

Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 8:54 AM
To: Slivken, David
Subject: RE: Liability Issues with In-House Guards

Hi David, this is a good question. It's been a while so I double checked again with our attorney, and the answer is no, the city did not feel it needed any additional insurance as these staff are city employees and thus covered by the existing legal representation and risk coverage as any other city employee. As these staff do not carry weapons and have been trained and told they have the same expectations as any other employee regarding how they engage a customer, they are viewed no differently than any other employee. Because they are direct government employees, governmental immunity applies to them. It is probably true that having a security uniform creates a higher probability that they might be involved in, and sustain injury from, an attack or scuffle, or be more prone to legal action by some physical action they might take in an altercation, their risk assessment is actually considered lower overall compared to public safety staff (police & fire), labor trades (such as streets or utility workers), drivers or even some positions in the city like recreation league basketball and softball referees and field/gym supervisors which actually have a pretty high risk level involving being assaulted and/or feeling compelled to intervene in a physical altercation.

Of course, your legal staff might have a different opinion and your insurance may be different as being a district, you don't have the diversity of jobs we have as a city.
Hope this helps.

City of Aurora, Department of Library & Cultural Services