

EXTRACT FROM THE CONSULTANTS REPORT DISTRIBUTED IN MARCH 2007.

Scenario and Description	Advantages and disadvantages	Estimated Annual Cost
<p>1. Outsourced option that currently services the City of Joondalup</p> <p><u>1.1 Matching Existing Service Levels</u> City Watch patrols provided by contractor. Ranger and management services provided in house as at present.</p>	<p><i>Advantages</i> Relative cost – this option appears to be the most cost effective for the level of service required. Flexibility - ability to stop service provision at contract end without significant costs. Reduced administrative cost to the City in terms of managing staff, training, recruiting, dealing with absenteeism, etc.</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i> 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. Existing Management/Rangers \$1.03M, total \$2.78M</p>
<p><u>1.2 Minimal Patrol Service Levels</u> 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> As per 1.1 City arguably over serviced at present. Reduces involvement in an activity traditionally peripheral to local government services. Funds 'freed up' could be channelled into more targeted crime preventative measures.</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i> As per 1.1</p>	<p>City Watch \$1.2M. Existing Management/Rangers \$1.03M, total \$2.23M pa</p>

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

<p>3. In- house provision of Security services that are shared between adjacent local authorities.</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 \$2.75M pa, Existing Management/ Rangers \$1.03M, total \$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>4. In-house provision whereby Security and Ranger services are combined.</p> <p><u>4.1 Matching Existing Service Levels</u> City directly employs staff to provide both patrol and Ranger services to the service levels presently provided.</p>	<p><i>Advantages</i> Access to a larger pool of staff. Able to be more flexible with rosters. Staff able to deal with a greater variety of situations. Easier for directly employed staff to access other City facilities and resources if required</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i> Cost – this is the most expensive option. City previously separated Patrols and Rangers (May 2000) to ensure focus on separate activities. Potential for industrial unrest from existing staff, leading to additional turnover, reductions in service reliability and quality, and/or additional cost to City. Need for higher training levels Difficulty in recruiting sufficient numbers of qualified staff from limited pool. Could result in under utilised equipment. Dilution of focus for both Ranger and Patrol activities.</p>	<p>\$3.81M - \$4.10M (Depending on Levels used for staff)</p>
<p><u>4.2 Provide services to a Level Within Existing Budget</u> City directly employs staff to provide both patrol and Ranger services. Service levels are determined by the existing budget.</p>	<p><i>Advantages</i> As per 4.1 No additional cost Allows the City to focus on a 'core' local government activity while still maintaining some Patrol service</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i> As per 4.1 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>5. Ward or region based Rangers 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> Having staff based in one area allows them to get more localised knowledge. Provides additional Ranger resources. Removal of Patrol Service focus allows staff to concentrate on 'core' local government functions.</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i> Wards are primarily based on the numbers of electors which may not be an appropriate basis on which to assign Ranger resources. 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>6. No Dedicated Patrols 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> 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> 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>

