PERFORMANCE AUDIT
OF THE

SAGINAW CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

November 2000

47-234-00

EXECUTIVE DIGEST

SAGINAW CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

INTRODUCTION

This report, issued in November 2000, contains the results of our performance audit* of the Saginaw Correctional Facility (SCF), 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

SCF, located in Saginaw County, is under the jurisdiction of DOC. The warden is appointed by the DOC director.

The mission of SCF is to protect the public by providing a safe, secure, and humane environment for staff and prisoners. SCF, which opened in August 1993, is a minimum*, medium* , and close security* (levels I, II, and IV) facility for males, with a capacity of 1,262 prisoners. Prisoners are housed two to a cell within a secured, double-fenced perimeter that includes an electronic detection system, two gun towers, and an armed response vehicle. An additional housing unit under construction at SCF will house up to 240 close security (level IV)

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

prisoners. The unit is expected to begin housing prisoners in fiscal year 2001-02.

For fiscal year 1998-99, SCF expenditures were $24.52 million. As of April 30, 2000, SCF had 389 employees, of which 270 were custody staff.

AUDIT OBJECTIVES, CONCLUSIONS, AND NOTEWORTHY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

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

Conclusion: We concluded that SCF'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 security monitoring exercises* , prisoner shakedowns*, and the Community Liaison Committee (Findings 1 through 3).

Noteworthy Accomplishments: As a result of SCF's telephone and mail monitoring activities during May and June 1998, SCF and the Michigan State police identified an SCF inmate who was organizing drug deals from prison. Information provided by SCF led to the arrests of seven people and seizure by State police of nearly 40 pounds of cocaine, $121,000 in cash, and three vehicles. The cocaine had an estimated street value of $2 million.

SCF minimum security (level I) prisoners built a home for the Saginaw County Habitat for Humanity organization. The home was constructed on site and moved to its permanent location on March 19, 2000. This accomplishment was the first of its kind for a Michigan prison. In addition, SCF prisoners built wall panels for 30 other Habitat for Humanity homes during 1999.

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

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

Conclusion: We concluded that SCF's prisoner care and maintenance operations were generally effective and efficient. However, we noted a reportable condition related to preventive maintenance (Finding 4).

Noteworthy Accomplishments: SCF's Maintenance Division has implemented an automated work order system that allows requests for repairs to be forwarded via SCF's local area network. The automated system provides an improved tracking system and eliminates unnecessary reviews and paperwork.

AUDIT SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Our audit scope was to examine program and other records of the Saginaw 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 SCF records and activities for the period October 1997 through April 2000. Our audit methodology included a preliminary review of SCF operations. This included discussions with various SCF staff regarding their functions and responsibilities and a review of program records and DOC policy directives and SCF operating procedures. To gain an understanding of SCF 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 in an effective and efficient manner.

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

AGENCY RESPONSES

Our audit report includes 4 findings and 4 corresponding recommendations. DOC's preliminary response indicated that SCF agrees with and has complied or has taken action to comply with the 4 recommendations.

November 2, 2000

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

Dear Mr. Martin:

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

The report contains our executive digest; description of agency; audit objectives, scope, and methodology and agency responses; comments, findings, recommendations, and agency preliminary responses; 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

SAGINAW 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, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS,
AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES

Safety and Security Operations	11
1. Security Monitoring Exercises	12
2. Prisoner Shakedowns	13
3. Community Liaison Committee	14
Prisoner Care and Maintenance Operations	15
4. Preventive Maintenance	15

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Description of Survey	19
Summary of Survey Responses	20

GLOSSARY

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms	22

Description of Agency

The Saginaw Correctional Facility (SCF), located in Saginaw County, is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections (DOC). The warden, who is the chief administrative officer for the facility, is a classified State employee under the State's civil service system. The warden is appointed by the DOC director.

SCF's deputy warden oversees security, housing, and prisoner programs. The administrative officer oversees the business office, physical plant, fire safety, food service, and storekeeping operations.

The mission of SCF is to protect the public by providing a safe, secure, and humane environment for staff and prisoners. SCF, which opened in August 1993, is a minimum, medium, and close security (levels I, II, and IV) facility for males, with a capacity of 1,262 prisoners. Prisoners are housed two to a cell within a secured, double-fenced perimeter that includes an electronic detection system, two gun towers, and an armed response vehicle. An additional housing unit under construction at SCF will house up to 240 close security (level IV) prisoners. The unit is expected to begin housing prisoners in fiscal year 2001-02.

For fiscal year 1998-99, SCF expenditures were $24.52 million. As of April 30, 2000, SCF had 389 employees, of which 270 were custody staff.

Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses

Audit Objectives

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

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

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

Audit Scope

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Saginaw 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 were conducted during January through May 2000 and included examination of SCF records and activities for the period October 1997 through April 2000.

To establish our audit objectives and to gain an understanding of SCF activities, we conducted a preliminary review of SCF operations. This included discussions with various SCF staff regarding their functions and responsibilities and a review of program records and DOC policy directives and SCF operating procedures. To gain an understanding of SCF 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 in an effective and efficient manner.

To assess the effectiveness of SCF's safety and security operations, we conducted tests of records related to firearm inventories and employee firearm qualifications. We

also examined records related to prisoner shakedowns and cell searches and employee searches. On a test basis, we inventoried keys and critical and dangerous tools. In addition, we reviewed security monitoring exercises, visitor safety, telephone monitoring systems, and documentation of items taken into and out of the facility.

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of SCF's prisoner care and maintenance operations, we conducted tests of records and reviewed preventive maintenance, disaster management, inventory controls, fire safety procedures, emergency backup tests, food service operations, prisoner care, and cash receipts. Also, we analyzed prisoner store financial and inventory controls and reviewed controls over the prisoner funds accounting system.

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

Agency Responses

Our audit report includes 4 findings and 4 corresponding recommendations. DOC's preliminary response indicated that SCF agrees with and has complied or has taken action to comply with the 4 recommendations.

The agency preliminary response which follows each 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 findings and recommendations within 60 days after the release of the audit report.

COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES

SAFETY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS

COMMENT

Background: The Saginaw Correctional Facility (SCF) operates under the policy directives established by the Department of Corrections (DOC) as well as operating procedures that were developed by the facility. SCF is responsible for providing a safe, secure, and humane environment for staff and prisoners. SCF operates within a secured, double-fenced perimeter with an electronic detection system that includes two gun towers with perimeter patrols by an alert response vehicle. DOC policy directives and local operating procedures have been implemented to help ensure the security of keys, tools, and firearms. SCF staff conduct periodic searches of prisoners, housing units, and prisoner belongings to detect contraband* . All visitors must register when entering the facility and are subject to being searched. DOC policy directives require periodic random searches of employees entering and exiting the facility.

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

Conclusion: We concluded that SCF'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 security monitoring exercises, prisoner shakedowns, and the Community Liaison Committee.

Noteworthy Accomplishments: As a result of SCF's telephone and mail monitoring activities during May and June 1998, SCF and the Michigan State police identified an SCF inmate who was organizing drug deals from prison. Information provided by SCF led to the arrests of seven people and seizure by State police of nearly 40 pounds of cocaine, $121,000 in cash, and three vehicles. The cocaine had an estimated street value of $2 million.

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

SCF minimum security (level I) prisoners built a home for the Saginaw County Habitat for Humanity organization. The home was constructed on site and moved to its permanent location on March 19, 2000. This accomplishment was the first of its kind for a Michigan prison. In addition, SCF prisoners built wall panels for 30 other Habitat for Humanity homes during 1999.

FINDING

1. Security Monitoring Exercises

SCF did not ensure that all security monitoring exercises (SMEs) were completed at the frequency required in SME descriptions.

SMEs were developed to test the effectiveness and alertness of staff in implementing institutional security measures. SCF operating procedures require that descriptions be developed for each SME that indicate the purpose of the exercise, frequency the SME is to be performed, staff involved in the exercise, and tasks to be performed. SMEs were to be assigned for completion in accordance with the frequency indicated in the SME descriptions.

SME records for the period March 1999 through February 2000 disclosed that completion of 293 (30%) of the required 969 exercises was not documented. We also noted that 209 (39%) of the 537 shifts required to perform SMEs did not complete the exercises at the frequency indicated in the SME descriptions.

Performing the required number of SMEs helps to ensure that prison staff are adequately trained in critical security measures. Performing and documenting the performance of SMEs provide assurance that the custody officers* actually received the intended training.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that SCF ensure that all SMEs are completed at the frequency required in SME descriptions.

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

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

SCF agrees and informed us that it has complied. In response to the audit, all SMEs have been reviewed. SCF's review revealed that frequencies listed in the SME descriptions were too ambitious to be feasible. This problem has been addressed and frequencies adjusted to a more manageable number. A quarterly audit will be performed by the assistant deputy warden of custody to ensure each shift completes SMEs in accordance with the frequency outlined in the SME descriptions.

FINDING

2. Prisoner Shakedowns

SCF did not ensure that custody officers performed and documented the required number of prisoner shakedowns.

DOC policy directives and facility operating procedures require that each custody officer with prisoner contact perform and document five prisoner shakedowns per day. These searches are necessary to help ensure that any prisoner contraband is detected in order to provide for the safety and security of staff and other prisoners.

Our review of prisoner shakedown records of 15 custody officers on nonhousing unit details disclosed that custody officers did not document 529 (49%) of the required 1,085 shakedowns were completed in March 2000. Also, 52% of the custody officers did not document that they completed the minimum of five shakedowns on their assigned shifts.

Without performing and documenting the required shakedowns of prisoners and their property, SCF management lacks assurance as to the detection and confiscation of all contraband.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that SCF ensure that custody officers perform and document the required number of prisoner shakedowns.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

SCF agrees and informed us that it has complied. First-line supervisors are monitoring the search documentation for each officer on a daily basis to ensure the minimum number of searches are performed and documented.

FINDING

3. Community Liaison Committee

SCF did not ensure that the Community Liaison Committee (CLC) met on a regular basis.

DOC policy requires correctional facilities to establish a system of communication with the local community for relaying DOC goals and policies, receiving and responding to community concerns and ideas, and disseminating and gathering information. DOC policy also requires the CLCs to meet on a regular basis, but not less than quarterly.

Our review of CLC minutes for January 1998 through March 2000 disclosed that SCF held 4 (44%) of the required 9 CLC meetings. SCF disclosed that staff changes and lack of public interest contributed to the reduced frequency of meetings. The results of our survey (see supplemental information) reinforced SCF's need to hold these meetings. Six (24%) of 25 respondents who live in the SCF vicinity indicated concerns related to security and lack of communication between SCF and the community, 15 (60%) respondents did not realize that SCF utilized a CLC, and 22 (88%) respondents did not know any of the CLC representatives to express their concerns to.

We recognize that SCF is actively involved in public relations with the community and supports local activities through the Saginaw County Habitat for Humanity organization (see noteworthy accomplishments), flower donation program, and staff involvement in various community projects. However, SCF should strive to address local residents' and businesses' security concerns through regularly scheduled CLC meetings.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that SCF ensure that CLC meets on a regular basis.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

SCF agrees and informed us that it has complied. CLC meetings have been scheduled quarterly since the audit and will continue to be.

PRISONER CARE AND MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS

COMMENTS

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

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

Conclusion: We concluded that SCF's prisoner care and maintenance operations were generally effective and efficient. However, we noted a reportable condition related to preventive maintenance.

Noteworthy Accomplishments: SCF's Maintenance Division has implemented an automated work order system that allows requests for repairs to be forwarded via SCF's local area network. The automated system provides an improved tracking system and eliminates unnecessary reviews and paperwork.

FINDING

4. Preventive Maintenance

SCF did not ensure that preventive maintenance on all facility buildings and equipment was scheduled or completed at the frequency required in task descriptions.

DOC policy 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. Preventive maintenance also includes visual observation, servicing, and testing of mechanical and electrical equipment and systems by individuals trained in the operation of the equipment. SCF established intervals for preventive maintenance inspections in its preventive maintenance plan.

Our review of SCF's preventive maintenance plan and maintenance records disclosed:

a. SCF's preventive maintenance plan and maintenance schedule did not include all of SCF's systems. Both the maintenance plan and the maintenance schedule did not include regularly scheduled inspections and maintenance tasks related to waste material storage and disposal and inspections of food service and health care equipment, as required by DOC policy. SCF stated that, although these inspections did not appear on the maintenance plan, they were being completed by staff or contract employees.

b. From January 1999 through March 2000, SCF did not complete 127 (43%) of the required 294 preventive maintenance activities for 31 preventive maintenance tasks we reviewed. Also, 27 (87%) of the 31 preventive maintenance tasks examined were not completed at the intervals required. Three (10%) of the 31 tasks analyzed were not completed at least once during the review period.

A comprehensive preventive maintenance plan and timely completion of all scheduled preventive tasks are necessary to minimize the possibility that preventable equipment and systems failures go undetected.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that SCF ensure that preventive maintenance on all facility buildings and equipment is scheduled and completed at the frequency required in task descriptions.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

SCF agrees. SCF informed us that computerized schedule for preventive maintenance is being implemented. Additionally, specific maintenance employees will be assigned and dedicated to preventive maintenance tasks.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Description of Survey

We developed a survey requesting input from certain individuals and businesses regarding their association with the Saginaw Correctional Facility (SCF).

We mailed surveys to 50 individuals and businesses located in the vicinity of SCF and received 25 responses. A review of these responses indicated that respondents were generally satisfied with SCF's administration. The responses also indicate that public concerns are addressed in a timely manner. However, the responses indicate that SCF had not effectively communicated the existence of its Community Liaison Committee or members who served on the Committee. In addition, some responses identified concerns regarding the effectiveness of SCF's communication with the community (see Finding 3) and SCF's use of sirens to simulate emergency situations. We referred these community concerns, along with a summary of the survey information, to the warden for follow-up.

SAGINAW CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

Department of Corrections

Summary of Survey Responses

Copies of Survey Distributed	50
Number of Responses	25
Response Rate	50%

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

Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion	No Answer
8	7	2	3	5	0

2. How satisfied are you with how management of the Saginaw Correctional Facility has addressed your individual concerns?

Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion	No Answer
6	6	1	2	10	0

3. How satisfied are you with the timeliness in which your individual concerns are addressed by the Saginaw Correctional Facility?

Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion	No Answer
6	5	2	1	10	1

4. How satisfied are you with the Saginaw Correctional Facility's process to notify the community of any problems or emergency situations related to the facility?

Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion	No Answer
4	9	2	6	4	0

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

Yes: 3 No: 22 No Answer: 0

6. If you visited the Saginaw 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
8	5	1	0	8	3

7. Are you aware that the Saginaw Correctional Facility utilizes a Community Liaison Committee to provide a system of communication between the facility and the local community?

Yes: 10 No: 15 No Answer: 0

How did you learn about the Committee?

3 of 10 Contacted Prison
3 of 10 Newspaper
2 of 10 Local Chamber of Commerce
2 of 10 Other/No Answer

Do you know any of the Committee's members to express your concerns to?

Yes: 3 No: 22 No Answer: 0

Do you know where and when the Committee meetings are held?

Yes: 2 No: 23 No Answer: 0

8. Overall, how satisfied are you with the extent of communication between the Saginaw Correctional Facility and the community?

Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion	No Answer
4	7	2	6	4	2

x

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

CLC	Community Liaison Committee.
close security (level IV)	A classification for prisoners who have a sentence of more than 60 months, who can generally be managed in the general population of prisons, and who have not shown a tendency to escape from close security.
contraband	Property that is not allowed on facility grounds 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 officers	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.
medium security (level II)	A classification for prisoners who generally have a longer sentence than do minimum security prisoners, who need more supervision but are not likely to escape, or who are not difficult to manage.
Minimum security (level I)	A classification of prisoners who can live in facilities with a minimum amount of security. They are normally relatively near parole.

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.
SCF	Saginaw Correctional Facility.
Security monitoring exercise (SME)	A systematic method of safely and effectively testing and monitoring security practices of the facility to enable staff to have an opportunity to perform these practices under controlled conditions.
Shakedown	The act of searching a prisoner, an employee, or a visitor to ensure that he/she does not have contraband in his/her possession.