PERFORMANCE AUDIT
OF THE

ALGER MAXIMUM CORRECTIONAL FACILITY AND CAMP CUSINO

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

August 1999

47-206-98

EXECUTIVE DIGEST

ALGER MAXIMUM CORRECTIONAL FACILITY AND CAMP CUSINO

INTRODUCTION	This report, issued in August 1999, contains the results of our performance audit* of the Alger Maximum Correctional Facility (AMCF) and Camp Cusino (CC), 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	AMCF and CC are located in Alger county. CC was annexed to AMCF on August 10, 1997 as part of the administrative reorganization of the Corrections Camp Program. One warden oversees the operation of both facilities. The DOC director appoints the warden, who is classified under the State civil service system. AMCF and CC are approximately eight miles from each other and share the following: business office, mailroom, personnel office, records office, training office, and fire safety.

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

The mission* of AMCF and CC is to protect society by providing a secure setting for prisoners. AMCF opened in 1990 and occupies 78 acres and 10 buildings with approximately 24 acres being within a secured, fenced perimeter that is guarded by alert response vehicles and five guard towers. AMCF housed an average of 527 level V maximum security* male prisoners in fiscal year 1997-98. CC opened in 1980 and occupies 40 acres and 5 buildings with approximately 4 acres being within a secured, fenced perimeter. CC housed an average of 311 level I minimum security* male prisoners in fiscal year 1997-98.

For fiscal year 1997-98, AMCF and CC operating expenditures were approximately $19.2 million and $4.2 million, respectively. As of September 30, 1998, AMCF had 326 employees and CC had 60 employees.

AUDIT OBJECTIVES, CONCLUSIONS, AND NOTEWORTHY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of AMCF's and CC's safety and security operations.

Conclusion: We concluded that AMCF's and CC's safety and security operations were generally effective in preventing escapes and protecting employees and prisoners from serious injury. However, we noted reportable conditions* related to AMCF and CC prisoner shakedowns* and cell searches*, CC employee shakedowns, and AMCF tool control (Findings 1 through 3).

Noteworthy Accomplishments: AMCF is accredited by the American Correctional Association. The American Correctional Association is a private, nonprofit organization

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

that administers a national accreditation program for all components of adult and juvenile corrections. The accreditation program offers the opportunity to management to evaluate its operations against national standards. The recognized benefits from such a process are a better understanding of policies and procedures by staff, a safer and more humane environment for personnel and offenders, and improved staff morale and professionalism. Accreditation is awarded to the "best of the best" in the corrections field. The standards used for accreditation address services, programs, and operations essential to good correctional management. They include administrative and fiscal controls, staff training and development, physical plant, safety and emergency procedures, sanitation, food service, and rules and discipline.

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of AMCF's and CC's prisoner care and maintenance operations.

Conclusion: We concluded that AMCF's and CC's prisoner care and maintenance operations were generally effective and efficient. However, we noted reportable conditions related to AMCF's and CC's preventative maintenance activities, disaster management manual, testing of emergency generators, fire safety, and food service operations (Findings 4 through 8).

AUDIT SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Alger Maximum Correctional Facility and Camp Cusino. 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 AMCF and CC records and activities for the period October 1995 through October 1998. Our audit methodology included a preliminary survey of AMCF and CC operations. This included discussions with various AMCF and CC staff regarding their functions and responsibilities and a review of program records and DOC, AMCF, and CC policy directives and procedures. In addition, we reviewed various AMCF and CC management, staff, and committee meeting minutes and reports. We conducted tests of records related to safety and security, prisoner care, and preventative maintenance operations for compliance with applicable policies and procedures and overall program effectiveness and efficiency.

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

AGENCY RESPONSES

Our audit report includes 8 findings and 9 corresponding recommendations. AMCF agreed with all of the findings and informed us that it either has complied or will comply with the recommendations.

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

Dear Mr. Martin:

This is our report on the performance audit of the Alger Maximum Correctional Facility and Camp Cusino, Department of Corrections.

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

Our comments, findings, and recommendations are organized by audit objective. The agency preliminary responses were taken from the agency's responses 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

ALGER MAXIMUM CORRECTIONAL FACILITY AND CAMP CUSINO
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, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS,
AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES

Safety and Security Operations	11
1. Prisoner Shakedowns and Cell Searches	12
2. Employee Shakedowns	14
3. Tool Control	14
Prisoner Care and Maintenance Operations	16
4. Preventative Maintenance Activities	16
5. Disaster Management Manual	18
6. Testing of Emergency Generators	19
7. Fire Safety	20
8. Food Service Operations	22

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Description of Survey	25
Summary of Survey Responses	26

GLOSSARY

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms	28

Description of Agency

The Alger Maximum Correctional Facility (AMCF), located in Munising, and Camp Cusino (CC), located in Shingleton, are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections (DOC). CC was annexed to AMCF on August 10, 1997 as part of the administrative reorganization of the Corrections Camp Program. One warden oversees the operation of both facilities. The DOC director appoints the warden, who is classified under the State civil service system. AMCF and CC are approximately eight miles from each other and share the following: business office, mailroom, personnel office, records office, training office, and fire safety. AMCF also provides assistance to CC in maintenance and food service operations.

The mission of AMCF and CC is to protect society by providing a secure setting for prisoners. AMCF opened in 1990 and occupies 78 acres and 10 buildings with approximately 24 acres being within a secured, fenced perimeter. AMCF housed an average of 527 level V maximum security male prisoners in fiscal year 1997-98. Double chain link fences, five guard towers, electronic detection systems, concertina wire, and alert response vehicles make up AMCF's perimeter security. CC opened in 1980 and occupies 40 acres and 5 buildings with approximately 4 acres being within a secured, fenced perimeter. CC housed an average of 311 level I minimum security male prisoners in fiscal year 1997-98.

The facilities provide programs to prisoners that include academic/vocational education, counseling and substance abuse programs, psychological counseling, religious activities, library access, and recreational activities. Prisoners are also given an opportunity to work at the facilities to earn money for personal needs and to develop good work habits. In addition, CC offers a public works program for eligible prisoners to provide services that benefit the general public.

For fiscal year 1997-98, AMCF and CC operating expenditures were approximately $19.2 million and $4.2 million, respectively. As of September 30, 1998, AMCF had 326 employees and CC had 60 employees.

Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses

Audit Objectives

Our performance audit of the Alger Maximum Correctional Facility (AMCF) and Camp Cusino (CC), Department of Corrections (DOC), had the following objectives:

1. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of AMCF's and CC's safety and security operations.

2. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of AMCF's and CC's prisoner care and maintenance operations.

Audit Scope

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Alger Maximum Correctional Facility and Camp Cusino. 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 were conducted during the period September through November 1998 and included examination of AMCF and CC records and activities for the period October 1995 through October 1998.

To establish our audit objectives and to gain an understanding of AMCF and CC activities, we conducted a preliminary survey of AMCF and CC operations. This included discussions with various AMCF and CC staff regarding their functions and responsibilities and a review of program records and DOC, AMCF, and CC policy directives and procedures. In addition, we reviewed various AMCF and CC management, staff, and committee meeting minutes and reports.

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of AMCF's and CC's safety and security operations, we conducted tests of records related to firearms inventories, employee firearm qualifications, and searches of employees. Also, we examined records related

to prisoner and cell searches. On a test basis, we inventoried keys and critical and dangerous tools. In addition, we reviewed guard towers, visitor safety, telephone monitoring systems, and documentation of items taken into and out of AMCF and CC.

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of AMCF's and CC's prisoner care and maintenance operations, we conducted tests of records related to preventative maintenance programs, disaster management planning, warehouse operations, fire safety procedures, emergency electrical backup tests, and food service programs. We tested records related to employee meals, prisoner stores, collections from prisoners, and cash receipts.

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

Agency Responses

Our audit report includes 8 findings and 9 corresponding recommendations. AMCF agreed with all of the findings and informed us that it either has complied or will comply with the recommendations.

The agency preliminary response which follows each recommendation in our report was taken from the agency's written comments and oral discussion 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 findings and recommendations within 60 days after release of the audit report.

COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES

SAFETY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS

COMMENT

Background: Alger Maximum Correctional Facility (AMCF) and Camp Cusino (CC) operate under the policy directives established by the Department of Corrections (DOC), as well as operating procedures, that are developed internally at each facility. AMCF and CC are responsible for providing a safe, secure, and humane environment for staff and prisoners. AMCF operates within a secured, electronically monitored, double chain link fenced perimeter with concertina wire that is guarded by custody staff in alert response vehicles and five guard towers. CC security perimeter is protected by a secured, fenced perimeter. Procedures have been implemented to ensure the security of keys, tools, and firearms. AMCF and CC staff conduct periodic searches of prisoners, their cells, and their belongings to detect contraband* . All persons visiting prisoners must register and are subject to a search. Randomly selected employees are also searched when entering or exiting the facilities.

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of AMCF's and CC's safety and security operations.

Conclusion: We concluded that AMCF's and CC's safety and security operations were generally effective in preventing escapes and protecting employees and prisoners from serious injury. However, we noted reportable conditions related to AMCF and CC prisoner shakedowns and cell searches, CC employee shakedowns, and AMCF tool control.

Noteworthy Accomplishments: AMCF is accredited by the American Correctional Association. The American Correctional Association is a private, nonprofit organization that administers a national accreditation program for all components of adult and juvenile corrections. The accreditation program offers the opportunity to management

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

to evaluate its operations against national standards. The recognized benefits from such a process are a better understanding of policies and procedures by staff, a safer and more humane environment for personnel and offenders, and improved staff morale and professionalism. Accreditation is awarded to the "best of the best" in the corrections field. The standards used for accreditation address services, programs, and operations essential to good correctional management. They include administrative and fiscal controls, staff training and development, physical plant, safety and emergency procedures, sanitation, food service, and rules and discipline.

FINDING

1. Prisoner Shakedowns and Cell Searches

AMCF management did not ensure that AMCF and CC custody staff* and housing unit officers* performed the required number of prisoner shakedowns and cell searches. Also, AMCF management did not ensure that CC custody staff retained documentation of prisoner shakedowns and cell searches as required by DOC policy directives.

DOC policy directive 04.04.110 and facility procedures require that each custody staff with direct prisoner contact perform five prisoner shakedowns per day. Also, all housing unit officers are required to perform a minimum of three cell searches per day. The procedure also requires facilities to record prisoner shakedowns and cell searches. These searches are necessary to help ensure that any prisoner contraband is detected to provide for the safety and security of staff and other prisoners.

We reviewed documentation for prisoner shakedowns and cell searches during selected months for AMCF and CC and noted:

a. Not all AMCF custody staff assignments with direct prisoner contact performed prisoner shakedowns. We noted 28 (4%) of the 651 custody staff assignments with direct prisoner contact did not perform prisoner shakedowns for the month of March 1998.

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

b. In two AMCF housing units, the housing unit officers did not complete 766 (61%) of the required 1,260 cell searches for the month of June 1998.

c. CC custody staff did not complete 755 (38%) of 2,010 prisoner shakedowns and 453 (38%) of 1,206 cell searches for the month of August 1998.

d. CC did not retain documentation to support the prisoner shakedowns and cell searches recorded on the logs. CC's prisoner shakedown and cell search log did not contain detail sufficient to identify the prisoners that had a shakedown or the cells that were searched.

We were informed by AMCF and CC housing unit officers that they did not fully understand the DOC policy directive 04.04.110 and facility procedures related to number of prisoner shakedowns and cell searches required per day.

Conducting prisoner shakedowns and cell searches improves AMCF's and CC's ability to ensure the safety of prisoners and employees. Also, proper documentation facilitates effective monitoring of prisoner shakedowns.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that AMCF management ensure that AMCF and CC custody staff and housing unit officers perform the required number of prisoner shakedowns and cell searches.

We also recommend that AMCF management ensure that CC custody staff retain documentation supporting prisoner shakedowns and cell searches conducted.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

AMCF agrees and will comply. Documentation for cell searches and shakedowns will be monitored on a daily basis to ensure compliance with the policy.

AMCF also complied by issuing an instructional memo to CC shift supervisors indicating that shakedown and area search sheets be completed and that form CSJ-468 be used and maintained for one year. The camp assistant deputy warden (ADW) will randomly check the documentation. The completion of shakedowns and area searches will be verified to the ADW in a monthly report.

FINDING

2. Employee Shakedowns

AMCF did not ensure that the CC facility staff randomly selected and searched employees prior to entry. We reviewed the employee shakedown log for June 1998 and noted that only 5 of 63 staff had been searched prior to entry during the month.

DOC policy directive 04.04.110 requires a periodic search of employees. While the directive does not specifically state that all employees will be searched at least once each month, we conclude that this is a reasonable time period to ensure that all employees entering the facility have been searched.

Increasing the number of randomly selected searches of employees entering the facility would help ensure the security of the facility and the safety of the employees and prisoners.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that AMCF ensure that the CC facility staff randomly select and search employees prior to entry.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

AMCF agrees and will comply by increasing the number of employees searched. The number of random shakedowns will be reported in the monthly report. However, DOC disagrees with the auditors' statements which imply that periodic searches should result in each employee being searched monthly. Searches should be conducted on a random basis. The randomness of searches keeps staff aware that a search may occur at anytime and reduces complacency after the "monthly" search has been completed.

FINDING

3. Tool Control

AMCF was not effective in ensuring that staff complied with procedures related to critical and dangerous tools.

DOC policy directive 04.04.120 and facility procedures require that AMCF maintain an accurate master inventory list of tools and complete an annual tool audit.

We inventoried tools and reviewed related inventory records for 4 of 7 tool storage locations on September 29 and 30, 1998 and noted:

a. Several discrepancies existed between master inventory listing and inventory on hand. We noted 6 items on hand that were not on either the master or the daily inventory listings. These items consisted of ice chippers and snow shovels. We also noted 9 items, such as scissors, hemostats, metal trays, and a push lawn mower, that were not on hand but were on the master and daily inventory listing.

b. Discrepancies existed between the master inventory listing and the daily inventory sheets. We discovered three tools on the daily inventory sheet that were not included on the master inventory list. We also noted one tool on the master inventory list that was not included on the daily inventory sheet.

Because of the tool control weaknesses, AMCF did not have assurances that critical and dangerous tools were properly controlled. Without such assurances, the safety and security of staff and prisoners may be jeopardized.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that AMCF ensure that staff comply with procedures related to critical and dangerous tools.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

AMCF agrees and has complied. The tool lists have been corrected and updated to reflect an accurate inventory of items. In addition, the post orders for area supervisors are being reviewed to ensure that they include tool control responsibilities. The tool control officers will verify compliance with the post orders and procedures.

PRISONER CARE AND MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS

COMMENT

Background: AMCF and CC are responsible for providing a safe, secure, and humane environment for staff and prisoners. AMCF and CC have developed procedures for their operations involving preventive maintenance programs, disaster planning, fire safety, sanitation and housekeeping inspections, warehouse operations, food service activities, power plant operations, prisoner accounting, and prisoner store operations.

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of AMCF's and CC's prisoner care and maintenance operations.

Conclusion: We concluded that AMCF's and CC's prisoner care and maintenance operations were generally effective and efficient. However, we noted reportable conditions related to AMCF's and CC's preventative maintenance activities, disaster management manual, testing of emergency generators, fire safety, and food service operations.

FINDING

4. Preventive Maintenance Activities

AMCF did not perform proper preventive maintenance activities on the AMCF and CC facility buildings, equipment, and utility systems.

DOC policy directive 04.03.100 provides that each facility develop a preventive maintenance plan to ensure that all facility systems and equipment are functioning properly. The preventive maintenance plan is to be designed to provide for consistent inspections, investigations, and coordinated repairs with the intent of minimizing equipment failures and breakdowns. Preventive maintenance is accomplished by periodic, planned inspections. It also includes visual observation, servicing, and testing of mechanical and electrical equipment and systems by individuals trained in the operation of the equipment. Each maintenance department shall develop inspection checklists, logs, or computer software commensurate with physical plant configuration, equipment, and systems to

facilitate monitoring and to document preventive and emergency maintenance activities.

Our review of AMCF and CC maintenance records disclosed:

a. AMCF did not perform the following inspections included in its preventive maintenance plan and maintenance schedule:

   (1) The annual plumbing inspection for fiscal years 1996-97 and 1997-98.

   (2) The annual asphalt and concrete inspection for fiscal year 1997-98.

   (3) The annual building inspection for fiscal year 1997-98.

   (4) Monthly sallyport* inspections for fiscal years 1996-97 and 1997-98.

b. AMCF did not utilize its preventive maintenance plan checklist while performing the weekly mechanical room inspections. Based on the intricate nature of that inspection, a checklist would provide assurance that the inspection is performed in accordance with the plan.

c. CC's preventive maintenance plan and maintenance schedule did not include all of CC's systems. Both the plan and the maintenance schedule did not include inspections and maintenance tasks for plumbing and water supply systems, waste material storage and disposal systems, fire suppression and detection systems, electrical distribution and lighting systems, and security systems.

d. CC's methods used to document and perform preventive maintenance activities were not sufficient to ensure that necessary inspections, investigations, and coordinated repairs were conducted in accordance with the facilities' preventive maintenance plans. Documentation was not organized and maintained centrally to support that these inspections were performed.

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

e. CC did not perform preventive maintenance inspections of its plumbing and water supply systems, waste material storage and disposal systems, electrical distribution and lighting systems, and security systems.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that AMCF perform proper preventive maintenance activities on the AMCF and CC facility buildings, equipment, and utility systems.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

AMCF agrees with the auditor's recommendations and will ensure that all preventive maintenance schedules and inspections are completed. A preventive maintenance and inspection checklist will be posted at each site. Supervisors will initial the checklist when the preventive maintenance is completed. A monthly report will be required to document preventive maintenance activities.

FINDING

5. Disaster Management Manual

AMCF did not develop a comprehensive written Disaster Management Manual for CC, that describes how unforeseen disasters will be controlled.

DOC policy directive 04.03.110 requires each facility to compile and distribute a Disaster Management Manual. The policy directive requires that the Disaster Management Manual contain narratives addressing its purpose, a description of hazards to which the site is susceptible, a summary of how the facility will respond to a disaster, and operating procedures to be employed by facility personnel during specific disaster occurrences. We noted that CC did have a Disaster Management Manual, but it did not contain the following:

a. The purpose of the Disaster Management Manual.

b. A summary of how the facility will respond to a disaster.

c. A building map designating tornado shelter areas and capacity.

d. A list of vital records to be protected in an emergency or disaster.

e. A media contact list, including radio, television, newspaper, and news services.

f. The operating procedures for tornado, hazardous materials incidents, flood, bomb threat, utility emergency, civil disturbance, and enemy attack disaster types.

The policy directive also requires that CC provide a copy of the Disaster Management Manual and its updates to local emergency service agencies. CC did not provide the Disaster Management Manual to those agencies.

A comprehensive Disaster Management Manual provides assurance that employees, prisoners, the general public, facility property, and the environment are protected in the event of an unforeseen disaster.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that AMCF develop a comprehensive written Disaster Management Manual for CC that describes how unforeseen disasters will be controlled.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

AMCF agrees with the recommendation and will update and complete a Disaster Management Manual.

FINDING

6. Testing of Emergency Generators

AMCF did not test AMCF's and CC's emergency backup generators in accordance with policies and procedures.

DOC policy directive 04.03.100 requires facilities to conduct weekly tests of emergency backup generators and monthly full-load tests of the emergency backup generators.

Our review of emergency backup generator logbooks for fiscal years 1996-97 and 1997-98 disclosed:

a. AMCF did not conduct full-load tests in 6 months in fiscal year 1996-97 and in 5 months in fiscal year 1997-98. AMCF did not conduct 7 weekly tests in fiscal year 1996-97 and 3 weekly tests in fiscal year 1997-98.

b. CC did not conduct any monthly full-load generator tests in fiscal year 1997-98. CC did not conduct 19 weekly tests on one generator and 15 weekly tests on the other generator during fiscal year 1997-98.

Testing of the emergency backup generators provides the assurance that they will function properly and critical security and safety equipment will remain operational if the power supply is interrupted.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that AMCF test AMCF's and CC's emergency backup generators in accordance with policies and procedures.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

AMCF agrees and will comply. Weekly and monthly generator tests will be completed and logged. In addition, full-load generator tests will become part of the disturbance control scenarios.

FINDING

7. Fire Safety

AMCF did not comply with some DOC fire safety procedures at AMCF and CC.

DOC policy directive 04.03.120 requires that facilities conduct fire evacuation drills quarterly on each shift in all locations that are normally occupied by staff or prisoners. Facilities should document these fire drills on evacuation drill reports and submit them to the facility head and fire safety inspector. Also, facilities must have their kitchen hood fire suppression systems inspected semi-annually by a firm certified by the Fire Marshal Division, Michigan Department of State Police.

Our review disclosed:

a. CC did not always conduct fire evacuation drills quarterly for each shift. For the first three quarters in calendar year 1998, 5 of 18 required fire evacuation drills were not conducted in the two housing units. In addition, for the 13 fire evacuation drills conducted, CC did not submit 5 of 13 fire evacuation drill reports to the fire safety inspector.

b. AMCF and CC did not have their kitchen hood fire suppression systems inspected on a semiannual basis. At the time of our fieldwork, AMCF had one inspection conducted in July 1997 and one inspection conducted in May 1998. CC had one inspection conducted in April 1997 and one inspection conducted in April 1998.

Completing all required fire safety activities increases AMCF's and CC's assurances that fire safety equipment will be fully operational and that evacuation procedures are fully understood by staff and prisoners to ensure their safety during emergencies.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that AMCF increase its efforts to comply with DOC fire safety procedures at AMCF and CC.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

AMCF agrees and will comply by inspecting fire suppression systems on a semiannual basis. AMCF will also comply by submitting all CC fire evacuation drill reports as required.

FINDING

8. Food Service Operations

AMCF did not ensure that CC's food service program met minimal sanitation standards.

DOC policy directive 04.07.103 requires that facilities establish sanitation standards for their food service programs and a systematic program for monitoring compliance with those standards.

Our review disclosed:

a. In September 1998, sanitation inspections were not conducted on 18 of 60 food service shifts. Also, pre-shift prisoner worker health inspections were not conducted on 8 of 60 food service shifts. DOC policy directive 04.07.103 requires that the food service supervisor conduct inspections on each shift. In addition, staff designated by the food service supervisor shall conduct pre-shift health inspections of prisoner workers. These inspections include making sure uniforms are clean, hair nets are worn, hands and fingernails are clean, and prisoner workers are free of open or infected wounds.

b. The camp supervisor did not conduct weekly sanitation inspections for the period January through September 1998. DOC policy directive 04.07.103 requires that the camp supervisor conduct weekly inspections of all areas. Weekly inspections must include documentation regarding whether cleaning duties have been performed and whether temperatures have been taken of all storage areas, food items from the daily menus, and dish machines.

c. CC did not document that 11 of the 25 prisoners who worked in the food service program in November 1998 received medical clearance from the Bureau of Health Care Services. DOC policy directive 04.07.103 requires that prior to placement of prisoners into the food service program, the Bureau of Health Care Services must review the prisoners' health records to ensure that all are medically cleared of communicable diseases.

Completing required sanitation and pre-shift health inspections and verifying that prisoners working in food service have medical clearance helps ensure the safety of staff and prisoners.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that AMCF ensure that CC's food service program meets minimal sanitation standards.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

AMCF agrees with the findings and will immediately correct all deficiencies noted. A weekly inspection will be conducted and documented by supervisory staff.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Description of Survey

We developed a survey requesting input from certain individuals and businesses regarding their association with the Alger Maximum Correctional Facility and Camp Cusino.

We mailed this survey to 50 individuals and businesses and received 23 responses. A review of the responses indicated that most respondents were highly satisfied with the facilities' administration. Also, the responses indicated that public concerns are generally addressed in a timely manner; however, some responses indicated a need for Camp Cusino to notify the community of any problems or security situations related to the facility. We referred the community's concerns to the warden for disposition.

ALGER MAXIMUM CORRECTIONAL FACILITY (AMCF) AND CAMP CUSINO (CC)

Department of Corrections

Summary of Survey Responses

Copies of Survey Distributed	50
Number of Responses	23
Response Rate	46%

1. How would you rate your satisfaction with the frequency of contacts between you or your organization and the Alger Maximum Correctional Facility (AMCF) or Camp Cusino (CC)?

	Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion
AMCF:	10	5			8
CC:	7	6	2	1	7

2. How satisfied are you with how management of the Alger Maximum Correctional Facility or Camp Cusino have addressed your individual concerns?

	Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion
AMCF:	10	4			9
CC:	9	4	1	1	8

3. How satisfied are you with the timeliness in which your individual concerns are addressed by the Alger Maximum Correctional Facility or Camp Cusino?

	Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion
AMCF:	11	3			9
CC:	8	5	2		8

4. How satisfied are you with the Alger Maximum Correctional Facility's or Camp Cusino's process to notify the community of any problems or emergency situations related to the facilities?

	Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion
AMCF:	11	4	1		7
CC:	8	5	3	1	6

5. Do you have any specific safety or security concerns that have not been addressed by Alger Maximum Correctional Facility's or Camp Cusino's personnel?

AMCF:	Yes: 1	No: 22
CC:	Yes: 3	No: 20

6. If you visited the Alger Maximum Correctional Facility or Camp Cusino, were you satisfied with the security provided to you while at the facilities?

	Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion
AMCF:	14	1			8
CC:	11	2			10

7. Overall, how satisfied are you with the extent of communication between the Alger Maximum Correctional Facility or Camp Cusino and the community?

	Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion
AMCF:	10	4	1		8
CC:	7	6	2		8

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

AMCF	Alger Maximum Correctional Facility.
CC	Camp Cusino.
cell search	The act of going through a prisoner's cell and belongings looking for contraband.
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.
custody staff	Corrections officers and resident unit officers.
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 officers	Corrections officers who work in the housing units.
level I minimum security	A classification of prisoners who can live in facilities with a minimum amount of security. They are normally relatively near parole.

level V maximum security	A classification of prisoners who need close supervision because of the likelihood they may try to escape or because they are difficult to control.
mission	The agency's main purpose or the reason the agency was established.
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 his/her 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.
sallyport	A controlled, secure gate by which vehicles can enter the prison grounds through the perimeter fencing.
shakedown	A patdown or clothed body search of a prisoner, an employee, or a visitor to ensure that he/she does not have contraband in his/her possession.