CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE REPORT:

INVESTIGATOR DATA REVIEW

PREPARED AND SUBMITTED
BY CIIC STAFF

June 6, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

PAGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

PAGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION

The following report is an analysis of the statistics presented in the 2003 and 2004 Annual Reports of the Office of the Chief Inspector released in June 2004 and June 2005 respectively. Although the Annual Reports include statistics on the grievances investigated by the ODRC Inspectors, as well as DRC Investigators, for CIIC evaluation and report purposes, it was decided to provide two separate reports, with one on the Investigators' data, and one on Inspectors' and their grievance procedure data.

The Chief Inspector is the administrative head of all Institutional Inspectors and Investigators within the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections (ODRC). The Chief Inspector's Annual Reports present a compilation of data from all Investigators in the 32 state prisons in operation in 2004. The data consists of raw numbers, and results of investigations undertaken at each correctional institution, but the Annual Reports do not provide any additional details or analysis.

Institutional Investigators work as counterparts to the Institutional Inspectors. While Inspectors investigate and report findings on inmate grievances, Investigators are generally focused on illegal substances, assaults, or professional misconduct. In the past, Investigators have also monitored Security Threat Group (STG, aka "gang") activity. While Investigators serve on the STG committee, the ODRC has moved toward hiring STG Coordinators to provide greater attention to security threats and activity.

The Annual Reports include data on the number of initiated investigations in the following areas:

- **Drugs**
  - **Positive Urinalyses**
  - **Staff/Inmate**
  - **Inmate/Visitor**
  - **Mail/Packages**
  - **Staff**
  - **Other**
- **Assaults**
  - **Inmate on Inmate**
  - **Inmate on Staff**
  - **Sexual**
- **Professional Misconduct**
  - **Staff Misconduct**
  - **Staff/Inmate Relationships**
- **Other**

According to follow-up communication from the DRC Chief Inspector's Office, the **Investigator does not conduct all investigations at any given institution, nor are Investigators even always aware of other investigations being done by custody. The**

Investigators only report the cases that they personally investigate. As such, institution numbers may vary from Investigator numbers.

In addition to the initiated investigations, the Annual Reports also provide data pertaining to Searches, Shakedowns, and Drugs and Alcohol Confiscated. Specifically, the following areas are covered:

- **Canine Search**
- **Visitor Strip/Patdown**
- **Employee Strip/Patdown**
- **Major Shakedown**
- **Marijuana**
- **Crack/Cocaine**
- **Heroin**
- **Illicit Pills**
- **Hooch**

For the purposes of this report, most tables within the body of this report only include the "Top Ten" institutions or subject area. The extended tables for all such "Top Ten" lists may be found in the Appendix.

In addition, for brevity's sake, many times institutions will be referred to by their abbreviations. These abbreviations may be found in Appendix A. For quick comparison and reference purposes, tables ranking all institutions by population and by security level may also be found in Appendix A.

All statistics found within this report that are not otherwise denoted were taken directly from the Chief Inspector's Report on CY 2003 and 2004. Any other statistics are calculated based on those numbers.

II. ODRC POLICY 09-INV-04: INSTITUTIONAL INVESTIGATOR

ODRC policy 09-INV-04 defines an Institution Investigator as "an employee of the DRC or employee of a private company assigned at a state correctional institution controlled by the department, whose primary duties include the investigations of alleged violations of administrative rules, policies, and procedures."

Policy

It is the policy of the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction that all allegations of and other possible incidents of violations of administrative rules, polices and procedures by staff shall be promptly investigated in a thorough and fair manner.

Procedures

- Each institution shall have at least one employee identified as the Institution Investigator. The Institution Investigator shall report directly to the Warden with functional supervision being maintained by the Chief Inspector or designee. Their duties shall include the investigation of allegations of, or incidents of serious violations of administrative rules, policies and/or procedures. The Investigator shall have sufficient authority, clerical support, and unfettered access to all records and areas of the institution required to carry out the duties of the office. The Warden may also assign the Investigator additional responsibilities, which do not conflict with or detract from their ability to conduct thorough, fair and timely investigations.

- The Institution Investigator shall serve as the central clearinghouse for information/intelligence gathered within the institution and shall be responsible for providing regular briefings to the Warden.

- The Institution Investigator shall serve on the institution STG committee as specified by DRC policy 310-SEC-12.

- The Institution Investigator shall submit a monthly report to the Warden, the Chief Inspector, and the Office of Prisons by the tenth of each month following the report month.

- The Institution Investigator shall be LEADS and CCH certified.

- The Institution Investigator shall control the ITMS system as specified by applicable DRC policy.

Investigations

- The Warden and/or the Chief Inspector shall evaluate incident reports, allegations, and unusual occurrences to determine if an investigation is warranted.

- In the event that an investigation becomes necessary, the Warden or the Chief Inspector in consultation with the Warden shall identify the appropriate individual to conduct the investigation. Investigations that require special skills, knowledge or expertise should be referred to the Institution Investigator, such as:

    - Drug Use/Trafficking
    - Staff/Inmate Relationships
    - Significant Staff Misconduct
    - Multi-Agency Investigations

- The Institution Investigator may also independently initiate investigations in cases where information has been received via monitored telephone calls, "tips," and other communications that indicate a serious violation of administrative rules, policies or procedures has occurred. All investigations initiated by the Institution Investigator shall be communicated to the Warden as practicable or reasonable.

- All investigations, which are conducted by the Institutional Investigator, shall be assigned a case number and logged on an investigation log and maintained for review by the Warden and the Chief Inspector.

- When practicable, an investigation shall be initiated within the next business day after the incident is reported or made known. Investigations shall be completed without undue delay. The Institution Investigator shall conduct a thorough, objective, and confidential investigation. The Institution Investigator shall attempt to resolve issues of fact, consistent with the scope of the investigation. To this purpose, the Institution Investigator will:

    - Collect relevant physical and documentary evidence from person(s) who possess it and other locations;
    - Assess the credibility of person(s) reporting information;
    - Assess the reliability of the documentary and/or physical evidence; and
    - Draw objective and logical conclusions from the reliable information collected to the extent that such conclusions are warranted.

- During the course of the investigation, the Institutional Investigator may employ the use of hand writing analysis, photographs, polygraph reports, CVSA reports, electronic surveillance recordings, fingerprints, interviews, interrogations, records or documents and other forms of lawfully obtained evidence. The use of such devices shall be in conformity with DRC policy 09-INV-01 and/or any other relevant policies, rules, or statutes.

- The Institutional Investigator shall issue a report of the findings to the Warden and/or the Chief Inspector. The report shall include, at a minimum, a summary of the allegation(s), investigation, and a conclusion with respect to all facts of the alleged violation(s).

- The Institutional Investigator shall collect and preserve any evidence obtained during the investigation in a manner consistent with law enforcement rules of evidence (chain of evidence) and be in accordance with applicable DRC policies and procedures. Investigation files and evidence shall be maintained in a secure location. All on-going investigative information is considered to be confidential.

- The Institutional Investigator shall be the liaison between the institution, the Ohio State Highway Patrol, and other law enforcement agencies.

- The Institutional Investigator may participate in investigations or join operations with other agencies, on prison grounds or in the community, with the prior approval of the Warden and/or the Chief Inspector, when such operation is related to the official business of the department.

III. 2004 CHIEF INSPECTOR ANNUAL REPORT SUMMARY

The Chief Inspector's 2004 Annual Report provides the following summary regarding the Investigator data:

- During CY 2004, Investigators initiated 6,678 cases with only 675 or 10.1% of their cases, including those still active from 2003, remaining under investigation by the end of the year. Excluding background checks and undefined cases (other), Investigators reported initiating 2,719 cases in 2004.

- The highest number of investigations initiated in 2004 concerned inmates testing positive for drugs (937), followed by the categories of drugs--other (383), inmate-on-inmate assaults (262), drugs-inmate/visitor (249), staff misconduct (247), and staff-inmate relationships (175).

- A total of 127 canine searches of institutional grounds occurred during CY 2004. Investigators were also involved in 52 major shakedowns within the institution.

- Investigators reported that 80 inmate visitors and 85 Department staff members were either strip searched or patted down during the calendar year for possible drug or other contraband conveyance.

- In CY 2004, Institutional Investigators seized over 6 lbs of marijuana, 1.16 ounces of crack and powder cocaine, 1.17 ounces of heroin, and approximately 447 illicit pills such as Zanex, Oxycontin, Valium, and Darvocet. Although a wide variation in the recording of “hooch” seizures exists across institutions, the approximate amount confiscated was roughly 784 gallons, based upon only those Investigators reporting.

IV. INITIATED INVESTIGATIONS

Table 1. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Initiated Investigations

Institution	Initiated Investigations
Ohio State Penitentiary	583
Madison Correctional Institution	538
Noble Correctional Institution	436
Trumbull Correctional Institution	416
Warren Correctional Institution	357
Ross Correctional Institution	352
Belmont Correctional Institution	342
Mansfield Correctional Institution	293
North Central Correctional Institution	287
Corrections Medical Center	270

"Initiated Investigations" refers to the total number of investigations initiated during CY 2004.

OSP, Ohio's only Level 5 "supermax" facility, had the highest number of initiated investigations, with a grand total of 583. This is somewhat remarkable considering its low population (455). The high number of initiated investigations may be due to two factors—both the high amount of activity that necessitates an investigation as well as the obvious diligence of the Investigator in pursuing an investigation. By demonstrating to the inmates that illegal activity will be addressed by institutional staff, it sets a positive zero-tolerance example that hopefully decreases an inmate's belief that he will "get away" with illicit behavior.

Similarly, MaCI, which is a level three (close) security facility, reports the second highest number of investigations. The Sex Offender Risk Reduction Center (SORRC) is located at the Madison Correctional Institution. All reception inmates who have committed a sex offense are first sent to MaCI for assessment and Basic Education classes pertaining to sex offender treatment before they are sent to their parent institutions.

The bulk of the investigations are reported as "Other." For example, of OSP's reported 583 initiated investigations, 555 (95.2%) are classified as "Other." It is likely that the vast majority of these "Other" investigations actually are background checks. Based on the large number of investigations in the "Other" category, the suggestion was relayed that perhaps additional categories (such as a category specifically for Background Checks) should be considered in order to provide greater and more useful information. In follow-up communication from the Chief Inspector's Office in that regard, it was relayed that the Investigator's Monthly Report does contain a section for listing "Background" investigations separately from the "Other" category, and has done so for at least three years. However, since CIIC does not receive the Investigator's Monthly Reports from the institutions, the only Investigator activity data available for review is contained in the

Chief Inspector's Annual Reports. The Chief Inspector's Office further relayed that the "Background" investigation category will be included in the annual report.

Also notable are the institutions that did **not** make the top ten list. SOCF, the only maximum security prison, houses a high number of violent and mentally ill, some who may be at the Ohio State Penitentiary if not for their serious mental illness. SOCF also has a concentration of several of the state's leading gangs. Further, SOCF inmate letters report a high level of sexual activity. However, SOCF reports a mere **62** initiated investigations for the entire CY 2004. **This is the sixth lowest number in the entire prison system**. According to the reported numbers, **even Franklin Pre-Release Center, a minimum security facility for females that houses half the number of inmates as SOCF, conducted more investigations during the year**. Furthermore, as opposed to the other institutions, SOCF has two full-time Investigators, plus a full-time Security Threat Group Coordinator.

Table 2. 2003/2004 Comparison of Initiated Investigations

Institution	2003	2004
Belmont Correctional Institution	519	342
Noble Correctional Institution	435	436
Ohio State Penitentiary	427	583
Southeastern Correctional Institution	391	164
Trumbull Correctional Institution	337	416
Corrections Medical Center	328	270
Ohio Reformatory for Women	257	134
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	237	142
Ross Correctional Institution	230	352
Warren Correctional Institution	223	357

As shown above in 2003, the two leading institutions for initiated investigations are Level 1/2 (minimum/medium) security facilities. Inmate letters have reported that medium security prisons often have a greater drug culture than the higher security facilities, due to the fact that inmates are generally "short-timers." Reportedly, many of these inmates are in prison for non-violent drug offenses, and they continue to carry on drug-trafficking and drug use within the correctional system.

Reviewing the data, although BeCI's total number of initiated investigations dropped by 177, it doubled its number of positive urinalyses during the same time period (more discussion of positive urinalyses will follow).

ORW's reported number of initiated investigations dropped by half over the biennium for reasons unknown. ORW has both a large population (1,955) and also is the only facility in the entire ODRC system to house inmates of all security classification levels for extended periods of time. Yet in CY 2004, it dropped to the bottom half of institutions for the reported total number of initiated investigations.

Ohio State Penitentiary, Trumbull CI, Ross CI, and Warren CI all increased their number of initiated investigations. This could indicate a problem at the institutions (which cannot be identified due to the bulk of the investigations falling under "Other"). However, it is hoped that the increase will enhance the security of the institution, as the Investigator's presence and diligence will be more apparent to the inmates and staff. **Institutions need to develop a zero-tolerance policy in which any hint of drugs or staff misconduct prompts an investigation.**

Table 3. 2004 Initiated Investigations by Subcategory

Type of Investigation	Number of Investigations
Drug-Related	**1,727**
- Positive Urinalysis	936
- Other	353
- Inmate/Visitor	272
- Staff/Inmate	72
- Mail/Packages	69
- Staff	25
Assault-Related	**566**
- Inmate on Inmate	254
- Inmate on Staff	188
- Sexual Assault	124
Professional Misconduct-Related	**428**
- Staff Misconduct	242
- Staff/Inmate Relationship	186
Other Investigations	**3,160**

V. DRUG INVESTIGATIONS

Of the number of investigations that are identified by a particular subcategory, Drug Investigations by far are the most prevalent, with good reason. Studies have reported a major increase in the number of persons incarcerated during the 1990s due to stricter drug enforcement laws. Thus, many of the persons currently in prison were incarcerated for illegal substance abuse. Persons who are addicted to illegal substances are likely to seek out opportunities to continue abusing substances even while in prison.

On March 1, 2006, DRC South Regional Director Steve Huffman provided the following testimony pertaining to Drug investigations:

> It is the policy of the Department to increase public safety, provide for inmate accountability, institutional control and order by establishing a zero tolerance of inmate drug use within our prisons. We strive to achieve this through a variety of methods.
>
> All staff, visitors, and contractors are subject to search by a metal detector upon entrance to any of our institutions, and all of their personal items are searched as well. Inmates working outside of the institution are subject to search before leaving and are strip-searched when they reenter the institution. Inmates are currently permitted to receive packages containing food from their family and friends, which are thoroughly searched for illegal drugs and other forms of contraband.
>
> Each institution has a full-time investigator that spends a considerable amount of time trying to identify those involved in the introduction of illegal drugs. This is done through the gathering of intelligence information by monitoring inmate telephone calls, interviewing inmates, visitors, and staff. They also follow up on leads from these sources. The institution investigators work in conjunction with the Ohio State Highway Patrol investigators and county prosecutors to ensure that all of the necessary information for prosecution is gathered during the investigative stages.
>
> Five percent of the inmate population is randomly drug tested each month. We also perform for cause testing when there is a reasonable suspicion of drug use. Inmates involved in specific recovery service programs or work sites are subjected to testing as well. In addition, each year we complete a saturation testing of approximately 20 percent of the inmate population. The Department tests inmates for the following substances: Cocaine, THC, Opiates, PCP, Amphetamines, Methamphetamines, Benzodiazepines and alcohol.
>
> Lastly, DRC has developed an enforcement unit comprised of parole officers and institution investigators. The focus of this unit is to stop the

introduction of drugs into the prisons by working with local law enforcement agencies to identify the sources and make arrests.

In the past two years, Department staff have deterred over 200 visitors and 50 staff from bringing drugs or attempting to bring drugs into our prisons…Appropriate disciplinary or legal action is taken in all such [staff] cases based upon the available evidence and investigation. It is important to note that in Amended Substitute Senate Bill 111, in the 122nd General Assembly, conveyance of drugs onto the grounds of a correctional facility by a DRC employee requires imposition of a mandatory prison term. The Department strongly advocated for this change in the law.

The number of drugs found in food packages has continued to rise over the last few years. In 2003 there were 29 food packages containing drugs, 31 in 2004, and 32 through October of 2005. We are still compiling the final numbers for 2005.

We are encouraged, however, that our drug testing results have decreased. In 2003, the number of positive drug tests was 2.35 percent of inmates tested. In 2004, the number was 2.24 percent of inmates tested and 2.18 percent in 2005.

While DRC has worked to eliminate dugs in our prisons, those desiring to convey the drugs have become increasingly adept at concealing their efforts. Food packages are a significant source of drugs…Drugs have been sent in using re-canned soup, resealed candy bars, hollowed out bagels, inside of sweetener and seasoning packets, and resealed pudding cups. These are only a few examples of the items intercepted through the tremendous efforts of our staff and the Ohio State Highway Patrol.

As a result of this growing issue, last year a leadership training team was assigned the task of reviewing our inmate package operation, benchmarking with other state correctional agencies and exploring an alternative method for inmates to be able to receive food packages through the use of a vendor. Their findings resulted in a committee being established to further investigate the need for such a system. Currently, the committee is obtaining information from potential vendors to identify how they would operate their system, what products would be offered, and ensuring that family members—and even the inmates themselves—would be able to order food items. The ordering would be done by mail, fax, telephone or the internet and would eliminate the costly and time consuming efforts to return unauthorized food items to the sender which would enable us to utilize our available custody staff in other areas of the prison operation. We plan to survey inmates and their families this month to establish support for this program.

> While this would be a change to our current system, we believe that it would continue to allow inmates to receive the desired food items from their loved ones and greatly enhance our ability to stop the obvious flow of drugs through the current system.

Further, on April 28, 2006, the DRC Director relayed information on the DRC preparations pertaining to a change to a vendor only system for inmate packages. On May 16, 2006, the CIIC staff met with the team that has been working on the proposed amendments to the AR on packages (5120-9-33). Per the DRC Director, the idea was first researched as a group project of their Executive Leadership class in 2005. DRC has conducted research, family surveys, and benchmarking with other state correctional agencies. Ohio is one of the last to allow packages from home. Because of the continued increase in drugs coming in via packages, changes were regarded as necessary. The change to packages provided via outside vendors is regarded as beneficial to all parties. It increases packages for some, especially high security levels and the separate classification of Death Row. It is anticipated that it will result in improvements for the family as one of the requirements of the vendor will be to have on-line ordering, fax ordering or mail ordering for the family. The change is regarded as an improvement in prison operations not only in terms of security, but for families and the inmate population.

Further testimony was provided to CIIC regarding the "Enforcement Unit," briefly mentioned by South Regional Director Huffman, which allows for the collaboration of parole officers and institution investigators:

> …With this new approach, investigations are primarily conducted at their community level. This creates a safer and more secure method for the prison, since many times the drugs or contraband do not reach the facility. An added benefit for the community is that other criminal activity may be revealed. Furthermore, this allows for the unit to interact and assist with outside law enforcement agencies. This strengthens relationships between agencies, information sharing occurs and communities and prisons benefit from this arrangement.
>
> The unit has been very successful with 25 staff arrests and/or terminations for institutional drug conveyance or other types of inappropriate relationship with offenders. They have been instrumental with helping solve other crimes along with confiscating large amounts of drugs, guns and stolen property as a result of DRC based investigations. They are committed to assisting other agencies with investigative support. Currently, the unit consists of two investigators, which operate in central Ohio. In March, two additional investigators will be added to cover the Cleveland area. Our goal is to also start an additional unit in Cincinnati in the near future…

A. POSITIVE URINALYSIS

DRC policy 70-RCV-03, Inmate Drug Testing, provides for the testing of every inmate within the DRC system at least annually. The policy's stated purpose is to "deter inmate drug use and trafficking by providing uniform guidelines for inmate drug testing, as well as sanctions and programming for inmates found guilty of [Conduct] Rule 39-Unauthorized Possession, Manufacture or Consumption of Drugs or any Intoxicating Substance, Rule 41-Unauthorized Possession of Drug Paraphernalia or Rule 43-Refusal to Submit Urine Sample or Otherwise Cooperate with Drug Testing."

In pertinent part, the policy provides for inmates to be tested as follows:

1. Randomly: Each month five percent (5%) of each institution's population will be randomly selected for drug testing. Inmates will be selected by computer assignment via the institution's Central Inmate Management System (CIMS).
2. For Cause: Inmates will be tested when there is a reasonable suspicion of drug use.
3. Programs: This category will include all other tests where a particular inmate sub-population is to be tested to include, but not limited to the following:
    a. Before and after transitional control;
    b. Alcohol and Other Drug Treatment Programs once every two months in addition to any other testing category;
    c. Once every two months 5% of the inmates who leave the secured perimeter of the institution as part of their job responsibility will be randomly selected for testing in addition to any other testing category;
    d. Before and after parole board hearings;
    e. Inmates under medication treatment for Hepatitis C as requested by the physician;
    f. As indicated by the Warden.
4. Saturation Level testing is to be completed once a year.
    a. A statistically valid, as determined by the Office of Policy, Bureau of Research, sampling of each institution's population will be selected for testing. This process provides a basis for comparison of drug levels annually at each institution.

The policy also provides for the appointment of a Drug Testing Coordinator, collection procedures, a drug testing kit, method of reporting results, mandatory substance abuse programs, and sanctions. Sanctions for positive urinalyses or refusal to participate include mandatory time in Local Control, as well as the following possibilities:

1. 15 days Disciplinary Control
2. Alternative dress
3. Special housing
4. Loss of Good time
5. Visit restrictions (within ACA guidelines)
6. Loss of audio/video equipment (storage at institution)
7. Loss of sundry
8. Adjustment C (Pay Category C - $9.00 per month)
9. Restricted commissary (except for hygiene items, writing materials and legal kits)
10. Loss of phone privileges (except for emergency or attorney calls)
11. Drug test one time per month
12. Restricted movement as a group
13. Restrictions on inmate funds incoming/outbound
14. Internal community service
15. Institutional work assignment.

Local Control placement may be suspended if the inmate successfully completes the Mandatory Substance Abuse Program (MSAP). In addition to MSAP, a range of treatment options are also provided per the policy.

It is unfortunate that the "Saturation" testing covers only 20% of the inmate population. The goal of reducing inmate drug abuse would be much more furthered if every inmate knew for certain that he or she would be tested not just annually, but more frequently. As it stands now, it is purely chance as to whether an inmate's drug use will be detected.

Table 4. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Positive Urinalyses

Institution	# Of Investigations
North Central Correctional Institution	202
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	96
Richland Correctional Institution	92
Belmont Correctional Institution	78
Allen Correctional Institution	59
Trumbull Correctional Institution	54
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	46
Mansfield Correctional Institution	46
Noble Correctional Institution	35
Pickaway Correctional Institution	33

As shown above, NCCI reported the highest number of positive urinalyses by a wide margin. However, this is possibly due to greater diligence on the part of the Investigator in testing inmates to better ensure that drug use within the institution is fully monitored.

With the exception of ManCI and TCI, all of the above institutions are primarily Level 1/2 (minimum/medium) security facilities. Is the greater amount of drug use due to more

lax security or to the higher population of inmates who may be in prison due to drug offenses rather than the more serious convictions (murder, rape, robbery, etc)? In addition to the deterrence facet of performing a systemwide, "saturation" testing, the institutional numbers could be more accurately compared.

In addition, while OSP, the Level 5 "supermax" facility, reports 7 positive urinalyses, and our Level 3 facilities (LeCI, LorCI, ManCI, RCI, ToCI, TCI, and WCI) report on average 22 positive urinalyses, SOCF, the Level 4 facility, reports zero.

Table 5. 2003/2004 Comparison of Positive Urinalyses

Institution	2003	2004	Change
Ross Correctional Institution	141	0	-141
Southeastern Correctional Institution	130	16	-114
Dayton Correctional Institution	102	31	-71
Lebanon Correctional Institution	100	23	-77
North Central Correctional Institution	48	202	+154
Richland Correctional Institution	45	92	+47
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	41	96	+55
Belmont Correctional Institution	36	78	+42
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	33	46	+13
Allen Correctional Institution	29	59	+30

The contrast in numbers between the two years is striking. RCI went from being the leader of the pack in 2003 to having zero positive tests in 2004. It is hoped that the lower number implies that the 2003 crackdown resulted in a fewer number of inmates using drugs within the institution. Surely, having been made aware of a drug issue within the institution in 2003, the institution would not have failed to comprehensively test inmates in 2004.

The other institutions are equally a mystery—why the sudden decrease in the top four institutions and the sudden increase in the subsequent six? Suffice it to say that clearly, up to 10% of an institution's population can be presumed to be using drugs at any given time. As that is the case, it is to be hoped that random drug testing—if not a sweeping testing of the entire institution—is made a priority and that penalties are swiftly imposed for evidence of drug use. Only by making inmates aware that drug usage absolutely will be found out and punished is there any hope in limiting the trafficking. If inmates know that there is a high chance that drug use will not be found out and/or punished, the inmate is most likely going to risk the chance and continue abusing the substance.

The total number of reported initiated investigations pertaining to Positive Urinalyses was 898 in CY 2003 and 936 in CY 2004.

B. DRUGS (OTHER)

This category pertains to drug investigations that do not fall under the other categories (Staff/Inmate, Inmate/Visitor, Mail/Packages, or Staff). Drugs that are caught being passed from one inmate to another or that are found on an inmate's person or in his possessions, for example, would qualify as "Other."

Table 6. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Drug Investigations: Other

Institution	# Of Investigations
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	49
Richland Correctional Institution	45
North Central Correctional Institution	33
Mansfield Correctional Institution	25
Ross Correctional Institution	25
Noble Correctional Institution	21
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	20
Marion Correctional Institution	18
Allen Correctional Institution	17
London Correctional Institution	17

Table 7. 2003/2004 Comparison of Drug Investigations: Other

Institution	2003	2004	Change
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	49	47	-2
Richland Correctional Institution	17	45	+28
Allen Correctional Institution	17	17	0
London Correctional Institution	17	17	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	16	11	-5
Marion Correctional Institution	15	18	+3
Belmont Correctional Institution	13	16	+3
Toledo Correctional Institution	13	11	-2
Pickaway Correctional Institution	13	7	-6
Mansfield Correctional Institution	12	25	+13

The total number of reported initiated investigations in the category of Drugs (Other) was 260 in CY 2003 and 356 in CY 2004. As stated previously, this category is difficult to analyze, as there are no defining characteristics on which to make an evaluation.

C. DRUGS (INMATE/VISITOR)

Table 8. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Investigations: Inmate/Visitor

Institution	# Of Investigations
Lebanon Correctional Institution	82
Warren Correctional Institution	34
Pickaway Correctional Institution	21
Richland Correctional Institution	20
Mansfield Correctional Institution	14
Southeastern Correctional Institution	11
Trumbull Correctional Institution	10
Allen Correctional Institution	9
Belmont Correctional Institution	8
Noble Correctional Institution	8

This table is most interesting in comparison with the other drug investigation tables. LeCI reports 82 investigations regarding the transfer of drugs between inmates and visitors, yet only 23 positive urinalyses are reported. If 82 inmates are suspected to be involved with the trafficking of drugs, it is extremely likely that more than 23 inmates are using drugs. Even if just those 82 inmates who were involved with the investigations were tested, it is probable that more than 23 inmates would test positive. Similarly, WCI reports 34 investigations pertaining to inmates and visitors, but a mere 9 reported positive urinalyses.

In fact, including a mandatory urinalysis for all inmates involved in a drug investigation could be a positive move toward catching and limiting inmate use.

In addition, although there is a healthy representation of the Level 2 and 3 institutions, neither SOCF nor OSP report even a single drug investigation pertaining to visitors. Either the visitors to SOCF and OSP are much less involved with illegal substances than the inmates they came to see, or there is not sufficient monitoring of visitors.

NCCI reported 202 positive urinalyses and yet only reported two investigations involving visitors. The reported numbers in the other categories of drug investigations do not yield any reasonable substitute explanation for the high number of positive urinalyses.

Table 9. 2003/2004 Comparison of Drug Investigations: Inmate/Visitor

Institution	2003	2004	Change
Lebanon Correctional Institution	53	82	+29
Warren Correctional Institution	53	34	-19
Richland Correctional Institution	20	20	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	13	10	-3
Dayton Correctional Institution	11	2	-9
Southeastern Correctional Institution	10	11	+1
Pickaway Correctional Institution	9	21	+12
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	9	3	-6
Mansfield Correctional Institution	8	14	+6
Madison Correctional Institution	7	7	0

The number of Inmate/Visitor Drug Investigations in 2003 is equally surprising, considering the number of 2003 positive urinalyses. RCI reported 141 positive urinalyses in 2003, but only three drug investigations regarding visitors. **SCI reported 130 positive urinalyses, but only ten visitor investigations; the other institutions follow a similar pattern.** The drugs have to enter the institutions in some manner. In addition, as previously discussed, the number of positive urinalyses does not even report the total number of inmates involved in drug use.

The total number of reported initiated investigations pertaining to Drug Investigations of Inmate/Visitor was 244 in CY 2003 and 272 in CY 2004.

D. DRUGS (STAFF/INMATE)

Table 10. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Drug Investigations: Staff/Inmate

Institution	# Of Investigations
Lebanon Correctional Institution	20
Pickaway Correctional Institution	17
Marion Correctional Institution	5
Trumbull Correctional Institution	4
Richland Correctional Institution	4
Warren Correctional Institution	3
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	3
Grafton Correctional Institution	3
Allen Correctional Institution	3
Mansfield Correctional Institution	2

As can be seen by the sudden decrease in the numbers, LeCI and PCI are the exceptions rather than the norm. On the positive side, it is good that institutions are recognizing that staff may be culpable in the spread of drugs in the institutions. On the negative side, 20

investigations, unless some of the investigations pertained to the same staff person, involve a sizeable chunk of an institution's staff. It is conjecture if the problem is adequately addressed through the investigations and whether the suspected transfer of drugs between staff and inmates has slowed due to the investigations.

As relayed above, the DRC South Regional Director reported to the CIIC that Department staff have deterred "50 staff from bringing drugs or attempting to bring drugs into our prisons…Appropriate disciplinary or legal action is taken in all such [staff] cases based upon the available evidence and investigation." Appropriate legal action could include the imposition of a mandatory prison term.

After the top ten, all other institutions report either one or zero investigations of drugs passed between staff and inmates.

Table 11. 2003/2004 Comparison of Drug Investigations: Staff/Inmate

Institution	2003	2004
Pickaway Correctional Institution	9	17
Richland Correctional Institution	7	4
Lebanon Correctional Institution	3	20
Warren Correctional Institution	3	3
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	2	3
London Correctional Institution	2	0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	1	0
Correctional Reception Center	1	0
Ross Correctional Institution	1	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	1	0

As can be seen, the numbers for 2003 were far lower. With the exception of the top six institutions, all other institutions reported at most one or, more likely, zero investigations into staff/inmate drugs. Again, it is not necessarily a red flag if an institution is performing more investigations; rather, the positive urinalyses would show that the inmates are getting the drugs from somewhere, and more investigations performed would hopefully reveal the source of the drugs.

In CY 2003, a total of 36 investigations were initiated into Staff/Inmate drug trafficking. In CY 2004, 72 investigations were initiated into the same.

E. DRUGS (MAIL/PACKAGES)

Table 12. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Drug Investigations: Mail/Packages

Institution	# Of Investigations
Ross Correctional Institution	13
Richland Correctional Institution	10
Warren Correctional Institution	7
Southeastern Correctional Institution	6
London Correctional Institution	5
North Central Correctional Institution	5
Lorain Correctional Institution	4
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	4
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	3
Pickaway Correctional Institution	2

Table 13. 2003/2004 Comparison of Drug Investigations: Mail/Packages

Institution	2003	2004
Warren Correctional Institution	11	7
Richland Correctional Institution	8	10
Southeastern Correctional Institution	7	6
London Correction Institution	5	5
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	5	4
Pickaway Correctional Institution	4	2
Ross Correctional Institution	3	13
Belmont Correctional Institution	3	2
Mansfield Correctional Institution	3	1
Dayton Correctional Center	3	0

As shown above, the average number of investigations that an institution performs pertaining to drugs conveyed via mail or packages tends to be quite low. As relayed above, DRC staff reported in a recent meeting of the CIIC that the option of a third party vendor for all food packages is being considered so as to reduce the amount of drug trafficking via mail/packages. Presumably, food packages will still need to be checked for contraband, so it is currently uncertain as to how much staff time it will actually save. In addition, DRC staff need to ensure that adequate tracking measures of the prepared packages are in place in case contraband is found to better ensure proper investigation and prosecution.

In CY 2003, 66 investigations were initiated into Drugs (Mail/Packages). In CY 2004, 69 investigations were initiated into the same.

F. DRUGS (STAFF)

Table 14. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Drug Investigations: Staff

Institution	# Of Investigations
Pickaway Correctional Institution	8
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	4
Allen Correctional Institution	3
Franklin Pre Release Center	2
Lorain Correctional Institution	2
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	1
Madison Correctional Institution	1
Correctional Reception Center	1
Grafton Correctional Institution	1
Ross Correctional Institution	1

Table 15. 2003/2004 Comparison of Drug Investigations: Staff

Institution	2003	2004	Change
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1	8	+7
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	1	1	0
Madison Correctional Institution	1	1	0
Corrections Medical Center	1	0	-1
Hocking Correctional Facility	1	0	-1
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	1	0	-1
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0	4	+4
Allen Correctional Institution	0	3	+3
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	2	+2
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	2	+2

At first glance, the numbers are almost positive in that they are low. However, the National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH) reports that 14.4% of Ohio residents 12 and older reported illicit drug use in the past year; 8.0% reported illicit drug use in the past month.[1] Lest one thinks that these numbers only pertain to the homeless, the impoverished, or the underemployed, a report on Drug Use by the Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics reported that **70% of illicit drug users were employed full-time.** The overall rate of full-time employee illicit drug use was 7.7% in 1997.[2]

[1] National Survey on Drug Use and Health. Fifty States report. http://www.oas.samhsa.gov/StatesList.htm
[2] Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. "Drug Use." Found at: http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/dcf/du.htm

Given that DRC employees are in a prison environment, it is possible that the rates of prevalence among DRC employees are higher than state averages. Regardless, the number of investigations reported by the institutions does not correlate to 14.4%, 8%, or even 1% of the staff population. Thus, not only are the inmates using drugs, but it is possible that a larger number of DRC staff are also using drugs while employed than is detected in the number of investigations.

We share the reported hope of DRC staff that the new DRC Enforcement Unit will result in increased surveillance of both inmates and staff. As DRC staff relayed that 50 staff had already been identified and action of some form had been taken, we look forward to reviewing the CY 2005 numbers.

In CY 2003, a total of 6 investigations were initiated in Staff Drug use. In CY 2004, that number jumped to 25.

VI. ASSAULT INVESTIGATIONS

Inmate assaults are seemingly a regrettable fact of institutional life. Prison is a stressful environment. Correctional facilities include a mix of the mentally ill, illegal substance abusers, and persons with poor anger management skills, not to mention the others who are simply upset at their current circumstances. Some inmates act out in aggression toward one another and toward staff.

Data pertaining to the following areas is reported in the Chief Inspector's Annual Reports of 2003 and 2004: **Inmate on Inmate Assault, Inmate on Staff Assault,** and **Sexual Assault.**

In response to questions from the state legislators who serve on the CIIC, information was requested regarding the assault statistics over the past decade. According to the information provided by the ODRC, a total of 4,726 Inmate-on-Staff assaults, including physical and sexual assaults, occurred system-wide from 1997 to 2005. Recent attention has been brought to the issue due to the near-fatal attack of a corrections officer by an inmate at SOCF.

A few changes in perspective have taken place in recent years. In 2003, Congress passed the Prison Rape Elimination Act, which focuses on sexual assault. In accordance with PREA, the ODRC recently adopted new Sexual Assault Investigation policies (79-ISA-01 and -02) to outline correct procedures to be followed in any investigation of a sexual assault.

In addition, greater penalties, including outside prosecution, have been sought for the inmates who throw feces and urine on corrections staff as well as on other inmates. Beyond the general disgust factor of the act, bodily fluids cause a greater concern in the modern day with the rising attention given to sexually transmitted diseases, such as HIV and AIDS.

More information pertaining to assaults may be found in the CIIC report, "Review of Assault Data," which may be accessed from the following website: http://www.ciic.state.oh.us/publications/assaultdata06.pdf.

A. ASSAULT (INMATE ON INMATE)

Table 16. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Assault Investigations: Inmate on Inmate

Institution	# Of Investigations
Noble Correctional Institution	41
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	21
Southeastern Correctional Institution	21
Madison Correctional Institution	18
Pickaway Correctional Institution	17
Ohio Reformatory for Women	15
Belmont Correctional Institution	15
Ross Correctional Institution	13
Richland Correctional Institution	13
Trumbull Correctional Institution	11

NCI, a medium security institution, is the number one institution for **reported** inmate on inmate assault investigations. A possible explanation is the high population of NCI. However, while it does have a high population compared to the other institutions, CCI, ManCI, and RCI, which each have higher populations than NCI, report an average of 6.3 investigations of inmate on inmate assault.

Even more surprising is that inmate letters to CIIC do not report a high incidence of inmate on inmate assault at NCI. There is not a high volume of letters from NCI in general. On the other hand, inmates at both CCI and SOCF have sent numerous letters to CIIC reporting high tension between inmates. Of these two, CCI reports four investigations into inmate on inmate assault; SOCF reports zero.

Thus, it is possible that rather than an indication of a problem, the high number of investigations into inmate on inmate assault is indicative of Investigator diligence. **The lower numbers are more questionable.**

Table 17. 2003/2004 Comparison of Assault Investigations: Inmate on Inmate

Institution	2003	2004
Madison Correctional Institution	29	18
Ohio Reformatory for Women	26	15
Southeastern Correctional Institution	23	21
Noble Correctional Institution	20	41
Pickaway Correctional Institution	20	17
Ross Correctional Institution	17	13
Richland Correctional Institution	14	13
Belmont Correctional Institution	12	15
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	12	4
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	10	21

Once again, the numbers are interesting for the institutions that are not represented. With the exception of ORW, which houses inmates of all security classifications, and RCI, a Level 3 institution, the rest are all Level 2 (medium) security institutions. **SOCF, for example, reported zero investigations of inmate on inmate assaults for two straight years.** Are the higher numbers due to greater population size, less strict security, or lesser Investigator involvement in investigating inmate assaults? Are institutions correctly reporting the numbers? Given the serious nature of the offense—inmate on inmate assault—it would seem that **a greater examination should be performed of these numbers to determine whether the amount of investigation is sufficient to the need**.

Although SOCF is reported as having initiated zero investigations in 2004, information relayed to this office from the ODRC regarding inmate on inmate assaults states that **SOCF experienced 55 inmate on inmate assaults during the first six months of 2005**. Obviously, these numbers do not correlate. It may be fruitful for the Chief Inspector to **inquire into the discrepancy between the number of reported inmate on inmate assaults and the number of initiated investigations**.

The following table provides a comparison between the number of inmate on inmate assaults reported by institutions (top ten only) during the period of January to June of 2005 and the number of investigations initiated in 2003 and 2004 pertaining to inmate on inmate assaults. Although it is clear that the time periods do not match, there is a strong possibility that the number of investigations in 2005 will tend to correlate with the number of investigations initiated in 2003 and 2004.

Table 18. Comparison of Reported Number of Inmate on Inmate Assaults in January through June of 2005 and the Number of Initiated Investigations Regarding Inmate on Inmate Assaults in 2003 and 2004

Institution	Reported Number of Inmate on Inmate Assaults in January through June of 2005	Reported Number of Initiated Investigations in CY 2003	Reported Number of Initiated Investigations in CY 2004
Southern Ohio CF	55	0	0
North Central CI	20	0	0
Oakwood CF	18	2	2
Southeastern CI	17	23	24
Noble CI	15	20	41
Mansfield CI	14	3	2
Richland CI	13	14	13
Ross CI	13	17	13
Lake Erie CI	9	10	21
Madison CI	9	29	18

Viewing the above chart, it appears that some institution, such as SCI, NCI, and MaCI, are investigating most incidents of inmate on inmate assaults. **The extreme discrepancy between the numbers for SOCF, NCCI, OCF, and even ManCI, is not understood.**

According to the numbers reported in the Annual Reports, there were 258 total investigations initiated pertaining to inmate on inmate assault in 2003 and 254 such investigations in 2004.

B. ASSAULT (INMATE ON STAFF)

"Assault" refers to a variety of actions, including the typical punch, slap, or kick, as well as spitting or throwing urine. If the assault is of a serious nature, the Investigator may initiate an investigation, as the following tables portray. Officers may also write a conduct report for the inmate, which will be heard by a Rules Infraction Board. If the inmate is found guilty of the rule infraction, he may be subject to a number of penalties, including segregation placement, an increase in security classification, transfer, etc. Of course, depending on the severity of the assault, inmates may also be subject to outside prosecution. Currently, the "throwing of bodily fluids" is considered a fifth degree felony.

Table 19. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Assault Investigations: Inmate on Staff

Institution	# Of Investigations
Ohio Reformatory for Women	22
Madison Correctional Institution	16
Noble Correctional Institution	14
Lorain Correctional Institution	12
Southeastern Correctional Institution	10
Pickaway Correctional Institution	10
Oakwood Correctional Institution	9
Correctional Reception Center	9
Ohio State Penitentiary	9
Lebanon Correctional Institution	8

Table 20. 2003/2004 Comparison of Assault Investigations: Inmate on Staff

Institution	2003	2004	Change
Ohio Reformatory for Women	26	22	-4
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	12	8	-4
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	12	6	-6
Pickaway Correctional Institution	11	10	-1
Lebanon Correctional Institution	11	8	-3
Richland Correctional Institution	9	4	-5
Southeastern Correctional Institution	8	10	+2
Madison Correctional Institution	7	16	+9
Noble Correctional Institution	7	14	+7
London Correctional Institution	6	7	+1

The reported totals for 2003 and 2004 were 146 and 188, respectively.

ORW, on the other hand, has the highest number of assaults for both years. On the positive side, it does show that assaults are given formal consideration by DRC staff. On the opposite side, it would also immediately beg the question as to what steps are being taken by institutional staff to confront a problem that is clearly serious and ongoing.

Once again, information provided, at the request of the CIIC, by the ODRC pertaining to inmate on staff assault data during the time period of November 2004 through October 2005 allows for a useful comparison. As in the previous section, it is understood that the time periods do not quite match; however, certain disturbing trends do become obvious.

Table 21. Comparison of Reported Number of Inmate on Staff Assaults from November of 2004 through October of 2005 and the Number of Initiated Investigations Regarding Inmate on Staff Assaults in 2003 and 2004

Institution	Reported Number of Inmate on Staff Assaults from Nov 2004 to Oct 2005	Reported Number of Initiated Investigations in CY 2003	Reported Number of Initiated Investigations in CY 2004
Southern Ohio CF	166	0	0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	44	26	22
Ohio State Pen.	37	0	9
Mansfield CI	34	1	1
North Central CI	29	0	0
Chillicothe CI	29	12	6
Lebanon CI	24	11	8
Oakwood CI	22	3	9
Belmont CI	18	1	5
Madison CI	15	7	16

It is understood that "assault" covers a wide range of behavior and not every assault may require an investigation. However, **this possibility cannot explain the huge discrepancy in the numbers of SOCF, OSP, ManCI, NCCI, OCF, and BeCI**. In fact, according to further information provided by the ODRC, SOCF reported **130** total inmate on staff assaults in 2003 and **119** total inmate on staff assaults in 2004, yet not a single initiated investigation was reported.

If these numbers are accurate, it is extremely disturbing that 166 assaults on staff have the likelihood of not resulting in a single initiated investigation. If the numbers are not accurate, corrective action is needed to increase accuracy in the reporting of the official numbers.

C. SEXUAL ASSAULT INVESTIGATIONS

There is reason to believe that sexual assaults have been taken more seriously since the passage of the Prison Rape Elimination Act in 2003. The DRC enacted two new policies on Sexual Assault Investigations (79-ISA-01 and –02) to delineate procedures that should be put in place after any allegation of sexual assault is made. In addition, the policy ensures that the Ohio State Highway Patrol is brought in to investigate the claims and to report findings to the local prosecutor.

In follow-up communication from the ODRC Chief Inspector's Office, it was relayed that **DRC has provided training with respect to sexual assaults for Investigators/OSHP via Joann Archambault, Training Director, SATI, Inc. at the DRC Best Practices Institute in March 2006. Actually, two days of training were provided on March 9 and 10**, 2006 on the following:

- **Sexual Assault Dynamics**:

    - Effectively Recognizing and Responding to Sexual Assault.
    - Developing Skills to Interview Sexual Assault Survivors
    - Documenting Sexual Assault – Effective Report Writing

- **Investigating Sexual Assault**:

    - A Multi-Disciplinary Collaborative Approach
    - Overcoming Challenges to Collaboration
    - Impact of DNA on the Sexual Assault Investigation
    - Sex Offenders: Who Are They?
    - Tying It All Together

The training also included information on "Dangerous Liaisons," Victim Interviews, Investigating Sexual Assault: A Multi-Disciplinary Collaborative Approach, Collaboration, Community SART Assessment Tool, Impact of DNA on the Sexual Assault Investigation, Sexual Assault Training and Investigations, Clothing Documentation, Drug Facilitated Sexual Assault Guide for Forensic Examiners, Toxicology Requests, Lab Preliminary Rape Case Information and Service, Pretext Phone Calls, Evidence Assessment, Interpretation and Case Impact, and **ODRC Policies on Inmate Sexual Assault and Misconduct** effective July 1, 2005, and **Sexual Assault Committee effective** July 1, 2005.

A Sexual Assault Awareness pamphlet distributed by the ODRC states:

> Sexual assault as defined by DRC Policy 79-ISA-01 is "Any contact between the sex organ of one person and the sex organ, mouth or anus of another person, or any intrusion of any part of the body of one person, or of any object into the sex organ, mouth or anus of another person, by the use of force or threat of force." The offender uses sex as a weapon to assault the body, the mind, psyche and spirit.
>
> Sexual assault affects everyone, either directly or through the experiences of those we care about. It is not only a women's issue as it can affect persons of any gender, age, race, ethnic group, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, or disability.
>
> The statistics are proof of this problem: According to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), in 2002 there were 247,730 victims of rape (this number does not include victims 12 or younger), seven out of every eight rape victims were female, and one in every eight rape victims was male. A 1998 study indicates that about 2.78 million American men have experienced an attempted or completed rape and one out of every six American women have experienced an attempted or completed rape.

RAPE AVOIDANCE

The only way rape can be prevented is when a potential rapist chooses NOT to rape. However, you may avoid an attack by keeping the following safety guidelines in mind:

- Be aware of situations that make you feel uncomfortable. Trust your instincts. If it feels wrong, LEAVE.
- Don't let your manners get in the way of keeping you safe. Don't be afraid to say "NO" or "STOP IT NOW."
- Walk and stand with confidence. Many rapists choose victims who look like they won't fight back or are emotionally weak.
- Avoid talking about sex, and casual nudity. These things may be considered a come on, or make another inmate believe that you have an interest in a sexual relationship.
- Do not accept commissary items or other gifts from other inmates. Placing yourself in debt to another inmate can lead to the expectation of repaying the debt with sexual favors.
- Avoid secluded areas. Position yourself in plain view of staff members. If you are being pressured for sex, report it to a supervisor immediately.

WHAT TO DO IF YOU ARE SEXUALLY ASSAULTED

If the attack has just happened…

Get to a safe place. **REPORT THE ATTACK TO A STAFF MEMBER IMMEDIATELY.** The longer you wait to report the attack the more difficult it is to obtain the evidence necessary for a criminal and/or administrative investigation.

Request immediate medical attention. You may have serious injuries that you are not aware of, and any sexual contact can expose you to sexually transmitted diseases.

Do not shower, brush your teeth, use the restroom, or change your clothes. You may destroy important evidence.

If you have been attacked or witness an attack, but you are unwilling to report it to institutional staff, then you may call (614) 995-3584 from an inmate telephone to leave a message for central office staff. This line will be checked daily for messages.

Later on…

Seek the support of a trusted friend, family member, or staff member, such as the chaplain or the victim services coordinator. The days ahead can be traumatic and it helps to have people who care about you supporting you.

Seek professional help. Mental Health staff is available for crisis care 365 days a year, to listen and offer support.

FACTS FOR THE INMATE THAT SEXUALLY ASSAULTS OTHER INMATES:

You will be issued a conduct report. If found guilty, sanctions will be harsh. In addition, your supervision level will be reviewed and likely increased, which could mean a transfer to a higher security prison or unit with significantly less freedom of movement and limited privileges. If you have family, how will this affect them and/or how will it affect their ability to visit you?

All cases of sexual assault are also referred to the Ohio State Highway Patrol for criminal investigation. You may be prosecuted and if found guilty of a felony, any additional prison time will be added to your current sentence, per the Ohio Revised Code.

Consider that regardless of how you choose to characterize it, sex with a member of the same sex is a homosexual act. And these acts significantly increase your risk of HIV infection, along with exposing you to other sexually transmitted diseases.

If you have trouble controlling your actions, seek help from mental health staff and/or consider participating in programs designed to control anger or reduce stress. To reduce immediate feelings of anger or aggression, try talking to or writing a friend, meditate or do breathing exercises to relax, work on a hobby, or engage in some type of exercise.

Table 22. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Assault Investigations: Sexual Assault

Institution	# Of Investigations
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	21
Madison Correctional Institution	13
Richland Correctional Institution	10
Correctional Reception Center	9
Lorain Correctional Institution	9
Mansfield Correctional Institution	8
Northeast Pre Release Center	8
Allen Correctional Institution	7
Noble Correctional Institution	7
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	6

The total number of sexual assault investigations in 2004 was 39.

The top ten list of institutions, with the exception of ManCI and CRC, are all Level 1/2 (minimum/medium) security institutions. Making the (perhaps rash) assumption that all institutions are investigating all allegations that come to them, certain questions are raised. The general prison rape stereotype is that of being locked in a cell with an abusive cellie. The greater incidence of sexual assaults in Level 2 institutions, which mostly house inmates in dorms, leads one to wonder where the assaults occur, given that a greater number of inmates are together at any given time. More eyes would logically seem to result in fewer sexual assaults, but the numbers would indicate otherwise. Once a particular location has been identified as dangerous, what steps have been taken by the institution to address the issue? Are there any similarities that can be identified to decrease the incidence rate?

One possibility is that inmates in lower security prisons feel more comfortable in telling authorities, as their sentences may be shorter. In one particular incident relayed to the CIIC, an inmate reported a sexual assault after he was released—it may be that inmates who are still within the system do not feel safe in reporting. **Steps need to be taken to combat this fear and to promote reporting.**

Further, it has been suggested in the greater society that men are far less likely than women to report a rape. If that is the case, all allegations of rape need to be investigated from the standpoint that the inmate is telling the truth, with a high level of empathy and counseling. **Inmate separations may need to be more amply used, as even investigations that cannot substantiate the allegations may result in enmity and reprisals between the inmates.**

Table 23. 2003/2004 Comparison of Assault Investigations: Sexual Assault

Institution	2003	2004	Change
Ross Correctional Institution	6	5	-1
Richland Correctional Institution	5	10	+5
Correctional Reception Center	5	9	+4
Ohio Reformatory for Women	5	2	-3
Madison Correctional Institution	4	13	+9
Noble Correctional Institution	3	7	+4
Mansfield Correctional Institution	2	8	+6
Warren Correctional Institution	2	2	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	2	1	-1
Northeast Pre Release Center	1	8	+7

The total number of sexual assault investigations jumped from 39 in 2003 to 124 in 2004. However, the increase in the number of investigations is a positive move, rather than indicative of a problem. The fact is that sexual assaults do happen in prison. Institutions need to ensure that each and every allegation is fully investigated, which will obviously result in a greater number overall of sexual assault investigations.

LaECI jumped from zero reported sexual assault investigations in 2003 to 21 in 2004. Overall, almost all institutions either stayed the same or increased the number of sexual assault investigations.

Related to the above note that Level 2 institutions had the lion's share of the investigations, OSP and SOCF both reported zero investigations of sexual assaults over both 2003 and 2004. Once again, SOCF's reported number of initiated investigations runs counter to the information provided by the ODRC to the CIIC. According to the information, SOCF reported two "completed sexual assaults" in 2004. Either the assaults were deemed completed, but were not investigated, or the numbers reported by SOCF to the Chief Inspector are not accurate.

VII. PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS

A. STAFF MISCONDUCT

Table 24. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Professional Misconduct Investigations: Staff Misconduct

Institution	# Of Investigations
Ohio Reformatory for Women	37
Pickaway Correctional Institution	20
Madison Correctional Institution	20
Ross Correctional Institution	17
Correctional Reception Center	15
Franklin Pre Release Center	14
Oakwood Correctional Facility	13
Richland Correctional Institution	10
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	8
Toledo Correctional Institution	8

The total number of staff misconduct investigations in 2004 was 237.

Without further details as to what constitutes each of these incidents of staff misconduct, it is difficult to evaluate this category. Staff misconduct can range from the very serious to the trivial. CIIC has received letters alleging staff sexual misconduct, staff embezzlement, and staff sleeping on the job. It is unknown the extent to which an internal investigation involves an outside investigation by the Highway Patrol, or what would trigger an outside investigation. Allegations of criminal contact are reported to the Patrol.

Table 25. 2003/2004 Comparison of Professional Misconduct Investigations: Staff Misconduct

Institution	2003	2004	Change
Ohio Reformatory for Women	40	37	-3
Oakwood Correctional Facility	34	13	-21
Trumbull Correctional Institution	21	7	-14
Correctional Reception Center	14	15	+1
Pickaway Correctional Institution	13	20	+7
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	13	6	-7
Richland Correctional Institution	11	10	-1
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	10	8	-2
Belmont Correctional Institution	10	6	-4
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	10	6	-4

The total number of staff misconduct investigations in 2003 was 274, presenting a decrease of 37 staff misconduct investigations from 2003 to 2004. Hopefully, one may infer that the number of incidents of staff misconduct similarly fell over the biennium.

ORW is the leading institution for staff misconduct investigations for two straight years. Although this may indicate a particular problem at this institution, the high number of investigations is promising in that it implies that action is taken in response to allegations of staff misconduct. Hopefully the increased Investigator diligence will aid in deterring staff misconduct.

OCF's presence as the number two institution is extremely disturbing. **OCF is a facility specifically for the mentally ill within the correctional system. This population is extremely vulnerable to victimization, and they are handicapped in terms of credibility when they report such incidents.** It may be more difficult for inmates to make reports—both in coherently forming the allegation as well as simply realizing that an allegation needs to be made—and it probably is more difficult to obtain corroborating testimony. It is hoped that all allegations, no matter how potentially unlikely, are investigated.

CRC's presence on the top ten list is also interesting as CIIC does not receive many letters from the institution and the inmates did not report high use of the grievance procedure during CIIC's inspection. Thus, although they are apparently unwilling to use the grievance procedure, they may perhaps still feel able to air concerns pertaining to staff misconduct.

B. STAFF/INMATE RELATIONSHIPS

Table 26. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Professional Misconduct Investigations: Staff/Inmate Relationships

Institution	# Of Investigations
Ohio Reformatory for Women	21
Madison Correctional Institution	16
Lorain Correctional Institution	13
Richland Correctional Institution	12
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	9
Pickaway Correctional Institution	8
Toledo Correctional Institution	7
Franklin Pre Release Center	7
Mansfield Correctional Institution	7
Allen Correctional Institution	6

Clearly, the above numbers demonstrate that allegations of staff/inmate relationships are investigated. Numerous inmate letters report names, places, and dates in intimate detail. It should not need to be said that staff/inmate relationships are perilous to the security of the institution.

In addition, it is a concern on which side the burden falls more heavily. In conduct reports and appeals sent to CIIC by inmates, the record seems to show that most investigations conclude that no relationship existed, but the inmate is given a conduct report for attempting to establish a relationship and is rode out to a higher security institution.

Table 27. 2003/2004 Comparison of Professional Misconduct Investigations: Staff/Inmate Relationships

Institution	2003	2004	Change
Ohio Reformatory for Women	37	21	-16
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	22	4	-18
Franklin Pre Release Center	18	7	-11
Madison Correctional Institution	14	16	+2
Pickaway Correctional Institution	13	8	-5
Toledo Correctional Institution	13	7	-6
Northeast Pre Release Center	12	3	-9
Allen Correctional Institution	11	6	-5
Mansfield Correctional Institution	9	7	-2
Southeastern Correctional Institution	9	3	-6

ORW outnumbers the other institutions. Thirty-seven investigations of staff/inmate relationships serve as a red flag that there is a problem at the institution. After a year of 37 investigations, one would think that the number would drastically reduce, if the institution had made a point that relationships would not be tolerated. It is hoped that the high number of investigations is an indication of the institution attempting to make this point.

Female-only institutions have a strong presence. ORW, FPRC, and NEPRC rank in the top ten on this list, as they rank together on no other list. The potential for male and female officers to abuse the authority given to them is huge and clearly needs to be addressed on a system-wide basis.

Rather than single investigations of illicit behavior, **it may be necessary to engage in extensive staff training on the dangers of staff/inmate relationships**. Institutions need to increase the peer pressure against the behavior.

In follow-up communication from the DRC Chief Inspector's Office regarding staff/inmate relationships, it was relayed that **unauthorized relationships are covered in pre-service, in-service, etc.** It was also noted that **both inmates and staff are advised of the seriousness of this issue** as is noted by the fact that DRC has several **Standards of Employee Conduct including #46 that relate to this area.**

The actual content of the **Employee Standards of Conduct** is not in any DRC Administrative Rule or in any DRC Policy. The most recent **ODRC Standards of**

Employee Conduct became effective on October 17, 2004. The 18 page document includes the following subheadings: Purpose, Responsibilities, Personal Conduct, Responsiveness, Illegal Activities, Conveying or Trafficking in Contraband, Investigations, Confidentiality, Government Property, Outside employment, Schedule of Rule Violations and Penalties, Progressive Discipline, Penalties within the Discipline Process, and Disciplinary Grid Absenteeism Track.

Number 46 cited above by the ODRC staff as relevant to the subject, is titled **"Unauthorized Relationships" in the "Disciplinary Grid Performance Track"** and is itemized as follows:

- The exchange of personal letters, pictures, phone calls, or information with any individual currently under the supervision of the Department or friends of family of same, without express authorization of the Department
- Engaging in any other unauthorized personal or business relationship(s) with any individual currently under the supervision of the Department or friends or family of same.
- Visiting with any individual under the supervision of the Department without express authorization of the Department.
- Residing with any individual currently under the supervision of the Department without express authorization of the Department.
- Committing any sexual act with any individual under the supervision of the Department.
- Engaging in any other sexual contact or misconduct with any individual under the supervision of the Department.
- Aiding and abetting any unauthorized relationships.
- For APA employees, without the express authorization of the appropriate supervisor, engaging in any personal or business relationship(s) with any individual currently under the supervision of the department or with any individual under the supervision of any other criminal justice agency.

There is a DRC policy titled "Employee Standards of Conduct," (31-SEM-02) which requires DRC employees "to conduct themselves in a professional, law-abiding manner," and to "follow the Standards of Employee Conduct." It further states that, "Failure to comply with the Standards of Employee Conduct shall result in discipline, up to and including removal." The policy states that:

> Upon employment, all employees will receive a copy of the Employee Standards of Conduct during pre-service training. The standards will be reviewed with all employees at that time. The employee shall sign an acknowledgement form stating that a copy of the standards was received and reviewed. It is the responsibility of the employee to further familiarize themselves with the contents of the standards.

In addition, the DRC follow-up communication noted that several Inmate Rule Violations including rule # 24, are specific to this area. Administrative Rule 5120-9-06 titled, **"Inmate Rules of Conduct,"** presents rule # 24 as **"Establishing or attempting to establish a personal relationship with an employee,** without authorization from the managing officer, including but not limited to:

- Sending personal mail to an employee at his or her residence or another address not associated with the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.
- Making a telephone call to or receiving a telephone call from an employee at his or her residence or other location not associated with the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.
- Giving to, or receiving from an employee, any item, favor, or service.
- Engaging in any form of business with an employee; including buying, selling, or trading any item or service.
- Engaging in, or soliciting sexual conduct, sexual contact or any act of a sexual nature with an employee.
- For purposes of this rule "employee" includes any employee of the Depart6ment and any contractor, employee of a contractor, or volunteer.

Further, in follow-up communication from the DRC Chief Inspector's office, it was relayed that DRC Policy 31-SEM-07 on Unauthorized Relationships has reportedly been in effect for approximately 10 years. The policy defines Sexual Misconduct, Sexual Contact, Sexual Assault, and Unauthorized Relationship. An Unauthorized Relationship is defined as:

> A relationship with any individual under the supervision of the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (department) and in the case of an APA employee, a relationship with any individual under the supervision of any criminal justice agency, **which has not been approved** by the Managing Officer/APA Regional Administrator in writing.

The policy itself states that:

> Department employees, independent contractors and volunteers will maintain **appropriate** authorized relationships with offenders in order to assure fairness, integrity, credibility and security in the work place. All employees, volunteers and independent contractors are expected to have a clear understanding that the department considers **any type of unauthorized relationship** with an individual under department supervision to be a **serious breach of the standards of employee conduct and these relationships will not be tolerated. Engaging in an unauthorized relationship may result in employment termination and or termination of the contractual or volunteer status.**

Prohibitions cited in the policy consist of the following:

- Engaging in any personal or business relationship(s) with any individual currently under the supervision of the department, or in the case of APA employees, engaging in same with an individual under the supervision of the department or any other criminal justice agency i.e. “offenders”, as defined by this policy.

- Prohibited activities include but are not limited to:

    - Exchange of personal letters, pictures, telephone calls, or personal information with an offender;
    - Visiting with any offender;
    - Entering into a business enterprise with an offender;
    - Residing with an offender;
    - Committing any sexual act with an offender;
    - Engaging in any other sexual contact or misconduct with an offender;
    - Aiding and abetting any unauthorized relationship.

The above referenced policy on unauthorized relationships also addresses staff training as follows:

> The Corrections Training Academy (CTA) will develop and utilize standardized lesson plans for pre-service and in-service to address inappropriate staff/offender relationships. All lesson plans or material used for the training shall be approved by the Superintendent of the CTA. Each work location will reinforce the importance of this policy during the orientation phase of their training for new employees, independent contractors, and volunteers. Each work location will further address this topic during annual in-service training.

Regarding offender education, the policy states:

- Inmates will be advised during orientation that unauthorized relationships are prohibited. They will be instructed on the procedure for reporting unauthorized relationships. This information will also be included in the inmate handbook/manual.

- During the initial meeting with their supervising officers, offenders under the supervision of the Adult Parole Authority will be advised that unauthorized relationships with department employees are prohibited. Offenders under supervision will be instructed on the procedure for reporting unauthorized relationships.

The policy provides the following on the reporting of potential unauthorized relationships:

> Any employee, contractor or volunteer who becomes aware of or reasonably suspects that another employee, contractor or volunteer is involved in an unauthorized relationship has an **affirmative duty to immediately report any such knowledge or suspicion** to their Appointing Authority/DPCS Section Chief or APA Regional Administrator for appropriate action.
>
> Inmates may report any knowledge or suspicion of an unauthorized relationship to any staff member. This information shall immediately be communicated to one of the following: the Inspector of Institutional Services, the Investigator, or the Managing Officer. Offenders under APA supervision shall report this information to the Unit Supervisor or Regional Administrator.
>
> **Employees who fail to report knowledge of a potential unauthorized relationship or withhold information concerning a potential unauthorized relationship may be subject to disciplinary action**, up to and including removal. In the case of contractors or volunteers, they may be subject to suspension of their volunteer status or termination of their contract.

The total number of staff/inmate relationship investigations reported by the 2003 and 2004 Annual Reports is 229 and 186, respectively.

VIII. "OTHER" INVESTIGATIONS

Table 28. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by "Other" Investigations

Institution	# Of Investigations	Percent of Total Number of Initiated Investigations
Ohio State Penitentiary	555	95.2
Madison Correctional Institution	430	79.9
Trumbull Correctional Institution	315	75.7
Noble Correctional Institution	301	69.0
Warren Correctional Institution	276	77.3
Ross Correctional Institution	264	75.0
Corrections Medical Center	259	95.9
Belmont Correctional Institution	206	60.2
Lorain Correctional Institution	186	70.7
Mansfield Correctional Institution	183	62.5

The title of "Other" is purposefully vague to provide a "miscellaneous" category for Investigators. For general knowledge and clarification, Lorain Correctional Institution reported that in CY 2005, its "Other" investigations included: Escape Plans, BWC Fraud, Attempted Suicide, STG Problem, STG Homeland Security, and Inmate Death. This small sampling gives a taste for the possible topics involved at the other institutions. In addition, it appears that the vast majority of "Other" investigations pertain to background checks. In CY 2005, for example, Lorain Correctional Institution reported that of its 498 total "Other" investigations, 489 were background checks. This is probably representative of other institutions.

Table 29. 2003/2004 Comparison of "Other" Investigations

Institution	2003	2004	Change
Belmont Correctional Institution	436	206	-230
Ohio State Penitentiary	416	555	+139
Noble Correctional Institution	378	301	-77
Corrections Medical Center	314	259	-55
Trumbull Correctional Institution	246	315	+69
Southeastern Correctional Institution	187	83	-104
Mansfield Correctional Institution	157	183	+26
Warren Correctional Institution	124	276	+152
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	119	56	-63
Ohio Reformatory for Women	103	29	-74

The totals reported in the Chief Inspector Annual Reports for "Other" Investigations are 3,147 initiated investigations in 2003 and 3,959 initiated investigations in 2004.

IX. SEARCHES, SHAKEDOWNS, DRUGS AND ALCOHOL CONFISCATED

The following sections present the data provided pertaining to Searches, Shakedowns, and Drugs and Alcohol confiscated during CY 2003 and 2004. The following areas are covered: Canine Searches, Visitor Strip/Patdown, Employee Strip/Patdown, Major Shakedown, Marijuana, Crack/Cocaine, Heroin, Illicit Pills, and Hooch.

In addition to the above contraband, the 2003 Report states that other contraband confiscated in CY 2003 included: **four cellphones, 14 rounds of ammunition, $1,210.25 in cash, 14 tattoo guns, and three syringes. The 2004 Report states that other contraband confiscated included: 1 cellphone, 1 handgun and ammunition, $40.98 in cash, 109 shanks, and 14 syringes.**

A. CANINE SEARCHES

Table 30. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Canine Searches

Institution	# Of Searches
Lorain Correctional Institution	13
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	13
Belmont Correctional Institution	11
Warren Correctional Institution	8
Grafton Correctional Institution	8
Noble Correctional Institution	8
Ross Correctional Institution	8
Lebanon Correctional Institution	6
London Correctional Institution	6
North Central Correctional Institution	5

Table 31. 2003/2004 Comparison of Canine Searches

Institution	2003	2004	Change
Lebanon Correctional Institution	12	6	-6
Lorain Correctional Institution	12	13	+1
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	12	13	+1
Warren Correctional Institution	12	8	-4
Grafton Correctional Institution	11	8	-3
Belmont Correctional Institution	6	11	+5
Noble Correctional Institution	5	8	+3
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	5	4	-1
Allen Correctional Institution	4	2	-2
Dayton Correctional Institution	4	0	-4

Although the issue of canine searches is not often raised with CIIC, it may be that canine searches are an asset not sufficiently employed. As will be discussed in later tables,

institutions need to be encouraged to perform more searches for illegal substances so as to best limit the flow of drugs into the facilities. Institutions may wish to consider using canines more often. Prison staff recommended to the CIIC years ago that canines posted as the entry building as a deterrent to drug smuggling attempts.

B. EMPLOYEE STRIP/PATDOWNS

Table 32. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Employee Strip/Patdowns

Institution	# Of Strip/Patdowns
North Central Correctional Institution	51
Belmont Correctional Institution	12
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	5
Toledo Correctional Institution	4
Allen Correctional Institution	3
Lorain Correctional Institution	3
Trumbull Correctional Institution	3
Pickaway Correctional Institution	2
Warren Correctional Institution	1
Grafton Correctional Institution	1

For the record, the "top ten" institutions are also the only institutions that reported performing any employee strip/patdowns. All other institutions reported zero initiated investigations for CY 2004.

NCCI far and away has the most reported employee strip/patdowns in 2004. This is most likely related to the reported 202 positive urinalyses. Clearly, a drug issue was identified at NCCI and it is being addressed. Given the previously quoted percentage of full-time employed Americans who abuse illegal drugs (7.7%), it is far more likely that NCCI is on the right track than that the other institutions do not have any problems. It is better to be more assertive and to have investigations prove inconclusive or unwarranted than to allow the presence of drugs to increase and infect any institution.

An inmate wrote to the CIIC,

> [One way to bring in drugs is with a] thermos…You know that bottle guards bring hot coffee in to work. Then you got the heel of a shoe. COs bring it in. No one checks their heels. And the best way I've known is the belt…Staff and COs bring it in. The females never get checked in their vagina, never, unless she's hot, meaning under investigation. But that's almost unheard of. The only way she will get caught is because some jealous inmate tells on her…

Of course, DRC employees most likely do not want to be subjected to random, frequent strip or patdowns. Yet the institutions have an obligation to provide a "secure" environment—this includes limiting the entry of illegal drugs into the institution.

Compared to the other tables, it is very surprising that there are not more strip/patdowns conducted. **PCI, which in 2004 reported eight investigations for staff drug use and 17 investigations for drug movement between staff and inmates, only reports two employee strip/patdowns during the entire year. Likewise, LeCI reported 20 investigations regarding drugs pertaining to staff/inmates, and yet reportedly performed absolutely no employee strip/patdowns. If the number of investigations indicates that there is an issue with staff and drug trafficking, it may prove fruitful for the institution to check staff as they enter and leave the institution.**

Table 33. 2003/2004 Comparison of Employee Strip/Patdowns

Institution	2003	2004	Change
Toledo Correctional Institution	3	4	+1
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	1	5	+4
Lebanon Correctional Institution	1	0	-1
London Correctional Institution	1	0	-1
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1	2	+1
Warren Correctional Institution	1	1	0
Allen Correctional Institution	0	3	+3
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	12	+12
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0

The 2003 numbers are even lower than the 2004 numbers. As shown above, the highest number of employee strip/patdowns conducted was three. **Again, PCI, as just one example, reported nine investigations regarding conveyance of drugs between staff and inmates, and yet only reported one employee strip/patdown for the entire year.**

If strip searches and patdowns are too uncomfortable and provoke sincere staff discontent, institutions need to find other ways to check their employees. Perhaps the previously discussed canine searches could be used to check staff and staff possessions.

C. VISITOR STRIP/PATDOWNS

Table 34. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Visitor Strip/Patdowns

Institution	# Of Strip/Patdowns
Warren Correctional Institution	21
Correctional Reception Center	10
Lebanon Correctional Institution	6
London Correctional Institution	5
Ross Correctional Institution	5
Allen Correctional Institution	4
Mansfield Correctional Institution	4
Toledo Correctional Institution	4
Southeastern Correctional Institution	3
Noble Correctional Institution	3

This table is also somewhat enigmatic in comparison with the other tables. LeCI, for example, reported a grand total of 82 drug investigations pertaining to inmates and visitors in 2004, and yet only performed a reported six visitor strip/patdowns. WCI is closer to the mark—34 inmate/visitor drug investigations and 21 visitor strip/patdowns. Still, even that seems low, given the higher security level of the institution. Understandably, strip searches are extremely intrusive on a person's sense of privacy—but why not perform more patdowns?

An inmate wrote to CIIC:

> A lot of girlfriends and/or wife get caught. How they do this is they bring it in by putting it in their vagina. First, they buy some small package of balloons at a party store [and] pack it full of coke, weed, and/or pills. I've known women [who] packed heroin. Once she has packed the small balloons and tied it tight, she puts them into her vagina and walks in. She can put, I'm told, up to 10-15 small balloons. These balloons are very small. So when the man she is seeing comes over to her table, she buys a bag of popcorn and a Coke for him to drink. She slips the balloons into the bag one by one and he pretends to eat popcorn when in fact he is swallowing the balloons and taking a drink to make it go down easy. Afterwards, he goes back to his block or dorm and throw it up by drinking shampoo. Now he has a street value of maybe some 6-8 thousand dollars worth of drugs…

Similar to LeCI, other institutions report low numbers of strip/patdowns. PCI reports 21 investigations of inmate/visitor drug conveyance, yet only one strip/patdown; RiCI, 20 inmate/visitor drug investigations and three visitor strip/patdowns; ManCI, 14 inmate/visitor drug investigations and four visitor strip/patdowns.

As with the employees, if strip searches and patdowns are considered to be too intrusive to the privacy of the visitor, then other creative means needs to be used to ensure that illegal substances—which threaten lives, rehabilitation, and the security of the institution—are not entering the institution through visitors.

Table 35. 2003/2004 Comparison of Visitor Strip/Patdowns

Institution	2003	2004	Change
Lebanon Correctional Institution	7	6	-1
Warren Correctional Institution	6	21	+15
London Correctional Institution	5	5	0
Belmont Correctional Institution	4	2	-2
Dayton Correctional Institution	4	0	-4
Mansfield Correctional Institution	4	4	0
Noble Correctional Institution	3	3	0
Richland Correctional Institution	3	3	0
Toledo Correctional Institution	3	4	+1
Southeastern Correctional Institution	2	3	+1

Similar objections can be made to the 2003 numbers. In fact, the highest number of visitor strip/patdowns fell to a mere seven. LeCI and WCI both reported 53 investigations pertaining to visitor/inmate drug trafficking, yet only seven and six, respectively, visitor strip/patdowns.

D. MAJOR SHAKEDOWNS

Table 36. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Major Shakedowns

Institution	# Of Major Shakedowns
Madison Correctional Institution	8
London Correctional Institution	7
Ohio State Penitentiary	5
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	4
Allen Correctional Institution	4
Oakwood Correctional Facility	3
Richland Correctional Institution	3
Grafton Correctional Institution	2
Lorain Correctional Institution	2
Mansfield Correctional Institution	2

Shakedowns are an important institutional tool. Shakedowns ensure that inmates do not become complacent, that inmates are aware that the rules are going to be enforced, and that stockpiled weapons and drugs will be found and confiscated. MaCI is to be praised for committing the time and staff resources to performing

eight shakedowns during one year. In fact, all of the top ten institutions are to be praised—even just two shakedowns a year will surely have an effect upon inmate weapon and drug stockpiling.

More surprising is the fact that 13 institutions reported zero shakedowns for the entire calendar year, including SOCF (the maximum security facility) and six Level 3 facilities (CRC, LeCI, ORW, RCI, ToCI, and WCI).

Table 37. 2003/2004 Comparison of Major Shakedowns

Institution	2003	2004	Change
Madison Correctional Institution	8	8	0
London Correctional Institution	7	7	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	5	5	0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	5	1	-4
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	4	0	-4
Southeastern Correctional Institution	3	0	-3
Allen Correctional Institution	3	4	+1
Hocking Correctional Facility	3	0	-3
Dayton Correctional Institution	2	0	-2
Mansfield Correctional Institution	2	2	0

MaCI showed consistent dedication to performing shakedowns, as did LoCI, OSP, ACI, and ManCI. It is interesting that an institution would perform four shakedowns in one year and none in the next, such as CCI. It is also interesting that while MaCI had eight shakedowns in a year, a facility dedicated to substance abusers such as NCCTF reports only one in 2003 and two in 2004.

Regrettably, the following institutions reported zero major shakedowns for two years consecutivle:

- **LeCI**
- **ORW**
- **WCI**
- **MCI**
- **CRC**
- **MEPRC**

Why two Level 3 facilities (LeCI and WCI) and two facilities that cater to all security levels (ORW and CRC) performed no shakedowns in two years or did not report any shakedowns is not understood.

E. MARIJUANA

Table 38. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Amount of Marijuana Confiscated

Institution	Marijuana Confiscated (oz.)
North Central Correctional Institution	23.24
Richland Correctional Institution	13.11
Noble Correctional Institution	13.0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	12.77
Belmont Correctional Institution	10.69
London Correctional Institution	8.76
Pickaway Correctional Institution	8.0
Ross Correctional Institution	2.72
Toledo Correctional Institution	2.25
Marion Correctional Institution	1.57

The Chief Inspector's 2004 Report states that a total of 99.68 oz. (6.23 lbs) were confiscated during CY 2004. The Report also notes that several institutions also reported the confiscation of marijuana joints and balloons that were not weighed.

The U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration's 2006 Ohio factsheet reports:

> Marijuana continues to be the most widely abused and readily available illicit drug throughout the state of Ohio. The available supply of marijuana ranges from pound to multi-hundred pound quantities. Ohio is a source area for marijuana. The rural areas of Ohio provide an adequate environment for the outdoor cultivation of cannabis, most of which occurs in the southern part of the state. In northern Ohio, the use of hydroponics and other sophisticated indoor growing techniques that produce sinsemilla with a high THC content continues to increase. Mexican marijuana is also frequently encountered in the state of Ohio. The marijuana is shipped from the southwest border states. Large quantities are shipped into Ohio mainly overland, and smaller quantities through package delivery services and the mail. Mexican criminal groups are the dominant wholesale suppliers of marijuana in Ohio. They supply multi-hundred kilogram quantities of marijuana to most districts throughout the state. Local independent and Jamaican criminal groups also are responsible for shipping and distributing wholesale amounts of marijuana into Ohio in multi-kilogram quantities. Ounce quantities of marijuana sell between $100-$250, pound quantities $800-$4000…[3]

NCCI continues to lead the pack in terms of drug investigations, but whether that is due to greater institutional diligence in confiscating the drugs or due to a greater presence of

[3] U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration 2006 Ohio Factsheet. Accessed at: http://www.usdoj.gov/dea/pubs/states/ohio.html

illegal substances is currently unknown. Also, it should be noted that of the top ten institutions, all but two are Level 2 (medium) security institutions.

Using the numbers provided by the DEA, the street price range of the confiscated marijuana ranges from $4,984 to $24,920. And, considering the fact that all commodities tend to be more expensive in prison, especially those that are illegal, it is likely that the total utility value of the assets exchanged verges toward the high end of the economic estimate. An inmate reported to CIIC that one joint could be sold for $10.00.

Table 39. 2003/2004 Comparison of Confiscated Marijuana

Institution	2003	2004
Southeastern Correctional Institution	24.46	0.76
Lebanon Correctional Institution	13.5	0.21
London Correctional Institution	9.5	8.67
Ross Correctional Institution	8.37	2.72
Toledo Correctional Institution	8.04	2.25
Richland Correctional Institution	7.67	13.11
Allen Correctional Institution	6.7	0.0
Noble Correctional Institution	6.0	13.0
North Central Correctional Institution	5.84	23.24
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	3.09	0.80

The Chief Inspector's Report states that a total of 103.465 oz. (6.47 lbs) were confiscated during CY 2003. Again, this number does not take into account the confiscation of marijuana joints and balloons that were not weighed. The street value of the marijuana confiscated, again using the DEA 2006 numbers, ranges from $5,176 to $25,880.

Viewing the above numbers, SCI had a sudden drop in the amount of marijuana confiscated, dropping from 24.46 oz. to 0.76 oz. LeCI also experienced a similar drop. No reason is given for this decrease. Certainly, as previously viewed, it is not due to the number of shakedowns that LeCI performs, as it performed no ne. However, LeCI was the leader in inmate/visitor drug investigations over both years. Perhaps the higher profile of the investigations reduced inmates' willingness to engage in illegal drug conveyance. That said, it is surprising that given the increase in investigations from 2003 to 2004, LeCI dropped from 13.5 oz. to 0.21 oz. Logic would dictate that more investigations would result in more drugs confiscated.

F. CRACK/COCAINE

Table 40. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Confiscated Crack/Cocaine

Institution	Crack/Cocaine Confiscated (Grams)
Ross Correctional Institution	15.44
North Central Correctional Institution	7.6
Pickaway Correctional Institution	3.0
London Correctional Institution	2.0
Noble Correctional Institution	1.0+
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1.0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	1.0
Richland Correctional Institution	0.901
Lorain Correctional Institution	0.56
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0.4

The Chief Inspector's Report states that a total of 32.901 grams of cocaine were confiscated during CY 2004. The following excerpt is from the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration's 2006 Ohio factsheet:

> Cocaine HCL and crack combined constitute the greatest drug threat in Ohio. Cocaine is transported into Ohio from the southwest border, including California and Texas, as well as from Miami, Florida and New York City. Detroit, Michigan and Chicago, Illinois serve as transshipment points and distribution centers for cocaine shipped from the southwest border and transported throughout Ohio. Mexican and Dominican criminal groups and to a lesser extent other ethnic criminal groups are the principal transporters and wholesale distributors of multi-kilogram quantities of powdered cocaine in Ohio. Gram quantities sell between $100-$120, ounce quantities, $750-$1400, and kilograms $22,500 - $32,000. The purity levels for cocaine HCL range from 32.54 to 72.75 percent. Purity levels for crack cocaine range from 19 to 63.7 percent. The Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services data indicates that the number of treatment admissions for cocaine abuse for 2003 was 9,879.

Although RCI tops the list for the amount of crack/cocaine confiscated, NCCI continued to portray significant drug problems, as it is second on the list. PCI, as with marijuana confiscated, reports a high amount of crack/cocaine in comparison with the other institutions.

According to the above price range reported by the DEA, the street price range of the amount of crack/cocaine confiscated ranges from $3,290 to $3,948. As with the other drugs, the street price range is most likely lower than the actual economic value of assets exchanged for the illegal substances in prison. An inmate reported to CIIC that one small rock could be sold for $25.00-50.00.

The reported Latino concentration of the drug traffickers is particularly interesting in that Latino gangs have not been big players in the Ohio corrections system until the most recent years. In a recent CIIC meeting that included testimony from the DRC Central Office STG Coordinator, the top six identified gangs within the DRC by population do not include a Latino-affiliated group.[4] The current relationship between Latino traffickers and the other ethnic-based gangs is not known. However, inmate letters have reported that Latino groups are accepted by both black and white groups, as Latinos are reportedly viewed as belonging to neither and thus are not "tainted" by the race war.

As the DEA reports a Latino connection to crack/cocaine trafficking, a quick survey of the ethnic populations of the institutions was performed. The ethnic populations do not correlate to the reported amount of crack/cocaine confiscated. As of March 18, 2006, the ODRC website reports the following Hispanic population numbers for the above institutions:

Institutions	Hispanic Population
Mansfield Corr. Inst.	83
Lorain Corr. Inst.	80
Lebanon Corr. Inst.	72
North Central Corr. Inst.	72
London Corr. Inst.	28
Pickaway Corr. Inst.	27
Ross Corr. Inst.	24
North Coast Corr. Treatment Facility	14
Noble Corr. Inst.	0
Richland Corr. Inst.	0

Table 41. 2003/2004 Comparison of Confiscated Crack/Cocaine (grams)

Institution	2003	2004
Warren Correctional Institution	44.4	0.0
Toledo Correctional Institution	19.55	0.0
Ross Correctional Institution	12.07	15.44
Richland Correctional Institution	6.54	0.901
Trumbull Correctional Institution	5.0	0.0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	3.0	3.0
London Correctional Institution	1.1	2.0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1.0	1.0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	1.0	1.0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0.6	Trace

As shown above, WCI reported a large amount of crack/cocaine confiscated in 2003. The subsequent 2004 report is therefore significant. Perhaps the strict treatment by the

[4] The top six identified Security Threat Groups (gangs) in the ODRC are: Aryan Brotherhood, White Supremacist, FOLKS, People, Crips, and Bloods.

institution in 2003 resulted in a brief lapse in trafficking in 2004. ToCI reports a similar sudden decrease.

The Chief Inspector reported a total of 95.1 grams confiscated in CY 2003. Using the DEA's 2006 price ranges, the street price of the crack/cocaine confiscated in 2003 ranged from $9,510 to $11,412.

G. HEROIN

Table 42. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Confiscated Heroin

Institution	Heroin Confiscated (Grams)
Mansfield Correctional Institution	8.5
Ross Correctional Institution	8.5
Richland Correctional Institution	8.5
London Correctional Institution	3.0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	2.0
Toledo Correctional Institution	1.6
Marion Correctional Institution	1.1
Noble Correctional Institution	1 packet
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	Trace
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0.0

The Chief Inspector reports a total of 33.2 grams of heroin confiscated in CY 2004. It should be noted that the rest of the institutions not listed above reported that they did not confiscate any heroin during CY 2004. The U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration 2006 Ohio fact sheet reports:

> Heroin distribution and abuse are increasing in Ohio. Heroin signature analysis indicates that South American and Mexican black tar are prevalent in the northern Ohio region. In the southern Ohio region Mexican black tar heroin is predominant. Dominican criminal groups control the distribution of South American heroin, while Mexican criminal groups control the distribution of Mexican black tar heroin. At the retail-level, African-American, Dominican, and Mexican criminal groups are involved in heroin distribution. Heroin is shipped into Ohio from major distribution centers such as Chicago, Detroit, New York and various cities along the southwest border. Heroin is also transported on commercial airline flights into Ohio. Wholesalers use major Ohio cities such as Cleveland, Cincinnati, Columbus, and Toledo as distribution centers for smaller cities in and outside the state. Gram quantities sell between $140-$250 and ounce quantities $2400-$7000. The purity levels range from 23.5 to 57 percent . The Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services data indicates the number of treatment admissions for heroin abuse increased overall from 6,878 in 2002 to 7,416 in 2003.

According to the DEA reported price range, the street price of the heroin confiscated ranges from $4,648 to $8,300. As stated with all other illegal substances discussed, due to the limited ability to traffick drugs into the prison, the total value of the assets exchanged for the substances probably verges on the high end of the price range, if not even higher.

Given the DEA note that the trafficking of heroin tends to be concentrated in Latino-affiliated ethnic groups, an analysis of the population of that particular subgroup could be interesting. However, as the institutions are primarily the same as discussed in the trafficking of crack/cocaine, it can be surmised that the Hispanic inmate population numbers also do not correlate to the amount of reported heroin confiscated.

Table 43. 2003/2004 Comparison of Confiscated Heroin

Institutions	2003	2004
Mansfield Correctional Institution	8.5	8.5
Trumbull Correctional Institution	8.0	0.0
London Correctional Institution	5.9	3.0
Toledo Correctional Institution	4.97	1.6
Ross Correctional Institution	4.0	8.5
Richland Correctional Institution	3.2	8.5
Lebanon Correctional Institution	2.0	2.0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	1.0	0.0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0.3	0.0
Allen Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0

Reviewing the above numbers, it is interesting that ManCI reported confiscating the exact same amount of heroin from one year to the next.

H. ILLICIT PILLS

Table 44. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Confiscated Illicit Pills

Institution	Illicit Pills Confiscated
Ross Correctional Institution	349
Noble Correctional Institution	76
Richland Correctional Institution	6
Correctional Reception Center	5
London Correctional Institution	5
Marion Correctional Institution	4
Belmont Correctional Institution	2
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0
Allen Correctional Institution	0

Clearly, RCI tops the chart with the number of illicit pills confiscated. It should be noted that all other institutions not listed above reported confiscating zero illicit pills in CY 2004. However, it seems extremely doubtful that RCI would have a massive proliferation of illicit pills while the vast majority of the other institutions would have no illicit pill problem whatsoever.

The U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration reported the following on club drugs and Oxycontin in its 2006 Ohio factsheet:

> The use of Club Drugs such as Ecstasy (MDMA), GHB, Ketamine, and LSD has steadily increased in Ohio. Club Drugs are growing in popularity among young adults and juveniles, particularly in most urban areas of the state where "Rave" parties are also increasing. MDMA is the club drug of choice and represents the greatest future threat to Ohio's youth. Most MDMA available in Ohio is produced outside the United States, typically in laboratories in the Netherlands and Belgium and transported through express mail services and by couriers on commercial airlines through distribution centers such as Miami, New York City, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C. MDMA also reaches Ohio from Canada via New York and is transported via the interstate highways and public modes of transportation. Most traffickers of MDMA are loose-knit independent entrepreneurs. Retail dealers typically are suburban teenagers, usually high school or college students. The pills are sold at an average of $25 per pill.
>
> The diversion and abuse of OxyContin represent a significant drug threat in Ohio. OxyContin, a powerful pain reliever whose effects are the same as other opiate derivatives, is obtained legally through prescriptions as well as illegally on the street. Formerly seen as a drug of abuse primarily among the Caucasian population, law enforcement officials in Ohio report increasing abuse among African Americans. According to the Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services, youth abusers of OxyContin have begun abusing heroin since they can no longer obtain or afford OxyContin. Continued incidents of overdoses and drug-related deaths were reported throughout the state during 2003. Also, a direct connection between abuse of this drug and drug-related robberies has been established.

The Chief Inspector reported a total of 447 illicit pills confiscated in CY 2004. Given the above estimate of $25 per pill of Ecstasy, it is possible that the 447 pills have a total estimated value of $11,175. However, the illicit pills are not delineated by type of drug and thus cannot truly be estimated.

Given the above stated possibility that the pills exist in the prison system but are not being confiscated, as well as the high lucrative potential and the ease of transporting pills that can be easily disguised as legal substances, it is hoped that the ODRC works toward

improving its ability to identify and confiscate any illicit pills currently available to inmates.

Table 45. 2003/2004 Comparison of Confiscated Illicit Pills

Institutions	2003	2004
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	152	0
Ross Correctional Institution	137	349
Grafton Correctional Institution	128	0
Allen Correctional Institution	60	0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	23	0
Correctional Reception Center	22	5
Pickaway Correctional Institution	15	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	10	0
London Correctional Institution	7	5
Corrections Medical Center	6	0

As previously noted, the sudden drop in the numbers from one year to the next—for example, SOCF reported 152 pills confiscated in 2003 and 0 in 2004—is disturbing. It is hoped that the high number of pills confiscated in one year would have dissuaded the inmates from trafficking. However, given the chemical dependency that illegal substances engender, it seems unlikely; it seems more likely that the inmates became more crafty in their methods of distributing the pills.

In CY 2003, the Chief Inspector reported 565 illicit pills confiscated in the ODRC system. Given the $25 per pill estimate, the total estimated value of the pills is $14,125. However, again, this estimate is extremely rough as the exact nature of the confiscated pills is unknown.

I. HOOCH

Table 46. 2004 Top Ten Institutions by Confiscated Hooch

Institution	Hooch Confiscated (Gallons)
Noble Correctional Institution	243.0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	224.0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	126.0
North Central Correctional Institution	82.34
Richland Correctional Institution	55.0
Belmont Correctional Institution	38.3
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	8.5
Southeastern Correctional Institution	6.0
Marion Correctional Institution	1.75
Allen Correctional Institution	0.0

The Chief Inspector's Report makes note that the confiscation and destruction of hooch varies across institutions and may have not included Investigator involvement. As such, a zero may only indicate that the Investigator did not have any involvement in the confiscation and destruction.

According to the Report, a total of 784.86 gallons of hooch were confiscated. It should be noted that all other institutions not listed above reported confiscating 0 gallons of hooch.

An SOCF inmate writes,

> The inmates in this block are cooking prison wine. I hear they need 150 packs of sugar. To make good wine, you need sugar, orange juice, prunes, bread (rice will be okay), and saltine crackers. Why crackers? Crackers have yeast in it. And that's the main thing you need, is yeast. You put all this stuff in a plastic bag. You must keep it hot and burp it at least two times a day. After seven to ten days, the wine has cooked and if you keep it cooking for about 14-17 days, you have wine that is 100% proof. One glass is enough to get you drunk. Back in the day when I learned how to make wine…we sold it for two packs a glass.

Verbally, SOCF staff reported hooch confiscation to CIIC, indiciating that it was quite frequent. However, in the Chief Inspector's Report of 2003 and 2004, **SOCF reported confiscating zero gallons of hooch in both years.**

Table 47. 2003/2004 Comparison of Confiscated Hooch

Institutions	2003	2004
Mansfield Correctional Institution	224.0	224.0
Noble Correctional Institution	150.0	243.0
Richland Correctional Institution	113.3	55.0
North Central Correctional Institution	92.5	82.34
Southeastern Correctional Institution	58.5	6.0
Warren Correctional Institution	34.0	0.0
Belmont Correctional Institution	32.3	38.3
Trumbull Correctional Institution	30.0	0.0
Marion Correctional Institution	22.5	1.75
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	16.5	8.5

As with the amount of heroin confiscated between 2003 and 2004, it is interesting that ManCI reports confiscating the exact same amount of hooch, to the gallon, in both 2003 and 2004. The accuracy is therefore questionable.

X. RESOURCES

Correctional Institution Inspection Committee. "Review of Assault Data." Accessed at: http://www.ciic.state.oh.us/publications/assaultdata06.pdf.

Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. "Drug Use." Found at: http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/dcf/du.htm

National Survey on Drug Use and Health. Fifty States report. Accessed at: http://www.oas.samhsa.gov/StatesList.htm

U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration. Ohio 2006 Factsheet. Accessed at: http://www.usdoj.gov/dea/pubs/states/ohio.html.

XI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Chief Inspector's Office needs to perform its own evaluation of the Institutional Investigators' reported numbers. From the Annual Reports, it does not appear that any real analysis is performed, nor does it provide any recommendations for improvement, or really any sentiment of expectation of improvement. Questions need to be asked and answered regarding the discrepancy in numbers, both between institutions as well as between years. If the low numbers of some institutions are in fact accurate, then the institutions deserve praise and their methods should be examined for best practices recommendations. If the low numbers are in fact the result of non-reporting, then the Chief Inspector's Office needs to take action to ensure that future years' numbers are more accurate.

Further, greater analysis needs to be made of the large number of investigations that fall under the "Other" category. Perhaps additional categories need to be added to provide greater detail.

The following areas need improvement:

- **Accurate Reporting**: The overall conclusion generated in reviewing the numbers of both 2003 and 2004 is that there is a real lack of accurate reporting. As relayed in the report, one institution reported the exact same amount of heroin (grams) and hooch (gallons) confiscated in both 2003 and 2004. Institutions that are known for problems report no problems whatsoever. Numbers jump by the hundreds from one year to the next. If, on the other hand, the numbers are accurate, lessons can be learned from the dramatic differences.

- **Urinalyses**: "Saturation testing" needs to include the entire institutional population to obtain accurate numbers of drug usage within the institution. Performing at least annual testing of every inmate should be considered. Efforts should be made to demonstrate that drug usage will most definitely be monitored, and most likely will be detected. Drug testing costs can be justified for the safety and security of the institution.

- **Staff Drug Use**: Accurate assessment of DRC employee drug use needs to be made. Prison staff have questioned the extent to which truly random tests are conducted.

- **Strip/Patdowns**: To truly limit the flow of drugs into and out of the institution, institutions need to become more vigilant of both staff and visitors. The infrequent use of strip/patdowns indicates that their potential is not being fully used.

- **Assaults**: The discrepancy between the number of reported assaults and the reported initiated investigations regarding those assaults needs to be closely

examined. It makes no sense to report 166 incidents of assault and zero initiated investigations.

- **Sexual Assault**: In conjunction with the new DRC policies, staff should examine ways to encourage reporting of sexual assault and explore methods of improving inmates' willingness to report sexual assault. Staff training may be a primary need.

- **Staff/Inmate Relationships**: This is an area of true concern. In-service staff training most definitely needs to be included regarding the hazards and consequences of staff/inmate relationships.

- **Major Shakedowns**: Institutions should have at least one major shakedown every year to improve institution security and to best ensure that weapons and drugs can not be used, held, and stockpiled with impunity.

APPENDIX A

INSTITUTION ABBREVIATIONS

Allen Correctional Institution	ACI
Belmont Correctional Institution	BeCI
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	CCI
Correctional Reception Center	CRC
Corrections Medical Center	CMC
Dayton Correctional Institution	DCI
Franklin Pre-Release Center	FPRC
Grafton Correctional Institution	GCI
Hocking Correctional Facility	HCF
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	LaECI
Lebanon Correctional Institution	LeCI
London Correctional Institution	LoCI
Lorain Correctional Institution	LorCI
Madison Correctional Institution	MaCI
Mansfield Correctional Institution	ManCI
Marion Correctional Institution	MCI
Montgomery Education Pre-Release Center	MEPRC
Noble Correctional Institution	NCI
North Central Correctional Institution	NCCI
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	NCCTF
Northeast Pre-Release Center	NEPRC
Oakwood Correctional Facility	OCF
Ohio Reformatory for Women	ORW
Ohio State Penitentiary	OSP
Pickaway Correctional Institution	PCI
Richland Correctional Institution	RiCI
Ross Correctional Institution	RCI
Southeastern Correctional Institution	SCI
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	SOCF
Toledo Correctional Institution	ToCI
Trumbull Correctional Institution	TCI
Warren Correctional Institution	WCI

INSTITUTION SECURITY CLASSIFICATION LEVELS

Levels 1 and 2 (Minimum/Medium)

ACI
BeCI
CCI
DCI
FPRC
GCI
HCF
LaECI
LoCI
MaCI*
MCI
MEPRC
NCCI
NCCTF
NCI
NEPRC
PCI
RiCI
SCI

Level 3 (Close)

CRC**
LeCI
LorCI
ManCI
RCI
TCI
ToCI
WCI

Level 4 (Maximum)

SOCF

Level 5 (Supermax)

OSP

All Security Levels

CMC
OCF
ORW

*MaCI, the home of the Sex Offender Risk Reduction Center (SORRC), also houses Level 3 sex offenders for the purpose of the Basic Education Sex Offender Treatment Program.

**CRC is the reception and intake center for inmates and houses inmates of all security levels until they are assigned a parent institution. However, CRC is also the parent institution for approximately 300 Level 2 work cadre inmates.

INSTITUTIONS RANKED BY 2004 POPULATION

Institutions	Population
Chillicothe Corr. Inst.	2,690
Mansfield Corr. Inst.	2,371
Richland Corr. Inst.	2,319
North Central Corr. Inst.	2,272
Ross Corr. Inst.	2,253
Belmont Corr. Inst.	2,153
Noble Corr. Inst.	2,084
London Corr. Inst.	2,071
Pickaway Corr. Inst.	2,038
Ohio Reformatory for Women	1,955
Lebanon Corr. Inst.	1,937
Madison Corr. Inst.	1,901
Marion Corr. Inst.	1,847
Correctional Reception Center	1,649
Southeastern Corr. Inst.	1,560
Lorain Corr. Inst.	1,463
Grafton Corr. Inst.	1,409
Lake Erie Corr. Inst.	1,380
Allen Corr. Inst.	1,302
Trumbull Corr. Inst.	1,097
Warren Corr. Inst.	1,034
Southern Ohio Corr. Facility	958
Toledo Corr. Inst.	791
North Coast Corr. Treatment Facility	546
North East Pre-Release Center	530
Hocking Corr. Facility	464
Franklin Pre-Release Center	455
Ohio State Penitentiary	455
Dayton Corr. Inst.	424
Mont. Education and Pre-Release Center	327
Oakwood Corr. Facility	125
Corrections Medical Center	122

APPENDIX B

INVESTIGATIONS

2004 INITIATED INVESTIGATION CASELOAD

Institution	Initiated Investigations
Ohio State Penitentiary	583
Madison Correctional Institution	538
Noble Correctional Institution	436
Trumbull Correctional Institution	416
Warren Correctional Institution	357
Ross Correctional Institution	352
Belmont Correctional Institution	342
Mansfield Correctional Institution	293
North Central Correctional Institution	287
Corrections Medical Center	270
Lorain Correctional Institution	263
Richland Correctional Institution	257
Pickaway Correctional Institution	256
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	240
Lebanon Correctional Institution	212
Southeastern Correctional Institution	164
Allen Correctional Institution	145
Northeast Pre Release Center	143
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	142
Ohio Reformatory for Women	134
Correctional Reception Center	123
Oakwood Correctional Facility	104
Franklin Pre Release Center	99
Marion Correctional Institution	82
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	75
Toledo Correctional Institution	75
Hocking Correctional Facility	69
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	62
London Correctional Institution	60
Grafton Correctional Institution	43
Dayton Correctional Institution	41
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	15
TOTALS	**6,678**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF INITIATED INVESTIGATIONS

Institution	2003	2004
Belmont Correctional Institution	519	342
Noble Correctional Institution	435	436
Ohio State Penitentiary	427	583
Southeastern Correctional Institution	391	164
Trumbull Correctional Institution	337	416
Corrections Medical Center	328	270
Ohio Reformatory for Women	257	134
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	237	142
Ross Correctional Institution	230	352
Warren Correctional Institution	223	357
Lebanon Correctional Institution	219	212
Mansfield Correctional Institution	215	293
Richland Correctional Institution	180	257
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	156	240
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	148	62
Madison Correctional Institution	126	538
Dayton Correctional Institution	124	41
Hocking Correctional Facility	114	69
Allen Correctional Institution	113	145
Pickaway Correctional Institution	112	256
Oakwood Correctional Facility	97	104
North Central Correctional Institution	88	287
London Correctional Institution	87	60
Marion Correctional Institution	83	82
Franklin Pre Release Center	81	99
Toledo Correctional Institution	67	75
Lorain Correctional Institution	60	263
Correctional Reception Center	60	123
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	57	75
Grafton Correctional Institution	36	43
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	28	15
Northeast Pre Release Center	23	143
Totals	**5,658**	**6,678**

POSITIVE URINALYSES

Institution	# Of Investigations
North Central Correctional Institution	202
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	96
Richland Correctional Institution	92
Belmont Correctional Institution	78
Allen Correctional Institution	59
Trumbull Correctional Institution	54
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	46
Mansfield Correctional Institution	46
Noble Correctional Institution	35
Pickaway Correctional Institution	33
Dayton Correctional Institution	31
Marion Correctional Institution	25
Lebanon Correctional Institution	23
Southeastern Correctional Institution	16
Correctional Reception Center	15
Madison Correctional Institution	13
Grafton Correctional Institution	13
Lorain Correctional Institution	12
Toledo Correctional Institution	11
Warren Correctional Institution	9
Ohio State Penitentiary	7
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	7
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	6
Northeast Pre Release Center	3
Ohio Reformatory for Women	2
Hocking Correctional Facility	2
London Correctional Institution	0
Ross Correctional Institution	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0
Corrections Medical Center	0
TOTAL	**936**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF POSITIVE URINALYSES

Institution	2003	2004
Ross Correctional Institution	141	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	130	16
Dayton Correctional Institution	102	31
Lebanon Correctional Institution	100	23
North Central Correctional Institution	48	202
Richland Correctional Institution	45	92
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	41	96
Belmont Correctional Institution	36	78
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	33	46
Allen Correctional Institution	29	59
Trumbull Correctional Institution	28	54
London Correctional Institution	25	0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	19	46
Pickaway Correctional Institution	19	33
Madison Correctional Institution	14	13
Grafton Correctional Institution	12	13
Warren Correctional Institution	11	9
Noble Correctional Institution	10	35
Ohio Reformatory for Women	10	2
Toledo Correctional Institution	9	11
Ohio State Penitentiary	9	7
Correctional Reception Center	7	15
Marion Correctional Institution	5	25
Lorain Correctional Institution	4	12
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	3	7
Hocking Correctional Facility	2	2
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	2	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	1	6
Northeast Pre Release Center	1	3
Franklin Pre Release Center	1	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	1	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0
Totals	**898**	**936**

DRUGS (OTHER)

Institution	# Of Investigations
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	49
Richland Correctional Institution	45
North Central Correctional Institution	33
Mansfield Correctional Institution	25
Ross Correctional Institution	25
Noble Correctional Institution	21
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	20
Marion Correctional Institution	18
Allen Correctional Institution	17
London Correctional Institution	17
Belmont Correctional Institution	16
Lorain Correctional Institution	12
Trumbull Correctional Institution	11
Toledo Correctional Institution	11
Correctional Reception Center	9
Pickaway Correctional Institution	7
Southeastern Correctional Institution	6
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	4
Madison Correctional Institution	3
Ohio Reformatory for Women	2
Dayton Correctional Institution	2
Warren Correctional Institution	1
Northeast Pre Release Center	1
Corrections Medical Center	1
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0
TOTAL	**356**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF DRUGS (OTHER)

Institution	2003	2004
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	47	49
Richland Correctional Institution	17	45
Allen Correctional Institution	17	17
London Correctional Institution	17	17
Trumbull Correctional Institution	16	11
Marion Correctional Institution	15	18
Belmont Correctional Institution	13	16
Toledo Correctional Institution	13	11
Pickaway Correctional Institution	13	7
Mansfield Correctional Institution	12	25
Ross Correctional Institution	11	25
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	11	20
Southeastern Correctional Institution	10	6
Noble Correctional Institution	9	21
Correctional Reception Center	9	9
North Central Correctional Institution	8	33
Ohio Reformatory for Women	6	2
Madison Correctional Institution	4	3
Dayton Correctional Institution	3	2
Grafton Correctional Institution	3	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	2	4
Warren Correctional Institution	2	1
Lorain Correctional Institution	1	12
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	1	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	1
Northeast Pre Release Center	0	1
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Institution	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0
Totals	**260**	**356**

DRUGS (INMATE/VISITOR)

Institution	# Of Investigations
Lebanon Correctional Institution	82
Warren Correctional Institution	34
Pickaway Correctional Institution	21
Richland Correctional Institution	20
Mansfield Correctional Institution	14
Southeastern Correctional Institution	11
Trumbull Correctional Institution	10
Allen Correctional Institution	9
Belmont Correctional Institution	8
Noble Correctional Institution	8
Lorain Correctional Institution	7
Grafton Correctional Institution	7
Madison Correctional Institution	7
Toledo Correctional Institution	7
Ross Correctional Institution	5
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	3
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	3
Correctional Reception Center	3
Dayton Correctional Institution	2
London Correctional Institution	2
North Central Correctional Institution	2
Northeast Pre Release Center	2
Marion Correctional Institution	2
Ohio Reformatory for Women	2
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	1
Hocking Correctional Facility	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0
Corrections Medical Center	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0
Total	**272**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF DRUGS (INMATE/VISITOR)

Institution	2003	2004
Lebanon Correctional Institution	53	82
Warren Correctional Institution	53	34
Richland Correctional Institution	20	20
Trumbull Correctional Institution	13	10
Dayton Correctional Institution	11	2
Southeastern Correctional Institution	10	11
Pickaway Correctional Institution	9	21
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	9	3
Mansfield Correctional Institution	8	14
Madison Correctional Institution	7	7
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	7	1
Grafton Correctional Institution	6	7
Correctional Reception Center	6	3
Belmont Correctional Institution	4	8
Noble Correctional Institution	4	8
Lorain Correctional Institution	4	7
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	4	0
Toledo Correctional Institution	3	7
Ross Correctional Institution	3	5
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	2	3
Marion Correctional Institution	2	2
Ohio Reformatory for Women	2	2
Allen Correctional Institution	1	9
London Correctional Institution	1	2
North Central Correctional Institution	1	2
Northeast Pre Release Center	1	2
Corrections Medical Center	1	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	1	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0
Totals	**244**	**272**

DRUGS (STAFF/INMATE)

Institution	# Of Investigations
Lebanon Correctional Institution	20
Pickaway Correctional Institution	17
Marion Correctional Institution	5
Trumbull Correctional Institution	4
Richland Correctional Institution	4
Warren Correctional Institution	3
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	3
Grafton Correctional Institution	3
Allen Correctional Institution	3
Mansfield Correctional Institution	2
Madison Correctional Institution	1
Ohio Reformatory for Women	1
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1
Toledo Correctional Institution	1
Belmont Correctional Institution	1
Lorain Correctional Institution	1
Noble Correctional Institution	1
Ohio State Penitentiary	1
London Correctional Institution	0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0
Correctional Reception Center	0
Ross Correctional Institution	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0
Corrections Medical Center	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0
Total	**72**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF DRUGS (STAFF/INMATE)

Institution	2003	2004
Pickaway Correctional Institution	9	17
Richland Correctional Institution	7	4
Lebanon Correctional Institution	3	20
Warren Correctional Institution	3	3
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	2	3
London Correctional Institution	2	0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	1	0
Correctional Reception Center	1	0
Ross Correctional Institution	1	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	1	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	1	3
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1	2
Madison Correctional Institution	1	1
Ohio Reformatory for Women	1	1
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1	1
Toledo Correctional Institution	1	1
Marion Correctional Institution	0	5
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0	4
Allen Correctional Institution	0	3
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	1
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	1
Noble Correctional Institution	0	1
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	1
Corrections Medical Center	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0
Totals	**36**	**72**

DRUGS (MAIL/PACKAGES)

Institution	# Of Investigations
Ross Correctional Institution	13
Richland Correctional Institution	10
Warren Correctional Institution	7
Southeastern Correctional Institution	6
London Correctional Institution	5
North Central Correctional Institution	5
Lorain Correctional Institution	4
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	4
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	3
Pickaway Correctional Institution	2
Belmont Correctional Institution	2
Noble Correctional Institution	2
Correctional Reception Center	2
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	1
Trumbull Correctional Institution	1
Ohio Reformatory for Women	1
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1
Dayton Correctional Institution	0
Madison Correctional Institution	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0
Allen Correctional Institution	0
Corrections Medical Center	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0
Toledo Correctional Institution	0
Total	**69**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF DRUGS (MAIL/PACKAGES)

Institution	2003	2004
Warren Correctional Institution	11	7
Richland Correctional Institution	8	10
Southeastern Correctional Institution	7	6
London Correction Institution	5	5
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	5	4
Pickaway Correctional Institution	4	2
Ross Correctional Institution	3	13
Belmont Correctional Institution	3	2
Mansfield Correctional Institution	3	1
Dayton Correctional Center	3	0
Madison Correctional Institution	3	0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	2	3
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	2	0
North Central Correctional Institution	1	5
Lorain Correctional Institution	1	4
Noble Correctional Institution	1	2
Ohio Reformatory for Women	1	1
Grafton Correctional Institution	1	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	1	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	1	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	2
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	1
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0	1
Allen Correctional Institution	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0
Toledo Correctional Institution	0	0
Totals	**66**	**69**

DRUGS (STAFF)

Institution	# Of Investigations
Pickaway Correctional Institution	8
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	4
Allen Correctional Institution	3
Franklin Pre Release Center	2
Lorain Correctional Institution	2
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	1
Madison Correctional Institution	1
Correctional Reception Center	1
Grafton Correctional Institution	1
Ross Correctional Institution	1
Toledo Correctional Institution	1
Corrections Medical Center	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0
Belmont Correctional Institution	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0
London Correctional Institution	0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0
Noble Correctional Institution	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0
Warren Correctional Institution	0
Total	**25**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF DRUGS (STAFF)

Institution	2003	2004
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1	8
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	1	1
Madison Correctional Institution	1	1
Corrections Medical Center	1	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	1	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	1	0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0	4
Allen Correctional Institution	0	3
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	2
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	2
Correctional Reception Center	0	1
Grafton Correctional Institution	0	1
Ross Correctional Institution	0	1
Toledo Correctional Institution	0	1
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0	0
London Correctional Institution	0	0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	0	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0	0
Noble Correctional Institution	0	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0	0
Warren Correctional Institution	0	0
Totals	**6**	**25**

ASSAULT (INMATE ON INMATE)

Institution	# Of Investigations
Noble Correctional Institution	41
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	21
Southeastern Correctional Institution	21
Madison Correctional Institution	18
Pickaway Correctional Institution	17
Ohio Reformatory for Women	15
Belmont Correctional Institution	15
Ross Correctional Institution	13
Richland Correctional Institution	13
Trumbull Correctional Institution	11
Allen Correctional Institution	11
Warren Correctional Institution	10
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	7
Toledo Correctional Institution	5
Ohio State Penitentiary	5
London Correctional Institution	4
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	4
Marion Correctional Institution	3
Correctional Reception Center	3
Franklin Pre Release Center	2
Hocking Correctional Facility	2
Mansfield Correctional Institution	2
Oakwood Correctional Facility	2
Grafton Correctional Institution	2
Northeast Pre Release Center	2
Lebanon Correctional Institution	2
Dayton Correctional Institution	2
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	1
Corrections Medical Center	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0
Total	**254**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF ASSAULT (INMATE ON INMATE)

Institution	2003	2004
Madison Correctional Institution	29	18
Ohio Reformatory for Women	26	15
Southeastern Correctional Institution	23	21
Noble Correctional Institution	20	41
Pickaway Correctional Institution	20	17
Ross Correctional Institution	17	13
Richland Correctional Institution	14	13
Belmont Correctional Institution	12	15
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	12	4
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	10	21
Warren Correctional Institution	10	10
Trumbull Correctional Institution	9	11
Marion Correctional Institution	9	3
Franklin Pre Release Center	9	2
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	8	7
Allen Correctional Institution	6	11
Lebanon Correctional Institution	4	2
Toledo Correctional Institution	3	5
London Correctional Institution	3	4
Hocking Correctional Facility	3	2
Mansfield Correctional Institution	3	2
Correctional Reception Center	2	3
Oakwood Correctional Facility	2	2
Grafton Correction Institution	1	2
Northeast Pre Release Center	1	2
Corrections Medical Center	1	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	1	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	5
Montgomery Education and Pre Release	0	1
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	2
North Central Correctional Institution	0	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0	0
Totals	**258**	**254**

ASSAULT (INMATE ON STAFF)

Institution	# Of Investigations
Ohio Reformatory for Women	22
Madison Correctional Institution	16
Noble Correctional Institution	14
Lorain Correctional Institution	12
Southeastern Correctional Institution	10
Pickaway Correctional Institution	10
Oakwood Correctional Institution	9
Correctional Reception Center	9
Ohio State Penitentiary	9
Lebanon Correctional Institution	8
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	8
London Correctional Institution	7
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	6
Ross Correctional Institution	6
Toledo Correctional Institution	6
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	5
Belmont Correctional Institution	5
Warren Correctional Institution	5
Grafton Correctional Institution	4
Richland Correctional Institution	4
Allen Correctional Institution	4
Marion Correctional Institution	4
Corrections Medical Center	2
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	2
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1
Franklin Pre Release Center	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0
Total	**188**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF ASSAULT (INMATE ON STAFF)

Institution	2003	2004
Ohio Reformatory for Women	26	22
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	12	8
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	12	6
Pickaway Correctional Institution	11	10
Lebanon Correctional Institution	11	8
Richland Correctional Institution	9	4
Southeastern Correctional Institution	8	10
Madison Correctional Institution	7	16
Noble Correctional Institution	7	14
London Correctional Institution	6	7
Lorain Correctional Institution	5	12
Ross Correctional Institution	5	6
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	5	5
Allen Correctional Institution	4	4
Marion Correctional Institution	4	4
Oakwood Correctional Facility	3	9
Toledo Correctional Institution	2	6
Corrections Medical Center	2	2
Franklin Pre Release Center	2	0
Belmont Correctional Institution	1	5
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	1	2
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1	1
Northeast Pre Release Center	1	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	1	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	9
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	9
Warren Correctional Institution	0	5
Grafton Correctional Institution	0	4
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0	0
Totals	**146**	**188**

SEXUAL ASSAULTS

Institution	# Of Investigations
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	21
Madison Correctional Institution	13
Richland Correctional Institution	10
Correctional Reception Center	9
Lorain Correctional Institution	9
Mansfield Correctional Institution	8
Northeast Pre Release Center	8
Allen Correctional Institution	7
Noble Correctional Institution	7
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	6
Ross Correctional Institution	5
Belmont Correctional Institution	5
North Central Correctional Institution	3
Southeastern Correctional Institution	2
Marion Correctional Institution	2
Grafton Correctional Institution	2
Ohio Reformatory for Women	2
Warren Correctional Institution	2
Lebanon Correctional Institution	1
Corrections Medical Center	1
London Correctional Institution	1
Oakwood Correctional Facility	1
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1
Dayton Correctional Institution	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0
Toledo Correctional Institution	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0
Total	**124**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF SEXUAL ASSAULTS

Institution	2003	2004
Ross Correctional Institution	6	5
Richland Correctional Institution	5	10
Correctional Reception Center	5	9
Ohio Reformatory for Women	5	2
Madison Correctional Institution	4	13
Noble Correctional Institution	3	7
Mansfield Correctional Institution	2	8
Warren Correctional Institution	2	2
Lebanon Correctional Institution	2	1
Northeast Pre Release Center	1	8
Allen Correctional Institution	1	7
Belmont Correctional Institution	1	5
North Central Correctional Institution	1	3
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1	2
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0	21
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	9
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0	6
Marion Correctional Institution	0	2
Corrections Medical Center	0	1
London Correctional Institution	0	1
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	1
Pickaway Correctional Institution	0	1
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0	2
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0	0
Toledo Correctional Institution	0	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0	0
Totals	**39**	**124**

STAFF MISCONDUCT

Institution	# Of Investigations
Ohio Reformatory for Women	37
Pickaway Correctional Institution	20
Madison Correctional Institution	20
Ross Correctional Institution	17
Correctional Reception Center	15
Franklin Pre Release Center	14
Oakwood Correctional Facility	13
Richland Correctional Institution	10
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	8
Toledo Correctional Institution	8
Trumbull Correctional Institution	7
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	6
Belmont Correctional Institution	6
Grafton Correctional Institution	6
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	6
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	5
Lorain Correctional Institution	5
Southeastern Correctional Institution	5
Warren Correctional Institution	4
Noble Correctional Institution	4
Mansfield Correctional Institution	4
Marion Correctional Institution	3
London Correctional Institution	3
Ohio State Penitentiary	3
Northeast Pre Release Center	3
Corrections Medical Center	2
Allen Correctional Institution	1
Lebanon Correctional Institution	1
Hocking Correctional Institution	1
Dayton Correctional Institution	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0
TOTALS	**237**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF STAFF MISCONDUCT

Institution	2003	2004
Ohio Reformatory for Women	40	37
Oakwood Correctional Facility	34	13
Trumbull Correctional Institution	21	7
Correctional Reception Center	14	15
Pickaway Correctional Institution	13	20
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	13	6
Richland Correctional Institution	11	10
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	10	8
Belmont Correctional Institution	10	6
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	10	6
Corrections Medical Center	9	2
Allen Correctional Institution	9	1
Franklin Pre Release Center	8	14
Grafton Correctional Institution	8	6
Ross Correctional Institution	7	17
Toledo Correctional Institution	7	8
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	7	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	5	5
Warren Correctional Institution	5	4
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	4	5
Marion Correctional Institution	4	3
Northeast Pre Release Center	4	3
Lebanon Correctional Institution	4	1
Madison Correctional Institution	3	20
London Correctional Institution	3	3
Hocking Correctional Facility	3	1
Ohio State Penitentiary	2	3
Lorain Correctional Institution	2	5
Noble Correctional Institution	2	4
Dayton Correctional Institution	1	0
North Central Correctional Institution	1	0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	0	4
Totals	**274**	**237**

STAFF/INMATE RELATIONSHIPS

Institution	# Of Investigations
Ohio Reformatory for Women	21
Madison Correctional Institution	16
Lorain Correctional Institution	13
Richland Correctional Institution	12
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	9
Pickaway Correctional Institution	8
Toledo Correctional Institution	7
Franklin Pre Release Center	7
Mansfield Correctional Institution	7
Allen Correctional Institution	6
Hocking Correctional Facility	6
Warren Correctional Institution	6
Corrections Medical Center	5
Oakwood Correctional Facility	5
Grafton Correctional Institution	5
London Correctional Institution	4
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	4
Correctional Reception Center	4
Northeast Pre Release Center	3
Marion Correctional Institution	3
North Central Correctional Institution	3
Southeastern Correctional Institution	3
Trumbull Correctional Institution	3
Ross Correctional Institution	3
Ohio State Penitentiary	3
Noble Correctional Institution	2
Dayton Correctional Institution	2
Lebanon Correctional Institution	2
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	1
Belmont Correctional Institution	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0
TOTAL	**186**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF STAFF/INMATE RELATIONSHIPS

Institution	2003	2004
Ohio Reformatory for Women	37	21
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	22	4
Franklin Pre Release Center	18	7
Madison Correctional Institution	14	16
Pickaway Correctional Institution	13	8
Toledo Correctional Institution	13	7
Northeast Pre Release Center	12	3
Allen Correctional Institution	11	6
Mansfield Correctional Institution	9	7
Southeastern Correctional Institution	9	3
Richland Correctional Institution	8	12
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	8	9
Hocking Correctional Facility	7	6
Oakwood Correctional Facility	5	5
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	5	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	4	5
London Correctional Institution	4	4
Dayton Correctional Institution	4	2
Lorain Correctional Institution	3	13
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	3	11
Correctional Reception Center	3	4
Trumbull Correctional Institution	3	3
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	3	1
Belmont Correctional Institution	3	0
Warren Correctional Institution	2	6
North Central Correctional Institution	2	3
Lebanon Correctional Institution	2	2
Marion Correctional Institution	1	3
Noble Correctional Institution	1	2
Corrections Medical Center	0	5
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	3
Ross Correctional Institution	0	3
Totals	**229**	**186**

'OTHER' INVESTIGATIONS

Institution	# Of Investigations
Ohio State Penitentiary	555
Madison Correctional Institution	430
Trumbull Correctional Institution	315
Noble Correctional Institution	301
Warren Correctional Institution	276
Ross Correctional Institution	264
Corrections Medical Center	259
Belmont Correctional Institution	206
Lorain Correctional Institution	186
Mansfield Correctional Institution	183
Northeast Pre Release Center	121
Pickaway Correctional Institution	112
Southeastern Correctional Institution	83
Franklin Pre Release Center	74
Oakwood Correctional Facility	74
Lebanon Correctional Institution	73
Hocking Correctional Facility	58
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	56
Correctional Reception Center	53
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	47
North Central Correctional Institution	39
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	38
Richland Correctional Institution	37
Ohio Reformatory for Women	29
Allen Correctional Institution	25
Toledo Correctional Institution	18
Marion Correctional Institution	17
London Correctional Institution	17
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	11
Dayton Correctional Institution	2
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0
Total	**3,959**

- The "Other Investigations" category also includes background checks.

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF 'OTHER' INVESTIGATIONS

Institution	2003	2004
Belmont Correctional Institution	436	206
Ohio State Penitentiary	416	555
Noble Correctional Institution	378	301
Corrections Medical Center	314	259
Trumbull Correctional Institution	246	315
Southeastern Correctional Institution	187	83
Mansfield Correctional Institution	157	183
Warren Correctional Institution	124	276
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	119	56
Ohio Reformatory for Women	103	29
Hocking Correctional Facility	96	58
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	92	11
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	57	47
Oakwood Correctional Facility	52	74
Marion Correctional Institution	43	17
Lebanon Correctional Institution	40	73
Lorain Correctional Institution	39	186
Madison Correctional Institution	39	430
Ross Correctional Institution	36	264
Richland Correctional Institution	36	37
Allen Correctional Institution	35	25
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	28	38
Franklin Pre Release Center	26	74
North Central Correctional Institution	26	39
London Correctional Institution	21	17
Toledo Correctional Institution	16	18
Correctional Reception Center	13	53
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	6	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	2	121
Pickaway Correctional Institution	0	112
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	2
Grafton Correctional Institution	0	0
Totals	**3,147**	**3,959**

*The "Other Investigations" category also includes background checks.

APPENDIX E

SEARCHES, SHAKEDOWNS, DRUGS, AND ALCOHOL CONFISCATED

CANINE SEARCHES

Institution	# Of Searches
Lorain Correctional Institution	13
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	13
Belmont Correctional Institution	11
Warren Correctional Institution	8
Grafton Correctional Institution	8
Noble Correctional Institution	8
Ross Correctional Institution	8
Lebanon Correctional Institution	6
London Correctional Institution	6
North Central Correctional Institution	5
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	5
Ohio State Penitentiary	4
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	4
Southeastern Correctional Institution	4
Correctional Reception Center	4
Trumbull Correctional Institution	4
Ohio Reformatory for Women	3
Richland Correctional Institution	3
Toledo Correctional Institution	2
Allen Correctional Institution	2
Marion Correctional Institution	2
Franklin Pre Release Center	1
Madison Correctional Institution	1
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1
Dayton Correctional Institution	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0
Corrections Medical Center	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0
Total	**127**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF INSTITUTIONS BY CANINE SEARCHES

Institutions	2003	2004
Lebanon Correctional Institution	12	6
Lorain Correctional Institution	12	13
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	12	13
Warren Correctional Institution	12	8
Grafton Correctional Institution	11	8
Belmont Correctional Institution	6	11
Noble Correctional Institution	5	8
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	5	4
Allen Correctional Institution	4	2
Dayton Correctional Institution	4	0
London Correctional Institution	4	6
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	4	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	4	4
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	3	0
North Central Correctional Institution	3	5
Toledo Correctional Institution	3	2
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	2	5
Marion Correctional Institution	2	2
Northeast Pre Release Center	2	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	2	4
Hocking Correctional Facility	1	0
Correctional Reception Center	1	4
Madison Correctional Institution	1	1
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1	1
Corrections Medical Center	0	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	1
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0	3
Pickaway Correctional Institution	0	1
Richland Correctional Institution	0	3
Ross Correctional Institution	0	8
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0	4
Total	**116**	**127**

EMPLOYEE STRIP/PATDOWNS

Institution	# Of Strip/Patdowns
North Central Correctional Institution	51
Belmont Correctional Institution	12
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	5
Toledo Correctional Institution	4
Allen Correctional Institution	3
Lorain Correctional Institution	3
Trumbull Correctional Institution	3
Pickaway Correctional Institution	2
Warren Correctional Institution	1
Grafton Correctional Institution	1
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0
London Correctional Institution	0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0
Corrections Medical Center	0
Correctional Reception Center	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0
Madison Correctional Institution	0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0
Noble Correctional Institution	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0
Ross Correctional Institution	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0
Total	**85**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF EMPLOYEE STRIP/PATDOWNS

Institutions	2003	2004
Toledo Correctional Institution	3	4
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	1	5
Lebanon Correctional Institution	1	0
London Correctional Institution	1	0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1	2
Warren Correctional Institution	1	1
Allen Correctional Institution	0	3
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	12
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0	1
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	3
Madison Correctional Institution	0	0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	0	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0	0
Noble Correctional Institution	0	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0	51
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0	0
Ross Correctional Institution	0	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0	3
Total	**8**	**85**

VISITOR STRIP/PATDOWNS

Institution	# Of Strip/Patdowns
Warren Correctional Institution	21
Correctional Reception Center	10
Lebanon Correctional Institution	6
London Correctional Institution	5
Ross Correctional Institution	5
Allen Correctional Institution	4
Mansfield Correctional Institution	4
Toledo Correctional Institution	4
Southeastern Correctional Institution	3
Noble Correctional Institution	3
Lorain Correctional Institution	3
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	3
Richland Correctional Institution	3
Belmont Correctional Institution	2
Grafton Correctional Institution	1
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	1
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1
Trumbull Correctional Institution	1
Dayton Correctional Institution	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0
Corrections Medical Center	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0
Madison Correctional Institution	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0
Total	**80**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF VISITOR STRIP/PATDOWNS

Institutions	2003	2004
Lebanon Correctional Institution	7	6
Warren Correctional Institution	6	21
London Correctional Institution	5	5
Belmont Correctional Institution	4	2
Dayton Correctional Institution	4	0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	4	4
Noble Correctional Institution	3	3
Richland Correctional Institution	3	3
Toledo Correctional Institution	3	4
Southeastern Correctional Institution	2	3
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	2	0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	2	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	2	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	1	3
Correctional Reception Center	1	10
Allen Correctional Institution	0	4
Corrections Medical Center	0	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0	1
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0	3
Madison Correctional Institution	0	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	1
Northeast Pre Release Center	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Institution	0	0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	0	1
Ross Correctional Institution	0	5
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0	1
Total	**49**	**80**

MAJOR SHAKEDOWNS

Institution	# Of Major Shakedowns
Madison Correctional Institution	8
London Correctional Institution	7
Ohio State Penitentiary	5
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	4
Allen Correctional Institution	4
Oakwood Correctional Facility	3
Richland Correctional Institution	3
Grafton Correctional Institution	2
Lorain Correctional Institution	2
Mansfield Correctional Institution	2
Noble Correctional Institution	2
North Central Correctional Institution	2
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	2
Belmont Correctional Institution	1
Corrections Medical Center	1
Franklin Pre Release Center	1
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	1
Toledo Correctional Institution	1
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0
Correctional Reception Center	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0
Ross Correctional Institution	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0
Warren Correctional Institution	0
Total	**52**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF MAJOR SHAKEDOWNS

Institutions	2003	2004
Madison Correctional Institution	8	8
London Correctional Institution	7	7
Ohio State Penitentiary	5	5
Pickaway Correctional Institution	5	1
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	4	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	3	0
Allen Correctional Institution	3	4
Hocking Correctional Facility	3	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	2	0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	2	2
Noble Correctional Institution	2	2
Northeast Pre Release Center	2	0
Corrections Medical Center	1	1
Grafton Correctional Institution	1	2
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	1	4
Lorain Correctional Institution	1	2
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	1	2
Trumbull Correctional Institution	1	0
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	1
Correctional Reception Center	0	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	1
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0	2
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	3
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0	3
Ross Correctional Institution	0	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0	1
Toledo Correctional Institution	0	1
Warren Correctional Institution	0	0
Total	**52**	**52**

MARIJUANA

Institution	Marijuana Confiscated (oz.)
North Central Correctional Institution	23.24
Richland Correctional Institution	13.11
Noble Correctional Institution	13.0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	12.77
Belmont Correctional Institution	10.69
London Correctional Institution	8.76
Pickaway Correctional Institution	8.0
Ross Correctional Institution	2.72
Toledo Correctional Institution	2.25
Marion Correctional Institution	1.57
Grafton Correctional Institution	0.81
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0.80
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0.76
Lorain Correctional Institution	0.64
Correctional Reception Center	0.35
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0.21
Mansfield Correctional Institution	0.05
Madison Correctional Institution	0.04
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	Trace
Ohio State Penitentiary	Trace
Northeast Pre Release Center	Trace
Allen Correctional Institution	0.0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0.0
Warren Correctional Institution	0.0
Corrections Medical Center	0.0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0.0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0.0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0.0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0.0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0.0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0.0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0.0
Total	***99.47 oz.** **6.22 lbs.**

*Data taken from 2004 Chief Inspector Annual Report. Figures should read 99.68 oz. and 6.23 lbs.

** It should also be noted that several institutions also reported the confiscation of marijuana joints and balloons that were not weighed.

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF MARIJUANA CONFISCATED

Institutions	2003	2004
Southeastern Correctional Institution	24.46	0.76
Lebanon Correctional Institution	13.5	0.21
London Correctional Institution	9.5	8.67
Ross Correctional Institution	8.37	2.72
Toledo Correctional Institution	8.04	2.25
Richland Correctional Institution	7.67	13.11
Allen Correctional Institution	6.7	0.0
Noble Correctional Institution	6.0	13.0
North Central Correctional Institution	5.84	23.24
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	3.09	0.80
Pickaway Correctional Institution	2.08	8.0
Belmont Correctional Institution	1.47	10.69
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1.29	0.05
Grafton Correctional Institution	1.25	0.81
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	1.23	12.77
Madison Correctional Institution	1.11	0.04
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0.81	0.0
Correctional Reception Center	0.60	0.35
Marion Correctional Institution	0.26	1.57
Warren Correctional Institution	0.14	0.0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0.05	Trace
Ohio State Penitentiary	0.005	Trace
Corrections Medical Center	0.0	0.0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0.0	0.0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0.0	0.0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0.0	0.64
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0.0	0.0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0.0	0.0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0.0	Trace
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0.0	0.0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0.0	0.0
Total	**103.465 oz. 6.47 lbs.**	***99.47 oz. 6.22 lbs.**

*Data taken from 2004 Chief Inspector Annual Report. Figures should read 99.68 oz. and 6.23 lbs. ** It should also be noted that several institutions also reported the confiscation of marijuana joints and balloons that were not weighed.

CRACK/COCAINE

Institution	Crack/Cocaine Confiscated (Grams)
Ross Correctional Institution	15.44
North Central Correctional Institution	7.6
Pickaway Correctional Institution	3.0
London Correctional Institution	2.0
Noble Correctional Institution	1.0+
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1.0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	1.0
Richland Correctional Institution	0.901
Lorain Correctional Institution	0.56
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0.4
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	Trace
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	Trace
Warren Correctional Institution	0.0
Toledo Correctional Institution	0.0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0.0
Belmont Correctional Institution	0.0
Allen Correctional Institution	0.0
Correctional Reception Center	0.0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0.0
Corrections Medical Center	0.0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0.0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0.0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0.0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0.0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0.0
Madison Correctional Institution	0.0
Marion Correctional Institution	0.0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0.0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0.0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0.0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0.0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0.0
Total	**32.901 g.** **1.16 oz.**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF CRACK/COCAINE CONFISCATED

Institutions	**2003**	**2004**
Warren Correctional Institution	44.4	0.0
Toledo Correctional Institution	19.55	0.0
Ross Correctional Institution	12.07	15.44
Richland Correctional Institution	6.45	0.901
Trumbull Correctional Institution	5.0	0.0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	3.0	3.0
London Correctional Institution	1.1	2.0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1.0	1.0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	1.0	1.0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0.6	Trace
Grafton Correctional Institution	0.10	0.0
Noble Correctional Institution	5 rocks	1.0+
Belmont Correctional Institution	3 rocks	0.0
Allen Correctional Institution	Trace	0.0
Correctional Reception Center	Trace	0.0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	Trace	Trace
Corrections Medical Center	0.0	0.0
North Central Correctional Institution	0	7.6
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0.0	0.0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0.0	0.0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0.0	0.56
Madison Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Marion Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0.0	0.0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0.0	0.4
Northeast Pre Release Center	0.0	0.0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0.0	0.0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0.0	0.0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0.0	0.0
Total	**95.1 g. 3.35 oz.**	**32.901g 1.16 oz.**

HEROIN

Institution	Heroin Confiscated (Grams)
Mansfield Correctional Institution	8.5
Ross Correctional Institution	8.5
Richland Correctional Institution	8.5
London Correctional Institution	3.0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	2.0
Toledo Correctional Institution	1.6
Marion Correctional Institution	1.1
Noble Correctional Institution	1 packet
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	Trace
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0.0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0.0
Allen Correctional Institution	0.0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0.0
Belmont Correctional Institution	0.0
Corrections Medical Center	0.0
Correctional Reception Center	0.0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0.0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0.0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0.0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0.0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0.0
Madison Correctional Institution	0.0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0.0
North Central Correctional Institution	0.0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0.0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0.0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0.0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0.0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0.0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0.0
Warren Correctional Institution	0.0
Total	**33.2 g.** **1.17 oz.**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF HEROIN CONFISCATED

Institutions	2003	2004
Mansfield Correctional Institution	8.5	8.5
Trumbull Correctional Institution	8.0	0.0
London Correctional Institution	5.9	3.0
Toledo Correctional Institution	4.97	1.6
Ross Correctional Institution	4.0	8.5
Richland Correctional Institution	3.2	8.5
Lebanon Correctional Institution	2.0	2.0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	1.0	0.0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0.3	0.0
Allen Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Belmont Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Corrections Medical Center	0.0	0.0
Correctional Reception Center	0.0	0.0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0.0	0.0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0.0	0.0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Madison Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Marion Correctional Institution	0.0	1.1
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0.0	0.0
Noble Correctional Institution	0.0	1 packet
North Central Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0.0	0.0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0.0	0.0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0.0	0.0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0.0	0.0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0.0	0.0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0.0	Trace
Warren Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Total	**37.87 g. 1.34**	**33.2 g. 1.17 oz.**

ILLICIT PILLS

Institution	Illicit Pills Confiscated
Ross Correctional Institution	349
Noble Correctional Institution	76
Richland Correctional Institution	6
Correctional Reception Center	5
London Correctional Institution	5
Marion Correctional Institution	4
Belmont Correctional Institution	2
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0
Allen Correctional Institution	0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0
Corrections Medical Center	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0
Madison Correctional Institution	0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0
Oakwood Correctional Institution	0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0
Toledo Correctional Institution	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0
Warren Correctional Institution	0
Total	**447**

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF ILLICIT PILLS CONFISCATED

Institutions	2003	2004
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	152	0
Ross Correctional Institution	137	349
Grafton Correctional Institution	128	0
Allen Correctional Institution	60	0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	23	0
Correctional Reception Center	22	5
Pickaway Correctional Institution	15	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	10	0
London Correctional Institution	7	5
Corrections Medical Center	6	0
Belmont Correctional Institution	3	2
Noble Correctional Institution	2	76
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	0
Madison Correctional Institution	0	0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	0	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0	4
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0	6
Toledo Correctional Institution	0	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0	0
Warren Correctional Institution	0	0
Total	**565**	**447**

HOOCH

Institution	Hooch Confiscated (Gallons)
Noble Correctional Institution	243.0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	224.0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	126.0
North Central Correctional Institution	82.34
Richland Correctional Institution	55.0
Belmont Correctional Institution	38.3
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	8.5
Southeastern Correctional Institution	6.0
Marion Correctional Institution	1.75
Allen Correctional Institution	0.0
Corrections Medical Center	0.0
Correctional Reception Center	0.0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0.0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0.0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0.0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0.0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0.0
London Correctional Institution	0.0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0.0
Madison Correctional Institution	0.0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0.0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0.0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0.0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0.0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0.0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0.0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	0.0
Ross Correctional Institution	0.0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0.0
Toledo Correctional Institution	0.0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0.0
Warren Correctional Institution	0.0
Total	**784.86****

- The confiscation and destruction of hooch varies across institutions and may have not included investigator involvement. As such, a zero may only indicate that the investigator did not have any involvement in the confiscation and destruction.
- ** Statistics taken from the 2004 Annual Chief Inspector Report. Figure should read 784.89.

2003/2004 COMPARISON OF HOOCH CONFISCATED

Institution	2003	2004
Mansfield Correctional Institution	224.0	224.0
Noble Correctional Institution	150.0	243.0
Richland Correctional Institution	113.3	55.0
North Central Correctional Institution	92.5	82.34
Southeastern Correctional Institution	58.5	6.0
Warren Correctional Institution	34.0	0.0
Belmont Correctional Institution	32.3	38.3
Trumbull Correctional Institution	30.0	0.0
Marion Correctional Institution	22.5	1.75
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	16.5	8.5
Allen Correctional Institution	10.0	0.0
Toledo Correctional Institution	8.0	0.0
Ross Correctional Institution	1 bottle vodka	0.0
Corrections Medical Center	0.0	0.0
Correctional Reception Center	0.0	0.0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0.0	0.0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0.0	0.0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0.0	126.0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
London Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Madison Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0.0	0.0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0.0	0.0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0.0	0.0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0.0	0.0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0.0	0.0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0.0	0.0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	0.0	0.0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0.0	0.0
Total	**791.6**	**784.86****

* The confiscation and destruction of hooch varies across institutions and may have not included investigator involvement. As such, a zero may only indicate that the investigator did not have any involvement in the confiscation and destruction.

** Statistics taken from the 2004 Annual Chief Inspector Report. Figure should read 784.89.