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ANR Security Concern Groupings
Last fall you convened a group of ANR employees and a representative from Buildings and General Services to discuss security issues within the ANR. We understood our charge to be to consider security issues that our employees face and to recommend steps that may be taken to improve these issues. With the submittal of this report, we believe we will have met this charge.

In order to determine the severity of concern for safety we surveyed the employees of ANR. While we want every employee to feel safe, we did the survey to help us understand what employees care the most about. We were pleased to have received a response rate of just under 20 percent. This is quite good for a survey and indicates a high level of interest in the topic. We understand that a response rate exceeding 10 – 15 % is considered quite good and generally offers valid results.

One of the questions on the survey asked employees for input on safety issues of concern. Using this information, the committee next grouped the responses into common themes. All items were grouped into six logical categories: Improve employee performance and development; facility security; targeted harassment due to being a state employee; field threats; problems related to former employees; and internal training & policy. Finally, using these six categories, we created an interrelational di-graph. This process essentially looks for cause and effect between the categories. In theory, one gets the most bang for one’s buck by first working on items that cause impacts on the most of the other areas. The areas having the greatest potential impact on other groups were internal training & policy (determined to influence all other five categories), facility security (three), and problems related with former employees (two).

Finally, the committee met to pick specific issues on which we would recommend the Agency begin to work. We ultimately created two lists. The first is a list that follows our process fairly accurately. It is the logical conclusion of our process. Once we finished this list, we realized that there were some simple items that could be easily accomplished and show movement that should receive immediate attention. Thus, we have listed them as a way to begin and have early successes.
Our recommendations on action steps follow:

**Internal Training & Policy**

**Seasonal & New Employee Training** – There is a need to ensure that seasonal & new employees are trained regarding how to deal with conflict and threatening situations. We suggest the Agency develop a training module that would become a part of our orientation program upon its availability.

**Threatening Situation Training** – We have many employees who face potentially threatening situations from time to time. While not all situations can be avoided, all employees can be equipped with the skills to handle the situation as well as possible. We recommend a training module or series of skill sets be developed, perhaps through the Cyprian Learning Center. This training could be made available on an ongoing basis and may need to be mandatory for certain jobs.

**Threats from Co-Workers** – There are times when employees feel threatened or are attacked by another employee. We recommend that a policy of "acceptable behavior" be considered by the agency. This item may have implications for our labor contracts and thus may need to be reviewed and approved by both the Personnel Department and the VSEA.

**Facility Security**

**After Hours Access / Open Access** – These issues represent the single largest concern of our employees. The message here is clear – our staff is concerned with the lack of security at many of our workstations. There is a desire to have certainty that after a specific hour only those with appropriate access tools may enter our spaces. This would provide greater security to those who are still here working. Similarly, employees worry about the totally open nature of access where the public may wander around and finally arrive at a workstation unannounced. We recommend that the services and attention of the Department of Buildings and General Services be requested immediately to work with our staff to address these issues.

**Exterior Lighting** - In the wintertime, our staff is concerned with the level of lighting outside. While this came up primarily from Waterbury staff, we do not know if the issue rests solely here. Staff was clear that we are not looking for it to be as bright as broad daylight in the middle of the night. However, there is a strong feeling that what we have is inadequate from the moment you walk out the door to the moment you are safely in your car. We recommend the same action as the item previous.

**Reception Desk** – This item is a distinct subset of the open access item noted above. However, this item largely is an ANR policy question as compared with the B&GS issues above. Staff suggested the idea of a reception desk to greet visitors and provide directions. This desk would then announce the
arrival of a visitor to the appropriate staff. This would help resolve the issue of "wandering". This item clearly raises both an employee cap issue and a fiscal issue. We recommend the core management team consider this proposal during the development of the budget request for FY2001.

**Understanding B&GS Policy** – Frequently asked questions surround Building & General Service contract employees – both housekeeping and security. What are they supposed to be doing? What are they not supposed to be doing? Are security checks done on these contract employees? What level of trust can we have in them? We recommend a dialogue occur with B&GS to become better informed as to their employees and their role.

**Surveillance Systems** – Again, this item is an outgrowth of the open access issue. In this case, we raise a policy question that may spill over to the administration agency as a broad state policy. Should state offices have a surveillance system in them to monitor activity? The answer to this question may be different depending on the answer to many of the items above, however, we recommend that the issue be put on the table. This likely should start with a request to B&GS. Ultimately, it may need input from Personnel or Administration.

---

**Targeted Harassment of State Employees**

**Reactivate / Invigorate or initiate the Bomb Threat System** – We have a spotty record of development and continued attention to this issue. For those work units that have a system in place, we need to reinvigorate attention to the system. For those who have not taken this issue seriously since it was required in 1994 we need to ensure that we move off the dime. We recommend the Secretary’s office take the lead in the effort to reinvigorate this process.

**Train Jointly with Public Safety** – We understand that the Department of Public Safety may offer training sessions dealing with threats and bomb situations. We would recommend that we attempt to gain this training to maximize the resource.

**Maps of Escape from Facilities** – Whether to escape from fire or harm, both our employees and the public should know exit routes from this facility. We recommend that exit maps, as required by VOSHA regulations, be located in every required location. We recommend that B&GS be asked to assist in this effort for our facilities as they have the in house expertise to develop the exit paths.

**Policy on Response to Comments** – Often times a political candidate will attack a State employee or group in the process of campaigning. Occasionally, editorial writers feel this same need. We recommend that the Agency have a written policy on how we will respond to such comments when directed at ANR staff. We further recommend that the Core Management Team should guide the development of this policy. This may be an item where a task team could be utilized to develop a draft for the Core Team’s consideration.
Each of the above items will take considerable work. However, we believe most of the items should be achievable in the near term. Once this list is complete, it is vital to look at the next tier of issues. There are not many items listed in the appendix that the committee believes are unimportant. Quite to the contrary, we believe the overwhelming majority of issues are real. This needs to be viewed as the first phase of a bigger project.

In the meantime, let us offer to you our list of quick wins referenced earlier. This is the list of ideas that the committee believes could be readily accomplished if the Core Management Team decides to do them. The list follows:

- Establish a policy that requires the return of keys from every employee when they leave service with the ANR or exchange keys when they move to different workstations in the ANR.
- Establish a process by which the Agency will respond to the loud obscenities that are shouted from the hospital lock up area. This is very unsettling to our employees and contributes to the feeling of a lack of safety.
- Establish a policy or practice that will require follow up of every reported threat. There is a feeling that some threats are followed up, while others are not. Employees need to know that if they report a threat it will receive attention.
- Accurate signage within the Waterbury complex – Everyone agrees this should be fixed. Everyone has agreed for years. This issue simply needs the leadership to say do it.

Summary

The committee would like to thank you for your interest in this important issue and for this opportunity to assist the Agency. With this submittal we view our formal role as complete and would suggest the ad hoc committee be disbanded. However, we feel that we can continue to play the unofficial role of advocate for the issues we have raised and propose to watchdog the issues to help you see them through to implementation. Attached you will find copies of our complete work product for your use now and in the future.

We would be pleased to answer any questions you may have on this report. Should you need to meet with us to get more specifics we would also be pleased to do this. Let us know how we might be helpful in seeing as many of these items be implemented as soon as possible.

Ad Hoc Security Committee
Question 1 - What security issues should be added to the list?

- Data / Computer security
- Customer service training
- Informed Consent training
- An office plan to address an office threat
- Harassment from co workers
- Security of staff doing Anight rounds@
- Dealing with drunk campers
- constant training is needed
- State vehicles with or without insignia
- Construction zone Aaccidents@
- Inadequate personal protection policy for EEO
- Lack of adequate communication with law enforcement agencies
- Lack of ability to gather intelligence information
- Need for locked doors in (Waterbury) complex
- Public & employees can carry guns into state buildings
- Private vehicles in parking lots while on a trip
- Loud / hostile obscenities coming from hospital lockup
- Poor lighting outside
- Fire Safety plan
- Unsafe state vehicles / poorly maintained
- working alone in field as a woman
- Injury in field and no way to call for help
- Mail / letter bombs
- VOSHA non compliance
- Bad Air & circulation
- Need to retrieve keys when employee leaves
- Directions signage to guide public in (Waterbury) complex
• Citizens stalking employees
• Communication systems to inform all employees of a threat
• Security surveillance system needed
• The conversion of part of the State Hospital to a corrections facility
• Employees driving state vehicles unsafely; putting passengers at risk
• Denegation of employees by political candidates
• Ability to lock individual doors to offices

**Security Survey Responses**

*Question 2 - What work place security issues of most concern?*

• 08 - Vandalism / Theft
• 02 - Crazy irrational people going Apostal@
• 18 - Night / after hours access to complex
• 13 - Attack from public
• 05 - Bomb scares / threats
• 05 - Obscene calls
• 01 - Implied threats to State workers
• 20 - Interaction of employee on private lands
• 05 - Interaction of employee on public lands
• 05 - Education of seasonal employees
• 03 - Increase security in buildings
• 03 - False sense of security
• 04 - Work Vehicles become threat
• 04 - Sexual harassment by public
• 02 - Employees threatening supervisors / peers
• 04 - Public attempting to intimidate their way out of trouble
Security Survey Responses

Question 3 - Scale 1 - 10, (1 low, 10 high) rank importance of issue?

1) 05
2) 07
3) 07
4) 08
5) 11
6) 04
7) 07
8) 19
9) 06
10) 28
__) 03

Total Responses: 105 = approximate response of 19.5% +/-

Average Importance = 6.72 (discounting the 3 non responses)
Agency of Natural Resources
Security Concerns - Interrelational Digraph

Note: The numbers on top of the cylinders represent the # of items that influence other items and are influenced by other items. Thus, logic would have you start with the item that has the highest number for the first digit. (Develop Internal Training & Policy). There is no reason to work on only one at a time, but resource availability ought to be considered when deciding how many to start at any given time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD THREATS</th>
<th>TARGETED HARASSMENT BECAUSE YOU ARE A STATE EMPLOYEE</th>
<th>INTERNAL TRAINING AND POLICIES</th>
<th>PROBLEMS WITH FORMER EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>FACILITY SECURITY</th>
<th>PROBLEMS RELATED TO CURRENT EMPLOYEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injury in field and no way to call for help</td>
<td>Obscene calls</td>
<td>Need training on how to deal with threatening situations</td>
<td>Threat from former employee</td>
<td>Security of staff doing &quot;night rounds&quot;</td>
<td>Worker to worker threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction of employee on private land</td>
<td>Pervasive attitude that regulation is wrong</td>
<td>Informed consent training</td>
<td>Need to retrieve keys when employee leaves</td>
<td>Private vehicles in parking lots while on a trip</td>
<td>Harassment from workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism / theft</td>
<td>Denigration of employees by political candidates</td>
<td>Education of seasonal employees</td>
<td>Crazy irrational people going &quot;postal&quot;</td>
<td>Outside light insufficient</td>
<td>Employees threatening supervisors / peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment by public</td>
<td>State vehicles with or without insignias</td>
<td>An office plan to address office threat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need for locked doors in Complex</td>
<td>Crazy irrational people going &quot;postal&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction of employee on public lands</td>
<td>Bomb scares / threats</td>
<td>Lack of adequate communication with law enforcement agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Security surveillance system needed</td>
<td>Employees driving state vehicle unsafely putting passengers at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens stalking employees</td>
<td>Hostility at public meetings</td>
<td>Customer service training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction zone &quot;accidents&quot;</td>
<td>Public attempting to intimidate their way out of trouble</td>
<td>Inadequate personal protection policy for EEO</td>
<td></td>
<td>The conversion of part of State Hospital to a corrections facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working alone in the field as a woman</td>
<td>Implied threats to state workers</td>
<td>False sense of security</td>
<td></td>
<td>Night / after hours access to Complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Concern Groupings</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attach from the public</td>
<td>Mail / letter bombs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with drunk campers</td>
<td>Safety at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of ability to gather intelligence information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data / Computer security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directions signage to guide public in Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public and employees can carry guns into state buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to lock individual doors to offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase security in buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loud hostile obscenities coming from State Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open access of offices by public / patients / cleaning crew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>