



Internal Audit
Department

301 W Jefferson
Suite 660
Phoenix, AZ 85003

[maricopa.gov/
internalaudit](http://maricopa.gov/internalaudit)
602.506.1585

Ross L. Tate
County Auditor

Sheriff's Office

Detention Intake and Release

August 2014

*Internal Audit Report Authorized by the
Maricopa County Board of Supervisors*

Report Highlights	Page
Central Intake's entrance security will be strengthened in the new facility proposed in the 10-year Jail Master Plan.	1
Central Intake's monitoring of compliance with mandatory training and certification is being improved.	2
Detention's reporting and internal controls will be improved in the new Jail Management System.	3
Detention's classification policies are consistent with industry guidelines.	5
Detention's controls over inmate reclassification at Central Intake will be strengthened by the new Jail Management System.	6
MCSO's procedures for classification and physical placement of inmates are being evaluated.	6
MCSO's classification assessment controls will be strengthened through bimonthly reviews.	7
MCSO's early intervention and complaint tracking are being addressed through new systems.	8
Detention's monitoring of inmate release turnaround and victims' rights compliance will be improved by expanding training and performance management.	9

Background

The Sheriff's Office Central Intake Division serves as the gateway to the jail system, annually booking approximately 100,000 people arrested by local, County, State, or Federal law enforcement.

After arriving at Central Intake, accompanied by the arresting officer, arrestees move through the booking process, which includes being medically assessed, searched, photographed, and fingerprinted. Inmates with new charges must be brought before an Initial Appearance (IA) Court judge within 24 hours of arrest. Approximately 40% of inmates are released by the IA judge and given a date to show up in court.

If an inmate is to remain in jail, the inmate is dressed out and interviewed by the Sheriff's Office Classification Division personnel. They determine the inmate's security level and appropriate housing through interviews, prior jail history, and current charges. The inmate is then transported to a housing facility.

If the charges are victim-related, the Sheriff's Office is required to notify victims of changes to an inmate's status, such as a scheduled initial appearance in court or a release.

Objectives

To determine that the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office (MCSO):

- Intake controls are sufficient to maintain and operate a safe and efficient environment for the acceptance of inmates booked into Maricopa County jails.
- Jail classification controls ensure inmates are classified and housed in accordance with MCSO policies and procedures, and government regulations.
- Inmate release controls ensure the accurate and timely release of inmates in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes and MCSO policies and procedures.
- Inmate information is provided to victims in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes and MCSO policies.

Scope

The testing period varied by area, but ranged from July 2010 through March 2014. To perform this audit, we (1) interviewed MCSO personnel and toured MCSO facilities, (2) reviewed State regulations, industry guidelines, MCSO policies, and Jail Management System (JMS) data and supporting documents, (3) performed a detailed analysis of 172,861 booking and 107,468 release records, and (4) analyzed MCSO training records.

Audit Results

Issue #1: Central Intake Policies and Procedures

Observation: We compared Central Intake policies and procedures to industry guidelines and found that MCSO's practices were consistent with four of the five key areas reviewed. We found one difference between the Department of Justice (DOJ) National Institute of Corrections (NIC) guidelines and MCSO practices regarding searching arriving arrestees. NIC guidelines state that an intake officer should frisk search arriving arrestees before they are allowed in the intake area, and should perform a follow-up search prior to dressing in jail clothing. MCSO currently only conducts the latter. MCSO relies on the arresting officer's pat/frisk search prior to arriving at Central Intake. An initial search would mitigate risk, but the current facility lacks a designated area to conduct the search.

Conclusion #1A: Central Intake policies are consistent with four of five industry guidelines.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
None	N/A
Conclusion #1B: Controls over admitting and searching arrestees could be strengthened.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
1B-1 Consider ways to implement initial search procedures by Intake officers in the Central Intake facility; ensure that this process is addressed in the Jail Master Plan.	Concur – Implementation not currently possible Due to current construction/space restrictions, facility Intake staff is not able to conduct additional search procedures. Arresting Agencies will be required to continue to pat search arrestees prior to entering Intake. In addition, the Jail Master Plan project incorporates the construction of a new intake-transfer-release (ITR) facility that is expected to incorporate an initial search area. This project is currently underway as presented in the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors meeting on 06/09/2014.

Issue #2: Central Intake Training

Observation: To determine that Central Intake complied with MCSO training and certification requirements, we reviewed the training documents of 25 detention officers. We found that mandatory annual training courses were being completed as required. However, we found that 14 of 25 officers (56%) did not maintain all of their required certifications throughout the test period; 7 had 1 lapsed certification (respirator fit test) and another 7 had 2 or 3 lapsed certifications (Taser, Pepperball, and/or respirator fit test). The lapses in certification ranged from 11 days to 364 days, and averaged 142 days.

Conclusion #2A: Mandatory annual training courses are being completed as required.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
None	N/A
Conclusion #2B: The tracking and reporting of the completion of training and certifications should be improved.	
Recommendations	MCSO Action Plan
2B-1 Determine if the training system adequately supports management's monitoring of training compliance.	Concur – In process Administrative Field Training Officer (FTO) will implement a tracking system and send out email alerts 60 days prior and 30 days prior to all shift FTOs when certificates and training are required. The Administrative FTO will also send out Monthly reports to the Administrative Sergeant and Administrative Lieutenant for their monitoring/review. Target Date: 07/28/2014
2B-2 Work with the Training Division to ensure that the training system produces timely information as to whether required training/certification deadlines are met.	Concur – In process (See comments in 2B-1) In addition, Skills Management Vista database is limited in the number of users and to the number of users that can access the database at the same time. Training staff has agreed to post all Compliance Reports on a weekly basis to the shared drive. Target Date: 08/04/2014

Conclusion #2C: Periodic review of training records should be implemented.	
Recommendations	MCSO Action Plan
2C-1 Reinforce the importance of completing required trainings and certifications; ensure consequences for non-compliance adhere to Policy GC-17.	Concur – Completed In May 2014, all FTO's were re-assigned back under the Administrative Sergeant(s) to ensure better accountability and compliance with office Policy GG-2. In December 2013, Policy (GC-17) provided a matrix which establishes specific criteria for issuing discipline. Failure to meet mandatory training requirements is included in the matrix.
2C-2 Periodically review training records of all Central Intake personnel to determine compliance with MCSO training requirements; follow-up as needed.	Concur – In process (See comments in 2B-1) Target Date: 07/28/2014

Issue #3: Central Intake Process

Observation: To assess the efficiency of Central Intake’s booking process, we performed time analyses of the four intervals listed below using Jail Management System (JMS) data from October 2011 through September 2013.

- Arrested to Entered Jail
- Entered Jail to Booked
- Arrested to Initial Court Appearance
- Booked to Initial Court Appearance

Arrest data is captured and temporarily retained through a front-end system used by the arresting agency called the pre-booking system. The data is transferred into JMS once the inmate is officially accepted into MCSO custody. We found that certain fields within the pre-booking system are not transferred to JMS. The field titled “Entered Jail” in JMS represents the time an arrestee is medically cleared and assigned a booking number. An arrestee’s actual arrival time at Central Intake is activated by the arresting agency in the pre-booking system, but this time stamp is not transferred to JMS. Therefore, the arresting officer’s and arrestee’s wait time for the medical assessment could not be determined.

Incomplete data and lack of management reporting capabilities diminish MCSO’s ability to accurately analyze the efficiency of the intake booking process. This hinders management’s ability to identify bottlenecks, evaluate operational performance, and pinpoint variances from policy or statutory requirements.

We found that, on average, 12.1 hours elapse from arrest to initial court appearance and 7.1 hours elapse from booking to initial court appearance. We found a few instances where the initial appearance time was earlier than the booking time, indicating that arresting officers are being allowed to take the arrestee to court prior to completion of booking. While this streamlines the booking process, it deviates from the current MCSO policy.

Conclusion #3A: Effective use of JMS data to analyze operational efficiencies should be improved.	
Recommendations	MCSO Action Plan
3A-1 Review pre-booking data fields to ensure that data is available for MCSO management reporting needs.	Concur – In process MCSO is currently working with vendors to select and implement a new JMS. In the meantime, MCSO will determine if changes to the current JMS system are feasible. Target Date: To be determined
3A-2 Ensure that pre-booking and JMS data retention practices are in accordance with County records retention policies.	Concur – Completed Currently in compliance with Arizona State County Library Retention Schedule.
Conclusion #3B: Procedures for approving exceptions to documented processes need to be developed.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
3B-1 Establish policy and procedures for approving exceptions to the documented Central Intake booking process.	Concur – In process While policies cannot address every unique exception that is encountered, the Central Intake policies will be updated to state that supervisor approval should be obtained for variations from the documented procedures. Target Date: 10/15/2014

Issue #4: Inmate Classification

Observation: Inmate classification involves assessing the risks and needs of inmates to determine their housing assignment, supervision requirements, services, and program participation. We compared MCSO classification policies and procedures for four primary areas to the DOJ NIC guidelines and found that, overall, MCSO policies appeared to be consistent with the NIC guidelines.

We reviewed 91 classification assessments from bookings that occurred between October 2011 and September 2013. We found that, other than minor administrative variances, the Classification Division substantively completed the assessments in accordance with MCSO policies. The administrative variances included some fields being left blank. Most frequently, those fields related to inmate-reported information and the use of prior booking information (older than two years) to determine classification. Complete and consistent assessment information would provide more support for classification decisions.

Of 91 classification assessments tested, we found that all matched the JMS screen print on file. However, when an inmate is reclassified prior to being transported to housing, the system may not alert the Transportation Division of the change. To prevent transport of the inmate to the incorrect facility, Classification must hand-deliver the new housing assignment to Transportation in time. This scenario is most common with inmates awaiting psychiatric evaluation.

Conclusion #4A: Classification policies are consistent with industry guidelines.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
None	N/A
Conclusion #4B: Classification procedures appear to result in appropriate housing assignments.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
None	N/A

Conclusion #4C: Controls for redirecting transportation of an inmate due to reclassification should be improved.	
Recommendations	MCSO Action Plan
4C-1 Address underlying system issue concerning reclassification of inmates prior to transport.	<p>Concur – In process</p> <p>Although it is not cost effective to make changes to the current system, MCSO is currently working with vendors to select and implement a new JMS. This issue has been incorporated into the new JMS project planning through meetings of the various stakeholders affected by the system.</p> <p>In the meantime, Classification staff will hand deliver the 2nd transfer message to the Intake Sergeant to ensure transport to the correct location.</p> <p>Target Date: To be determined (based on implementation of the new system)</p>
4C-2 To ensure consistency, consider codifying the procedures Classification staff should employ when dealing with inmates awaiting psychiatric evaluation.	<p>Concur – In process</p> <p>MCSO is currently evaluating the addition of specific procedures for classification and physical placement of inmates for whom psychiatric orders are expected but have not yet been received.</p> <p>Target Date: 11/01/2014</p>
Conclusion #4D: Classification assessments should be monitored regularly.	
Recommendations	MCSO Action Plan
4D-1 Review the assessment form periodically to determine if it sufficiently captures all useful information.	<p>Concur – Completed</p> <p>The assessment form currently utilized has been revised twice in the last year to meet updated information requirements with the most recent being June 2014.</p>
4D-2 Perform periodic assessment reviews to monitor compliance with policy and procedures.	<p>Concur - In process</p> <p>Supervisors will conduct a quality control review every 60 days.</p> <p>Target Date: 09/01/2014</p>

Issue #5: Special Housing

Observation: After initial classification, inmates' special housing assignments are periodically reviewed for appropriateness through Special Management Review Committee (SMRC) meetings. We reviewed the documentation of 25 SMRC meetings from October 2011 through September 2013, covering 119 inmate housing assignments. We found that 95% were entered accurately and timely in the inmate's jail record. Five inmate records were not updated with the recommended housing change and one was not made until a week after the meeting took place. Classification management informally defines timeliness as within a 24-hour period. We also found two instances where the conclusions regarding the inmates' housing were not clearly documented in the meeting minutes. Additionally, there is no periodic review to ensure all decisions made in the meetings have been performed.

During our testing, we noted that JMS does not currently provide a report indicating which inmates require SMRC review, resulting in the need to compile the list manually. Consequently, MCSO cannot determine if all applicable inmates were reviewed by SMRC in accordance with policy.

Conclusion #5A: 95% of inmate classification reviews were entered in accordance with SMRC meeting conclusions.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
None	N/A
Conclusion #5B: Periodic review of SMRC meeting decisions should be implemented.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
5B-1 Institute periodic reviews of SMRC results and the subsequent updating of JMS records to ensure all requested changes are implemented.	Concur – In process Supervisors will conduct a quality control review of SMRC results and JMS every 60 days. Target Date: 09/01/2014

Conclusion #5C: Policy and procedures should provide guidance on the timely updating of an inmate's JMS record.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
5C-1 Define timeliness of updating JMS record in the Classification Operations Manual.	<p>Concur – In process</p> <p>An addition will be made to the Operations Manual to reflect that, "The supervisor attending the SMRC meetings will review all updates in JMS and that changes have been implemented. This will usually take place within 24 hours after the SMRC meeting. However, some changes may be delayed or changed, until further information is obtained to determine appropriate housing."</p> <p>Target Date: 08/07/2014</p>

Issue #6: Incident Reports

Observation: We reviewed incident reports for 40 inmate-on-inmate assaults and 40 inmate-on-officer assaults for the period of January 2011 through September 2013. None of the reports indicated that the assaults were the result of a misclassification by the Classification Division. However, incident reports are designed as an investigative tool, not to identify possible underlying operational issues, such as training or housing protocols that may have contributed to the incident.

Conclusion #6A: Assaults do not appear to be caused by inmate misclassification.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
None	N/A

Conclusion #6B: Underlying operational issues are not identified in incident reports.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
6B-1 Consider ways to enhance the identification, tracking, and monitoring of operational issues (e.g., training, policy compliance, etc.) that may contribute to incidents.	<p>Concur – In process</p> <p>MCSO has recently implemented two integrated systems, IAPro and BlueTeam, to address early intervention and tracking of complaints and incidents, among other topics. These systems were put into service in July 2014 and personnel are currently going through training.</p> <p>Target Date: 10/02/2014</p>

Issue #7: Inmate Release

Observation: We compared MCSO release policies and procedures for eight primary processes to industry guidelines (DOJ NIC guidelines). Overall, we found MCSO policies were consistent with the guidelines except for incorporating the confirmation of victim notification during the release process. This confirmation process helps ensure that a victims' rights are upheld.

We selected 25 inmate files from bookings between October 2011 and September 2013 and found the records were compliant with MCSO policies in 7 of 10 areas reviewed. We found that: 17 inmate releases exceeded the 5-hour limit, 2 release records were missing supervisory approval from the Sheriff's Information Management Services Division, and 2 release checklists were missing supervisory approval from the release facility. Per MCSO policy, an inmate is to be released within five hours of the JMS initial release message, which occurs after all court paperwork has been verified by Sheriff's Information Management Services.

An expanded review of all release activity showed that, of the 107,468 total inmate releases, 44,187 (41%) were completed within the 5-hour limit. The remaining 63,281 (59%) releases were completed within the following intervals:

- Greater than 5 to less than 10 hours (25%)
- Greater than 10 to less than 15 hours (16%)
- Greater than 15 to less than 20 hours (15%)
- Greater than 20 to 24 hours (3%)

Conclusion #7A: Victim notification should be considered during the release process.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
7A-1 Incorporate the confirmation of victim notification into the release process.	<p>Concur – Implementation not currently possible</p> <p>Although it is not cost effective to make changes to the current system, MCSO is currently working with vendors to select and implement a new JMS. This issue has been incorporated into the new JMS project planning through meetings of the various stakeholders affected by the system.</p> <p>Target Date: To be determined (based on implementation of the new system)</p>
Conclusion #7B: Controls over the timely release of inmates need strengthening.	
Recommendations	MCSO Action Plan
7B-1 Review the 5-hour limit requirement in the release policy and incorporate procedures to monitor compliance.	<p>Concur – In process</p> <p>MCSO is currently evaluating the use of the 5-hour limit as a performance measure, rather than a policy. In addition, the Jail Master Plan project incorporates the construction of a new intake-transfer-release (ITR) facility that is expected to improve release turnaround times. This project is currently underway as presented in the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors meeting on 06/09/2014.</p> <p>Target Date: To be determined</p>
7B-2 Perform periodic reviews of JMS release data to ensure compliance with established release policies and procedures.	<p>Concur – In process</p> <p>See 7B-1 above.</p>
7B-3 Strengthen release-process training for detention officers, to improve compliance with policy.	<p>Concur – In process</p> <p>Change the Release Procedures course from optional to required.</p> <p>Target Date: 01/01/2015</p>

Issue #8: Victims' Rights

Observation: We reviewed 40 bookings that occurred between February 2013 and March 2014. For these bookings, the Victim Assistance and Notification Unit (VANU) was legally required to notify 64 victims regarding the inmates' scheduled initial court appearances. We found that 42 (66%) were completed. These results represent an improvement over the findings presented in the State of Arizona Attorney General's audit report issued in 2012. Prior to that audit, VANU was not completing any initial appearance notifications.

Additionally, of the 40 bookings tested, a total of 68 other notifications were required (terms and conditions of release, release, post-conviction, and re-arrest). Of those 68 required notifications, 65 (96%) occurred timely. We found one instance of a victim not being notified of an inmate's terms and conditions of release, and two instances of a release notification not being made in a timely manner.

We found that MCSO's victim notification policies align with applicable Arizona Revised Statutes and industry guidelines. However, we identified two areas with internal control gaps:

- MCSO does not have procedures to ensure that all bookings with a victim-related charge have the completed Victims' Rights Request/Waiver forms before the inmate is accepted into MCSO custody. Intake officers can bypass the field within JMS that asks if victim forms have been received. Additionally, there is no reconciliation process to ensure all victim forms are sent to the VANU for notification.
- Neither the statutes nor MCSO policies define the term "timely" as it relates to how soon the VANU must make contact with the victim after an event requiring notification takes place. We found that the average time it takes the VANU to contact a victim after receipt of the internal trigger message is 2 to 3 hours for an initial appearance and 1 to 2 hours for a release.

Conclusion #8A: Victim notification policies are consistent with the Arizona Revised Statutes and industry guidelines.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
None	N/A

Conclusion #8B: Controls around collection of victim information during booking need strengthening.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
8B-1 Develop processes to ensure that completed Victims' Rights Request/Waiver forms are received from arresting officers and forwarded to VANU for all bookings with a victim-related charge.	Concur – In process Require staff working in a booking facility to review the training video on e-learning that outlines procedures for issuing Victims' Rights form during the booking process. Target Date: 01/01/2015
Conclusion #8C: Timeliness of victim notification needs to be defined.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
8C-1 Establish performance measures for timely notification; monitor effectiveness in meeting policy; and take corrective action, when warranted.	Concur – In process VANU Supervisor will be tasked with improving reporting on bookings completed without Victims' Rights compliance so that meaningful performance measures can be developed. Once the measures are determined, they will be monitored by the VANU Supervisor. Target Date: 09/18/2014
Conclusion #8D: Victim notification management reporting should be improved.	
Recommendation	MCSO Action Plan
8D-1 Include victim notification performance monitoring and reporting requirements in the new Jail Management System.	Concur – In process See comments in 8C-1 for discussion of performance monitoring changes. In addition, MCSO is currently working with vendors to select and implement a new JMS. This issue has been incorporated into the new JMS project planning through meetings of the various stakeholders affected by the system. Target Date: To be determined (based on implementation of the new system)

Standards	This audit was approved by the Board of Supervisors and was conducted in conformance with the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing. The specific areas reviewed were selected through a formal risk-assessment process.
Auditors	Eve Murillo, Deputy County Auditor, CPA, MBA, CFE, ITIL Toni Sage, Audit Supervisor, MBA, CIA, CGAP, CRMA Jennifer Sigüenza, Senior Auditor, CPA, MAcc KPMG LLP

This report is intended primarily for the information and use of the County Board of Supervisors, County leadership, and other County stakeholders. However, this report is a matter of public record and its distribution is not limited.

We have reviewed this information with Sheriff's Office management. The Action Plan was approved by Jerry Sheridan, Chief Deputy, on August 12, 2014.

If you have any questions about this report, please contact Eve Murillo, Deputy County Auditor, at 602-506-7245.