

## EXTRACT FROM THE CONSULTANTS REPORT DISTRIBUTED IN MARCH 2007.

| Scenario and Description   | Advantages and disadvantages   | Estimated Annual Cost   |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>1. Outsourced option that currently services the City of Joondalup</b></p> <p><u>1.1 Matching Existing Service Levels</u><br/>City Watch patrols provided by contractor. Ranger and management services provided in house as at present.</p> | <p><i>Advantages</i><br/>Relative cost – this option appears to be the most cost effective for the level of service required.<br/>Flexibility - ability to stop service provision at contract end without significant costs.<br/>Reduced administrative cost to the City in terms of managing staff, training, recruiting, dealing with absenteeism, etc.</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i><br/>Service enhancements require contract revisions. It is unlikely that the reductions in cost will be directly commensurate with reductions in man hours of service provided.</p> <p>Improvements to service constrained by possible concerns over direct access to City held information about complaint histories and property information by external contractor.</p> | <p>City Watch \$1.75M.<br/>Existing Management/Rangers \$1.03M, total \$2.78M</p> |
| <p><u>1.2 Minimal Patrol Service Levels</u><br/>Ranger and management services provided in house, City Watch patrols provided by contractor, but to a reduced level below that provided at present.</p>  | <p><i>Advantages</i><br/>As per 1.1<br/>City arguably over serviced at present.<br/>Reduces involvement in an activity traditionally peripheral to local government services.<br/>Funds 'freed up' could be channelled into more targeted crime preventative measures.</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i><br/>As per 1.1</p>  | <p>City Watch \$1.2M. Existing Management/Rangers \$1.03M, total \$2.23M pa</p>   |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>2. In-house provision of Security services separate from the Rangers service.</b></p> <p><u>2.1 Matching Existing Service Levels</u><br/>City directly employs Patrols staff to provide exactly the same level of service as Existing (1.1). Rangers remain 'as is'.</p> | <p><i>Advantages</i><br/>Introduction of service adjustments or enhancements is (arguably) easier, particularly concerns over access to property information by an external contractor.<br/>Police may feel more comfortable in liaison with City employees rather than contractors<br/>Could provide a pool of staff to draw on for Ranger work if required.<br/>Potentially more flexibility with staff arrangements and not having to consider contractual obligations.<br/>Separate Ranger/City Watch functions maintain focus of each area.<br/>Direct control of personnel providing the service.</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i><br/>Increased cost for no additional service or range of activity.<br/>Reduction in service level from existing</p> | <p>City Watch<br/>\$2.70M,<br/>Existing<br/>Management/<br/>Rangers<br/>\$1.03M, total<br/>\$3.73M pa</p> |
| <p><u>2.2 Patrol Services to a Level Within Existing Budget</u><br/>City directly employs Patrol staff to provide a level of service that can be accommodated within the existing City Watch budget.</p>   | <p><i>Advantages</i><br/>As per 2.1</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i><br/>Reduced man hours of service.<br/>Focus still on patrols.<br/>No scope for additional enhancements without increased costs.</p>   | <p>As per 1.1</p>   |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>3. In- house provision of Security services that are shared between adjacent local authorities.</b></p> <p><u>3.1 Matching Existing Service Levels</u></p> <p>An adjoining local government provides a Patrol service to Joondalup using directly employed staff to existing service levels.</p> | <p><i>Advantages</i></p> <p>Sharing of 'intelligence' across local government boundaries.</p> <p>Able to spread overhead costs over a larger number of ratepayers.</p> <p>City of Stirling has existing day to day management expertise, including automated call routing and data collection.</p> <p>Potential to integrate systems and policies over time.</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i></p> <p>What's in it for the other Local Government?</p> <p>Additional cost.</p> <p>Dual management and reporting responsibilities – eg need to keep track of two sets of data, organised by local government.</p> <p>Differing service levels to be managed.</p> <p>Differing ways of dealing with issues may require dual systems and training (eg graffiti reports).</p> <p>Cost to integrate systems and policies over time.</p> | <p>City Watch<br/>\$2.75M pa,<br/>Existing<br/>Management/<br/>Rangers<br/>\$1.03M, total<br/>\$3.78M pa</p> |
| <p><u>3.2 Patrol Services to a Level Within Existing Budget</u></p> <p>An adjoining local government provides a Patrol service to Joondalup using directly employed staff to a level determined by the existing budget</p>   | <p><i>Advantages</i></p> <p>As per 3.1</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i></p> <p>As per 3.1, but no additional cost.</p> <p>Reduced man hours of service.</p> <p>Focus still on patrols.</p> <p>No scope for additional enhancements without increased costs</p>  | <p>As per 1.1</p>  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p><b>4. In-house provision whereby Security and Ranger services are combined.</b></p> <p><u>4.1 Matching Existing Service Levels</u><br/>City directly employs staff to provide both patrol and Ranger services to the service levels presently provided.</p> | <p><i>Advantages</i><br/>Access to a larger pool of staff.<br/>Able to be more flexible with rosters.<br/>Staff able to deal with a greater variety of situations.<br/>Easier for directly employed staff to access other City facilities and resources if required</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i><br/>Cost – this is the most expensive option.<br/>City previously separated Patrols and Rangers (May 2000) to ensure focus on separate activities.<br/>Potential for industrial unrest from existing staff, leading to additional turnover, reductions in service reliability and quality, and/or additional cost to City.<br/>Need for higher training levels<br/>Difficulty in recruiting sufficient numbers of qualified staff from limited pool.<br/>Could result in under utilised equipment.<br/>Dilution of focus for both Ranger and Patrol activities.</p> | <p>\$3.81M - \$4.10M<br/>(Depending on Levels used for staff)</p>                        |
| <p><u>4.2 Provide services to a Level Within Existing Budget</u><br/>City directly employs staff to provide both patrol and Ranger services. Service levels are determined by the existing budget.</p>   | <p><i>Advantages</i><br/>As per 4.1<br/>No additional cost<br/>Allows the City to focus on a 'core' local government activity while still maintaining some Patrol service</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i><br/>As per 4.1<br/>Reduction in Security Patrol service levels for no reduction in cost</p>   | <p>Additional \$0.32M in Year 1, then as per 1.1 (Existing). Total \$3.01M in Year 1</p> |
| <p><b>5. Ward or region based Rangers</b><br/>The current security patrols service is discontinued, and an additional 6 Rangers employed and assigned to each Ward or a region of the City; the remainder act as 'floaters'.</p>                               | <p><i>Advantages</i><br/>Having staff based in one area allows them to get more localised knowledge.<br/>Provides additional Ranger resources.<br/>Removal of Patrol Service focus allows staff to concentrate on 'core' local government functions.</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i><br/>Wards are primarily based on the numbers of electors which may not be an appropriate basis on which to assign Ranger resources.<br/>Operational difficulties in assigning workloads</p>  | <p>\$2.31M</p>   |

|   |  |                |
|---|--|----------------|
|   | <p>between Ward and floating Rangers – care to ensure one or the other is not under/over loaded.</p> <p>Operational difficulties in determining who is responsible for dealing with particular issues that may arise – ‘Ward’ or floating Ranger.</p> <p>Tendency for Elected Members to get involved in day to day operational management issues if they want to contact ‘their’ Ranger direct.</p>   |                |
| <p><b>6. No Dedicated Patrols</b><br/>The security Patrols service is discontinued altogether. Some of the present activities are undertaken by existing departments of the City.</p> | <p><i>Advantages (of retaining the Patrol Service)</i><br/>Council operated security patrols give greater local level control over resource allocation – where, how often.</p> <p>Councils can contract service providers without the political or Union related objections that the State would face if it were to chose to do so (ie - employ Police not security guards)</p> <p>Patrol services should be provided and funded by local governments because the State can or will not.</p> <p>Community confidence is increased by a locally provided service that can be readily accessed.</p> <p>A greater protection of property under the City’s care, control and management is given</p> <p>Council provided Patrol services act as a deterrent to low level crimes such as graffiti and vandalism that affect both Council and other agency property such as traffic signs, power poles, bridges and railway facilities.</p> <p>Funds freed up could be applied to more worthy issues and projects before the City.</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i><br/>Policing work is best dealt with by State level agencies who have the expertise and greater depth of resources.</p> <p>There is no demonstrable relationship between Council operated security patrol patrols and crime levels.</p> <p>Patrol staff have no powers of arrest and can act as observers only.</p> <p>Local governments cannot develop the scale and depth of expertise required to deal with a complex issue such as crime and its prevention - 6 patrol cars on the streets of a City containing 58,000 properties arguably has little or no influence on the crime levels.</p> <p>Arguably, better value for money can be obtained by putting scarce resources into other ‘core’ local government projects.</p> <p>Patrol type services do not address causes of serious crime.</p> | <p>\$1.33M</p> |

