

2008 Innovations Awards Program APPLICATION

CSG reserves the right to use or publish in other CSG products and services the information provided in this Innovations Awards Program Application. If your agency objects to this policy, please advise us in a separate attachment to your program's application.

ID # (assigned by CSG): 08-M-28OH

Please provide the following information, adding space as necessary:

State: Ohio

Assign Program Category (applicant): Public Safety - Corrections

1. Program Name – Vulnerability Analysis
2. Administering Agency - Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction
3. Contact Person (Name and Title) – Richard Hall, Regional Security Administrator
4. Address -1050 Freeway Drive North, Columbus, Ohio, 43229
5. Telephone Number – (614) 728-1914
6. FAX Number – (614) 644-8880
7. E-mail Address – richard.hall@odrc.state.oh.us
8. Web site Address - www.drc.state.oh.us
9. Please provide a two-sentence description of the program.
Vulnerability Analysis is an objective, performance based method of analyzing the physical protection system of a correctional facility to primarily prevent escapes. The process identifies vulnerable areas of the facility's physical layout as well as the operational procedures involving staff duties.
10. How long has this program been operational (month and year)? Started in January, 2006.
11. Why was the program created? What problem[s] or issue[s] was it designed to address?
Preventing escapes is the number one priority of any correctional facility. Typically our response is reactive. After an inmate escapes we ensure that it will not happen again in that manner. We did not have a method to identify these escape pathways in advance.
12. Describe the specific activities and operations of the program in chronological order.
A team of ten to twenty (depending on the size and complexity of the facility) experienced staff from outside the facility, consisting of persons with experience in security, maintenance and electronic technology is selected to conduct the analysis. The team spends an entire week observing, testing and challenging the facility's ability to prevent escapes. Only objective, quantifiable data is used in the analysis. The resulting report provides quantified estimates of an inmate escaping using identified pathways. The report also generates, objective observations of vulnerabilities and recommendations on how to mitigate the vulnerabilities.
13. Why is the program a new and creative approach or method?
The process is proactive. It seeks to prevent escapes. Once there is an escape the damage is done. Mitigating escape pathways after the escape is far less desirable than before an escape can happen.
14. What were the program's start-up costs? (Provide details about specific purchases for this program, staffing needs and other financial expenditures, as well as existing materials, technology and staff already in place.)
The only start up costs is training for a core group of staff. This training was provided to Ohio free of charge by the National Institute of Corrections. Four trainers conducted the training at an

Ohio correctional facility. Ohio has since conducted this training for other state correctional agencies for less than \$5,000.00 per session. The training material costs consist of a photocopied manual for each participant at less than \$600.00 dollars per average class size. The cost to allow trainees to participate is difficult to estimate. Hotel and per diem expenses would be less than \$8,000.00 per average class.

15. What are the program's annual operational costs?

Ohio conducts six analyses per year for a total cost of approximately \$30,000.00.

16. How is the program funded?

The program is funded through general operation funds.

17. Did this program require the passage of legislation, executive order or regulations? - No

18. What equipment, technology and software are used to operate and administer this program?

Existing laptop computers with Microsoft Office software, digital cameras and intrusion system testing equipment

19. To the best of your knowledge, did this program originate in your state? No

20. Are you aware of similar programs in other states?

The Pennsylvania Department of Corrections developed the initial program in conjunction with Sandia National Laboratories through a federally funded project. Colorado and Texas also have used this process. Ohio has trained the Iowa and Indiana departments of corrections in the process. Ohio has altered the program to suit its unique operational characteristics. The core process is unchanged.

21. Has the program been fully implemented? Yes

22. Briefly evaluate (pro and con) the program's effectiveness in addressing the defined problem[s] or issue[s]. Provide tangible examples.

The program has been very effective. Ohio's prisons have increased operational security significantly. Additionally, staff in all facilities has been trained in how to apply the core process used in with this procedure which allows and better security in day to day operations. Numerous examples of vulnerabilities have been identified at one facility that also exists in other facilities of similar design and construction. These vulnerabilities and the methods to mitigate them are distributed to the other faculties via email, training and meetings. There really are no cons to this initiative other than the small cost. Because facility staff observes their protection system actually being defeated in front of their eyes, there is tremendous buy-in from facility staff. They take the results very seriously and quickly move to mitigate problems.

An example of the process working comes from inmate ID cards. At one Vulnerability Analysis the identified that the picture on an inmate ID card was the same size and background color as staff ID card pictures. The team was able to successfully cut out an inmate picture, paste it on a stolen staff ID card and use this ID card to successfully escape through the front entrance of the high security facility. The department immediately moved to replace over 47,000 inmate ID cards with cards that were different in size, background color and configuration.

Another good example involves pad locks. A team discovered in the first vulnerability analysis we conducted, that the padlocks that we were using to secure doors and gates could easily be broken or opened. This discovery inspired a program of actually testing all the kinds of padlocks in use to determine if they could easily be beaten or pried open with materials available to inmates. The test findings resulted in numerous padlocks being replaced throughout the department.

23. How has the program grown and/or changed since its inception?

The program has grown through the experience of staff involved in the process. The knowledge base has increased tremendously, allowing team members to identify vulnerabilities more quickly and effectively. The process becomes more effective and efficient with each additional facility

analyzed. With the use of computer, email, digital cameras and videotaping we are able to develop archives of demonstrated vulnerabilities that can be used by practitioners in the future.

24. What limitations or obstacles might other states expect to encounter if they attempt to adopt this program?

One obstacle involves this being a new technology. Traditionally correctional facilities use a system of audits and inspections to check security. This system is neither creative, adaptive nor flexible. It forces the same eyes to look in the same places time after time. Vulnerability Analysis breaks this mold. It is sometimes difficult to get staff that has a lot of experience with the old system to adopt the new way of looking at things. It takes commitment and determination on the part of the team leaders to train, coach and encourage all team members to adopt and use the new approach. If the team leaders are not carefully selected and allowed to participate in the process in other states they may not be able to accomplish this goal.