

SENATE BILL REPORT

SB 6214

As Reported By Senate Committee On:
Labor, Commerce, Research & Development, February 2, 2006

Title: An act relating to security guard training.

Brief Description: Modifying requirements for security guard training.

Sponsors: Senators Keiser, Schmidt, Kastama, Kohl-Welles, Jacobsen, Pridemore, Roach, Shin, Benson and Franklin.

Brief History:

Committee Activity: Labor, Commerce, Research & Development: 1/24/06, 2/2/06 [DPS, DNP].

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR, COMMERCE, RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

Majority Report: That Substitute Senate Bill No. 6214 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.

Signed by Senators Kohl-Welles, Chair; Franklin, Vice Chair; Brown, Keiser and Prentice.

Minority Report: Do not pass.

Signed by Senators Parlette, Ranking Minority Member; Hewitt and Honeyford.

Staff: John Dzedzic (786-7784)

Background: There are about 150 security guard businesses, employing about 7000 licensed security guards, in Washington. A person must be licensed by the Department of Licensing (DOL) to provide security guard services personally, or in the employ of a private security company. DOL regulates the content of training required of licensees.

An applicant for a security guard license must meet certain minimum age and other qualifications (including a background investigation), be employed by or have an offer of employment from a licensed private security company, and have successfully completed at least eight hours of "pre-assignment" training. Prior to July 1, 2005, four hours of such training was required.

New licensees became subject to a "post-assignment" or "on-the-job" training requirement effective July 1, 2005. Four hours of this training must be completed within the first six months after becoming licensed, and eight hours before the end of the licensee's first year. The amount of post-assignment training required of new licensees increases by one hour each year until the requirement reaches 15 hours in 2012. A new licensee must complete the training in excess of eight hours within the first 18 months after receiving a license.

Summary of Substitute Bill: In addition to the training described above, a private security company must annually provide eight hours of certain skills training to each of the licensed

security guards it employs. Security guard companies must maintain records of such training for three years.

Only a trainer certified by DOL may provide training required by the act. A security guard company must accept a certificate of completion issued by a certified trainer as evidence that the licensee has completed the required pre-assignment training.

In adopting rules, DOL must consult with consumers, labor organizations representing private security officers, private security companies, law enforcement and other public safety agencies, educators and subject matter experts. DOL may revoke the licenses of , and assess civil penalties against, companies that violate the act.

Substitute Bill Compared to Original Bill: The substitute bill makes various clarifications concerning the role and responsibilities of DOL and department-certified trainers. Penalty provisions refer to the Uniform Regulation of Business and Profession Act instead of unique penalties established in this statute. Requires at least two-thirds of the annual post-assignment training to relate to public safety or emergency procedures. The effective date is delayed until July 1, 2007

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Available.

Committee/Commission/Task Force Created: No.

Effective Date: Ninety days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

Testimony For: With heightened security concerns, the demands and pressures on private security guards have increased. The on-site security personnel are more likely to respond to natural or other disasters before the first responders. With the high turnover in this industry and better training is needed to protect the public safety responders as well as the public. Current training regimens, which lack statewide consistency, are often self-study or video-taped, and not the more effective hands-on training or practice drills.

Testimony Against: An increased training requirement became effect last year, and is only just now being implemented. That law should be allowed to work before increasing training requirements again. A standardized training requirement does not take into account the significant differences between types of facilities, or the specialized, industry- and site-specific training that occurs now.

Who Testified: PRO: Bruce Berkbigler, Richard Pond, Mitchell Hunter, Sergio Salinas, Service Employees International Union, Local 6.

CON: Michael Transue, Pierce County Security Services; Rod Kaufman, Building Owners and Managers Assn.; Lynn Vasil, Darlene Larson, Northwest Security Services, Inc.