



MICHIGAN

OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL

AUDIT REPORT



THOMAS H. McTAVISH, C.P.A.
AUDITOR GENERAL

“...The auditor general shall conduct post audits of financial transactions and accounts of the state and of all branches, departments, offices, boards, commissions, agencies, authorities and institutions of the state established by this constitution or by law, and performance post audits thereof.”

– Article IV, Section 53 of the Michigan Constitution

Audit report information may be accessed at:

<http://audgen.michigan.gov>



Michigan
Office of the Auditor General
REPORT SUMMARY

Performance Audit

Report Number:
 47-238-05

Southern Michigan Correctional Facility

Department of Corrections

Released:
 January 2006

Southern Michigan Correctional Facility's mission is to ensure the public's safety by effectively, humanely, and efficiently managing the Facility's resources. The Facility houses level II and level IV prisoners, with a capacity of 1,466 prisoners. The Facility is located in Jackson County.

Audit Objective:

To assess the Facility's compliance with selected policies and procedures related to safety and security.

Audit Conclusion:

We concluded that the Facility was generally in compliance with selected policies and procedures related to safety and security. However, we noted reportable conditions related to prisoner shakedowns, prisoner counts, prisoner drug tests, key controls, monthly tool inspections, self-contained breathing apparatus squads, and hazardous materials (Findings 1 through 7).

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Audit Objective:

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Facility's food service operations, prisoner accounts, and prisoner store operations.

Audit Conclusion:

We concluded that the Facility's food service operations, prisoner accounts, and prisoner store operations were effective

and efficient. Our report does not include any reportable conditions related to this audit objective.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Noteworthy Accomplishments:

On March 15, 2004, the Dialysis Unit officially opened at the Southern Michigan Correctional Facility. The opening of the Dialysis Unit took months of planning and coordinated efforts among Ryan Correctional Facility, Regional Guidance Center transportation staff, health unit managers, Correctional Facilities Administration classification staff, Kidney Replacement Services, and Facility staff.

Facility management informed us that the Dialysis Unit was moved to the Facility because of its proximity to Duane L. Waters Hospital and space limitation at Ryan Correctional Facility and as a cost savings measure. The Unit was expanded from a 9-chair operation, six days per week to an 18-chair operation, three to four days per week.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Agency Responses:

Our audit report contains 7 findings and 11 corresponding recommendations. The Facility's preliminary response indicated that it agrees and has complied with all of our recommendations.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

A copy of the full report can be obtained by calling 517.334.8050 or by visiting our Web site at: <http://audgen.michigan.gov>



Michigan Office of the Auditor General
201 N. Washington Square
Lansing, Michigan 48913

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

Scott M. Strong, C.P.A., C.I.A.
Deputy Auditor General



STATE OF MICHIGAN
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL
201 N. WASHINGTON SQUARE
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48913
(517) 334-8050
FAX (517) 334-8079

THOMAS H. MCTAVISH, C.P.A.
AUDITOR GENERAL

January 18, 2006

Ms. Patricia L. Caruso, Director
Department of Corrections
Grandview Plaza Building
Lansing, Michigan

Dear Ms. Caruso:

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

This report contains our report summary; description of the agency; audit objectives, scope, and methodology and agency responses; comments, findings, recommendations, and agency preliminary responses; 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.

AUDITOR GENERAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SOUTHERN MICHIGAN CORRECTIONAL FACILITY DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	
Report Summary	1
Report Letter	3
Description of Agency	6
Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses	7
COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES	
Safety and Security	9
1. Prisoner Shakedowns	10
2. Prisoner Counts	11
3. Prisoner Drug Tests	13
4. Key Controls	14
5. Monthly Tool Inspections	15
6. Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA) Squads	16
7. Hazardous Materials	17
Food Service Operations, Prisoner Accounts, and Prisoner Store Operations	19
GLOSSARY	
Glossary of Acronyms and Terms	21

Description of Agency

Southern Michigan Correctional Facility's mission* is to ensure the public's safety by effectively, humanely, and efficiently managing the Facility's resources. The Facility, located in Jackson County, was created by the restructuring program of the State Prison of Southern Michigan. It opened in 1997 to house security classification level IV* prisoners, housing special management male prisoners in single-bunked cells. In December 2001, the Facility was converted to house security classification level II* prisoners in double-bunked cells. In 2003, the Facility became a multi-level facility, housing level II and level IV prisoners, with a capacity of 1,466 prisoners. Prisoners are held within a 40-foot perimeter wall. The Facility has two layers of concertina wire attached to its walls, motion sensors on every fence, an "E-field" on the roof (sensor beams), and recording cameras that cover the entire perimeter. The Facility's security is further enhanced by four gun towers.

The Facility provides programs to prisoners that include academic/vocational education, substance abuse programs, psychological counseling, hobby crafts, recreation, and special activities. Prisoners are given the opportunity to work at the Facility to earn money for personal needs and to develop good work habits.

For fiscal year 2004-05, the Facility was appropriated approximately \$33.5 million. As of May 31, 2005, the Facility had 449 employees.

* See glossary at end of report for definition.

Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses

Audit Objectives

Our performance audit* of Southern Michigan Correctional Facility, Department of Corrections (DOC), had the following objectives:

1. To assess the Facility's compliance with selected policies and procedures related to safety and security.
2. To assess the effectiveness* and efficiency* of the Facility's food service operations, prisoner accounts, and prisoner store operations.

Audit Scope

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of Southern Michigan 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 May 2005, included examination of Facility records and activities primarily for the period October 1, 2002 through May 31, 2005.

To establish our audit objectives and to gain an understanding of Facility activities, we conducted a preliminary review of Facility operations. This included discussions with various Facility staff regarding their functions and responsibilities and examination of program records, policy directives, and operating procedures. In addition, we reviewed self-audits*, monthly reports to the warden, and community liaison committee meeting minutes. We also reviewed the DOC internal audit reports for selected operations.

To assess the Facility's compliance with selected policies and procedures related to safety and security, we examined records related to firearm inventories, employee firearm qualifications, medication control, drug testing, prisoner and cell searches, and

* See glossary at end of report for definition.

daily prisoner counts. We also examined records for fire safety and preventive maintenance. We reviewed procedures and records for security monitoring exercises and documentation of items taken into and out of the Facility. On a test basis, we inventoried keys and tools.

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Facility's food service operations, prisoner accounts, and prisoner store operations, we tested food service records and procedures related to Statewide menus, production, and quality evaluations. In addition, we analyzed prisoner store financial information and reviewed controls over prisoner funds and prisoner store operations.

Agency Responses

Our audit report contains 7 findings and 11 corresponding recommendations. The Facility's preliminary response indicated that it agrees and has complied with all of our recommendations.

The agency preliminary response that 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

COMMENT

Background: Southern Michigan Correctional Facility operates under policy directives and operating procedures established by the Department of Corrections (DOC) as well as operating procedures developed by the Facility. These policies and procedures are designed to have a positive impact on the safety and security of the Facility as well as to help ensure that prisoners receive proper care and services. The procedures address many aspects of the Facility's operations, including key, tool, and firearm security; prisoner, employee, visitor, and housing unit searches; prisoner counts; fire safety, preventive maintenance, and disaster planning; and food, medical, and educational services. Although compliance with these procedures contributes to a safe and secure facility, the nature of the prison population and environment is unpredictable and inherently dangerous. Therefore, compliance with the procedures will not entirely eliminate the safety and security risks.

Audit Objective: To assess the Facility's compliance with selected policies and procedures related to safety and security.

Conclusion: We concluded that the Facility was generally in compliance with selected policies and procedures related to safety and security. However, we noted reportable conditions* related to prisoner shakedowns, prisoner counts, prisoner drug tests, key controls, monthly tool inspections, self-contained breathing apparatus* (SCBA) squads, and hazardous materials (Findings 1 through 7).

FINDING

1. Prisoner Shakedowns

Southern Michigan Correctional Facility did not ensure that officers performed and properly documented the required number of prisoner shakedowns. Conducting the required number of prisoner shakedowns improves the likelihood of detecting and confiscating contraband* and improves the safety and security of staff and prisoners.

Facility operating procedure 04.04.110 requires each housing and custody officer with direct prisoner contact to perform five prisoner shakedowns per day. Also, the

* See glossary at end of report for definition.

procedure requires the officers to record the prisoner shakedowns on a daily prisoner shakedown report, which documents each prisoner's name and number and the time that the officer performed the shakedown.

Our review of the January and February 2005 prisoner shakedown records noted that the Facility did not retain 430 (14.2%) of the required 3,020 first shift daily prisoner shakedown reports and 638 (26.0%) of the required 2,458 second shift daily prisoner shakedown reports.

Also, we noted 514 (11.7%) instances of 4,410 prisoner counts in which the officer did not record the prisoner's name and 1,734 (39.3%) instances in which the officer did not record the time that the officer performed the shakedown on the daily prisoner shakedown report.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that Southern Michigan Correctional Facility ensure that officers perform and properly document the required number of prisoner shakedowns.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

The Facility agrees and informed us that it has complied. The Facility also informed us that supervisors are required to check the shakedown logs daily to ensure that shakedowns are being done and properly recorded. In addition, the Facility informed us that corrective measures are taken when needed.

FINDING

2. Prisoner Counts

Southern Michigan Correctional Facility did not always document the prisoners' physical locations on the formal count reconciliation. Also, the Facility did not document that it confirmed with Facility staff at the hospitals that the respective prisoners were present for each shift count. Documentation provides assurance that prisoners are accounted for on a regular basis throughout the day and that security measures are being performed in accordance with Facility operating procedures.

The Facility's control center is responsible for reconciling formal prisoner counts taken in the 13 housing units and other assignment locations within the prison.

First and second shift officers conduct one formal count daily; third shift officers perform three formal counts daily. The control center accounts for up to 1,466 prisoners.

We noted that the Facility performed the required number of formal counts and accounted for the total number of prisoners within the Facility. However, it did not always document the reconciliation and resolution of prisoner formal counts when a prisoner was in a location other than a housing unit, such as a work assignment or a hospital.

Our review of 70 formal counts (14 required counts for the first shift, 14 required counts for the second shift, and 42 required counts for the third shift) during two one-week periods disclosed:

- a. The first and third shift count officers did not retain documentation of the number and identity of prisoners who had not been assigned a permanent housing unit or prisoners who were at area hospitals for any of the 56 formal counts. Also, the second shift formal count reconciliation documentation did not indicate the prisoners' physical location when the prisoners were not in the housing unit. As a result, the officers could not provide documentation of the location of approximately 11 prisoners to reconcile to the master counts for 9 of the 14 counts.
- b. During the formal count, the housing units identified the hospital where respective prisoners were located at the time of the count. However, the Facility did not document that it contacted Facility staff at the hospitals to confirm that the prisoners were at the hospitals.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Southern Michigan Correctional Facility always document the prisoners' physical locations on the formal count reconciliation.

We also recommend that the Facility document that it confirmed with Facility staff at the hospitals that the respective prisoners were present for each shift count.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

The Facility agrees and informed us that it has complied by ensuring that a wall count sheet is included with the formal counts. The Facility also informed us that contact is being made with staff providing hospital coverage as well as Duane Waters Hospital staff to verify prisoner patients.

FINDING

3. Prisoner Drug Tests

Southern Michigan Correctional Facility did not retain a listing of prisoners assigned to work at Michigan State Industries (MSI) that documented that the appropriate prisoners working within MSI were drug tested. Also, the Facility did not ensure that the employee who collected the specimen signed the instant drug testing form to ensure accountability when on-site testing devices were used. Drug testing helps ensure that prisons are drug-free for the safety and security of staff and prisoners.

DOC policy directive and operating procedure 03.03.115 require drug tests of 3% of the monthly prisoner population and a sample of prisoners who work within MSI. In addition, the Facility schedules random tests of those prisoners deemed to be a high risk for drug abuse or those who have demonstrated probable cause for illegal drug use. The Facility may use on-site testing devices to obtain instant results for MSI prisoners and prisoners with probable cause. The employee collecting the specimen and recording the test results is required to sign the instant drug testing form to attest that the drug test was accurate and reliable.

Our review of DOC-required prisoner drug tests conducted during October and December 2004 disclosed that the Facility did not retain a list of MSI prisoners for one of the two months. We requested additional MSI listings and the Facility informed us that it does not normally retain a prisoner listing. Therefore, the Facility could not provide documentation that all prisoners who worked within MSI with the respective identification numbers provided by DOC were drug tested. Also, during the two months, the employee who collected the instant test specimen did not sign 31 (23.0%) of the 135 drug testing forms.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Southern Michigan Correctional Facility retain a listing of prisoners assigned to work at MSI that documents that the appropriate prisoners working within MSI are drug tested.

We also recommend that the Facility ensure that the employee who collects the specimen signs the instant drug testing form to ensure accountability when on-site testing devices are used.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

The Facility agrees and informed us that it has complied. The Facility also informed us that it maintains a list of MSI prisoner workers that documents that the appropriate number of prisoners working in MSI were drug tested. In addition, the Facility informed us that staff have been reinstructed to sign the instant drug testing form and that this is being monitored by the second shift captain who oversees drug testing.

FINDING

4. Key Controls

Southern Michigan Correctional Facility did not always document the physical inventories of the key cabinets during all shifts.

Completion of inventories of keys helps ensure the safety and security of the Facility by verifying that all keys are accounted for at all times. The Facility maintains its keys in key cabinets located at seven locations throughout the Facility. Facility operating procedure 04.04.100E requires the control center to document a physical inventory of keys stored in the key cabinets throughout the Facility within the first two hours of each shift and at the end of each shift for a total of six inventories per key cabinet daily.

Our review of the Facility's key control records for three locations disclosed:

- a. For September 2004 and January 2005, the Facility did not document 172 (47.0%) of the 366 required physical key inventories for the control center key cabinet. Also, the Facility did not perform the physical inventory of the control

center key cabinet within the first two hours for 10 (6.6%) of the 152 inventories that were conducted at the beginning of the shift.

- b. For September 2004 and February 2005, the Facility did not document 96 (27.6%) of the 348 required key inventories for the pre-shift meeting room key cabinet. Also, the Facility did not record the time of the physical inventory for 151 (89.9%) of the 168 shifts to document that the pre-shift meeting room key cabinet was inventoried within the first two hours of the beginning of the shift.
- c. The Facility did not document that it had completed any physical inventories of the medical clinic key cabinet on each shift. The key cabinet contained 10 keys that were not identified and were not included in the Facility's key inventory records and 2 key rings that held duplicate keys. After our audit, the Facility identified all keys and removed the duplicates from the cabinet.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that Southern Michigan Correctional Facility document the physical inventories of the key cabinets during all shifts.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

The Facility agrees and informed us that it has complied. The Facility also informed us that it put systems in place to ensure that the required physical inventories of key cabinets are completed within the first two hours of each shift and at the end of each shift. In addition, the Facility informed us that this is monitored daily by the key control officer and the assistant deputy warden of operations.

FINDING

5. Monthly Tool Inspections

Southern Michigan Correctional Facility did not perform monthly tool inspections. The monthly tool inspections help ensure that proper control is maintained over the tool inventory, that all tools are accounted for, and that any lost or missing tools are detected and recovered in a timely manner. Proper accountability of critical tools helps ensure the safety and security of staff and prisoners.

Facility operating procedure 04.04.120 requires the tool control officer to perform monthly tool inspections.

Although the monthly inspections were not being performed, our review of a sample of tools within the MSI, food services, and health services areas disclosed no missing tools. Also, we observed that the Facility displayed tools to help identify when tools are being used and implemented acceptable methods for signing tools in and out.

The tool control officer informed us that monthly tool inspections were not performed because of a lack of resources.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend Southern Michigan Correctional Facility perform monthly tool inspections.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

The Facility agrees and informed us that it has complied by ensuring that monthly tool inspections are being conducted.

FINDING

6. Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA) Squads

Southern Michigan Correctional Facility did not provide timely recertification in the use of SCBA equipment. Also, the second shift supervisor did not have information as to which custody officers had current SCBA training when the supervisor was making SCBA squad assignments. As a result, the Facility did not have assurance that custody officers were properly trained in safety precautions in the event of a prison disturbance or fire.

Facility operating procedures require the Facility training officer to ensure that each SCBA-certified staff person is recertified semiannually and that a sufficient number of employees are trained on each shift so that five SCBA qualified staff are on duty and available for response. SCBA equipment is used for respiratory protection when officers assist with the evacuation of prisoners from a smoke-contaminated area.

Our review of 6 days for the first shift noted that 12 of 20 officers assigned to the SCBA squad had not been recertified in the last six months. Also, the Facility did not have adequate documentation that four officers were certified. In addition, the second shift supervisor did not have documentation for which officers were SCBA certified or in need of recertification if their original certification had expired. After our audit, the Facility provided SCBA training to its officers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Southern Michigan Correctional Facility provide timely recertification in the use of SCBA equipment.

We also recommend that the Facility provide shift supervisors with information as to which custody officers have had current SCBA training when the supervisors are making SCBA squad assignments.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

The Facility agrees and informed us that it has complied. Staff have been recertified and will be recertified semiannually. The Facility also informed us that shift commanders have been instructed to ensure that staff who are assigned to the SCBA squad have current qualifications in the use of the equipment. In addition, the Facility indicated that the training officer will ensure that an updated SCBA training record is provided to shift commanders semiannually and the assistant deputy warden of operations will monitor and ensure compliance.

FINDING

7. Hazardous Materials

Southern Michigan Correctional Facility did not ensure that hazardous materials were properly inventoried on a regular basis. Also, the Facility did not ensure that each hazardous materials storage location contained material safety data sheets as required. Maintaining proper inventories over hazardous materials used by staff and prisoners facilitates detection of missing hazardous materials to ensure that they are recovered in a timely manner. Maintaining the material safety data sheets helps ensure that staff and prisoners are knowledgeable of the safe handling of the hazardous materials.

Facility operating procedure 01.03.110C requires the Facility to maintain a perpetual inventory of hazardous materials in each storage area. Also, this operating procedure requires that a copy of the material safety data sheet for each hazardous material be maintained at each storage location.

Our review of 13 of the 31 hazardous materials storage locations disclosed that the Facility did not maintain inventory records for at least one hazardous material, such as floor stripper, at 4 locations. Also, the physical inventory did not agree with the inventory records at 2 locations. The print shop had not properly inventoried or signed out 32 ounces of lime remover and MSI was missing 20 ounces of degreaser. Complete and accurate inventory records provide accountability for the use of hazardous materials by staff and prisoners.

In addition, 4 locations did not have the material safety data sheets at the storage area. Material safety data sheets provide a quick and easy reference for staff and prisoners on the hazardous materials' ratings, safe handling of the materials, and emergency procedures to follow when an individual is exposed to hazardous materials.

After our audit, the Facility revised its inventory records to agree with the physical inventory. Also, the Facility informed us that it provided the material safety data sheets at some of the locations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Southern Michigan Correctional Facility ensure that hazardous materials are properly inventoried on a regular basis.

We also recommend that the Facility ensure that each hazardous materials storage location contains material safety data sheets as required.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

The Facility agrees and informed us that it has complied. The Facility also informed us that staff have been instructed to ensure that hazardous materials in storage locations within their area of responsibility are properly inventoried daily and that material safety data sheets are available at each hazardous material storage location. This will be monitored by the area supervisor as well as the sanitation officer.

FOOD SERVICE OPERATIONS, PRISONER ACCOUNTS, AND PRISONER STORE OPERATIONS

COMMENT

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Facility's food service operations, prisoner accounts, and prisoner store operations.

Conclusion: We concluded that the Facility's food service operations, prisoner accounts, and prisoner store operations were effective and efficient. Our report does not include any reportable conditions related to this audit objective.

Noteworthy Accomplishments: On March 15, 2004, the Dialysis Unit officially opened at the Southern Michigan Correctional Facility. The opening of the Dialysis Unit took months of planning and coordinated efforts among Ryan Correctional Facility, Regional Guidance Center transportation staff, health unit managers, Correctional Facilities Administration classification staff, Kidney Replacement Services, and Facility staff.

Facility management informed us that the Dialysis Unit was moved to the Facility because of its proximity to the Duane L. Waters Hospital and space limitation at Ryan Correctional Facility and as a cost savings measure. The Unit was expanded from a 9-chair operation, six days per week to an 18-chair operation, three to four days per week.

GLOSSARY

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

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.
DOC	Department of Corrections.
effectiveness	Program success in achieving mission and goals.
efficiency	Achieving the most outputs and outcomes practical with the minimum amount of resources.
level II	The security classification assigned to prisoners who generally have longer sentences than level I prisoners, who need more supervision but who are not likely to escape, or who are not difficult to manage.
level IV	The security classification assigned to 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.
mission	The agency's main purpose or the reason that the agency was established.
MSI	Michigan State Industries.
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 that, in the auditor's judgment, represents either an opportunity for improvement or a significant deficiency in management's ability to operate a program in an effective and efficient manner.
self-contained breathing apparatus SCBA	An atmosphere-supplying respirator for which the breathing air source is designed to be carried by the user.
self-audits	Audits performed by facility staff that enable management and staff to ensure that all operational units comply with policy directives and take proactive steps to correct any noncompliance. Performing self-audits is intended to maximize safe and efficient operations by DOC.

