

SECURITY SYSTEMS IN LOS ANGELES
COUNTY GOVERNMENT

ECONOMY & EFFICIENCY COMMISSION

OCTOBER, 1990

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY COMMISSION

October 17, 1990

Arthur J. Peever, *Chairperson*
Efrem Zimbalist, III, *Vice Chairperson*

Alfred P. Balderrama
George E. Bodle
Gunther W. Buerk
Joe Crail
Jack Drown
Emma Fischbeck
Louise Frankel
Dr. Alfred J. Freitag
Chun Y. Lee
Robert D. Leland
Robert J. Lowe
Abraham M. Lurie
Lauro J. Neri
Robert H. Philibosian
Daniel M. Shapiro
Randolph B. Stockwell
Wally Thor
Betty Trotter
Robert L. Williams

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

Dear Supervisors:

SUBJECT: SECURITY SYSTEMS TASK FORCE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On August 7, 1990, your Board requested the Economy and Efficiency Commission, in consultation with the Sheriff and the Director of Internal Services, to undertake a study of the County's security Systems, to recommend ways to better coordinate the County's security operations and to implement an integrated County-wide security system. This report responds to your request.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, the Economy and Efficiency Commission's Task Force for Security Systems' findings for security within the County are:

- The 1984 Board approved recommendations of our Commission have not been fully implemented.
- There have been some notable improvements in security measures since our original report in 1984.
- The current security systems, however, are still not optimal because there is no accountable program management capability to plan, recommend, evaluate, coordinate, monitor, and report on security for the County as a whole.
- We recommend the establishment of such a security program management capability, reporting within the Chief Administrative Office as the organization location where it can be most effective. The CAO currently is operating two successful organizational models similar to what we are recommending. See page 6 of our Report.

- The Commission strongly believes that personal security and safety for citizens and employees who use County facilities, and for prevention of property losses, is a large and growing concern, from both humane and cost avoidance perspectives.

Therefore, the Commission urges the Board of Supervisors to both adopt, and assure the implementation of the following recommendations:

Recommendation I.

The Board of Supervisors establish and fund the office of County Security Program Management, assigned to the Chief Administrative Office. The office should be filled by Security professionals, and the lead position should have management experience in the security profession. The duties of the office would be:

- 1) Reporting regularly to the CAO and the Board on the status of security measures within the County, and recommending appropriate actions;**
- 2) Developing County-wide standards for security and appropriate standards at each department and facility, with consideration for the recommendations of the County Security Advisory Council (see Recommendation II.);**
- 3) Providing consultation on security to County departments and special districts;**
- 4) Establishing systems for the reporting and analysis of data on security which will support monitoring and decision making;**
- 5) Reviewing departmental proposals, and recommending budget decisions affecting security to the CAO and the Board of Supervisors;**
- 6) Monitoring and inspecting compliance with standards and other aspects of security performance;**
- 7) Assisting departments in developing and implementing employee training and awareness programs for security matters;**
- 8) Reviewing plans for new and remodeled buildings, and making recommendations to provide for cost effective security measures;**

- 9) **Developing plans for cost effective methods to utilize contract security services, or suitable alternatives to outside contractor security services within the County organization, and assisting departments with their implementation.**
- 10) **Developing cost saving proposals for coordination or consolidation of departmental security operations, and for coordinated purchases of County security equipment and supplies; and working with departments for their implementation.**

Recommendation II.

The Board of Supervisors direct the Chief Administrative Officer and the County Security Program Manager to perform the following tasks within twelve months of the Manager's appointment:

- 1) **Appoint a County Security Advisory Council to assist the Security Program Manager in formulating security policy and standards, and recommending actions. The Council membership would be composed of the Security Program Manager, and a representative from each major County department which supplies security services; i.e., Sheriff, Internal Services, Health Services, Public Works, Parks and Recreation, Beaches and Harbors, Museum of Art, Museum of Natural History. Security experts outside of the County organization should also be considered for membership in an advisory capacity.**
- 2) **Develop and promulgate County-wide security standards, and appropriate standards at each facility, taking into consideration the recommendations of affected County departments.**
- 3) **Develop a plan for the cost-effective use of outside contractor security under the supervision of County-employed security personnel; or alternatively, using County employed personnel.**
- 4) **Develop a plan for establishing single department responsibility for security at locations where it does not currently exist.**
- 5) **Develop a simplified system for reporting and recording security incidents through the County.**

- 6) Develop a time table for completion of additional security plan elements, as outlined in the original report on Security Svstems issued by the Economy and Efficiency Commission in October, 1984.**

Sincerely,

The Los Angeles County Economy and Efficiency Commission

Arthur J. Peever,
Chairperson

Members of the Task Force on Security Systems

Louise Frankel, Chairperson of Task Force

Dr. Alfred J. Freitag

Wally Thor

Betty Trotter

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY CITIZENS
ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY COMMISSION**

Report and Recommendations of the
Security Systems Task Force

October 17, 1990

On August 7, 1990, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors requested the Economy and Efficiency Commission, in consultation with the Sheriff and the Director of Internal Services, to undertake a study of the County's security systems, to recommend ways to better coordinate the County's security operations and to implement an integrated County-wide security system.

BACKGROUND FOR THIS STUDY

For several months prior to this request, our Commission has had a Security Systems Task Force reviewing those same security issues, and reviewing the level of implementation of the recommendations contained in the Economy and Efficiency Commission's October, 1984 report, Security Systems in Los Angeles County Government. Those recommendations were approved by the Board of Supervisors in December, 1984, and in summary were (see Enclosure #1 for the complete recommendations):

- 1) The Board establish and fund the position of County Security Program Manager, assigned to the Chief Administrative Office initially, with certain specific duties which would be instrumental in establishing a coordinated, effective County-wide security system.
- 2) In each County location, a single department be responsible for security.
- 3) The Board direct the CAO to submit specific initial elements of a comprehensive plan for security within nine months.

None of these Board-approved recommendations has been fully implemented.

In October, 1985, the County contracted for the services of a full-time professional security consultant, initially assigned to the CAO, and now reporting in the Internal Services Department. Our Task Force has found that through his efforts, and those of certain individual departments which provide security services for themselves or for others, there have been improvements in security since 1984. Some examples are:

- Greater awareness of security needs and requirements by County employees and managers.
- Increased number of County security personnel, and improvements in their selection, training, and equipment.

- Establishment by the Board of Supervisors of a Courthouse Security Task Force which has determined security requirements for all County courthouses, and has installed security devices in courthouses with the most critical needs. The Task Force currently in the process of purchasing and installing security, equipment for the balance of County courthouses. The Task Force is chaired by the CAO's Public Safety Division Chief, and has high level representation from all the involved departments: Superior Court, Municipal Court, District Attorney, Sheriff, Marshal, and Internal Services.
- The Chief Administrative Officer's installation of a lead-tenant proprietorship program at each County facility has helped to define which department is responsible for providing security (as well as other building services).

But most of the originally recommended requirements for a complete County-wide security system, as approved by your Board, remain undone.

- There is no assigned management responsibility for reporting to the Board on the status of security, and advising on appropriate actions.
- There are no County-wide approved security standards which must be complied with.
- There is no assigned responsibility to monitor compliance with County security standards, and take corrective actions.
- There is no security information system for reporting and recording incidents across the County, which data can be used for analysis, decision-making, budget decisions, and reporting to the Board.
- There is no required County-wide security training and awareness program for employees (such as exists for earthquake survival), which would help to ensure a safe and secure workplace and reduce losses of County and personal property.

We believe the elements of fully effective security system for the County remain undone because there is no organizational capability to accomplish them.

Our Commission is not recommending centralization of management for all County security. We believe our original recommendation for the establishment of a security program management capability can function effectively in a de-centralized organization such as exists within Los Angeles County government. But the County does need an accountable management capability to oversee the development, implementation, and monitoring of standards; to report on security status and needs; to review and comment on budget proposals; and to supply expert guidance and assistance to departments.

AVOIDANCE OF SECURITY INCIDENTS AND RELATED COSTS

It is widely believed by those with whom we met that the number of security incidents and the more violent type of incidents are on the increase, both within the County and within society in general.

Although we could find no County-wide statistics to support or to deny such beliefs - which is a flaw within the County's security systems as referred to above - there are certain indicators which point in that direction. Some examples are: the recent stabbing attacks in the Pasadena Courthouse of a defendant, and in the Criminal Courts building of a Sheriff's Deputy; the stabbing death of a County Mental Health worker by a patient in 1989; the shooting of a Van Nuys bailiff in 1988; the confiscation of numerous concealed weapons when metal detectors are installed at high risk locations such as courthouses; the increased level of demonstrations for various causes which sometimes become unruly or violent; and the increasing level of gang related violence which can and does occur at County facilities such as hospitals and parks.

We have also been advised by County Counsel's Litigation Division that although the total number of claims filed against the County for all reasons has leveled off within the past 18 months, the cost of pay outs has escalated. This would seem to indicate that any future litigation costs or pay outs for security reasons would be more costly than those at present.

For these reasons we believe that the County should take reasonable, cost effective steps to assure that security needs are being addressed. It would be false economy to expose the County government to potentially costly losses resulting from ineffective security measures.

APPROACH TO THIS STUDY

The Security Systems Task Force reviewed the original recommendations of the Economy and Efficiency Commission's report of 1984, and the extensive supporting data the report contained.

Interviews were then held to determine the status of security, and the degree of implementation of the Board - approved recommendations. The interviews were held with department directors, and/or with management directly responsible for security. Departments contacted were most of those with major interests in and needs for security, including:

Department of Health Services
Department of Parks and Recreation
Internal Services Department
Chief Administrative Office

The Task Force also met with the Security Consultant assigned to the Internal Services Department, and the Chairman of the Courthouse Security Task Force. As per the Board's request, consultation was held with the Director of the Internal Services Department, and the Assistant Sheriff (designated as the Sheriff's representative).

(A letter from the Sheriff's Department supporting the recommendations in this report is included as Enclosure #2. Letter from the Department of Parks and Recreation with security recommendations is also included as Enclosure #3.)

The information provided from the interviews was then analyzed, and consideration was given to alternative ways to approach the security needs of the County. Our conclusions were:

- 1) Security is too important a matter for both the citizens and employees who use County facilities to be addressed in a fragmented fashion, and
- 2) The original Board approved recommendations, along with some additional issues identified within the past six years, provided the best approach to substantially improve County-wide security without the need for major organizational changes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation I.

The Board of Supervisors establish and fund the office of County Security Program Management, assigned to the Chief Administrative Office. The office should be filled by security professionals, and the lead position should have management experience in the security profession. The duties of the office would be:

- 1) Reporting regularly to the CAO and the Board on the status of security measures within the County, and recommending appropriate actions;**
- 2) Developing County-wide standards for security and appropriate standards at each department and facility, with consideration for the recommendations of the County Security Advisory Council (see Recommendation II.);**
- 3) Providing consultation on security to County departments and special districts;**
- 4) Establishing systems for the reporting and analysis of data on security which will support monitoring and decision making;**
- 5) Reviewing departmental proposals, and recommending budget decisions affecting security to the CAO and the Board of Supervisors;**
- 6) Monitoring and inspecting compliance with standards and other aspects of security performance;**
- 7) Assisting departments in developing and implementing employee training and awareness programs for security matters;**

- 8) **Reviewing plans for new and remodeled buildings, and making recommendations to provide for cost effective security measures;**
- 9) **Developing plans for cost effective methods to utilize contract security services, or suitable alternatives to outside contractor security services within the County organization, and assisting departments with their implementation.**
- 10) **Developing cost saving proposals for coordination or consolidation of departmental security operations, and for coordinated purchases of County security equipment and supplies; and working with departments for their implementation.**

DISCUSSION

Our review and analysis shows that although improvements in security have been made in a number of places in the County since our Commission made its 1984 report and recommendations, and the subsequent employment of a full time professional security consultant, the organization and system for addressing security needs is not optimal for these reasons:

- Because the professional security position functions as a consultant, the use of its expertise is optional by departments within the County. Only upon request can the position review the appropriateness of departmental security measures. It has no defined responsibilities to report on the status of security, or to develop and promulgate security standards.

For a function as important to the County as the security of its citizens and employees when visiting or working in County facilities, we believe much more is required. There should be a management position with responsibilities as shown above.

- The responsibility for developing and promulgating security standards is currently within the Chief Administrative Office, but the expertise for the security function exists with the Security Consultant position in the Internal Services Department, and in certain other departments which employ security professionals.

We believe that the responsibility and the expertise for security should be together, not separated.

- As stated above, an accountable organizational capability to fully address County security needs to be established. We recommend that this security management function be assigned to the Chief Administrative Officer, which is the most appropriate organization within the County to provide the necessary direction and coordination.

Currently, the CAO's office is successfully directing two operations which are models similar to what we propose: The Courthouse Security Task Force, and the Disaster Preparedness unit. These supply overall direction and coordination from the CAO's office to the rest of the County organization for their respective functions, with participation by the departments at interest.

This placement also provides the County Security Program Management office close organizational proximity to the Budget and Operations and the Risk Management groups in the CAO's office, which is important for communication and coordination on security activities.

We are proposing that this office will operate within the current de-centralized County government structure. Departments will continue to be primarily responsible for funding and operating their own security systems, and maintaining approved County-wide security standards. The County Security Program Manager we are recommending will operate as a staff management position supplying security overview and direction for the County.

We are not recommending a large organization structure for the proposed County Security Program Management Office. Los Angeles County is a large, complex organization with over 75,000 employees and more than 750 major facilities. To supply an effective level of staff management overview and direction comparable to similar size organizations, an organization of two professionals (a Security Program Manager and a Security Program Specialist), and one, or a shared, administrative support position seems appropriate.

The estimated costs for such an office are in the range of \$250,000 to \$300,000 annually, which is a very reasonable expenditure to ensure a superior security system for the County, and to help avoid costly claims against the County for lapses in security.

Further, the Security Program Management office can be effective in helping to control security costs by recommending appropriate levels of expenditures to meet approved standards, such as the use of technology rather than manpower where appropriate.

Recommendation II.

The Board of Supervisors direct the Chief Administrative Officer and the County Security Program Manager to perform the following tasks within twelve months of the Manager's appointment:

- A. Appoint a County Security Advisory Council to assist the Security Program Manager in formulating security policy and standards, and recommending actions. The Council membership would be composed of the Security Program Manager, and a representative from each major County department which supplies security services; i.e., Sheriff, Internal Services, Health Services, Public Works, Parks and Recreation, Beaches and Harbors, Museum of Art, Museum of Natural History. Security experts outside of the County organization should also be considered for membership in an advisory capacity.**

- B. Develop and promulgate County-wide security standards, and appropriate standards at each facility, taking into consideration the recommendations of affected County departments.**
- C. Develop a plan for the cost-effective use of outside contractor security under the supervision of County-employed security personnel; or alternatively, using County employed personnel.**
- D. Develop a plan for establishing single department responsibility for Security at locations where it does not currently exist.**
- E. Develop a simplified system for reporting and recording security incidents through the County.**
- F. Develop a time table for completion of additional security plan elements, as outlined in the original report on Security Systems issued by the Economy and Efficiency Commission in October, 1984.**

DISCUSSION

- We believe the establishment of a County Security Advisory Council is an important step in assuring departments the opportunity to participate in the development of County security policy, standards, monitoring, and related security matters. Such an organization helps to develop security policy and standards which have the benefit of the experience of a number of departments, and avoids objections from departments that policy and standards are unilaterally imposed from above. The Courthouse Security Task Force under the Chief Administrative Office's leadership has used a similar participative organization model successfully.
- As was pointed out to us by the Internal Services Department, the roles and responsibilities for security between the departments and the County Security Program Management office need to be clearly defined. We have made an attempt to define those roles and responsibilities as we currently see them for a number of security functions. These are included as Enclosure #4. We recognize that these may be modified as the County Security Program Manager and the departments discuss and negotiate them. The County Security Advisory Council would be a good vehicle for such discussions of the inter-locking roles and responsibilities.
- The Chief Administrative Office has responsibility for developing and promulgating standards for security (as well as for a number of other functions) within the County organization. As we stated above, however, the technical expertise to develop those standards does not currently exist within the CAO's office. This is partly the reason why the issuance of security standards have been delayed.

The security standards we are referring to would include, but are not limited to: Personnel selection, background, motivation, compensation, and turnover; job content, career path and advancement opportunities; levels of security required at each facility; supervision; training; weapons; equipment; physical security; contracting; reporting and recording security related incidents.

As we recommended in **Recommendation I.** above, we believe that placement of technical expertise and responsibility for issuing standards together is a necessary step.

As recommended by the Department of Parks and Recreation, another benefit which can result from establishing County-wide standards for safety police officers is the development of a pool of qualified officers available for promotion or transfer throughout the County

- On the issue of the use of outside contractor security personnel there are widely differing views. Most agree there are substantial cost savings to be realized from their use, but some feel these savings are obtained at the expense of compromising security, especially at critical or potentially troublesome locations.

Therefore we recommend that the County Security Program Manager develop either cost effective methods of using contract security services, or suitable alternatives using County personnel.

- Our Commission's 1984 report on County Security Systems recommended that at each County location, whether a lone facility or a number of adjacent facilities, a single department be responsible for security. This has not been done at all County locations.

We believe then, and continue to believe now, that this is important because there needs to be unity of command in operations involving public safety or emergencies, and there are efficiencies which result from coordination of services at each site.

Therefore we recommend that the County Security Systems Manager develop a plan for establishing single department responsibility for security at each County facility where it does not currently exist.

- Some individual departments have their own security information Systems, but there is no County-wide system, or any assigned responsibility to consolidate and report on departmental data. Therefore, there is no way for the Board to obtain an answer to questions on how well or poorly the County overall is performing on security, or to compare current data to previous periods or to comparable organizations. Such data is needed to determine performance, analyze needs, and take corrective actions.
- In the Economy and Efficiency Commission's report on Security Systems in October, 1984, other important elements of a Security System were identified, i.e.,
 - Specifications for the post conditions under which guards, whether contracted or not, should be equipped with firearms;
 - Specifications for the experience, training, and supervision required for the various kind of security assignments, whether contracted or not.

These elements, and others as identified by the Security Systems Manager, will need to be implemented within an appropriate time frame.

- In the past, security has tended to be a low priority item for departments, as they have been hard pressed to accomplish their main missions with often inadequate financial resources. We believe there has been a growing recognition that an adequate security system is an essential cost of doing business similar to costs for personnel, utilities, and space requirements. We endorse this direct on. As was pointed out to us, security is like fire insurance: It's not a good investment until you need it.

CONCLUSION

We urge the Board of Supervisors to adopt the recommendations contained in this report, and more importantly, to assure their implementation within the County organization. The advantages which will accrue to the County from a coordinated and integrated security system would be:

- Providing a safe and secure workplace for County employees and visitors.
- Reduction of potential liability for claims and pay-outs against the County for lapses in security.
- Reduction of losses of County and personal property.

- More efficient use of security personnel among departments.
- Cost savings through coordinated purchasing of equipment and supplies.
- More professional, uniform, and cost effective security services throughout the County organization.

END OF REPORT

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**Larry J. Monteilh, Executive Office
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
383 Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012**

55

The following matter was called lip for consideration:

Economy and Efficiency Commission's report and recommendations on security systems.

Marvin Rowen, Joe Healy and Louise Frenkel, Economy and Efficiency Commission, and Sandy Kiasky, Commission for Women addressed the Board.

On motion of Supervisor Danal seconded by Supervisor Hahn, unanimously carried (Supervisor Antonovich being absent), the Economy and Efficiency Commission's report was adopted and referred to the Chief Administrative Officer for implementation and re-evaluation of their recommendation on the Security Program Manager's recommendations (Persuasive versus Authoritarian), and report back in 30 days with a progress report, and in 60 days with the final implementation.

MIN1:m2

December 4, 1984

ENCLOSURE #1

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

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 Officer (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 district;
- 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 hearing 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.

ENCLOSURE # 2

County of Los Angeles
Office of the Sheriff
Hall of Justice
Los Angeles, California 90012

SHERMAN BLOCK, SHERIFF

September 11, 1990

Mrs. Louise Frankel
Task Force on Security Systems
Citizen's Economy and Efficiency Commission
163 Ball of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mrs. Frankel:

The Sheriff's Department supports the current efforts of the Economy and Efficiency Commission in your review of facility security systems within Los Angeles County. We were an enthusiastic participant in the original study conducted and reported on in 1984.

The Sheriff's Department concurs that safety and security for County employees and property should be a priority for all County Departments. Just as important is our responsibility to ensure the safety of all individuals who visit a County facility.

We felt that the recommendations made in the 1984 report would substantially support a safe and secure environment at all facilities. However, not all of the Commission's recommendations have been implemented.

At a recent meeting your Task Force on Security Systems requested the Sheriff's Department make suggestions that would help improve security at County facilities. We have already identified the validity of your 1984 recommendations. The other issues that we discussed are:

The County Security Manager/Coordinator must have sufficient authority to ensure compliance with approved security policies.

ENCLOSURE # 2

Mrs. Louise Frankel

-2-

September 11, 1990

Each County facility should be evaluated for its specific security needs. There will be criteria that is common at most facilities. Each Department should have the flexibility to select the manner in which it will satisfy its particular security requirements.

A standardized procedure for reporting security related incidents must be developed. This is the only means to properly evaluate the successes and failures of the system and to make necessary and timely adjustments.

All County employees should be educated regarding the need and means to ensure a safe and secure workplace.

There is a need for increased awareness in all County Departments of the tremendous potential for monetary losses due to internal theft and malicious property damage. Security measures could be developed to minimize these losses.

The Sheriff's Department will continue to assist the Economy and Efficiency Commission in your task of improving safety and security at County facilities. We are willing to participate in a committee established for this purpose.

Sincerely,

SHERMAN BLOCK, SHERIFF

RICHARD L. FOREMAN
ASSISTANT SHERIFF

ENCLOSURE #3

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

433 South Vermont Avenue - Los Angeles, California 90020-1975 - (213) 738-2961
Rodney E. Cooper ... Director

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

September 7, 1990

Pete Schabarum
First District

Kenneth Hahn
Second District

Edmund Edelman
Third District

Deane Dana
Fourth District

Mike Antonovich
Fifth District

PARK AND RECREATION
COMMISSION

James Bishop

Artuw Chayra

Gloria Heer

George Ray

Douglas Washington

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

J. Bradford Crow

Bradley Nurembeg

Richard Knerr

George Kolayashi

David Lippey

Ms. Louise Frankel, Chairperson
Security Systems Task Force
Los Angeles County Economy and Efficiency Commission
163 Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Ms. Frankel:

Thank you for the recent opportunity to address the Task Force on security services and the organization of Safety Police activities in Los Angeles County. I was pleased to share my perspective of Safety Police services based upon my relatively short tenure as Director of Parks and Recreation, and to relate my views and experiences from other agencies with which I have been affiliated in the past.

I would like to offer the comments relative to areas in the County's Safety Police services system, which your Task Force may wish to address.

County-wide Standards for Training

The Department of Parks and Recreation sends its Safety Police officers to a Safety Police Academy at Rio Hondo College to receive over 400 hours of training covering over 30 subject areas in law enforcement. Additionally, the Department sends its officers to a three week Advanced Officer Training course and arranges for training seminars on other areas as required to keep current on significant issues such as gang activities, training on new weapons and tactics, etc. Subject matter experts from other agencies and institutions are engaged to provide the training.

While basic training has been standardized, we believe that minimum standards and training elements should be established for other relevant security subject areas in order to ensure that security personnel have the basic skills and knowledge to be prepared to work in any County department. This would ensure that a qualified pool of

**PARKS ARE FOR
PEOPLE**

ENCLOSURE #3

Ms. Louise Frankel,
Chairperson
September 7, 1990
Page Two

Safety Police employees would be available for promotion and/or transfer to any assignment without extensive additional training. The development of a common base of knowledge and skills, with resultant interchangeability is expected to improve the caliber of the County's Safety Police personnel and enhance departments' operations.

Equipment

Vehicle and equipment funding resources should be augmented and handled on a County-wide basis rather than by individual departments. As a County-wide priority, Safety Police services should have uniform standards for funding and replacement of vehicles and other support equipment and supplies, rather than to be left to individual departments funding resources and competition with main mission requirements.

Communications

Priority attention should be given to improvement of communication systems used by Safety Police personnel. The current system which is used by Parks and Recreation and other departments is sadly antiquated and does not adequately support our operations. This need has been identified since 1984, along with recommendations for system improvements, however other communication priorities and technology changes have resulted in no improvements to our communication system. Our system is ineffective in having numerous "dead spots", depending upon the location of our patrol units in the County, and represents a major deficiency and hazard in our security service operations.

Review of Minimum Requirements

In an effort to improve the caliber of Safety Police personnel, many of whom face difficult law enforcement situations, we believe that the position classification, training, educational, and psychological requirements should be reviewed.

Finally, in terms of the County-wide organization for Safety Police services, from the Parks and Recreation standpoint, we believe that this function should remain under the control and direction of the department. The recreational programs and services which we provide through both our local and regional parks are closely tied to our efforts to provide patron assistance and security, traffic and crowd control, and community relations through our Safety Police component.

I hope that my input will assist in your review of Safety Police services in the County, and would be very happy to discuss this with you.

Sincerely,
Rodney E. Cooper
Director

JJO:lr

DRAFT

SECURITY SYSTEMS - ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

LOS ANGELES COUNTY GOVERNMENT

I. SECURITY FUNCTIONS

1) MISSION/OBJECTIVES

II. SECURITY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT / CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT, CONSIDERING ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE COUNTY SECURITY ADVISORY COUNCIL, A COUNTY-WIDE SECURITY SYSTEM WHICH INTEGRATES AND COORDINATES SECURITY ACTIVITIES WITHIN LOS ANGELES COUNTY GOVERNMENT

FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY GOVERNMENT, PROVIDE LEADERSHIP AND DIRECTION FOR THE SECURITY FUNCTION, AND ACT AS PRIMARY SPOKESPERSON FOR SECURITY REQUIREMENTS AND NEEDS.

2) PLANNING

DEVELOP A WRITTEN COUNTY-WIDE SECURITY PLAN WHICH INTEGRATES DEPARTMENTAL SECURITY PLANS INTO A COORDINATED SECURITY SYSTEM FOR THE COUNTY. THE COUNTY SECURITY PLAN IS TO BE UP-DATED ANNUALLY AND PRESENTED TO THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT, AND THEN TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

III. ALL COUNTY DEPARTMENTS

PROVIDE APPROPRIATE DEPARTMENTAL SECURITY SERVICES, DIRECTLY OR BY CONTRACT, IN ORDER TO:

- SAFEGUARD THE PERSONAL SECURITY OF EMPLOYEES, CLIENTS, AND VISITORS
- PROTECT COUNTY AND PERSONAL PROPERTY

FOR THE DEPARTMENT, PROVIDE LEADERSHIP AND DIRECTION FOR THE SECURITY FUNCTION, AND ACT AS SPOKESPERSON FOR SECURITY REQUIREMENTS AND NEEDS.

DEVELOP A WRITTEN DEPARTMENTAL SECURITY PLAN WHICH DEFINES SECURITY NEEDS BY FACILITY, AND OPERATING PLANS TO MEET THOSE NEEDS. PLANS ARE TO BE UP-DATED ANNUALLY, AND SUBMITTED TO THE COUNTY SECURITY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OFFICE FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.

IV. ADDITIONAL DUTIES FOR DEPARTMENTS PROVIDING CONTRACT SECURITY SERVICES TO OTHER DEPARTMENTS

PROVIDE APPROPRIATE SECURITY SERVICES TO DEPARTMENTS CONTRACTING FOR SECURITY SERVICES, UTILIZING COUNTY OR CONTRACTED PERSONNEL, IN ORDER TO:

- SAFEGUARD THE PERSONAL SECURITY OF EMPLOYEES, CLIENTS, AND VISITORS
- PROTECT COUNTY AND PERSONAL PROPERTY

FOR THE CONTRACTING DEPARTMENTS, PROVIDE LEADERSHIP AND DIRECTION FOR THE SECURITY FUNCTION, AND ACT AS SPOKESPERSON FOR SECURITY REQUIREMENTS AND NEEDS.

FOR DEPARTMENTS CONTRACTING FOR SECURITY SERVICES, DEVELOP A WRITTEN DEPARTMENTAL SECURITY PLAN WHICH DEFINES SECURITY NEEDS BY FACILITY, AND OPERATING PLANS TO MEET THOSE NEEDS. PLANS ARE TO BE UP-DATED ANNUALLY, AND SUBMITTED TO THE COUNTY SECURITY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OFFICE FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.

DRAFT

SECURITY SYSTEMS - ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES - CONTINUED

I. SECURITY FUNCTIONS

II. SECURITY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT / CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

III. ALL COUNTY DEPARTMENTS

IV. ADDITIONAL DUTIES FOR DEPARTMENTS PROVIDING CONTRACT SECURITY SERVICES TO OTHER DEPARTMENTS

3) COUNTY SECURITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

ESTABLISH AND CHAIR A COUNTY SECURITY ADVISORY COUNCIL OF SECURITY MANAGEMENT THE DEPARTMENTS OF:

SHERIFF	PARKS & RECREATION
MARSHAL	BEACHES AND HARBORS
INTERNAL SERVICES	MUSEUM OF ART
HEALTH SERVICES	MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY
PUBLIC WORKS	OUTSIDE EXPERTS

THE COUNTY SECURITY ADVISORY COUNCIL WILL ADVISE AND ASSIST THE SECURITY PROGRAM MANAGER ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COUNTY SECURITY SYSTEM AND SECURITY STANDARDS.

PARTICIPATE AS REQUESTED IN THE COUNTY SECURITY ADVISORY COUNCIL TO ASSIST IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A COUNTY-WIDE SECURITY SYSTEM AND SECURITY STANDARDS.

DEPARTMENTS NOT REPRESENTED ON THE COUNCIL MAY MAKE THEIR COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNCIL EITHER IN WRITING OR IN PERSON AT COUNCIL MEETINGS.

REPRESENT THE VIEWS AND INTERESTS OF DEPARTMENTS CONTRACTING FOR SECURITY SERVICES WITH THE COUNTY SECURITY ADVISORY COUNCIL.

4) SECURITY STANDARDS

DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT COUNTY-WIDE SECURITY STANDARDS, CONSIDERING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COUNTY SECURITY ADVISORY COUNCIL. SECURITY STANDARDS INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO: PERSONNEL SELECTION, BACKGROUND, MOTIVATION, COMPENSATION, AND TURNOVER; JOB CONTENT, CAREER PATH AND ADVANCEMENT OPPORTUNITIES; LEVELS OF SECURITY REQUIRED AT EACH FACILITY; SUPERVISION; TRAINING; WEAPONS; EQUIPMENT; PHYSICAL SECURITY; CONTRACTING; REPORTING AND RECORDING SECURITY RELATED INCIDENTS.

PARTICIPATE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF COUNTY-WIDE SECURITY STANDARDS BY SUBMITTING COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNTY SECURITY ADVISORY COUNCIL AND THE OFFICE OF COUNTY SECURITY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.

COOPERATE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AND COMPLIANCE WITH APPROVED COUNTY SECURITY STANDARDS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT.

REPRESENT DEPARTMENTS CONTRACTING FOR SECURITY SERVICES BY PRESENTING THEIR COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COUNTY SECURITY STANDARDS.

IMPLEMENT AND COMPLY WITH COUNTY SECURITY STANDARDS WITHIN CONTRACTING DEPARTMENTS

DRAFT

SECURITY SYSTEMS - ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES - CONTINUED

I. SECURITY FUNCTIONS	II. SECURITY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT / CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE	III. ALL COUNTY DEPARTMENTS	IV. ADDITIONAL DUTIES FOR DEPARTMENTS PROVIDING CONTRACT SECURITY SERVICES TO OTHER DEPARTMENTS
5) BUDGETING/FUNDING	<p>RECOMMEND TO THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR COUNTY-WIDE SECURITY PROGRAMS, BASED ON APPROVED COUNTY SECURITY STANDARDS.</p> <p>REVIEW AND COMMENT ON DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR SECURITY PURPOSES, ESPECIALLY AS TO THEIR COMPLIANCE WITH APPROVED COUNTY SECURITY STANDARDS.</p>	<p>RECOMMEND TO DEPARTMENT MANAGEMENT BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR DEPARTMENT SECURITY BASED UPON APPROVED COUNTY SECURITY STANDARDS.</p> <p>SUBMIT DEPARTMENT SUDGET PROPOSALS FOR SECURITY TO THE OFFICE OF SECURITY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.</p>	<p>RECOMMEND TO MANAGEMENT OF DEPARTMENTS CONTRACTING FOR SECURITY SERVICES BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR DEPARTMENT SECURITY BASED UPON APPROVED COUNTY SECURITY STANDARDS.</p> <p>FOR CONTRACTING DEPARTMENTS, SUBMIT DEPARTMENT SUDGET PROPOSALS FOR SECURITY TO THE OFFICE OF SECURITY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.</p>
6) COMPLIANCE/ MONITORING	<p>DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT, WITH DEPARTMENTAL PARTICIPATION, PROGRAMS TO MONITOR COMPLIANCE WITH APPROVED COUNTY SECURITY STANDARDS. THE PREFERRED MODEL PROGRAM WOULD INCLUDE INTER-DEPARTMENTAL MONITORING TEAMS WHICH INSPECT FOR COMPLIANCE.</p>	<p>COMPLY WITH APPROVED COUNTY SECURITY STANDARDS, AND PARTICIPATE AS REQUESTED ON INTER-DEPARTMENTAL MONITORING TEAMS.</p>	<p>FOR DEPARTMENTS CONTRACTING FOR SECURITY SERVICES, COMPLY WITH APPROVED COUNTY SECURITY STANDARDS, AND PARTICIPATE AS REQUESTED ON INTER-DEPARTMENTAL MONITORING TEAMS.</p>
7) REPORTING AND INFORMATION SYSTEM	<p>DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT, WITH DEPARTMENTAL PARTICIPATION, A STANDARDIZED PROCEDURE FOR REPORTING SECURITY RELATED INCIDENTS FOR USE BY ALL COUNTY DEPARTMENTS. DATA COLLECTED WILL BE ANALYZED TO EVALUATE THE SUCCESSES AND FAILURES OF THE SECURITY SYSTEM, AND TO TAKE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS.</p> <p>REPORTS ON THE STATUS OF COUNTY SECURITY WILL BE ISSUED AT REGULAR INTERVALS TO THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, AND ALL COUNTY DEPARTMENTS.</p>	<p>PARTICIPATE AS REQUESTED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STANDARDIZED SECURITY INCIDENT REPORTING SYSTEM.</p> <p>REPORT SECURITY-RELATED INCIDENTS TO THE COUNTY SECURITY INFORMATION SYSTEM.</p>	<p>FOR DEPARTMENTS CONTRACTING FOR SECURITY SERVICES, REPORT SECURITY-RELATED INCIDENTS TO THE COUNTY SECURITY INFORMATION SYSTEM.</p>

DRAFT

SECURITY SYSTEMS - ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES - CONTINUED

I. SECURITY FUNCTIONS	II. SECURITY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT / CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE	III. ALL COUNTY DEPARTMENTS	IV. ADDITIONAL DUTIES FOR DEPARTMENTS PROVIDING CONTRACT SECURITY SERVICES TO OTHER DEPARTMENTS
8) EMPLOYEE SECURITY TRAINING AND AWARENESS	DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT, WITH DEPARTMENTAL PARTICIPATION, EMPLOYEE SECURITY TRAINING AND AWARENESS PROGRAMS. THE OBJECTIVE IS THAT ALL EMPLOYEES WILL RECEIVE PERIODIC TRAINING TO ENSURE A SAFE AND SECURE WORKPLACE, AND THE SECURITY OF COUNTY AND PERSONAL PROPERTY.	PARTICIPATE IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF EMPLOYEE SECURITY TRAINING AND AWARENESS PROGRAMS, TO MEET THE OBJECTIVE AS SHOWN IN COLUMN II	FOR DEPARTMENTS CONTRACTING FOR SECURITY SERVICES, IMPLEMENT EMPLOYEE TRAINING AND AWARENESS PROGRAMS AS INDICATED IN COLUMN III.
9) REVIEW OF BUILDING PLANS	REVIEW ALL PLANS FOR NEW AND REMODELED COUNTY BUILDINGS, AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH PROVIDE FOR A SAFE AND SECURE FACILITY AND FOR INSTALLATION OF APPROPRIATE SECURITY EQUIPMENT.	SUBMIT ALL DEPARTMENTAL PLANS, OR NEW AND REMODELED COUNTY BUILDINGS TO THE COUNTY SECURITY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OFFICE FOR REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	FOR DEPARTMENTS CONTRACTING FOR SECURITY SERVICES, SUBMIT PLANS AS INDICATED IN COLUMN III.
10) INTER-DEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION	DEVELOP AND RECOMMEND PLANS WHICH COORDINATE OR CONSOLIDATE THE DEPARTMENTAL SECURITY OPERATIONS IN ORDER TO IMPROVE OPERATIONAL AND/OR REDUCE COSTS.	PARTICIPATE IN INTER-DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAMS WHICH COORDINATE OR CONSOLIDATE SECURITY OPERATIONS IN ORDER TO IMPROVE OPERATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND/OR REDUCE COSTS.	FOR DEPARTMENTS CONTRACTING FOR SECURITY SERVICES, PARTICIPATE AS INDICATED IN COLUMN III.