

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Letter of Transmittal	
Summary of Performance Audit.....	i
Chapter 1 – Internal Controls Over Inmate Property.....	1
Chapter 2 – Computer Equipment Inventory.....	7
Chapter 3 – Cellular Phone Usage.....	10
Chapter 4 – Facility Maintenance.....	14
Agency Response to Report Recommendations.....	26

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT
SEPTEMBER 2003

The Office of Audits and Investigations performed an audit of the Department of Corrections in accordance with the County Charter. Our audit included reviewing the internal controls over inmate monies and funds collected under the Home Detention Program. We reviewed controls over the Department's computer equipment. We reviewed the Department's use of cellular phones and the related costs, and reviewed the maintenance activities conducted at the facility. The major areas addressed in our report are:

Internal Controls Over Inmate Monies

- Home Detention Program monies should be collected from Drug Lab Unit twice weekly.
- Monthly reconciliations should be performed on the inmate holding account within 30-days of month's end.
- Numbers used in the inmate holding account reconciliation were incomplete and/or inaccurate.

Computer Equipment Inventory

- The Office of Information Technology and Communications should conduct an inventory of the Department's computer equipment and reconcile their inventory to the Department's records and investigate any variances.
- Computer equipment removed from the Department should be tracked and signed for.
- The Chief of the Facilities Services Section should periodically verify that equipment is returned to the facility.
- The Chief of the Facilities Services Section should ensure that staff sign for computer equipment that is easily converted to personal use.

Cellular Phone Usage

- An Administrative Procedure should be established regarding cellular phones used by County agencies and employees.
- The Department should evaluate cellular phone plans and consider changing plans that are more cost effective when applicable.

Facility Maintenance

- The maintenance supervisor should report to the Facilities Operations Management Division when contractors do not perform preventive maintenance and the head of the FOMD should take appropriate actions to ensure contractors comply with contracts.
- Contractors should document service tickets and invoices with information related to the piece of equipment serviced and the work performed.
- The maintenance supervisor should use the AssetWorks' system to track and monitor preventive maintenance and Work Requests.
- The head of the FOMD should improve the timeliness and accuracy of data being entered into AssetWorks' system.
- The FOMD should provide DOC with a report that reflects the status of DOC Work Requests.
- The maintenance supervisor should maintain records and repair data on all maintenance performed and enter data and information into the AssetWorks' system.
- The FOMD should re-evaluate and analyze the timeliness of repairs, the workload and man-hour requirements, and material and labor costs at DOC.

CHAPTER 1

INTERNAL CONTROLS OVER INMATE PROPERTY

INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE

An integral component in effectively managing an organization is its system of internal controls. Management is responsible for establishing and maintaining a system of internal accounting controls. The objectives of an internal control system are to provide management with reasonable, but not absolute, assurance that assets are safeguarded against loss from unauthorized use or disposition, and that transactions are executed in accordance with management's authorization and recorded properly.

The Department of Corrections (DOC) takes possession of inmate monies and personal property when inmates are processed into the system. The monies and property are verified, recorded and secured. The amount of monies received from inmates is recorded into a financial inmate holding account. The inmate can use the money from his/her account for commissary purchases, haircuts, sick calls, postage and other purchases. Each inmate receives his/her personal property and the monies remaining in the inmate holding account when he/she leaves the system. Each month the DOC Inmate Finance Office (IFO) should reconcile the DOC inmate holding account record to the County's inmate holding account financial records to ensure the account balances.

The DOC also receives monies from inmates who are under the Home Detention Program (HDP). The inmates must pay a specific fee based on his/her employment wages on a weekly or bi-weekly basis. The fees are collected, recorded and deposited by various DOC units.

During our audit, we reviewed the adequacy of the processing steps for handling inmate monies and personal property when inmates are processed into the DOC system. We reviewed the inmate holding account reconciliation process for adequacy. We also reviewed the adequacy of the processing steps for handling monies received under the HDP.

FINDINGS, COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Inmate Holding Account Reconciliation

During our audit, we found that the process for handling inmate monies and personal property when inmates are processed in and out of the DOC system appeared adequate. The DOC inmate holding account record is to be reconciled on a monthly basis to ensure that the account agrees with the County's financial system records for inmate funds.

During our review of the reconciliation process, we learned that the IFO performed 22 of 42 reconciliations during the period of May 1999 through October 2002. The reconciliations reflected a difference between the account records that ranged from a positive \$6,832.34 to a negative \$4,871.92. During calendar year 2002, only three reconciliations had been completed. According to IFO staff, the reconciliations were not completed due to the IFO Inmate Daily Balance report not being generated timely due to understaffing. We also learned that no one outside the IFO reviews the reconciliations for monitoring purposes. Additionally, reconciliations were done manually without the aid of an automated spreadsheet to eliminate mathematical errors. During our review of the 22 completed reconciliations, we noted that one was mathematically incorrect.

We also note that in past audit reports related to the DOC, we found large differences in the reconciliations and recommended that the cause of the differences be determined, that the difference be written off, and the DOC start the next reconciliation with an adjusted, accurate balance.

To ensure that reconciliations are conducted properly, timely, and accurately, we recommend:

- 1. The supervisor of the Inmate Finance Office develop an automated spreadsheet to use when reconciling the inmate holding account.**
- 2. The supervisor of the Inmate Finance Office conduct monthly reconciliations of the inmate holding account within 30-days of months end.**
- 3. The supervisor of the Inmate Finance Office forward each month's reconciliation to the Fiscal Services Section Chief who should review the reconciliations to ensure that the reconciliations are complete and accurate. The Chief should investigate any differences noted in the account balance and take the appropriate follow-up steps.**

During our audit, we conducted our own reconciliation of the July 2002 inmate holding account (the last reconciliation completed by the IFO) in an attempt to determine the causes for the differences. The reconciliation conducted by the IFO reflected a difference of \$3,524.44. Our reconciliation reflected a difference of \$1,977.01.

We found that the numbers used in the reconciliation process were incomplete and/or inaccurate. Numbers used were not based on month-end figures, did not include specific payments, were not deducted as necessary, or did not match when used in both accounts. To ensure that accurate data is used in the reconciliation, we recommend:

- 4. The supervisor of the Inmate Finance Office, when reconciling the inmate holding account, should use end of the month figures, ensure that applicable numbers match when used in both accounts, include all receipts and payments applicable to the accounts, and use figures based on monthly activity (versus quarterly).**

Once the above recommendations have been implemented and reconciliations are completed on a more accurate and consistent basis, we recommend:

- 5. The supervisor of the Inmate Finance Office determine the difference in the inmate holding account reconciliation, and request through appropriate channels within the DOC that the difference be written off so that the next reconciliation is started with an accurate balance.**

Home Detention Program Monies

Under the Home Detention Program, inmates must pay a specific fee by money order based on his/her employment wages on a weekly or bi-weekly basis. The fee is paid at the Drug Lab Unit (DLU). Each individual is provided a receipt copy for their payment.

Monitoring Services Unit (MSU) staff pick up the original receipts along with the payments once a week. The payments are then recorded in a manual log. The MSU retains a copy of each money order and a copy of the original receipt and files them in a payment file. The original receipt and payment is then forwarded to the IFO.

The IFO records payments on a County Agency/Activity Collection/Transmittal Report (Transmittal Form) and forwards the Transmittal Form and the payments to the County's Treasury Division. The IFO maintains the original receipt and a copy of the Transmittal Form. Once the payments are transmitted, the yellow copy of the Transmittal Form is attached to the IFO copy. The IFO maintains two automated records – one recording weekly payments by inmate and one by inmate total.

During our audit, we reviewed the steps for processing the Home Detention Program payments. We found that the DLU keeps no log or record of the payments. A log should be maintained to track payments and used as a record to ensure that all

payments were properly recorded to each inmate's payment history and transmitted to the Treasury Division. We recommend:

- 6. The Chief of the Population Management Division have the Drug Lab Unit maintain a log on Home Detention Program payments. When the Monitoring Services Unit staff pick-up the payments, they should sign the log for the payments and obtain a copy of the log. The original copy of the log should be maintained by the Drug Lab Unit. A new log sheet should be started by the Drug Lab Unit for the next set of payments. The Monitoring Services Unit should maintain a copy of the log for their records and forward a copy of the log with the payments to the Inmate Finance Office.**

We found that the receipts used by the DLU are not pre-numbered and only provide one carbon copy. The DLU does not maintain a copy of the receipt for their records. The DLU should maintain a copy of the payments for tracking and monitoring purposes to ensure that all payments are deposited and entered into the proper records. A triplicate carbon copy receipt book could be used to record payments so that a copy could be provided to the DLU, the inmate, the MSU and the IFO. The receipts should also be pre-numbered for tracking and monitoring purposes. We recommend:

- 7. The Chief of the Population Management Division purchase a pre-numbered receipt booklet for the Drug Lab Unit that provides triplicate carbon copies. The carbon copies should be distributed as discussed under our findings.**

We found that payments are only picked up by the MSU weekly. Based on our review of the Transmittal Forms and Home Detention Program records, the DLU generally collects more than \$100 a day. We recommend:

- 8. The Chief of the Population Management Division require the Monitoring Services Unit to pick up payments from the Drug Lab Unit twice a week and more often if deemed necessary based on the amount collected.**

We found that the MSU maintains a manual log of inmate payments, which is duplicative since the IFO keeps an automated record of all payments. The IFO can provide a copy of the records to the MSU. Also, the copy of the log to be maintained by

the DLU can be used by the MSU as a record of payments. The MSU can compare the log to the IFO records to ensure that all payments were properly recorded. We also reviewed the IFO automated records of inmate payments and found that some payments were not recorded. We found that seven of 25 payments were not listed in the record, but were recorded on the Transmittal Form and forwarded to the Treasury Division. We recommend:

- 9. The Chief of the Population Management Division have the Monitoring Services Unit eliminate the manual log of Home Detention Program payments. The Chief request that the Inmate Finance Office forward the Monitoring Services Unit a copy of the automated record to be used by the Monitoring Services Unit as a record of payments. Also, the Chief require the Monitoring Services Unit to compare the Drug Lab Unit log to the Inmate Finance Office record to ensure that all payments were properly recorded.**

CHAPTER 2

COMPUTER EQUIPMENT INVENTORY

INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE

The Department of Corrections (DOC) uses a variety of computer equipment to conduct its daily activities and functions. According to DOC Procedure 2.2, titled Inventory Control & Supply Distribution (hereafter called Procedure), the Department will establish a system to ensure accountability for timely procurement, orderly issue and proper control of supplies, equipment and furnishings used by staff and inmates. The Procedure stipulates how to track and monitor fixed assets and sensitive equipment. The Department also conducts inventories of computer equipment biannually. The County's Office of Information Technology and Communications (OITC) is also responsible for maintaining an accurate inventory of County computer equipment.

During our audit, we conducted a sample inventory of DOC computer equipment to ensure items were on hand and properly documented. We also compared the OITC computer inventory to the DOC inventory to determine if they matched and reviewed the DOC inventory procedures for adequacy and compliance.

FINDINGS, COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

During our audit, we conducted a sample inventory of 23 pieces of computer equipment and located each item. Additionally, from our comparison of the OITC inventory to the DOC inventory, we found that numerous items (approximately 148) listed on the OITC inventory were not on the DOC inventory list. DOC staff informed us that some of these items are obsolete equipment that the DOC turned in or disposed of.

DOC staff stated they have requested the OITC to conduct a simultaneous inventory of computer equipment with the DOC so that they have matching and accurate inventories.

We recommend:

- 1. The Director of the Office of Information Technology and Communications conduct an inventory on the Department of Corrections' computer equipment. The completed inventory should be reconciled with the DOC inventory. Any variances between the inventories should be investigated and the inventory lists updated.**

All computer equipment brought into the facility is tagged with a DOC number and entered into the inventory records for tracking purposes. The DOC Procedure states that Division Chiefs should ensure persons removing item(s) from the facility sign for the item(s). A copy of the receipt is to be given to the person to present to security before the item(s) are removed from the facility. The Facilities Services Section is to be contacted for instructions when items are to be repaired or disposed of. These types of items are to be processed through the loading dock area and released through the Facilities Services Section.

During our audit, we reviewed and discussed with the DOC staff the procedural steps used to maintain, track and monitor the DOC computer equipment. We found that the procedural steps appear to be adequate except for the following areas:

- The DOC does not keep a log/record of computer equipment removed from the facility.
- DOC staff who take computer equipment out of the facility for work related business do not sign for the equipment, although items are checked by security at the reception area.

- The information technology vendor and OITC staff do not sign for computer equipment when it is removed from the facility.
- Computer equipment (such as CPUs and terminals) is being taken out through the security reception area by OITC staff or by the information technology vendor versus through the loading dock area.

We also found that the Procedure requires Division Chiefs to sign for equipment upon receipt, however, this is not being complied with. Individuals assigned computer equipment (such as laptops) are not required to sign for the equipment, however, the Procedure states that an inventory will be kept on items assigned to individuals.

To ensure that computer equipment is properly tracked and monitored, and that DOC sensitive computer data is protected, we recommend:

- 2. The Chief of the Facilities Services Section make use of tracking receipts to be provided to all persons who remove computer equipment from the facility. All receipts should be signed by the Chief, or his designee, or by the Manager of the Information Services Unit, authorizing the removal of the computer equipment. When a person leaves the facility, a copy of the receipt should be given to security or the Facilities Services Section staff. The other copy of the receipt should be forwarded to the Facilities Services Section for tracking purposes. Security staff should periodically forward the receipts to the Facilities Services Section for monitoring and control purposes.**
- 3. The Chief of the Facilities Services Section require DOC staff to advise the Chief when equipment is returned to the facility. The Chief should periodically verify that equipment was returned to the facility or determine the current status of the equipment.**
- 4. The Chief of the Facilities Services Section require and take steps to ensure that Office of Information Technology and Communications staff or the information technology vendor remove computer equipment through the loading dock area and that the equipment is released by the Facilities Services Section upon proper authorization.**
- 5. The Chief of the Facilities Services Section ensure that staff sign for computer equipment that is easily converted to personal use (i.e. laptops.) The fixed assets system Equipment Custody Receipt form can be used for this purpose.**

CHAPTER 3

CELLULAR PHONE USAGE

INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE

The Department of Corrections (DOC) uses two cellular phone systems in conducting daily activities. The systems used include various plans under Nextel Communications and Cingular Wireless through a State of Maryland contract. As of December 2002, the DOC had 46 cellular phones that were assigned to various DOC staff and Office of Emergency Preparedness staff. During Fiscal Year 2001-02, the DOC expended \$27,810 for cellular phones and \$15,071 for the first six months of Fiscal Year 2002-03.

During our audit, we reviewed the procedural steps for the purchase, control and monitoring of cellular phone systems. We reviewed DOC cellular phone bills to determine if cellular phones were being used within the allotted minutes. We reviewed the cellular phone plans used by DOC to determine if they were cost effective.

FINDINGS, COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

During our audit, we learned that the Office of Information Technology and Communications (OITC) was at one time responsible for approving all cellular phone purchases and monitoring cellular phone usage. The County Executive's Office subsequently took over the responsibility for approving cellular phone plans and equipment purchases. Currently, agency directors approve cellular phone purchases and the agency is responsible for monitoring cellular phone usage. The OITC still monitors

the overall plans and contracts, orders cellular phones for agencies, and monitors some agency cellular phone usage.

During our audit, we found that there is no written County Administrative Procedure or policy regarding cellular phones. The OITC staff knew of no written procedure for cellular phone usage, and the DOC has no internal written procedures regarding cellular phone plans and usage. The DOC monitors cellular phone bills for usage of minutes but does no further review regarding cost/plan efficiencies.

To ensure that proper authority is provided to purchase and use cellular phones, that adequate guidelines are provided for monitoring and controlling the plans and costs of cellular phones, and that the use of cellular phones is not abused, especially in regards to personal use and long distance calls, we recommend:

- 1. The Chief Administrative Officer establish an Administrative Procedure regarding the purchase, usage, minute limits, management, and control over plans for cellular phones used by County agencies and employees. The Administrative Procedure should require agencies to establish in-house procedures and to adequately monitor costs and usage trends of cellular phones including long distance calls and personal use. The Administrative Procedure should also require that periodic reviews and analysis be conducted related to the plans used in the County to ensure compliance with the Administrative Procedure.**
- 2. The Director of the Department of Corrections establish procedures for the use of cellular phones within the Department. The procedures should at minimum include most of the issues discussed in Recommendation 1. The Director require the staff who monitor cellular phones to conduct reviews and analysis on the Department's plans to determine cost effective use of cellular phones and any misuse of cellular phones.**

During our audit, we reviewed DOC cellular phone bills for the period of November 2001 through October 2002 (in addition, five Nextel Communication bills were reviewed through November 2002) to determine if the users were within the plan's allotted minutes and long distance usage. From our review of 35 Nextel user's bills, we

found that nine users were over their allotted minutes during several months resulting in a user charge being applied for the overages. Under the agreement with Nextel, the County is in a group-shared plan in which a credit will be provided for users who exceed allotted minutes when other users are under the overall allotted minutes. At the time of the audit, DOC appeared to recover almost the entire over expenditure for minutes over during the period reviewed.

We also found that 22 users were charged a fee for long distance calls totaling \$1,271. We further found that 14 users using 600-minute plans were under utilizing their plans and could use 400-minute plans (a yearly cost savings of \$4,537).

We reviewed 14 Cingular Wireless user bills. We found that the DOC initially paid for each minute used plus the plan costs, subsequently, the plans were changed to paying plan costs plus a fee for any minutes used over the allotted minutes. In many cases this change saved the County money. We also found that nine users were over their plan minutes for several months. The DOC should monitor these plans closely to determine the reasons for overage and if the plans should be changed. We additionally found that one plan was under utilized and should be reviewed for a possible plan change.

OITC staff advised us that Nextel Communications and Cingular Wireless staffs were reviewing the County's cellular phone usage and plans to determine if plans are appropriate. Frequently, both Nextel Communications and Cingular Wireless issue promotional rates that could be cost beneficial to the County. According to OITC staff, the County's overall usage of cellular phones appears to be on the increase. The County may want to re-evaluate cellular phone usage throughout the County and issue a bid to have a collective coverage contract.

- 3. The Director of the Department of Corrections, based on the current OITC and vendors review of the Department's cellular phone plans and those plans found to be over or under utilized through the audit, change the plans used by Departmental staff to plans that are more cost effective, as well as, meet the needs of the user.**

Based on the overall results of the reviews being conducted by Nextel Communications and Cingular Wireless regarding the County's phone plans, we recommend:

- 4. The Chief Administrative Officer or the Director of the Office of Information Technology and Communications, as appropriate, consider a Countywide plan when establishing future agency or user cellular phone plans.**

CHAPTER 4
FACILITY MAINTENANCE

INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE

The Department of Corrections (DOC) resides in a 346,000 square foot facility that operates 24 hours per day, 365 days per year. The equipment and utility services within the facility are maintained by the Office of Central Services, Facilities Operation and Management Division (FOMD) maintenance staff and by contractors. The FOMD maintenance staff conducts preventive maintenance on a variety of equipment and performs repairs for electrical, plumbing, heating and ventilation, and other maintenance problems. The contractors conduct scheduled preventive maintenance on certain equipment such as elevators, chillers, boilers, emergency generators and other equipment.

Since the function of the Department of Corrections' facility is to house incarcerated individuals, security is of the utmost importance. Essential to providing adequate security is a well-maintained facility. In addition to security aspects, liability issues related to a facility in disrepair also pose risks. We feel that facility maintenance should be given a higher level of priority considering the unique risks involved with the facility.

During our audit, we reviewed preventive maintenance activities to determine if preventive maintenance was performed and documented. We reviewed the general maintenance repair activities and process for adequacy and timeliness.

FINDINGS, COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Preventive Maintenance by Contractors

Facilities should receive regularly scheduled inspections and preventive maintenance to ensure that equipment operates efficiently, to reduce equipment downtime and unexpected failures, and to enable equipment to reach its useful life expectancy. Additionally, an effective preventive maintenance program helps to minimize repair costs and warranty losses.

The equipment located within the DOC facility receives preventive maintenance through outside contractors and FOMD maintenance staff. Elevators, chillers, boilers, emergency generators, pneumatic systems and other equipment receive scheduled preventive maintenance by contractors. Contractors are to perform preventive maintenance weekly, monthly, semi-annually or annually.

During our audit, we reviewed the fiscal year 2001-02 preventive maintenance performed by contractors on six pieces of equipment. We reviewed preventive maintenance files and service tickets to determine when preventive maintenance was performed. Based on the documentation in the files, we found that contractors were not performing all the required preventive maintenance on the equipment. We found that the number of monthly preventive maintenance services performed on five pieces of equipment ranged from four months to eleven months. We found that the semi-annual preventive maintenance service on the emergency generator had not been performed. We found no record of the annual State inspection on a boiler.

According to FOMD maintenance staff assigned at the DOC facility, they do not specifically monitor when contractor preventive maintenance is due and when contractor

preventive maintenance was completed to ensure that all preventive maintenance services were performed. As such, the County may be paying for services it's not receiving.

To ensure that contractors perform preventive maintenance and that preventive maintenance is adequately tracked and monitored, we recommend:

- 1. The head of the Facilities Operations and Management Division require the maintenance supervisor at the Department of Corrections to maintain a log as to when preventive maintenance is to be performed and when contractors complete preventive maintenance.**
- 2. The Facilities Operations and Management Division maintenance supervisor at the Department of Corrections report to the head of the FOMD when contractors do not perform required preventive maintenance on equipment. The head of FOMD take appropriate action to ensure that contractors comply with preventive maintenance requirements stipulated in the contracts.**

During our review of contractor service tickets, we noted that the tickets were not adequately documented as to which equipment received preventive maintenance, or what specific service was performed. Since the DOC facility has similar pieces of equipment (i.e. elevators, boilers), it is important to record this data for monitoring, recordation and historical purposes. We also learned that some contractor service ticket records were disposed. These should be maintained for record keeping, historical and warranty purposes. We recommend:

- 3. The head of the Facilities Operations and Management Division require preventive maintenance contractors to adequately document service tickets with information related to specific pieces of equipment and specific work performed for each piece of equipment.**
- 4. The Facilities Operations and Management Division maintenance supervisor at the Department of Corrections obtain service tickets for each preventive maintenance service provided by the contractors. The service tickets should be adequately maintained for at least three years or for the warranty period if more than three years.**

Since adequate service tickets were unavailable to verify that preventive maintenance had been performed, we reviewed contractor accounts payable records for January 2002 through June 2002 to determine if contractors had performed preventive maintenance. The records further supported that the contractors had not performed preventive maintenance.

We found that the contractor invoices did not always document when and what specific equipment was serviced. We also found that for thirteen instances in which we could locate payment records, six did not have a service ticket on file to verify that the service was performed. We additionally found that copies of service tickets were not always sent to the FOMD office to be used as support for invoice payments.

Again, to ensure that preventive maintenance is adequately tracked and documented, and that records are properly maintained for historical and warranty purposes, we recommend:

- 5. The head of the Facilities Operations and Management Division require preventive maintenance contractors to itemize invoices with specific information related to equipment and the type of work performed, or attach service tickets to the invoices to support services performed.**
- 6. The head of the Facilities Operations and Management Division ensure that adequate support documentation is provided to FOMD accounts payable staff to verify that work was performed by contractors prior to invoices being paid for preventive maintenance services.**

Preventive Maintenance In-House Staff

Air handlers, boilers, centrifugal pumps, chillers, exhaust fans, and cooling towers receive scheduled preventive maintenance by FOMD maintenance staff. Preventive maintenance Work Requests are issued automatically through the FOMD AssetWorks' Facilities Management (FM) Enterprise software (hereafter called AssetWorks' system)

to maintenance staff when preventive maintenance is scheduled to be performed (i.e. monthly, quarterly). Once the preventive maintenance is completed, the Work Requests are forwarded to the FOMD office so that data (such as date completed, work hours, material costs) can be entered into the AssetWorks' system.

During our audit, we reviewed preventive maintenance Work Requests and the AssetWorks' system to determine if monthly preventive maintenance was being performed on equipment. For the period July 2001 through July 2002, we found that not all monthly preventive maintenance was being performed, based on a sample of ten pieces of equipment. We found that the number of times monthly preventive maintenance was performed on the equipment ranged from 0 to 12 times. Preventive maintenance needs to be performed on a regularly scheduled basis to keep equipment working efficiently, to reach the useful life of the equipment, to help prevent extensive equipment downtime, and for warranty purposes. We recommend:

- 7. The head of the Facilities Operations and Management Division enhance the monitoring of the preventive maintenance services performed by FOMD maintenance staff at the Department of Corrections to ensure all services are performed in a timely manner.**

We also learned that the maintenance staff assigned to the DOC do not track or monitor the preventive maintenance Work Requests to ensure that all preventive maintenance is performed. The AssetWorks' system can provide the maintenance staff at DOC with a daily list (status report) of open and completed Work Requests for tracking and monitoring purposes. We recommend:

- 8. The Facilities Operations and Management Division maintenance supervisor at the Department of Corrections use the Asset Works' system status report to track and monitor preventive maintenance Work Requests issued to his unit.**

During our review, we found that the AssetWorks' system is not updated timely. We found that data may be entered into the system to close the Work Request up to a month after the work was completed and up to seven months after the Work Request was assigned. We found that the date work was actually completed did not always match the date the system shows the work was completed. (It appears that the date the data was entered into the system is the date being used as the date completed. The date completed should represent the date the work was actually performed.) To utilize the AssetWorks' system as an effective tool to monitor preventive maintenance Work Requests, repair costs, days to complete Work Requests and manhours, data needs to be input into the AssetWorks' system accurately and timely. We recommend:

- 9. The head of the Facilities Operations and Management Division take the necessary steps to improve the timeliness and accuracy of data being entered into the AssetWorks' system.**

We learned that maintenance staff did not always keep a copy of the preventive maintenance Work Request on file and those copies that are maintained were filed along with regular repair Work Requests. Copies of the preventive maintenance Work Request should be maintained by each piece of equipment to document that work was performed and for warranty purposes.

- 10. The Facilities Operations and Management Division maintenance supervisor at the Department of Corrections maintain a copy of every completed preventive maintenance Work Request and maintain the copies by each piece of equipment.**

General Maintenance

The DOC, Facilities Services Section receives repair requests from the various DOC units. The Section maintains a Repair Request Log for these requests. Information from the DOC Repair Request form is entered into the AssetWorks' system. The

AssetWorks' repair request number is recorded on the DOC Repair Request form for tracking purposes.

Through the AssetWorks' system, a Work Request is forwarded to the FOMD maintenance staff assigned to the DOC facility. The Work Request is assigned to maintenance staff for repair work and the maintenance supervisor updates the AssetWorks' system as "working" status. Once the repair is completed, the supervisor updates the AssetWorks' system as "completed" status and enters material costs, if any. The Work Request is then forwarded to the FOMD, where other data (labor hourly rates and labor costs) is entered into the system. The Work Request is then coded "closed" status.

In conjunction with Work Requests, each week the maintenance staff conduct an inspection of a housing unit performing various needed repairs. The maintenance staff also conduct a monthly facility general house cleaning inspection and an overall building inspection.

During November 2001 through September 2002, the FOMD maintenance staff at DOC received 2,624 Work Requests. The majority of the requests (2,348) were for plumbing and electrical repairs, mainly for lights out (984) and stoppages (898). Other repairs included areas such as carpentry, HVAC, welding, and lock problems.

During our audit, we reviewed the steps taken to process and track Work Requests, housing unit inspections and building inspections. We found that the maintenance supervisor does not monitor the status of assigned Work Requests. A daily or weekly report can be generated by the AssetWorks' system to monitor and track these requests. We recommend:

11. The Facilities Operations and Management Division maintenance supervisor at the Department of Corrections generate a daily or weekly report from the AssetWorks' system to monitor and track Work Requests assigned to his unit.

Once Work Requests are completed, the maintenance supervisor at the DOC forwards the Work Request forms to the FOMD so that data can be entered into the system and the Work Requests can be closed. We found that the FOMD no longer maintains the Work Requests for recordation purposes. Once the repair data is entered into the AssetWorks' system, the Work Request forms are destroyed. The Work Requests should be maintained for some time period as backup support to the system in the event electronic data is lost.

12. The head of the Facilities Operations and Management Division require staff to maintain Work Requests that are closed for a predetermined time period (i.e. three years).

During our review, we learned that the Facilities Services Section does not receive a report from the FOMD to monitor the status of the repair requests they entered in the AssetWorks' system. The Section cannot pull a status report from the AssetWorks' system. The Section can obtain the status of each individual Work Request in the AssetWorks' system, however, this is a very time consuming effort. To assist the Section in monitoring their substantial number of repair requests, we recommend:

13. The head of the Facilities Operations and Management Division provide the Department of Corrections, Facilities Services Section with a periodic report (i.e. weekly) that reflects the status of their Work Requests. These two organizational units should determine what type of report would be adequate to monitor the status of the DOC Work Requests.

We found that the FOMD maintenance staff at the DOC do not maintain records on the housing unit inspections, but keep an inspection form on general house cleaning inspections and building inspections. However, information regarding repairs made to

the housing units and general building maintenance and repairs is not entered into the AssetWorks' system unless a vendor is called to do the repair. Therefore, material costs, labor hours, labor costs and other data is not entered into the system, which is beneficial in determining the overall workload, costs and man-hours needed to adequately maintain the DOC facility. Any information pulled from the system regarding total maintenance performed by staff would be inaccurate since data input into the system would be incomplete.

14. The head of the Facilities Operations and Management Division require the maintenance supervisor at the Department of Corrections to maintain records and repair data on repairs made at the facility by maintenance staff that are not Work Request related, and forward this information to the FOMD so that this data can be entered into the AssetWorks' system.

During our audit, we selected the most recent plumbing and electrical Work Requests for the time period of July 1, 2002 through November 7, 2002 for review. Plumbing and electrical repairs were the highest percentage (overall 89.5% of the 2,624 Work Requests) of repair problems at the DOC facility. We reviewed Work Requests to determine the actual average time to complete the Work Requests, the average time the requests were open, the average number of requests received each day, and the average labor hours to complete the repairs. Listed below are our findings:

Plumbing and Electrical Work Requests
July 1, 2002 through November 7, 2002

Repair Type	Average Number of Requests Received Daily	Number of Requests Open	Number of Requests Closed	Average Number of Days Open as of 11/8/02	Percentage of Requests Open 30 or More days	Average Labor Hours to Complete a Request
Plumbing	5.3	242	225	41.7	61.6%	1.4
Electrical	6	250	233	39.8	66.4%	0.6

We determined the amount of time required to complete Work Requests by reviewing Work Requests that were open as of November 7, 2002, using the completion date recorded in the AssetWorks' system. We manually reviewed the AssetWorks' system to determine the actual date staff completed the work. We used this date since the date in the end date data field in the AssetWorks' system was not always the actual date work was completed, therefore unreliable. The actual date work is completed should be recorded in the end date data field. Based on a sample of 37 plumbing Work Requests, we determined that it took an average of 52.9 days to complete the work. Additionally, from a sample of 54 electrical Work Requests, we determined it took an average of 30.3 days to complete the work.

As of July 10, 2002, we learned that that there were 143 Work Requests that were still open at the DOC facility. Of these Work Requests, 7 were unassigned, 13 were assigned, 118 were in "working" status and 5 had been completed. We learned that the reason the Work Requests were open for an extended period of time was due to time constraints on the maintenance supervisor in entering data into the system showing the

work had been completed. As of October 2002, additional staff were assigned to assist the supervisor in updating the data in the AssetWorks' system.

We reviewed the number of work hours expended by staff to estimate the adequacy of staffing levels necessary to complete Work Requests. We estimate that the maintenance staff at DOC expends 1,929 hours performing plumbing repairs. We estimate they expend 936 hours performing electrical repairs.

During the time period of the Work Requests we reviewed, five FOMD maintenance staff worked the day shift and performed all repairs and preventive maintenance at the DOC facility. During our audit, four additional maintenance staff were assigned to the facility and were working a day and an evening shift. Since further staff were added, we reviewed a sample of 25 Work Requests that were issued for the DOC facility during February 2003. We found that the average time to complete the Work Requests was 4.9 days versus 52.9 and 30.3 days. It appears that additional staff has helped reduce the time to complete tasks and improved the efficiency of completing Work Requests.

However, as discussed above, Work Request data is still not being entered into the system in a timely manner, and not all data regarding all repair work performed by the maintenance staff is being entered into the AssetWorks' system. The AssetWorks' system is not being used to its fullest capabilities to effectively manage maintenance activities.

To effectively monitor, track and determine workload, repair costs, repair parts and materials, and man-hour requirements to maintain the DOC facility, all repair information needs to be entered into the AssetWorks' system and entered timely.

Once Recommendation 14 is implemented, and accurate and timely maintenance repair data for the DOC facility is being entered into the AssetWorks' system, we recommend:

- 15. The head of the Facilities Operation and Management Division re-evaluate and analyze the timeliness of repairs performed, the workload and man-hour requirements, and material and labor costs at the Department of Corrections facility. The head of the FOMD take appropriate steps, as needed, to improve adverse findings noted based on the analysis and re-evaluation.**