RESPONSE TO REQUEST
FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW

SECURITY
DETROIT METROPOLITAN WAYNE COUNTY AIRPORT

PREPARED FOR
THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE SELECT COMMITTEE
ON THE WAYNE COUNTY DETROIT METROPOLITAN AIRPORT

27-617-00L

October 19, 2000

The Honorable Glenn D. Steil
Michigan Senate
Co-Chairperson, Joint Legislative Select Committee
1020 Farnum Building
Lansing, Michigan
and
The Honorable James L. Koetje
Michigan House of Representatives
Co-Chairperson, Joint Legislative Select Committee
N1093 House Office Building
Lansing, Michigan

Dear Senator Steil and Representative Koetje:

This special report is in response to your June 6, 2000 letter requesting a more detailed review of the Detroit Metropolitan Wayne County Airport (the Airport). This special report contains our response to a specific request in the general issue area of Airport security.

Specifically, you have asked us if the observations noted in your request were accurate and supported by the material in the preliminary review.

Our procedures were of limited scope. Therefore, our review should not be considered an audit in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

We are available to present this special report to the Joint Legislative Select Committee on the Wayne County Detroit Metropolitan Airport upon request. If this is the Committee's desire or if you have any questions or concerns regarding this review, please contact me.

Sincerely,

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

This page left intentionally blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AIRPORT SECURITY

INTRODUCTION

	Page
Report Letter	1
Overview of Airport Security	4
Scope of Review	4
Comments	4

OVERVIEW OF AIRPORT SECURITY

Part 107 of the federal aviation regulations requires the Detroit Metropolitan Wayne County Airport to provide adequate security to protect the traveling public. The Airport is required to submit, for Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approval, an airport security program which details the Airport's methods and procedures that will be utilized to comply with Part 107. The Airport maintains an FAA-approved airport security program as required by the federal aviation regulations.

SCOPE OF REVIEW

Our procedures were of limited scope. Therefore, our review should not be considered an audit in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

The Committee did not request a further review of the Security Division and additional information was not needed.

COMMENTS

Request:
Are the observations noted in the letter from the Joint Legislative Select Committee on the Wayne County Detroit Metropolitan Airport accurate and supported by the material in the preliminary review?

Committee Observations:
In its June 6, 2000 letter, the Committee observed that the Preliminary Review of Airport Security included a brief description of roles and responsibilities of the Airport's

various security positions and contained a short background on applicable security requirements imposed by the FAA:

1. Public Safety Division

   As of January 20, 2000, the Division included 279 employees who staff the Security Operations, Airport Police, Airport Rescue and Fire, and Central Communications. The Airport expended approximately $17.6 million (12% of total Airport expenditures) for the Division in fiscal year 1997-98.

   a. Security Operations

      The auditors reviewed the FAA letters of correction issued in 1997, 1998, and 1999 and found that the Airport has completed all corrections by the mandated correction dates.

   b. Airport Police

      The auditors reviewed documentation covering officer training, history, firearm qualifications, training and weapons inspections, passenger screening, incident reports, and daily activity reports. The auditors summarized monthly security activity reports submitted to the FAA during 1998 and 1999 and indicated that, between 1998 and 1999, weapons detected at the Airport increased from 5 to 26; persons arrested for firearm possession increased from 4 to 15; and the number of persons referred for bomb threats increased from 1 to 11.

      The lone discrepancy identified in the preliminary review dealt with weapons inspections. The Airport did not provide the auditors with documentation for weapons inspections for 22 of 23 officers and also could not document its statement that weapons were inspected annually. Subsequent to the auditors' review, the Airport changed its policy to require weapons inspection every six months.

   c. Airport Rescue and Fire

      The auditors reviewed documentation that included the 1997, 1998, and 1999 FAA letters of correction, fire safety inspection reports, and employee training records and found that the Airport had conducted the necessary safety inspections and fire drills as required by FAA operating procedures.

2. Operations Division

As of January 20, 2000, the Operations Division employed 89 staff for airfield and ground transportation, terminal, and paging operations. The preliminary review indicates that the Airport expended approximately $15.4 million (10% of total Airport expenditures) for this Division in fiscal year 1997-98. The auditors reviewed the operating procedures and documentation for incident reports and found that the FAA's 1999 letter of correction cited the Airport for failure to perform fuel farm and fuel truck inspections and for failure to implement a system to ensure prompt corrective action of discrepancies noted in the self-inspection program. The Airport corrected these deficiencies by the mandated correction date. No other deficiencies in Airport operations are cited in the report.

Procedure:

We reviewed the Committee's letter and compared it to our preliminary report and working papers to determine if the letter is accurate and supported by the preliminary report.

Comment:

The aforementioned observations of the Committee are accurate and supported by the material in the preliminary review with one exception. Item 1.b. states that the auditors reviewed documentation covering passenger screening. It is noteworthy that passenger screening is the responsibility of the airlines and not the Airport. However, the Airport is responsible for testing the primary and secondary alerting system in the passenger screening equipment.