

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY COMMISSION

ROOM 163, HALL OF ADMINISTRATION / 500 WEST TEMPLE / LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 / 974-1491

August 6, 1986

Joe Crail, Chairperson
Robert J. Lowe, Vice Chairperson

Susan Berk
George E. Bodle
Theodore A. Bruinsma
Gunther W. Buerk
John D. Byork
Jack Drown
Dr. Edward H. Erath
Louise Frankel
Dr. Alfred J. Freitag
Abraham M. Lurie
Lauro J. Neri
Sidney R. Petersen
Glenn Quillin
Daniel M. Shapiro
Dean Sweeney, Jr.
Wally Thor
Robert L. Williams

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
Room 383 Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING
SECURITY SYSTEMS

On December 4, 1984, the Board approved this Commission's report and recommendations titled "Security Systems in Los Angeles County Government". A copy of those recommendations is attached.

Effective October 1, 1985 the County contracted for the services of a full-time professional security consultant (Recommendation 1). The Commission has monitored the County's utilization of this position and the progress which the County has made in implementing the remaining recommendations.

The Commission concludes that the program is working as intended. The presence of professional expertise coupled with the authority of the Chief Administrative Office has resulted in an increase of cooperative efforts among County departments to meet security needs, which require immediate attention, primarily in courthouse facilities. More importantly, the groundwork is being laid for systems, which will reduce the future frequency of unwanted security-related incidents and crises.

With the security consultant's assistance, progress has been made in a variety of significant areas:

-- A resource library has been established with information on vendors and prices of security equipment and services.

- Review procedures have been implemented to ensure
 - that appropriate security features are incorporated in the construction and modification of County facilities and
 - that enforceable specifications for qualifications, training, and supervision of guards are included in County security contracts.

- Interdepartmental planning efforts such as the Civic Center Security Committee and the committee of departmental security chiefs have been revitalized.

- A model in-service security officer training program has been implemented in the Parks and Recreation Department, and departmental security coordinators are preparing employee awareness programs.

- Surveys are being conducted
 - to classify guard posts with regard to weapons requirements,
 - to evaluate the training of departments' security chiefs,
 - to define radio communications needs,
 - to identify unmonitored intrusion alarms which could be wired to a central monitoring facility, and
 - to identify major facilities from which the security chief could offer professional oversight to mailer nearby County facilities.

- Specifications are being drafted
 - for a security reporting and management information system and
 - for contract security guard background investigations.

- Work has begun on a manual of security standards.

More work needs to be done in the areas mentioned above and in the establishment of standards for all aspects of County security operations. In addition, action is needed to determine which department shall be responsible for managing security at each multi-department location where currently two or more departments manage independent security forces (Commission Recommendations 2 and 3b). This issue should be resolved promptly, in order to ensure unity of command and coordination of resources at these locations.

The valuable consultation which has been provided to numerous departments and the additional work which needs to be done justify the continuation of this program. The professional experience and qualifications of the program manager, David Hetzel, provide the necessary expertise as well as credibility with security and law enforcement personnel. Implementation of this function has been satisfactory largely because its assignment to the Chief Administrative Office has provided a level of prestige, authority and neutrality which has maximized cooperation among departments and has enhanced the program's effectiveness.

THEREFORE, THE ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY COMMISSION RECOMMENDS THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:

1. COMMEND THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER FOR EFFECTIVELY IMPLENENTING THIS PROGRAM;
2. DETERMINE THAT THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE CONTINUES TO BE THE APPROPRIATE LOCATION WITHIN THE CCXINTY STRUCTORE FOR THE ASSIGNMENT OF THE FUNCTION AND POSITION OF COUNTY-WIDE SECURITY PROGRAM MANAGER;
3. DIRECT THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER TO CONTINUE HIS IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMISSION'S ORIGINAL STTDY RECOMMENDATIONS (ATTACHED), AND ESPECIALLY
 - A. TO REPORT BACK AS SCON AS FEASIBLE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING WHICH DEPARTMENT SHOULD BE ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITY FOR MANAGING SECURITY AT EACH MULTI-DEPARTMENT LOCATION, AND
 - B. TO ACCELERATE THE DEVELOPMENT AND PROMULGATION OF STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR SECURITY SERVICES AND SYSTEMS.

Joe Crail, Chairperson

Louise Frankel, Chairperson
Task Force on Security

Attachment

cc: Chief Administrative Officer

ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY COMMISSION
1984 RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING SECURITY SYSTEMS

Recommendation 1: We recommend that the Board of Supervisors establish and fund the position of County security program manager. We further recommend that the position be assigned to the Chief Administrative Office (CAO) initially and be evaluated for possible assignment to the Facilities Management Department within one year. The position should be filled by a security professional with management experience and should be assigned the following duties:

- a. develop County-wide standards for security and appropriate standards at each department and facility, with the expert assistance of the Sheriff and other public and private sources;
- b. provide consultation on security to County departments and special districts;
- c. recommend budget decisions affecting security to the CAO and Board;
- d. establish Systems for the reporting and analysis of data on security which will support monitoring and decision-making; and
- e. monitor compliance with standards and other aspects of security performance.

Recommendation 2: We recommend that, in each County location, i.e., a lone facility or a number of adjacent facilities, a single department be responsible for security, and that this department have the authority to decide whether to provide security surveys, staffing and other services internally or purchase them from another source.

Recommendation 3: That the Board of Supervisors direct the CAO to submit the following initial elements of a comprehensive plan for security within nine months:

- a. a method of establishing accountability for security in each County department and location;
- b. recommendations concerning which department should be responsible for security at each multi-department location.
- c. the specifications for County-wide and departmental information systems bearing on security;
- d. specifications for the post conditions under which guards, whether contracted or not, should be equipped with firearms;
- e. specifications for the experience, training, and supervision required for the various kinds of security assignments, whether contracted or not;
- f. a schedule for implementation and follow-up of the above items; and
- g. a timetable for development of additional plan elements.