



Pickaway Correctional Institution Follow-Up

July 30, 2012

Joanna E. Saul,
Report Coordinator

**CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE REPORT
ON THE FOLLOW-UP INSPECTION OF
PICKAWAY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION**

Date of Inspection:	July 30, 2012
Type of Inspection:	Announced
CIIC Staff Present:	Joanna E. Saul, Director Jamie Hooks, Inspector Kayla Kilar, Intern
Facility Staff Present:	Warden Brian Cook Acting Deputy Warden Ricky Seyfang Major Stephen Ratcliff Inspector Mary Lawrence

Follow-Up Inspection Overview:

Overall, CIIC believes that the institution has demonstrated improvement on all issues, with the exception of the inmate grievance procedure, which is going to require greater attention. PCI is currently undergoing a large institutional change as it transitions into serving as one of the DRC's four primary "reintegration" prisons. Reintegration prisons will focus on prosocial programming, job skills training, and building connections between inmates and the outside community, all with the intention of preparing inmates for a successful reentry and reducing recidivism. While still providing a secure environment, the facility's mission will change from custody/control to true rehabilitation/reentry. This is going to require a culture change at the institution and significant training for both inmates and staff, but ultimately it will benefit both groups.

The August 2011 CIIC inspection of PCI raised seven primary concerns in the following areas: (1) conditions of C and D housing units; (2) water temperature; (3) staff/inmate interaction; (4) lack of staff supervision; (5) conveyance of contraband; (6) closure of recreation; and (7) lack of staff response to informal complaints. The follow-up inspection addressed these seven issues only and did not attempt a full facility inspection. Each concern is broken down into the following areas:

- description of the concern identified during the 2011 inspection,
- the DRC's response to the 2011 inspection report, as provided by institutional staff,
- CIIC's action plan as part of its 2012 follow-up inspection, and
- the CIIC findings from the 2012 follow-up inspection.

2011 CIIC Concern: Facility Conditions

Housing units C and D are the oldest dormitories on the compound. The deteriorating conditions included peeling paint on the walls of the housing units and bathrooms. The showers, which were in serious need of repair, had signs of rusty water, dirt, and mildew. It is noted that staff are fully aware of the condition of the housing units and that any major capital improvements would have to be approved by the DRC Operation Support Center. However, additional concerns included debris surrounding the toilets and urinals, and the floor, which was in need of serious cleaning.

2011 DRC Response

- No response documented in the 2011 inspection report.

2012 CIIC Follow-Up Inspection

- Inspect C and D housing units with standard inspection checklists, including visual observation of units.

2012 CIIC Findings

- CIIC found that the shower conditions were improved. The shower renovation project is progressing, albeit slowly. CIIC staff compared the renovated shower to the older showers and found the renovated shower to be a distinct improvement. The older showers, while still in need of renovation, appeared clean. PCI staff relayed that they are utilizing Ohio Penal Industries' inmates for the work, which is a cost savings for the state.
- CIIC found that peeling paint on the walls, ceilings, and pipes was still an issue in three of the units inspected.
- CIIC staff did not observe any debris around the toilets or floors. There was no discernible smell in the restrooms. Overall, despite the age of the housing unit, the facilities appeared clean, if in continued need of renovation.

2011 CIIC Concern: Water Temperature

Inmates in nearly every housing unit relayed serious concerns regarding the lack of hot water. According to inmates, hot water had been unavailable for more than two weeks at the time of the inspection. Some inmates from the meat packing plant relayed sanitation concerns regarding their inability to wash their hands in hot water. Although staff relayed on the second day of the inspection that the issue had been fixed, inmates stated in the second week of the inspection period that the issue was ongoing.

2011 DRC Response

- Unit staff to monitor the shower temperatures on a monthly basis as required for ACA documentation.
- Unit staff to contact PCI maintenance department when shower temperatures are not within the appropriate range so assessment may be made. This process may be initiated by the monthly shower temperature checks or due to inmate complaints. Unit staff should follow up with a work order.
- Maintenance will assess the situation and make adjustments or facilitate repairs to equipment as needed.

2012 CIIC Follow-Up Inspection

- Interview inmates in housing units.

2012 CIIC Findings

- CIIC found that this issue is much improved and/or resolved in comparison to the 2011 inspection. CIIC staff interviewed a total of 40 inmates in C and D housing units and asked inmates whether they felt hot water was still a concern in these specific units. Of the 40 inmates interviewed, 10 (25 percent) reported that there is cold water approximately one time per week; however, inmates also reported that it is generally fixed on the same day that it occurs.
- PCI staff relayed that the Maintenance Superintendent position has been filled, providing more labor and supervision. In addition, PCI staff relayed that they are doing more work “in-house,” using PCI inmates for the maintenance work.

2011 CIIC Concern: Staff/Inmate Interactions

Inmates raised concerns regarding the manner in which several levels of staff addressed them or their concerns. Inmates stated that at least two Food Service Coordinators called them inappropriate names and that certain executive level staff were either directly disrespectful or failed to respond to inmate communication. Inmates also relayed that corrections officers in the housing units were disrespectful and they raised concerns about staff accountability.

2011 DRC Response

- Warden to reiterate to staff the expectations in regards to interpersonal communications at Executive Staff Meetings, Department Head Meetings and annual in-service training.
- Investigate complaints and take corrective action.
- Executive Staff, Supervisors, and Administrative Duty Officer will make quality rounds, which will include staff/inmate interaction and document issues for action.

2012 CIIC Follow-Up Inspection

- Interview inmates regarding concerns.
- Review PCI grievance data.

2012 CIIC Findings

- CIIC found that the issue appeared to be improved. Inmates in C unit were very complimentary regarding the new Unit Manager. Furthermore, all inmates relayed that they could communicate with at least some staff on the units.

2011 CIIC Concern: Staff Supervision

Current budgetary realities have resulted in restricted staffing across the DRC. At the time of the inspection, each housing unit had only one corrections officer on duty per shift. Each unit also has one officer, known as a “floater,” that rotates between the upper and lower levels of each housing unit. With one officer managing a unit of nearly 200 inmates, the concern reported by inmates and staff is that some incidents would go unnoticed.

2011 DRC Response

- Increased security rounds.
- Increased Unit Staff rounds.
- Back to Basics for recreation.
- Installation of additional security cameras and systems.

2012 CIIC Follow-Up Inspection

- Review staffing data provided by the institution.

2012 CIIC Findings

- CIIC found that the number of posts on C and D housing units remains the same, but incidents at PCI are relatively low due to the minimum/medium security classification level of the inmate population (only 15 physical assaults were reported from April 2011 through March 2012). As PCI transitions to a reintegration prison, the inmate population will be minimum security and therefore require less supervision.
- PCI staff relayed that they actively track the number of staffing vacancies and that they fill officer positions up to the allowed 4% vacancy rate.
- PCI staff relayed that medical staff recruitment is still an issue, but that executive staff are considering enhanced recruitment strategies. PCI is among the top five institutions across the DRC for total overtime hours, with most hours predominantly performed by nursing staff; this clearly ties back to the recruitment issue, as well as the fact that PCI also houses the Frazier Health Center, which is one of the DRC’s primary long term care center for inmates requiring intensive nursing care and supervision.

2011 CIIC Concern: Conveyance of Contraband

Staff relayed that conveyance of contraband is a major issue of concern at the facility, partially due to the centralized location of the facility, the large number of visitors, and the physical structure of the institution itself. Staff stated that tobacco is a particularly large concern that requires an ever-increasing amount of staff attention, and multiple staff questioned whether the benefit of prohibiting tobacco outweighed the cost of staff time in investigation and supervision. Both inmates and staff stated that conveyance of contraband has been exacerbated by the transfer of honor dorm inmates inside the compound.

2011 DRC Response

- Staff Shakedowns: coordinated efforts with OSHP to conduct random shakedowns of staff/contractors entering the institution using an OSHP K-9. We will be coordinating these efforts immediately. Conducted 2nd Shift Staff Search on April 27th. 1st Shift, Special Duty and Administrative Staff search was conducted on July 6th. 3rd Shift is being planned for the next month.
- Requested OSHP (Pickaway County Post) increase patrols of the Orient Complex and watch for suspicious vehicles on or near our grounds. Currently, OSHP Troopers conduct an on-grounds patrol of PCI and CRC each shift, seven days/week depending on availability. Contact has been made with the post to ensure this is still occurring. Ongoing.
- Continue to cultivate new inmate confidential informants that have provided valuable and accurate information. Ongoing – currently we have multiple investigations involving the possibility of staff involvement in the conveyance of contraband/drugs as well as multiple investigations involving non-employees. William Card, Painter recently retired was being investigated for attempted conveyance and unauthorized relationship with an inmate. Note-many times we are investigating what we believe to be drug drops and the final outcome is tobacco. We have worked with the prosecutor's office and law enforcement to at least get misdemeanor convictions for trespassing in these cases.
- A review of the search procedures and accountability will be done again using the back to basic methodology. B2B was presented and approved in regards to the processing of level 1a's in and out of the facility. A copy is attached. Maintenance is working to secure plans, permits, etc.
- Informed all PCI and CTA Staff, via email and in-service, of the contraband activity to include the dissemination of example photographs. Encouraged Staff to remain vigilant and report any suspicious vehicle or activity immediately. We will continue these efforts. Ongoing.
- Assigned eligible Return to Work Officers to serve as an external observe and report patrol on the Orient Complex grounds. The Officer reports suspicious activity/vehicles for Area or Perimeter Patrol to challenge. Ongoing.
- Review entry procedures for the processing of staff and visitors. Scheduled for August.

- Continue to inform residential neighbors of our contraband conveyance issues and request their assistance in observing and reporting suspicious vehicles/activities (Block watch). This was discussed during the Community Emergency Management Meeting to be held at the Orient Methodist Church on August 17th at 7PM. The meeting involved the Mayor and members of the community. This will occur again at the next meeting. Spoke to this topic again at our LSA Table Top on May 10th.
- A large scale clear out has been requested (formally requested 7/12/11). A mini-clear out of units A1, D1 and D2 was conducted June 21st.
- Ensure proper shakedowns and searches are occurring.

2012 CIIC Follow-Up Inspection

- Interview Warden regarding the success of increased enforcement measures to control contraband conveyance.

2012 CIIC Findings

- According to PCI staff, 11 percent of the inmate group tested in November as part of a random drug screening was positive for drug use. Following this result, staff instituted an action plan that included the following:
 - adding a bank of lights to the cornfields to provide additional visibility for staff,
 - increasing staff shakedowns, and
 - challenging shifts of staff to compete to find contraband.

Staff relayed that they have seen significant success and are now running at a 1 – 2 percent rate of positive drug use indication based on random drug tests.
- In addition, PCI staff relayed that they are reaching out more to community stakeholders regarding the issue and are receiving assistance from the Ohio State Highway Patrol to provide greater surveillance.

2011 CIIC Concern: Closure of Recreation

Both inmates and staff relayed that the number of recreation hours afforded to inmates is often and increasingly decreased significantly. Staff pointed to low levels of staffing, which often forces the institution to pull officers who would otherwise be able to supervise recreation to instead assist on transportation or other institutional needs. Staff also pointed to an increasing amount of time needed to run both lunch and evening chow.

2011 DRC Response

- Open recreation immediately upon completion of noon meal.
- Back to Basics for recreation.
- Start noon meal within 5 minutes of Signal 21.
- Additional review of Pick a Post Parameters dated April 12, 2011.

2012 CIIC Follow-Up Inspection

- Interview Warden regarding the results of the Back to Basics Committee on the recreation issue.
- Interview inmates regarding recreation.

2012 CIIC Findings

- CIIC finds that recreation has improved, but still needs continued attention. Of the 40 inmates interviewed, 20 (50 percent) stated that access to recreation is an ongoing concern. However, they stated that the yard is open during the morning and afternoon; the problem is primarily in the evening, at which time the institution splits recreation and also frequently closes down recreation due to staffing issues. CIIC notes that this is an improvement over the past inspection, when inmates reported closure at lunchtime as well.
- PCI staff relayed that they engaged in a Back to Basics Committee analysis of recreation, which produced seven recommendations. The Warden immediately implemented the three recommendations that he could, three are impeded by the union contract, and one will be reevaluated once there is sufficient staffing.
- PCI staff further relayed that they were aware of the recreation concern on second shift and working on addressing the staffing issue that is causing recreation to be curtailed.
- PCI staff also relayed that they are updating outdoor recreational facilities in general by repaving the track, including adding a walking/wheelchair lane, putting in water fountains, and adding picnic tables.

2011 CIIC Concern: Inmate Grievance Procedure

According to the grievance statistics for Pickaway Correctional Institution, of 805 informal complaints received in 2010, 219 (27.2 percent) responses were untimely. While the DRC only requires an action plan for an untimely response rate above 15 percent, CIIC believes that an untimely response rate above 10 percent is unacceptable, and 5 percent is preferred; regardless of which measurement is chosen, the rate of untimely responses at the facility is beyond unacceptable.

2011 DRC Response

- Decrease the number of untimely informal complaint responses to comply with DRC's set standard and CIIC's vision
- Work with the managing officer to educate supervisors about their responsibility to respond to inmates' informal complaints.
- Educate staff about the effectiveness of their prompt response to ICR and how this affects the climate of the inmate population and everyone else's area.
- Devise a more effective action plan that will alert the managing officer about delinquent ICR responses to allow him to take the appropriate action. If necessary disciplinary measures will be taken.

2012 CIIC Follow-Up Inspection

- Review 2011 PCI data regarding the grievance procedure.
- Review of 20 informal complaint resolutions filed between April 1 – June 30, 2012, selected at random.
- Review of 8 grievances filed between April 1 – June 30, 2012, selected at random.
- Interview inmates in housing units.

2012 CIIC Findings

- **CIIC finds that this concern is not resolved.** In CY 2011, PCI reported that there were 1,035 informal complaints filed. Of those, 189 (18.3 percent) received no response at all. Of the 846 informal complaints that did receive a response, 341 (32.9 percent) received a response beyond the seven day timeframe in DRC administrative rule.
- CIIC finds that although staff are being notified that they have an outstanding response, they are not being held accountable for failure to respond to grievance procedure paperwork in a timely manner. **CIIC strongly recommends that staff be held accountable for failure to respond to informal complaints.**
- Anecdotally, inmates relayed that they choose not to use the grievance procedure because they do not believe that it is effective or that they will receive a response.

- CIIC finds that there is inconsistency in how the informal complaints are being logged into the DRC system, which is ultimately going to impact the ability to hold staff accountable. Most institutions have relayed that they hold staff accountable to respond to the inmate within seven days of the Inspector receiving the pink carbon copy of the informal complaint (rather than the date that the inmate writes on it). In PCI's case, the pink copies of the informal complaints are in some cases being logged into the system a full month after the inmate's date. It is unclear why this would occur. Furthermore, this likely is going to skew the numbers in the DRC computer system because it calculates untimely responses based on the date that the Inspector logs it. To explain, if staff respond to an informal complaint two weeks after the inmate sends it to them (an untimely response), but the Inspector logs the informal complaint into the system after this time, the computer system will document it as a timely response because staff responded prior to the complaint within seven days of the Inspector logging it.
- The Inspector relayed that in some cases, she may receive the pink copy late or may not ever receive it at all. In CIIC's opinion, there can only be two reasons for this: either (1) inmates do not understand how to use the grievance procedure or (2) the mail is not being delivered to the Inspector in a timely manner. Both of these can be addressed by staff action.
- In total, CIIC finds that there are problems with the grievance procedure at multiple points at PCI and that greater attention/pressure needs to be applied if improvement is going to be achieved.