



State of Wisconsin \ LEGISLATIVE AUDIT BUREAU

JANICE MUELLER
STATE AUDITOR

22 E. MIFFLIN ST., STE. 500
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53703
(608) 266-2818
FAX (608) 267-0410
Leg.Audit.Info@legis.state.wi.us

October 14, 2003

Senator Carol A. Roessler
and Representative Suzanne Jeskewitz, Co-chairpersons
Joint Legislative Audit Committee
State Capitol
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Dear Senator Roessler and Representative Jeskewitz:

At the request of Representative Sheryl Albers, we have compiled some information on the management of inmate property in the Department of Corrections' Division of Adult Institutions.

Because managing inmate property falls within the duties of many staff within the institutions, there is no direct way to identify the total expenditures required to inventory, monitor, control, and ship inmate property. However, in fiscal year (FY) 2002-03, the Department assigned an estimated 27.3 full-time equivalent correctional officers and sergeants to institution property rooms, where they created and maintained manual inventories of all inmate property and managed personal property shipped with inmates who were transferred to other adult institutions. The salaries and fringe benefits for these positions totaled approximately \$1.2 million. We estimate that in FY 2002-03, there were 47,300 inmate departures and arrivals, for which between 94,600 and 141,900 boxes of inmate property were inventoried and shipped, and between 47,300 and 94,600 oversized items were transferred between institutions.

Department staff may confiscate any inmate property if they believe doing so serves a legitimate interest, such as the preservation of prison security or safety of officers and inmates. Under s. DOC 309.20 (3)(g), Wis. Adm. Code, the Department reimburses inmates for any property lost or damaged by its staff. The Department each year investigates a large number of personal property complaints from inmates. While the number of complaints has increased steadily over the past four years, the number of complaints approved by wardens and the amount of reimbursements paid out to inmates has decreased. In 2002, out of a total of 7,371 inmate personal property claims, the Department authorized reimbursement for 156 and paid \$4,641. The rate at which inmate property complaints are approved has fallen from 4.4 percent in 1999 to 2.1 percent in 2002.

Because of the amount of staff time spent on managing inmate property, particularly in maintaining manual, hand-written property inventories, we include a recommendation that the Department conduct a business process analysis of its inmate property inventory procedures to automate the system and further increase efficiency.

I hope you find this information useful. Please contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Janice Mueller'.

Janice Mueller
State Auditor

JM/DB/bm

INMATE PROPERTY ISSUES

As the number of inmates and the number of adult institutions in Wisconsin have increased, so too has the amount of inmate property that Department of Corrections staff are required to inventory, monitor, control, and ship. Inmates can possess personal property subject to the restrictions of state law and the Department's policies; however, there is no constitutional right to personal property for inmates. Department staff may confiscate any inmate property if they believe doing so serves a legitimate interest, such as the preservation of prison security or safety, without regard for constitutional privacy protections that apply outside the prison system.

The amount the Department currently spends to manage and transport inmate property is significant, and state law requires the Department to reimburse inmates for property lost or damaged by its staff. The Department received 7,371 inmate complaints in calendar year (CY) 2002 related to personal property, although the amount actually paid to inmates is small and has been declining in recent years.

Operating Expenditures

In fiscal year (FY) 2002-03, the Department spent an estimated \$1.2 million to manage inmate property, as shown in Table 1. This estimate is based on staff salary and fringe benefit costs for property room officers and sergeants who maintain inventories for inmates, and for payments to inmates for property lost or damaged by prison staff. However, this estimate represents only a portion of the total amount spent by the Department to manage inmate property. For example, cell searches for contraband property are conducted frequently, but we were not able to estimate the number of hours spent on this type of activity. Further, we excluded costs associated with the Department's central transportation unit, based at the Dodge Correctional Institution, which is the Department's primary method for shipping inmate property throughout the system. Costs to operate this unit would not decrease significantly even if no inmate property were involved, because the unit's primary function is to move inmates to their assigned institutions.

Table 1

Estimated Inmate Property-Related Expenditures FY 2002-03

Property Room Staff Salaries and Fringe Benefits	\$1,213,100
Inmate Complaint Payments ¹	<u>6,100</u>
Total	\$1,219,200

¹ Estimated.

Wisconsin Administrative Code and Department of Corrections policies govern the type and amount of property inmates are allowed to keep in their cells, and rules established by each institution further regulate what property inmates are allowed to take with them when they are transferred to another adult institution. Section DOC 309.20, Wis. Adm. Code, establishes five categories of authorized inmate personal property:

- personal effects, which must fit into a 32" x 16" x 16" box;
- medically prescribed items, for which there are no volume restrictions;
- hobby materials, which must fit into a 14" x 14" x 14" box;
- certain oversized electronic items in addition to inmates' other personal effects, including electronic equipment like televisions, typewriters, and fans; and
- legal materials, which must fit into a 20" x 20" x 20" box.

Under administrative code, inmate property is limited to three boxes plus medical items and one oversized item. Inmates are not allowed to have personal computers as property, although personal computers without Internet access are available in the libraries of some institutions for limited use by inmates.

The Department's policies slightly expand the maximum amount of property inmates are allowed. For example, the Department allows inmates materials for active legal actions in excess of the volume specified in administrative code but requires these materials to be shipped by a commercial carrier, at inmate expense, in case of a transfer to another prison in the Division of Adult Institutions. Further, the Department's policies allow inmates to possess one additional oversized hobby item, such as a musical instrument, in addition to the 14" x 14" x 14" box specified in administrative code. In practice, inmates' property may include regulation-size boxes for personal effects, for hobby materials, and for legal materials, as well as one oversized electronic item, which is often a television (with a maximum 13" screen); one oversized hobby item, often a musical instrument; and one fan.

With the exception of the minimum-security correctional centers, each institution has one or more officers assigned to a property room within the facility, where records are kept, inventories are completed, and property is stored for inmates who are out of the general prison population on a temporary basis. According to an internal survey conducted in September 2002, an estimated 27.3 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff were assigned in FY 2002-03 to manage inmate property. Given the average salary and fringe benefits earned by correctional officers and sergeants in that year, the Department spent approximately \$1.2 million to employ staff whose principal assignment was to oversee inmate property. Department staff report that other institution staff assist in the property room on an as-needed basis, such as when a large group of inmates is scheduled to be transferred to or from the prison. However, we were unable to measure how often this occurs. Therefore, the \$1.2 million spent on property staff is a minimum estimate.

The Department's inmate property system is entirely manual. Property room staff maintain a hand-written inventory of all personal property for every inmate. The inventory is updated to reflect new property acquired by inmates and to remove property that inmates no longer possess. Inmates can acquire personal property by purchasing it from the institution store, or "canteen"; by purchasing it from catalog retail outlets; and as gifts brought into the prison on visits by relatives and friends. Maintaining a personal property inventory is important to control theft among inmates; to disrupt undesirable communication between inmates and persons within or outside the prison; and to prevent the introduction of contraband items, such as illegal drugs or weapons, into the prison environment.

In addition to maintaining a current inventory when an inmate acquires property from approved sources, the Department also conducts a complete inspection and inventory of each inmate's property when he or she is transferred to or from another prison facility. Completing a transfer-related inventory requires more staff time than the updates that occur when an inmate purchases an item from the canteen or receives a gift from a visitor, because all of the inmate's property must be inspected, recorded, and packed in boxes for transport before the transfer.

A significant number of interfacility transfers occur each year, and a complete personal property inspection and inventory must be completed twice for each transfer: on departure and again on arrival of the inmate. As shown in Table 2, a total of 30,829 interfacility transfers occurred within the Division of Adult Institutions in FY 2002-03, resulting in 61,658 inmate departures and arrivals. We estimate that 47,300 transfers involved up to the amount of property allowed by state law and the Department's policies. All facilities experienced interfacility transfers, although the assessment and evaluation unit at the Dodge Correctional Institution had by far the largest number of arrivals and departures, because of its role as the intake point for the adult institution system.

Table 2

Number of Inmate Transfers
FY 2002-03

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Transfers Out</u>	<u>Transfers In</u>	<u>Departures and Arrivals</u>
Dodge Assessment and Evaluation Unit	10,253	3,361 ¹	13,614
Dodge General Population	3,380	3,471	6,851
Milwaukee Secure Detention Facility	3,432	2,658	6,090
Correctional Centers	1,207	3,442	4,649
Contract Beds—Corrections Corporation of America	2,398	1,428	3,826
Fox Lake Correctional Institution ²	1,279	2,018	3,297
Jackson Correctional Institution	1,297	1,645	2,942
Racine Correctional Institution	1,110	1,800	2,910
Oshkosh Correctional Institution	800	1,497	2,297
Stanley Correctional Institution ³	319	1,892	2,211
Kettle Moraine Correctional Institution	740	1,200	1,940
Redgranite Correctional Institution	614	1,033	1,647
Columbia Correctional Institution	684	779	1,463
Green Bay Correctional Institution	602	705	1,307
Waupun Correctional Institution	557	734	1,291
Oakhill Correctional Institution	390	836	1,226
Contract Beds—County Jails	562	482	1,044
Racine Youthful Offender Facility	277	387	664
Taycheedah Correctional Institution	220	441	661
Wisconsin Secure Program Facility ⁴	268	336	604
Wisconsin Resource Center ⁵	220	334	554
Prairie du Chien Correctional Institution	176	350	526
Contract Beds—Federal	39	0	39
Division of Intensive Sanctions	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	30,829	30,829	61,658

¹ Includes inmates transferred from the Milwaukee Secure Detention Facility and the Racine Correctional Institution, two facilities that receive inmates from county jails in those counties after sentencing; however, does not include newly arriving inmates from other county jails.

² Includes minimum- and medium-security inmates.

³ Partial year; opened in September 2002.

⁴ Formerly known as SuperMax Correctional Institution.

⁵ A secure facility, operated by the Department of Health and Family Services, that holds inmates who are receiving mental health treatment that is unavailable at a correctional institution.

As noted, state laws and the Department's policies and practices allow inmates up to three boxes of personal property, hobby, and legal materials, plus one over-sized hobby item such as a

musical instrument, one over-sized electronic item, and one electric fan. Inmates who have recently entered the system do not have a significant amount of property, and some institutions, such as the boot camp at the St. Croix Correctional Center and county jail contract beds, do not allow any significant amount of property. However, inmates who have been incarcerated for a number of years have, in some cases, accumulated property up to and even exceeding the amount allowed.

Because the inmate property inventories are all hand-written, we were unable to identify the number of boxes and items, in total, processed by property room staff at each institution. However, based on our estimate of 47,300 inmate departures and arrivals in which inmates were allowed to transfer property up to the amount allowed in practice, we estimate that property room staff inspected and inventoried the contents of between 94,600 and 141,900 boxes and between 47,300 and 94,600 oversized items in FY 2002-03.

Partly in response to our recommendations for improving the coordination of transfers, made in a 1995 audit of inmate transportation, the Department operates a fleet of four large, secure buses to transport inmates from facility to facility, using a hub-and-spoke system. Most of these interfacility transfers are accomplished by the transportation unit located at the Dodge Correctional Institution, which is where all inmates begin their incarceration in state prisons and where they are assessed and evaluated for security-level classification and for program needs. Because buses are the primary method for accomplishing interfacility transfers, they also transport the bulk of inmate property.

The Dodge transportation unit's estimated annual operating expenditures are approximately \$807,000. They consist primarily of salary and fringe benefit expenditures for the 14.0 FTE correctional officers and supervisory staff; however, they also include bus maintenance, fuel, officer meals and overtime, a bus lavatory cleaning contract, and commercial driver licensing fees. FY 2002-03 expenditures also included \$766,400 to fund the purchase of two new inmate buses and related equipment; costs for transporting ill inmates to the University of Wisconsin Hospitals and Clinics, which do not involve movement of property; the purchase of a passenger van for other trips; and maintenance work. Responsibility for inmates being transferred to or from out-of-state contract beds, including their property, lies with a vendor, Corrections Corporation of America (CCA).

Occasionally, property is not loaded on the bus along with the inmate to whom it belongs. Inmate property can be left behind when there is insufficient space in the cargo hold, or when late notification for the transfer prevents property room staff from completing the pre-transfer inventory. Without sufficient notice, property room staff may not be able to complete a thorough inspection and inventory and to repack inmate belongings, especially if a significant number of inmates are being transferred or if the transfer occurs in the evening, when the property room staff have gone home for the day. These staff typically work a first-shift schedule.

When inmate property is left behind, property room staff indicate that they seek to send it by other institution vehicles, or a few days later on the regular bus from the Dodge transportation unit or by commercial carriers such as United Parcel Service of America, Inc. (UPS), or FedEx Corporation (FedEx). Because there is no separate accounting code for shipments of

inmate property, we were unable to identify all institutions' total spending for commercial shipping of inmate property. However, some anecdotal information is available. For example, the Columbia Correctional Institution reported spending \$1,700 to ship inmate property to other adult institutions in FY 2002-03; Dodge reported spending approximately \$2,800 in the same period; and Oshkosh had no expenditures for this purpose.

Performance

While inmate complaints regarding lost or damaged property are frequent, few complaints are approved by wardens, and the trend over the past four years has been fewer payments to inmates for lost or damaged property.

The Department operates an internal inmate complaint system under which inmates and staff can refer a wide range of issues related to inmate confinement to an inmate complaint examiner. The complaint examiner investigates each complaint and recommends an action for the warden to take, which can include payment to an inmate for lost or damaged property. After considering the recommendation of the complaint examiner, the warden approves or denies each complaint and determines how approved complaints will be addressed. As shown in Table 3, in total, the number of inmate complaints has been growing steadily over the past several years and has increased from 31,690 to 44,952, or by 41.8 percent, from 1999 to 2002. The number of property complaints also increased during these four years, although complaints in other categories, such as staff actions and medical complaints, have increased at a faster rate. Personal property complaints were the most frequent type of inmate complaint in three of the past four years.

Table 3

Comparison of Total Complaints and Personal Property Complaints
CY 1999 through CY 2002

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>
Total Complaints	31,690	32,898	37,870	44,952
Staff Actions	4,563	4,757	5,882	7,448
Personal Property	6,847	6,788	7,146	7,371
Medical	3,073	3,729	4,569	6,085
Correspondence and Publications	1,894	2,384	3,059	3,711
Discipline	3,189	2,655	3,044	3,449
All Other	12,124	12,585	14,170	16,888
Payments for Property Complaints	\$8,119	\$5,673	\$5,720	\$4,641

Inmates submit property-related complaints for a wide range of reasons. Complaints commonly allege transfer damage caused by incorrect packing by property room staff, loss of property during storage in the property room while inmates are held in segregated status, and property damaged during cell searches. In CY 2002, wardens approved 156 of 7,371 property complaints, or 2.1 percent.

There is significant variation in the number of inmate property complaints among prisons, which can be partly explained by differences in populations and property rules of each facility. As shown in Table 4, complaint rates at some institutions, such as the Wisconsin Secure Program Facility (formerly SuperMax) and the Prairie du Chien Correctional Institution, were more than twice those experienced by most other institutions. The appendix presents the four-year property complaint trend for each facility, as well as amounts each institution reimbursed inmates for lost or damaged property.

Table 4

Average Property-Related Complaints
CY 1999 through CY 2002

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Average Annual Property Complaints per 100 Inmates</u>
Wisconsin Secure Program Facility ¹	173
Prairie du Chien Correctional Institution	158
Milwaukee Secure Detention Facility ²	105
Taycheedah Correctional Institution	102
Columbia Correctional Institution	79
Redgranite Correctional Institution ³	62
Racine Youthful Offender Correctional Facility	50
Kettle Moraine Correctional Institution	49
Green Bay Correctional Institution	45
Jackson Correctional Institution	44
Fox Lake Correctional Institution	38
Oakhill Correctional Institution	37
Waupun Correctional Institution	36
Oshkosh Correctional Institution	35
Racine Correctional Institution	33
Dodge Correctional Institution	18
Stanley Correctional Institution ⁴	11
Correctional Centers	8
Wisconsin Resource Center	8

¹ Opened November 1999.

² Opened October 2001.

³ Opened January 2001.

⁴ Opened September 2002.

Department staff have noted that in previous years, inmates submitted a significant number of property complaints when returning from out-of-state CCA facilities. These complaints commonly alleged packing problems and damage during transit back to Wisconsin. While we were not able to identify the number of property complaints, in total, related to out-of-state inmates, staff believe that the number of problems has declined and is likely to fall further as more inmates are returned to Wisconsin facilities. Previously, CCA subcontracted inmate transportation, including inmate property, with a private correctional transportation firm. However, beginning in October 2002, CCA began using commercial shipping firms such as UPS or FedEx to transport inmate property.

Department staff indicated that inmates returning from CCA contract facilities are more likely to submit property complaints because these inmates believe they have a better chance of receiving payment than inmates assigned to in-state adult facilities do. Payment for property lost or damaged when inmates are under the control of CCA is not the responsibility of the Department, and any amounts owed to inmates for property damage are subtracted from the monthly payment to CCA and paid directly to inmates. While some legitimate damage has occurred on transfers from CCA facilities, it appears that inmates are aware that it is CCA, in effect, and not the Department, that pays for lost or damaged property. In FY 2002-03, the Department reduced the monthly payments to CCA for lost or damaged inmate property by \$6,181 on 62 claims, with an average payment of \$99.69. The damage amounts awarded to returning inmates were higher than the amounts paid to inmates who made property complaints against in-state institutions, where a total of \$4,641 was paid on 156 claims, with an average of \$29.75 in CY 2002. Although the Department appears to be saving money by reducing CCA's monthly contract payment for inmate claims, fraudulent claims are likely to cost the Department in the long term, because CCA will be able to recover the cost of inmate claims in future contract fees.

Inmates also occasionally submit property damage claims to the State's Claims Board. This board—whose five members are appointed by the Governor, the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Department of Administration, and the co-chairs of the Joint Finance Committee—investigates and recommends payment or denial of all financial claims of more than \$10 made against the State. Since FY 1997-98, the Department of Administration has referred 15 claims from nine inmates, totaling \$5,600, to the Claims Board. All 15 claims were denied.

Future Considerations

Because of security issues, the staffing resources involved, and the number of inmate complaints involving property, the Department has a standing internal committee that identifies property issues and recommends policy changes. This committee is currently reviewing property rules that are not standardized across institutions and security levels. For example, desk lamps for reading are not allowed at three maximum-security institutions—including Waupun, Green Bay, and Columbia—yet they are allowed in the general population at Dodge, which also operates as a maximum-security institution. Pens and ink cartridges are allowed at medium-security Fox Lake, Jackson, Kettle Moraine, Oshkosh, and Racine but are not allowed at Redgranite or Racine Youthful Offender. Hotpots for cooking in inmate cells are allowed at Green Bay but are not allowed at other institutions.

Because policies are not standardized, property room staff must explain separate property rules and determine how inmates wish to dispose of the unauthorized property. Further, inmates may perceive the lack of property standardization as a fairness issue, which can lead to increased complaints. Standardization would promote fairness and simplify the inventory process for property room staff. On the other hand, staff believe that standardization could negatively affect the climate at institutions where property privileges would be reduced.

In addition to reviewing standardization of property rules, the Department's property committee is currently considering making more products available at canteens within the institutions, both to control incoming property and to raise program revenue. The Department is considering soliciting a proposal from a Tennessee company that specializes in consumer products suitable for the correctional environment. Under this proposal, inmates would be allowed to purchase approved consumer products only from the institution canteen, and not from outside retailers. The primary advantage would be increased security, but the Department's costs associated with inventorying inmate property could also be lowered under such an initiative.

Larger potential efficiencies would be possible if the Department re-engineered its antiquated manual inventory system. As noted, staff currently maintain hand-written, paper inventories of all personal property for every inmate. As inventories are updated, staff must individually search the hand-written lists to determine if items in inmates' possession are on the list.

Bar-coding, personal digital assistants (PDAs), and handheld computers are effective and widely used technologies for efficiently maintaining, tracking, and modifying inventories. These technologies allow rapid scanning of property and immediate comparison of a scanned item with a pre-existing property inventory and could increase efficiency at the time of inmate transfers. In addition, their use could promote efficiencies during routine cell searches and when inventories are conducted by other correctional officers. Therefore, we recommend the Department of Corrections direct its property committee and information technology staff to conduct a study of the cost-effectiveness of using off-the-shelf technology to automate its current inventory practices.

Appendix

Number of Inmate Personal Property Complaints, by Institution Calendar Years 1999 through 2002

Inmates in adult institutions are allowed to file complaints regarding a wide range of issues related to their confinement. These include, for example, institution rules, work conditions, medical issues, disciplinary actions, inmate security classification, visiting rules, behavior of institution staff, religious activities, and personal property issues. Each institution is assigned an inmate complaint examiner, who investigates each complaint and recommends action for the warden to take. Under s. DOC 310.01, Wis. Adm. Code, the Department's objectives for the inmate complaint review system are:

- to allow inmates to raise, in an orderly fashion, significant issues regarding rules, living conditions, and staff actions affecting the institutional environment;
- to provide the Department an early opportunity to resolve the issue before an inmate commences a civil court action;
- to encourage communication between inmates and staff;
- to develop inmates' sense of involvement in and respect for the correctional process;
- to explain correctional policy to inmates and staff;
- to afford inmates and staff the opportunity to review correctional policy;
- to correct any errors and deficiencies in correctional policy through this review; and
- to allow inmates to raise civil rights grievances.

The following pages summarize data from the Department's computerized tracking system that were related to inmate property complaints at all Division of Adult Institutions facilities open at the end of December 2002.

Columbia Correctional Institution

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	817	834	814	818	821
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	905	715	456	467	636
Successful Property Complaints	<u>16</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	9
Total Property Complaints	921	726	458	475	645
Complaints per 100 Inmates	113	87	56	58	79
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$256	\$390	\$98	\$83	\$207

Dodge Correctional Institution¹

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	1,598	1,445	1,518	1,551	1,528
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	304	246	222	297	267
Successful Property Complaints	<u>10</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>13</u>	11
Total Property Complaints	314	260	230	310	278
Complaints per 100 Inmates	20	18	15	20	18
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$122	\$305	\$46	\$121	\$149

¹ Includes Assessment and Evaluation (reception), the institution proper, and female inmates.

Fox Lake Correctional Institution¹

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	1,091	1,370	1,278	1,308	1,262
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	431	433	507	423	448
Successful Property Complaints	<u>19</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>39</u>	36
Total Property Complaints	450	454	570	462	484
Complaints per 100 Inmates	41	33	45	35	38
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$723	\$464	\$3,473	\$1,752	\$1,603

¹ Includes minimum security barracks in 2000, 2001, and 2002.

Green Bay Correctional Institution

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	1,000	1,031	1,047	1,031	1,027
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	556	422	435	446	465
Successful Property Complaints	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<1
Total Property Complaints	556	422	435	447	465
Complaints per 100 Inmates	56	41	42	43	45
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5	\$1

Jackson Correctional Institution

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	991	988	987	990	989
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	369	298	498	416	395
Successful Property Complaints	<u>89</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>23</u>	44
Total Property Complaints	458	352	509	439	439
Complaints per 100 Inmates	46	36	52	44	44
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$2,974	\$2,239	\$381	\$362	\$1,489

Kettle Moraine Correctional Institution

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	1,239	1,198	1,188	1,191	1,204
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	693	516	540	609	589
Successful Property Complaints	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	2
Total Property Complaints	697	516	541	611	591
Complaints per 100 Inmates	56	43	46	51	49
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$148	\$0	\$3	\$29	\$45

Oakhill Correctional Institution

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	574	563	595	592	581
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	173	242	232	186	208
Successful Property Complaints	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>12</u>	9
Total Property Complaints	180	248	241	198	217
Complaints per 100 Inmates	31	44	41	33	37
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$127	\$153	\$358	\$243	\$220

Milwaukee Secure Detention Facility

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u> ¹
End of December Population	n.a.	n.a.	46	364	364
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	n.a.	n.a.	36	377	377
Successful Property Complaints	n.a.	n.a.	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	6
Total Property Complaints	n.a.	n.a.	36	383	383
Complaints per 100 Inmates	n.a.	n.a.	78	105	105
Total Payments for Property Complaints	n.a.	n.a.	\$0	\$90	\$90

¹ Average computed on full years of operation only, beginning in 2002.

Oshkosh Correctional Institution

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	1,927	1,898	1,897	1,913	1,909
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	724	693	656	615	672
Successful Property Complaints	<u>19</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	5
Total Property Complaints	743	694	657	615	677
Complaints per 100 Inmates	39	37	35	32	35
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$489	\$5	\$160	\$0	\$164

Prairie du Chien Correctional Institution

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	301	298	315	316	308
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	320	419	580	591	478
Successful Property Complaints	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>22</u>	9
Total Property Complaints	321	419	594	613	487
Complaints per 100 Inmates	107	141	189	194	158
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$11	\$0	\$177	\$480	\$167

Racine Correctional Institution

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	1,406	1,439	1,400	1,467	1,428
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	638	408	403	413	466
Successful Property Complaints	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	1
Total Property Complaints	639	408	405	414	467
Complaints per 100 Inmates	45	28	29	28	33
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$5	\$0	\$46	\$13	\$16

Racine Youthful Offender Correctional Facility

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	399	397	400	400	399
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	305	166	130	108	177
Successful Property Complaints	<u>64</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>3</u>	24
Total Property Complaints	369	184	141	111	201
Complaints per 100 Inmates	92	46	35	28	50
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$1,947	\$385	\$148	\$19	\$625

Redgranite Correctional Institution

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	n.a. ¹	n.a.	967	979	973
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	n.a.	n.a.	634	570	602
Successful Property Complaints	n.a.	n.a.	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<1
Total Property Complaints	n.a.	n.a.	634	571	602
Complaints per 100 Inmates	n.a.	n.a.	66	58	62
Total Payments for Property Complaints	n.a.	n.a.	\$0	\$9	\$4

¹ Not applicable.

Stanley Correctional Institution

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u> ¹
End of December Population	n.a. ²	n.a.	n.a.	317	n.a.
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	30	n.a.
Successful Property Complaints	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	<u>4</u>	n.a.
Total Property Complaints	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	34	n.a.
Complaints per 100 Inmates	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	11	n.a.
Total Payments for Property Complaints	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	\$75	n.a.

¹ Institution was not in operation for a full year in 2002.

² Not applicable.

Taycheedah Correctional Institution

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	565	646	588	629	607
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	479	909	540	517	611
Successful Property Complaints	<u>16</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>1</u>	11
Total Property Complaints	495	925	549	518	622
Complaints per 100 Inmates	88	143	93	82	102
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$182	\$455	\$279	\$3	\$230

Waupun Correctional Institution

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	1,247	1,226	1,223	1,228	1,231
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	528	390	360	377	414
Successful Property Complaints	<u>49</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>	25
Total Property Complaints	577	424	370	385	439
Complaints per 100 Inmates	46	35	30	31	36
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$1,114	\$836	\$185	\$771	\$726

Wisconsin Resource Center¹

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	225	198	322	313	264
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	15	11	6	46	20
Successful Property Complaints	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>2</u>	<1
Total Property Complaints	15	11	6	48	20
Complaints per 100 Inmates	7	6	2	15	8
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$108	\$27

¹ A secure facility, operated by the Department of Health and Family Services, that holds inmates who are receiving mental health treatment that is unavailable at other Division of Adult Institutions.

Wisconsin Secure Program Facility¹

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average²</u>
End of December Population	121	320	284	380	328
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	16	639	575	479	564
Successful Property Complaints	<u>0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	5
Total Property Complaints	16	650	576	482	569
Complaints per 100 Inmates	13	203	203	127	173
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$0	\$239	\$195	\$30	\$155

¹ Formerly known as SuperMax Correctional Institution.

² Average computed on full years of operation only, beginning in 2000.

Wisconsin Correctional Center System

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Average</u>
End of December Population	1,917	1,733	2,042	2,083	1,944
Unsuccessful Property Complaints	94	92	192	248	156
Successful Property Complaints	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>	4
Total Property Complaints	96	95	194	255	160
Complaints per 100 Inmates	5	5	10	12	8
Total Payments for Property Complaints	\$21	\$202	\$171	\$448	\$210
