COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

312 SOUTH HILL STREET, THIRD FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90013
(213) 974-6100
http://oig.lacounty.gov

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

ERIC BATES
INTERIM INSPECTOR GENERAL

November 13, 2026

TO: Michael P. Dempsey
Monitor for California Department of Justice

FROM: Eric Bates
Interim Inspector General

SUBJECT: Monthly Report for July 2026 on Internal Affairs Bureau Investigations, Closed-Circuit Television Review, and Searches at Barry J. Nidorf and Los Padrinos Juvenile Halls

This monthly report reviewing the Los Angeles County Probation Department's (Probation Department) compliance with the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) investigations, closed-circuit television review, and search mandates outlined in the Order Amending Stipulated Judgment (Amended Order) for the Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall (BJNJH) and the Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall (LPJH) covers the month of July 2026.

Review of IAB Cases

The Amended Order in paragraph 18 requires the Office of Inspector General to report the number of new IAB referrals, open cases, and results of investigations conducted by the Probation Department. The Probation Department provided documentation to the Office of Inspector General indicating the following:

Summary of Amended Order Compliance

July 2026

Referrals[1]	Opened Cases[2]	Results of Completed Investigations
30	13	▪ 3 investigations were *Sustained (2 criminal and 1 administrative)* ▪ 1 investigation was *Not Sustained (0 criminal and 1 administrative)* ▪ 0 investigations were *Unfounded* ▪ 2 *Bureau Determination*[3] (95 total number of current open cases - *75 administrative, 20 criminal*).

The Office of Inspector General did not review the underlying facts of the investigations to form an opinion as to whether the results were appropriate, or if the investigations were conducted properly.

Closed-Circuit Television

The Amended Order (paragraph 20) requires that the Office of Inspector General randomly select two days per month to determine the Probation Department's compliance with the Department's Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) review protocol. The Office of Inspector General is to review documentation and video recordings of use-of-force incidents and assess whether (1) the incident violates Department policies, the Amended Order or state law, (2) the incident has been properly identified and elevated to the appropriate Department staff and (3) the video recording was tampered with. Substantial compliance requires verification by the Office of Inspector General that the Department is compliant with its CCTV review protocol.[4] The Office of Inspector General reviewed CCTV video recordings to assess proper documentation of

[1] New cases referred to IAB for consideration for investigation.

[2] Cases opened for investigation by IAB during the month of July 2026.

[3] These two cases represent cases completed by Probation Department contract investigators, who do not make findings or recommendations. Upon completion, these cases are returned to the Performance Management Unit for determination of findings by the Bureau Senior Director.

[4] The Amended Order does not provide a numerical value for determining compliance.

use-of-force incidents as well as the identification by Department staff of possible violations of law, judgment, or policy, and the proper elevation of such incidents for review. The Office of Inspector General also reviewed CCTV logs and monitored Department compliance with its CCTV protocols.

Methodology

The Office of Inspector General constructed a sample of two days of CCTV video recordings relating to use-of-force incidents at BJNJH and LPJH for the month of July 2026. Office of Inspector General staff reviewed Physical Incident Reports (PIR), Safe Crisis Management Incident Reviews (SCM), as well as available CCTV video recordings. The Amended Order requires monthly verification by the Office of Inspector General that the Probation Department properly identifies and elevates use-of-force incidents that are not in compliance with its policies, the original stipulated judgment, or state law.

July 2026 – Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall

Case Summary 1

A youth was resistant and combative during an officer escort from a school classroom to a living unit. [5] Three Deputy Probation Officers (DPOs) attempted to escort youth into his room, but the youth did not comply and reportedly dropped his weight to the floor and became aggressive towards the DPOs. The DPOs restrained the youth's legs and placed him inside his room. The youth was medically evaluated within the required timeframe. [6] CCTV video for this incident was available.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
NO	N/A	NO

[5] SCM LPJH 2026-2573.

[6] DSB Section 1008 (C) provides: "Any youth involved in a physical intervention incident in DSB facilities shall be referred to medical staff for assessment no later than thirty (30) minutes following containment of the occurrence."

Case Summary 2

Two youths failed to comply with verbal commands to cease defiant, out-of-control behavior while in the school classroom.[7] A DPO intervened and confronted Youth 1 and a second DPO (DPO 2) placed Youth 2 in a seated position on the floor and then handcuffed Youth 2. Both youths were escorted to their rooms. Youth 1 was medically assessed 50 minutes, and Youth 2 was medically assessed one hour and 31 minutes beyond the required timeframe. CCTV video for this incident was available.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES ▪ Youths were not medically assessed in a timely manner.[8] ▪ Child Safety Assessments were not completed in a timely manner.[9]	NO ▪ The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.	NO

July 2026 – Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall

Case Summary 1

A youth was involved in a physical altercation with a representative from a community-based organization[10] Three DPOs secured the youth and physically escorted him to the opposite side of the living unit. During the restraint, a DPO secured youth's arms and a

[7] SCM LPJH 2026-2672.

[8] DSB Section 1008 (C) provides: "Any youth involved in a physical intervention incident in DSB facilities shall be referred to medical staff for assessment no later than thirty (30) minutes following containment of the occurrence." The Probation Department indicated that the delay in medical assessment was due to the occurrence of multiple incidents.

[9] DSB Section 1008 (B) provides: "Upon being notified that a physical intervention incident has occurred, the duty supervisor shall immediately conduct a Child Safety Assessment (CSA) involved in the incident . . . The CSA shall be completed within *one hour* of being notified." (Emphasis added.)

[10] SCM BJNJH 2026-1048.

second DPO had his arm around the youth's neck and ultimately placed the youth in a seated position on the ground.[11] The youth was medically assessed two hours and 52 minutes beyond the required timeframe. CCTV video for this incident was available.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES ▪ Youth was not medically assessed in a timely manner. ▪ The Physical Intervention Packet was incomplete.	NO ▪ The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.	NO

Case Summary 2

A youth failed to comply with instructions to return to his room.[12] A DPO (DPO 1) intervened and touched the youth on his shoulder attempting to get the youth to comply with DPO1's direction. The youth resisted and DPO 1 deployed Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) spray and placed the youth on the floor with the assistance of three additional DPOs. The youth was then handcuffed. The youth was properly decontaminated but was not medically assessed within the required timeframe. CCTV video for this incident was available.

[11] The Probation Department indicated extensive review of this incident at its Use of Force Meeting at BJNJH. All three DPOs were ordered to undergo remedial use-of-force training.

[12] SCM BJNJH 2026-1134.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES ▪ Child Safety Assessment was not completed in a timely manner. ▪ Youth medical assessment was not completed. ▪ Failure by Director to complete a SCM review report.	UNKNOWN[13]	NO

Search Logs

The Amended Order Detailed Plan in paragraph 25 requires the Office of Inspector General to review a randomly selected representative sample of searches conducted by the Probation Department to determine the Department's compliance with its search policies and state law and that searches were accurately documented. The Amended Order mandates that the Department follow its policies and state law in 90% of all searches. The Department's policy requires a *minimum* of *two* random searches of youths' rooms on the living unit during the morning and evening work shifts. (Required Searches).[14]

[13] SCM was not completed by Director as required by Probation Department policy.

[14] Detention Services Bureau (DSB) Manual 700, Section 715 and Secure Youth Treatment Facility Manual 700, Section 715 provides: Staff shall search youths' rooms daily. At the minimum, two (2) random room searches shall be conducted per each AM and PM shift. Searches should be scheduled in a manner that does not create a pattern for the youth to predict such searches. During the search, if any weapons or contraband are found, staff shall complete a Special Incident Report (SIR) and follow the procedures per the Crime Scene Evidence Preservation/Evidence Handling policy.

Based on this policy, there should be a total of four searches per living unit each day. In addition, the Department conducts body scans of youths in its interdiction efforts.[15]

For this reporting period, the Office of Inspector General included Campus Vernon Kilpatrick (CVK) in its continued review of the Probation Department's compliance with its search policies and state law, and accurate documentation of searches. The Residential Treatment Services Bureau (RTSB) policy, to which CVK is subject, requires a daily search of youths' room or camp dorm area; including bed area, sheets, blankets, desks, any personal items that are in the room, door jams, windows and light fixtures.[16] Per Department policy, these searches should be completed on each shift, and also include all areas that youth have access to (Required Searches). Based on this policy, there should be *two* total searches per living unit per day.

Methodology

The Office of Inspector General requested documentation relating to all searches conducted for all living units in both work shifts for the month of July 2026. In response, the Probation Department provided search logs for 971 work shifts at BJNJH, 1125 at LPJH and 536 shifts at CVK for July 2026.[17]

The Office of Inspector General randomly selected and reviewed four days of living unit searches conducted by Probation Department staff during the morning and evening shifts across all units at BJNJH, LPJH and CVK.[18]

---

[15] Directive 1519 provides: Staff members conducting the body-scan and those within sight of the visual display shall be of the same sex as the youth being scanned or adhere to the youth's stated gender search preference as indicated on the Unit Classification form (Penal Code § 4030; 15 CCR 1360). The body scanner viewing monitors shall not be in direct view of other youth.

[16] RTSB 1316 Searches in Detention Facilities.

[17] The daily searches reviewed were conducted in all 20 units at BJNJH (BJNJH reduced the total number of living units to 16, effective July 8, 2026) and all 18 units at LPJH. In addition to daily unit searches by unit staff, there are also occasional searches by Special Enforcement Operations (SEO) officers or unit staff, typically based on suspicion(s) and/or observed activities reported by unit staff. At BJNJH, SEO or unit staff conducted one such search in July 2026, no such searches were conducted at LPJH.

[18] The four days reviewed were July 1, 2026, July 5, 2026, July 13, 2026, and July 30, 2026. In constructing the samples described in this report, the Office of Inspector General followed current government audit standards to obtain a statistically valid sample and used a research randomizer to select incidents.
(Off. of the Comptroller of the United States, U.S. Accountability Office (2018), https://www.gao.gov/yellowbook.)

The Office of Inspector General determined compliance primarily based on information provided in the Department's search logs.

Findings

Unit Searches

The Office of Inspector General found an 86% compliance rate at BJNJH and 88% at LPJH, meaning both facilities are not in compliance with the Amended Order. In addition, the Office of Inspector General found a 75% compliance rate at CVK and also not in compliance with the Amended Order.

Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall

Of the sampled four days of unit searches at BJNJH in July 2026, the Probation Department conducted searches per unit as follows:

70 Sampled Living Unit Searches
4 searches per unit – 60 times; 86% of the sampled living units.
3 searches per unit -1 time; 1% of the sampled living units.
2 search per unit – 5 times; 7% of the sampled living units.
1 search per unit – 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.
0 *searches per unit*- 4 times; 6% of the sampled living units.

The Office of Inspector General's review found that at BJNJH, the Probation Department conducted two searches per shift (four searches per day), as required by its policy in 86% of the sampled living units and is therefore out of compliance with the Amended Order.

Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall

As noted above, the Probation Department policies require each living unit to be searched twice during the morning and evening shifts, for a total of four (4) searches per day. Of the sampled searches at LPJH in July 2026, the Department conducted searches per living unit as follows:

72 Sampled Living Unit Searches
4 searches per unit – 63 times; 88% of the sampled living units.
3 searches per unit – 1 time; 1% of the sampled living units.
2 searches per unit – 6 times; 8% of the sampled living units.
1 search per unit – 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.
0 searches per unit – 2 times; 3% of the sampled living units.

The Office of Inspector General's review found that at LPJH the Probation Department conducted two searches per shift (four searches per day), as required by its policy in 88% of the sampled living units and is therefore out of compliance with the Amended Order.

Campus Vernon Kilpatrick

Of the sampled four (4) days of living unit searches at CVK in July 2026, the Probation Department conducted searches per unit as follows:

40 Sampled Living Unit Searches
2 searches per unit – 30 times; 75% of the sampled living units.
1 search per unit – 7 times[19]; 18% of the sampled living units.
0 *searches per unit*- 3 times; 7% of the sampled living units.

The Office of Inspector General's review found that at CVK, the Probation Department conducted one search per shift (two searches per day), as required by its policy in 75% of the sampled living units and is therefore out of compliance with the Amended Order.

Body-Scan Searches

The Office of Inspector General requested documentation relating to all body-scan searches conducted in July 2026. Based on documentation provided, the Probation Department conducted 169 body scans at BJNJH and 880 at LPJH. The Office of Inspector General selected and reviewed a representative sample of searches for July 2026: 19 for BJNJH and 118 for LPJH.

The Probation Department is required to document each body scan in its electronic Probation Case Management System (PCMS). In addition, each body-scan search is required to be conducted by a Department staff member of the same sex/gender as the youth being searched.[20]

For BJNJH, based on the Office of Inspector General's review of PCMS records and body-scan documentation, the Probation Department entered body-scan information into PCMS in 16 of the 19 (84%) body scans conducted. In addition, the Department conducted appropriate same sex/gender body scans in 19 of the 19 (100%) of the body

[19] Documentation provided by the Department that failed to clearly identify an AM or PM search, or where the Office of Inspector General could not determine an AM or PM shift were calculated as "0"; indicating no search was conducted.

[20] Directive 1519 provides: Each youth's scan records shall be included in their file and PCMS to prevent exceeding annual scan limits upon transfer within juvenile facilities. Staff members conducting the body scan and those within sight of the visual display shall be of the same sex as the youth being scanned or adhere to the youth's stated gender search preference as indicated on the Unit Classification form (Penal Code § 4030; 15 CCR 1360). The body scanner viewing monitors shall not be in direct view of other youth.

scans conducted on the youths. BJNJH is in compliance with the Amended Order regarding conducting same sex/gender body scans but out of compliance with properly entering body-scan information into PCMS.[21]

For LPJH, based on the Office of Inspector General's review of PCMS records and body-scan documentation, the Probation Department entered body-scan information into PCMS in 111 of the 118 (94%) sampled searches conducted. The Department conducted required same sex/gender body scans in 116 of the 118 (98%) of the body scans conducted on the youths. LPJH is in compliance with the Amended Order regarding conducting same sex/gender body scans of youths and properly entering body-scan information into PCMS.[22]

For CVK, the Probation Department did not provide documentation for body scan searches conducted, stating that there is no body scan unit at CVK and such searches are not applicable at the facility at this time.[23] The Department stated that it is not required to perform body scans but rather utilize the body scan units whenever it's reasonably practicable in place of a pat down search, strip search or body cavity search. Directive 1519, the Department's body scan policy, provides:

> "Body Scanning may be used at intake, after visiting, and other circumstances that can jeopardize the safety and security of the youth while respecting their dignity and rights. The following requirements shall apply to the use of the Body Scanner: All youth, except those suspected or confirmed to be pregnant, shall undergo a body scan during the intake process. . . Youth returning from any transportation outside the facility shall be scanned upon return to the facility prior to transfer to housing unit or being integrated with other youth."

---

[21] The Office of Inspector General also noted that 100% of the body scans were conducted by Probation Department staff with certification for conducting body scans.

[22] Directive 1519 requires all staff members to complete comprehensive training prior to the operation of the body scanners. This comprehensive training includes a two-hour course which addresses system operations, fundamental safety protocols and radiation safety, as well as hands-on training in scanning and camera operation. After certification, staff are also required to complete annual refresher training. The Office of Inspector General noted that only 55% of the body scans were conducted by Probation Department staff with certification for conducting body scans.

[23] The Probation Department reports that it is not required to have a body scan unit at CVK and if there is a need to conduct a body scan, the youth would be transferred to BJNJH or LPJH.

The Probation Department's policy is unclear whether the Department is required to perform body scans at all facilities. The Department's body scan policy does not contain language specifically excluding any Residential Treatment Services Bureau (RTSB) facility or camp from conducting such searches. Additionally, the Office of Inspector General did not identify any Department policies that exclude, prohibit, or absolve any RTSB facility or camp from conducting body scan searches. The Office of Inspector General has determined that implementing that body scan searches at CVK is appropriate given that youth girls and gender expansive youth are now housed at the facility. Accordingly, the Office of Inspector General recommends that a body scan unit be deployed at CVK and all youth returning to the facility be subjected to body scan screening in accordance with Department policy.

Because a body scanner is not being used at CVK, the Office of Inspector General could not review body scanning documentation to determine compliance with its body scanner policy nor determine its compliance with the Amended Order in this area.[24]

Conclusion

The Office of Inspector General continues to recommend that the Probation Department: (1) continue to properly review CCTV video recordings for misconduct involving uses of force and investigating and determining whether staff engaged in misconduct, (2) continue to conduct living unit searches as required by policy, (3) continue to enter body-scan information into the PCMS system, (4) continue to ensure that body-scan searches are always conducted by a staff member of the same gender as the youth searched or the stated gender search preference of the youth, (5) ensure that medical assessments are conducted in a timely manner, and (6) implement body scan searches at CVK.

c: Guillermo Viera Rosa, Chief Probation Officer
Joseph M. Nicchitta, Chief Executive Officer
Edward Yen, Executive Officer
Dawyn R. Harrison, County Counsel
Wendelyn Julien, Executive Director, Probation Oversight Commission

[24] The Probation Department reported that it has not discovered any contraband at CVK and therefore, there was no need to log any relevant search information but will do so if contraband is found in the future. With respect to the body scanner policy, the Probation Department reported the policy was only intended to apply to those facilities with a body scanner and the requirements section of the policy therefore only applies when a facility uses a body scanner. However, the Department has reported that it has obtained an estimated cost for a body scanner and is in the process of purchasing it in the next fiscal year for the facility.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
PROBATION DEPARTMENT

9150 EAST IMPERIAL HIGHWAY – DOWNEY, CALIFORNIA 90242
(562) 940-2501

Guillermo Viera Rosa

TO: Eric Bates, Interim Inspector General
Office of Inspector General

FROM: Aaron Broom
Compliance Officer, Probation

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO MONTHLY REPORT FOR JULY 2026 ON INTERNAL AFFAIRS BUREAU INVESTIGATIONS, CLOSED-CIRCUIT TELEVISION REVIEW, AND SEARCHES AT BARRY J. NIDORF, LOS PADRINOS AND CAMPUS VERNON KILPATRICK JUVENILE HALLS

The Probation Department Compliance Division submits this formal response to the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) Monthly Report for July 2026 on behalf of its operational leadership. The response reflects the Department's review and assessment of the matters identified by the OIG, including relevant operational considerations, actions taken, and measures underway to address identified deficiencies and areas of concern. The Department remains committed to ensuring accountability and achieving sustained compliance with applicable legal, regulatory, and policy requirements. The Chief Executive Office's Probation Compliance Office (CEO PCO) has assisted in coordinating the development of this response with the appropriate operational stakeholders to ensure the Department's position is accurately and comprehensively represented. The comments below on the validation draft received by the Department reflect feedback from Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall (LPJH), Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall (BJNJH), Campus Vernon Kilpatrick (CVK) and the Department's Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB).

Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) Review

- Based on IAB's review of the LPJH and BJNJH case summaries and assessments in the validation draft, the Department concurs with the OIG's findings, with the exception of Safe Crisis Management (SCM) BJNJH 2026-1134. The

Department agrees that SCM LPJH 2026-2573, SCM LPJH 2026-2672 and SCM BJNJH 2026-1048 were accurately summarized and assessed.

- SCM BJNJH 2026-1134 was listed in error due to a duplicate entry in the Probation Case Management System (PCMS). The correct case number is SCM BJNJH 2026-1132, for which an SCM Review was completed.

- Although the youth's medical assessment for SCM BJNJH 2026-1132 was not documented in the medical records system, it was verified that the youth was escorted to the Medical Unit.

Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) Review – Facility Comments

Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall (LPJH)

- Regarding SCM LPJH 2026-2672, in which the OIG found that the medical assessments and Child Safety Assessments (CSA) were not completed in a timely manner, LPJH issued a memorandum on July 30, 2026, clarifying expectations and establishing reasonable timeframes for youth to receive medical assessments following use-of-force incidents. The guidance recognizes the operational considerations involved in safely securing youth, coordinating medical personnel and ensuring assessments are completed without unnecessary delay.

- LPJH will reinforce compliance with the July 30, 2026, memorandum. Directors will continue to reinforce the timely completion and documentation of CSAs and ensure supervisor accountability through direct oversight and incident reviews, and unit Directors will continue to monitor for delays and address deficiencies through corrective action when warranted.

Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall (BJNJH)

- Regarding SCM BJNJH 2026-1048, the incident occurred on a pre-disposition unit operating under Detention Services Bureau (DSB) manuals, and the applicable medical policy was not updated until August 6, 2026. The Department therefore agrees that the medical assessment was late without justification under the policy in effect at the time. The policy has since been updated and no longer contains the 30-minute response requirement.

- With respect to the incomplete Physical Intervention Packet for this incident, the CSA submissions were also late without justification, and the required debriefing and explanations for the delays were never received. Follow-up emails were sent; however, no response was received because the emails had been directed to a Director who was out of the office. BJNJH has since resolved the identified issues by implementing a new form and tracking process to improve accountability, timeliness and follow-up.

- Regarding SCM BJNJH 2026-1132 (listed in the report as SCM BJNJH 2026-1134), two officers initially completed supplemental Physical Incident Reports (PIR) and were instructed to complete the required PIRs, which they did.

Search Logs – Required Unit Searches

Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall (LPJH)

- LPJH acknowledges the OIG's finding that required searches were conducted in 63 of 72 sampled living units (88 percent). To address the deficiencies, shift supervisors will verify that all required searches are completed and documented before the end of each shift and immediately report any missed searches to the Director on Duty; supervisors will continue to meet daily with the compliance team to identify and address missed searches; officers who fail to complete or document required searches will receive corrective counseling, retraining or progressive discipline when warranted; and LPJH management will conduct periodic audits of unit search records to evaluate compliance, identify recurring deficiencies and implement additional corrective measures as necessary.

Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall (BJNJH)

- The OIG found that BJNJH conducted required searches in 60 of 70 sampled living units (86 percent). Phase 1 search documentation for July 29 through 31, 2026, was not uploaded due to human error, so the documentation for July 30, one of the sampled days, was unavailable for the OIG's review. The documentation has since been uploaded.

- In addition, during the review period Unit D housed only one youth. Staff searched the youth's room but did not search a second area, such as the laundry room, utility room or pantry, and therefore fell below the requirement to search a minimum of two rooms.

Campus Vernon Kilpatrick (CVK)

- The OIG found that CVK conducted required searches in 30 of 40 sampled living units (75 percent). The CVK Administrative Supervising Deputy Probation Officer will audit July's searches, identify staff who did not complete the required searches and refer that information to the Assistant Directors for accountability follow-up with unit supervisors and staff.

- Consistent with our responses to the OIG's prior reports, a court has not yet determined whether CVK falls under the settlement agreement with the DOJ and, if so, whether the agreement applies to the entire facility or only to those areas housing pre-disposition youth.

Body-Scan Searches

The OIG found LPJH in compliance with entering body-scan information into PCMS (94 percent) and conducting same sex/gender body scans (98 percent), and BJNJH in compliance with conducting same sex/gender body scans (100 percent).

Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall (BJNJH)

- The OIG found that BJNJH entered body-scan information into PCMS for 16 of 19 sampled scans (84 percent). On June 24, 2026, BJNJH sent an email outlining documentation expectations and requirements for body scans and PCMS entries, and that direction continues to be implemented in practice.

Campus Vernon Kilpatrick (CVK)

- Although the Department continues to believe its body-scan policy does not require a scanner at CVK, the Department has procured body scanners for the facility and is awaiting delivery.

The Department continues to review the incidents identified by the OIG and to address any areas of concern to ensure ongoing compliance with applicable policies, procedures and requirements. We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the OIG's July 2026 report and remain committed to continuing to work collaboratively with the OIG to achieve and sustain full compliance across all three facilities.