

PERFORMANCE AUDIT
OF THE

RIVERSIDE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS:
RIVERSIDE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY AND
IONIA TEMPORARY FACILITY

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

February 1999

47-230-98

EXECUTIVE DIGEST

RIVERSIDE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

INTRODUCTION

This report, issued in February 1999, contains the results of our performance audit* of the Riverside Correctional Institutions (RCI), 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

RCI includes Riverside Correctional Facility (RCF) and Ionia Temporary Facility (ITF), which are located in Ionia. The warden of each facility is its chief administrative officer. The DOC director appoints the wardens, who are classified employees under the State civil service system.

The two facilities share the business office, personnel office, and school principal. In addition, RCF prepares food for both facilities.

The mission* of RCI is to protect society by providing a secure setting for prisoners. RCF opened in 1977 and occupies 69 acres with over 21 acres within a secured,

* See glossary on page 26 for definition

fenced perimeter that is guarded by four staffed gun towers. RCF houses approximately 970 close custody and medium security male prisoners. ITF opened in 1985 and occupies 30 acres with approximately 13 acres within a secured, fenced perimeter. ITF houses approximately 960 minimum security male prisoners.

For fiscal year 1996-97, RCF and ITF operating expenditures were approximately \$29 million and \$15 million, respectively. As of June 30, 1998, RCF and ITF had 521 and 229 employees, respectively. RCF operating expenditures included approximately \$7 million paid to the Department of Community Health (DCH) under a contract to deliver mental health services to prisoners. As of June 30, 1998, DCH had 58 employees at RCF.

**AUDIT OBJECTIVES
AND CONCLUSIONS**

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

Conclusion: We concluded that RCI'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 RCF and ITF gate manifests* and prisoner shakedowns and cell searches and to RCF weapons qualification and employee shakedowns (Findings 1 through 4).

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

Conclusion: We concluded that RCI's prisoner care and maintenance operations were generally effective and efficient. However, we noted reportable conditions related

* See glossary on page 26 for definition.

to RCF cash receipts, emergency power generator, work orders, and preventive maintenance (Findings 5 through 8).

**AUDIT SCOPE AND
METHODOLOGY**

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Riverside Correctional Institutions. 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 RCI's records and activities for the period October 1995 through June 1998. Our audit methodology included a preliminary review of RCI's operations. This included discussions with various RCF and ITF staff regarding their functions and responsibilities and review of program records and DOC, RCF, and ITF policy directives and procedures. In addition, we reviewed ITF's goals and objectives, various RCF and ITF committee meeting minutes, and ITF's Commission on Accreditation for Corrections evaluation report to gain an understanding of RCF and ITF activities and to form a basis for selecting certain operations for audit. We conducted tests of records related to safety and security, prisoner care, and preventative maintenance activities 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 RCF and ITF.

AGENCY RESPONSES

Our report contains 8 findings and 9 recommendations. RCI indicated that it has either complied with or taken steps to comply with all 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 Riverside Correctional Institutions, Department of Corrections.

This report contains our executive digest; description of agency; audit objectives, scope, and 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.

AUDITOR GENERAL

This page left blank intentionally.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RIVERSIDE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

INTRODUCTION

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Executive Digest | 1 |
| Description of Agency | 8 |
| Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses | 10 |

COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES

| | |
|--|----|
| Safety and Security Operations | 12 |
| 1. Gate Manifests | 12 |
| 2. Prisoner Shakedowns and Cell Searches | 14 |
| 3. Weapons Qualification | 15 |
| 4. Employee Shakedowns | 16 |
| Prisoner Care and Maintenance Operations | 17 |
| 5. Cash Receipts | 18 |
| 6. Emergency Power Generator | 19 |
| 7. Work Orders | 20 |
| 8. Preventive Maintenance | 21 |

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

| | |
|-----------------------------|----|
| Description of Survey | 23 |
| Summary of Survey Responses | 24 |

GLOSSARY

| | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Glossary of Acronyms and Terms | 26 |
|--------------------------------|----|

Description of Agency

The Riverside Correctional Institutions (RCI) include Riverside Correctional Facility (RCF) and Ionia Temporary Facility (ITF), which are located in Ionia. These facilities are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections (DOC). The warden of each facility is its chief administrative officer. The DOC director appoints the wardens, who are classified employees under the State civil service system. The facilities are adjacent to one another and have separate wardens, security operations, maintenance sections, power plant operations, and supplies and materials warehouses. However, the two facilities share the business office, personnel office, and school principal. In addition, RCF prepares food for both facilities.

The mission of RCI is to protect society by providing a secure setting for prisoners. RCF opened in 1977 and occupies 69 acres with over 21 acres within a secured, fenced perimeter that is guarded by four staffed gun towers. RCF houses approximately 970 close custody and medium security male prisoners. ITF opened in 1985 and occupies 30 acres with approximately 13 acres within a secured, fenced perimeter. ITF houses approximately 960 minimum security male prisoners.

RCI provides academic programs to prisoners, including adult basic education and general educational development (GED) completion. Also, RCF provides for college credits through correspondence courses. RCI vocational trade programs include building maintenance and building trades. Also, ITF provides vocational trade programs in graphic arts and horticulture.

Other programs offered to prisoners are recreational activities, religion, group counseling, substance abuse counseling, alcoholics anonymous, smoking cessation, and library services. In addition, RCI provides routine medical and dental care. Also, RCF provides support services to the reception center and residential treatment program. In addition, ITF provides an eyeglass prescription reading program in cooperation with the Lions Club.

For fiscal year 1996-97, RCF and ITF operating expenditures were approximately \$29 million and \$15 million, respectively. As of June 30, 1998, RCF and ITF had 521 and 229 employees, respectively. RCF operating expenditures included approximately \$7 million paid to the Department of Community Health (DCH) under a contract to deliver mental health services to prisoners. As of June 30, 1998, DCH had 58 employees at RCF.

Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses

Audit Objectives

Our performance audit of the Riverside Correctional Institutions (RCI), Department of Corrections (DOC), had the following objectives:

1. To assess the effectiveness of RCI's safety and security operations.
2. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of RCI's prisoner care and maintenance operations.

Audit Scope

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Riverside Correctional Institutions. 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 March through July 1998 and included examination of RCI's records and activities for the period October 1995 through June 1998.

To establish our audit objectives, we conducted a preliminary review of RCI's operations. This included discussions with various Riverside Correctional Facility (RCF) and Ionia Temporary Facility (ITF) staff regarding their functions and responsibilities and review of program records and DOC, RCF, and ITF policy directives and procedures. In addition, we reviewed ITF's goals and objectives, various RCF and ITF committee meeting minutes, and ITF's Commission on Accreditation for Corrections evaluation report to gain an understanding of RCF and ITF activities and to form a basis for selecting certain operations for audit.

To assess the effectiveness of RCI'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 shakedowns and cell searches. We reviewed the calibration procedures for metal detectors. On a test basis, we inventoried critical and dangerous tools. In addition, we reviewed guard towers, security cameras, alarm systems, telephone monitoring systems, and the documentation process for items entering and leaving RCF and ITF.

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of RCI's prisoner care and maintenance operations, we conducted tests of records related to preventative maintenance programs, inventory controls, fire safety procedures, and emergency electrical backup tests. We tested records related to employee meals, prisoner stores, collections from prisoners, and cash receipts. Also, we reviewed and tested the reconciliation of the resident accounting credit card system to the State's accounting system.

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

Agency Responses

Our report contains 8 findings and 9 recommendations. RCI indicated that it has either complied with or taken steps to comply with all 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: The Riverside Correctional Institutions (RCI) operate under the policy directives established by the Department of Corrections (DOC), as well as operating procedures that are developed internally at each facility. Riverside Correctional Facility (RCF) and Ionia Temporary Facility (ITF) are responsible for providing a safe, secure, and humane environment for staff and prisoners.

Procedures have been implemented to ensure the security of keys, tools, and firearms. RCF and ITF staff conduct periodic searches of prisoners, their cells, and their belongings to detect contraband* . All visitors must go through a metal detector when entering the facilities and are subject to a search. Employees are also randomly searched when entering or exiting the facilities.

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

Conclusion: We concluded that RCI'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 RCF and ITF gate manifests and prisoner shakedowns and cell searches and to RCF weapons qualification and employee shakedowns.

FINDING

1. Gate Manifests

RCF and ITF did not effectively monitor gate manifests to ensure that the movement of critical and dangerous items into and out of the secured areas was properly controlled.

* See glossary on page 26 for definition.

RCF and ITF operating procedures require gate manifests to include a complete description of the transported items and to contain authorized approval. The procedures also require that items be inspected by a gate officer and that a verification be made of items returned through the gates.

Our review of 50 RCF and 50 ITF gate manifests for the month of June 1998 disclosed:

- a. At RCF, 4 manifests did not include the gate officer's signature and 1 manifest was not dated. Also, for 1 manifest, the description area that describes the items taken into the secured area was left blank.
- b. RCF and ITF did not routinely have an assigned gate officer. The gate officer is responsible for routine inspections of items entering and leaving secured areas. RCF assigned permanent manifests and ITF assigned annual manifests to briefcases that employees needed to bring into secured areas of the facilities on a daily basis. Without an assigned gate officer, briefcases were not routinely inspected to ensure that the contents remained in agreement with the manifests.
- c. At ITF, 5 manifests that included maintenance tools to be returned from the secured area through the gates did not contain documentation that this occurred. As a result, ITF had no assurance that the maintenance tools were removed from the secured area. Also, for 2 manifests the description area that describes the items taken into the secured area was left blank.

Failure to follow procedures could result in critical and dangerous items being left inside the secured areas.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that RCF and ITF effectively monitor gate manifests to ensure that the movement of critical and dangerous items into and out of the secured areas is properly controlled.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

RCF concurs and has complied. Steps have been taken to ensure that all manifests are properly completed. RCF will routinely inspect manifested items, including employee briefcases. In addition, RCF has submitted program revision requests to fund a gate officer position.

ITF concurs and has complied by taking steps to ensure that all permanently manifested items are inspected daily and that all manifests are complete.

FINDING

2. Prisoner Shakedowns and Cell Searches

RCF and ITF management did not ensure that custody staff* performed the required number of prisoner shakedowns and cell searches. Also, RCF custody staff did not always prepare and retain the prisoner shakedown reports as required by DOC policy directive.

DOC policy directive 04.04.110 requires that each corrections officer with direct prisoner contact perform five prisoner shakedowns each day. Also, each corrections officer assigned to a housing unit must perform three cell searches each day.

Our review of prisoner shakedowns and cell searches performed by custody staff for five days in March 1998 disclosed:

- a. Only 176 (66%) of 268 RCF custody staff performed the required number of cell searches.
- b. Only 40 (66%) of 61 ITF custody staff completed the required number of prisoner shakedowns, and only 22 (31%) of 70 custody staff performed the required number of cell searches.

* See glossary on page 26 for definition.

- c. RCF did not retain the prisoner shakedown reports as required by its records retention schedule and DOC policy directive. As a result, we could not determine whether custody staff performed the required number of prisoner shakedowns. We estimate that 500 prisoner shakedowns should have been conducted during the five days reviewed.

By not conducting the required number of prisoner shakedowns and cell searches, RCF and ITF have diminished assurance regarding the safety of prisoners and employees. In addition, prisoner shakedowns cannot be effectively monitored without proper documentation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that RCF and ITF management ensure that custody staff perform the required number of prisoner shakedowns and cell searches.

We also recommend that RCF custody staff prepare and retain prisoner shakedown reports as required by DOC policy directive.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

RCF concurs and has complied. RCF instructed shift commanders to ensure that each custody officer conducts the required number of prisoner shakedowns and cell searches. RCF will monitor compliance through daily shakedown reports and the captain's monthly reports. RCF will retain shakedown information for one year.

ITF concurs and has complied. ITF has taken steps to ensure that each custody officer conducts the required number of prisoner shakedowns and cell searches.

FINDING

3. Weapons Qualification

RCF did not ensure that all custody staff were current on their firearms qualification prior to assigning them to positions that require such a qualification.

DOC policy directive 03.03.100 requires that all employees assigned to a position which requires the use of a firearm be qualified and trained in its use.

Assignments that may require the use of a firearm include officers assigned to the gun towers, gun squads, and alert response vehicles.

To facilitate the officer assignment process, the RCF training officer notifies the shift commanders of the weapons qualification and the expiration date of the qualification for each officer. However, we examined the weapons qualification records for such officers and noted that 28 (4%) of 800 assignments were made to officers who had not qualified in the use of the appropriate firearm.

Because RCF did not always assign staff qualified in the use of weapons to positions that require this qualification, RCF did not have assurance that adequate protection would exist in the event of a prison disturbance.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that RCF assign only custody staff who are qualified in the use of a firearm to positions that require such qualification.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

RCF concurs and has complied. RCF instructed shift commanders and squad leaders to ensure that officers are qualified in the use of the appropriate firearm before assigning them to positions which require such qualification. The arsenal sergeant will review staffing schedules weekly to check for compliance.

FINDING

4. Employee Shakedowns

RCF procedures did not ensure that all employees entering the security perimeter area were periodically searched.

DOC policy directive requires the periodic search of employees. RCF operating procedure 04.04.110 states that employees are subject to search. Although the policy does not specify the frequency of employee shakedowns, other facilities have developed procedures that all employees entering the facility will be searched at least once each month. For example, ITF operating procedure 04.04.110a

requires that all staff who are assigned to work inside the security perimeter area be shaken down at least once per month.

We reviewed the RCF employee shakedown log for March 1998 and determined that 653 employee shakedowns were conducted. However, 141 (42%) of 338 custody staff who normally enter the security perimeter area on a daily basis had not been searched during the month.

We noted numerous noncustody staff who have normal work assignments within the security perimeter area who were not searched during the month. However, some noncustody staff were searched as many as 10 times during the month.

By not procedurally specifying the frequency of periodic searches of all employees entering the facility, RCF could not ensure the security of the facility and the safety of the employees and prisoners.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that RCF review its procedures to determine if security can be improved by requiring monthly searches of all employees entering the security perimeter area.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

RCF concurs and has complied by requiring monthly searches of all employees who enter the security perimeter area. RCF established a shakedown record which will be reviewed monthly to ensure compliance.

PRISONER CARE AND MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS

COMMENT

Background: RCI has developed procedures for its operations involving preventive maintenance programs, 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 RCI's prisoner care and maintenance operations.

Conclusion: We concluded that RCI's prisoner care and maintenance operations were generally effective and efficient. However, we noted reportable conditions related to RCF cash receipts, emergency power generator, work orders, and preventive maintenance.

FINDING

5. Cash Receipts

RCF mail openers did not record, upon opening, cash items received through the mail.

Department of Management and Budget Administrative Guide procedure 1270.02 requires that cash items received by mail be recorded on a cash log prepared by the mail openers. The log must contain the date, type of cash item, amount received, and the initials of the mail openers. The cashier must initial the cash log acknowledging verification of the completeness and transfer of money from the mail openers.

RCF mail openers forwarded cash items received through the mail to another employee, who logged the cash items, then returned them to the mailroom. Because mail openers did not create a record of the cash items received, they did not have a means to account for all cash items logged by the other employee. As a result, RCF did not have assurance that all cash items received through the mail were forwarded to the cashier's office for deposit.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that RCF mail openers record, upon opening, cash items received through the mail.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

RCF concurs and will comply. The mailroom staff will use a log to record cash items received in the mail so that the cash items can be reconciled.

FINDING

6. Emergency Power Generator

RCF did not have effective controls and procedures to ensure that emergency generator power would be available during a power outage.

DOC policy directive and facility operating procedures require that generators be tested under full load at least monthly.

RCF did not conduct a monthly full load test for the emergency generator. We were informed that RCF did not run a full load test on the emergency generator because switching back to the main power source after a test would result in a temporary power outage. In February 1997, a consultant informed DOC and RCF that additional equipment costing \$250,000 would be required to perform monthly full load tests. DOC has contacted the Department of Management and Budget to review the study and determine feasibility and funding.

On a weekly basis, RCF tested the generator in conjunction with the main power source. However, in April 1998, RCF lost its main power source and the emergency generator failed to start. This resulted in an emergency situation for RCF. If monthly tests had been conducted, RCF may have avoided approximately \$14,000 for costs to rent a generator and additional costs for custody staff overtime to guard the perimeter because the power outage lasted several hours.

Without effective controls and procedures to emphasize the importance of maintaining emergency power generators, RCF has limited assurance regarding the effectiveness of the emergency power generator during a power supply interruption.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that RCF establish effective controls and procedures to ensure that emergency generator power will be available during a power outage.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

RCF concurs and has taken steps to comply. RCF tests the generators weekly. However, one of the older units cannot be tested under full load without the

installation of an automated transfer system. RCF has requested capital outlay funds to renovate the power plant operation.

FINDING

7. Work Orders

RCF did not effectively monitor outstanding work order requests.

DOC policy requires that the maintenance department develop inspection checklists, logs, or other computer software commensurate with physical plant configuration, equipment, and systems to facilitate monitoring and documenting preventive maintenance and emergency maintenance activities. In addition, DOC policy requires wardens to ensure that procedures are developed requiring that maintenance defects be reported and scheduled for correction and that emergency maintenance be accomplished expeditiously.

The April 1998 work order request report showed 735 outstanding work orders. The work order request report provides RCF with one means to prioritize the requests and determine that emergency repair requests are accomplished expeditiously. Because RCF maintenance staff did not review and update the report on a monthly basis, the report included duplicate and completed work order requests. The report also included work order requests that were over three months old.

Effective monitoring of incomplete work order reports helps ensure that work order requests are prioritized and completed expeditiously.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that RCF effectively monitor outstanding work order requests.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

RCF concurs and will comply. Maintenance supervisors will audit the work order database and review work order reports with staff on a monthly basis.

FINDING

8. Preventive Maintenance

RCF had not developed a comprehensive preventive maintenance plan.

DOC policy states that the warden shall develop a written preventative maintenance plan. The plan is to be designed to provide economical use of all facility equipment and to ensure that all equipment will operate effectively during emergency situations. Also, the plan must include regularly scheduled inspections and maintenance tasks for: heating, cooling, and ventilation systems; electrical distribution and lighting systems; sewage systems; agency-owned plumbing and water supply systems; refrigeration systems; security systems; fire suppression and detection systems; and waste material storage and disposal.

The preventive maintenance plan is also 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 and includes visual observation, servicing, and testing of mechanical and electrical equipment and systems by individuals trained in the operation of the equipment.

Development and monitoring of a comprehensive preventive maintenance plan provides assurance that facility devices will function and operate properly and effectively during emergency situations. This helps to ensure the safety and security of staff, prisoners, and the community.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that RCF develop a comprehensive preventive maintenance plan.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

RCF concurs and will take steps to comply. DOC is testing a new software preventive maintenance program at some facilities. RCF needs this software or a similar software package and available staff to operate and maintain an effective preventive maintenance program. RCF will seek authorization to acquire the software package and make an effort to divert maintenance staff from projects to perform preventive maintenance.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Description of Survey

We developed a survey requesting input from certain area individuals and businesses regarding their association with the Riverside Correctional Facility and Ionia Temporary Facility.

We mailed this survey to 50 individuals and businesses and received 21 responses. A review of the responses indicated that most respondents were either highly or somewhat satisfied with the facility administration. Also, the responses indicated that public concerns are generally addressed in a timely manner.

RIVERSIDE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS
Riverside Correctional Facility and Ionia Temporary Facility
Department of Corrections
Summary of Survey Responses

Copies of Survey Distributed 50
Number of Responses 21
Response Rate 42%

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

| Highly Satisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Highly Dissatisfied | No Opinion |
|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------|
| 13 | 6 | | | 2 |

2. How satisfied are you with how management of Riverside Correctional Facility and Ionia Temporary Facility have addressed your individual concerns?

| Highly Satisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Highly Dissatisfied | No Opinion |
|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------|
| 12 | 5 | 1 | | 3 |

3. How satisfied are you with the timeliness in which your individual concerns are addressed by Riverside Correctional Facility and Ionia Temporary Facility?

| Highly Satisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Highly Dissatisfied | No Opinion |
|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------|
| 12 | 3 | 1 | | 5 |

4. How satisfied are you with Riverside Correctional Facility's and Ionia Temporary Facility's process to notify the community of any problems or emergency situations related to the facilities?

| <u>Highly Satisfied</u> | <u>Somewhat Satisfied</u> | <u>Somewhat Dissatisfied</u> | <u>Highly Dissatisfied</u> | <u>No Opinion</u> |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| 13 | 4 | | | 4 |

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

Yes _____ No 21

6. If you have visited Riverside Correctional Facility and Ionia Temporary Facility, were you satisfied with the security provided to you while at the facilities?

| <u>Highly Satisfied</u> | <u>Somewhat Satisfied</u> | <u>Somewhat Dissatisfied</u> | <u>Highly Dissatisfied</u> | <u>No Opinion</u> |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| 12 | 1 | | 1 | 7 |

7. Overall, how satisfied are you with the extent of communication between Riverside Correctional Facility and Ionia Temporary Facility and the community?

| <u>Highly Satisfied</u> | <u>Somewhat Satisfied</u> | <u>Somewhat Dissatisfied</u> | <u>Highly Dissatisfied</u> | <u>No Opinion</u> |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| 11 | 7 | | | 3 |

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| contraband | Property that is not allowed on a facility's grounds by State law, rule, or DOC policy. |
| custody staff | Corrections officers and resident unit officers. |
| DCH | Department of Community Health. |
| 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. |
| gate manifest | A record used to control materials and supplies entering and leaving the facility through various gates and to control contraband. |
| ITF | Ionia Temporary Facility. |
| 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. |

RCF Riverside Correctional Facility.

RCI Riverside Correctional Institutions.