



ASIS Councils NEWSLETTER

LAW ENFORCEMENT LIAISON COUNCIL

October 2008



LEADERSHIP 2008

Chairperson:
Mr. Richard E. Chase,
CPP

Vice-Chairperson:
Oksana Farber

COMMITTEES:

Chairperson

Annual Seminar

Mr. Michael D. Gambrill

Book Reviews

Mr. James T. "Tom"
Roberts, Jr. CPP

Council Certification

Mr. Walt Smith

Guidelines Committee

Ms. Gail M. Simonton
Esq.

Membership Committee

Mr. James W. Birch

Publications Committee

/Newsletter Editor

Mr. James H. Fetzer, III

CPP: jfa@tds.net

P3 - Private/Public

Partnership Strategy

Mr. Robert E. Lee

Session Reviewers

Mr. Robert F. Graham,
CPP

Subject Matter Experts

Mr. Ira S. Somerson,
CPP

School Violence

Mr. Jeffrey Roehm & Mr.

Michael Scala, CPP

Transitional Training

Mr. James Birch, Ms.

Stacy Irving, Mr. Walt

Smith

Web Master

Mr. Mark Competello

SEE:

"ASIS Dynamics"
for leadership
contact
information.

LELC: OPENING REMARKS

From the Desk of Oksana Farber, Vice - Chairperson

The annual LELC meeting that took place on Sunday, September 14, 2008 at the seminar in Atlanta, Georgia welcomed members of the Private Security Liaison Council (PSLC) from the International Association of the Chiefs of Police (IACP) who attended as our honored guests: co-chairs Rad Jones and Rocco Diina, Jim Emerson, Chris Swecker, Arthur Gann, Glen Mowrey, John McCann, Cedric Scheiber, Scott Knight, David Mowrey, H. Clark and B. Bray. Additionally, we were privileged to have former LELC chair, Bill Cunningham, also attend the meeting. With the enthusiastic assistance of many LELC members, this meeting attested to the work being done to further enhance the partnership between the IACP and ASIS. The two respective councils, PSLC and LELC, have been able to proactively engage in important relationship developments, such as a meeting between the executive directors of each society, extending invitations to each of the presidents to their respective annual conferences, extending invitations to each others' annual council meetings and having crafted a memorandum of understanding, which is currently under review at the IACP board level.

The various committees provided updates on their respective projects. Jim Birch of the membership committee reported on the status of members' participation and made recommendations for future considerations of new members. PSLC member Glen Mowrey submitted a request for LELC membership, which was unanimously approved. Bob Graham provided deadline dates for session reviewers for the Asia-Pacific, European and 2009 annual conferences and with Paul Sweeney provided a Safe Cities update. Mike Gambrill reviewed seminar booth duty and luncheon coordination and, with Steve Harris, discussed the IACP Shanahan award. Jim Fetzer of the publications committee reinforced our newsletter's significance and each member's contribution. Tom Roberts gave a CIP status report.

Ed Appel provided an Operation Partnership update. Ira Somersen explained the need for a program that delivers risk assessment from both law enforcement and private sector perspectives. Stacy Irving explained how the transitional training program was successfully coordinated in Philadelphia. Oksana Farber provided information on the upcoming transitional training program in New York City. Al Youngs distributed a CD from Proteus, a 'think tank' that

promotes studies on developing critical decision-making processes for national security, military and intelligence challenges.

Tom Conley, who was interviewed by Security Management Magazine in March, explained the First Responder Appreciation Model. In this issue, you'll enjoy reading his interesting, informative and skillfully written article on public/private partnerships.

Chairman Dick Chase distributed the LELC Administrative Book to all attending LELC and PSLC members. This book, which we would like to encourage all LELC members to reference frequently and become as familiar with as possible, serves as our guideline to properly follow all council protocol. Because of your hard work and dedication, our council has earned a "blue ribbon" reputation; therefore, everyone's familiarity with the administrative functions of our council will help to insure that our council's objectives and efforts are properly completed and documented. We are very grateful to Dick for having provided us with this important and comprehensive tool that will aid us in recording our council's achievements, future strategic growth and development plans.

At the meeting in Atlanta, Dick Chase presented Susan Powers with a plaque of appreciation for her untiring service to the LELC. Her administrative efforts, monthly teleconference meeting coordination assistance and representation of the LELC at the NYC Trade Show for the past two years will always be remembered.

Dick Chase was also presented with a plaque for his highly skillful leadership as our LELC chairman for these past two years. Dick committed himself to the LELC mission to "foster and facilitate strategic alliances with essential stakeholders within the law enforcement and public sector communities" by recognizing, supporting, actively promoting and helping to expedite members' projects, suggestions and ideas. His distinguished and effective service to our members, our council and the society has enhanced the professional paradigm set by previous chairs, whose leadership helped to proactively set our council on the path to success. Dick is being considered for a Council Vice President position and we genuinely wish him great and continued success in all of his endeavors.

Thank you for all of your hard work, your pledge to our LELC cause and the measurable differences we have been able to make as a council.

*"You cannot forget your duty for a moment,
because there might come a time when that weak spot in you should affect you ...,
and then the whole history of the world might
be changed by what you did not do or did wrong."
President Woodrow Wilson*

"THE BRIDGE TO SOMEWHERE: TRASITIONING PUBLIC / PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP FROM CONCEPT TO OPERATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS"

Tom Conley, CPP Law Enforcement Liaison Council

The movement toward, and the strategic concept of, public/private partnership is not new. However, it has taken on a much more urgent thrust since the horrific events of September 11, 2001. Creating and sustaining a robust and systemic public/private partnership is not an easy mission to accomplish. It is a big job that carries with it the likelihood of significant consequences – both positive and negative. The recognition that it is essential to create and sustain a robust and systemic public/private partnership is perhaps why so many people and agencies in the public and private sectors are working hard together to accomplish this "must win" mission. While there are many strategic and tactical steps involved in developing and nurturing a true partnership, the antithesis of the strength of partnership and the true test is when public and private sectors can respond together and be operationally effective during a crisis.

As is the case with any type of partnership, all partners have responsibilities to their partners. Perhaps one of the most significant, if not the most significant, obligation partners have to each other is to operate toward a common purpose. But, responsibilities to other partners do not mean agendas do not exist. The School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University conducted a 2006 study that surveyed police officers and security professionals. The Michigan State study found, in part, that both police officers and security professionals predicted greater cooperation between the two sectors in the future, with two important differences. First, police officers believe policing will remain a state function, while security professionals believe that private security will emerge as a major policing body. Second, security professionals are more

likely to believe that joint police-security efforts will increase in the future and that the boundaries between private and public police will eventually vanish.¹ This highlights the need for the common purpose to be first and foremost, or public/private partnerships will be rife with opportunities for failure. While disagreement will occur along the way, egos must be set aside and all leaders must possess an unwavering commitment and dedication to the success of partnership. The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Policy Paper: *Private Security/Public Policing Partnerships* listed, among others, egos and turf battles, insufficient commitment and support from higher levels of participating organizations, and insufficient alignment of interests as three causes of partnership failure.² Partnership failure cannot occur if the public is to have the best chance of safe and secure communities.

Private partners have responsibilities and obligations to their own organizations, as well as to their public sector partners. To the extent that laws or company policies are not violated, private sector partners need to share information and resources with their public sector partners, and be strong public advocates for public safety agencies. Whereas public safety leaders work for elected officials, the elected officials work for the taxpayers. This dynamic represents a great opportunity for private sector partners to be strong advocates for their public safety partners with elected officials and at all levels of government. Likewise, public safety partners have responsibilities and obligations to their own organizations, as well as to their private sector partners. Notwithstanding legal constraints or internal policies that legitimately restrict certain tools and information from being shared with private sector partners, there is much that the public sector can and is doing to assist their private sector partners by allowing access to some traditional public sector tools.

One of the areas where there has been significant progress is that of virtual information sharing systems. The public sector has done an excellent job of creating and maintaining virtual information sharing and communications secure portals such as InfraGard, CyberCop, the Regional Information Sharing System – Automated Trusted Information Exchange (RISS ATIX), the Health Alert Network (HAN), and the Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN) to name a few. Another area of success is the public sector outreach and resulting collaboration that is occurring. Whether it is the 500 plus public/private partnerships that are occurring at the local level throughout the United States, or personnel from state fusion centers that are actively reaching out to their private sector partners, or the fact that the FBI assigns a special agent to be actively involved in every InfraGard chapter, it is clear that the public sector is committed to an active physical outreach to private sector partners that has resulted in the use of virtual information sharing and communications secure portals. However, there are also other areas where the public sector needs to do a much better job with sharing traditional public safety tools with the private sector.

While there is an important distinction by both the public sector and the private sector regarding the difference between “can’t do” and “won’t do,” there is an obligation by the public sector to treat their private sector partners like true partners, and vice versa. This is why there needs to be a commitment by the public sector to provide private sector partners with all the tools they need to be effective partners, such as direct access to public safety two-way radio communications systems, support for emergency vehicle permits for certain private sector partners, and to allow private sector partners to purchase emergency equipment that will be used specifically for the private sector to support public safety purposes at government contract pricing. The reason many private sector partners need access to traditional public safety tools goes to the matter of public and private sectors being able to be operationally effective in a crisis. In exchange, the private sector has the obligation to prove to their public sector partners that they can be trusted to use traditional public safety tools responsibly and only when necessary, as well as to pay the costs for such equipment.

An example of why private sector partners need access to traditional public safety tools to be operationally effective in a crisis is the matter of communications inoperability. It is widely accepted that communications inoperability and interoperability challenges between first responders is the leading roadblock to effective emergency and disaster response. Nowhere was this problem more evident in one location than during the response to the World Trade Center attacks on September 11, 2001. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, within minutes of impact, Port Authority police officers from the PATH [Port Authority Trans-Hudson Corporation], bridges, tunnels, and airport commands began responding to the WTC. The PAPD [Port Authority Police Department] lacked written standard operating procedures for personnel responding from outside commands to the WTC during a major incident. In addition, officers from some PAPD commands lacked interoperable radio frequencies. As a result, there was no comprehensive coordination of PAPD’s overall response.³ First responders must be able to communicate with each other in times of emergency or disaster. But, who really is a first responder? When people think of first responders, law enforcement officers, fire fighters and emergency medical personnel are some of the first that come to mind. However, in many cases when an emergency or a disaster occurs, private security personnel are the ones who are on-site when an emergency or disaster occurs. It is the private sector partners who are the true first responders. Thus, while private sector partners are not the first public safety responders, they are the first responders because they are on-site when the emergency or disaster occurs. It simply makes sense for all first responders to be able to talk with each other during an emergency or disaster. This need is highlighted by the

fact that Initiative 6.2 of the National Emergency Communications Plan is to expand the use of public and private sector partnerships related to emergency communications.⁴

With the majority of our nation's critical infrastructures and key resources being owned, operated, and protected by the private sector, the commitment to public/private partnership not only makes sense, but is essential for an operationally effective response. In fact, private security organizations are responsible for protecting more than many suspect; by some estimates, 85 percent of the critical U.S. infrastructure is protected by private security.⁵ In order for effective partnerships to fully develop and be truly operationally effective, all persons who comprise both sectors must share tools and information with each other. However, sharing tools and information with each other, in and of itself, is inadequate. Partners must also be trained in the same way, such as all agencies, both public and private being NIMS-complaint. Partners must also drill and work together in events such as disaster exercises. If partners fail to train together, then it is unlikely that they will work well together when an actual emergency or disaster event occurs.

Both those in the public sector and in the private sector must understand the separate and distinct roles that each plays, while collaborating to the highest level possible on matters of common interest functions as a force multiplier against street crime, terrorism, and responding to and coping with disasters. Developing and nurturing strong public/private partnerships can be a tricky business, which is why a strong and unyielding commitment to partnership for a common purpose must not waiver. Both those in the public sector and the private sector will make mistakes along the way. It is important for all people not to expect perfection from their partners, and to never look for reasons to disengage partnerships when mistakes occur. Forgiveness and understanding are important elements to the process, and will be needed. Partnership is also long process that will span generations, so patience and nurturing the process from everyone is an absolute necessity. The benefits of strong public/private partnerships are significantly improved public safety and ultimately better protection for the citizens of the United States, and the values and way of life that Americans hold dear. That objective is well worth the work of ensuring that strong and effective partnerships are built and maintained.

ENDNOTES

¹ Mahesh Nalla and Donald Hummer, "Relations between Police and Security in Michigan," Michigan State University, School of Criminal Justice, 15 September 2006, <<http://www.cj.msu.edu/~outreach/security/relations.html>> (27 September 2008).

² U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, National Policy Summit 2004, Policy Paper: Private Security/Public Policing Partnerships, 17-18.

³ National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, The 9/11 Commission Report, New York, N.Y.: W. W. Norton, 2002, 292-293.

⁴ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, National Emergency Communications Plan, July 2008, 34.

⁵ "Building Private Security/Public Policing Partnerships to Prevent and Respond to Terrorism and Public Disorder," International Association of Chiefs of Police, 15 September 2006, <<http://www.theiacp.org/documents/pdfs/Publications/ACFAB5D%2Epdf>> (27 September 2008)

TARGET CORPORATION AND IT'S CORPORATE PARTNERS" "SAFE CITY" PROGRAM

Robert Graham, CPP Member Law Enforcement Liaison Council

The number one objective of the Law Enforcement Liaison Council is to identify and encourage programs and projects that connect law enforcement and private enterprise in a joint effort to combat crime and enhance our nation's security. One of the outstanding programs is the Safe City Program originally known as TARGET & BLUE.

Target Corporation has a history of assisting law enforcement since the mid-1900's by providing up-to-date technology. After the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, Target sent executives to Europe to research how law enforcement there worked with private businesses to increase security and fight crime. As a result, Target launched their Safe City Program in 2004 in Minneapolis, Minnesota, the location of their corporate headquarters. Since its implementation, Target has brought on fifteen national corporations as partners to embellish the Safe City Program with funding and technology. Through this program, participating

organizations can leverage a partnership to enhance a community's security, economic stability, and well being through mutual planning and preparedness.

The Objectives of Safe City Program is to maximize safety and reduce crime in communities by implementing a community based Public-Private Partnership that is led by local law enforcement.

Broad term goals:

- To reduce crime and create safer communities
- To increase public perception of safety
- To sustain proactive and engaged Safe City Partnerships
- To encourage community support for Safe City
- To increase the number of retail stores involved with Safe City by demonstrating successful implementation of the program in other communities

Specific term goals:

- To strengthen ability of law enforcement to lead local Safe City initiatives
- To reduce crime by implementing situational crime prevention techniques and other technical solutions
- To identify ways that Safe City partners can effectively identify, prioritize, analyze and prevent crime
- To increase collaboration among internal partners
- To create a formal infrastructure for partnerships with law enforcement, neighboring businesses and community partners

The Safe City Program is a community-based initiative that unites businesses, residents, city officials and law enforcement to maximize safeness and minimize crimes.

The program involves identifying key private sector partners and garnering support from local law enforcement after which a formalized Safe City program is created and financially supported. The initial step of the program is to introduce the Safe City Program to law enforcement, gain their support and transfer ownership of the program to them with a commitment from the private sector.

Established partnerships under the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program can expand their effectiveness, increase private sector business involvement, and bring a heightened focus on community safety as well as crime related issues and concerns.

The program is led by local law enforcement with strong support from and in collaboration with the private sector. The partnership employs real-time communications technologies and targeted preventive measures, including situational crime prevention techniques such as crime trends and solutions to address these problems.

Safe City Program supplies funds for meetings, guidance, and training as well as resources for equipment and services, which have been identified through, and a result of the partnering of law enforcement and private sector.

The following cities and/or communities listed by year of entry are participating in the Safe City Program:

2004

Minneapolis, MN

Boston, MA

2005

Flint, MI

Hyattsville, MD

Clovis, CA

Ft. Worth, TX

2006

Philadelphia, PA

Cincinnati, OH

Springfield, VA

Dallas, TX

Houston, TX

Fresno, CA

Chula Vista, CA

2007

St. Paul, MN

Charlotte, NC

Miami, FL

Denver, CO

Albuquerque, NM

Richmond, CA

Victorville, CA

Compton, CA

Federal Way, WA

2008

Flushing, NJ

Cherry Hill, NJ

Baltimore West, MD

Washington, DC

Orlando, FL

Even-though Target Corporation created the Safe City Program, it was not for the purpose of publicity but for public service by establishing a system for corporations to cooperate with law enforcement to come together to create safer communities.

The following companies are current participating partners in the Safe City Program:
(Information regarding these companies can be obtained by visiting the Safe City website at www.mysafecity.com.)

Target Corporation

T3Motion, Inc.

Lensec

Axis Communications

Firetide

Netsential

Uniseys

ShotSpotter, Inc.

Eyenet

Federal Signal

Segway

Avrio Group

Citizen Notification Service (CNS)

NorthWrite

Motorola

The Crisis Prevention Institute

In conclusion, Safe City is a community-based initiative that leverages partnerships and technology to help communities and businesses reduce crime and create an environment where people feel safe and secure. Through your commitment and effort, your city can implement a Safe City project. Additional information can be obtained by visiting www.mysafecity.com.

The Missing Link in Crime & Loss Prevention

Ira S. Somerson, BCFE, CPP, CSC Law Enforcement Liaison Council

I have just completed reading an article concerned with violence in schools and the need for training teachers, administrative staff, volunteers, and parents in what is needed to identify and respond to foreseeable risks of violence. The article covers significant points and encourages all schools to do so. Throughout the article, I kept asking myself, "how can you train persons who do not understand or feel the need, or whose personal agenda does not have an open mind to the subject, especially parents?" Many of my friends and colleagues, who at some point in their careers were educators, bemoan the fact that one of the critical issues of school safety and security, least of all student education, is parental participation and the need for them to be intrinsically involved in the solution. I offer this example as I am firmly convinced it is the missing link in our ability to manage crimes in our communities and security risks within private organizations. Most Americans simply do not want to be part of the solution, "that is *your* responsibility, not mine!"

I have sold or designed thousands of security systems, but the consumers (private or business) were normally the victim of a crime or serious security event (or one closely near them) immediately before the buying decision. It was the event that precipitated their rationale. Prior to the event, they looked to law enforcement, their organization's management, and/or corporate security for their safety and security. In some organizations, the assets at risk were so significant (e.g., loss of strategic information, or the nature of an event so serious that it would be critical to the survival of a business entity). This would then overcome normal apathy. This could also be said of our communities (e.g. serial sexual assaults). But the bottom line is that our communities are more likely to be part of the problem than part of the solution.

In a perfect world, if *everyone* learned and accepted their responsibility to recognize their personal or community's/organization's exposure to crime and security risks and had a safe means to report their concerns or observation through a centralized source, the impact to crime and loss prevention would be extraordinary. Having considered this utopian thought and shrugged, the next thought must be to analyze each environment that we do have a responsibility to protect and seek to expose, orient, cajole, train, motivate, etc. as many within our target of influence to the strategic necessity of persons we protect being part of the solution. It would be easy to discuss examples of apathy, but I want to use this brief discussion to consider ways that our society can improve the attitude about crime and loss prevention.

There are excellent examples. John Walsh's "*America's Most Wanted*" television series and the many Crime Stopper organizations have had a significant impact in making Americans more aware. In retrospect, these efforts have had a greater effect in apprehending criminal actors and the public has watched these programs with interest, but mostly as entertainment. Except in the highest risk business environments and "high-

crime” communities, most Americans do not choose to think pro-actively or consider it their responsibility to *prevent* crime.

I suppose we will leave it to the criminologists and sociologists to tell us why, but the reality is profound and needs to be addressed by law enforcement executives and corporate security if we are to expect our communities to support our efforts.

Some thoughts are:

- A significantly greater liaison with the media to promulgate the “good stories” of citizen support. The negative story has always been appealing, but corporate security and law enforcement executives need to be far more creative in attracting the media to praise and benefit safe community involvement.
- A national committee urging greater community involvement made up of law enforcement and security executives (e.g. International Association of Police, ASIS Law Enforcement Liaison Council, and the IACP Private Sector Liaison Committee) can have a significant impact in this effort.
- Research could be granted by the NCJS and other criminal justice granting arms of the federal government to identify why Americans avoid a greater participation and the advantages to them (other than the obvious one of less crime). This is a project long overdue and worthy of significant support.

REDMOND SECURITY FORUM– A PUBLIC – PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

Chief Steven R. Harris, Redmond (WA) PD Law Enforcement Liaison Council (Lieutenant Charles Gorman, Redmond (WA) Police Department)

The City of Redmond, Washington is a vibrant community of over 51,000 residents just 20 minutes from downtown Seattle. In addition to providing a high quality of life for its residents, it is also home to companies including Microsoft and Nintendo of America. These and many other businesses in Redmond raise the workday population to well over 100,000 people.

The Redmond Police Department is a professional, accredited law enforcement agency with a Community Oriented Policing philosophy that continuously strives to fulfill its mission statement of “Providing quality policing in partnership with the community”. Community Oriented Policing requires cooperative public - private partnerships between the police and the community.

The Redmond Security Forum brings these two entities together for information exchange, specialized training, collaboration on specific projects, and networking between public and private sector representatives. Crime prevention and public safety requires the efforts of both public and private entities. The police can provide crime trend information, access to law enforcement records, special legal powers, and extensive

training. The private sector can provide special-topic expertise and resources, including personnel and equipment that the public sector may lack.

The Redmond Security Forum is composed of over 100 registered representatives from the Redmond Police Department and the security/management personnel of businesses located within Redmond. In addition to Redmond Police Department participants, public sector members include fire department personnel and school district safety managers as well as law enforcement representatives from agencies adjacent to Redmond.

Private sector members include representatives from businesses such as Microsoft, Nintendo of America, UPS, Aerojet, Honeywell, Home Depot, Target, Safeway, Genie Industries, Medtronic, Expedia, REI, AT&T Wireless, and Costco. In addition to the listed businesses, representatives from local private security companies, shopping centers, banks, hospitals, public utilities, and telecommunications organizations are members of the Security Forum.

Security Forum members meet on a quarterly basis. These meetings are coordinated by Police Department representatives and meeting notifications are sent by e-mail to all members. In addition to meeting notifications, email alerts are sent to forum members about community sensitive issues and training topics. All businesses located within or doing business within the City of Redmond are encouraged to join and attend the meetings.

The Forum also serves to educate both sides on their concerns and difficulties in dealing with crime in Redmond. In the past, the Forum has featured training on terrorism, Pandemic Flu, violence in the workplace, organized retail theft, safety planning, business continuity, regional information sharing networks, and white-collar crime trends. The ongoing goal of the Security Forum is to reduce crime and increase safety within the community.

Forum meetings are hosted by various forum members. Meetings have been held in the city's Emergency Coordination Center, Microsoft's Global Security Operations Center, and at the Lake Washington School District's EOC to provide forum members with insight into both the government's and the private sector's efforts in continuity of operations in the event of a critical incident.

The networking that takes place as part of the Redmond Security Forum has led to working relationships that have garnered outstanding results. CCTV and surveillance video from the private sector has been shared with law enforcement to investigate and solve crimes. Data from law enforcement crime analysis has been shared with the private sector to assist with employee safety, facility security, and business continuity. Tabletop and on-scene practical emergency response exercises between law enforcement, fire, and private sector business security organizations regularly take place.

In 2002, representatives from the Redmond Police and Fire Departments, Microsoft, and United Parcel Service participated in joint planning meetings as a part of the Critical Incident Protocol Community Facilitation program facilitated by staff from Michigan State University. The Critical Incident Protocol process allowed participants to familiarize themselves with each other's organizational capabilities and cooperatively develop plans for mitigation, response, and recovery from all hazards major critical incidents.

The Redmond Security Forum is a prime example of providing for the community's health and safety through public – private collaboration and cooperation.

Articles submitted are the opinion of the author and not necessarily the opinion or position of ASIS Int. or the Law Enforcement Liaison Council.

