



OPERATION PARTNERSHIP

Trends and Practices
in Law Enforcement and
Private Security Collaborations

Executive Summary

By The Law Enforcement-Private Security Consortium



COPS
COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ILJ

Operation Partnership

Trends and Practices in Law Enforcement and Private Security Collaborations

This project was supported by Grant Number 2005-CK-WX-0454 awarded by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions contained herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice. References to specific agencies, companies, products, or services should not be considered an endorsement by the authors or the U.S. Department of Justice. Rather, the references are illustrations to supplement discussion of the issues.

The Law Enforcement-Private Security Consortium was formed in 2005 to provide research, training, and technical assistance services that support development of effective law enforcement-private security collaborations nationwide. Consortium members are the Institute for Law and Justice (ILJ), Hallcrest Systems, Inc., SECTA LLC, and Ohlhausen Research, Inc. ILJ administered the grant supporting the Consortium's production of this report and also administers a separate grant from the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services that supports the Consortium's follow-up work to develop online training on law enforcement-private security partnerships.

The Internet references cited in this publication were valid as of July 2009. Given that URLs and web sites are in constant flux, neither the authors nor the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services can vouch for their current validity.

Background

Operation Partnership, a project sponsored by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (the COPS Office), addressed a key recommendation of the COPS/ International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) National Policy Summit¹ to examine law enforcement-private security (LE-PS) partnerships and develop guidelines for forming and sustaining them. The project updated and expanded an earlier effort, Operation Cooperation, which was completed in 2000.²

Importance of Collaboration. Private security addresses crimes and public safety issues that law enforcement cannot handle alone because it lacks the human resources, mandate, or technology. LE-PS partnerships have existed for 30 years, but the need for LE-PS collaboration became more evident after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. With 85 percent of the nation's critical infrastructure owned by the private sector,³ police and private security must work jointly to protect these resources as well as to address other crime problems.

Major Tasks and Products. The Operation Partnership team⁴ identified 450 LE-PS partnerships nationwide through surveys, literature reviews, and referrals; interviewed more than 50 partnership leaders; and analyzed trends, assisted by expert advisors and focus groups. The full report includes many partnership examples, offers guidelines for operating LE-PS partnerships, and is serving as the basis for online training being developed under a separate COPS Office grant.

Partnership Benefits

LE-PS partnership leaders report the following as significant benefits of partnership participation:

- **Crime control.** Private security officers outnumber sworn law enforcement officers by about three to one, and local and state police staffing levels are not expected to grow significantly.⁵ Private security provides "more eyes and ears" for law enforcement and is often described as a force multiplier.
- **Resources to address computer and high-tech crimes.** Law enforcement benefits from private security's technical and financial resources, and private security gains access to law enforcement's legal authority and investigative skills.
- **Resources to address financial and intellectual property crimes.** Collaboration is essential to resolve complex financial crimes and to prosecute egregious intellectual property crimes,⁶ which are difficult to solve because of a lack of investigative resources and the complexity of tracing the money flow.

- **Advanced technologies.** Through various partnerships, private security has provided technical expertise and resources, such as access to its digital forensics capabilities. Private security also stands to benefit from law enforcement's own use of technologies, including today's crime analysis and mapping applications.
- **Critical incident planning and response.** LE-PS collaboration to develop joint response plans and produce training, including full-scale exercises, improves the readiness of both law enforcement and private security to handle critical incidents.
- **Information and intelligence.** Intelligence from private security sources, including sources overseas, has become increasingly important for homeland security. Both private security and law enforcement are benefiting from secure radio, e-mail/text messaging, and web-based crime and incident alert systems. "Intelligence-led policing"⁷ is also influencing how some law enforcement agencies obtain, analyze, and share information from multiple sources.
- **More effective community policing.** All LE-PS collaborations reflect the core partnership principle of community policing, and some partnerships have been recognized as exemplary community policing efforts.
- **Training opportunities.** Industry-specific training for law enforcement (e.g., on crimes affecting the oil or pharmaceutical industries) addresses both safety and investigative issues. Training provided by law enforcement to private security has covered crime scene protection, terrorism-related topics, and many others.
- **Career opportunities.** The private security and law enforcement fields recruit qualified employees from each other. Personnel with LE-PS partnership experience may be at an advantage later if they want to make a career shift.

Challenges

Key challenges in forming and operating LE-PS partnerships are highlighted here.

- **Awareness.** Law enforcement still lacks awareness of what private security can bring to the table,⁸ and of its specialized functions.⁹ Similarly, some in private security—for example, personnel who do not have law enforcement experience—may not be fully aware of law enforcement's capabilities and resources.
- **Trust.** Partnership leaders emphasized the importance of trust and discussed having overcome initial distrust through member screening processes, security directors' backgrounds in law enforcement, and successes on joint projects.
- **Information sharing and privacy.** Law enforcement, private security, and the public have legitimate concerns about the sharing of personal, sensitive, and classified information. Some of the concerns include fears that business competitors will gain access to proprietary information, issues surrounding security clearances, and the potential for information glut (too much irrelevant information collected and/or disseminated).

- **Technology.** Some technologies are complex or controversial with respect to management, oversight, or public acceptance. Many are costly and require time for selection of system features, acquisition, setup, training, and maintenance.
- **Personnel issues.** Some segments of the security industry (e.g., guard services) experience high employee turnover. Related concerns include the quality of security officer compensation, background screening, and training; and inconsistency in state licensing and training standards. Law enforcement personnel challenges include staffing shortages because of difficulties filling authorized positions¹⁰ and the practice of rotating managers through assignments, which may result in inconsistent leadership for an LE-PS partnership.
- **Decision making.** Risk aversion in government can slow the positive changes that might come from LE-PS collaborations. Typically, private security is better positioned to seize opportunities, but security directors must still convince their employers that time spent on partnership activities is worthwhile.
- **Taxpayer support for police and private security services.** Private security often delivers certain services that traditionally were provided by law enforcement, such as security patrols in a business improvement district (BID). This trend is not universally embraced by police, and some businesses are reluctant to be taxed twice for crime-prevention services they believe a public (taxpayer-supported) law enforcement agency should provide.

Key Trends in Public–Private Partnerships

By far the most evident LE-PS partnership trend is a substantial rise in the number of partnerships.¹¹ The Operation Partnership report compares the scope and size of the policing and private security fields¹² and discusses the following trends:

General Trends

- Increasing number of partnerships
- High degree of satisfaction with partnerships
- Changes in leadership of partnerships toward more sharing of responsibilities
- More energetic outreach for members
- Greater range of partnership activities
- Better information sharing between partnership members
- More private provision of traditional law enforcement functions
- Growth in leveraging of resources
- Institutionalization of partnerships.

Trends Specifically Related to Homeland Security

- Increased high-level attention to law enforcement/private security partnerships
- Development of new partnerships with a clear focus on homeland security
- Homeland security focus added to partnerships that existed before 9/11
- Federally sponsored, privately led infrastructure protection partnerships
- Homeland security training for private security partners.

Two factors driving these trends are economics and homeland security needs. Since 2001, federal funds have declined for local policing not directly related to homeland security. LE-PS partnerships are one way to control crime with fewer public resources while also addressing new homeland security responsibilities. In addition, the growth of electronic communication has made it much easier for partnerships to collect and distribute information.

Other important factors are a rise in mutual esteem¹³ as private security gained sophisticated capabilities and increased credentialing and skills in the security field. Some corporate security departments maintain intelligence operations and forensic labs that surpass those of many law enforcement agencies. The security field has also seen gains in certification (more certifications, more certified practitioners), standards, academic programs,¹⁴ and other measures of professionalism. At the same time, law enforcement has shown a greater willingness (often driven by necessity) to work with private security. Increasingly, LE-PS partnerships are seen as an extension of community policing, which calls on police to collaborate with others to prevent and solve crimes. Finally, LE-PS partnerships have grown because of support and encouragement from professional associations (e.g., ASIS International) and government agencies (e.g., the COPS Office, Bureau of Justice Assistance).

Forms of Partnerships

There is no model form of LE-PS partnership that suits every situation. Partnerships vary with respect to organizational structure, purpose, leadership, funding, and membership.

Organizational structure. Less formal partnerships are easier to establish and administer but may have difficulty managing funds and continuing operations as membership turns over. More formal partnerships may require substantial setup efforts (such as incorporation and the hiring of staff) but often experience greater longevity. Varieties of organizational structure include committees within larger organizations (e.g., a state police chiefs association), 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations, quasigovernmental entities (e.g., Business Improvement Districts [BIDs]), and others.

Purpose. Some LE-PS partnerships address one issue (e.g., false alarms), but most deal with several public safety and security concerns. Partnerships formed to address a single problem—laptop thefts from hotels, for example—often evolve to take on other crimes affecting an industry or geographic area. After 9/11, many partnerships, regardless of initial purpose, added training and information-sharing activities to prevent and respond to terrorism.

Leadership. It is common for law enforcement to lead partnerships, especially when a partnership's main purpose is to disseminate crime-related information to the private sector. But some partnerships have joint leadership (e.g., law enforcement and private security co-chairs); and others, such as industry-specific partnerships, are led by private security.

Funding. Many partnerships incur no out-of-pocket costs, but all partnerships need resources that must be donated or paid for. Most need meeting space, staff time, and increasingly, web site hosting. Depending on a partnership's objectives, it may need radios, other equipment, or paid staff. Funding sources range from membership dues and fees for conferences or special training, to more complex funding arrangements, such as tax assessments that support BIDs, and grants (most commonly for partnerships focused on homeland security).

Membership. Partnerships vary with regard to the organizations belonging to the partnership and the degree to which potential members are vetted. Often, members are screened informally, but some partnerships conduct criminal background checks of potential members, especially when the partnership disseminates law enforcement-sensitive information. Partnerships may also designate different levels of membership with different privileges—for example, all members may receive crime information but only selected members may send it.

Types of Partnership Activities and Programs

Information sharing. This is a key activity for at least 90 percent of partnerships and has always been a major reason for LE-PS collaboration. Two factors, however, have greatly influenced the nature of information sharing in recent years:

1. Advances in technologies, which now permit partnerships to share crime and threat information immediately via e-mail, text messaging, joint radio systems, secure web sites, and other means.
2. Heightened concerns about terrorism, resulting in changes in or expansions of existing partnerships and formation of new information-sharing partnerships.

Examples of LE-PS Partnership Information-Sharing Systems

Nassau County SPIN (Security Police Information Network). Established in 2004, the Nassau County (New York) Police Department (NCPD) SPIN program is an e-mail-based information-sharing partnership whose members include 700 security entities. The NCPD provides SPIN with a dedicated staff of two officers and a sergeant.

Philadelphia Crime Prevention Council (PCPC). In 2004, the Center City District (CCD), a downtown BID, and the Philadelphia Police Department each provided \$25,000 to fund an alert system for the PCPC. The system has grown to include about 1,200 participants. At first the alert system used e-mail only but now notifies participants via text message and cell phone, as well.

Minneapolis SafeZone. This partnership operates a secure police-private security radio system and also uses e-mail, cell phones, pagers, and other means to share crime alerts, crime tips, photos, video, incident reports, and online victim impact statements. The partnership also won a prestigious IACP community policing award.

Several information-sharing systems developed through LE-PS partnerships are noted in the sidebar. In addition, various partnerships use web sites to share information with members (e.g., through members-only pages) and the public; send information by fax; and produce newsletters (usually sent electronically). Finally, most partnerships share information at regular meetings, regardless of whether they have high-tech information-sharing systems.

Training. Nearly two-thirds of the LE-PS partnerships identified offer training. Their approach to training varies with respect to planning and development, which may be done by law enforcement, private security, or both; intended audience; duration, which ranges from brief presentations to intensive courses culminating in professional certifications; format (lectures, demonstrations, etc.); and subject matter. Examples of training topic areas include the following:

- Terrorism, e.g., responding to critical incidents, identifying suspicious packages, impact of terrorism on special events
- Professional development, e.g., ethics, leadership development for law enforcement, conducting background investigations, search and seizure laws
- Industry-specific crime investigations, including officer safety measures (e.g., at nuclear facilities)
- Community policing, e.g., tourism safety and security, patterns of gang activity, private security role in responding to nuisance crimes.

Resource sharing. In addition to sharing information and training, many partnerships share investigative resources or technical expertise. Private security support for law enforcement may also include donations or loans of equipment and funding to provide training or to support other partnership goals.

Crime control and loss prevention. Many LE-PS partnerships have significantly changed how policing is done with respect to field operations, particularly patrol and access control. Examples include the following:

- **Business improvement districts (BID).** BIDs may offer extra patrol services by both private security and police; they often employ security teams or similar personnel who coordinate with police and provide safety escorts, check on businesses, deter panhandling, or offer other safety services. Some BIDs sponsor a public safety coalition or committee composed of decision-makers from private security, law enforcement (local, state, and federal), and other partner organizations.
- **Special events.** Law enforcement and private security have a long history of collaborating to reduce risks to life and property at special events, including regional holiday celebrations, national political conventions, major sports and cultural events, and others.¹⁵
- **Community policing approaches.** LE-PS collaborations focused on crime and quality of life in specific geographic areas—downtown business districts, areas that attract tourists, and residential neighborhoods—often involve additional partners (e.g., code enforcement, public works, resident and business associations) to devise creative solutions to crime problems.

Resource Sharing: Safe City and Target & BLUE

The **Safe City** program, initiated by Target Corporation but designed to be led by law enforcement, has provided many jurisdictions with grants to purchase CCTV systems for downtown business areas and other strategic locations.

The **Target & BLUE** program of Target Corporation includes many efforts to collaborate with and support law enforcement agencies across the country by providing grants, materials, expertise, information, forensic services, and investigative support. In 2007, Target received the FBI Director's Community Leadership Award for extraordinary contributions to communities and law enforcement.

Examples of Crimes Prevented and Solved

Southeastern Transportation Security Council recovered stolen tractor trailers, each containing more than \$100,000 worth of merchandise.

Mobile Phone Interest Group broke up a \$2 million mobile phone theft ring on eBay.

International Association of Financial Crimes Investigators stopped a Nigerian money transfer scheme at a Colorado bank, helping prevent losses in the millions.

Nassau County Security/Police Information Network (SPIN) solved serial bank robberies and thefts from gas stations worth more than \$100,000.

Boise Organized Retail Theft/Fraud Prevention and Interdiction Network contributed to early identification and arrest of hundreds of suspects involved in theft, refund fraud, credit card fraud, drug trafficking, vehicle theft, armed robbery, and assault; recovered merchandise valued at several hundred thousand dollars; and disbanded large-scale organized theft rings.

Investigations. LE-PS partnerships have been vital for investigating computer, financial, and intellectual property crimes, as well as many other types of crimes affecting numerous industries. In addition, various partnerships have facilitated installation of closed-circuit television (CCTV) products and systems as an investigative aid in downtown BIDs, special-event venues, shopping malls, and other strategic sites.

All-hazards preparation and response. "All-hazards" partnerships are concerned with natural and manmade disasters as well as crime and terrorism. Partnership members, in addition to law enforcement and private security, include fire and emergency medical services, hospitals, public works, and representatives of other private- and public-sector organizations.¹⁶

Research, policy development, and legislation. Partnership examples in this category include government-supported research and development involving manufacturers of security equipment and research on elements of successful partnerships and associated partnership dynamics. In addition, various partnerships—especially those sponsored by national professional associations and state law enforcement associations—advocate for improved policies and professional standards and for legislative or regulatory changes.

Key Components of LE-PS Partnerships

Successful LE-PS partnerships typically have the following qualities:

Compelling mission. Without a mission to solve a problem or improve a condition that concerns both law enforcement and private security, a partnership will be unable to retain members or attract new ones. Like other thriving organizations, the most successful LE-PS partnerships have leaders who consistently communicate the mission, goals, and objectives to the membership and outside the partnership to other stakeholders and the public.

External support or models for partnership formation. Successful LE-PS partnerships often tap into a range of resources for support and ideas. They review publications and descriptions of various partnership models; attend related conferences; consult with and visit existing partnerships; obtain guidance from ASIS chapters and other associations; seek institutional support from law enforcement agencies and corporations; and explore possibilities for initial and ongoing financial support from outside sources.

Founders, leaders, and facilitators as active enablers. The Operation Partnership study found that leaders of successful LE-PS partnerships have a great deal in common. Regardless of the partnership's purpose and objectives, these leaders do the following:

- Encourage continuity by helping the partnership plan for leadership succession.
- Strive for consensus in decision-making.
- Ensure that partnership members gain immediate benefits. Although preventing and solving crimes may take time, initial benefits include opportunities to network with members who have needed skills and resources, as well as more structured information-sharing activities and training events.
- Serve as "champions of the cause" and are able to communicate and work credibly with people from different environments, including big business, small business, and local, state, and federal law enforcement.
- Attend to both tasks and relationships. In addition to leading such initial tasks as setting goals, recruiting members, and obtaining commitments, successful leaders also take deliberate steps to strengthen relationships among members and between the partnership and other parties.¹⁷

Five Tips for Enhancing an Existing LE-PS Partnership

1. Improve the communication process.
2. Improve the content of the communication.
3. Improve training content.
4. Facilitate personal contacts among the membership.
5. Find out what other LE-PS partnerships are doing.

A lower-profile role than that of founder or leader is that of facilitator, yet this also is an essential partnership component. The facilitator role includes managing such tasks as arranging for meeting space, distributing alerts, producing a newsletter, and handling other partnership business, and may be filled by private security members, law enforcement members, or paid staff.

Effective means of communication. Regular communication builds good working relationships and is another essential component of successful LE-PS partnerships. Many partnerships are taking advantage of advances in electronic communications. Most also meet regularly and emphasize the value of in-person communication, although they also caution that meetings must be purposeful and action-oriented. In addition, some partnerships sponsor conferences or training events to which they extend invitations beyond their membership.

Sustaining structure and resources. Many partnerships function well without formal organizational structures, but key structural elements are still needed: a clearly stated purpose and scope of work; operating and membership guidelines; assignments of responsibility for key tasks; and leadership, including planning ahead for changes in leadership. It also is important to maintain records of the partnership's main activities, training events, and accomplishments (e.g., crimes and incidents prevented and solved) and provide summaries to stakeholders and, if appropriate, the public. This helps members justify to their employers the time they spend on partnership work; helps attract new members; and supports future funding requests for staff or equipment if those become important for meeting objectives or expanding the partnership.

Factors Related to Success and Failure of LE-PS Partnerships

The Operation Partnership team identified many successful partnerships as well as a small number of partnerships that could not obtain adequate membership or experienced other problems that resulted in less success than expected. The lessons learned are summarized below.

Factors Associated with Successful LE-PS Partnerships

- Strong support from organizational leaders
- Shared leadership and power
- Benefits to all participants, especially the exchange of important information
- Acceptance and trust
- Tangible results in crimes prevented or solved
- Sustaining structure and resources
- Publicity and recognition for the partnership

- Flexibility to adapt to changing environments
- Rewards for those responsible for the partnership; assurance that their labors will be considered when promotion and pay issues arise.

Factors Associated with Failed LE-PS Partnerships

- Failure to address or solve joint problems. If no successful work is accomplished, there is little reason to continue the partnership.
- Changes in leadership with no succession plan.
- Inadequate resources, such as the personnel needed to carry out or communicate partnership activities.
- Lack of innovative thinking, which may result in training that lacks appeal to the membership, a failure to conduct meaningful activities or meetings, and an inability to set new goals and retain members after resolving a problem or crisis.

Future Steps

Recommendations for all police chiefs and sheriffs are to actively support an existing LE-PS partnership or assist in forming a new regional partnership, and to consider managers' outreach to the private sector on security matters as a key factor when evaluating their community policing performance. Security directors and managers are encouraged to reach out to their counterparts in law enforcement and explore the potential benefits of collaboration and information sharing.

The COPS Office, other Department of Justice agencies, and the Department of Homeland Security are urged to persist in supporting the LE-PS partnership movement through research, analysis, training, and technical assistance, and to support a national conference that brings together representatives of active LE-PS partnerships to exchange ideas, discuss promising practices, and plan future steps. Such a collaboration of LE-PS partnerships might consider creating a central clearinghouse for best practices, contacts, and technology, permitting LE-PS partnerships around the nation and world to access the clearinghouse rather than reinvent the wheel when developing their own partnerships or web sites.

Selected Partnerships

Listed below are some of the more formally organized, law enforcement-private security (LE-PS) partnerships that were reviewed during the Operation Partnership study. Many of these partnerships have been in operation for 20 years or more.

Anaheim Crime Alert Network (C.A.N.). In the early 1980s, Anaheim (California) Police Department (APD) burglary detectives launched a partnership to address crimes in hotels. Collaborators now include the APD's Tourist Oriented Policing Team and private security members representing all segments of the hospitality industry, with about 50 members participating in monthly meetings and 400 persons attending the C.A.N. annual training conference. anaheimoc.org/Articles/Archive/Webpage101091.asp

Boise Organized Retail Theft/Fraud Prevention and Interdiction Network. During the past 19 years, the Network has contributed to early identification and arrest of hundreds of suspects involved in merchandise refund fraud, credit card fraud, drug trafficking, vehicle theft, armed robbery, and other crimes. Hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of merchandise have been recovered and large-scale organized theft rings disbanded. www.cityofboise.org/Departments/Police/CommunityOutreachDivision/CrimePrevention/index.aspx

Boston Consortium for Higher Education, Public Safety Group. The Boston Consortium, composed of 14 Boston area colleges and universities, encourages collaboration for cost saving and quality improvement across numerous communities of practice, including public safety. Public Safety Group projects have included participation in statewide disaster planning for higher education, training on handling campus protests, and development of a campus police information network. www.boston-consortium.org/about/what_is_tbc.asp

Chicago BOMA (Building Owners and Managers Association) Security Committee. Formed more than 20 years ago by proprietary security directors of large buildings in the Chicago Police Department's First Precinct, the Committee expanded its membership after September 11, 2001, to include employees of contract security firms. Activities include daily fax alerts from the police, an emergency radio alert system, email alerts, and use of CCTV to share photos of suspects. www.boma-chicago.org/about/staff.asp

Dallas LEAPS (Law Enforcement and Private Security) Program. Formed in the 1980s to foster better communication among police and private security, the Dallas Police Department's LEAPS partnership has sponsored numerous training workshops for private security and a fax information distribution network. www.dallaspolice.net

Energy Security Council. Created in 1982 and based in Houston, Texas, the Energy Security Council (ESC) is a nonprofit corporation funded by private-sector members. The ESC Law Enforcement Liaison Committee, composed of ESC members who conduct investigations, works with law enforcement on oilfield theft cases, trains law enforcement on the oil and gas industry, and shares information and intelligence on trends, crime patterns, and suspects. www.energysecuritycouncil.org/index.cfm/MenuItemID/149.htm

Frontline Defense Initiative (FDI) of the Institute for Public Safety Partnerships (IPSP), housed at the University of Illinois, Chicago, is one of about 15 educational programs offered by the IPSP. FDI training is designed specifically for private security, hospitality, and other industries that are in a position to notice potential terrorist activity. www.ipsp.us/trainings.cfm#frontline

Grand Central Partnership (GCP), a business improvement district incorporated in 1988, covers 68 blocks in Midtown Manhattan and employs about 45 uniformed public safety officers, trained by the New York City Police Department (NYPD), who patrol neighborhood streets and may assist the NYPD with investigations. In addition, approximately 15 NYPD officers, with department approval, work with the GCP on their days off. www.grandcentralpartnership.org/what_we_do/protect.asp

Greater Chicago Hotel Loss Prevention Association (GCHLPA). This partnership began in the early 1980s when a few security professionals joined together to address pick-pocketing in a tourist area and is now concerned with virtually any crime committed in or near hotels. Its membership includes 46 hotels, three local police departments, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Secret Service, Department of Homeland Security, and Office of Emergency Management. www.ilssa.org/gchlpa/GCHLPA_Info.htm

Hillsborough County (Florida) Public Safety & Security Partnership. This partnership has addressed auto thefts, graffiti, gang activities, disturbances at nightclubs, and other problems. The sheriff's department has a long history of involvement in community policing and regularly involves community resource deputies at partnership meetings. A founding partner, Critical Intervention Services, has devoted a portion of its web site to partnership concerns. www.safetampabay.org/index.html

Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police, Public & Private Police Liaison Committee (PPPLC). Founded in 1975 with goals related to education, liaison, and legislation, the committee is led by two chairpersons—an active police chief and a private security representative selected by private-sector members of the committee. Activities include homeland security training for private security personnel. www.ilchiefs.org/subpage.asp?pagenumber=46358

InfraGard. This is a partnership between the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and businesses, academic institutions, state and local law enforcement, and others. Founded in 1996, InfraGard has more than 70 chapters nationwide whose purpose is to share and analyze information and intelligence to prevent hostile acts against the United States. www.infragard.net

Michigan Intelligence Operations Center for Homeland Security. This state fusion center's initial activities included developing a business plan for private sector collaboration. All 13 critical infrastructure sectors (utilities, medical, education, automotive industry, etc.) are represented on the advisory board. www.michigan.gov/mioc

Michigan State University (MSU) Critical Incident Protocol—Community Facilitation Program. Developed by the MSU School of Criminal Justice and funded by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, this program's goal is to build public-private partnerships across the nation for critical incident management. The program is now active in 39 communities in 23 states. Activities include joint planning and tabletop and full-scale exercises. www.cip.msu.edu

Minneapolis SafeZone. SafeZone accomplishments include installing CCTV cameras downtown; establishing a common police-private security radio channel; creating a web site that allows its 900 members to share police incident reports, videos and photos, and other information; and delivering training events. Officially launched in 2005, the Minneapolis SafeZone partnership won a community policing award from the International Association of Chiefs of Police. www.mplssafezone.org

Nassau County SPIN (Security/Police Information Network). Started by the Nassau County (New York) Police Department in 2004, SPIN has a membership of some 1,600 businesses, trade associations, civic associations, government agencies, hospitals, utilities, and others. Information is shared within SPIN primarily by e-mail, as well as through text messaging and meetings. www.police.co.nassau.ny.us/SPIN/spininfo.htm

Overseas Security Advisory Council (OSAC). OSAC is a Federal Advisory Committee, a highly structured partnership involving the U.S. Department of State, federal law enforcement, numerous corporations doing business overseas, and academia. OSAC has a 34-member core council, an executive office, and more than 100 country councils. www.osac.gov/About/index.cfm

Philadelphia Center City District (CCD). A business improvement district with a long history of public/private cooperation, the CCD has private security officers (called community service representatives) who work closely with Philadelphia Police Department officers daily. In addition, the Philadelphia Crime Prevention Council, created by the CCD in 1997, has expanded over the years and now devotes about half of its efforts to homeland security and disaster preparedness issues. www.centercityphila.org/about/Safe.php

Southeast Wisconsin Homeland Security Partnership, Inc. This nonprofit organization was formed in 2004, serves seven southeast Wisconsin counties, and has more than 200 members. The partnership tests and validates responses to homeland security threats and major disasters; works to develop cost-effective policy and technology solutions; and has facilitated resource sharing (e.g., equipment, expertise). www.swhsp.org

Southeast Transportation Security Council. This corporate security-law enforcement partnership was formed in 2002 to facilitate prevention and recovery of stolen cargo in the transportation industry. In addition to operating several task forces, the Council operates a blast fax system reaching about 200 law enforcement agencies, provides member access to the Georgia Cargo Theft Alert System, and offers POST-certified training. www.setsc.org/home.html

Target & BLUE. This program of the Target Corporation includes many efforts to collaborate with and support law enforcement agencies across the country by providing grants, materials, expertise, information, forensic services, and investigative support. In 2007, Target received the FBI Director's Community Leadership Award for extraordinary contributions to communities and law enforcement. For more information, contact the Outreach Programs Manager at AP.Community@Target.com.

U.S. Secret Service Electronic Crimes Task Forces and Working Groups. This is a nationwide network of 24 task forces that involves federal, state, and local law enforcement, private industry, and academia in preventing and investigating attacks on the nation's financial and other critical infrastructures. Although the task forces differ somewhat in areas of emphasis and other characteristics, priorities include crimes involving significant economic impact, organized criminal groups, and schemes using new technologies. www.secretservice.gov/ectf.shtml

Washington Law Enforcement Executive Forum (WLEEF). Founded in 1980 by the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, WLEEF is one of the longest-lived LE-PS partnerships in the nation. WLEEF has sponsored numerous legislative, training, information sharing, and other initiatives. www.waspc.org/index.php?c=Law%20Enforcement%20Executive%20Forum

Wilmington Downtown Visions. This business improvement district sponsors public safety initiatives that include deployment of private-security personnel (community resource officers); use of CCTV cameras at strategic locations; and in cooperation with the Wilmington Police Department, a new "bridge program" to help prepare individuals for law enforcement careers. www.downtownvisions.org/safety-division/bridge-program

Endnotes

1. The summit, which included more than 140 executive-level experts and practitioners in law enforcement, government, private security, and academia, was cosponsored by the COPS Office and the IACP. See National Policy Summit: Building Private Security/Public Policing Partnerships to Prevent and Respond to Terrorism and Public Disorder, 2004. www.cops.usdoj.gov/ric/ResourceDetail.aspx?RID=246
2. See Operation Cooperation: Guidelines for Partnerships between Law Enforcement & Private Security Organizations, Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2000. www.ilj.org/publications/docs/Operation_Cooperation.pdf
3. The 9/11 Commission, Final Report, Official Government Edition, U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004.
4. Operation Partnership was conducted by the Law Enforcement-Private Security Consortium. The Consortium is composed of the Institute for Law and Justice (ILJ), Hallcrest Systems, Inc., Ohlhausen Research, Inc., and SECTA LLC. Support throughout the project was provided by ASIS International and its Law Enforcement Liaison Council and the Private Sector Liaison Committee of the IACP.
5. From 2000 to 2004, the number of sworn police nationwide increased by only 1 percent; and the number of sworn officers decreased in 20 of the nation's 50 largest police departments. See Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin: Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, 2004, June 2007.
6. Intellectual property crimes include the counterfeiting or pirating of goods for sale—not only items like fake designer watches but also potentially toxic items like medicines.
7. See Intelligence-Led Policing: The New Intelligence Architecture, U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2005. www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/bja/210681.pdf
8. See *National Policy Summit*, 13, "What Would Help Eliminate the Obstacles to Cooperation?"
9. ASIS International recognizes at least 34 specialty security career areas. See *Career Opportunities in Security*, www.asisonline.org/careercenter/careers2005.pdf.
10. Woska, William J., "Police Officer Recruitment: A Public Sector Crisis," *The Police Chief*, October 2006.
11. In the 1980s, only a few formal cooperative programs existed. By contrast, Operation Partnership uncovered more than 450 LE-PS partnerships.
12. Spending and employment are significantly greater in the private security field than in the law enforcement field. The number of private security employees in the U.S. is unknown but is estimated at more than 2 million, compared to fewer than 732,000 local and state law enforcement officers.
13. In one recent survey, both law enforcement and private security respondents gave the other field much higher satisfaction ratings than in the past. See *ASIS Foundation Security Report: Scope and Emerging Trends*, Alexandria, Virginia: ASIS Foundation, 2004.
14. ASIS International has found that more than 100 U.S. institutions of higher education offer security degree programs. See www.asisonline.org/education/universityPrograms/traditionalprograms.pdf.
15. For numerous detailed examples of partnerships to improve safety at major special events, see Connors, Edward. *Planning and Managing Security for Major Special Events: Guidelines for Law Enforcement*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, March 2007. www.cops.usdoj.gov/ric/ResourceDetail.aspx?RID=441
16. Examples include partnerships supported by Michigan State University's Critical Incident Protocol (CIP) Community Facilitation Program, which (as of June 2008) has been initiated in 39 communities in 23 states. www.cip.msu.edu
17. See Gratton, Lynda, and Tamara J. Erickson, "8 Ways to Build Collaborative Teams," *Harvard Business Review*, November 2007, 102.



The Executive Summary of **Operation Partnership: Trends and Practices in Law Enforcement and Private Security Collaboration** is an overview of the full report, which is intended to help law enforcement and private security organizations develop and operate effective partnerships to address issues of mutual concern. The Executive Summary synthesizes the key trends, challenges, benefits, and forms and types of partnerships between law enforcement and private security.



U. S. Department of Justice
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
1100 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20530

To obtain details about COPS Office programs, call the COPS Office Response Center at 800.421.6770.

Visit COPS Online at www.cops.usdoj.gov.

e08094224