PERFORMANCE AUDIT
OF THE

MACOMB CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

November 2001

47-216-01

EXECUTIVE DIGEST

MACOMB CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

INTRODUCTION

This report, issued in November 2001, contains the results of our performance audit* of the Macomb Correctional Facility (MCF), Department of Corrections (DOC).

AUDIT PURPOSE

This performance audit was conducted as part of the constitutional responsibility of the Office of the Auditor General. Performance audits are conducted on a priority basis related to the potential for improving effectiveness* and efficiency*.

BACKGROUND

MCF, located in Macomb County, is under the jurisdiction of DOC. The warden, who is the chief administrative officer, is appointed by the DOC director.

The deputy warden oversees custody (safety and security), housing, and prisoner programs. The administrative officer oversees the business office, physical plant, warehouse, and food service operations.

The mission* of MCF is to protect the public by providing a safe, secure, and humane environment for staff and prisoners. MCF, which opened in 1993, is a minimum security (level I)* and medium security (level II)* facility for males, with a capacity of 1,232 prisoners. Prisoners are

* *See glossary at end of report for definition.*

housed two to a cell within a secured, double-fenced perimeter that includes an electronic detection system, gun towers, and an armed officer in a response vehicle.

For fiscal year 1999-2000, MCF operating expenditures were approximately $25.4 million. As of June 15, 2001, MCF had 357 employees.

AUDIT OBJECTIVES, CONCLUSIONS, AND NOTEWORTHY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness of MCF's safety and security operations.

Conclusion: We concluded that MCF's safety and security operations were generally effective. However, we noted a reportable condition* related to cell and prisoner searches (Finding 1).

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of MCF's practices and procedures related to prisoner care and facility maintenance.

Conclusion: We concluded that MCF's prisoner care and maintenance operations were generally effective and efficient.

Noteworthy Accomplishments: In January 2000, MCF began the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Program. It is DOC's only therapeutic in-house program for medium security male prisoners. The program is located in one of the housing units and is operated by Self Help Addiction Rehabilitation, Inc., a contractual provider from Detroit.

The program functions as a therapeutic community, focusing on patterns of alcohol and other drug use and criminal conduct. Residents progress through three

* *See glossary at end of report for definition.*

phases of treatment, which takes approximately nine months. The fourth phase of treatment is considered the aftercare phase. Aftercare occurs after release on parole, on tether, or to a corrections center, in which graduate offenders are required to participate and complete substance abuse treatment.

In 1996, MCF started a horticulture program. The number of prisoners enrolled in the program ranges from 15 to 30 and it operates six months a year. The program has allowed the mass production of flowers and vegetables for use by MCF and for donation to the community. Since the inception of the program, MCF estimates that the program has provided 6,000 pounds of produce to MCF and 50,000 plants to nonprofit organizations in the community. MCF has received many letters of thanks from nonprofit organizations that have received donations from the program.

AUDIT SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Macomb Correctional Facility. Our audit was conducted in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included such tests of the records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

Our audit procedures included examination of MCF records and activities for the period October 1998 through June 2001. We conducted a preliminary review of MCF operations. This included discussions with various MCF staff regarding their functions and responsibilities and a review of program records, DOC policy directives, and MCF operating procedures. To gain an understanding of MCF activities and to form a basis for selecting certain operations for audit, we conducted tests of records related to safety and security, prison operations, prisoner care,

and maintenance activities for compliance with applicable policies and procedures and for program effectiveness and efficiency. In addition, we developed a survey (see supplemental information) requesting input from certain individuals regarding their association with MCF.

AGENCY RESPONSE

Our report includes one finding and recommendation. MCF's preliminary response indicated that it agreed and has complied with the recommendation.

November 6, 2001

Mr. Bill Martin, Director
Department of Corrections
Grandview Plaza
Lansing, Michigan

Dear Mr. Martin:

This is our report on the performance audit of the Macomb Correctional Facility, Department of Corrections.

The report contains our executive digest; description of agency; audit objectives, scope, and methodology and agency responses; comments, finding, recommendation, and agency preliminary response; description of survey and summary of survey responses, presented as supplemental information; and a glossary of acronyms and terms.

Our comments, finding, and recommendation are organized by audit objective. The agency preliminary response was taken from the agency's response subsequent to our audit fieldwork. The *Michigan Compiled Laws* and administrative procedures require that the audited agency develop a formal response within 60 days after release of the audit report.

We appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended to us during this audit.

Sincerely,

Thomas H. McTavish, C.P.A.
Auditor General

This page left intentionally blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MACOMB CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

INTRODUCTION

	Page
Executive Digest	1
Report Letter	5
Description of Agency	8
Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses	9

COMMENTS, FINDING, RECOMMENDATION,
AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Safety and Security Operations	11
1. Cell and Prisoner Searches	11
Prisoner Care and Maintenance Operations	13

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Description of Survey	15
Summary of Survey Responses	16

GLOSSARY

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms	18

Description of Agency

The Macomb Correctional Facility (MCF), located in Macomb County, is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections (DOC). The warden, who is the chief administrative officer, is appointed by the DOC director.

The deputy warden oversees custody (safety and security), housing, and prisoner programs. The administrative officer oversees the business office, physical plant, warehouse, and food service operations.

The mission of MCF is to protect the public by providing a safe, secure, and humane environment for staff and prisoners. MCF, which opened in 1993, is a minimum security (level I) and medium security (level II) facility for males, with a capacity of 1,232 prisoners. Prisoners are housed two to a cell within a secured, double-fenced perimeter that includes an electronic detection system, gun towers, and an armed officer in a response vehicle.

For fiscal year 1999-2000, MCF operating expenditures were approximately $25.4 million. As of June 15, 2001, MCF had 357 employees.

Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses

Audit Objectives

Our performance audit of the Macomb Correctional Facility (MCF), Department of Corrections (DOC), had the following objectives:

1. To assess the effectiveness of MCF's safety and security operations.

2. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of MCF's practices and procedures related to prisoner care and facility maintenance.

Audit Scope

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Macomb Correctional Facility. Our audit was conducted in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included such tests of the records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

Audit Methodology

Our audit procedures, conducted from March through June 2001, included examination of MCF records and activities for the period October 1998 through June 2001.

To establish our audit objectives and to gain an understanding of MCF activities, we conducted a preliminary review of MCF operations. This included discussions with various MCF staff regarding their functions and responsibilities and a review of program records, DOC policy directives, and MCF operating procedures. To gain an understanding of MCF activities and to form a basis for selecting certain operations for audit, we conducted tests of records related to safety and security, prison operations, prisoner care, and maintenance activities for compliance with applicable policies and procedures and for program effectiveness and efficiency.

To assess the effectiveness of MCF's safety and security operations, we conducted tests of records related to firearm inventories and firearm qualifications. Also, we examined records related to prisoner, cell, and employee searches, and accounting for prisoners. On a test basis, we inventoried keys and critical and dangerous tools. In

addition, we reviewed and tested procedures for screening prisoners for public works projects, and we reviewed security monitoring exercises.

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of MCF's practices and procedures related to prisoner care and facility maintenance, we conducted tests of records and reviewed food service operations, fire safety procedures, preventive maintenance, emergency electrical backup tests, disaster management, and housekeeping and sanitation inspections.

In addition, we developed a survey (see supplemental information) requesting input from certain individuals regarding their association with MCF.

Agency Responses

Our report includes one finding and recommendation. MCF's preliminary response indicated that it agreed and has complied with the recommendation.

The agency preliminary response which follows the recommendation in our report was taken from the agency's written comments and oral discussions subsequent to our audit fieldwork. Section 18.1462 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* and Department of Management and Budget Administrative Guide procedure 1280.02 require DOC to develop a formal response to our audit finding and recommendation within 60 days after release of the audit report.

COMMENTS, FINDING, RECOMMENDATION, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

SAFETY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS

COMMENT

Background: The Macomb Correctional Facility (MCF) operates under the policy directives established by the Department of Corrections (DOC) as well as operating procedures that were developed by MCF. DOC policy directives and MCF operating procedures have been implemented to help ensure the security of firearms, keys, and tools. MCF staff conduct periodic searches of prisoners, cells, and prisoner belongings to detect contraband*. All visitors must register when entering the facility and are subject to being searched. DOC policy directives provide for periodic random searches of employees entering and exiting the facility.

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness of MCF's safety and security operations.

Conclusion: We concluded that MCF's safety and security operations were generally effective. However, we noted a reportable condition related to cell and prisoner searches.

FINDING

1. Cell and Prisoner Searches

MCF needs to ensure that the housing unit officers* perform and properly document the required number of prisoner cell searches and that non-housing unit officers perform and properly document the required number of prisoner searches.

DOC policy directive 04.04.110 requires that each housing unit officer assigned to first and second shifts perform and document a minimum of three cell searches each day. The policy directive also requires that each non-housing unit officer perform and document a minimum of five prisoner searches per shift. These searches are necessary to help detect prisoner contraband and to provide for the safety and security of staff and other prisoners.

* *See glossary at end of report for definition.*

Our review of cell search documentation for selected days in February and March 2001 disclosed that 15 (42%) of the 36 housing unit officers in our review did not document whether the required number of cell searches were performed.

Also, our review of prisoner search documentation for selected days in February and March 2001 disclosed that MCF did not have documentation to show whether 18 (100%) of the 18 non-housing unit officers in our review performed the required prisoner searches. We were informed that because of space limitations the control center had not retained the documentation, but the documentation would be retained in the future.

Conducting the required number of cell and prisoner searches gives MCF assurance that contraband will be detected and confiscated in order to ensure the safety and security of staff and prisoners.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that MCF ensure that the housing unit officers perform and properly document the required number of prisoner cell searches and that non-housing unit officers perform and properly document the required number of prisoner searches.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

MCF agreed and informed us that it has already implemented a procedure that requires housing cell searches to be recorded in the appropriate logbooks daily on the 6 a.m. - 2 p.m. and 2 p.m. - 10 p.m. shifts. The resident unit manager and assistant resident unit supervisor are required to review the logbooks daily to ensure that searches are conducted and recorded as appropriate. The assistant deputy warden for housing will closely monitor each housing unit operation for ongoing compliance.

The assistant deputy warden for custody will ensure that prisoner search documentation is retained in accordance with DOC's records retention schedule. First-line custody supervisors monitor prisoner searches to ensure that each non-housing unit officer performs the required five prisoner searches daily and records them on the daily prisoner shakedown report (form CSJ-468) as appropriate. These forms are turned in to the shift supervisor daily and submitted to the assistant deputy warden for custody monthly by the shift commanders.

PRISONER CARE AND MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS

COMMENT

Background: MCF is responsible for providing a safe, secure, and humane environment for staff and prisoners. MCF has developed practices and procedures involving food service operations, fire safety, preventive maintenance, disaster management, prisoner accounting, and prisoner store operations.

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of MCF's practices and procedures related to prisoner care and facility maintenance.

Conclusion: We concluded that MCF's prisoner care and maintenance operations were generally effective and efficient.

Noteworthy Accomplishments: In January 2000, MCF began the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Program. It is DOC's only therapeutic in-house program for medium security male prisoners. The program is located in one of the housing units and is operated by Self Help Addiction Rehabilitation, Inc., a contractual provider from Detroit.

The program functions as a therapeutic community, focusing on patterns of alcohol and other drug use and criminal conduct. Residents progress through three phases of treatment, which takes approximately nine months. The fourth phase of treatment is considered the aftercare phase. Aftercare occurs after release on parole, on tether, or to a corrections center, in which graduate offenders are required to participate and complete substance abuse treatment.

In 1996, MCF started a horticulture program. The number of prisoners enrolled in the program ranges from 15 to 30 and it operates six months a year. The program has allowed the mass production of flowers and vegetables for use by MCF and for donation to the community. Since the inception of the program, MCF estimates that the program has provided 6,000 pounds of produce to MCF and 50,000 plants to nonprofit organizations in the community. MCF has received many letters of thanks from nonprofit organizations that have received donations from the program.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Description of Survey

We developed a survey requesting input from certain individuals regarding their association with the Macomb Correctional Facility (MCF).

We mailed surveys to 50 individuals located in the vicinity of MCF. Three were returned as undeliverable mail. We received 13 responses from the 47 delivered surveys, a response rate of 28%. The responses indicated that most respondents were satisfied or had no opinion regarding the MCF administration. The responses did indicate concerns about loud concert music and sirens going off periodically. We referred these concerns to the warden for follow-up and provided him with a summary of the survey information.

MACOMB CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

Department of Corrections

Summary of Survey Responses

Copies of Survey Delivered	47
Number of Responses	13
Response Rate	28%

1. How would you rate your satisfaction with the frequency of communication between you or your organization and the Macomb Correctional Facility?

Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion	No Answer
4	0	3	1	4	1

2. Have you expressed any concern to the Macomb Correctional Facility regarding its operations?

Yes 4 No 8 No Answer 1

a. If yes, how satisfied were you with how management of the Macomb Correctional Facility addressed your individual concerns?

Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion	No Answer
3	0	0	1	0	9

b. How satisfied were you with the timeliness in which your individual concerns were addressed by the Macomb Correctional Facility?

Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion	No Answer
3	0	0	1	2	7

3. Do you have any specific safety or security concerns that have not been addressed by Macomb Correctional Facility personnel?

Yes 1 No 11 No Answer 1

4. If you have visited the Macomb Correctional Facility, were you satisfied with the security provided to you while at the facility?

Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion	No Answer
4	0	0	0	7	2

5. Overall, how satisfied are you with the communication between the Macomb Correctional Facility and the community?

Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion	No Answer
4	0	2	0	5	2

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

contraband	Property that is not allowed on facility property or in visiting rooms by State law, rule, or DOC policy. For prisoners, this includes any property that they are not specifically authorized to possess, authorized property in excessive amounts, or authorized property that has been altered without permission.
DOC	Department of Corrections.
effectiveness	Program success in achieving mission and goals.
efficiency	Achieving the most outputs and outcomes practical for the amount of resources applied or minimizing the amount of resources required to attain a certain level of outputs or outcomes.
housing unit officer	A corrections officer who works in the housing units.
medium security (level II)	A classification for prisoners who generally have longer sentences than do minimum security prisoners, who need more supervision but who are not likely to escape, or who are not difficult to manage.
minimum security (level I)	A classification for prisoners who can live in facilities with a minimum amount of security. They are normally relatively near parole.
mission	The agency's main purpose or the reason that the agency was established.
MCF	Macomb Correctional Facility.

performance audit An economy and efficiency audit or a program audit that is designed to provide an independent assessment of the performance of a governmental entity, program, activity, or function to improve public accountability and to facilitate decision making by parties responsible for overseeing or initiating corrective action.

reportable condition A matter coming to the auditor's attention that, in the auditor's judgment, should be communicated because it represents either an opportunity for improvement or a significant deficiency in management's ability to operate a program in an effective and efficient manner.