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ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

INTEGRATING PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS INTO PUBLIC SAFETY:
THE SAN DIEGO ORGANIZED RETAIL CRIME ALLIANCE, A CASE STUDY

By
David Matthew Iorillo
American Public University
Charles Town, West Virginia

Dr. Joseph Molyneux, Thesis Professor

The public safety industry is spread across a broad network of law enforcement, prosecution and incarceration agencies and programs that work to reduce crime at each level. In today’s economic and political environment, law enforcement agencies across the country are facing stricter budget and staffing models that have a profound effect on their ability to police neighborhoods and reduce crime. Private sector industries such as retail loss prevention, facility and private security corporations and financial organizations conduct investigations and implement crime reduction programs that mirror the efforts of law enforcement. Through the creation and utilization of partnerships between law enforcement and strategic private sector industries, crime can be reduced and the overall costs of combating crime can be shared among multiple resources. The reductions in budget and staffing make it an absolute necessity for law enforcement to look outside of traditional partnerships and bridge the gap better law enforcement and the private sector.
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Chapter I: Introduction

The purpose of this research paper is to identify what constitutes public-private partnerships and how they can be used to reduce crime, increase investigation efficiency and assist in ongoing budget reductions. Private business entities that are constantly victimized by criminals are actively seeking out law enforcement agencies that are willing to work with them. Many industries already have budgets and staffing resources in place that can be used as a ‘force multiplier’ for law enforcement. If law enforcement agencies (LEA) fail to partner with these industries, there will continue to be drastic budgetary constraints that will make providing basic police services increasingly restrictive (“the impact of”, 2011).

Beginning in 2007, I began working as a police detective investigating crimes that occurred in the downtown division of San Diego, California. This division is comprised of residential, commercial and hospitality properties that converge in the epicenter of the 9th largest city in the United States. A major urban shopping center is centrally located and was, as most shopping centers are, plagued by theft, fraud and robbery related crimes. In the early part of 2008, I was assigned three (3) shoplifting cases when another detective was transferred to a different assignment. These three cases would be my introduction to a type of organized crime I came to know as ‘organized retail crime’ (ORC).

The National Retail Federation (NRF) is a retail trade association that represents retailers and chain restaurants from the United States and over 45 countries abroad (National Retail Federation, 2012). As the trade association for retailers, the National
Retail Federation conducts an annual survey of its members to track shoplifting and fraud incidents. Through this survey, the NRF reports organized retail crime activity is an estimated $20 Billion dollar issue effecting domestic United States business. As these businesses are affected with the losses and costs associated with being victimized by organized retail crime, these costs are passed on to the consumer.

In addition to the business related costs, local and state jurisdictions are directly impacted by organized retail crime and those losses as they affect consumers. An easy way to consider the basic upfront loss to law enforcement agencies that serve the areas affected by retail crime activity would be to consider the substantial sales tax revenue from these thefts. According to the Forbes.com article ‘Average U.S. Sales Tax Rate Drops—A little’, the average sales tax rate in the United States is currently 9.6 percent (Barrett, 2012). If you consider just half of the suspected financial loss to business from ORC activity as $10 Billion annually, the loss in sales tax revenue would be approximately $960 million annually across the United States.

The three cases I began working in 2008, blossomed to show a persistent criminal presence in San Diego that was conducting high-end shoplifting and fraud crimes across the entire county. The suspects responsible for these three cases of ‘simple shoplifting’ were ultimately found complicit in over 150 documented cases of shoplifting with a combined estimated loss in excess of $1.2 million. Throughout the investigation into this organized crime crew, I was repeatedly introduced to other detectives and Investigators from every law enforcement agency represented in the county. As extensive as this crew was, they had conducted thefts and subsequently cost each city, tens of thousands in
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potential tax review, lost law enforcement response and investigations time and resources and victimized large and small business. Considering the average sales tax rate in San Diego County is 10%, the theft from this one crew alone cost $120,000 in lost tax revenue, as well as unreported expenses associated with the police response and investigation of these cases and this crew. It is reasonable to consider the overall financial and staffing impact and burden placed on city and law enforcement management.

Chapter II: Literature Review

Organized Retail Crime (ORC) Defined

In order to understand the scope of organized retail crime as a crime and social welfare issue, it is important to understand what constitutes organized retail crime. In their annual ‘Organized Retail Crime Survey: 2012’, the National Retail Federation defines organized retail crime as:

The theft/fraudulent activity conducted with the intent to convert illegally obtained merchandise, cargo, cash or cash equivalent into financial gain (no personal use), typically through their online or offline sales. Organized retail crime typically involves a criminal enterprise that organizes large-scale thefts from a number of retail stores and employs a fencing operation to sell the illegally-obtained goods for financial gain. It should be distinguished from “shoplifting,” which is typically a theft by a single individual of a small number of goods for personal use. (p. 6)
The National Retail Federation continues by highlighting the extent to which retailers are affected by organized retail crime, reporting that 96% of survey respondents indicated their company had been a victim of organized retail crime (NRF, 2012). This covers the majority of respondents and shows a slight increase over the previous year of 94.5%. Additionally, 87.7% of the respondents indicated they felt organized retail crime activity had increased over the past three years of the survey (NRF, 2012).

The Organized Retail Crime Act of 2008 goes on to point out a major feature of ORC is the act of ‘acquiring retail merchandise by illegal means for the purposes of reselling the items’ (Organized Retail Crime Act, 2008). The element related to the theft or fraud being conducted in order to later profit from the act is an important distinction which separates organized retail crime from the traditional concept of ‘shoplifting’. It is important to understand that organized retail crime is more than just the opportunistic
thief who steals from the inattentive employee or the teenager who steals the latest video game because they cannot afford to buy it. Walter Palmer and Chris Richardson write in the ASIS Foundation report of 2009, ‘Organized Retail Crime: Assessing the Risk and Developing Effective Strategies’ that regardless of how any individual business defines organized retail crime, at least one of the following four basic elements need to be present:

1. Theft from a retail establishment in quantities that would not normally be used for personal consumption.

2. Reselling large quantities of stolen items to be re-entered into the marketplace (through selling the items back to vendors, or selling the items through either traditional fencing operations or through online platforms)

3. Receiving, concealing, transporting, or disposing of stolen items in quantities not normally used for personal consumption.

4. Coordinating, organizing, or recruiting to commit the above offenses. (pg. 4)

This Organized Retail Crime Survey of 2012 diagram illustrates the concepts from the CRISP report in its most basic form:
In whatever way companies, loss prevention programs or law enforcement agencies go about defining organized retail crime, the issue remains that it involves complexity, organization and sophistication which requires an equally coordinated and extensive response.

**Economic Impact of Organized Retail Crime on States:**

Although the estimated business losses attributed to organized retail crime activity are clearly in the billions of dollars, the exact number cannot be accurately estimated based on the discrepancies related to the reporting of incidents by both retailers and law enforcement. There is currently no standard across the retail or business communities on when a case is reported to law enforcement and what actions might take place to further prosecution of organized retail crime. Additionally, the abilities and areas of responsibility vary across the loss prevention community. Some retail loss prevention
programs are prioritized toward internal theft and fraud, over organized retail crime. As these retailers are likely to be victimized, there is no way to accurately record the losses. At the same time, there is currently no state or federal standard in place to document what constitutes organized retail crime. Law enforcement agencies do not have any national standard or protocol related to investigating or reporting organized retail crime. Additionally, the dollar amounts which constitute felony levels of theft vary across the United States, with very little uniformity.

As there is an extreme range in dollar amounts that will allow a law enforcement agency to arrest and then a prosecutorial agency to charge for a felony theft. Virginia has the low of $200 in order to charge a shoplifter or organized retail theft crew with a felony. On the high end of the spectrum is Wisconsin, which will not allow a felony theft until $2,500 worth of merchandise has been stolen. Having such a large range of charging levels makes it extremely difficult for police agencies from different states to coordinate large conspiracy cases. Organized crews and individual thieves learn quickly what they can steal in order to stay within the threshold of a misdemeanor, knowing that they stand to face smaller fines, sentencing and potential incarceration. The following table shows the dramatic range in dollar amounts from state to state for categorizing a felony theft, as reported in the Congressional Research Service report of 2010, by Kristin Finklea, ‘Organized Retail Crime’.
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### State Felony Theft Levels (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Felony Theft Level (in dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana (a)</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (b)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(a) In Indiana, theft is always a Class D felony, regardless of amount.

(b) The federal law addressing theft does not criminalize theft itself, but rather prohibits the transportation of stolen goods across state lines (18 U.S.C. § 2314) as well as the sale or receipt of these goods (18 U.S.C. §2315).

Source: CRS presentation of data provided by Frank Muscato, Walgreens ORC Investigations Supervisor, November 9, 2009.

Table 1-- Felony Theft dollar levels by state
The economic impact on retailers and government tax coffers is quite high and ultimately trickles down to the consumer who pays a higher price for their products and services, as well as citizens within a community who lose out on services from the city due to lost tax revenue. Of the 46 states that have a sales tax in place, the estimated lost revenue associated with organized retail crime averages over $1.6 billion each year (Organized Retail Theft Prevention, 2007). Figures vary from state to state based on average annual sales within the retail, trade and food services industry, sales tax rate and % of annual retail sales. Table 2 illustrates the figures for the year 2009, as reported by the Food Marketing Institute (Food Marketing Institute, 2013, “Organized Retail Crime”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Annual Sales - Retail Trade and Food Services (2009)</th>
<th>State % of Annual Retail Sales</th>
<th>Est. Amount of Stolen Merchandise Attributed to ORC (by State)</th>
<th>State Sales Tax Rates</th>
<th>Est. Lost Sales Tax Revenue Attributed to ORC (by State)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>$4,320,920,742,646</td>
<td>$30,000,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,695,997,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$65,008,159,844</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>$451,349,356</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>$18,053,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$93,052,595,234</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>$646,060,880</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>$42,640,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$38,330,197,315</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>$266,125,205</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$15,967,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$519,572,073,157</td>
<td>12.02%</td>
<td>$3,607,370,540</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>$270,552,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$75,326,144,250</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
<td>$522,986,757</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>$15,166,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$54,371,639,518</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td>$377,500,371</td>
<td>6.35%</td>
<td>$23,971,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>$6,442,777,339</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>$44,731,975</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$2,683,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$282,927,546,331</td>
<td>6.55%</td>
<td>$1,964,355,955</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$117,861,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$130,324,613,844</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>$904,839,188</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>$36,193,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>$21,625,622,363</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>$150,145,932</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>$6,005,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$21,887,928,410</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>$151,967,113</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$9,118,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>$178,910,455,515</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>$1,242,168,969</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>$77,635,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$85,301,305,055</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>$592,243,946</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>$41,457,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$40,304,570,853</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>$279,833,211</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$16,789,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>$34,823,433,738</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>$241,777,870</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>$15,232,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$54,695,615,324</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
<td>$379,749,724</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$22,784,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$64,295,659,495</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>$446,402,491</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>$17,856,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>$21,638,788,744</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>$150,237,345</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>$7,511,867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Sales Tax Revenue</th>
<th>Crime Rate</th>
<th>Loss Rate</th>
<th>Public Revenue</th>
<th>Crime Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$82,402,100,400</td>
<td>1.91%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$34,326,892</td>
<td>1.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$96,567,108,420</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>$41,903,876</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$128,858,685,148</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>$25,242,147</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$76,968,685,292</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
<td>6.88%</td>
<td>$36,739,372</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$37,955,730,168</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>$18,446,771</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>$86,050,744,105</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
<td>4.23%</td>
<td>$25,242,147</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>$26,964,339,736</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>$10,296,685</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$44,768,400,311</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
<td>$21,291,541</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>$131,206,754,997</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
<td>4.23%</td>
<td>$63,767,470</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$27,656,941,284</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
<td>$9,841,085</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$267,670,577,876</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>$74,337,094</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$128,139,868,648</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$42,259,353</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>$11,602,499,064</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>$4,027,787</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$145,058,724,425</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>$55,392,568</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>$47,207,323,320</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>$14,749,145</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$174,483,292,728</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$72,685,880</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>$13,968,255,187</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>4.75%</td>
<td>$43,509,179</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>$60,305,185,816</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$25,121,806</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>$13,759,492,431</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>$3,821,267</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$89,523,674,250</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>$43,509,179</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$336,509,063,793</td>
<td>7.79%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>$146,023,159</td>
<td>7.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$40,796,456,286</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>$13,312,673</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>$10,471,453,069</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$4,362,176</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$119,784,372,151</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>$33,266,346</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$97,463,755,385</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>$43,684,682</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>$24,338,144,567</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$10,138,733</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$76,251,637,365</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>$26,470,621</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$9,824,004,472</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>$2,728,309</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: States with no state sales tax were omitted (AK, DE, MT, NH, and OR)

Table 2-- 2009 Sales Tax Revenue lost to ORC

Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) defined

These examples of organized retail crime and revenue loss touch across all spectrum of business to include big-box retailers like Target and Wal-Mart, hotels/motels, tourist attractions, tourism and small business owners. Each of these business or service entities have their own programs in place for loss prevention/asset protection which can be effectively coupled with the efforts of ongoing traditional law
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enforcement techniques to combat the costs associated with the investigation of and response to, any type of crime. The effort to combine the public and private efforts is consistent with the creation of public-private partnership (P3) networks (Simeone, 2006).

Public-private partnerships can be defined as law enforcement and ‘non-law enforcement governmental agencies working with private security, service associations and businesses in a collaborative nature toward a common goal’ (Operation partnership, 2009). In order to increase their crime prevention capabilities, while fighting shrinking budgets, law enforcement agencies are turning to partnerships with the private sector (Operation partnership, 2009).

Law enforcement administrators and city management are constantly faced with how to best provide for the delivery of urban services, in particular public safety. The management of budgetary cutbacks and the resulting reductions in staffing and resources make it a constant struggle to meet the increasing demand of policing larger and more interconnected populations (Stewart, 1985).

One of the most important assessments for law enforcement is their ability to provide for the public safety of its citizens while striking the appropriate balance between financial and community accountability (Stewart, 1985). As the economy declines and less people are employed, states raid the financial accounts of cities and counties, who receive reduced tax revenues. Federal government programs are slow to provide adequate secondary funding options and those that do exist are highly sought after and competitive, pitting departments and cities against one another for the limited resources (Busch & Givens, 2012).
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The economics of policing major cities has seen a stark decline in federal funding. Police departments are increasingly seeing the benefits associated with partnering with the private security. These partnerships work to aid law enforcement agencies in crime prevention, while relying on fewer public resources and improved relationships between the public and private sector (Youngs, 2004).

There are distinct benefits to building public-private partnerships for both the government and business entities involved. Through these unique cooperative efforts; resource allocation, technology and specialization advancements can be significant. Businesses have the ability to conduct research and development of technology or production that government does not have the benefit of due to stricter legal requirements or regulation. By reaching out to the private sector, public safety administrators can learn of technological applications that might not have been considered previously for law enforcement, or can assist in adapting military or civilian computer or radio systems into law enforcement applications (Busch & Givens, 2012).

One of the most obvious attractions to introducing and building public-private partnerships is the potential for financial assistance from the private sector. Many businesses have private grant programs through their corporate or non-profit identities that can be utilized by law enforcement for annual costs associated with equipment or project management. In 1994, Project Safe Neighborhoods attempted to encourage participation in their project by providing $300,000 grants to participants (O’Shea, 2007). Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) was a program created by the George W. Bush administration to reduce crime through the aggressive enforcement of existing gun laws.
The enticement of grant money assisted in getting State Attorney’s to implement the program, which worked to reduce gun related crime. The program was supported by the private business association, The National Rifle Association (NRA).

**Origin of public-private partnerships (PPP) within law enforcement**

The origins of public-private partnerships between law enforcement and private security date back to the 1960’s. The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) is an international association which originated in 1893 with the goal to advance the science and art of police services. Many programs which have enhanced the job of policing and police executives can trace their origins to the IACP (Operation partnership, 2009). In 1974, the Private Security Advisory Council of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice formed a committee specifically designed to study law enforcement and private security relationships. Through these Advisory council meetings came the need “to promote increased cooperation and the development of mechanisms to improve working relationships between public law enforcement agencies and the private security industry in their mutual objective of crime prevention” (Private security, 1976).

Community policing is the concept of organizational strategies that supports the system wide use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address issues related to crime prevention. Community oriented policing relies heavily on the ability of law enforcement agencies to build partnerships and solve problems (the impact of, 2011). As community policing has expanded and the use of partnerships has increased; police departments have pushed toward privatizing services traditionally
Integrating public-private partnerships into public service

reserved for law enforcement. In great part, this has been a result of the tightening down of public safety budgets and the willingness of citizens to increase payments or taxes has decreased (Law Enforcement – Private Security Consortium, 2009).

Developing a public-private partnership (PPP):

There are several key components to creating an effective public-private partnership. The leadership of the partnership needs to be represented by all of the stakeholders in the group. A board representing a member from each profession is needed, if the formation of a partnership with law enforcement and private security or loss prevention is going to be successful. Another critical component is having a clear vision and set of goals to accomplish. The vision needs to be clear, motivational and easy to communicate to the members. A collaborative relationship needs to be endorsed by all sides and the goals of the organization should be representative of that relationship. Finally, for any public-private partnership to truly be effective, the leadership of the stakeholders needs to be supportive and endorse the efforts of the partnership. By developing a detailed plan of action, the membership of an alliance and the leaders of the stakeholders can see the intentions of the partnership and be more supportive (Womack, 2013).

Once the basic leadership of partnership comes together and is able to endorse the significance of a partnership, the identification of the key stakeholders becomes the next issue. The identification of the entities most likely willing and able to contribute to any partnership is a vital first step toward building a collaborate alliance, according to the report by ‘Organized Retail Crime: Private Sector and Law Enforcement Collaborate to
Deter and Investigate Theft’, by Eileen Larence (Government Accountability Office, 2011). In building a public-private partnership to combat organized retail crime, Larence identifies three main stakeholder groups: Retailers, State and Local law enforcement and Federal investigative agencies.

The sophistication and magnitude of many of these organized retail crime crews, leads them to develop the ability to both steal and profit from the thefts of merchandise across jurisdictions that state and local law enforcement are limited to. This makes it essential to have federal law enforcement agencies involved to assist in both investigating cases and apprehending fleeing fugitives. Once these partnerships are endorsed by management and stakeholders are identified, the development of these critical important partnerships can begin (Gunter & Kidwell, 2004). An essential step in the process of creating and maintaining any public safety program is a review process. Conducting annual or bi-annual reviews of programs can assist in both gauging the overall effectiveness of a particular program toward addressing the crime or nuisance the program was developed for, but also to assist in keeping the program fresh with new ideas and strategies.

**Chapter III: Hypothesis/Problem Statement:**

1. There is a direct correlation between the reduction of policing budgets and an increase in property related crimes.
2. There is a positive correlation between the introduction of public-private partnerships into law enforcement activities and a reduction in repeat crime in which the partnership is associated with.

3. If law enforcement agencies fail to search out resources from non-traditional sources, they will be unable to keep up with the demands of policing neighborhoods.

4. If private sector businesses want to partner with law enforcement to help reduce their criminal exposure, they need to be willing to provide funding resources to alleviate the burden associated with shrinking public safety budgets.

**Significance of the Study:**

The significantly high financial effect of combating organized retail crime (ORC) has become overwhelming for both the private sector and public sector to combat individually. In order to address the issues associated with policing and reducing a specific crime issue, it becomes necessary to look at all aspects associated with that process.

Each public safety organization is under tremendous pressure to address crime issues with the increasing frequency of reduced budgets, reduced staffing and reduced resources. Police departments are being stretched thin under the weight of these reductions while still having increases in property crime categories. Those property crime categories most often on the rise during economic troubles in a country are: shoplifting, petty and grand theft, cash/credit and gift card fraud, commercial burglaries
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and robberies. Each of these categories of crime can fall under the umbrella of organized retail crime (ORC).

In examining the earlier technical definitions of organized retail crime and looking to explain it in more simpler terms; organized retail crime can be most easily defined as organized crime that falls under retail related businesses. Organized shoplifting, credit and gift card fraud, return fraud and cargo theft are most commonly associated with ORC groups (Thuemer, 2007). Organized crews can include career criminals, opportunistic criminals, gangs and terrorist organizations. As a result, more organized and successful criminal crews to include domestic and international members have increased their participation in ORC activity.

The most common association with shoplifting crews are criminals who comprise a loose network or organization of boosters, fencing operations and middle-men who buy up the stolen merchandise and then re-sell to legitimate vendors. Several different groups that have traditionally not participated in ORC or major theft operations have begun to participate in organized theft due to the potential for high dollar yields and relatively low risk. The sales and trafficking of guns, drugs and prostitutes that have funded cartel, gang and terrorist organizations have a high return on the effort but also carry very stiff penalties if caught. During his Congressional testimony regarding the investigation into terrorism funding, Steven Emerson, Executive Director of the Investigative Project on Terrorism (ITP), identified both traditional and non-traditional conduits for terrorist financing. He specifically states, ‘Recent federal investigations of retail theft rings have resulted in indictments and subsequent arrests of Arab and Muslim criminal enterprises.
Integrating public-private partnerships into public service throughout the country’ (Money Laundering and Terror Financing Issues in the Middle East, 2005).

There are several reasons that retailers and business entities have seen an increase in their victimization under ORC activity. The first is the realization that many organizations do not have an organized or targeted approach to combating ORC activity. Many retailers see loss prevention programs as a ‘necessary evil’ that does not have a specific benefit to the financial bottom line of the business. Corporations and retailers are held accountable to their Board of Directors and stockholders who can potentially see loss prevention or asset protection programs as an unsupported financial cost that affects their bottom line and shareholder dividend.

A second and related issue is the failure of retailers to have an incorporated loss prevention department that is able to effectively work within the organization to reduce both internal and external theft and fraud issues. ORC activities often originate from external crews that target specific retailers due to the demand and popularity of their product. Other retailers are targeted for their unique or cost associated with their product. Regardless of the attraction by the ORC crew, the loss prevention program needs to be able to effectively address the issues and craft a response that is most appropriate. Some retailers set specific restrictions on the ability of loss prevention departments in what they investigate, how they investigate the cases and ultimately what the outcome will be.

Many times retailers will fail to report incidents because they do not meet an internal ‘thresh hold’ value that the retailer has determined to be so costly that it justifies reporting and investigating. Unfortunately this information also gets to those participants
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of ORC crews and they learn what stores are less likely to report theft or ORC activity. These retailers essentially make themselves victims and in essence promote the ORC activity. If retailers failed to allow themselves to be victimized and actively worked to reduce their exposure, ORC activity will be positively affected.

A third reason for the increase in property crime and more specifically organized retail activity increases is the police response. Many departments are struggling with the ability to address chronic crime problems, coupled with the need to focus on their core activities such as responding to calls for service and emergency demands of their citizens. Budgets, staffing and resources are reduced consequently drastically attenuating the effectiveness of policing organizations. Mandates develop or attitudes from police department management are expressed that ‘lesser’ crimes or property crimes are of a lower priority. Officers responding to these calls of shoplifting or fraud related to organized retail crime activity are therefore increasingly less likely to follow up by initiating an active investigation. Additionally, officers are less likely to lend sufficient credibility to the store personnel or loss prevention investigator who relays to the officer the activity was organized and more than just a singular incident. A lack of education on the part of both responding officers and the detectives later assigned to investigate ORC cases do not effectively address the broader conspiracy related charges. Included in this equation is the lack of understanding of the complexity of these cases by the prosecuting agency which leads to reduced sentencing guidelines or dismissal of cases as being minor or trivial in nature.
Combining the shortcomings of the retail industry response to organized retail crime with the limited knowledge and experience by law enforcement related to organized retail crime prosecutions creates a gigantic void in the investigation and prosecution of ORC. The associated profit and products related to ORC is conservatively estimated to be between $10 and $20 Billion dollars (US) in the domestic United States annually. The loss prevention and law enforcement investigators and departments spend tens of thousands of hours annually in responding to, investigating and prosecuting organized retail crime cases. Factor in the millions of dollars annually to employ the professionals associated with investigating loss prevention, asset protection and crime reduction and the numbers become staggering.

As a direct result of loss prevention and law enforcement investigators working together to attempt to address the ORC issues in their respective communities, many Organized Retail Crime Alliances (ORCAs) have developed (Archie, 2013). Currently there are 18 recognized ORCAs throughout the United States that are direct partnerships between the public and private sector that are geared specifically to addressing organized retail crime activity. As of 2013, the understanding of the complexity of the organized retail crime issue has increased by both law enforcement and retail management (Mellor, 2013).

One of the first and most successful programs developed began in San Diego, California in 2008. The San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance (SDORCA) began as a direct result of the extensive amount of ORC activity in the San Diego County region. The annual losses in San Diego that can be attributed to ORC activity is well in
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excess of $10 million dollars (US). This figure is represented by those retailers who report and investigate ORC activity and is not an inclusive figure. The 8 primary law enforcement agencies in the County have all been forced to develop strategies and direct resources toward combating and reducing ORC activity. Through the collaborative nature of the San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance and the fact that all local, state and federal law enforcement agencies and the local, state and federal prosecutorial agencies are participating members of SDORCA, there has been a significant reduction in ORC activity and the associated costs the departments have endured.

The significance of the study and the importance of the related surveys will show the value of an Organized Retail Crime Alliance (ORCA) and how it can effectively reduce both the costs associated with combating ORC and the financial loss the retailers and businesses see in the form of shrinkage. The surveys will be directed toward the membership of the San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance (SDORCA), both representative of the private and public sectors. The survey responses will look to evaluate the effectiveness of a collaborative ORCA on both the overall reduction of organized retail crime activity and evaluating the effectiveness of collaborative relationships between loss prevention and law enforcement. The research and this paper will look to highlight the success and failures of SDORCA and related organizations, how to best develop a program within a community and if there are better alternatives to public-private partnerships.
Definition of Terms

**Crime**- An act committed or omitted in violation of a law forbidding or commanding it and for which punishment is imposed upon conviction. The crimes can include infractions, misdemeanors and felony level offenses with citations, probation or incarceration as punishment (Findlaw.com, 2013).

**Crime Reduction**- the goal of law enforcement to utilize the budget, staffing and resources at its disposal to prevent and reduce crime in a jurisdiction; in order to improve the quality of life and the safety of people. Crime reduction involves a range of activities, to include improving physical security of targets, improving communication with law enforcement and identifying crime trends which pose significant social costs.

**Criminal Justice System**- the accepted system of laws, police, courts and corrections within the United States that is responsible for the creation, implementation and enforcement of codified rules for the purpose of social order and criminal deterrence (Findlaw.com, 2013).

**Deterrence**- A theory that criminal laws are passed with well-defined punishments to discourage individual criminal defendants from becoming repeat offenders and to discourage others in society from engaging in similar criminal activity (McKean & Rasford, 2004).

**Effective**- The effectiveness of crime prevention practices and the integration of public-private partnerships are evaluated on participant perception and measuring reductions in crime categories associated with the focus of the partnership (i.e., organized retail crime)
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Law Enforcement agency- an agency that has been created and empowered to enforce the laws in the United States. The agency can be local, state or federal in its authority; but will have direct responsibility to also implement enforcement policy within the jurisdiction it serves.

Organized Retail Crime- the theft/fraudulent activity conducted with the intent to convert illegally obtained merchandise, cargo, cash or cash equivalent into financial gain, through either online or offline sales. Ordinarily it consists of a criminal enterprise with the intent to shoplift or fraudulently purchase items and then sell these items for financial gain. (National Retail Federation, 2012)

Private Sector- an individual, business or organization, not influenced by government or state controlled, which is part of the economy and provides goods or services for financial gain (Busch & Givens, 2012).

Private Security- both the proprietary (corporate) security and contract security firms across the full spectrum of security services and technology (Law Enforcement – Private Security Consortium 2009).

Public-Private Partnership (PPP)- a collaboration between a public sector (government) entity and a private sector (for-profit) entity to achieve a specific goal or set of objectives (Busch & Givens, 2012)

Staffing- the process of assigning civilian and sworn employees within law enforcement to address the daily needs of the policing of neighborhoods within the agency’s jurisdiction
Task Force- a unit or group that has been formed to work on a particular criminal issue or geographic area comprised of multiple law enforcement agencies and civilian resources.

Chapter IV: Research Design/Methodology

Rational for the Study

Law enforcement executives need to develop effective partnerships that combat the increased costs associated with policing and shrinking municipal budgets. The purpose of this research is to determine the overall effectiveness of building public-private partnerships between law enforcement agencies and private sector business. Public-private partnerships are a tool used to aid in crime prevention, with the added benefit of assisting law enforcement with staffing and budgetary constraints. As economic and political forces push against law enforcement to reduce budgets and staffing, there is a need to have creative policing tools becomes more critical ("The impact of," 2011).

Several established partnerships exist between law enforcement and private security and business. The Los Angeles Area Organized Retail Crime Alliance (LAAORCA) and the San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance (SDORCA) programs work to bridge the gap between the public and private sector in combating organized retail crime. Law enforcement and loss prevention managers and investigators work in conjunction with each other to reduce the rate of crime related to shoplifting and fraud. In addition, training of the members allows for an increase in awareness and enhanced investigative ability. These organizations provide an opportunity to evaluate the
effectiveness of bringing together law enforcement with the stakeholders to reduce crime rates in the categories affected by these organized retail crime crews.

**Methodology**

**Survey**

The decision was made to initiate a survey of current members of a public-private partnership in order to ensure the responses were relevant to the current state of partnerships. Secondary analysis of existing research was then used for historical research of public-private partnerships in public safety. There were two surveys conducted of the members of the SDORCA program. The first survey (Appendix 1) looked to normalize what organized retail crime is and how much of a perceived problem it is for the members of each organization. The questions looked to narrow what accounts for the losses and expenses associated with combating organized retail crime for both law enforcement and loss prevention.

The second survey (Appendix 2) looked to determine what success the SDORCA programs have had in reducing organized retail crime and the financial costs for the retailers and law enforcement agencies represented in both organizations. In order to have normalcy in the responses and scores, the same survey were sent to all participants, regardless of profession or role within the organization.

**Sample**

The primary target group for these surveys was the law enforcement and loss prevention investigators and managers. A potential, but welcome “ballooning” sampling
effect would have been created if investigators and managers forwarded the survey e-mail to other workers in their organizations, thus increasing the survey study’s sample size.

All members in the organization were invited to participate. The goal was to have at least 10% of the membership of law enforcement and loss prevention respond in order to have a representative sample. The purpose behind counting the groups individually is to ensure some level of equality between the public and private sector in regard to representative sampling. In order to categorize the respondents into law enforcement or loss prevention, for purposes of tracking participation, some demographic questions regarding profession and task were included in the survey. No limitations were placed on participants’ reference their areas of responsibility, job title or specific job responsibilities.

**Procedure**

Each potential participant received a notification e-mail from the San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance, telling of a future survey study to determine prevailing attitudes towards the effectiveness of public-private partnerships and combating organized retail crime. This email outlined the purpose of the survey and the desire to have people respond. In addition, this email informed members they would soon receive an email that would include more information about the purpose and method of the survey study and a direct link to the actual survey.

For the purpose of this study, a survey was created through a paid online survey program located at [www.surveygizmo.com](http://www.surveygizmo.com). The survey contained a total of Forty (40)
questions that were focused on identifying the level of participation and perceived benefit of participating in an organized retail crime alliance, such as the San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance (SDORCA).

The initial e-mail provided a link to the surveys where the participants were asked to read a brief letter outlining the purpose of the study and to continue the survey by clicking on the acknowledgement. After acknowledging the voluntary status of participation, the survey would then begin. Minimal demographic information was collected in an effort to improve confidence in the confidentiality of responses in hopes of keeping the response rate higher.

Two follow up reminders were sent to all members over the course of the next two weeks. The survey closed four weeks from the initial email inviting participation. At that time, the data was reviewed and sorted. Only the data from those respondents who completed both surveys was included in the results.

In addition to surveys of the SDORCA program, an email was sent out requesting data for shrink and crime rate comparisons for the areas serviced by these two alliances. The request identified the need for crime statistics associated with organized retail crime in a comparison format for pre and post implementation of the SDORCA programs. Crime stats were solicited from the different law enforcement agencies represented in each alliance and reviewed to compare any increase or decrease since SDORCA creation.

Loss prevention shrink data was requested from those participants that responded to the survey and accepted the definition of organized retail crime set out in the initial
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survey. A desire for information related to shrink increases or decreases showing pre and post involvement with SDORCA programs was requested.

All of the data was separated and reviewed by county instead of city, as there may be no way to guarantee individual city responses. No specific law enforcement agency or business will be mentioned in an attempt to guarantee an increase in participation. Once the data was collected, it was charted out in an effort to establish the participants understanding of the issue of organized retail crime and their interpretation of the necessity for public-private partnerships.

Secondary Analysis

In addition to the survey results I produced through the solicitation of the alliance membership, I conducted secondary analysis of pre-existing research into the effectiveness of community oriented policing and the building of public-private partnerships. The majority of law enforcement agencies and organizations collect and produce statistics and data on crime rates and costs associated with many of the crimes associated with organized retail crime. Organizations which report on organized retail crime trends also collect data specific to each state and major metropolitan area (National Retail Federation, 2012). Using these resources and the data collected during my surveys, was be able to get an adequate picture of the problem of organized retail crime and the effectiveness of programs like the San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance.
Chapter V: Results and Analysis

At the conclusion of the four (4) week survey period, the data was collected in order to evaluate the responses of the survey participants. Throughout the survey period, the survey data being collected was monitored to ensure there was at least some participation. The data from the survey is presented in an effort to validate the specific responses.

San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance (SDORCA):

In order to understand who the participants of the survey were, the membership of the San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance was reviewed for breakdown across three basic categories. There are three membership types for the San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance and is determined by your job classification: Law Enforcement, Loss Prevention, or Private Security. Within each of these categories there is no limitation of who can join so the membership is represented at all levels; local, state or federal loss prevention, law enforcement and private security. Additionally, members of each category can have varying roles and responsibilities. Law enforcement members represent state, local and federal investigators and prosecutor agencies. Loss prevention members represent investigators who work within the continental United States, with varying geographical boundaries. As each company develops individual areas of coverage, respective of the needs of their organization, membership is not limited to those investigators who only work San Diego or only California. As a result, loss prevention members can have responsibility over several cities, several counties or across several states. Finally, private security members represent both traditional security guard
organizations and corporate security investigators who work for a specific business entity.

The San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance began in the fall of 2008 as law enforcement agencies and loss prevention departments came together as an informal group in response to a county-wide shoplifting ‘booster’ crew outlined in the introduction of this research. At this time, the San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance as an organization did not exist. However, there were approximately two (2) dozen law enforcement and loss prevention investigators who came together to meet and discuss ongoing cases and trends that were being seen both locally and nationally. These intelligence led meetings brought the key stakeholders from both the private and public sector together to collaborate, investigate and improve the regional response to combating organized retail crime (Archie, 2013).

The San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance formalized the leadership under the direction of several law enforcement stakeholders and created a website. This website: www.sdorca.org, subsequently became the focal point in the sharing of intelligence, networking and initiating organized retail crime investigations in and around San Diego County, California and at the national level.

Some demographic data follows to identify the membership breakdown of the San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance. As of December 26, 2013 the total membership for SDORCA is 1,097 registered members. The complete registration statistics were collected and evaluated in order to give an accurate representation of who might be participating in an organized retail crime alliance and who might be participating in the
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subsequent survey. At this point the membership is broken down by one of the three categories previously discussed; loss prevention, law enforcement or private security. Figure 3 shows the corresponding percentage for the membership; 397 law enforcement, 613 loss prevention, and 87 private security members.

![Figure 3- SDORCA membership by profession](image)

The website allows for immediate uploading of criminal investigation files, geo-location of current investigations, and a complete directory of the membership and a database of past and present case information which has become the main resource to the organized retail crime investigators in the organization. Secondary to the website, SDORCA holds bi-monthly regional intelligence meetings and sponsors annual training events to include a single-day training conference.

Underscoring the importance of networking, collaboration and participation in a regional organized retail crime alliance (ORCA), figure 4 shows the total number of site visits to the SDORCA website for calendar year, 2013.
Survey Results:

The survey results were collected and evaluated using reports generated through the online platform that hosted the surveys, www.surveygizmo.com. The four week period of the survey began on December 1st and finished on December 28, 2013. The results were reviewed and the reports were generated on December 29th. During the period the survey was open, 100 San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance members who received the solicitation e-mail followed the link and opened the survey. Of those 100 members, 89 completed the survey and there were 11 partial responses. Figure 5 shows the breakdown of survey participation, related to incomplete and completed surveys. Of those surveys which were not completed, there was no indication that the survey was faulty or the program had failed to complete the survey. Rather, the surveys had been stopped at varying stages within the first page of questioning.
The Survey data further reported in this research paper will only focus on the answers recorded in the 89 completed surveys. Partial and/or incomplete surveys were evaluated for possible errors in the submittal process of the survey, but the data collected in them was not included in the final results.

An important consideration in any survey of a specific group is how is the membership going to respond to a survey request and who might participate. In formulating and sending out the survey, it was important that the respondents were representative of the make-up of the organization. In evaluating the 89 complete survey responses, Figure 6 shows the make-up of the survey respondents based on the three categories of membership: loss prevention, law enforcement and private security. A concern is the obvious skewing of data that would result if all completed surveys had only been completed by one of the three categories, or if one category had been completely omitted. Of interest is the categorical make-up of the respondents to the survey closely mirrors the categorical make-up of the total membership of SDORCA, as reported in Figure 3.
Survey Responses:

This review of the survey responses focused more on the overall perspective and perception of the respondents and was not intended to evaluate each question. Rather, all of the survey questions and their responses, broken down by percentage, were included in Appendix 3 of this report. Of specific interest is the survey respondents understanding of the issues associated with organized retail crime and their active response to organized retail crime. For ease in reporting, discussion of the survey results will be rounded to the nearest whole number.

From the survey results, it is clear that the members of the San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance are aware of the organized retail crime as a crime issue and primarily focus their time on investigating this type of activity.

Question 1 of the survey asked respondents if they believed that organized retail crime was an issue in the jurisdiction that they worked.
Approximately 86% of respondents feel they are dealing with organized retail crime in their area of work respondents, regardless of job category.

In attempting to evaluate the SDORCA memberships understanding of organized retail crime as a global issue and its overall effect on the retail industry, the respondents were asked if organized retail crime is a problem for most retailers.

Approximately 86% of the respondents felt that organized retail crime was a problem for most retailers and an additionally 8% responded ‘neutral. These numbers mirror those reported by the National Retail Federation annual survey of 2012, which stated 9 out of 10 of their survey responders had been a victim of organized retail crime activity in the past 12 months (NRF, 2012).

Conversely, only 9% of the respondents stated they believed organized retail crime was not a problem for most retailers.

Evaluating the respondent’s understanding of organized retail crime continued by asking a series of questions regarding how much time they spent investigating organized retail crime and if they felt having a dedicated unit or program helped in combating organized retail crime.
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There was a mixed response when asked to evaluate how much individual time they spent investigating organized retail crime as part of their work responsibility.

When asked if organized retail crime took up less than 25% of their time, 41% responded in the affirmative and only 35% believed it took up more than 25% of their time.

Interestingly, although 86% of the respondents felt that organized retail crime was a problem for most retailers, less than half of that number spent more than 25% of their time involved in investigating ORC.

On the extreme end of the spectrum, 15% of survey participants stated they spend more than 75% of their time investigating organized retail crime.

Participants were asked if the organization they worked for had a dedicated unit or team specifically geared toward investigating organized retail crime related offenses, with only 35% responding that their organization did.
The next few questions posed to participants referenced if they felt there should be a unit dedicated to investigating organized retail crime incidents within police a police department and if they felt that would be beneficial. They were next asked if a retail organization should have a dedicated unit and if it would be beneficial within a company. Respondents felt strongly that a company should have a dedicated unit or team assigned to investigate organized retail crime related incidents, by an overwhelming majority, 86%.

The respondents also felt strongly about the success rate of those companies that have dedicated units. 82% of respondents felt that retailers who have a dedicated organized retail crime investigations unit have more success in investigating and prosecuting organized retail crime related cases.

Regarding law enforcement having a dedicated unit to investigate organized retail crime incidents the number remained fairly close;
86.5% believing a police department should have a dedicated unit. Not surprisingly, possibly that same 86.5% who believed a police department should have a dedicated unit; also felt that a police department who had a theft unit had more success investigating and prosecuting theft related crime cases.

Based on the responses by the survey participants, it becomes obvious that there is an awareness of what organized retail crime is and that there is an active response. Up to this point, the survey was focused on the individual perspective of stakeholder groups regarding the scope of the problem and what the response to the problem might be. Going forward, the discussion will focus on the potential benefit of public-private partnerships (PPP).

In order to understand the membership benefits to participation in an organized retail crime alliance (ORCA), several questions were asked to gauge the level of involvement in an organization and possible attendance of training and meetings. As the survey population came directly out of the membership of an existing alliance, it can be reasonably assumed that each respondent is a member of at least one organized retail crime alliance, SDORCA. Membership in an alliance goes beyond the meetings and handshakes and goes directly to sharing of information and the collaborative partnerships in reducing crime and increasing investigative ability (Nagappan, 2013). This becomes
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important to note as participation in an organized retail crime alliance does not
necessarily mandate participation in the meetings, training or intelligence sharing.

All survey participants were members of the San Diego Organized Retail Crime
Alliance, so the question became, do they attend any meetings of either SDORCA or any
other ORCA organization.

Somewhat surprising, 25% of
those surveyed stated that they did
not attend any type of organized
retail crime alliance meetings.
This question did not specify if

they had ever attended, but looked to gauge if they actively attend a meeting.

This same percentage of
respondents also noted that they
did not attend any conference
trainings put on by either the San
Diego Organized Retail Crime
Alliance or any other ORCA organization.

It can be difficult to gauge the success of public-private partnerships like the San
Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance. Survey respondents were asked several
questions regarding organized retail crime activity or investigations that might have
benefited by attendance at an organized retail crime alliance meeting.
Of those members who do participate in organized retail crime alliance meetings, 26% stated that they been able to get a case which had originated at an alliance meeting, prosecuted successfully.

An equally important statistic was the high percentage (66%) of those who attended a meeting, ultimately learned about a case at either an SDORCA or other ORCA meeting.

The perspective of the survey population overwhelming recognizes that being a member and actively participating in the meetings, networking and intelligence sharing of an alliance is far more beneficial to the stakeholders and ultimately the cities and consumers. The respondents gave a very similar response to whether a retailer/business should be a member of a public-private partnership alliance and whether a law enforcement agency should be a member of a public-private partnership.

Nearly 93% of the survey respondents, agreed or strongly agreed that it was beneficial to the retailer/business partner.
Approximately 90%, either agreed or strongly agreed that it membership in a public-private partnership, like the San Diego Organized Retail Crime Alliance, was beneficial.

Actual statistics related to the investigation, issuing, prosecution and adjudication of cases that were either related to organized retail crime and/or investigated as part of a public-private partnership are difficult to track. Currently there is no way to gain the statistical data necessary, as neither police departments nor retailers effectively track the outcome of these cases. Partly due to the non-uniformity of what is or is not considered organized retail crime.

However, the perception of the positive benefits of participation in any public-private partnership by the stakeholders who invest their time, money and energy into these organizations can be a key factor in their success (Thacher, 2001).

Partnerships begin by having an equal understanding of not only the goals of the partnership but an equal level of participation. 92% of those surveyed, felt that the
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Prosecution of suspects for organized retail crime related cases were more successful when both loss prevention and law enforcement actively participated.

While trying to create and maintain any public-private partnership (PPP) through membership and participation, it becomes important to show the management and senior leadership the benefits of participation. In the paper, ‘Developing Local Police and Federal Law Enforcement Partnerships: G.R.E.A.T. as a case study of Policy Implementation’, the authors identify several key factors that work toward assisting the success of any partnerships, highlighting the fourth element ‘a committed and enthusiastic leadership component’ (Winfree, Lynskey, & Maupin, 1999). The need to get the management and leadership involved and invested becomes a key to successful creation and participation.

One of the most basic indicators that any stakeholder can use to encourage participation into a public-private partnership, via their senior management, is the metric of cost. Translating the cost of doing business, lost resources and time into a way the management can understand can lead to more innovative partnerships and increased participation (‘ASIS, IACP Share’, 2010). The survey looked to attempt to measure the perception of the benefit to costs that membership and involvement in an organized retail crime alliance brings.

Police departments are always strained to find ways in reducing the amount of time and manpower

![Graph showing police department participation in public-private partnerships](image)
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it takes to solve problems related to crime reduction and crime investigation. A large majority of respondents, 89%, believe that police departments who participate in a PPP have more success investigating cases. The National Council for Public-Private Partnerships (NCPPP) writes, in the white paper titled ‘For the Good of the People: Using Public-Private Partnerships to Meet America’s Essential Needs’ that ‘a public-private partnership is possible because each partner’s needs are met’ (NCPPP, 2013).

Partners evaluating their level of participation in any public-private partnership and if considering expanding into other types, it is important to consider the cost savings associated with membership.

Effectively explaining to management the cost benefit of involvement in a public-private partnership begins in the partnership through the confidence of the participants. A high of 90% of the members expressed the understanding that police department who take the time to get enrolled into public-private partnerships are sure to save costs when given access to the resources that retailers and businesses bring to a partnership.

There are great examples of cost saving resources that retailers have access to that they are then able to pass onto law enforcement ranging from technology and digital video capabilities, to actual forensics services. In ‘The Evolution of Data Sharing in Retail’s Battle against ORC’ by Jack Trlica, the author describes the creation of a ‘secure
national database for the reporting of retail theft and serious incidents that allows retailers to share information with each other and with law enforcement’ called the Law Enforcement Retail Partnership Network or LERPnet (Trlica, 2012). Several articles and reports were reviewed regarding the resources that retailers and businesses have created in order to engage law enforcement agencies, during the researching stage of this report.

One of the most interesting private sector resources made available to other retailers and law enforcement agencies was created and funded by the Target Corporation. In the September of 2009 issue of ‘The Police Chief’ journal, Rick Lautenbach wrote an article regarding the two Target Forensic Labs that are accredited by the American Society of Crime Lab Directors/Laboratory Accreditation Board (ASCLD/LAB) (Lautenbach, 2009). These labs are able to conduct forensics in the areas of audio, video, image and latent fingerprint analysis in support of criminal investigations. Obtaining and maintaining ASCLD certification allows Target to assist law enforcement on criminal investigations ranging from shoplifting and burglary to robbery and homicide investigations.

Survey participants also reported the belief that retailers and business who participate in public/private partnerships save costs by having the unique resources that law enforcement agencies have. Local, state and federal law enforcement agencies have the ability and connections to conduct specialized enforcement activity,
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undercover investigations and complex, multi-agency vertical prosecutions cases that carry more significant incarceration time.

One of the most important elements of any public-private partnership is a sense of accomplishment toward what is perceived to be the ultimate goal. If the stakeholders identify the same goal, in this case a sense the work they are doing has value and benefits the public (i.e., consumers, taxpayers, residents) then the partnership is ultimately going to be a success in order to achieve the same goal.

The answers to the last survey question were designed to gauge the mutual sense of shared accomplishment. In their responses, a combined 94% believed the general public benefit when law enforcement and private entities partner in crime prevention programs.

Chapter VI: Conclusion and Recommendations:

Conclusion and Recommendations

The analysis of secondary data and the results of the survey for this research paper support the idea that law enforcement agencies, taxpayers, consumers and loss prevention programs/retailers benefit from participation in public-private partnerships. Securing the support of key stakeholders from the public and private sector, to specifically include the senior management is a key factor to developing and maintaining momentum for
emerging partnerships. Although the benefits and benevolence of public-private partnerships are clearly supported by the research, it is important to also consider some concerns related to partnering with the private sector. In ‘The Paradox of Private Policing’, the author highlights two potential downsides ‘misunderstood motives and skepticism about the quality of security personnel and training’ (Joh, 2004). These are legitimate concerns for public agencies when seeking to partner with the private sector, as the private sector is driven by profit and shareholders. Seeking out the key stakeholders and having a pre-existing working relationship with them, prior to the development of any partnership can help allay some of these concerns. Additionally, these concerns can be overcome by an agreed upon vetting as part of the membership process.

As stated in, ‘Collaborative Partnerships and Crime in Disorganized Communities’,

The logic is that collaborative partnerships for public safety draw community resources into crime protection efforts and boost informal social controls in disorganized communities. The governance approach suggests that government agencies cannot easily solve “wicked” problems by themselves and that working together has a beneficial effect when it comes to dealing with community issues and improving community capacity (pg. 228)

The development of programs designed to bridge the gap between the public and private sectors can trace their basis in the concepts brought on by Sir Robert Peel, the father of modern policing.

"The police are the public and the public are the police; the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full time attention to the duties to which are incumbent on every citizen in the interests of community welfare and existence."
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Appendix

Appendix 1 -- Organized Retail Crime identified

Below are 15 statements about organized retail crime (ORC). For this survey, organized retail crime refers to theft and fraud crimes related to retail organizations (i.e., shoplifting, credit card/gift card fraud, check fraud and return fraud). Please select the corresponding number from the rating scale given below for the answer that best describes the way you feel or what you believe. There is no absolute answer, with some responses based primarily on opinion, there is no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answer. I am more interested in your perception of the problem as it relates to your specific job and organization. Even if you have no general knowledge about the issue, please provide an answer to each question.

**Items and Scoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Organized retail crime is a problem in the jurisdiction I work
2. Organized retail crime results in lost tax revenue for cities only
3. Organized retail crime results in lost business revenue for retailers only
4. Organized retail crime is a larger problem than people imagine
5. Organized retail crime is not a problem for most retailers
6. Organized retail crime is a problem for most retailers
7. Organized retail crime is more than just drug users and teenagers taking a single item or opportunism
8. Investigating ORC takes up less than 25% of my time
9. Investigating ORC takes up between 25-50% of my time
10. Investigating ORC takes up more than 75% of my time
11. Your organization has a dedicated unit or team that only investigates ORC related offenses
12. Each company should have a unit dedicated to investigating organized retail crime related incidents
13. Each police department should have a unit dedicated to investigating organized retail crime related incidents
14. Retailers who have a dedicated ORC investigations unit have more success investigating and prosecuting organized retail crime
15. Law enforcement departments who have a theft unit have more success investigating and prosecuting theft related crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law Enforcement (this column only)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate cases</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated ORC unit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend SDORCA/LAAORCA meetings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend SDORCA/LAAORCA conference</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successfully had cases prosecuted that originated at an alliance meeting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You learned of a case while attending a SDORCA/LAAORCA meeting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigated ORC case over $500,000 in identified loss to the business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loss Prevention (this column only)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate cases</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated ORC unit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend SDORCA/LAAORCA meetings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend SDORCA/LAAORCA conference</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successfully had cases prosecuted that originated at an alliance meeting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You learned of a case while attending a SDORCA/LAAORCA meeting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigated ORC case over $500,000 in identified loss to the business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 -- Public-Private partnerships and effect on combating ORC

Below are 14 statements about public-private partnerships and their effect on combating organized retail crime. For this survey, public-private partnerships refer to organizations which bring law enforcement and the private sector together who have a similar goal, in this instance combating organized retail crime. Please select the corresponding number from the rating scale given below for the answer that best describes the way you feel or what you believe. There is no absolute answer, with some responses based primarily on opinion, there is no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answer. I am more interested in your perception of the problem as it relates to your specific job and organization. Even if you have no general knowledge about the issue, please provide an answer to each question.

Items and Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Organized retail crime is a problem in the jurisdiction I work
2. Investigating organized retail crime is a law enforcement only responsibility
3. Investigating organized retail crime is a loss prevention only responsibility
4. Investigating ORC cases is a responsibility of law enforcement and loss prevention combined
5. Being a member of a public-private partnership alliance (i.e., SDORCA / LAAORCA) is beneficial to the retailer/business
6. Being a member of a public-private partnership alliance (i.e., SDORCA / LAAORCA) is beneficial to the law enforcement agency
7. ORC Cases investigated with input from both law enforcement and loss prevention are more successful in prosecuting suspects
8. Police departments who participate in a public/private partnership have more success investigating cases
9. Police departments who participate in a public/private partnership save costs by having the available resources of retailers and businesses
10. Retailers who participate in a public/private partnership save costs by having the available resources of law enforcement agencies
11. Public-private partnership alliances benefit the private entity more than the law enforcement agency
12. Public-private partnership alliances benefit the law enforcement agency more than the private entity
13. Public-private partnership alliances benefit both groups equally
14. The general public benefit when law enforcement and private entities partner up for crime prevention
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7. Organized retail crime is more than just drug users and teenagers taking a single item or opportunity

8. Investigating ORC takes up less than 25% of my time

9. Investigating ORC takes up between 25-50% of my time

10. Investigating ORC takes up more than 75% of my time

11. Your organization has a dedicated unit or team that investigates ORC-related offenses

12. Each company should have a unit dedicated to investigating organized retail crime-related incidents

13. Each police department should have a unit dedicated to investigating organized retail crime-related incidents

14. Retailers who have a dedicated ORC investigations unit have more success investigating and prosecuting organized retail crime

15. Law enforcement departments who have a unit have more success investigating and prosecuting theft-related crimes

16. Law Enforcement
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17. Loss Prevention
No 43.6%  Yes 56.4%

18. Supervisor
No 47.7%  Yes 52.3%

19. Investigate Cases
No 24.3%  Yes 75.7%

20. Dedicated CRTC Unit
No 31.3%  Yes 68.7%

21. Attend SDORCA or other ORCA meetings
No 24.7%  Yes 75.3%

22. Attend SDORCA or other ORCA conferences
No 24.7%  Yes 75.3%

23. Successfully had cases prosecuted that originated at an alliance meeting
No 24.6%  Yes 75.4%

24. You learned of a case while attending a SDORCA or other ORCA meeting
No 31.7%  Yes 68.3%

25. Investigated CRTC case over $100,000 in identified losses to a business
No 51.6%  Yes 48.4%

26. Investigated CRTC case over $250,000 in identified losses to a business
No 79.8%  Yes 20.2%
Integrating public-private partnerships into public service
Integrating public-private partnerships into public service