-9/11 Era

Engaging the Private Sector To Promote Homeland Security: Law Enforcement-Private Security Partnerships



U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Alberto R. Gonzales
Attorney General

Regina B. Schofield
Assistant Attorney General

Domingo S. Herraiz
Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance

Office of Justice Programs
Partnerships for Safer Communities
www.ojp.usdoj.gov

Bureau of Justice Assistance
www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA

NCJ 210678

Written by Andrew Morabito and Sheldon Greenberg

This document was prepared by the International Association of Chiefs of Police, under cooperative agreement number 2003-DD-BX-K002, awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime.

Engaging the Private Sector To Promote Homeland Security: Law Enforcement-Private Security Partnerships

September 2005

NCJ 210678

Contents

Acknowledgmentsv

Executive Summaryvii

The Issues1

Local and Regional Programs and Initiatives11

Other State and Local Programs19

Federal Programs21

Endnotes23

References25

Acknowledgments

Post-9/11 Policing Project Staff

The Post-9/11 Policing Project is the work of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), National Sheriffs' Association (NSA), National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE), Major Cities Chiefs Association (MCCA), and Police Foundation. Jerry Needle, Director of Programs and Research, IACP, provided overall project direction.

■ International Association of Chiefs of Police

Phil Lynn served as IACP's Project Director, managed development and publication of the four Promising Practices Briefs, and authored *Mutual Aid: Multijurisdictional Partnerships for Meeting Regional Threats*. Andrew Morabito coauthored this monograph, *Engaging the Private Sector To Promote Homeland Security: Law Enforcement-Private Security Partnerships*, and analyzed Post-9/11 survey data. Col. Joel Leson, Director, IACP Center for Police Leadership, authored this monograph, *Assessing and Managing the Terrorism Threat*. Walter Tangel served as initial Project Director.

Dr. Ellen Scrivner, Deputy Superintendent, Bureau of Administrative Services, Chicago Police Department, contributed to all phases of project design and cofacilitated the Post-9/11 Roundtables with Jerry Needle. Marilyn Peterson, Management Specialist-Intelligence, New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice, authored *Intelligence Led Policing: The New Intelligence Architecture*.

■ National Sheriffs' Association

Fred Wilson, Director of Training, directed NSA project activities, organized and managed Post-9/11 Roundtables, and worked closely with IACP staff throughout the course of the project. NSA project consultants included Chris Tutko, Director of NSA's Neighborhood Watch Project;

John Matthews; and Dr. Jeff Walker, University of Arkansas, Little Rock.

■ National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives

Jessie Lee, Executive Director, served as NOBLE's Project Director and conducted most staff work.

■ Major Cities Chiefs Association

Dr. Phyllis McDonald, Division of Public Safety Leadership, Johns Hopkins University, directed the work of the Major Cities Chiefs Association. The MCCA team included Denis O'Keefe, Consultant; Corinne Martin, Program Coordinator; and Shannon Feldpush.

Dr. Sheldon Greenberg, Director of the Division of Public Safety Leadership, coauthored this monograph—*Engaging the Private Sector To Promote Homeland Security: Law Enforcement-Private Security Partnerships*.

■ The Police Foundation

Edwin Hamilton directed Police Foundation project activities and managed Post-9/11 survey formatting and analysis, assisted by Rob Davis. Foundation consultants included Inspector Garth den Heyer of the New Zealand Police and Steve Johnson of the Washington State Patrol.

Promising Practices Reviews

Promising Practices drafts were critiqued and enriched by a series of practitioners/content experts, including Richard Cashdollar, Executive Director of Public Safety, City of Mobile, AL; George Franscell, Attorney-at-Law, Franscell, Strickland, Roberts and Lawrence, Los Angeles, CA; Mary Beth Michos, State Mutual Aid Coordinator, Prince William County, VA; David Bostrom, Manager, Community Policing

Consortium, IACP; John P. Chase, Chief of Staff, IAIP, Department of Homeland Security; John M. Clark, Assistant Vice President/Chief of Police, Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad; John A. LeCours, Director/Intelligence, Transport Canada; Ronald W. Olin, Chief of Police, Lawrence, KS; Ed Jopeck, Analyst, Veridian; Jerry Marynik, Administrator, State Terrorism Threat Assessment Center, California Department of Justice; and Bart Johnson, Office of Counter-Terrorism, New York State Police.

Executive Oversight

The Post-9/11 Policing Project was initially conceptualized by the Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Since its inception, the project has been guided throughout by the chief executive officers of the partner associations:

- Daniel N. Rosenblatt, Executive Director, International Association of Chiefs of Police

- Thomas N. Faust, Executive Director, National Sheriffs' Association
- Jessie Lee, Executive Director, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives
- Hubert Williams, President, The Police Foundation
- Thomas C. Frazier, Executive Director, Major Cities Chiefs Association

Bureau of Justice Assistance Guidance

We gratefully acknowledge the technical guidance and patient cooperation of executives and program managers who helped fashion project work: James H. Burch II, Deputy Director; Michelle Shaw, Policy Advisor; and Steven Edwards, Ph.D., Senior Policy Advisor for Law Enforcement.

Executive Summary

Since the attacks of September 11, 2001, law enforcement-private security partnerships have been viewed as critical to preventing terrorism and terror-related acts. Because the private sector owns and protects 85 percent of the nation's infrastructure, while local law enforcement often possesses threat information regarding infrastructure, law enforcement-private security partnerships can put vital information into the hands of the people who need it. Thus, to effectively protect the nation's infrastructure, law enforcement and private security must work collaboratively because neither possesses the necessary resources to do so alone.

Law enforcement-private security partnerships are not new. Prior to September 11, the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), National Sheriffs' Association, and ASIS International (formerly the American Society for Industrial Security) joined together, with funding from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs' Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), to launch "Operation Cooperation," a national effort to increase collaborative efforts between the private sector, particularly private security, and state and local law enforcement agencies. But efforts such as this one must expand beyond a crime-and-disorder focus to include homeland security-related issues if the policing community is to prevent future terrorist acts.

Law enforcement and private security have strengths and weaknesses that must be considered to form realistic expectations of what each can bring to collaborative partnerships. Partnerships offer a number of benefits to both sides, including creative problem solving; increased training opportunities; information, data, and intelligence sharing; "force multiplier" opportunities; access to the community through private sector communications technology; and reduced recovery time following disasters. Partnerships, however, are not without their obstacles. The primary ones are barriers to information sharing, mistrust, and misinformation.

Even though a reported lack of trust and mutual knowledge has inhibited the formation of law enforcement-private security partnerships in the past, gains have been made. The goal of partnerships is *collaboration*, in which partners recognize that their missions overlap and work to share resources and achieve common goals. Successful collaborative partnerships include common tasks, clearly identified leaders, operational planning, and a mutual commitment to provide necessary resources.

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has issued recommendations for jurisdictions seeking to improve collaboration with their private sector agency counterparts. To prevent terrorism, DHS recommends that public and private agencies (1) prepare memorandums of understanding and formal coordination agreements describing mechanisms for exchanging information regarding vulnerabilities and risks; (2) use community policing initiatives, strategies, and tactics to identify suspicious activities related to terrorism; (3) establish a regional prevention information command center; and (4) coordinate the flow of information regarding infrastructure.

Police chiefs and sheriffs should consider formalizing relationships with their private security counterparts. Formalization shows both law enforcement and private security employees that the partnership is an organizational priority. Law enforcement-private security partnerships tend to revolve around networking, information sharing, crime prevention, resource sharing, training, legislation, operations, and research and guidelines. Each of these areas contains a homeland security and terrorism prevention element.

Selecting the right person as a liaison is an important, and often overlooked, responsibility. The success of a partnership can often depend on the liaison. The selection of private security personnel for this position can be complicated by a lack of prescreening, standards, and training.

Four years after September 11, few jurisdictions have homeland security-driven law enforcement-private security partnerships. Instead, most focus on proven crime prevention-driven partnerships. The chapter titled, “Local and Regional Programs and Initiatives,” includes examples of both crime prevention- and homeland security-driven partnerships with the understanding that the principles behind crime prevention transfer well to homeland security.

Government at the federal, state, and local level must actively collaborate and partner with the private sector, which controls 85 percent of America’s infrastructure . . . the nation’s infrastructure protection effort must harness the capabilities of the private sector to achieve a prudent level of security without hindering productivity, trade, or economic growth.

—The President’s
National Strategy for Homeland Security

Police are not experts when it comes to site security. Partnerships between the police and private security are necessary to assist in these types of homeland security efforts.

—Post-9/11 Policing Roundtable participant

Current estimates of public sector policing strength by the Bureau of Justice Statistics indicate that there are 16,661 state, local, and county law enforcement agencies in the United States, and they employ a total of 677,933 sworn officers. Studies on private security staffing indicate there may be as many as 10,000 private security agencies employing slightly less than 2 million private security officers in the United States. Clearly, if these numbers are accurate, then private security officers are a vast potential resource that can assist law enforcement agencies in fulfilling our mission.

—Joseph Samuels, Jr., former Chief of Police,
Richmond, California and Past President,
International Association of Chiefs of Police

All disasters are essentially local. There is no such thing as a Homeland Security Department disaster or an FBI disaster; there are only New York City, Los Angeles, Chicago, or even Des Moines disasters. Yes, their impact matters and relates to the larger community. If we are to be successful in developing a more productive anti-terrorist environment, both the public police sector and the private security sector need to change their client culture from one of mere security awareness or knowledge to that of security ownership and responsibility.

—Charles P. Connolly, former Assistant Commissioner,
New York City Police Department and
Vice President in Charge of Security,
Merrill Lynch Corporation

The Issues

With the push in local policing throughout the 1990s toward a new model of service delivery that focused on problem solving and partnerships (called community policing), sheriffs' offices and police departments engaged community organizations, neighborhood residents, other government agencies, and the private sector in collaborative partnerships to reduce crime and disorder. Law enforcement tapped into resources and expertise previously unavailable to them, with a focus on a shared vision, shared responsibility, and shared success. These partnerships reduced crime and encouraged a public trust that had been dormant in some communities for decades.

Since the attacks of September 11, 2001, law enforcement-private security partnerships have been viewed as critical to preventing terrorism. Local law enforcement and private security organizations working together is vitally important to homeland security; the private sector owns or protects the overwhelming majority of the country's infrastructure, but local law enforcement tend to possess any threat information regarding that infrastructure. In short, because neither law enforcement nor private security can protect the nation's infrastructure alone, law enforcement-private security partnerships are essential to bridging the gap. Even though existing partnerships may need improvement, we can build on the lessons learned from community policing.

Law enforcement-private security partnerships are not new. The International Association of Chiefs of Police's (IACP's) Private Sector Liaison Committee has been in place for almost 20 years. ASIS (formerly the American Society for Industrial Security) International established a Law Enforcement Liaison Council to promote understanding and cooperation between private security and law enforcement. Recognizing a gap in homeland security, IACP called a national policy summit on the issue. Prior to September 11, IACP, the National Sheriffs' Association, and ASIS joined together, with funding from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice

Programs' Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), to launch "Operation Cooperation," a national effort to increase collaboration between the private sector, particularly private security, and state and local law enforcement agencies. The document that emerged from that work, *Operation Cooperation: Guidelines for Partnerships Between Law Enforcement and Private Security Organizations*, is as relevant today as when it was published in 2000. The document focused on how the public and private sector could pool their resources to reduce crime and public disorder. The principles it elucidated are particularly important to our nation's focus on homeland security since September 11. With chemical, biological, nuclear, and traditional terror threats a reality, the need for collaborative partnerships between local law enforcement and private security is as great today as it ever has been.

The record shows that neither public law enforcement nor firefighters were the first to respond to the attack on the Twin Towers in 2001; private security personnel stationed in the two buildings and nearby facilities rapidly and selflessly became the first responders. Since September 11—and as a component of the national and world focus on preventing terrorist acts—the discourse on private security and its relationship to law enforcement has assumed a more complex dimension and reached new heights.

The 9/11 Commission estimated that 85 percent of the nation's infrastructure is privately owned.¹ Infrastructure includes not only physical assets, such as buildings, but also energy production facilities and assets, utilities (e.g., water and waste management), and transportation and communication networks. The number of people employed by private security, moreover, is at least three times larger than the number employed by public law enforcement.² The amount of money spent on private security is many times greater than state, county, and local law enforcement expenditures combined. The growth in private protective forces ranges from mobile community patrols to executive protection personnel.

Two further considerations attest to the urgency of public-private security partnerships: the sheer size of the United States and terrorists' expressed interest in inflicting mass casualties on its people.

Because partnerships are a core component of community policing, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) supported a national policy summit³ on partnerships in 2004. More than 140 representatives, ranging from chiefs of police to private security executives, concluded that law enforcement partnerships with private security have not evolved to the same degree as they have with community organizations. Law enforcement officials who meet regularly with neighborhood leaders, representatives of the faith community, and others do not routinely meet with corporate security directors or others in the security industry. Enormous strides were made in reducing crime and disorder through community partnerships in the 1990s. Further successes in public-private security partnerships will depend on leadership, planning, and relationship building.

This document provides important background information on law enforcement-private security partnerships; discusses why these partnerships are important to homeland security and supplies information that enables police chiefs and sheriffs to make partnerships successful; and profiles a number of law enforcement-private security partnerships that local and state agencies might consider replicating.

Private and Public: Definitions and Background

While some overlap in the missions of public law enforcement and private security exists, the two groups are not the same. To explain how local law enforcement and private security can better protect the country, this section starts by clarifying the difference between public and private security. To start with, "public policing" consists of services offered by local, state, tribal, and federal agencies, i.e., local and state police, tribal agencies, and sheriffs' offices. These agencies provide the bulk of policing services across the United States. "For the most part, they are not concerned with corporate internal problems; they are concerned primarily with street crimes."⁴

Private security services, on the other hand, fall into two categories: (1) proprietary or *corporate* security; and (2) *contract* or private security firms. *Corporate* security generally refers to the security departments that exist within businesses or corporations. *Contract* security firms by contrast sell their services to the public, including businesses, homeowners, and banks.

Private security is not a monolithic entity. Just as differences exist between state and local law enforcement, private security performs functions that can differ considerably. IACP's summit report notes that "[a] security practitioner could be an experienced director of security at a major multinational corporation, a manager of contract security officers at a client site, a skilled computer crime investigator, an armed protector at a nuclear power plant, or an entry-level guard at a retail store."⁵ For local police chiefs and sheriffs, some or all of these classes of private security might be appropriate to incorporate into their homeland security strategies, depending on the characteristics of their jurisdictions.

Law enforcement and private security have strengths and weaknesses that must be considered to form realistic expectations of what each can bring to partnerships. Private security is often criticized for absent or inadequate preemployment screening, training, standards, certification, regulation, and high turnover rates. However, recent findings indicate that private security has made gains in these areas.⁶ Private sector security also has significant strengths. The sheer number of private security officers makes it an important force. It often is able to protect small geographic areas with large numbers of officers or guards, something law enforcement cannot afford. Some private security officers, moreover, possess specialized technical capacity, including the knowledge and ability to protect computer networks, chemical plants, financial institutions, health care institutions, and retail establishments. Law enforcement often does not possess this knowledge or only the largest agencies possess it.⁷ More generally, the large and growing security industry "is armed with considerable and often sophisticated resources to deter crime and prevent other losses."⁸

The public law enforcement community is substantially smaller in size. Yet it is strong where private security is weak. To begin with, public law enforcement powers are far greater than those of private security. The selection process for becoming a

deputy or police officer, moreover, is vigorous and includes a thorough background investigation. Law enforcement officers are well trained, receiving academy, field, and inservice instruction. Officers tend to stay at the same agency for the duration of their careers, and officers in agencies that practice community policing are likely to have established rapport and trust with local citizens and business groups that can share information with them. Trust and information are invaluable for preventing terrorist acts. Law enforcement agencies, however, like private security, have limitations. They sometimes lack the financial resources of private firms because of tight budgets. Law enforcement response time can also lag: In rural jurisdictions it is not unusual for a service call to require a considerable drive; in urban jurisdictions, on the other hand, a considerable delay in response can result from a heavy call load.

The IACP's summit report notes that in some respects, "the line between public law enforcement and private security [can be] blurred."⁹ It is not unusual for law enforcement executives at local, state, and federal levels to start a second career in private security. Sheriffs' deputies and police officers work part time in private security to supplement their incomes. Colleges and universities are also much more likely to possess "private sector, sworn law enforcement agencies" than they were 20 years ago.¹⁰

Benefits of Law Enforcement-Private Security Partnerships

The advent of radical terrorism in the United States has placed great pressure on the law enforcement community. Specifically, agencies have been searching for a way to balance homeland security and traditional crime and disorder responsibilities. Limited and sometimes scarce resources must be allocated based on need, leading some chief executives to acknowledge that they are having considerable difficulty conducting this balancing act. Private security officials are experiencing a similar phenomenon. While their traditional responsibility to protect people, property, and information has continued, they are now also expected to be active participants in the national effort to protect the country's infrastructure.¹¹

Clearly, law enforcement and private security have much to gain from each other. **Law enforcement** can:

- Prepare private security to assist in emergencies.
- Coordinate efforts to safeguard the nation's critical infrastructure.
- Obtain free training and services.
- Gain additional personnel and expertise.
- Use the private sector's specialized knowledge and advanced technology.
- Obtain evidence in criminal investigations.
- Gather better information about incidents (through reporting by security staff).
- Reduce the number of calls for service.

Private security can:

- Coordinate plans with the public sector regarding evacuation, transportation, and food services during emergencies.
- Gain information from law enforcement regarding threats and crime trends.
- Develop relationships so that private practitioners know whom to contact when they need help or want to report information.
- Build law enforcement understanding of corporate needs (e.g., confidentiality).
- Boost law enforcement's respect for the security field.

Working together, private security and law enforcement can realize impressive benefits:

- Creative problem solving.
- Increased training opportunities.
- Information, data, and intelligence sharing.
- "Force multiplier" opportunities.
- Access to the community through private sector communications technology.
- Reduced recovery time following disasters.

Obstacles to Law Enforcement-Private Security Partnerships

While the benefits to law enforcement-private security partnerships are many, a chief executive must know that these partnerships are not without obstacles: barriers to information sharing, lack of trust, and misinformation are the primary problems.

Barriers to Information Sharing

Corporations hire former law enforcement, FBI, and CIA employees as security staff because these individuals typically retain strong information networks. Although these information networks are clearly valuable, information sharing of this type is normally limited and often inefficient. Law enforcement and the private sector must work together to cultivate more effective systems of information sharing.¹²

Barriers to information sharing between law enforcement and private security clearly exist. Starting with private security limitations, law enforcement staff should bear in mind the for-profit nature of businesses. Specifically, because the private sector is in the business of making money, companies often do not want to release, give away, or otherwise share privileged business information that could ultimately hurt profitability. For example, if company representatives speak candidly at a public meeting, business competitors could exploit this information, as it may become publicly available through Freedom of Information Act requests. Law enforcement agencies, by the same token, have their own difficulties: They may be reticent to share information with companies owned by foreign enterprises and may also not be able to do so legally. When it comes to sharing information, however, the two greatest barriers are a lack of trust and misinformation.

Lack of Trust

Although there are exceptions, one obstacle to creating effective partnerships may be a lack of trust between law enforcement and private security. Despite considerable discussion about partnerships between the two groups, overlapping missions, and the need to work together, the level of trust is reported to be quite low. The two sectors often view each other as having separate goals and have even viewed each other as competitors.

Both sides must overcome the trust obstacle. Peter Homel, Director of the Crime Prevention Division of the New South Wales Attorney General's Department, asserts that partnerships cannot endure that are not based on mutual trust. If trust does exist, it is often based on the working relationship of top executives seeking to establish a law enforcement-private security partnership. In many cases, these executives have worked together in the past because many security managers and directors serve in local law enforcement agencies prior to joining private industry. But trust at the top among a couple of key players cannot overcome decades of distrust across the professions.

To develop trust, police chiefs, sheriffs, and their staffs must:

- Create a vision and passion that brings workers together.
- Deliver what is promised.
- Ensure consistency. Constant change or change that is not understood destroys credibility.
- Communicate.
- Draw out and address past suspicions and concerns.
- Pay attention to detail.
- Train.
- Ensure equity and equality. Both sides must produce their share of work and be recognized for it.
- Reinforce the importance of the partnership (with an emphasis on sharing the credit for successes).
- Admit mistakes and learn from them. Both sides will make errors.

Misinformation and Misunderstanding

One of the major causes of lack of trust is misinformation and misunderstanding. Often, neither law enforcement nor private security has an accurate understanding of what the other does or can do. This can be problematic with regard to crime and disorder, but in the area of homeland security and terrorism it can be perilous. Even smaller scale terrorist acts can cause considerable physical, psychological, and economic damage. As noted in *Perspectives on*

Preparedness, “the private sector’s current lack of integration into domestic preparedness programs is dangerous.”¹³ Every law enforcement officer needs to know how private security can help with homeland security and he or she must know this *before* an incident occurs, not after. The best way to gain this information is from the source: private security professionals in their community.

If law enforcement-private security partnerships are to be effective, law enforcement executives must work with their private security counterparts to communicate clear and consistent messages not only to each other, but also down through their organizations to the line-level officer or guard. At the national policy summit, joint training was recommended so that each side knows what the other has to offer. Training can also broaden the knowledge of line-level employees (e.g., private security guards could receive training on homeland security, crime prevention, and problem solving).

Where We Stand Today—The 4 C’s

In the past, lack of trust and knowledge has inhibited the formation of law enforcement-private security partnerships. This is not to say, however, that gains have not been made over the years. As the “Operation Cooperation” guidelines noted, “law enforcement agencies and private security operations (both contract security providers and corporate security departments) have increasingly come together, pooling their strengths to prevent and solve crimes.”¹⁴ Today, however, these partnerships must not simply prevent and solve crimes, they must also prevent terrorist acts. And although significant progress has been made in establishing partnerships, some partnerships are more comprehensive and effective than others. Understanding the 4 C’s—*communication*, *cooperation*, *coordination*, and *collaboration*—is crucial to achieving effective partnerships.

Readers can think of each of the 4 C’s as a step on the way to full partnering. *Communication*, the exchange of information and ideas, is the first step in establishing a relationship between two organizations. The second step, *cooperation*, involves partners undertaking a joint project or operation such as the sharing of personnel. *Coordination*, the third step, is achieved when the partners adopt a common goal, for instance, to reduce crime in a certain neighborhood.

The final and most comprehensive step, *collaboration*, occurs when partners understand that their missions overlap and adopt policies and projects designed to share resources, achieve common goals, and strengthen the partners. The goal of public-private partnerships, described in greater detail below, is to achieve collaboration.

What We Need To Do—The 12 Components of Partnerships

Understanding that law enforcement-private security partnerships are important to the nation’s security is only a first step. Defining and operationalizing a partnership is the critical next step. What do chief executives need to do to engage in these partnerships? First, they must understand what a partnership is. Although this may seem too simple a factor to consider, people often overlook the basics. And agencies seeking to achieve collaboration must understand the components that their partnerships will contain.

A successful public-private partnership has 12 essential components:

- Common goals.
- Common tasks.
- Knowledge of participating agencies’ capabilities and missions.
- Well-defined projected outcomes.
- A timetable.
- Education for all involved.
- A tangible purpose.
- Clearly identified leaders.
- Operational planning.
- Agreement by all partners as to how the partnership will proceed.
- Mutual commitment to providing necessary resources.
- Assessment and reporting.

Executives need to agree on these components *before* the partnership moves forward. For the police chief or sheriff, this may include not only working with a corporation’s security director but also with the corporation’s chief executive or similar designee. Private security professionals at the summit, both executives and others, expressed great interest in collaborating with local law enforcement to protect the nation’s infrastructure. They simply need to be asked.

Executives should also be mindful of adopting policies that only partially contribute to successful partnerships. For instance, although the following can be elements in a partnership, in and of themselves they do not constitute a public-private collaboration:

- Executives attending partner meetings.
- Officers attending partner meetings.
- Individual projects undertaken with private security.
- Joint grant undertaken with private security.

Attending meetings and working on projects can be integral *parts* of a partnership. In fact, meetings are often used to share information and plan activities. Likewise, working together on projects or grants is often of value. However, these activities do not add up to the 12 threads that tie groups together in collaborative partnerships.

How We Do It—The Nine Guidelines for Collaboration

DHS Guidelines for Collaboration

While public-private cooperation can take many forms, *collaborative partnerships* are more defined; *collaboration* requires common goals and tasks, clearly identified leaders, and the other components described above. *Cooperation*, as suggested on page 5, might simply entail government contracting with private security for services traditionally performed by law enforcement agencies, or the employment of off-duty police officers or sheriffs’ deputies by private security agencies. However, these activities only scratch the surface of what the two sides can do to foster public safety. Homeland security arrangements between law enforcement and private security require much more than cooperation.

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has issued recommendations for jurisdictions seeking to improve *collaboration* with their private sector counterparts. DHS suggests that agencies:

- Recognize the need for prevention.
- Establish a system, center, or task force to serve as a clearinghouse for all potentially relevant domestically generated terrorism information.
- Ensure timely interpretation and assessment of information.
- Prepare Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) and formal coordination agreements between public and private agencies. MOUs should describe mechanisms for exchanging information about vulnerabilities and risks, coordination of responses, and processes to facilitate information sharing and multijurisdictional preemption of terrorist acts.
- Use community policing initiatives, strategies, and tactics to identify suspicious activities related to terrorism.
- Explicitly develop “social capital” through collaboration between the private sector, law enforcement, and other partners so that data, information, assistance, and “best practices” may be shared and collaborative processes developed.
- Coordinate federal, state, and local information, plans, and actions for assessments, prevention procedures, infrastructure protection, and funding priorities to address prevention.
- Establish a regional prevention information command center and coordinate the flow of information regarding infrastructure.
- Include prevention and collaboration measures in exercises.¹⁵

Outreach and Trust

The key to success is implementation. When implemented properly, collaborative partnerships can minimize (and sometimes avoid) duplicative efforts and leverage limited resources. Once a sheriff or police chief has decided to engage a private security entity in a partnership, initial outreach will be necessary. Outreach is easiest when trust levels are

high. In these instances, the public sector chief executive will likely have established a relationship with his or her private sector counterpart as trust is normally built over time. For those chief executives who have not engaged their private sector counterparts before, an initial gesture of goodwill, respect, commitment, and purpose can go a long way.

Formalization and Memorandums of Understanding

Once trust has been established, police chiefs and sheriffs should formalize the new relationship by signing an MOU. Formalization shows employees that the partnership is a priority. At the national level, summit participants called on public and private sector leaders to make a formal commitment to partnerships and to endorse “the implementation of sustainable public-private partnerships as a preferred tool to address terrorism, public disorder, and crime.”¹⁶ As part of this effort, law enforcement chief executives should expect, measure, and reward efforts.

Formalization helps institutionalize homeland security-driven partnerships. As steps towards achieving this goal, summit participants encouraged:

- The Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) and state accreditation bodies to require public-private partnerships as an accreditation standard.
- Law enforcement agencies and private security organizations to institutionalize communication by sharing personnel directories with each other; to make collaboration an objective in their strategic plans; and to require monthly and annual reporting of progress.¹⁷

As part of writing an MOU and general startup, partners will need to identify the partnership’s goals, establish their expectations, and educate and train personnel and other stakeholders. The goals of partnerships can be quite varied. The *Operation Cooperation* guidelines noted eight areas in which law enforcement and private security can collaborate:

- Networking.
- Information sharing.
- Crime prevention.

- Resource sharing.
- Training.
- Legislation.
- Operations.
- Research and guidelines.

Each of these areas contains a homeland security or terrorism prevention element.

Networking: An example of networking might be breakfast and lunch meetings to discuss the common problems both groups have in protecting critical infrastructure. These meetings could elicit not only a constructive exchange about the pressures, motivations, and constraints on both the public and private sides of the equation, but also possible solutions.

Information sharing: The lifeblood of any policing agency is information; thus, information sharing (and its analyzed counterpart, intelligence sharing) should be a central component of any law enforcement-private security partnership. Information sharing includes planning for critical incident response, protecting infrastructure, enhancing communications, minimizing liability, and strategically deploying resources. Information should flow in both directions between law enforcement and private security.

Crime prevention: Crime prevention *is* terrorism prevention.¹⁸ The links between crime and terrorism are well understood—whether that connection has to do with document fraud or the illegal drug market. Terrorists often commit a number of lesser crimes toward their goal of the actual terrorist act. Based on what is known of terrorist groups and their penchant for “casing” targets (sometimes years in advance), it is not unreasonable to assume that terrorists might trespass on private property for these purposes. While private security may have in the past simply barred such individuals from returning to the property, they might now photograph trespassers and share the photographs with local law enforcement. Even without unlawful activity, private security should share any information about anything that is unusual or suspicious with law enforcement, especially when it involves the photographing of critical infrastructure.

Resource sharing: Lending expertise is an excellent example of resource sharing that can benefit terrorism prevention. As noted earlier, private security companies often have considerable technical knowledge that the local law enforcement community may lack.

Training: Lending expertise has clear connections to training. Another way to include training in a partnership is to host speakers on topics of joint interest, which can be extremely beneficial to law enforcement and private security, broadening the knowledge base of both.

Legislation: Law enforcement and private security can work together to track legislation that is important to both. More importantly, they should help legislators at the local, state, and national levels understand how legislation can affect, impair, or assist homeland security—not the least of which might be related to the sharing of certain types of sensitive information.

Operations: For line-level officers, investigators, and command staffs, the greatest opportunities for collaboration with private security are in the operational areas. Terrorism-related opportunities for collaboration include critical incident planning, the investigation of complex financial fraud or computer crimes (i.e., cybercrime), and joint sting operations (e.g., those targeting cargo theft).

Research and guidelines: The review and distribution of and action on research papers and protocols are areas in which law enforcement and private security can collaborate. Research and guidelines might be related to product tampering, closed-circuit television, security personnel standards, or whatever happens to be the homeland security issue of most importance to a region.

These examples are not intended to exhaustively illustrate the types of collaborative activities in which private security and law enforcement might engage. Many other examples exist for each of the eight areas, some of which will be discussed in the chapter “Local and Regional Programs and Initiatives.” Regardless of activity, it is important to keep the 4 C’s in mind: *communication, cooperation, coordination, and collaboration*. Each “C” represents an increasingly sophisticated component of the partnership. The end goal always is to collaborate.

Choosing Liaison Officers

Once both sides agree to form a partnership and set common goals and objectives through an MOU, selecting the right person as a liaison officer is an important, and often overlooked, responsibility. The success of a partnership often depends on the liaison. No substitute exists for a well-informed officer who is committed to and passionate about a partnership. These officers become invaluable resources, motivating others to accomplish the goals and tasks of the partnership, improving information sharing, and fostering lasting relationships—all-important elements in a successful partnership.

Executives should also bear in mind that selecting the wrong law enforcement officer to represent the department—even for a single meeting—can be devastating. Unfortunately, officers are sometimes thrust into liaison roles without adequate preparation, understanding, or commitment. They are not briefed on how or why the partnership was begun or its goals. Police chiefs and sheriffs should take the following steps to select and support their liaison:

- Involve supervisors in the selection process—supervisors are the closest management rank to officers and most often best know the strengths and weaknesses of the officers under their command. Before the selection is made, supervisors should develop or be given criteria on the type of involvement and time commitment required for the position, and its projected outcomes. Supervisors should take a lead role in the selection process.
- Fit the officer to the assignment. “Fit” should be based on a candidate’s personal interests, prior experience, and commitment.
- Give as much notice as possible before asking officers to represent the department as liaison. This allows them time to prepare.
- Inform officers of the desired outcomes of the partnership.
- Explain expectations clearly at the start of the process.
- Educate officers on the “who, what, when, where, why, and how” of partnerships. Officers should know how to facilitate a partnership and support its mission.

- Introduce the officer to key players.
- Follow up regularly on participation by officers.
Followup demonstrates a commitment by people other than the liaison and provides additional perspective on the partnership's progress.
Additional guidance can be given to the liaison.

Just as selecting the wrong law enforcement officer as liaison can lead to failure, selecting the wrong private security guard or officer can do the same. The problem with selecting private security personnel is perhaps more complicated. As noted above, private security prescreening, standards, and training are often lacking. Law enforcement and private security executives both recognize these deficiencies. Summit participants noted that the “protection of the nation’s critical infrastructure depends substantially on the competence of private security officers” and recommended that an advisory council work to improve the selection and training of private security officers.¹⁹

Local and Regional Programs and Initiatives

Four years after September 11, few jurisdictions have *homeland security-driven* law enforcement-private security partnerships. Instead, most agencies focus on *crime prevention* partnerships, which have proved effective over the past decade. As law enforcement-private security partnerships continue to emerge as an area of interest in terrorism prevention, however, numerous homeland security partnerships will likely materialize over the next few years. In the interim, and to encourage the process, this chapter describes several examples of successful local and regional public-private security partnerships. Based on information that has been collected during this project, these descriptions are offered to law enforcement executives as examples of law enforcement-private security partnerships they might consider replicating. The principles in the crime prevention-driven partnerships are not only transferable to homeland security-driven partnerships, but are interrelated and inseparable from them.

Area Police/Private Security Liaison (APPL)—New York, New York

APPL, created in 1986, enhances public-private security cooperation. It aims to protect persons and property, encourage the exchange of information between police and security, and eliminate issues of credibility and misperception. While it started with only 30 private security organizations, it now boasts more than 1,000. Since September 11, APPL's mandate has widened and taken on new importance.

APPL is linked with the Crime Prevention and Recruit Training sections (RTS) of the New York Police Department (NYPD). The Crime Prevention section's mission "is to provide crime prevention services and programs to the citizens and businesses of New York City that include but are not limited to conducting security surveys, lectures, the administration of crime reduction programs, and various forms of outreach."²⁰ Officers attend APPL meetings and work with private

security to identify issues and solutions. The RTS trains both recruits and citizens, among which are APPL members.

Because New York City is a high-priority target for terrorists, NYPD operates under a heightened state of awareness. The police work with APPL to review police security alertness at member facilities. Their joint recommendations include the following admonitions:

- Pay special attention to employee and visitor identification, suspicious packages, and all entrances and exits, particularly those that are not commonly used.
- Give careful scrutiny to all vehicles entering facilities and those parked in the immediate area.
- Review building evacuation plans to ensure that they are up to date.
- Remind security directors to not hesitate in calling 911 if they encounter suspicious individuals, packages, automobiles, or trucks.

NYPD Commissioner Ray Kelly noted in his statement to the 9/11 Commission that the police have "worked extensively with private security professionals from major facilities and corporations under APPL, [and that the program] gives the NYPD an instant communications network through which we can send out terrorism bulletins and security updates." This is accomplished principally through an e-mail network established for APPL members. For more information, go to www.nyc.gov/html/nypd/home.html.

Tabletop Exercises—Arlington, Virginia

The Arlington County Police Department recently began conducting tabletop exercises (e.g., hypothetical scenarios) with the private sector in two of the county's busiest commercial centers. Private sector

participants—for instance, building security personnel, engineers, and managers—are partly chosen based on their decisionmaking authority. But participants also include office workers, who constitute the majority of office building occupants.

County tabletop exercises normally start with smoke drifting past an office building, which requires the participants to respond. The exercises often highlight the fact that most participants aren't prepared for such incidents. Instructors encourage participants and ensure that they are ready should an incident occur or should they observe something suspicious. Facilitators prepare the participants to make decisions they have not considered previously and flag vulnerabilities. The exercises also acquaint the audience with the capabilities and limitations of the police, fire department, and other county agencies so that participants have realistic expectations of what the government can deliver in an emergency.

As part of this process, police officials direct participants to information on the county web site and promote an initiative called the Arlington Alert System. In the event of a terrorist attack or other emergency, this system sends notifications, updates, and alerts to citizens' cell phones, pagers, Blackberrys, PDAs, and e-mail. For more information, go to www.arlingtonva.us.

Center City District— Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

As with many large cities, Philadelphia's downtown suffered from decades of deterioration, neglect, and resident flight to outlying areas. To reverse this trend, city police provided services that helped lay the foundation for the downtown area's stabilization and renewal.

Philadelphia's officials recognized that the city would not rebound unless its downtown could be revitalized: The downtown area accounted for 33 percent of city tax revenue and more than 250,000 jobs. Moreover, the location of downtown next to the city's historic district, which contains such national treasures as Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell, meant that its revitalization would also improve the city's important tourist industry. In 1989, concerned citizens founded the Central Philadelphia Development Corporation (CPDC), which persuaded area businesses to accept a

property tax to fund redevelopment and raised \$6 million in 2 years. In 1991, CPDC helped designate 80 blocks next to the city's historic district as the Center City District.

But this was only the beginning. To change perceptions about Center City, the city police department focused manpower and resources in the area to reduce crime. The department staffed its Center City substation with 57 patrol officers, who supplemented, rather than replaced, existing neighborhood car patrols. Officers worked in tandem with a newly created corps of community representatives (referred to as "clean and safe" workers) to help revitalize the district. Based in a central facility, police, private security personnel, sanitation workers, and community representatives cleaned up the district, improved public safety, and made thousands of contacts with district residents. At the same time, the city implemented a marketing campaign to spread the word about improving conditions in Center City.

Results have been impressive: the number of crimes in the district declined; more companies acquired space in the area and the number of jobs stabilized; bookings at the city convention center, located in the district, rose; and new construction began. Perhaps most telling, other cities, such as Baltimore and Richmond, have taken note of the improvements and modeled their own revitalization programs on Philadelphia's efforts. Clearly, Philadelphia's Center City initiative serves as an example of a successful public-private partnership. For more information, go to www.centercityphila.org.

Law Enforcement and Private Security Council of Northeast Florida

Started in St. Johns County in 1996, the Law Enforcement and Private Security Council of Northeast Florida now includes organizations and jurisdictions throughout the greater Jacksonville area. The council does not require an organization to reach a certain size before it can join the partnership—several counties, cities, law enforcement agencies, and smaller jurisdictions are members, including the local U.S. Department of Defense police departments and the National Guard.

The partnership has expanded dramatically since September 11, shifting its focus from private security companies to individual security guards, community crime watch groups, and any individual who serves a security function. The other major change since September 11 has been the partnership's focus on information exchange between members.

One of the founding assumptions of the council was the need to increase public-private security collaboration. The law enforcement partners on the council recognized that the number of private security professionals was far greater than the number of police, that private security spends exponentially more money on security and protection than does public law enforcement, and last, that private security professionals bring valuable expertise and experience that the police sometimes do not have.

The St. Johns Sheriff's Office notes two principal council successes. First, relationships between the public and private sides of local security are being developed. The goal is to encourage a private security guard to approach or call a deputy or officer when he or she has information to share, and vice versa. Second, the Security Communications Assistance Network (SCAN) has been created. SCAN provides radios with alternate frequencies to private security personnel so that they can contact local law enforcement if an incident occurs or if they have information to share.

Other successes include setting up a council web site, expanding the fax notification program to e-mail so that messages are shared as quickly as possible, and sending a representative to or placing a brochure at all ASIS meetings, IACP events, and other local security meetings.

Council representatives now participate in the Local Domestic Security Task Force. The task force works regionally on a number of homeland security efforts, including security preparations for the 2005 Super Bowl in Jacksonville. Like the council, the task force also has private sector representation; members from Northrop Grumman and Blue Cross/Blue Shield participate in the task force because of the size and criticality of their organizations' facilities. The information from the task force feeds back into council's information exchange through briefings and faxed information. Information is shared whenever it

relates to the job responsibilities of the private security partner.

The council has grown in part because its members have worked to keep things interesting for participants. Leaders work hard to select guest speakers who interest professionals individually, but who can also speak to the partnership as a whole. As a result, partners recognize that both public and private security forces have valuable contributions to make.

For more information, go to the St. Johns County Sheriff's Office web site at www.sjso.org/emerg_prep/homeland.htm.

North Texas Regional Law Enforcement and Private Security (LEAPS)

LEAPS began in 1983, but lasted only a few years due to staff turnover. In 1993, Dallas Police Chief Benjamin Click revisited LEAPS and pulled together 20 dedicated individuals from both the police department and the private security community; the partnership has been in effect ever since.

The events of September 11 reinforced to LEAPS the importance of what it had been trying to do. Although the partners always understood the need for communication and collaboration, the terrorist attacks motivated them to redouble their efforts.

LEAPS offers workshops for the training academy and for inservice officers. A balance of private security and police officers attend LEAPS quarterly meetings.

LEAPS security officers receive four core training sessions and are eligible to take a number of elective training sessions. Once the private security officer has completed core training, he or she receives a badge that indicates the officer has received training over and above what is required.

LEAPS officers can be "activated." In situations in which police need additional people who do not have to be peace officers, the department calls LEAPS and requests private security personnel.

LEAPS reports two primary successes. First, the initiative has established a trust that allows

relationships to build. In fact, when problems arise between private security and police, LEAPS staff are often asked to intervene to settle the problem. Second, LEAPS partners have shown a propensity to share information, which has led to a number of arrests. Information is shared in both directions through fax, e-mail, quarterly meetings, and especially, personal contact. Board meetings are open so that any issue can be brought to the table immediately.

The partnership has been institutionalized as a result of these successes; both sides recognize the benefits of LEAPS. With only a few hundred police officers on duty at any given time, the large number of private security professionals who can be tapped greatly augments the police department's capacity. For more information, go to www.leaps.us.

NET Teams, WatchMail, and Crime Free Mini-Storage—Irvine, California

The Irvine Police Department (IPD) has embarked on a number of programs designed to bring stakeholders (e.g., private security, apartment managers, and storage facility personnel) together around crime and terrorism prevention. Because IPD views community awareness, education, and reassurance as essential in the fight against terrorism, these programs offer stakeholders training, including terrorism-related tips.

IPD has helped create a strong and growing relationship between law enforcement, private security, and local business. It takes a multifaceted approach, going beyond one or two showcase programs to proactively partner with city agencies and the private sector. For more information, go to www.cityofirvine.org/ipd/divisions/crimeprev.

NET Teams

Irvine is divided into three service areas, supported by the city's geo-based system. A Neighborhood Enhancement Team (NET), consisting of representatives of various city agencies including the police, serves each area. NET teams take the lead in preventing and resolving problems.

WatchMail

Similar in concept to Neighborhood Watch, WatchMail provides effective dissemination of crime and disaster

information. Residents, private security firms, and businesses obtain information rapidly, stay informed, and become active participants in neighborhood safety.

WatchMail expands the power behind Neighborhood Watch, which often involves a block captain and residents, who patrol their neighborhood and share information through a phone tree. WatchMail, on the other hand, goes beyond the block. A host broadcasts crime- and disaster-related information via e-mail to neighbors, sharing information with perhaps 300 to 500 homes. In this way, WatchMail complements Neighborhood Watch, but is not dependent on it. And because approximately 80 percent of the Irvine population has access to e-mail, WatchMail holds out the promise of alerting most of the city's residents.

Although the police department does not manage WatchMail on a daily basis, it does identify neighborhood recruit hosts, provides training, and assists with startup. Communities oversee operation and maintenance, often with support from private businesses, which sustain the system's e-mail technology. IPD is included in each host's e-mail database so that police can monitor information. The police department in turn provides crime and disaster information to hosts, who forward the information to other participants.

Focusing on neighborhoods that could benefit from the service, IPD has helped five communities set up WatchMail. The police conduct interviews, background and fingerprint checks, and monthly training for hosts.

The host obtains e-mail addresses from neighbors and businesses; creates and maintains the e-mail database; takes calls about unusual or suspicious occurrences; analyzes reports for accuracy and validity; and, if necessary, broadcasts the information to the WatchMail group. If circumstances warrant, a "reporter" contacts the IPD dispatch center or calls 911. Hosts spend from 1 to 5 hours a month serving the team.

Neighborhood participants observe unusual activity, collect descriptive information, and, when needed, call the host to request a broadcast. Participants are also connected with neighbors who do not have access to e-mail or the Internet so that they may send them bulletins and information. There is communitywide acceptance of and reliance on WatchMail.

Crime Free Mini-Storage

Many mini-storage facilities are secured in such a way that patrol officers can make only a passing check of the property. The potential for crime is compounded because many facilities allow customers round-the-clock access. The Crime Free Mini-Storage Program helps mini-storage facilities keep criminals off their property by implementing effective screening and teaching owners and managers how to deal with crime. Specifically, the program prevents offenders from renting storage space, decreases time delays from crime to discovery, and increases property recovery. The program has reduced crime and calls for service in mini-storage properties.

As one law enforcement executive noted, terrorists “need somewhere to keep their stuff.” The program can help prevent terrorism-related activity by ensuring an open exchange of information between facilities and IPD personnel, who rarely are onsite.

In addition to educating renters, the program offers training to managers and employees of the facilities. In the first phase, managers learn to spot problems before they occur and deal with them without police involvement.

Reducing Crime Against Tourists—Las Vegas, Nevada

Las Vegas, a growing city with a population of nearly 480,000, had more than 35 million visitors in 2001. Approximately 4 million were convention delegates, making Las Vegas one of the largest convention cities in the nation. The impact on the local and state economy is staggering: tourists spend more than \$31 billion a year.

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI’s) *Uniform Crime Reports*, Las Vegas has the highest crime rate of the five cities that U.S. tourists most visit. Most of the crime stems from tourism and includes theft and alcohol-related incidents. To help deal with the problem, Las Vegas hotels employ more than 7,500 security personnel and 1,000 surveillance specialists. Such an environment cannot be secured by the police alone. Partnership with private security is not simply desired—it is a necessity.

The police department’s Tourist Safety Unit (TSU), begun in 1995, manages police response to tourist-

related crime and provides quality service to victims. TSU targets pickpockets and check forgers, assigning each officer to between 5 and 12 hotels. He or she works directly with hotel security directors, investigators, and security officers.

For example, officers who follow a pickpocket into a hotel rely on the hotel’s security personnel to assist in observing the suspect, most often via electronic surveillance. Security personnel will detain the suspect if they observe criminal behavior before the police do. In another example, police may set up a sting on a maid suspected of stealing to keep the hotel from having to handle the problem. In emergencies, high-speed fax systems allow the police to send alerts to 100 hotels in less than 3 minutes, which facilitates rapid use of hotel security.

The result of this close teamwork is an excellent working relationship between police and frontline hotel security personnel. But the partnership extends farther, into areas like training.

The police department and private security are taking advantage of each other’s resources to provide superior training to their staffs. The police train hotel security personnel and often develop specialized programs to deal with emerging crime trends, such as a sudden increase in credit card fraud. In turn, the local security industry provides instruction to police on crimes unique to casinos and other areas in which it has expertise. Las Vegas hotels require security personnel to undergo training in areas such as report writing, detection, the use of force, and the law.

As a result, security personnel in Las Vegas are highly skilled and are recognized as such by the police. Close communication, joint training, and shared authority foster mutual respect.

TSU accepts hotel security reports on the victim’s behalf and, as a courtesy, sends them to the insurance company. Plans call for the courthouse to be wired so that felony victims who live out of state can testify via closed-circuit television over the Internet.

The police department takes other steps to maintain the relationship: (1) it encourages detectives to give security personnel their home phone numbers; and (2) it holds police and security personnel to the same standards when interacting with business people. For example, when officers stop for meals at a hotel, they

eat in the same facility as security employees, rather than in tourist areas.

The Las Vegas Security Chiefs Association and police representatives meet monthly to discuss training, crime trends, and security problems. Personnel from 90 hotels attend.

One of the benefits arising from the partnership is that it provides a mutual source of applicants. Security officers employed by hotels offer a source for recruiting new officers for the police department. By the same token, police personnel often retire to assume positions in private security. For more information, go to www.lvmpd.com/Tourist_Safety.

Transit Crisis Resolved—Durham, North Carolina

Turning to private security to fill a role traditionally assumed by local law enforcement is becoming more common. In Durham, police contracted with private security and worked closely with corporate officials to help stem a crisis in the transit system.

In early 2003, a series of shootings occurred on Durham Area Transit Authority buses, garnering considerable publicity. Fear set in, and many passengers stopped riding the buses. Transit Authority employees in turn shared the public's concern.

Police lacked the resources to place officers on every bus and at every bus stop, although many residents and political leaders demanded this. To stem the tide of fear, increase ridership, and, ultimately, rebuild trust in the bus system, the city turned to a private security enterprise, the Wackenhut Corporation.

Uniformed Wackenhut officers began patrolling bus stops and riding buses. The private officers were well trained and, like police officers, had power of arrest. In addition, the security officers were armed and their uniforms were distinctly different from those worn by police. The presence and visibility of these security officers helped reduce fear among residents.

Wackenhut maintained close contact with the police and city officials. The effort evolved from a simple contract to a security service to a full partnership involving common goals, a commitment to achieving the goals, and a positive working relationship. Neither

the police nor Wackenhut security officers could have accomplished the task without each other's support.

People quickly realized that fewer crimes were occurring along bus routes. Ridership increased and people's satisfaction with the bus system improved. Although there is still much to be done, the improvements have endured.

Metropolitan Atlanta Technological Crimes Task Force (MetroTech)—Atlanta, Georgia

In 1995, an increase in the theft of laptop computers and other technology-related crimes in Atlanta led to the establishment of MetroTech. MetroTech began with five members, but this sharply focused group, which brought together police and corporate representatives, quickly grew into one of the nation's largest public-private partnerships dedicated to reducing crime. Today, MetroTech has 800 members representing private corporations and law enforcement organizations, extending beyond Atlanta to include Georgia and the southeastern United States.

MetroTech improves communication between corporate security services and local, state, and federal law enforcement, combating organized criminal factions and seeking to resolve crimes such as fraud, forgery, counterfeiting, and cargo theft. The task force aims to break down traditional barriers that exist between police and corporate security.

Of particular interest to MetroTech when it was organized were industrial and financial crimes, which many corporate and security officials believed were not getting appropriate police attention: difficult and time-consuming to investigate, they rarely received media attention. It was believed that many police officials assigned these crimes a low investigative priority.

Monthly meetings, direct communication, and an e-mail network managed by the Emory University Police Department underpin MetroTech. The key to the partnership's success is the speed with which the members share important information on criminal investigations. Information sharing in MetroTech focuses on developing investigative leads, distributing lookouts, identifying patterns and practices, identifying criminal factions or groups, and soliciting

assistance from other members with expertise. Attendance at monthly meetings is optional; the atmosphere is informal and participants are encouraged to share information openly. Meetings are closed to the public and media.

Each member knows what is needed and, within the limits of law, is committed to sharing all necessary data. Information sent to MetroTech is screened by task force officials for content, importance, and legality before it is shared through the network or forwarded to law enforcement agencies.

MetroTech is administered by a steering committee comprising the partnership's leading members. Membership in the committee is balanced between corporate security and law enforcement, with an emphasis on experience.

Partnerships like MetroTech took on new meaning in the wake of September 11. As other jurisdictions began seeking ways to bring private security and police together and target crimes such as cargo theft and fraud, the Atlanta region was dramatically ahead of the curve because of MetroTech, which subsequently became a model for the FBI's InfraGard Program, a national infrastructure information exchange program (www.infragard.net).

Other State and Local Programs

The initiatives and programs listed below were also highlighted in the “Operation Cooperation” guidelines. These are promising examples of law enforcement-private security partnerships.

- **Austin Metro High Tech Foundation:** Contact the Austin Police Department’s High Tech Crime Unit at www.ci.austin.tx.us/police/htech.htm.
- **California High Technology Crime Advisory Committee.**
- **Pooling Resources in Defense of our Environment (PRIDE):** Contact the Southfield (Michigan) Police Department at 248-354-4720.
- **Washington Law Enforcement Executive Forum:** Contact WLEEF through the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs at www.waspc.org.
- **Virginia Police and Private Security Alliance (VAPPSA):** Contact the Fairfax County Police Department at 703-691-2131.

Federal Programs

Although both of the programs described below are federal initiatives, local and state law enforcement executives may consider using them as models. As noted earlier, the successful law enforcement-private security initiative must have the support of the private sector chief executive officers and their corporate security directors—a goal that both of these initiatives have achieved. The Overseas Security Advisory Council (OSAC) has been particularly successful in gaining these individuals' support because its “goal (has been) to support U.S. corporations by developing efficient and cost-effective security information and communication networks that provide the U.S. business community with the tools needed to cope with security-related issues.”²¹ Law enforcement chief executives must understand that their private security counterparts often cannot separate these twin concerns of security and cost. Police chiefs and sheriffs should bear in mind these high-priority considerations when entering into a collaborative partnership with private security.

Awareness of National Security Issues and Response (ANSIR) Program

Since the early 1970s, the FBI has worked to “reduce the vulnerability of United States persons, corporations, and institutions to intelligence and terrorist activities.”²² While ANSIR was originally designed to protect classified government information, property, and personnel, the 1990s saw an expansion of the program to include a focus on private sector proprietary economic information. When September 11 occurred, the FBI recognized the immediate need to reach nongovernmental organizations and their infrastructure, now considered high-priority targets by terrorist groups.

Although the ANSIR e-mail program was temporarily suspended in spring 2003, the FBI's counterintelligence division has continued to work with private security professionals on national and

local ANSIR programs that provide services, including information sharing. For more information, go to www.fbi.gov/programs/ansir/ansir.htm.

Overseas Security Advisory Council

OSAC, created in 1985, is a joint venture that develops and maintains effective security communications and information sharing between the federal government and private sector enterprises overseas, including private security. Today, OSAC consists of 30 private sector and 4 public sector organizations and has an additional 2,300-affiliated U.S. companies and organizations, all of which are supplied with the tools necessary to effectively manage security-related issues abroad. Current OSAC committees are:

- Transnational Crime and Terrorism.
- Protection of Information and Technology.
- Security Awareness and Education.
- Country Council Support.

OSAC considers information exchange paramount to security overseas. Its web site, www.ds-osac.org, provides member organizations with unclassified information issued by the U.S. Department of State on security-related incidents and threats overseas, including travel advisories, public announcements, daily security-related news articles, overseas reports on security and crime incidents, terrorist group profiles, significant anniversary dates, general crime information for cities and countries, locations of and contacts at U.S. posts overseas, and updates on new or unusual situations. Additionally, OSAC provides publications on all facets of security, produced for private sector security professionals to incorporate in their organizations' awareness and education programs.

Upcoming Publication

The Police Foundation, with funding support from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), is engaged in a collaborative publication project with ASIS International titled “Assessment of the Preparedness of Private Security in Shopping Malls to Prevent and Respond to Terrorist Attacks.” This ongoing project assesses state regulation of private security, examines state homeland security initiatives and recommendations for private security, and determines how well private security is prepared to prevent terrorist attacks.

Endnotes

¹ The 9/11 Commission. 2004. *Final Report, Official Government Edition*. Washington, DC: GPO.

² Reynolds, Morgan O. 2001. *Using the Private Sector to Deter Crime* at www.ncpa.org/studies/s181/s181.html, p. 1.

³ Held in Arlington, Virginia, January 26–27, 2004. Participants included law enforcement, private security, professional organizations, academic institutions, and the federal government. The summit formed working groups on crime-, disorder-, and homeland security-related issues.

⁴ Connors, E., W. Cunningham, and P. Ohlhausen. 1999. *Operation Cooperation: A Literature Review*. ILJ and Hallcrest Division of SAIC, p. 1.

⁵ IACP et al. 2004. *Building Private Security/Public Policing Partnerships*. Washington, DC: COPS, p. 2.

⁶ Cunningham, W. 2003. “U.S. Private Security Trends.” Presentation. February, p. 1.

⁷ *National Policy Summit*, p. 6.

⁸ Cunningham, W. “U.S. Private Security Trends,” p. 1.

⁹ *National Policy Summit*, p. 6.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *The 9/11 Commission Report*.

¹² *National Policy Summit*, p. 16.

¹³ Kayyem, Juliette, and Patricia Chang. 2002. “Beyond Business Continuity: The Role of the Private Sector in Preparedness Planning,” *Perspectives on Preparedness*, August, p. 2.

¹⁴ Connors, E., W. Cunningham, P. Ohlhausen, L. Oliver, and C. Van Meter. 2000. *Operation Cooperation: Guidelines*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Assistance, p. 1.

¹⁵ ODP. 2003. *Office for Domestic Preparedness Guidelines for Homeland Security*. Washington, DC: DHS, pp. 6–10.

¹⁶ *National Policy Summit*, p. 19.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

¹⁸ National Crime Prevention Council. 2002. “Feature: Crime Prevention is Terrorism Prevention,” *Catalyst* 22(8). Retrieved July 6, 2005 from www.ncpc.org/ncpc/ncpc/?pg=5882-3200-2630-2632-3108-3276.

¹⁹ *National Policy Summit*, p. 24.

²⁰ Mission statement retrieved July 6, 2005 from www.nyc.gov/html/nypd/html/chfdept/chfdept-cprevent.html.

²¹ OSAC web site, www.ds-osac.org, July 7, 2005.

²² FBI web site, www.fbi.gov/hq/ci/ansir/ansirhome.htm, July 7, 2005.

References

- The 9/11 Commission. 2004. *The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, Official Government Edition*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Alain, M. 2003. "Beyond Good Intentions: Issues and Competition in the Field of Security." Presentation at the Conference on Policing and Security Around the World. February 19–22, 2003. Quebec, Canada.
- Appel, Edward J. 2003. "Terrorists, Computers and the Internet: Challenges and Solutions." Joint Council on Information Age Crime. Unpublished paper.
- Bayley, David H., and Clifford D. Shearing. 2001. *The New Structure of Policing: Description, Conceptualization, and Research Agenda*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Broadbent, J., and R. Laughlin. 2003. "Public Private Partnerships: an Introduction," *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 16(3): 332–341.
- Center for Security, Safety & Society. *Assessment of Common Problems Between Private Security and Law Enforcement*. n.d. Lowell, MA: University of Massachusetts-Lowell.
- Chen, C. 2003. "Wackenhut Officers Police Durham, N.C. Buses," *The News & Observer*, April.
- Connolly, Charles P. 2003. "The Role of Private Security in Combating Terrorism." Presentation at the Major Cities Chiefs Association Conference, June 13, 2003. Sun Valley, ID.
- Connolly, Charles P. 2003. "The Role of Private Security in Combating Terrorism," *Journal of Homeland Security*, July.
- Connors, E., W. Cunningham, and P. Ohlhausen. 1999. *Operation Cooperation: A Literature Review of Cooperation and Partnerships Between Law Enforcement and Private Security Organizations*. Institute for Law and Justice and Hallcrest Division of Science Applications International Corporation. Retrieved July 6, 2005 from www.ilj.org/Publications/Lit.Rev-final.PDF.
- Connors, E., W. Cunningham, P. Ohlhausen, L. Oliver, and C. Van Meter. 2000. *Operation Cooperation: Guidelines for Partnerships Between Law Enforcement and Private Security Organizations*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Assistance. Retrieved July 6, 2005 from www.ilj.org/securitypartners/Operation_Cooperation.PDF.
- Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. 2001. "Collaboration Fundamentals." In *The COPS Collaboration Toolkit: How to Build, Fix, and Sustain Productive Partnerships*. Retrieved July 6, 2005 from www.cops.usdoj.gov/mime/open.pdf?Item=346.
- Cunningham, William C. 2003. "U.S. Private Security Trends." Presentation at the Conference on Policing and Security Around the World. February 19–22, 2003. Quebec, Canada.
- Cunningham, William C. 2003. *U.S. Private Security Trends*. Amelia Island, FL: Hallcrest Systems, Inc.
- Greene J., T. Seamon, and P. Levy. 1995. "Merging Public and Private Security for Collective Benefit: Philadelphia's Center City District." *American Journal of Police*. 14(2): 3–20.
- Grossman, Michael. 2003. "First Responders: How States, Localities, and the Federal Government Are Working Together To Make America Safer." Testimony before U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Homeland Security. Retrieved July 12, 2005 from www.mipt.org/pdf/House108-17-First-Responders.pdf.
- Hayes, J. 2003. *Fifteenth Annual Retail Theft Survey*. Fruitland Park, FL: Jack L. Hayes International.

Hemel, P. 2000. "When Worlds Collide: Or Who Is In Charge of This Partnership Anyway?" Paper presented at the Conference, Reducing Criminality: Partnerships and Best Practice. July 31–August 1, 2000. Perth, Australia: Australian Institute of Criminology.

International Association of Chiefs of Police, et al. 2004. *National Policy Summit: Building Private Security/Public Policing Partnerships to Prevent and Respond to Terrorism and Public Disorder*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. Retrieved July 6, 2005 from www.cops.usdoj.gov/mime/open.pdf?Item=1355.

John F. Kennedy School of Government. 2002. *Beyond the Beltway: Focusing on Hometown Security: Recommendations for State and Local Domestic Preparedness Planning a Year After 9/11*. Report of the Executive Session on Domestic Preparedness. Boston, MA: Harvard University. Retrieved July 6, 2005 from bcsia.ksg.harvard.edu/BCSIA_content/documents/beyond_the_beltway.pdf.

Johnston, L. 1999. "Private Policing: Uniformity and Diversity." In *Policing Across the World: Issues for the Twenty-first Century*, edited by R.I. Mawby. London, England: Routledge.

Kayyem, Juliette, and Patricia Chang. 2002. "Beyond Business Continuity: The Role of the Private Sector in Preparedness Planning," *Perspectives on Preparedness*, August.

Law Commission of Canada. 2002. "In Search of Security: The Roles of Public Police and Private Agencies." Discussion Paper. Retrieved July 20, 2005 from www.lcc.gc.ca/about/2002_dis_paper_b-en.asp.

Law Commission of Canada. 2003. "In Search of Security: The Roles of Public Police and Private Security." Presentation at the International Conference of Policing and Security, February 19–22. Quebec, Canada.

The Lexington Institute. 2003. *The State of Homeland Security: Assessing Progress in Securing the United States Against the Threat of Terrorism*. White Paper. Retrieved July 6, 2005 from www.lexingtoninstitute.org/docs/489.pdf.

McNally, S. 2004. "Turn Away Turnover," *Security Magazine*, January.

Michigan State University, IACP Private Sector Liaison Committee, and General Dynamics Land Systems. 2002. "Dialogue on Public/Private Sector Critical Incident Issues." Unpublished paper.

Miller, Patricia P. ed. 2000. *Critical Incident Protocol: A Public and Private Partnership*. Washington, DC: Office for Domestic Preparedness, U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Retrieved July 6, 2005 from www.ojp.usdoj.gov/odp/docs/cip.pdf.

National Crime Prevention Council. 2002. "Feature: Crime Prevention is Terrorism Prevention," *Catalyst* 22(8). Retrieved July 6, 2005 from www.ncpc.org/ncpc/ncpc/?pg=5882-3200-2630-2632-3108-3276.

Office for Domestic Preparedness. 2003. *The Office for Domestic Preparedness Guidelines for Homeland Security: Prevention and Deterrence*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Retrieved July 6, 2005 from www.ojp.usdoj.gov/odp/docs/ODPPrev1.pdf.

Ohlhausen, Peter, Edward Connors, and William Cunningham. 2002. *The Changing Relationship Between Private Security and Law Enforcement*. Alexandria, VA: Institute for Law and Justice.

O'Leary, Dennis. 1994. "Reflections on Police Privatization," *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, September.

Pilant, Lois. 2004. "How to Work with Resort Security." *Police Magazine*, August. www.policemag.com.

President's National Strategy for Homeland Security. 2002. Washington, DC: The White House.

Private-Sector Liaison Committee. n.d. *Private Security Officer Selection, Training, and Licensing Guidelines*. Alexandria, VA: International Association of Chiefs of Police. Retrieved July 6, 2005 from www.theiacp.org/pubinfo/pubs/pslc/pslc6.toc.htm.

Reynolds, Morgan O. 2001. *Using the Private Sector to Deter Crime*, Study #181. Dallas, TX: National Center for Policy Analysis. Retrieved July 6, 2005 from www.ncpa.org/studies/s181/s181.html.

Samuels, J., Jr. 2003. "Building Partnerships Between Private Sector Security and Public Sector Police," *The Police Chief*, September. Retrieved July 14, 2005 from www.policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display_arch&article_id=94&issue_id=092003.

Sarre, R., and T. Prenzler. 2000. "The Relationship Between Police and Private Security: Models and Future Directions," *Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 24(1).

Seamon, Thomas. 1999. "IACP's Private Sector Liaison Committee: Partners in Public Safety," *The Police Chief*, May.

Symantec Corporation. 2004. "The Growing Emphasis on Public/Private Partnership." Public Sector Article #4418. Cupertino, CA. Retrieved July 19, 2005 from www.enterprisesecurity.symantec.com/publicsector/article.cfm?articleid=4418&EID=0.

Tilley, N., and M. Hopkins. 1998. *Business As Usual: An Evaluation of the Small Business and Crime Initiative*. Police Research Series, Paper 95. London, England: Home Office. Retrieved July 19, 2005 from www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/prgpdfs/fprs95.pdf.

Vatis, Michael. 2002. *Cyber Attacks: Protecting America's Security Against Digital Threats*. Executive Session on Domestic Preparedness. Boston, MA: Harvard University.

Vera Institute of Justice. 2000. *The Public Accountability of Private Police: Lessons from New York, Johannesburg, and Mexico City*. Retrieved July 6, 2005 from www.vera.org/publication_pdf/privatepolice.pdf.

Westrate, Dave. 2003. "Manpower for Hire," *Access Control and Security Systems*, April.

Wilcox, D. 2000. *The Guide to Development Trusts and Partnerships*. London, England: The Development Trust Association.

Yim, Randall. 2002. "National Preparedness: Integration of Federal, State, Local, and Private Sector Efforts Is Critical to an Effective National Strategy for Homeland Security." Statement before the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Retrieved July 20, 2005 from www.gao.gov/new.items/d02621t.pdf.

Bureau of Justice Assistance Information

BJA's mission is to provide leadership and services in grant administration and criminal justice policy to support local, state, and tribal justice strategies to achieve safer communities. For more indepth information about BJA, its programs, and its funding opportunities, contact:

Bureau of Justice Assistance

810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
202-616-6500
Fax: 202-305-1367
www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA
E-mail: AskBJA@usdoj.gov

The BJA Clearinghouse, a component of the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, shares BJA program information with federal, state, local, and tribal agencies and community groups across the country. Information specialists provide reference and referral services, publication distribution, participation and support for conferences, and other networking and outreach activities. The clearinghouse can be contacted at:

Bureau of Justice Assistance Clearinghouse

P.O. Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000
1-800-851-3420
Fax: 301-519-5212
www.ncjrs.org
E-mail: askncjrs@ncjrs.org

Clearinghouse staff are available Monday through Friday, 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. eastern time. Ask to be placed on the BJA mailing list.

To subscribe to the electronic newsletter *JUSTINFO* and become a registered NCJRS user, visit <http://puborder.ncjrs.org/register>.



U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Justice Programs

Bureau of Justice Assistance

Washington, DC 20531

Official Business

Penalty for Private Use \$300



PRESORTED STANDARD
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/BJA
Permit No. G-91