

PERFORMANCE AUDIT  
OF THE  
RYAN CORRECTIONAL FACILITY  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
September 2000

## EXECUTIVE DIGEST

# RYAN CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

---

### INTRODUCTION

This report, issued in September 2000, contains the results of our performance audit\* of the Ryan Correctional Facility (RCF), 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

RCF, located in Wayne County, is under the jurisdiction of DOC. The warden, who is the facility's chief administrative officer, is a classified State employee under the State's civil service system. The warden is appointed by the DOC director.

The mission\* of RCF is to protect the public by providing a secure, safe, and humane environment for staff and prisoners. RCF, which opened in 1991, is a medium security (level II)\* and close security (level IV)\* facility for males, with a capacity of 1,044 prisoners.

RCF's operating expenditures were approximately \$22.3 million for fiscal year 1998-99. As of February 3, 2000, RCF had 362 employees.

\* See glossary at end of report for definition.

---

AUDIT OBJECTIVES  
AND CONCLUSIONS

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

**Conclusion:** We concluded that RCF's safety and security operations were generally effective and efficient in preventing escapes and protecting staff and prisoners from serious injury. However, we noted reportable conditions\* related to cell searches\*, prisoner program evaluations, and security monitoring exercises (Findings 1 through 3).

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

**Conclusion:** We concluded that RCF's prisoner care and maintenance operations were generally effective and efficient. However, we noted reportable conditions related to preventive maintenance, emergency backup generator testing, the prisoner store, and reconciliation of the Resident Accounting Credit Card System (RACCS) and the Michigan Administrative Information Network\* (MAIN) (Findings 4 through 7).

---

AUDIT SCOPE AND  
METHODOLOGY

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Ryan 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.

\* See glossary at end of report for definition.

Our audit procedures included examination of RCF records and activities for the period October 1997 through February 2000. We conducted a preliminary review of RCF operations. This included discussions with various RCF staff regarding their functions and responsibilities; tests of program records; and a review of DOC policy directives, DOC procedures, and RCF operating procedures. Also, we conducted tests of records related to safety and security operations and prisoner care and maintenance operations for compliance with applicable policies and procedures and for overall program effectiveness and efficiency. In addition, we developed a survey (see supplemental information) requesting input from individuals and businesses regarding their association with the facility.

---

**AGENCY RESPONSES**

Our audit report contains 7 findings and 8 corresponding recommendations. DOC's preliminary response indicated that RCF has complied or will comply with the 8 recommendations.

This page left intentionally blank.

September 11, 2000

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

Dear Mr. Martin:

This is our report on the performance audit of the Ryan Correctional Facility, 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 intentionally blank.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### RYAN CORRECTIONAL FACILITY DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

#### INTRODUCTION

	<u>Page</u>
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. Cell Searches	11
2. Prisoner Program Evaluations	12
3. Security Monitoring Exercises	13
Prisoner Care and Maintenance Operations	14
4. Preventive Maintenance	15
5. Emergency Backup Generator Testing	16
6. Prisoner Store	17
7. Reconciliation of RACCS and MAIN	18

#### SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Description of Survey	20
Summary of Survey Responses	21

#### GLOSSARY

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms	23
--------------------------------	----



## Description of Agency

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

The deputy warden oversees custody (safety and security), housing, and prisoner programs. The administrative officer oversees the business office, physical plant, fire safety, warehouse, and food service operations.

The mission of RCF is to protect the public by providing a safe, secure, and humane environment for staff and prisoners. RCF, which opened in 1991, is a medium security (level II) and a close security (level IV) facility for males, with a capacity of 1,044 prisoners. The facility housed 1,042 prisoners as of February 22, 2000. Prisoners are housed two to a cell within a secured, double-fenced perimeter that includes five gun towers that are staffed 24 hours per day and an armed response vehicle that constantly patrols the facility perimeter.

RCF's operating expenditures were approximately \$22.3 million for fiscal year 1998-99. As of February 3, 2000, RCF had 362 employees.

## Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses

### Audit Objectives

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

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

### Audit Scope

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Ryan 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 performed from December 1999 through February 2000 and included examination of RCF records and activities for the period October 1997 through February 2000. We conducted a preliminary review of RCF operations. This included discussions with various RCF staff regarding their functions and responsibilities; tests of program records; and a review of DOC policy directives, DOC procedures, and RCF operating procedures to gain an understanding of RCF activities and to form a basis for selecting certain operations for audit. Also, we reviewed the RCF Community Liaison Committee meeting minutes and analyzed the Commission on Accreditation for Corrections of the American Correctional Association evaluation reports. In addition, we developed a survey (see supplemental information) requesting input from individuals and businesses regarding their association with the facility.

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of RCF's safety and security operations, we analyzed safety and security activities for compliance with applicable policies and procedures and overall program effectiveness. Also, we conducted tests of records

related to firearms inventories and employee firearm qualifications, searches of employees, key controls, gate manifests, cell searches, and prisoner shakedowns. On a test basis, we inventoried keys and critical and dangerous tools. In addition, we reviewed visitor searches and telephone monitoring systems.

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of RCF's prisoner care and maintenance operations, we reviewed procedures and conducted tests of records related to preventive maintenance, disaster management, inventory controls, fire safety procedures, emergency backup tests, housekeeping and sanitation inspections, and food service operations. In addition, we analyzed prisoner store financial information and inventory controls and reviewed controls over the prisoner funds accounting system.

### Agency Responses

Our audit report contains 7 findings and 8 corresponding recommendations. DOC's preliminary response indicated that RCF has complied or will comply with the 8 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 Ryan Correctional Facility (RCF) operates under policy directives established by the Department of Corrections (DOC) as well as operating procedures that are developed at the facility. DOC policies and local operating procedures have been implemented to help ensure the security of keys, tools, and firearms. RCF custody 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 search. DOC policy provides for periodic random searches of employees entering and exiting the facility.

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

**Conclusion:** We concluded that RCF's safety and security operations were generally effective and efficient in preventing escapes and protecting staff and prisoners from serious injury. However, we noted reportable conditions related to cell searches, prisoner program evaluations, and security monitoring exercises.

### FINDING

#### 1. Cell Searches

RCF did not ensure that housing unit officers perform the required number of cell searches and document them in the appropriate logbooks.

DOC policy directive and RCF operating procedure 04.04.110 require that each housing unit officer perform a minimum of three cell searches per day and that such searches be recorded in the appropriate logbook. Recorded information

\* See glossary at end of report for definition.

should include the date and time of the search and the name(s) of the employee(s) conducting the search. Cell searches are necessary to help ensure that contraband is detected in order to provide for the safety and security of staff and prisoners.

We reviewed housing unit logbooks and cell search logsheets for two housing units for March 1998, September 1998, April 1999, and August 1999. RCF did not provide documentation to show that cell searches were performed during March and September 1998 and April 1999. In addition, for August 1999, one housing unit had documentation for only 160 (43%) of the 372 required cell searches, and the other housing unit had documentation for only 344 (46%) of the 744 required cell searches.

By ensuring that the required number of cell searches are performed, RCF increases its ability to provide for the safety of staff and prisoners.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

We recommend that RCF ensure that housing unit officers perform the required number of cell searches and document them in the appropriate logbooks.

### **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

RCF agrees and informed us that it has taken steps to comply with the recommendation. RCF will ensure that the resident unit managers and assistant resident unit managers monitor the unit logbooks daily to ensure that the cell searches are conducted and logged in the unit logbook. The assistant deputy warden of housing will also ensure that cell search verification information is included in the housing monthly reports.

### **FINDING**

#### **2. Prisoner Program Evaluations**

RCF did not complete all required prisoner program evaluations for prisoners assigned to the food service and school programs.

DOC policy directive 05.02.110 requires prisoners on food service assignment to be evaluated every 30 days and prisoners on school assignment to be evaluated every 90 days.

Our review of 16 prisoner files for the 24-month period ended February 2000 disclosed:

- a. For 7 prisoners assigned to work in the food service program, documentation was not available for 37 (25%) of the 147 required program evaluations.
- b. For 5 prisoners assigned to the school program, documentation was not available for 9 (29%) of the 31 required evaluations.

Preparing prisoners' program evaluations in a timely manner helps ensure that prisoners are properly placed in programs and is necessary to determine if prisoners are performing their work or school assignments at a satisfactory or average status as required by policy.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

We recommend that RCF complete all required prisoner program evaluations for prisoners assigned to the food service and school programs.

### **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

RCF agrees and informed us that it has taken steps to comply with the recommendation. RCF informed us that a tickler file has been set up for all assignments by the classification director to ensure that the program evaluations are completed on a timely basis. The classification director will monitor the process.

### **FINDING**

#### **3. Security Monitoring Exercises**

RCF did not ensure that custody staff completed and properly documented security monitoring exercises (SMEs).

RCF operating procedure 04.04.100-C requires that plans be developed for SMEs and that SMEs be performed as planned. The procedure also requires that the inspector be notified in writing of the reason why an SME cannot be completed. SMEs were developed to test established procedures by simulating the condition, behavior, or emergency that the procedures were designed to prevent or control. SMEs were designed to ensure staff understanding and alertness.

SME records for July 1999 showed that only 46 (45%) of the 103 required SMEs were completed. In addition, documentation did not exist to explain the reason for not completing the other 57 required SMEs.

Performing the required SMEs helps to ensure that custody staff are adequately trained in critical security measures. Documenting the occurrence of SMEs provides assurance that custody staff actually received the intended training.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

We recommend that RCF ensure that custody staff complete and properly document SMEs.

### **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

RCF agrees and informed us that it has taken steps to comply with the recommendation by requiring supervisors to ensure that the required SMEs are performed and documented. The supervisors' review will be reported in RCF's monthly report.

## **PRISONER CARE AND MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS**

### **COMMENT**

**Background:** RCF has developed procedures for preventive maintenance, disaster planning, fire safety, food service activities, power plant operations, prisoner accounting, and prisoner store operations.

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

**Conclusion: We concluded that RCF's prisoner care and maintenance operations were generally effective and efficient.** However, we noted reportable conditions related to preventive maintenance, emergency backup generator testing, the prisoner store, and reconciliation of the Resident Accounting Credit Card System (RACCS) and the Michigan Administrative Information Network (MAIN).

## **FINDING**

### **4. Preventive Maintenance**

RCF did not always document in maintenance records when preventive maintenance was performed on prison buildings, equipment, and utility systems.

DOC policy directive 04.03.100 provides that each facility develop a preventive maintenance plan to ensure that all facility systems and equipment are functioning properly. The preventive maintenance plan is to be designed to provide for consistent inspections, investigations, and coordinated repairs with the intent of minimizing equipment failures and breakdowns. Preventive maintenance is accomplished by periodic, planned inspections.

Our review of RCF's maintenance records disclosed that documentation was not available for the following inspections:

- a. Weekly boiler checks for 119 (96%) of the 124 weeks ended February 2000.
- b. Quarterly plumbing and refrigeration inspections for the 9 quarters ended December 1999.
- c. Quarterly inspections of the air handling fan for the 8 quarters ended September 1999.
- d. Semiannual inspections of the boiler, unit washers and dryers, and sewage system for fiscal years 1998-99 and 1997-98.
- e. Two semiannual inspections of the air compressor, one missing for fiscal year 1998-99 and one for fiscal year 1997-98.
- f. Annual alternative fuel tests for fiscal years 1998-99 and 1997-98.



Documentation of the completion of all scheduled preventive maintenance and safety inspections is necessary to minimize the possibility that preventable equipment or system failures occur. In addition, these inspections may help RCF identify potential safety and security hazards to visitors, staff, and prisoners.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

We recommend that RCF always document in maintenance records when preventive maintenance is performed on prison buildings, equipment, and utility systems.

### **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

RCF agrees and informed us that it has taken steps to comply with the recommendation by ensuring that preventive maintenance is documented in the maintenance records. RCF will also ensure that documentation is retained in accordance with the records retention schedule.

### **FINDING**

#### **5. Emergency Backup Generator Testing**

RCF did not ensure that staff performed and properly documented the required emergency backup generator tests.

DOC policy directive 04.03.100 requires that emergency backup generators be tested weekly and under full-load conditions monthly.

Our review of weekly emergency generator tests during the 29-month period ended February 2000 disclosed that RCF staff did not document whether they performed 108 (87%) of the 124 required weekly emergency generator tests. Also, RCF staff did not document whether the emergency generator was operated under full-load conditions each month during fiscal years 1998-99 and 1997-98.

Completion of required weekly testing of emergency backup generators and the monthly full-load testing of the emergency backup generators provides assurance that emergency power will be available during an emergency situation.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

We recommend that RCF ensure that staff perform and properly document the required emergency backup generator tests.

## **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

RCF agrees and will ensure that documentation is maintained for weekly tests. RCF will also comply by obtaining approval for a policy variance for monthly full-load tests because of the adverse effect that full-load tests have on a neighboring hospital.

## **FINDING**

### **6. Prisoner Store**

RCF did not consistently prepare monthly profit-and-loss statements and balance sheets for the prisoner store. Also, RCF did not reconcile prisoner store receipts with RACCS store charges on a daily basis as required by DOC policy directive.

DOC policy directive 04.02.130 states that a profit-and-loss statement and balance sheet must be prepared monthly for the prisoner store. It also states that prisoner store receipts shall be reconciled with RACCS store charges for each regular business day.

Our review of prisoner store financial records for the 28 months ended February 2000 disclosed that profit-and-loss statements and balance sheets were not prepared for 13 of the 28 months. Also, RCF did not reconcile daily prisoner store receipts with RACCS accounting records. As a result, RCF lacked assurance that prisoner store transactions or account balances were correct.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

We recommend that RCF consistently prepare monthly profit-and-loss statements and balance sheets for the prisoner store.

We also recommend that RCF reconcile prisoner store receipts with RACCS store charges on a daily basis as required by DOC policy directive.

## **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

RCF agrees and informed us that it has complied with the recommendations. RCF informed us that it is currently preparing profit-and-loss statements and balance sheets for the prisoner store. RCF also informed us that the new commissioner system interfaces with RACCS, which eliminates the need to reconcile store receipts with RACCS charges.

## **FINDING**

### **7. Reconciliation of RACCS and MAIN**

RCF did not reconcile RACCS with MAIN.

Sound internal control requires that RACCS be reconciled with MAIN to help ensure that the amounts recorded in RACCS and MAIN are correct and that any possible errors are detected.

We reviewed the 1998-99 fiscal year-end balance of the prisoner working fund recorded in MAIN and compared it with the 1998-99 fiscal year-end balance recorded in RACCS. The RACCS balance was \$10,196 more than the MAIN balance.

The difference between RACCS and MAIN may be caused by timing differences in recording transactions and/or errors in prisoner account balances. Without periodic reconciliations, errors may not be detected and the prisoner accounts in RACCS and MAIN may not be appropriately recorded.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

We recommend that RCF reconcile RACCS with MAIN on a periodic basis.

## **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

RCF agrees and informed us that it has taken steps to comply with the recommendation by ensuring that RACCS is reconciled with MAIN on a periodic basis.

# SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

## Description of Survey

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

We mailed surveys to 63 individuals and businesses located in the vicinity of RCF and received 11 (17%) responses. Several respondents indicated concern over the lack of a plan of warning should there be a prison escape. We referred this community concern to the warden for follow-up and provided a summary of this survey information to the warden.

RCF had an active community liaison committee at the time of the survey and field visit.

RYAN CORRECTIONAL FACILITY  
 Department of Corrections  
Summary of Survey Responses

Copies of Survey Distributed: 63

Number of Responses: 11

Response Rate: 17%

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

Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion	No Answer
3	1	2	2	3	0

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

Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion	No Answer
2	2	0	2	4	1

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

Highly Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	No Opinion	No Answer
1	2	1	2	4	1

4. How satisfied are you with the Ryan 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
1	2	1	4	2	1

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

Yes: 4      No: 7      No Answer: 0

6. If you visited the Ryan Correctional Facility, were you satisfied with the security provided to you while at the facility?

<u>Highly Satisfied</u>	<u>Somewhat Satisfied</u>	<u>Somewhat Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Highly Dissatisfied</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>	<u>No Answer</u>
3	2	0	0	5	1

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

<u>Highly Satisfied</u>	<u>Somewhat Satisfied</u>	<u>Somewhat Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Highly Dissatisfied</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>	<u>No Answer</u>
2	2	1	3	3	0

## Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

cell search	The act of going through a prisoner's cell and belongings looking for contraband.
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 staff	Corrections officers and housing 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 longer sentences than do minimum security prisoners, who need more supervision but who are not likely to escape, or who are not difficult to manage.



Michigan Administrative Information Network (MAIN)	A fully integrated automated financial management system for the State of Michigan.
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.
RACCS	Resident Accounting Credit Card System.
RCF	Ryan Correctional Facility.
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.
SMEs	security monitoring exercises.