



July 19, 2010

Honorable Dave Jones  
California State Assembly  
State Capitol, Room 6005  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Assemblyman Jones:

On behalf of the California Association of Licensed Security, Agencies, Guards & Associates (CALSAGA), I am writing to express our opposition to your Assembly Bill 2626. AB 2626 would expand the duties of a security officer employed by the Sheriff of Sacramento County to include the security and protection of the property of an entity whose primary business supports national defense, or whose facility is qualified as national critical infrastructure, or who stores or manufactures material that, if compromised, would compromise national security or pose a danger to residents of the County of Sacramento

CALSAGA is the only trade association in California representing the private security industry, with nearly 300 member companies that employ roughly 60,000 security officers in the State. With strong support from the Legislature in recent years, California has made major strides in professionalizing private security, mandating DOJ and FBI background checks prior to security officers going to work, dramatically increasing the training requirement for these officers and requiring private and proprietary security employers to register with the State.

Because of this, private security is increasingly being called upon to protect some of California's most critical infrastructure sites, including oil refineries, high-rise buildings, chemical facilities and sports and entertainment venues.

We feel that AB 2626 is bad public policy because the perception that utilizing the Sheriff's public security officers brings some greater authority to the facility protection. Furthermore, a security officer employed by the Sheriff of Sacramento County is trained under California Penal Code 832, which is inherently different from the training curriculum that private security officers are required to complete under California Business and Professions Code 7583.6.

PC 832 does not require fundamental security officer training such as, weapons of mass destruction, access control and hazmat awareness, to name a few. In fact, the Bureau of Security & Investigative Services has already opined that a private security officer can not use PC 832 training in place of the private security training requirement under BPC 7583.6.

The roles of a security officer protecting a facility are inherently different from those of a peace officer, or even a security officer trained under public law enforcement authority. To place the two in competition with each other creates perceptions, not always accurate, that they are the same and that one would have greater authority in the eyes of the law. For these reasons, we oppose your legislation.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Roy A. Rahn". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Roy A. Rahn  
President

Cc: Senate Committee on Public Safety

Members of the California State Senate  
**California Association of Licensed Security Agencies, Guards & Associates**  
915 L Street, # C251 / Sacramento, CA 95814 P 916-930-0552 / 866-310-2551 F 916-930-0702  
www.calsaga.org / info@calsaga.org