

Operation Cooperation

A Literature Review of
Cooperation and Partnerships Between
Law Enforcement and
Private Security Organizations

**Prepared for the
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice**

**By
Institute for Law and Justice
and
Hallcrest Division of
Science Applications International Corporation**

**Edward F. Connors
William C. Cunningham
Peter E. Ohlhausen**

1999

This project was supported by Grant #97-DD-BX-K005 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. 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. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Definitions..... | 1 |
| Distinctions..... | 2 |
| Need for Cooperation | 3 |
| History of Cooperation | 4 |
| Issues in Cooperation..... | 5 |
| Status..... | 6 |
| Competition..... | 7 |
| Ignorance..... | 8 |
| False Alarms | 8 |
| Refusal to Recognize Authority..... | 8 |
| Government’s Relationship with Business | 8 |
| Constitutional Issues..... | 9 |
| Joint Council’s Issues..... | 9 |
| Types of Cooperation | 10 |
| Formal versus Informal | 10 |
| Contractual | 11 |
| Familiarity and Goodwill Programs..... | 12 |
| Umbrella Programs | 13 |
| Topic-Specific Efforts..... | 15 |
| Trends..... | 18 |
| The Future..... | 20 |

Introduction

In a project that studies the nature of cooperation between law enforcement agencies and private security operations, a literature review unearths academic papers, periodical articles, books, and written agreements governing cooperative programs. Those sources provide useful information on the need for cooperation, the history of cooperation, and relevant issues, forms, examples, and trends. In fact, the research for this paper examined well over a hundred such sources. However, most of the work in law enforcement–private security cooperation is expended in actually participating in cooperation, not writing about it. Across the country, there are many cooperative programs, both formal and informal, about which no literature exists. Therefore, this literature review should be seen as offering a synopsis of the key concepts in law enforcement–private security cooperation and not as providing a comprehensive list of cooperative programs.

Definitions

In law enforcement–private security cooperation, terms are important. Both *law enforcement* and *private security* are comprehensive terms. In this context, law enforcement consists of a wide range of local, state, and federal agencies, including police and sheriffs' departments and various investigative and enforcement bureaus. Employment in law enforcement is estimated at 738,000 full-time sworn law enforcement officers,¹ and expenditures in that field run to about \$45 billion annually.² Law enforcement agencies typically prevent and respond to criminal activities, yet for the most part “are not concerned with corporate internal problems; they are concerned primarily with street crimes. In many cases, the internal crimes of fraud and theft are not even reported to the police by the corporations.”³

Private security shares some of the missions of law enforcement but is substantially different in many ways. In fact, “labeling private security the ‘private police’ unfairly and incorrectly restricts their scope and invites comparisons from a police perspective rather than from the comprehensive framework of protective functions.”⁴

The two main divisions in private security are (1) proprietary or corporate security, which consists primarily of security departments within businesses and various institutions, and (2) contract and other private security firms, which are businesses that provide security goods and services to businesses, institutions, and homeowners. The former “encompasses such sophisticated and diverse concerns as assets protection, loss prevention, coun-

¹ Bureau of Justice Statistics website.

² Year 2000 estimate from William C. Cunningham, John J. Strauchs, and Clifford W. Van Meter, *Private Security Trends 1970-2000: The Hallcrest Report II* (Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1990), p. 229.

³ “Summary of a Feasibility Conference on Training Possibilities Addressing Private Security/Public Law Enforcement Relationships,” Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, Glynco, Georgia, 1986.

⁴ Charles P. Nemeth, *Private Security and the Law* (Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co., 1995), p. 176.

termeasures for industrial espionage, drug testing in the work environment, extortion, product tampering, dignitary and facility protection, and communications security, to name a few examples.”⁵ Firms in the latter category “provide guard and patrol services to business, industry, and residential areas; develop, sell, lease, and monitor simple to sophisticated communications and alarms systems; provide investigative, intelligence, and body-guard equipment and services—among other services.”⁶ Both proprietary and contract security organizations conduct “a significant amount of the investigations involving credit card theft and fraud, check cases, shoplifting, embezzlement, employee theft, computer hacking, and other criminal enterprises.”⁷

By the year 2000, the private security industry is expected to employ 1.9 million persons, and annual spending for private security products and services is estimated at about \$100 billion.⁸

Distinctions

The distinction between law enforcement and private security, especially as regards their ability to cooperate effectively, has been drawn thus:

[G]enerally, a corporate security manager is employed by a firm whose interests cross not only city, county, and state lines but international borders as well. The security manager often cannot form policy that would dramatically affect overall corporate operations, nor does he have direct access to the chief executive officer or the senior executive vice-president. In the main, security policy changes must pass through a variety of corporate staff reviews.

In contrast, the law enforcement executive’s principal sphere of concern is the comparatively small geographic area whose safety he must superintend; he also enjoys both relative autonomy from and reasonable access to his jurisdiction’s senior public officials. Additionally, the law enforcement manager works openly with civic groups and the media on a broad range of community issues. Bureaucrats who want to affect the public safety agency, as in the case of budget decisions, cannot make unilateral incursions but must follow a typically well-publicized budget hearing process.

These differences help explain why, over the years, it has been difficult for law enforcement officials to establish common protocols to be followed throughout the business community.⁹

⁵ Terence J. Mangan and Michael G. Shanahan, “Public Law Enforcement/Private Security: A New Partnership?” *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, Jan. 1990, p. 19.

⁶ Mangan and Shanahan.

⁷ Mangan and Shanahan.

⁸ *Hallcrest Report II*, p. 229.

One last term to define is *cooperative effort*. Operation Cooperation, the effort of which this literature review is a part, examines the following types of cooperation: ongoing, formal or informal meetings between law enforcement and security organizations to resolve common problems; promotion and recognition of professionalism in the training for both security and law enforcement; sharing of information in criminal investigations; joint planning for special events and emergencies in the community; sharing of research and resources; and collaboration in prosecuting and convicting perpetrators.

Need for Cooperation

The number of cooperative programs around the country testifies to the perceived importance of such programs. Why, in particular, is law enforcement–private security cooperation needed? These are a few of the reasons:

- Calls for police service have increased significantly over the years.¹⁰
- “Resources to meet the increasing demand have dwindled. In most major cities, police personnel have declined”¹¹
- Although some crime rates have declined in the last few years, overall rates are still relatively high, and it seems to “take more officers to make the same number of arrests as [in the ’70s] The result is that police necessarily tend to focus more narrowly on serious crimes, reducing or even eliminating the watchman and service functions which they traditionally provided.”¹²
- Some types of economic crime are beyond the scope and jurisdiction of most local law enforcement agencies. “Local police do not have sufficient investigative resources, nor do they have the expertise to track down sophisticated criminals. Again, private security is the immediate recourse open to corporations to prosecute criminals who threaten the jobs and finances of thousands of individuals.”¹³
- High-tech crimes tend to be “unusually difficult for law enforcement agencies to prevent and investigate”¹⁴ because they are often unfamiliar, complex, and transjurisdictional. A cooperative arrangement can “provide a central point of contact between

⁹ Michael G. Shanahan, “Private Enterprise and the Public Police: The Professionalizing Effects of a New Partnership,” in *Police Leadership in America: Crisis and Opportunity*, ed. William A. Geller (New York: Praeger, 1986), p. 452.

¹⁰ James K. Stewart, “Public Safety and Private Police,” *Public Administration Review*, November 1985, p. 758.

¹¹ James K. Stewart.

¹² James K. Stewart.

¹³ James K. Stewart, p. 760.

¹⁴ Peter E. Ohlhausen, “Combating High-Tech Crime in California: The Task Force Approach,” produced for the California High-Tech Task Force Committee under a grant from the Technology Theft Prevention Foundation, 1997, p. iv. Available at <http://members.aol.com/pohlhausen/library/fa/fa.html>.

government and the high-tech industry, which is eager to lend its assistance,”¹⁵ especially expertise and material resources.

- “When businesspeople are familiar with law enforcement agents, they are more likely to report crimes—it’s a matter of knowing who to contact. Also among the benefits of increased reporting are increased leads into other . . . crimes.”¹⁶
- The business community is a great untapped resource for solving community problems. Law enforcement should break away from its old mindset that cooperation with the private sector brings unwanted baggage. When businesses are encouraged by law enforcement to become active corporate citizens, they can make the community safer and create a better environment for their employees.

Each sector can help the other fulfill its mission. In fact, given the large overlap of their concerns, “A failure to communicate is a nonsensical policy that can only hinder the social order.”¹⁷

History of Cooperation

A certain amount of informal cooperation between law enforcement and private security practitioners has probably taken place since the beginning of formal law enforcement. The earliest examples of formal cooperation may be those between the federal government and security practitioners in the defense industry. Certainly that issue was the driving force behind the formation of the American Society for Industrial Security in 1955.

A subsequent example of formal cooperation developed in the era of skyjacking. “Local police were stationed at security checks at concourse entrances and arrested many armed suspects before they reached the planes. Police officials confronted by manpower crises had to make a choice between staffing beats or positioning officers at airline security checkpoints. Today, passenger and baggage screening is generally carried out by private security firms that operate under contract to the airlines and who can communicate quickly with law enforcement agencies if assistance is needed.”¹⁸

Later, the Private Security Advisory Council was chartered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration from 1972 to 1977 “to improve the crime prevention capabilities of private security and reduce crime in public and private places by reviewing the relationship between private security systems and public law enforcement agencies, and by developing programs and policies regarding private protection services that are appropriate and consistent with the public interest.”¹⁹ Among other projects, the council published advi-

¹⁵ Ohlhausen, “Combating High-Tech Crime in California: The Task Force Approach,” p. v.

¹⁶ Ohlhausen, “Combating High-Tech Crime in California: The Task Force Approach,” p. 17.

¹⁷ Nemeth, p. 279.

¹⁸ James K. Stewart, p. 761.

¹⁹ “Guidelines for the Establishment of State and Local Private Security Advisory Councils,” report prepared by the Private Security Advisory Council to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, 1977, pp. iii-iv.

sory reports on false alarms, regulation of private security services, crime prevention through environmental design, ethics for security managers and employees, prevention of terrorism, “law enforcement and private security sources and areas of conflict and strategies for conflict resolution,” scope of legal authority of private security personnel, model security guard training curricula, and more.

By the 1980s, several formal cooperative programs were in place. In the early 1980s, the Washington Law Enforcement Executive Forum was formed to address problems facing both law enforcement and the business community in that state. In 1983, the Dallas Police/Private Security Joint Information Committee was formed. In 1986, the public sector–private sector liaison committees of the National Sheriffs’ Association (NSA), the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), and American Society for Industrial Security (ASIS) formed a Joint Council of Law Enforcement and Private Security Associations. By 1989 the Detroit area boasted at least four formal cooperative programs.²⁰

In the early 1990s, the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center’s Operation Partnership brought together teams of two to four law enforcement and private security operations from given jurisdictions for three-day training courses. On returning home, they were asked to submit quarterly reports on the progress of their cooperative programs. Operation Partnership training covers the history of law enforcement and private security, business and economics, future trends in law enforcement and private security, exemplary programs, identification of resources, scanning and assessing the environment, legal and ethical issues, and how to develop, evaluate, modify, present, and market an action plan.²¹

Academia has expressed interest in its own form of cooperation for some time. A 1980 paper by a professor of criminal justice called for academic programs in security studies that would be the equal of criminal justice studies. “Security and crime prevention studies can make numerous contributions to improved effectiveness in the control of crimes committed in the private sector. Accordingly, these topics should be perceived as fully interactive elements of criminal justice and fully coequal partners.”²²

Issues in Cooperation

A recurring theme in the literature is conflict between law enforcement and private security. “Historically there has been a tension between public police and private security agents. This tension has several components. First, the roles and functions of public and private police are often unclear or poorly understood. While much public attention has been focused on the ‘police’ in recent years, there has been little public assessment of the private police, despite the fact that private policing has been growing exponentially over

²⁰ *Hallcrest Report II*, pp. 246-260.

²¹ “Law Enforcement and Private Security Executive Training Program: Operation Partnership,” Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, Glynco, Georgia, 1991.

²² James D. Calder, “The Security–Criminal Justice Connection: Toward the Elimination of Separate But Equal Status,” University of Texas at San Antonio, 1980.

the past decade.”²³ As early as 1978, the Private Security Advisory Council was able to outline such areas of conflict as lack of mutual respect, lack of communication, lack of cooperation, lack of law enforcement knowledge of private security, perceived competition, lack of standards in security, and perceived corruption on both sides.²⁴

Status

Security officers have long been known by the unflattering term “rent-a-cops,” and law enforcement officers often hold them in contempt; by contrast, the stature of police has been high since the professionalization efforts of the 1960s.²⁵ The low esteem is partly due to the “lack of selection standards for private guards, resulting in guards [who] are not respected by the law enforcement officer, [and the] lack of standards for training of private guards, resulting in a lack of confidence on the part of the law enforcement officer that the guard would not be a problem during a criminal incident.”²⁶ In sum, “Many of the problems in communication between police and private security are rooted in the working officer’s perception of the security guard.”²⁷

Law enforcement officials sometimes state that private security is not accountable to anyone. Others disagree. Private security is accountable to customers, regulators, and the market, which penalizes them for failing to meet specific obligations. Also, private security practitioners can be fired for sub-optimal performance, a threat that few law enforcement officials face. Like the police, they are also accountable to civil and criminal law and the media.²⁸ In fact, private security sometimes sees law enforcement as the agency that always comes after the fact, has little accountability for crime, and shows disdain for private security.²⁹

Private security officers indeed receive less training than most police, but even law enforcement practitioners observe that “the key is to ensure that professional level training for the specific duties and jobs to be undertaken by the private sector is provided.”³⁰ Before law enforcement would feel comfortable contracting out some of its service to private security, “the private sector security industry must be prepared to accept that only its professional members will be asked to share in the work of the public police.”³¹

²³ Jack R. Greene, Thomas M. Seamon, and Paul R. Levy, “Merging Public and Private Security for Collective Benefit: Philadelphia’s Center City District,” paper, 1993, p. 5.

²⁴ “Law Enforcement and Private Security: Sources and Areas of Conflict and Strategies for Conflict Resolution,” prepared by the Private Security Advisory Council to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, 1978.

²⁵ Greene, Seamon, and Levy, p. 5.

²⁶ “Program Narrative,” organizing document for Joint Council of Law Enforcement and Private Security Associations, 1986, p. 2.

²⁷ James K. Stewart, p. 764.

²⁸ Bob Stewart, “Breaking Barriers: Public Police and Private Security,” *Gazette (A Royal Canadian Mounted Police Publication)*, December 1997, p. 14.

²⁹ Greene, Seamon, and Levy, p. 9.

³⁰ Bob Stewart, p. 16.

³¹ Bob Stewart, p. 13.

The status problem is not new. In a national study during the early 1980s, "Law enforcement executives and line officers (patrol and detective personnel) both rated the performance of private security personnel as fair to poor and the overall contributions of private security as only somewhat effective Private security was not perceived as an equal partner in crime prevention and control, but rather as a junior or silent partner."³²

However, some evidence suggests that the relationship may be improving:

A recent survey of 127 police officers and 109 security professionals in Michigan revealed interesting findings on the relationship between public law enforcement and private security Nearly two-thirds of all security respondents have prior law enforcement experience while 43 percent of police officers worked in the security field before joining law enforcement agencies Security professionals were more likely to believe they were equal partners than were police officers. Police officers were more likely than security professionals to rank the police/security relationship positively Security professionals appear more optimistic and hopeful than police officers in evaluating various strategies for improved relations. The strategies considered include, among others, improving interagency communications, creating joint databases, training exchanges, and conducting regular meetings of agency representatives Both police and security professionals predicted greater cooperation between the two sectors in the future.³³

Competition

Another barrier comes from market competition. Some observers feel that as private security grows, law enforcement (especially overtime and off-duty work) may have to shrink.³⁴ Thus, law enforcement practitioners may fear that cooperating with private security will erode their own responsibilities and opportunities.³⁵

In fact, the knife cuts both ways. When police provide guard duty for pay, some security companies see that practice as government-subsidized competition. A 1996 lawsuit filed in federal court by four private security companies in Virginia accused the state and seven localities of violating the Sherman Antitrust Act and of price-fixing. "Since the police officers are using their uniforms, badges, guns, and cars supplied by the government [for off-duty private security work], it creates unfair competition. The government basically is subsidizing private business," said a lawyer representing the security companies. The suit

³² William C. Cunningham and Todd H. Taylor, *Private Security and Police in America: The Hallcrest Report I* (Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1985), p. 189.

³³ Mahesh K. Nalla and Donald Hummer, "Relations Between Police and Security in Michigan," report published by the School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University, 1997.

³⁴ Greene, Seamon, and Levy, p. 6.

³⁵ "Summary of a Feasibility Conference," p. 12.

was dismissed but at this writing is on appeal in the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in Richmond.³⁶

Ignorance

To a great extent, law enforcement practitioners are unaware of the role and resources of private security. Why? “The private sector has put forth little effort to educate the police as to the impact of corporate losses and how the impact is passed on to the citizen/customer, nor the loss/benefit ratios utilized in determining the acquisition and commitment of security resources.” Further, “there is a definite perception of differing motivating factors (profit vs. the protection of citizenry), when, in actuality, both [law enforcement and private security] are motivated by a very common factor—loss prevention.”³⁷

False Alarms

False alarms both divide and unite law enforcement and private security. On one hand, alarms are a private security activity that has become a law enforcement headache. “Unnecessary calls for police service due to false burglar alarms have grown into a tremendous problem. Burglar alarms serve as useful deterrents to crime, but the amount of time and money police spend responding to the 7 million to 15 million or more false alarm calls every year has become intolerable to many law enforcement agencies. Projected growth in the use of alarms portends a worsening problem.”³⁸ On the other hand, the issue has created several occasions for cooperation among local law enforcement agencies, alarm companies, International Association of Chiefs of Police, National Burglar and Fire Alarm Association, Central Station Alarm Association, and Security Industry Association.

Refusal to Recognize Authority

Sometimes private security would like to participate more fully in stopping crime but is prevented from doing so. “Armed private security officers in Northern Virginia have the power of arrest, yet are prevented from carrying out that authority by magistrates and commonwealth attorneys who are reluctant to accept an official summons issued by a security officer. [Security is] a legitimate crime-fighting body—separate from public law enforcement yet dependent on its cooperation.”³⁹

Government’s Relationship with Business

In some places, government is unfriendly to business; in others, the relationship is more cooperative. The latter type of relationship led to the development of one of the most successful, longest-lived law enforcement–private security cooperative programs, the Washington Law Enforcement Executive Forum (WLEEF), which includes law enforce-

³⁶ Kristan Trugman, “Security Firms Sue to Get Cops’ Jobs,” *Washington Times*, June 15, 1998.

³⁷ “Summary of a Feasibility Conference,” p. 12.

³⁸ Peter E. Ohlhausen, “False Alarm Perspectives: A Solution-Oriented Resource,” International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1993.

³⁹ S. Woodruff Bentley, “An Alliance is Born,” *Security Management*, October 1997, p. 77.

ment leaders of that state's major cities and counties, state and federal law enforcement professionals, and "captains of industry." The rationale behind WLEEF is that "although there are those who would impugn it and attach negative images to the concept, ours is a democracy supported by capitalism in a free enterprise system. Therefore, it is important that law enforcement be sure that its relationships transcend not only our neighborhoods and various units of government, but that we develop a viable interface in the commercial sphere in the State of Washington."⁴⁰

Constitutional Issues

An issue that does not necessarily cause conflict but may complicate cooperation has to do with legal accountability. In some ways, private security's legal accountability may not be as great as that of law enforcement.⁴¹ On the other hand, when private security acts alongside or under the direction of law enforcement, it may be acting under "color of state law," meaning it must meet the same legal standards that apply to law enforcement.

Joint Council's Issues

Finally, the Joint Council of Law Enforcement and Private Security Associations raises important issues by asking the following questions, to which it suggests all the answers are "yes":

- Should the law enforcement officer see his or her private security counterpart as a peer professional?
- Should the law enforcement and property protection objectives of law enforcement be supported by involved corporate and private security agency leaders?
- Can the net cost for both private and public security be reduced through coordinated actions?
- Can the corporation's profit line be increased through cooperative relationships with law enforcement?
- Can corporate citizenship be enhanced through cooperative actions with law enforcement?
- Is there an element of risk on the part of a corporation in joining hands with a law enforcement agency?
- Is there an element of risk on the part of the law enforcement agency in providing police resources and criminal history record information to the private sector?

⁴⁰ Remarks of Chief Michael G. Shanahan, President, Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, June 19, 1980.

⁴¹ Greene, Seamon, and Levy, p. 6.

- Is there a way for the resources of the two sectors to be joined in providing levels of personal or asset protection that cannot be reached independently?⁴²

Types of Cooperation

Cooperative programs fall into the following broad, somewhat overlapping categories: informal, formal, contractual, familiarity/goodwill, topic-specific, and umbrella.

Formal versus Informal

Setting up by-laws, sectors, committees, and funding is very difficult and time-consuming. For that reason, some groups of law enforcement and private security officials opt to cooperate informally. For example, a New Jersey partnership created by AlliedSignal, Inc., is informal and unnamed. “Begun in 1996, the partnership has evolved into an informal network that allows local, state, and federal law enforcement officials based in the area to meet with security professionals and top executives in some of the county’s [Morris County, NJ] *Fortune* 500 companies.” The partnership holds three to four breakfast meetings or other get-togethers per year. “The sessions have no formal agenda. [After a speaker speaks, participants] can give or receive advice on security projects or discuss how corporate security professionals can help police solve or prevent criminal activity The meetings have also been used by security professionals to discuss common problems, such as how several companies with employees overseas could work together if their workers had to be suddenly evacuated from international trouble spots.”⁴³

By contrast, some groups opt to organize formally, usually in the hope that structure will increase longevity. One such group is the Virginia Police and Private Security Alliance (VAPPSA), which sponsors educational presentations at its meetings, works to apply problem-solving approaches to public safety issues, conducts shared training programs, maintains a public/private information and resource network, and tracks and tries to influence legislation. VAPPSA features by-laws, membership dues, voting and nonvoting membership categories, a board of directors, and half a dozen formal committees. Interestingly, “the VAPPSA members who initiated the group did not realize how much time it would take to establish by-laws, create a formal structure, remedy legal entanglements, and create momentum The founders realized early on that their attention could easily be diverted from the original vision and get lost in the swamp of organizational development.” On the plus side, VAPPSA has remained in existence since 1991.

⁴² Minutes and statements from the Joint Council of Law Enforcement and Private Security Associations, 1986-87.

⁴³ David R. Green, “Joining Forces Against Crime,” *Security Management*, May 1998, pp. 95-98.

Contractual

Some cooperative programs go beyond being formal to being literally contractual. Such programs are typically business improvement districts (BIDs) or other forms of privatization.

BIDs can be formed in several ways. “In New York, the formation of a BID can be initiated by property owners, by a local development corporation or a Chamber of Commerce, by a local Community Board or that area’s City Council member, or by the mayor or a mayoral agency. Any commercial, retail, or industrial area in New York city may apply for BID status through any such sponsor.”⁴⁴ Once the BID is approved by the government, a special assessment is added to the property tax bills of all businesses within its geographical area. The money is collected by the government, then returned to the BID for the purposes stated in the BID’s official plan. Typically, BIDs use the money for capital improvements, marketing of the area, sanitation, and security. Often, the security contractor hired by the BID contacts the police when an arrest needs to be made, and its security officers serve as extra eyes and ears for the police. In return, the police sometimes provide training and crime information to the security contractor or to in-house security departments of businesses that belong to the BID.

BIDs divide public safety responsibilities in this way: “The public police have typically regulated social order outside of buildings, while the private police have typically regulated order within a building or within building complexes. More importantly, whether recognized or not, these groups interact in fundamental ways all of which contribute to the ‘security net’ within central business districts. In essence the ‘horizontal and vertical’ safety of any center city business area is greatly enhanced with cooperative public and private police arrangements.”⁴⁵

In other cases, law enforcement agencies or local governments actually contract out work that was formerly performed by law enforcement. Such arrangements necessarily involve cooperation between law enforcement and private security. For example, to relieve its police department from the burden of investigating some 500 bad-check complaints each year, the city of Kentwood, Michigan, contracted with a private firm to do the work. The result is that investigations are no longer backlogged, merchants have an effective means for recovering their losses, and police have more time for their other duties.⁴⁶ One of the most famous instances of contracting out involves the Corrections Corporation of America, which builds and operates prisons.⁴⁷ One observer notes that “contracting out enables police officers to concentrate on the tasks for which they are trained and can be most ef-

⁴⁴James P. Murphy, “The Private Sector and Security: A Bit on BIDs,” *Security Journal*, Volume 9, 1997, p. 11.

⁴⁵Greene, Seamon, and Levy, p. 5.

⁴⁶Announcement, Webber Seavey Award, regarding the Kentwood (Michigan) Police Department, no date.

⁴⁷“America’s New Watchword: If It Moves, Privatize It,” *Business Week*, Dec. 12, 1994, p. 39.

fective . . . [freeing up] a well-trained, professional police force from administrative and routine duties to concentrate on tackling crime”⁴⁸

Familiarity and Goodwill Programs

Some cooperative programs exist mainly to familiarize individual law enforcement and private security professionals with each other.

Law Enforcement Appreciation Nights

Typically, the liaison committee in a private security organization will host an annual law enforcement appreciation night. For example, the Law Enforcement Liaison Committee of the Greater Milwaukee Chapter of the American Society for Industrial Security (ASIS) holds annual law enforcement appreciation nights for about 100 police chiefs, sheriffs, and executives of federal law enforcement agencies in southeastern Wisconsin. The first benefit of such meetings is that key parties get to know each other. The second benefit is the actual cooperative work that develops from those relationships. For example, a member of the chapter assisted the Milwaukee County Sheriff’s Department on security surveys, security policies and procedures, and security awareness to help the department in its new role of providing security at several county facilities.⁴⁹

Directories

The ASIS Greater Milwaukee Chapter publishes a directory of all Wisconsin police chiefs and state and federal law enforcement contacts. The chapter distributes the directory to ASIS members and law enforcement agencies.⁵⁰

Awards

An effort similar to law enforcement appreciation nights is the awarding of honors by security organizations to law enforcement. It is cooperation in the sense that security thereby encourages law enforcement to perform in ways that benefit private security. For example, the John J. Duffy Memorial Award, given by the National Council of Investigation and Security Services to the Threat Management Unit (TMU) of the Los Angeles Police Department in 1997, “spotlighted the effectiveness of the police program. But it also underlined the necessary dialog between law enforcement and private security and the complexities of stalking crimes.” NCISS lauded the TMU for aggressively enforcing the anti-stalking laws on the books instead of working for the closure of public records, which would hinder private investigations.⁵¹

⁴⁸ Bob Stewart, p. 14.

⁴⁹ Ronald L. Kuhar and Jon C. Paul, “The Milwaukee Experience,” *ASIS Dynamics*, July/August 1996, pp. 5-7.

⁵⁰ Directory, ASIS and Wisconsin Chiefs of Police Association, 1995.

⁵¹ “Security Group Honors Anti-stalking Police Unit,” *SECURITY*, July 1997, pp. 7-8.

Umbrella Programs

Many cooperative programs are best described as umbrella programs, as they are designed to develop law enforcement–private security relationships, teams, and task forces that address a wide range of concerns.

One of the most notable is the Washington Law Enforcement Executive Forum, mentioned earlier, which, among other activities, funds a statewide loaned-executive program to enhance management of local police agencies; provides support for the *Law Enforcement Executive Journal*, the nation’s first law enforcement/business publication; sponsored legislation on the regulation and training of private security personnel and on computer crime; and created an “Economic Crime Task Force to assess the nature and extent of white-collar crime in the state, develop strategies to reduce such crime, promote appropriate legislation initiatives and revisions, and collect and disseminate information on economic crime.”⁵²

Similarly, the Downtown Detroit Security Executive Council (DDSEC), which includes corporate security executives and local, state, and federal law enforcement professionals, tackles such projects as identifying security problems from police reports and incidents reported to private security and promoting crime prevention through environmental design in new construction and renovation projects.⁵³

Likewise, the Business/Law Enforcement Alliance (BLEA), created in 1994, is a formal partnership between California businesses and city, county, state, and federal law enforcement agencies. An arm of the California Peace Officers Association, it includes some 200 participants from various industries and law enforcement and has a 10-member board of directors. BLEA’s purpose is to create a link between the California business community and law enforcement so that both can work together to solve specific problems in the state. “The organization’s leadership recognizes, for example, that some law enforcement agencies do not have the specialized expertise, tools, or time to investigate and prosecute certain high-tech offenders.” BLEA is currently working on three projects: reducing check fraud, stopping the theft of rental equipment, and reducing false alarms. It may soon develop alliances with trade organizations to combat audio and video piracy.⁵⁴

Another umbrella program is the Baltimore County Police and Private Security Association, which meets once a month, has a newsletter, organizes joint training, works on legislation and reducing false alarms, addresses specific crimes (such as graffiti), organizes training of security officers to make better witnesses, and conducts other activities.⁵⁵

The Area Police–Private Security Liaison Program (APPL), formed in 1985, consists of high-ranking New York City Police Department members and respected security directors in New York City. “The program’s main goals are to engage in cooperative efforts to

⁵² William C. Cunningham, “Success Across America,” *Security Management*, November 1991, p. 43.

⁵³ Cunningham, “Success Across America.”

⁵⁴ Green, p. 96.

⁵⁵ Baltimore County Police–Private Security Association, newsletter, April 1990.

protect people and property, exchange information to aid in the accomplishment of mutual goals, [and] eliminate the ‘credibility gap’ between police and private security.” Police members provide information on local crime trends, patterns, and incidents; offer expertise to help private security protect assets and clientele; and provide an atmosphere conducive to trust and cooperation. Private security members learn how to cooperate with and help the police, and they offer expertise in technology, building security, and asset protection. The group holds quarterly regional meetings with speeches on specific topics. Members train each other and work together on legislation.⁵⁶

In Missouri, the Creve Coeur Joint Crime Prevention Program consists of the Creve Coeur Police Department, Monsanto Corporate Security, and St. John’s Mercy Medical Center Safety and Security Department. It has initiated a community-wide project to develop a mobile crime prevention display and command center trailer for the education and safety of the community. It holds Neighborhood Watch appreciation awards dinners to recognize citizens of the community for their efforts in assisting the police and preventing crime. Other activities include a bike rodeo with a crime prevention theme; crime prevention booths at local festivals; participation in National Night Out; Halloween parties for children; crime prevention displays at program members’ sites; one-day seminars at program members’ sites on sexual assault, burglary prevention, drug and alcohol abuse, traffic safety, vacation safety, and security checks; and a phone notification system to alert neighborhood and business watch groups about crimes.⁵⁷

Some umbrella programs operate on the national level. For example, the Private Sector Liaison Committee of IACP has produced, for national distribution to law enforcement and private security practitioners, several resource and guideline documents. Examples include “Non-Sworn Alarm Responder Guidelines: Guidelines for Employers and Law Enforcement” and “False Alarm Perspectives: A Solution-Oriented Resource.” Other papers have addressed product tampering, workplace drug crimes, and workplace violence. Recently, such efforts have been able to reach a wider audience by being posted on the Internet (www.amdahl.com/ext/iacp), which was itself an instance of cooperation, as the site space was donated by Amdahl Corporation.

Similarly, since the early 1980s, the Law Enforcement Liaison Committee (LELC) of ASIS has promoted cooperation by sponsoring seminars and presentations on (1) security and police issues, such as improving communications and working relationships; (2) trends in outsourcing and privatization; (3) training law enforcement personnel about private security functions; and (4) encouraging the establishment of law enforcement and security partnerships. In the late 1980s the LELC produced a video describing the roles and typical functions of private security. The video was distributed to virtually every major police training academy in the United States. The LELC has also worked to develop a closer association with such law enforcement organizations as IACP and the National Sheriffs’ Association. In 1997, the LELC provided the initiative for a national project (supported

⁵⁶ Anthony M. Voelker, “Area Police–Private Security Liaison Program,” New York City Police Department document. Circa 1988.

⁵⁷ “1991 Annual Report,” Creve Coeur (Missouri) Joint Crime Prevention Program.

by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice) to develop guidelines for establishing and improving partnerships between public law enforcement and private security.

Topic-Specific Efforts

Other cooperative programs focus primarily on a single topic or activity. The following section describes specific topics addressed by such programs or, in some cases, by umbrella programs.

Equipment

The Maryland Chiefs of Police Association and ASIS put together a booklet that makes it easier for law enforcement to borrow equipment and resources from private security. It gives specific contact information for borrowing or using auditoriums, classrooms, conference rooms, a firing range, four-wheel drive vehicles, a helicopter landing area, an indoor swimming pool, lecturers on security, open areas for personnel deployment, printing services, and vans or trucks.⁵⁸

Another effort, Project Blue Lights (named after its purpose: to get more “blue lights,” or police, on the information superhighway) locates, obtains, and distributes usable, surplus computer hardware donated by private corporations to law enforcement agencies. The project’s sponsor is the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, which sent out letters to police departments and private companies to find out who needed computers and who had computers to donate. About a third of police chiefs and sheriffs responded with their needs. United Parcel Service offered dozens of computers, which the company then shipped to any law enforcement agency in the state that needed one.⁵⁹

Another equipment transfer grew out of a rise in murders at San Diego’s Balboa Park. Rangers felt they could not stop the problem. One ranger contacted a former coworker who had gone to work for Robot Research, a manufacturer of digital video products and CCTV control systems. Robot agreed to donate the multiplexing equipment necessary for a video surveillance system for the park. Then other companies (Pelco, Elmo, and Rainbow) donated the remaining needed equipment to create a five-camera system. Crime is now down in the park.⁶⁰

Incident News

Through the Hot Fax program in Bethesda, Maryland, the Montgomery County police, on learning of a crime, fax news of it to local business and community organizations. Those organizations then relay the fax to several hundred businesses and merchants. Fairfax

⁵⁸ “Private Security and Public Law Enforcement: A Partnership . . . Private Security Resources Available to the Law Enforcement Community,” resource booklet prepared for law enforcement by the Maryland Chiefs of Police Association and ASIS, no date, p. 8.

⁵⁹ E-mail from Sandy Moy, Feb. 8, 1998, to Private Sector Liaison Committee of International Association of Chiefs of Police.

⁶⁰ “Public and Private Sector Unite to Fight Crime,” *Security Concepts*, March 1996, p. 11.

County, Virginia, has a similar program, as do Buffalo, Phoenix, and Stamford, CT. The Fairfax system reaches nearly 1,000 participants.⁶¹ Through the Rocky Mountain Business Watch, the Denver Police Department does much the same thing.⁶² In New York City, the Supermarket Security Council developed a central clearinghouse for armed robbery information to establish criminal patterns in order to help police plan stakeouts and conduct investigations.⁶³

Terrorism and Overseas Safety

The Overseas Security Advisory Council (OSAC) consists of high-level corporate security directors and U.S. State Department representatives. OSAC provides an annual international security briefing for members. Its Research and Information Support Center provides international business intelligence to help American companies compete in the global economy.⁶⁴

High-Tech Crime

Local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies, along with corporations in the high-tech industry, have been working to establish networks of regional, specialized task forces. The approach has already been tested in some locales, formally and informally, with great success. The Sacramento Valley High-Tech Crime Task Force has coordinated the efforts of several law enforcement departments and federal agencies with the advice and support of local high-tech businesses, which lend expertise, donate equipment, and sometimes provide “buy money.” In 1996, the task force investigated over \$13 million in property losses, recovering more than two-thirds. It performed 98 original investigations, assisted in 25 others, and conducted 53 forensic investigations. Those successes were largely due to several strengths of the task force approach: improved cooperation among different agencies, use of investigators who specialize in high technology, a focus on long-term investigations, and development of intelligence networks.⁶⁵

White-Collar Crime

A recent journal article⁶⁶ points out that private security and law enforcement have similar, though not identical, interests in preventing, investigating, and prosecuting white-collar crime. Opportunities for cooperation arise where those interests overlap. For example, to improve the likelihood of successful prosecutions, law enforcement investigators can teach private sector investigators how to gather evidence in accordance with police policies. Likewise, the private sector can teach law enforcement about computer security and other

⁶¹ R. H. Melton, “Bethesda’s Phone Posse,” *Washington Post*, November 21, 1995, p. B1.

⁶² *Law Enforcement and Private Security: A Team Effort*, video, Denver Police Training Bureau and PACE Membership Warehouses, Inc., 1992.

⁶³ *Hallcrest I*, p. 194.

⁶⁴ Proceedings of 12th annual briefing of OSAC.

⁶⁵ Ohlhausen, “Combating High-Tech Crime in California: The Task Force Approach.”

⁶⁶ Chris A. Bradford and Clifford E. Simonsen, “The need for cooperative efforts between private security public law enforcement in the prevention, investigation, and prosecution of fraud-related criminal activity,” *Security Journal*, Volume 10, 1988, pp. 161-168.

complex topics that arise in investigations of sophisticated white-collar crimes. Interest in such cooperation is not new; in 1978, the National District Attorneys Association held a conference that sought out potential areas of cooperation between the criminal justice system and private organizations in “detecting, investigating, and prosecuting organizational fraud and abuse.”⁶⁷

Background Investigations

“In many states, thanks to cooperative law enforcement/private security initiatives, corporations are simply obtaining a release from applicants, submitting a fingerprint card, paying an established fee, and subsequently receiving a criminal history from the desired police agency. There has been no evidence of problems with these arrangements, and corporations that operate in multiple states have been willing to adjust their procedures to conform to applicable state laws.”⁶⁸

Operations

Over a period of many years, Conrail, Yellow Freight, American President Lines, Consolidated Freightways, and other shippers have teamed up with local law enforcement agencies to “wage war on cargo crime” by setting up sting operations.⁶⁹

To help police officers more safely respond to incidents inside its stores, PACE Membership Warehouse produced a video reenacting the shooting of two police officers who were responding to an armed robbery at a PACE store in the Los Angeles area. Now PACE works with police so employees and police officers will know what to do during a robbery. PACE invites patrol officers to tour stores, shows them blueprints, and offers its store as a site for SWAT team practice at night.⁷⁰

Legislation

The ASIS Greater Milwaukee Chapter has worked with the Wisconsin Chiefs of Police Association and a Wisconsin state senator on legislation regarding licensing of guards, private detectives, detective agencies, and armored car companies.⁷¹ Similarly, at its founding, the Joint Council of Law Enforcement and Private Security Associations identified, as a topic for immediate action, working for passage of legislation that gives access by corporations to conviction records of prospective employment applicants and developing model legislation.⁷²

⁶⁷ Bradford and Simonsen, p. 165.

⁶⁸ Mangan and Shanahan, p. 21.

⁶⁹ Felecia Stratton, “Cargo Cops: To Catch a Thief,” *Inbound Logistics*, March 1991.

⁷⁰ *Law Enforcement and Private Security: A Team Effort*.

⁷¹ Directory, ASIS and Wisconsin Chiefs of Police Association.

⁷² Minutes of the first meeting of the Joint Council of Law Enforcement and Private Security Associations, Aug. 21-22, 1986, p. 5.

Shared and Mutual Training

“Launched as a pilot program by the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Operation Bootstrap now reaches into 40 states with support from private foundations and the National Institute of Justice. It offers state-of-the-art training and self-help programs that . . . cover subjects such as effective supervision, conflict resolution, group problem solving, and stress management. About 70 corporations donated over 800 seats in their executive education programs in 1988, absorbing tuition costs for law enforcement personnel and leaving participants responsible only for travel and per diem expenses through their departments. At an average cost of \$600 a course, corporations donated approximately \$500,000 to the law enforcement sector [that] year.”⁷³

Police recruits in Wisconsin can take their elective classes at either the Milwaukee Area Technical College or the Milwaukee Police Department Academy. “Both agreed to allow representatives from the [ASIS] Greater Milwaukee Chapter to speak to their recruit classes as part of a pilot program in security/police cooperative efforts. Topics to be discussed will include the history and description of private security; comparisons between the private and public sectors; the professionalization of the security industry; interaction and cooperation; and developing sound relationships.” The chapter then began working to get the Wisconsin Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board to make the ASIS orientation mandatory curriculum in all certified training academies throughout the state.⁷⁴

It is common for law enforcement and security professionals to speak at each other’s conferences.

Trends

The literature reflects a number of trends that are affecting or will affect cooperation between law enforcement and private security.

The most powerful trend is the *continued growth of the private security industry*, both in real terms and relative to law enforcement. In 1987 the director of the U.S. Justice Department’s National Institute of Justice (NIJ) wrote that “cooperation becomes increasingly essential with the growth of the private security industry.”⁷⁵ In policing, “resources to meet the increasing demand have dwindled. In most major cities, police personnel have declined, and the number of police employees per 1,000 population dropped 10 percent between 1975 and 1985. Shrinking tax revenues throughout the country and outright tax-

⁷³ Bill Bruns, “Operation Bootstrap: Opening Corporate Classrooms to Police Managers,” *NIJ Reports*, National Institute of Justice, November/December 1989, p. 2.

⁷⁴ Kuhar and Paul.

⁷⁵ Marcia Chaiken and Jan Chaiken, “Public Policing—Privately Provided,” *Issues and Practices*, National Institute of Justice, June 1987, p. iii.

payer revolts . . . have curtailed growth in government. Police, like other public administrators, have become familiar with cutback management.”⁷⁶

Another trend is the change in law enforcement’s approach to much of its work. The philosophies of *community policing*, *neighborhood-oriented policing*, and *problem-oriented policing* all call on law enforcement to cooperate with the community, which includes private security. Similarly, “where law enforcement is actively involved in crime prevention activities, cooperation with private security is better because the interests of the two agencies are more closely aligned.”⁷⁷ For example, at the Detroit Police Department, security industry representatives sit on the Chief’s Crime Prevention Advisory Committee.⁷⁸

In addition, *increasing professionalism in private security* has slowly been improving law enforcement’s attitude toward security practitioners, and “each successful contact aids in establishing further ties and acts as a building block for increased communication and joint programs.”⁷⁹

Another trend is the private sector’s *increasing need to prosecute*. “[C]orporations have been deterred from criminally prosecuting their employees by the prospects of bad publicity, unsympathetic juries, counter lawsuits, and other real and perceived problems. Instead, employers frequently settle for the offender’s dismissal or resignation. The current reluctance of the business world to fight its internal crime wave with a joint private-public offensive cannot last forever, however. The entrance of the high-tech white-collar criminal, whose skillful predations can prove disastrous for a corporation, will likely be the most significant catalyst bringing together the private sector and the various components of the criminal justice system for mutual assistance.”⁸⁰

Also driving cooperation is the evolutionary *loss of preexisting relationships*. “Informal levels of communication and cooperation are dissipating as private security firms promote managers more from within rather than from the field of law enforcement. The ‘good ole boy’ network cannot be relied upon for communication in future years.”⁸¹

Finally, the issue of *privatization* is likely to continue to drive cooperation. According to a former director of NIJ, “nearly as much money is now paid by governments to private security companies as is spent for public law enforcement by the federal and state governments combined.”⁸² There are many examples of privatization requiring cooperation between law enforcement and private security. “[I]nstead of using regular police officers for security and crowd control at its civic center and other city-owned buildings, Phoenix con-

⁷⁶ James K. Stewart, p. 758.

⁷⁷ “Summary of a Feasibility Conference,” p. 10.

⁷⁸ Judith D. Feins, “Partnerships for Neighborhood Crime Prevention,” National Institute of Justice, 1983, p. 45.

⁷⁹ Greene, Seamon, and Levy.

⁸⁰ Shanahan, “Private Enterprise and the Public Police: The Professionalizing Effects of a New Partnership,” p. 450.

⁸¹ “Summary of a Feasibility Conference.”

⁸² Chaiken and Chaiken.

tracts that service to Anderson Agency, Inc. . . . The company's marketing director says lower costs are not the only benefit the city receives from its private security force. 'Our men are trained to prevent things from happening, while police officers are trained to stop crimes in progress or solve them after they have happened.' . . . In New York City, badge-wearing employees of a private company patrol streets in search of cars with outstanding parking tickets."⁸³

The Future

An experienced participant in law enforcement–private security collaborations makes these comments about the possible future of cooperation:

This interaction will probably produce different benefits for each participant, including enhanced professionalization of public law enforcement. Corporate people eventually will learn to operate more comfortably with some of the openness and public accessibility required of criminal justice agencies. Private sector executives will also learn to interact with people who are action-oriented, who show a great deal of initiative, and whose freshness in attacking problems is devoid of some of the intrigue and subtleties that frequently are found in the corporate bureaucracy.

On the other side, law enforcement officials will be exposed to a higher degree of organizational sophistication. They will learn to view corporate problems through the eyes of chief executive officers, upwardly mobile corporate managers, and stockholders They will learn, too, that realistic planning and effective marketing are basic to survival. The police managers also will become sensitized to the fact that corporate entities, unlike police agencies, must measure up to competing firms or go out of business.⁸⁴

⁸³ Peter A. Holmes, "Taking Public Services Private," *Nation's Business*, August 1985, pp. 20-22.

⁸⁴ Shanahan, "Private Enterprise and the Public Police: The Professionalizing Effects of a New Partnership," p. 455.