

**Responses to Survey - Board of Private Security**

Total responses: 48 (of which 3 out-of-state)

<b>Highest Compliment</b>	Ability to monitor on behalf of licensees - 11 Ability to keep profession from criticism because of bad actors - 3 Other: - The Dept of Labor is the only place I can turn to because Securitas USA has a policy called employment at will, which is I am free to end my employment but Securitas may at any time end my employment! -- Board Program Manager is extremely friendly and helpful. -- Communication has improved.			
<b>Biggest Complaint</b>	Licensing fees too high - 28 Licensing renewal timelines too strict - 3 Other:--Just a burden on business, not useful regulation. Adding additional licenses for no good reason. -- Fees have been increased but services have not been improved and licensing has become more complicated. Prefer the old system of handling it locally. -- Total lack of proactive enforcement. -- Renewal fees should not be as high as first time license fee. -- Board's lack of consistency in enforcing rules on all companies and unlicensed individuals. -- As a small security business, it is growing more difficult if not impossible to meet the licensing standards if you need to hire part-time employees. In the past there used to be an exception for security guards that only worked a few days a year Now, that is not allowed and it may be forcing some small business to close up and allowing the larger out-of-state companies to take over. -- What does the board do for Security Officers? -- There is no reason why I should be licensed by the state of Montana. I am an investigator employed by the Federal Defenders of Montana to conduct investigations on behalf of our clients. I do no outside work. I am an employee and not a private contractor. I have been paying fees for 18 years to the state after unsuccessfully challenging the requirement. Montana does not require federal law enforcement agents to be licensed by the state, nor do they require the hundreds of state employees that act as investigators for a variety of departments be licensed by this Board. I think the requirement the Board puts on 4 Federal Defender Investigators to be licensed began as a protest by the individual private investigators on the Board and retaliation for what they perceived as an agency that may take away business from them. If this Board continues to require us to pay the fees then they should also force all other city, county, state, and federal investigators to pay as well. I am an employee of an agency that is more than capable of monitoring my work and taking steps to correct any problems that may occur. I also have insurance through my office yet each year am required to prove I have coverage. -- Not being able to see what the licensing fees are used for. -- In my opinion the board wastes money on redundant services. They run background checks on applicants when the security company already has. -- I am unable to understand why it takes so long the get a security license and what the licensing fees are used for. -- Not being able to get the Guards a license in a timely manner and not being able to get the card until they have training.			
<b>Public Health -</b>	<b>Public Welfare - 5</b>	<b>Public Safety - 15</b>	<b>None of these - 17</b>	<b>All or combination - 10</b>
<b>Scope of Practice:</b>	<b>Too Narrow - 6</b>	<b>Too Broad - 9</b>		<b>Just Right - 26</b>

**Problems with own or other professions' scope of practice** - None with own profession =

-- **Comment regarding too broad a scope:** -- Private investigation work is so broad that it would be very difficult for a board to monitor the activities of an individual investigator. If an investigator is not good at their job or is unethical, that is handled by either the free market (will not be hired by attorneys or private parties) or a judge (if work on a case is unethical or illegal). -- Only security-related business should be encompassed in its own area not grouped with other fields.

-- **Comments regarding too narrow a scope:** -- In my opinion the board stifles new security companies. -- We need to ensure some room for growth within our profession, which could attract a higher caliber of employee. -- The scope of our profession was created to provide funding for the board. (part omitted). These expansions are not for the good of Montana but for the good of the employees of the board. -- Virtually every other state has the right to sub-serve legal papers, allowing us to serve any resident over the age of 16, or thereabouts. We need that in Montana. The greatest danger to us process servers is returning to the service address, after they know we will be coming back.

-- **Comments regarding just right scope:** I have seen the Private Security board in action and have the highest respect for the previous members. Sheriff Leo Dutton and Police Capt. Brian Lockerby come to mind. Also the professionalism of the Attorney assigned in 2007 was wonderful. Thank you for your service. -- I say just right but it needs some tweaking. Some of the statutes that we deal with are a very gray area and we would like to look to the board for help in certain areas, such as in the area of trespass.

**What laws/regulations have caused the most problems?** None =

Continuing education is a joke as conducted by the board and is a waste of my time. -- Pending decision on the amount of training required prior to a Guard License being issued. -- The 300% increase in annual licence fee from 2010. -- When licensing for process servers was taken care of by the district courts I was considered a real person with a name. Now I am nothing more than a number on a computer whose only significance is to direct deposit money into the state coffers. You cannot convince me that removing personal interaction with those that are licensed will help you "monitor" them.-- I believe the yearly fee paid by us is a fair amount. Unfortunately, the company I work for will not follow the prevailing wage guidelines and it is difficult to find the money in my household budget raising two children. -- Doubling of licensing fees and the vagueness of our current training requirements. -- Professionalism due to the board not dealing with unlicensed companies and individuals in a timely manner. Letting a company and an individual slide for 21/2 years or better while dealing with others almost immediately, seems a little one sided and prejudicial. - Inability to place a license on hold. -- Licensing fees and the inability to have a security guard work spot events without having to pay a large licensing fee and now the possibility of required and mandatory training will make it nearly impossible for a small business owner to hire a large amount of security personnel for large events. If you are looking at having to license 40-50 people to work one large event per year it is impossible to meet the requirements set by the Board of Private Security. I understand the need for regulation however, there needs to be different categories of licensing within the Board of Private Security or the definition of security guard needs to be changed. -- Carrying the liability insurance even if not practicing. These are pretty tough economic times and carrying a \$1,000-a-year insurance policy when not working is a financial hardship.-- Requirements for training with out spelling out what training shall be required. When creating legislation with such open interpretation, it create a sense of am I doing too much just to cover me legally or have I not done enough.

**Consumer complaint filed?**

No = 41

Yes = 3 Board was not effective = 2 (1) Unlicensed, but practicing Security Officers with other companies (2) Told to file a complaint with the Department of Labor and Industry over prevailing wage rate issue but concerned for loss of job.  
Board was effective = 1, but long process.

**Nonlicensee comments**

Saying Board of Private Security:  
Necessary for Public Health - 81, Public Safety - 120, Public Welfare - 91. Some respondents marked all or a combination.