

U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Washington, DC

**Office of Internal Affairs
Report for Fiscal Year 2021**



Executive Summary of Findings	1
Reporting Incidents of Misconduct	3
Guidance for Reporting Allegations of Staff Misconduct	3
OIA “Complaints”	5
Review of Local Staff Misconduct Investigations.....	6
Local Investigation Guidance.....	6
Reported Misconduct	8
USA Patriot Act	10
Closed/Sustained Misconduct	11
BOP Employees Statistics	11
BOP Employees Disciplinary Process.....	13
BOP Employees Disciplinary Action Statistics.....	14
BOP Employees Gender Statistics	15
BOP Employees Job Discipline Statistics	18
Residential Reentry Center Employees/Drug Treatment Contractors	19
Staff in Privatized Facilities	20
Contract Employees/Volunteers Working in a BOP Facility	21
Public Health Service Employees Working in a BOP Facility	22
Physical Abuse of Inmates	23
Title 18, United States Code, Chapter 13 – Civil Rights	23
Statistics	24
Introduction of Contraband	25
Title 18, United States Code, Chapter 87 – Prisons.....	25
Statistics	27
Sexual Abuse of Inmates.....	28
Title 18, United States Code, Chapter 109A – Sexual Abuse.....	28
Statistics	32
Representative Case Summaries.....	33
Appendices.....	40
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2020	40
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2019	41
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2018	42
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2017	43
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2016	44
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2015	45
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2014	46
Types of Misconduct.....	47
OIA Special Agent Monitoring Assignments.....	51

Executive Summary of Findings

This report from the Office of Internal Affairs (OIA) for Fiscal Year 2021 provides information concerning the types and frequency of misconduct that occurs within the Bureau of Prisons (BOP or Bureau) operations. The report is intended for managers and supervisors to address any trends and to identify any need for training to prevent misconduct from occurring.

The report examines all aspects of BOP operations, and therefore data is examined for BOP employees; Public Health Service (PHS) staff who work in BOP facilities; contractors and volunteers that work in BOP facilities; and contractors that manage inmates in outside facilities such as Residential Reentry Centers (RRC) and secure private facilities.

OIA tracks several data points, to include the number of allegations received; the number of cases treated as complaints; the number of cases opened; the number of cases closed (i.e., OIA has determined whether an allegation is sustained or not sustained); and the number, type, and gender of employees involved.

The data is tracked through broad categories of misconduct, which includes behavior of varying levels of seriousness. The offenses included in these broad categories, as well as representative examples of some cases, can be found in the Appendices.

Please note, the data system used by OIA is dynamic; i.e., subject to change as new allegations are discovered, cases are closed, etc. In addition, as some matters continue from one fiscal year to another, it is difficult to provide exact figures for the reporting period. Therefore, this report is meant to provide a “snapshot” which will be instructive for agency management.

Findings from FY 2021 include the following:

- There was a 39.7 percent increase in the total number of misconduct allegations reported in Fiscal Year 2021, as compared with Fiscal Year 2020. The rate of reported misconduct allegations specifically for BOP employees increased 44.9 percent from Fiscal Year 2020.
- There was a 46.1 percent increase in the number of cases opened in Fiscal Year 2021, as compared with Fiscal Year 2020.
- Cases classified as Classification 1 offenses showed an increase of 37.1 percent; cases classified as Classification 2 offenses showed an increase of 23.6 percent; and cases classified as Classification 3 offenses showed an increase of 61.7 percent.
- The most frequently reported type of misconduct in Fiscal Year 2021 was Abuse of Inmates. Failure to Follow Supervisor’s Instructions and Unprofessional Conduct placed second and third, respectively.

Executive Summary of Findings

- All categories of reported misconduct showed an increase from Fiscal Year 2020, except for the allegation of Unauthorized Release of Information (decrease of 1.6 percent).
- During Fiscal Year 2021, two cases involved Patriot Act violations. As of March 30, 2022, two cases remained open pending investigation. No cases involving Patriot Act violations were sustained.
- As of March 30, 2022, the most frequently sustained categories of misconduct among BOP employees with a sustained decision as of March 30, 2022, were Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions and Personnel Prohibitions.
- For those BOP employees with a sustained decision as of March 30, 2022, the rate was highest among Correctional Services staff.
- As of March 30, 2022, the most frequently sustained category of misconduct for Residential Reentry Center employees was Inappropriate Relationships with Inmates. The most frequently sustained category of misconduct for staff in privatized facilities was Off-Duty Misconduct.
- There were four sustained allegations of Physical Abuse as of March 30, 2022, stemming from four separate incidents. Two subjects were BOP employees; both employees separated from the BOP prior to discipline. The other two subjects were contractors at privatized facilities; one received an oral reprimand, and other was terminated as a result of the sustained allegation. None of the subjects were criminally prosecuted.
- During Fiscal Year 2021, 713 allegations of Introduction of Contraband were reported. As of March 30, 2022, 24 of these allegations were sustained. There were 21 individuals involved in the sustained allegations of Introduction of Contraband.
- During Fiscal Year 2021, 554 allegations of Sexual Abuse were either reported to the OIA or detected during the course of an investigation. As of March 30, 2022, two of these allegations were sustained.

Reporting Incidents of Misconduct

Staff Reporting

In accordance with the Bureau's Standards of Employee Conduct, staff who become aware of any violation or alleged violation of the Standards of Employee Conduct must report said allegations/violations to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), the Office of Internal Affairs (OIA), or the Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of the Inspector General (OIG).

Additionally, the OIG has established a toll-free hotline (1-800-869-4499) which is available to report DOJ employees' misconduct, to include potential areas of fraud, waste, or abuse in government. Bureau Staff are encouraged to use the OIG hotline if they wish to remain anonymous, and/or perceive fear of retaliation/reprisal.

To report violations directly to the OIA Central Office, please submit a written complaint to:

Federal Bureau of Prisons
Office of Internal Affairs
320 First Street, NW, Room 600
Washington, DC 20534

Written complaints may also be emailed to BOP-DIR-InternalAffairs-S@bop.gov or sent via fax to (202) 514-8625.

CEO Reporting

Upon becoming aware of any possible violation of the Standards of Employee Conduct (either through a report from staff or personal knowledge), the CEO at the institution, Regional Office or Central Office Division, or his/her designee, is to report the violation to the OIA **within 24 hours**. Details and definitions are as follows:

- Classification 1 cases are defined as allegations, which, if substantiated, would constitute a prosecutable offense (other than offenses such as misdemeanor arrests).
- Classification 2 cases are defined as allegations which involve violations of rules, regulations, or law that, if substantiated, would not likely result in criminal prosecution, but constitute serious misconduct.
- Classification 3 cases are defined as allegations of misconduct, which ordinarily have less impact on institutional operations.

Note: Classification 1 and 2 cases must be reported to the OIA immediately. As a particular investigation unfolds, the severity of misconduct may increase or decrease, thereby moving it into another classification.

Reporting Incidents of Misconduct

Again, written notification to the OIA will be made **within 24 hours** (not to include weekends and holidays) from the time management official(s) learn of the matter. When there is suspected criminal conduct, the CEO may refer the matter *simultaneously* to the OIA and the local OIG or Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) office.

Submitting Initial Information

A Referral of Incident form (BP-A715.012) is used to organize the information to be provided (for contract employees form BP-A774.012 is used). Be sure to include the following information:

- The identity of the complainant(s), subject(s), witness(es), and victim(s);
- The details of the allegation(s); and
- **All corroborating evidence.**

The subject of the allegation or complaint must not be questioned or interviewed prior to receiving clearance from the OIG and the OIA. This is to ensure against procedural errors, as well as to safeguard the rights of the subject(s).

Supporting Documentation

A Referral of Incident form (BP-A715.012) and all supporting documentation (e.g. victim or witness statements, medical reports, photos, BP-583/586, and related memoranda), must be sent to the OIA immediately.

If an inmate alleges physical or sexual abuse by a staff member, and has not received a medical examination, the CEO **must** arrange an immediate, confidential medical examination and forward a copy of the results to the OIA as soon as possible. PREA related protocols must be followed, accordingly.

Contact the OIA immediately if there is any question as to the classification of the misconduct. It is important to note that case classifications are often based upon limited information.

All signed Referral of Incident forms (BP-S715.012 or BP-S774.012), in tandem with appropriate predating information, should be scanned as a single file (via .pdf, Adobe Acrobat) and sent directly to the OIA via e-mail: OIA BOPNet GroupWise mailbox, “BOP-DIR/InternalAffairs-Referrals-S.” The signed Referral of Incident form should appear on the top of the file with all supporting documentation underneath.

Reporting Incidents of Misconduct

Complaints

Matters designated by the OIA as complaints are forwarded to the CEO via memorandum. Such complaints will be categorized as follows: Complaint for Information and Complaint for Disposition.

Additionally, correspondence received by the OIA, which has been determined to not include any discernable allegation of staff misconduct, will be forwarded to the CEO directly.

During Fiscal Year 2021, the OIA reviewed approximately 295 items which did not contain any discernable allegation of staff misconduct. These matters were forwarded to the CEO directly.

A **Complaint for Information** will be sent via memorandum in the event the OIA has reviewed a referred matter, and determined the allegations do not rise to a level of staff misconduct.

During Fiscal Year 2021, the OIA opened 697 matters as a Complaint for Information. (This value does not include additional information received by the OIA concerning Complaints for Information which were already opened within Fiscal Year 2020).

A **Complaint for Disposition** will be sent via memorandum for CEO edification and review. A summary of the CEO's findings is not required by the OIA. Should the CEO determine, however, that any misconduct might have occurred, he/she will make an appropriate referral back to the OIA in accordance with policy. These complaints are generally received from external sources (e.g., deferred by OIG) for OIA review.

During Fiscal Year 2021, the OIA opened 4,171 matters as a Complaint for Disposition. (This value does not include additional information received by the OIA concerning Complaints for Disposition which were already opened within Fiscal Year 2020).

Review of Local Staff Misconduct Investigations

The CEO must receive OIA approval prior to initiating a local investigation. The investigator must forward the complete investigative packet for all misconduct investigations directly to the OIA for approval **prior** to forwarding it to the CEO for action. These procedures apply to **all** local staff misconduct investigations in which BOP employees are the subject (Classification 1, 2, and 3 allegations), regardless of whether any misconduct will be sustained.

Where to Send Local Investigative Packets

Local investigative packets should be sent via e-mail to the OIA GroupWise mailbox: "BOP-DIR/Internal Affairs-Local Investigative Packets-S" (not to be confused with OIA's main resource mailbox, "BOP-DIR/Internal Affairs-S"). The subject of your e-mail message should include the OIA case number and the facility mnemonic code (e.g., 2020-00001 - BUX).

To ensure local investigative packets are reviewed by the OIA in a timely manner, packets should **not** be sent to either any individual OIA staff member or directly to any OIA field office.

Format for Local Investigative Packets and What to Send

Local investigative packets should include the investigative report (signed by the investigator) and all supporting documentation (e.g. affidavits, memorandums, video files, etc.). Note: The Summary of Investigation for Classification 3 Cases form (BP-A716.012) is no longer applicable and should not be used.

Documents must be scanned as .pdf format (Adobe Acrobat), and saved as follows:

Investigative Report (OIA Case Number)
Affidavits and MOIs (OIA Case Number)
Supporting Documentation (OIA Case Number)

Do not send documents in other formats (e.g., .tif files, .docx files). Photo and graphic images should be forwarded in .pdf, .jpg, or .gif format and must be in color.

Do not send an e-mail that exceeds 50.0 MB in size (including attachments).

Affidavit files should include the "Warning and Assurance to Employee Required to Provide Information" (BP-A194.012/Form B), if applicable, as well as the Affidavit and signed Oath for each individual. The investigative packet should not include national policy or any documents not specifically related to the investigation (e.g., staff rosters, inmate SENTRY information, etc.).

Review of Local Staff Misconduct Investigations

Time Guidelines

Local investigators must complete investigative packets and forward them to the OIA within **120 calendar days** of the date a local investigation was authorized by the OIA.

Once received, the OIA will complete their review of the local investigative packet within ten business days. The local investigator will be advised as to whether the investigative packet is approved, or if additional information is required. This information will be sent via e-mail to the local investigator with a copy to the CEO. If additional information is required, the local investigator should forward the additional information to the OIA within 30 calendar days, who will again notify the local investigator and CEO if the packet has been approved. Once the investigative packet has been approved, the local investigator should forward the investigative packet to the CEO for appropriate action, with **all** requisite “Review of Local Investigative Packet” forms attached.

No disciplinary proceedings or other notifications to subject(s) should occur prior to the OIA's approval of the investigative packet.

Reports from the OIA

The OIA sends the CEO a monthly report of all local staff misconduct investigations which have extended past established deadlines. Special Investigative Agents/Special Investigative Services (SIAs/SISs) should continue to work with the OIA monitoring agent assigned to their facility on an ongoing and recurring basis. SIAs/SISs should provide updates on any outstanding matters. The OIA monitoring agent will provide guidance, as needed.

Reported Misconduct

All allegations of misconduct received by the OIA are reviewed and classified. Allegations classified as Category 1 or 2 matters are immediately referred to the OIG for review and disposition. The OIG determines which matters they will accept for investigation and possible criminal prosecution and defers other matters to the OIA for investigation. The OIA coordinates with the OIG and/or the FBI when investigations may lead to criminal prosecution or when there

are allegations involving the deprivation of an individual's rights under color of law. For those matters deferred for investigation, the OIA determines, after consulting with relevant BOP management officials, whether an on-site investigation is warranted, or if the matter can be investigated at the local institution level. Allegations categorized as Classification 3 offenses are referred to the OIG via computer extract on a monthly basis.

During Fiscal Year 2021, the OIA opened 7,702 cases involving 9,654 BOP employees, 25 contract employees working in BOP facilities, 46 Public Health Service (PHS) employees working in BOP facilities, one volunteer working in a BOP facility, 218 contract/residential reentry center employees, 237 employees working in privatized facilities, and nine other individuals.

These 7,702 cases represent a 46.1 percent increase from the 5,270 cases opened during Fiscal Year 2020. The rate of reported misconduct among BOP employees increased 39.7 percent from Fiscal Year 2020.

The 7,702 cases opened during Fiscal Year 2021 were classified as follows:

Classification 1	1,560
Classification 2	1,732
Classification 3	4,410

NOTES

Due to the dynamic nature of the OIA database, figures in this report are subject to change. During the course of an investigation, evidence may indicate circumstances other than those initially reported, causing data to be added, deleted, and/or changed. There is no nexus between reported and sustained allegations.

The number of subjects exceeds the number of cases throughout this report as some cases have multiple subjects. Also, some subjects may be charged with multiple types of misconduct in a single case, causing the number of allegations to be higher. Finally, individual employees may be subjects in more than one case.

Allegations referred to as "Inmate Related" included some type of inmate involvement, while allegations referred to as "Non Inmate Related" occurred in the workplace but did not include inmate involvement. For a complete list of the types of misconduct included in each category, please reference the Appendices section of this report.

Reported Misconduct

Cases classified as Classification 1 offenses showed an increase of 37.1 percent, cases classified as Classification 2 offenses showed an increase of 23.6 percent, and cases classified as Classification 3 offenses showed an increase of 61.7 percent.

Types of Misconduct	Number of Reported Allegations				
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL	% Change from 2020
Total	8,244	7,817	830	16,891	+ 42.94
Abuse of Inmates	2,029			2,029	+ 61.80
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	554			554	+ 11.02
Introduction of Contraband	571	142		713	+ 103.14
Discrimination	5	9		14	+ 7.69
Fiscal Improprieties	165	319		484	+ 22.84
Bribery	88	3		91	+ 24.66
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	713			713	+ 34.27
Investigative Violations		142		142	+ 25.66
Personnel Prohibitions		2,299	41	2,340	+ 95.00
Unauthorized Release of Information	75	48		123	0
Inattention to Duty	556	684		1,240	+ 25.63
Breach of Security	140	168		308	- 19.79
Unprofessional Conduct	1,227	764		1,991	+ 25.85
Failure to Follow Policy	1,040	937		1,977	+ 44.10
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions		1,596		1,596	+ 62.03
Other On-Duty Misconduct	1,081	706		1,787	+ 22.15
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			789	789	+ 60.04

Table 1 provides a breakdown of those categories of misconduct reported during Fiscal Year 2021.

Note: A single case may contain multiple allegations; therefore, the number of misconduct allegations exceeds the number of opened cases.

Reported Misconduct

USA Patriot Act

In the aftermath of September 11, 2001, Congress passed the USA PATRIOT Act, signed into law by President George W. Bush on October 26, 2001. One of the provisions of the Patriot Act addressed reporting any potential abuse(s) of individual civil rights and liberties by DOJ employees involving violence, discrimination, or threats. Accordingly, the Patriot Act mandated that the OIG widely advertise receiving allegations and any associated investigations of violence, discrimination, or threats on the part of a DOJ employee; particularly when such cases are directed toward individuals or groups associated with the public's perception of “extremist ideology” pertaining to an individual’s religious beliefs, place of birth, and/or appearance. Patriot Act allegations typically reported to the OIA involve alleged mistreatment or unprofessional behavior of BOP staff toward/around certain inmates, their visitors, or members of the public.

Due to the sensitivity of these allegations, they are automatically classified as Classification 2 or higher offenses; they should be forwarded immediately to the OIA. All Patriot Act violation allegations are referred to a Special Operations Unit at OIG Headquarters, devoted to reviewing and investigating such alleged misconduct.

During Fiscal Year 2021, two cases involved potential Patriot Act violations. As of March 30, 2022, two cases remained open pending investigation.

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

NOTES

All figures in this section relate to cases, which were opened during Fiscal Year 2021 and were closed as of March 30, 2022. Figures are subject to change as additional cases are closed, and only relate to cases which were sustained and not sustained.

Please refer to the appendices section of this report for the types of misconduct sustained against BOP employees in cases opened during Fiscal Year 2021.

7,702 cases were opened during Fiscal Year 2021. As of March 30, 2022, 1,866 (24.2 percent) were closed. The remaining 5,836 cases (75.8 percent) were still open pending investigation.

Of the 1,866 cases closed: 1,769 (94.8 percent) were investigated at the institution level (“local investigation”) with authorization and monitoring provided by the OIA; 69 (3.7 percent) were OIA on-site investigations; and 28 (1.5 percent) were investigated by the OIG.

Of the 1,870 cases closed, 541 (28.9 percent) were sustained. Misconduct was sustained against 470 BOP employees, four contractors working in a BOP facility, three PHS employees working in a BOP facility, 28 contract/residential reentry center employees, 68 contractors working in privatized facilities, and four other non-BOP individuals.

BOP Employees

Out of 38,015 active-duty BOP employees, there were 9,654 BOP employees identified as subjects of alleged misconduct in cases opened during Fiscal Year 2021. As of March 30, 2022, the cases had been closed for 20.7 percent of those employees. Of the 20.7 percent (or 2,001 employees), 23.5 percent (470 employees) had a sustained decision (1.2 percent of total BOP employees).

Table 2 (on the following page) reflects the categories of misconduct sustained against BOP employees in cases closed as of March 30, 2022. The most frequently sustained categories of Personnel Prohibitions and Failure to Follow Supervisor’s Instructions. Please note, the number of sustained allegations will vary, as some BOP employees were involved with multiple allegations.

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Table 2: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2021 With 24.2 Percent Closed				
Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	147	536	23	706
Abuse of Inmates	6			6
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	2			2
Introduction of Contraband	1	15		16
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	2	13		15
Bribery	1	0		1
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	21			21
Investigative Violations		13		13
Personnel Prohibitions		154	2	156
Unauthorized Release of Information	1	1		2
Inattention to Duty	36	49		85
Breach of Security	2	11		13
Unprofessional Conduct	13	42		55
Failure to Follow Policy	36	71		107
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions		127		127
Other On-Duty Misconduct	34	40		66
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			21	21

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Disciplinary Process

Once a subject is investigated and the allegations are sustained, the type of disciplinary action taken is left to the deciding official, generally the CEO. Since each case is unique, with varying degrees of seriousness attached to the allegation of misconduct, disciplinary actions may vary from case-to-case. In addition, a subject may be charged with multiple types of misconduct in any particular incident(s). The *Douglas* factors¹ must be considered when deciding the appropriate penalty to impose on employees if the penalty will be an adverse action.

Douglas Factors

The *Douglas* factors derive from the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) decision, *Douglas v. Veterans Administration*. In *Douglas*, the MSPB identified a non-exhaustive list of twelve factors which deciding officials must evaluate in determining the appropriate penalty to impose in cases of sustained employee misconduct. The specific *Douglas* factors are as follows:

- The nature and seriousness of the offense;
- The employee's job level and type of employment;
- The employee's disciplinary record;
- The employee's past work record, including length of service and duty performance;
- The effect of the offense on the employee's ability to perform and its effect on the supervisor's confidence in such ability;
- The consistency of the penalty with penalties imposed upon others for like or similar misconduct;
- The consistency of the penalty with the BOP's table of penalties (Program Statement 3420.11, Standards of Employee Conduct);
- The notoriety of the offense or its impact on the BOP's reputation;
- The clarity with which the employee was on notice of any rules violated or warned about the conduct in question;
- The employee's potential for rehabilitation;

¹See *Douglas vs. Veterans Administration*, 5 M.S.P.R. 280 (1981).

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

- Any and all mitigating circumstances surrounding the offense (e.g., job stress/tension, personality problems, mental impairment, harassment or bad faith, malice or provocation on the part of others involved);
- The adequacy and effectiveness of alternative sanctions.

The CEO is required to consider only relevant *Douglas* factors, and need not consider all the *Douglas* factors in every case. In addition, some of the *Douglas* factors may weigh in favor of a serious penalty, while others may weigh in favor of mitigation. It is incumbent upon the CEO to choose the appropriate penalty within these guidelines.

Statistics

As of March 30, 2022, the following actions were taken for those BOP employees with a sustained finding in Fiscal Year 2021 (including findings on allegations that were made in prior fiscal years):

Written Reprimand.....	82
Resignation.....	97
Suspension	172
No Action.....	17
Retirement.....	32
Termination.....	46
Combined With Action in another OIA Matter.....	7
Demotion.....	2
Other	14

The specific type of misconduct most frequently sustained against those individuals for whom no disciplinary action was taken was Failure to Follow Supervisor’s Instructions.

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Gender

Tables 3 and 4 (on the following pages) reflect the categories of sustained allegations for male and female BOP employees as of March 30, 2022. The most frequently sustained category of misconduct among both male and female BOP employees was Personnel Prohibitions, and Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions was the second most sustained.

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Table 3: Types of Sustained Misconduct for Male BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2021 With 24.2 Percent Closed				
Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Abuse of Inmates	5			5
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	0			0
Introduction of Contraband	1	10		11
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	1	8		9
Bribery	0	0		0
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	10			10
Investigative Violations		7		7
Personnel Prohibitions		103	2	105
Unauthorized Release of Information	1	0		1
Inattention to Duty	23	29		52
Breach of Security	1	8		9
Unprofessional Conduct	5	33		38
Failure to Follow Policy	27	49		76
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions		89		89
Other On-Duty Misconduct	20	27		47
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			16	16

Those categories of misconduct highlighted in pink were sustained with greater frequency among male BOP staff than among female BOP staff.

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Abuse of Inmates	1			1
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	2			2
Introduction of Contraband	0	5		5
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	1	5		6
Bribery	1	0		1
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	11			11
Investigative Violations		6		6
Personnel Prohibitions		49	0	49
Unauthorized Release of Information	0	1		1
Inattention to Duty	13	20		33
Breach of Security	1	3		4
Unprofessional Conduct	8	8		16
Failure to Follow Policy	9	22		31
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions		37		37
Other On-Duty Misconduct	6	13		19
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			5	5

Those categories of misconduct highlighted in pink were sustained with greater frequency among female BOP staff than among male BOP staff.

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Job Discipline

As of March 30, 2022, 470 BOP employees identified as misconduct subjects during Fiscal Year 2021 had a sustained decision.

Table 5 reflects the rate of misconduct among the various job disciplines.

Table 5: Discipline of BOP Employees With Sustained Misconduct - FY 2021 With 24.2 Percent Closed			
Discipline	Total Employees	Number of Employees With Sustained Misconduct	Rate Per 100 Total Employees
Human Resources	754	3	0.40
Mechanical Services	2,522	15	0.59
Psychology Services	1,210	5	0.41
Recreation	808	2	0.25
CEOs Office and Staff	743	6	0.81
Food Service	1,721	14	0.81
Computer Services	260	0	0
Correctional Services	16,680	333	2.00
Health Services/Safety	3,556	32	0.90
Unit Management	2,906	23	0.79
Religious Services	348	3	0.86
Records/Inmate Systems	1,105	6	0.54
Education & Vocational Training	1,205	8	0.66
Financial Management	1,480	9	0.61
Central Office/Staff Training Centers	1,406	3	0.21
UNICOR	772	0	0
Inmate Services	501	1	0.20
Other*	36	1	2.78

* "Other" staff includes those assigned to work areas other than those listed (e.g. NIC).

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Residential Reentry Center Employees and Drug Treatment Contractors

There were 218 contract/residential reentry center employees identified as misconduct subjects in Fiscal Year 2021. As of March 30, 2022, OIA closed cases for 60.6 percent of those 218 contractors. Of the 60.6 percent (or 132 contractors), 7.1 percent (or 28 contractors) had a sustained decision.

There were no drug treatment contractors identified as misconduct subjects during Fiscal Year 2021.

Table 6: Sustained Misconduct – Residential Reentry Center Employees / Drug Treatment Contractors – FY 2021			
Allegation	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty
Inappropriate Relationship with Inmates	13		
Investigative Violations		1	
Unauthorized Release of Information	0	0	
Inattention to Duty	8	0	
Failure to Follow Policy	7	1	
Unprofessional Conduct	0	1	
Personnel Prohibitions		4	
Other On-Duty Misconduct	6	0	
Off-Duty Misconduct		3	

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Contractors in Privatized Facilities

There were 237 contractors working in privatized facilities identified as misconduct subjects during Fiscal Year 2021. As of March 30, 2022, OIA closed cases for 76.8 percent of those 237 contractors. Of the 76.8 percent (or 182 contractors), 37.4 percent (or 68 contractors) had a sustained decision.

Table 7 provides a breakdown of the categories of misconduct sustained against employees working in privatized facilities. The most frequently sustained category of misconduct for staff working in privatized facilities was Unprofessional Conduct.

Table 7: Types of Sustained Misconduct for Staff in Privatized Facilities - Fiscal Year 2021 With 76.8 Percent Closed				
Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Abuse of Inmates	2			2
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	0			0
Introduction of Contraband	3	3		6
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	0	0		0
Bribery	3	0		3
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	9			9
Investigative Violations		2		2
Personnel Prohibitions		7	0	7
Unauthorized Release of Information	0	0		0
Inattention to Duty	2	4		6
Breach of Security	5	0		5
Unprofessional Conduct	1	7		8
Failure to Follow Policy	5	2		7
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions			1	1
Other On-Duty Misconduct	2	5		7
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			34	34

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Contractors and Volunteers Working in BOP Facilities

There were 25 contractors and one volunteer working in BOP facilities identified as misconduct subjects during Fiscal Year 2021.

As of March 30, 2022, OIA closed cases for 10 contractors. Four contract employees had a sustained decision.

Table 8: Sustained Misconduct - Contract Employees/Volunteers – FY 2021			
Allegation	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	1	0	
Introduction of Contraband	2	0	
Inappropriate Relationship with Inmates	2		
Inattention to Duty	0	0	
Breach of Security	0	0	
Bribery	1	0	
Other On-Duty Misconduct	0	1	
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			0

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

PHS Employees Working in BOP Facilities

Of the approximately 565 PHS employees working in BOP facilities, 46 were identified as misconduct subjects during Fiscal Year 2021. As of March 30, 2022, OIA closed 21.7 percent of cases involving those 46 PHS employees. Of the 21.7 percent (or 10 PHS employees), three had a sustained decision.

Table 9: Sustained Misconduct – PHS Employees – FY 2021			
Allegation	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty
Breach of Security	0	0	
Unprofessional Conduct	0	0	
Inattention to Duty	1	2	
Failure to Follow Policy	0	2	
Fiscal Improprieties	0	0	
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			0

Physical Abuse of Inmates

Title 18, United States Code, Chapter 13 - Civil Rights

§241 Conspiracy against rights

If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having exercised the same; or

If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured --

They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, they shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.

§242 Deprivation of rights under color of law

Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such inhabitant being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

If bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or may be sentenced to death.

Physical Abuse of Inmates

Statistics

During Fiscal Year 2021, 997 allegations of Physical Abuse of Inmates were either reported to the OIA, or detected during the course of an investigation. As of March 30, 2022, OIA closed cases for 21.6 percent (or 215) of those allegations.

Allegations of Physical Abuse are tracked by the degree of injury sustained by the inmate(s)-- life threatening injury, serious injury, minor/slight injury, minor/no injury (harassment), and superficial injury (injuries associated with the normal use of restraints).

Four allegations of Physical Abuse reported during Fiscal Year 2021 were sustained as of March 30, 2022, stemming from four separate incidents.

One inmate involved sustained minor/slight injury. Three inmates involved sustained minor/no injuries (harassment).

Two subjects with a sustained allegations of Physical Abuse of Inmates were BOP employees. Both of those employees separated from the BOP prior to receiving discipline.

Two subjects were contractors in privatized facilities. One was terminated as a result of the sustained allegation, and the other received an oral reprimand.

None of the involved subjects were criminally prosecuted.

Introduction of Contraband

Title 18, United States Code, Chapter 87 - Prisons

§1791 Providing or possessing contraband in prison

(a) Offense.-Whoever-

(1) In violation of a statute or a rule or order issued under a statute, provides to an inmate of a prison a prohibited object, or attempts to do so; or

(2) being an inmate of a prison, makes, possesses, or obtains, or attempts to make or obtain, a prohibited object;

shall be punished as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) Punishment.-The punishment for an offense under this section is a fine under this title or-

(1) imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both, if the object is specified in subsection (d)(1)(C) of this section;

(2) imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both, if the object is specified in subsection (d)(1)(A) of this section;

(3) imprisonment for no more than 5 years, or both, if the object is specified in subsection (d)(1)(B) of this section;

(4) imprisonment for no more than one year, or both, if the object is specified in subsection (d)(1)(D) or (c)(1)(E) of this section; and

(5) imprisonment for not more than six months, or both, if the object is specified in subsection (d)(1)(F) of this section.

(c) Any punishment imposed under subsection (b) for a violation of this section by an inmate of a prison shall be consecutive to the sentence being served by such inmate at the time the inmate commits such violation.

(d) Definitions.-As used in this section-

(1) the term “prohibited object” means:

(A) A firearm or destructive device or a controlled substance in Section I or II, other than marijuana or a controlled substance referred to in subparagraph (C) of this subsection;

Introduction of Contraband

(B) marijuana or a controlled substance in schedule III, other than a controlled substance referred to in subparagraph (C) of this subsection, ammunition, a weapon (other than a firearm or destructive device), or an object that is designed or intended to be used as a weapon or to facilitate escape from a prison;

(C) a narcotic drug, methamphetamine, its salts, isomers, and salts of its isomers, lysergic acid diethylamide, or phencyclidine;

(D) a controlled substance (other than a controlled substance referred to in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of this subsection) or an alcoholic beverage;

(E) any United States or foreign currency; and

(F) any other object that threatens the order, discipline, or security of a prison, or the life, health, or safety of an individual;

(2) the terms “ammunition,” “firearm,” and “destructive device” have, respectively, the meanings given those terms in section 921 of this title;

(3) the terms “controlled substance” and “narcotic drug” have, respectively, the meanings given those terms in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 USC, §802); and

(4) the term “prison” means a Federal correctional, detention, or penal facility or any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of our pursuant to a contract or agreement with the Attorney General.

Introduction of Contraband

Statistics

During Fiscal Year 2021, 713 allegations of Introduction of Contraband were either reported or detected during the course of an investigation. As of March 30, 2022, OIA closed cases for 19.1 percent (or 136) of those allegations. Of the 19.1 percent, 17.6 percent (or 24) were sustained:

Type of Contraband	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related
Soft Item	1	2
Weapons	1	4
Unauthorized Electronic Device	4	10
Cigarettes/Tobacco	0	
Heroin and Derivatives	0	0
Alcoholic Beverages	0	1
Creatine/Weightlifting Supplement	1	0

There were 21 individuals involved in the sustained allegations of Introduction of Contraband. Fifteen of these individuals were BOP employees (11 male and 4 female). Thirteen of the BOP employees worked in Correctional Services, one worked in Health Services/Safety, and one worked in Recreation. Five individuals were contractors working in privatized facilities, and one was a contractor working in a BOP facility.

Sexual Abuse of Inmates

Title 18, United States Code, Chapter 109A - Sexual Abuse

§2241 Aggravated Sexual Abuse

(a) By force or threat. - Whoever, in the special maritime or territorial jurisdiction of the United States or in a Federal prison, or in any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of or pursuant to a contract agreement with the head of any Federal department or agency, knowingly causes another person to engage in a sexual act -

(1) by using force against that other person, or

(2) by threatening or placing that other person in fear that any person will be subjected to death, serious bodily injury, or kidnapping;

or attempts to do so, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for any term of years or life, or both.

(b) By other means. - Whoever, in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States or in a Federal prison, or in any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of or pursuant to a contract or agreement with the head of any Federal department or agency, knowingly -

(1) renders another person unconscious and thereby engages in a sexual act with that other person; or

(2) administers to another person by force or threat of force, or without the knowledge or permission of that person, a drug, intoxicant, or other similar substance and thereby -

(A) substantially impairs the ability of that other person to appraise or control conduct; and

(B) engages in a sexual act with that other person;

or attempts to do so, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for any term of years or life, or both.

§2242 Sexual Abuse

Whoever, in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States or in a Federal prison, or in any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of or pursuant to a contract or agreement with the head of any Federal department or agency, knowingly -

(1) causes another person to engage in a sexual act by threatening or placing that other person in fear (other than by threatening or placing that other person in fear that any person

Sexual Abuse of Inmates

will be subjected to death, serious bodily injury, or kidnapping); or

(2) engages in a sexual act with another person if that other person is -

(A) incapable of appraising the nature of the conduct; or

(B) physically incapable of declining participation in, or communicating unwillingness to engage in, that sexual act;

or attempts to do so shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for any term of years or for life.

§2243 Sexual Abuse of a Ward

(b) Of a ward - Whoever, in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States or in a Federal prison, or in any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of our pursuant to a contract or agreement with the head of any Federal department or agency, knowingly engages in a sexual act with another person who is -

(1) in official detention; and

(2) under the custodial, supervisory, or disciplinary authority of the person so engaging;

or attempts to do so, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

§2244 Abusive Sexual Contact

(a) Sexual contact in circumstances where sexual acts are punished by this chapter. - Whoever, in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States or in a Federal prison, or in any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of or pursuant to a contract or agreement with the head of any Federal department or agency, knowingly engages in or causes sexual contact with or by another person, if so to do would violate -

(1) subsection (a) or (b) of section 2241 of this title had the sexual contact been a sexual act, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than ten years, or both;

(2) section 2242 of this title had the sexual contact been a sexual act, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than three years, or both;

(3) subsection (a) of section 2243 of this title had the sexual contact been a sexual act, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than two years, or both;

(4) subsection (b) of section 2243 of this title had the sexual contact been a sexual act, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

(5) subsection (c) of section 2241 of this title had the sexual contact been a sexual act, shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for any term of years or for life.

Sexual Abuse of Inmates

(b) In Other Circumstances. - Whoever, in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or a Federal prison, or in any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of our pursuant to a contract or agreement with the head of any Federal department or agency, knowingly engages in sexual contact with another person without that other person's permission shall be fined under this title, imprisoned no more than two years, or both.

§ 2246 Definitions

(1) the term "prison" means a correctional, detention, or penal facility;

(2) the term "sexual act" means -

(A) contact between the penis and the vulva or the penis and the anus, and for the purposes of this subparagraph, contact involved the penis occurs upon penetration, however slight;

(B) contact between the mouth and the penis, the mouth and the vulva, or the mouth and the anus; or

(C) the penetration, however slight, of the anal or genital opening by another by a hand or finger or by any object, with an intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade, or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person;

(D) the intentional touching, not through the clothing, of the genitalia of another person who has not attained the age of 16 years with an intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade, or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person;

(3) the term "sexual contact" means the intentional touching, either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks of any person with intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade, or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person;

(4) the term "serious bodily injury" means bodily injury that involves a substantial risk of death, unconsciousness, extreme physical pain, protracted and obvious disfigurement, or protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ, or mental faculty.

(5) the term "official detention" means -

(A) detention by a Federal officer or employee, or under the direction of a Federal officer or employee, following arrest for an offense; following surrender in lieu of an arrest for an offense; following a charge or conviction of an offense, or an allegation or finding of juvenile delinquency; following commitment as a material witness; following civil commitment in lieu of criminal proceedings or pending resumption of criminal

Sexual Abuse of Inmates

proceedings that are being held in abeyance, or pending extradition, deportation, or exclusion; or

(B) custody by a Federal officer or employee, or under the direction of a Federal Officer or employee, for purposes incident to any detention described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, including transportation, medical diagnosis or treatment, court appearance, work, and recreation; but does not include supervision or under control (other than custody during specified hours or days) after release on bail, probation, or parole, or after release following a juvenile delinquency.

The BOP's policy concerning compliance with the Prison Rape Elimination Act is in Program Statement 5324.12, Sexually Abusive Behavior Prevention and Intervention Program.

Sexual Abuse of Inmates

Statistics

During Fiscal Year 2021, 556 allegations of Sexual Abuse were either reported to the OIA or detected during the course of an investigation. Of the 556 allegations, 499 involved BOP employees, five involved a PHS employee working in a BOP facility, 32 involved contract staff working in residential reentry facilities, 19 involved contractors working in privatized facilities, and two involved contract staff working in a BOP facility.

The allegations that appeared with the most frequency were Abusive Sexual Contact between male staff and male inmates, with 171 allegations reported, and Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature between male staff and male inmates, with 120 allegations reported.

As of March 30, 2022, four allegations of Sexual Abuse reported during Fiscal Year 2021 were sustained. These allegations involved three BOP employees and one contract staff working in a BOP facility; 212 allegations were not sustained; 339 allegations were pending.

Representative Case Summaries

The following are brief summaries of some of the cases which were completed recently:

- **Discreditable Behavior**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer admitted to maintaining a fake Twitter account and to posting several tweets of his own opinion regarding a BOP Special Confinement Unit and antagonizing a female anti-death penalty attorney. Additionally, the subject listed several specific institutions in which he worked, and he listed names of specific inmates currently on death row and scheduled for execution. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegation of Discreditable Behavior against the subject. The subject received a written reprimand. (OIA-2021-00028)

- **Absent Without Leave; Failure to Follow Leave Procedures**

A local investigation revealed a female Drug Treatment Specialist failed to report for work at her assigned time. When a female DAP Coordinator contacted the subject by telephone, the subject told the caller she had overslept and then requested annual leave for the day. The female DAP Coordinator advised the subject she would approve annual leave from 7:15 a.m. until the end of the subject's shift, but the subject would be placed on AWOL from 6:00 a.m. to 7:15 a.m. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegations of Absent Without Leave and Failure to Follow Leave Procedures against the subject. The subject resigned her position prior to any discipline being taken. (OIA-2021-00282)

- **DWI/DUI**

The local investigation revealed a male privatized facility Lieutenant self-reported that he had been arrested and pled guilty to Driving While Intoxicated (DWI), BAC \geq 0.15. The subject reported his blood alcohol test result was 0.181. The subject was assigned 16 months Community Supervision, required to attend a Victim Impact Panel and Alcohol Offender Program, complete and pay for a substance abuse evaluation and alcohol abuse counseling, have installed a camera equipped interlock device for eight months, and perform 40 hours of community service. The subject completed all requirements of the court. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegation of DWI/DUI against the subject. The subject received a written reprimand. (OIA-2021-00413)

- **Weapons Introduction – Other**

A local investigation revealed a male privatized facility Electrical Technician brought a knife disguised as a key into the facility. A male Maintenance Technician reported seeing the subject in possession of a knife disguised as a key. During screening at the front entrance, the subject was found to be in possession of a knife disguised as a key attached to his personal key chain. Photographs of the SOG key/knife were taken, and the key/knife was confiscated. The subject admitted to bringing in the key disguised as a knife on at least two prior occasions. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegation of Weapons Introduction - Other against the subject. The subject was terminated. (OIA-2021-00667)

Representative Case Summaries

- **Failure to Pay Just Debts**

A local investigation revealed a male privatized facility Correctional Officer failed to pay his debts in a timely manner. The subject admitted he owed \$4,900.00, to approximately six debtors. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegation of Failure to Pay Just Debts against the subject. The subject received an oral reprimand. (OIA-2021-02179)

- **Improper Contact with an Inmate/Inmate's Family; Appearance of an Inappropriate Relationship; Refusing to Cooperate During an Investigation**

A local investigation revealed a female Teacher's voice was positively identified by a male Special Investigative Agent (SIA) on the other end of a male inmate's telephone calls. The male SIA also linked dates and events discussed in emails from two male inmates, to dates and events posted by the subject on Facebook. Additionally, Special Investigative Services (SIS) staff members at another institution discovered sexually explicit photographs of the subject and handwritten letters from the subject's home address in the personal property of a male inmate, which matched the handwriting on a note the male SIA discovered on the rear seat of the subject's vehicle. Further, the male SIA discovered a handwritten note in the subject's backpack where the writer of the note mentions failing a GED test, which was linked to a male inmate's GED testing history. The male SIA also discovered a contact named "MC" located on the contact list of the subject's personal cell phone, and the phone number was linked to a male inmate. Lastly, two male inmates admitted to having some sort of relationship with the subject. The subject admitted to having some sort of relationship with the two male inmates. With the exception of the subject admitting to engaging in some sort of relationship with the two male inmates, the subject refused to answer all other questions, when the male SIA attempted to question her. The subject only stated, "My lawyer told me not to say anything." There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegations of Improper Contact with an Inmate/Inmate's Family, Appearance of an Inappropriate Relationship with an Inmate, and Refusing to Cooperate During an Investigation against the subject. The subject resigned after being questioned. (OIA-2021-02056)

- **Unprofessional Conduct**

An OIA investigation revealed a male Warden admitted to stating, "Are you eye fucking me?" to a male inmate in the presence of a female Clinical Psychologist. The subject denied stating, "Can you not speak fucking English," and mocking the male inmate hurting himself by making punching gestures to his (the subject's) head. The subject's denial was refuted by the female Clinical Psychologist, a male Associate Warden, and a female Quality Assurance Specialist. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegation of Unprofessional Conduct against the subject. The subject retired prior to receiving disciplinary action. (OIA-2021-01629)

- **Inattention to Duty**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a privatized facility used unprofessional language toward an inmate during a medical examination. The subject received a verbal reprimand. (OIA-2021-02576)

Representative Case Summaries

- **Soliciting/Accepting Anything of Value**

A local investigation revealed a female Residential Reentry Center (RRC) Correctional Officer accepted a scarf from an inmate as a Christmas gift. Video evidence revealed the subject was seen leaving the RRC with something hidden under her top. The subject admitted to accepting a scarf from an inmate. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegation of Soliciting/Accepting Anything of Value against the subject. The subject received no disciplinary action. (OIA-2021-02011)

- **Use/Abuse of Illegal Drugs/Alcohol**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer received a random urine drug test. When the test results were received by the facility, the test results indicated the subject's urine tested positive for Marijuana. The subject admitted to using Marijuana for pain management. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegation of Use/Abuse of Illegal Drugs/Alcohol against the subject. The subject was terminated. (OIA-2021-00904)

- **Off-Duty Misconduct**

An OIG investigation revealed a male Contract Specialist utilized an electronic device from his residence to access the internet to download, view, and distribute images containing child pornography. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegation of Off-Duty Misconduct. The subject committed suicide while the U.S. Attorney's Office was engaged in negotiating a pre-indictment plea agreement with the subject's defense attorney. (OIA-2021-05252)

- **Bribery; Unauthorized Electronic Device Introduction; Improper Contact with an Inmate/Inmate's Family**

An OIG investigation revealed a male privatized facility Food Service Officer smuggled cellular telephones into the facility on more than one occasion, in exchange for bribes from a male inmate. Three privatized facility employees reported the subject had unexplained cash and offered to pay the staff members' bills. The subject received three payments totaling \$1,400.00, in August 2019, from individuals associated with the inmates. The subject admitted to smuggling cellular telephones into the facility on several occasions for monetary bribes from a male inmate and receiving payments totaling \$12,200.00 from civilians on behalf of inmates for smuggling the cellular telephones into the facility. Further, the subject admitted to contacting, both in-person and by telephone, individuals who represented the interests of the male inmate and providing the male inmate with his (the subject's) home address. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegations of Bribery, Improper Contact with an Inmate/Inmate's Family, and Unauthorized Electronic Device Introduction. The subject resigned and pleaded guilty to a single count of Bribery of a Public Official. The subject was sentenced to 18 months incarceration, 12 months supervised probation, and ordered to pay a \$100.00 special assessment. (OIA-2021-04379)

Representative Case Summaries

- **Endangering the Safety of Others; Unprofessional Conduct**

A local investigation revealed a female Correctional Officer took a male inmate's bedding, placed it into a trash can, and then placed the trash can into the shower, soaking the inmate's bedding by turning on the shower. The subject then ordered the male inmate to lock in his cell, but the male inmate refused. The subject then entered the male inmate's cell, conducted a "shake down" of the cell, and removed nuisance contraband. When the male inmate became angry with the subject, the subject hit her body alarm. The subject's actions escalated the situation to the point that other staff members who responded to the subject's body alarm were placed in danger. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegations of Endangering the Safety of Others and Unprofessional Conduct. The subject resigned prior to receiving disciplinary action. (OIA-2021-03235)

- **Falsification of Documents**

A local investigation revealed a male Shift Supervisor at a privatized facility self-admitted to writing and presenting an incident report to an inmate for tattooing/self-mutilation and signing the name of another staff member as the reporting staff member. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegation of Falsification of Documents. The subject received a 5-day suspension. (OIA-2021-02746)

- **Weapons Introduction – Handgun**

A local investigation revealed a handgun, four rounds of ammunition, and two magazine clips were detected in the personal belongings of a female Nurse, as she was being processed through the Front Lobby into the institution. The subject noted she forgot she had these items in her bag. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegation of Weapons Introduction – Handgun. The subject resigned from the BOP prior to any discipline being issued. (OIA-2021-02555)

- **Excessive Use of Force – OC Spray**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer used excessive force against a male inmate when the staff member administered two separate bursts of OC spray from his MK-4 as the inmate was walking away and posed no threat toward the staff member. The subject retired prior to completion of the disciplinary process. (OIA-2021-00354)

- **Failure to Follow Policy; Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions**

A local investigation revealed a female Correctional Officer failed to review the Electronic Posted Picture File for April, August, September, October, and November 2020. The investigation revealed the subject's daily assignments provided the subject with ample time to access a computer and complete the task. There was insufficient evidence to sustain the allegation of Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions, as the subject did not open the monthly reminder emails sent by the SIS Lieutenant from the SIS email proxy, which were eventually emptied electronically from the subject's BOP email account. However, there was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegation of Failure to Follow Policy. The subject was terminated. (OIA-2021-00826)

Representative Case Summaries

- **Unauthorized Release of Information**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer posted a photograph of the secure confines of a BOP correctional institution on the Facebook page for the BOP. The photograph that was posted to the Facebook page revealed a hallway that connects two inmate housing units and the unit team area. In the post, the subject described, in detail, an incident regarding an inmate who was in possession of a homemade weapon. Upon being interviewed, the subject admitted to posting the surveillance footage to the BOP's Facebook page, without proper authorization, for the purpose of training. The subject received a letter of reprimand as discipline. (OIA-2021-03001)

- **Cigarettes/Tobacco Introduction; Soliciting/Accepting Anything of Value; Appearance of an Inappropriate Relationship; Failure to Follow Policy; Inattention to Duty**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer developed a personal relationship with inmates, accepted items from an inmate, and was inattentive to his assigned duties. An investigation into this matter was initiated when a male inmate claimed the staff member offered to provide an inmate with a can of snuff in exchange for a drawing created by an inmate. When interviewed, the staff member denied soliciting a portrait drawn by an inmate or bringing snuff into the institution for inmate consumption. Conversely, the staff member admitted he printed an image of a deer and engaged an inmate in conversations about deer and deer hunting. Additionally, the staff member admitted to accepting an art pencil from an inmate and using the art pencil to create drawings between making rounds. Lastly, the staff member admitted he did not make log entries into TRUSCOPE on four consecutive days. The allegations of Soliciting/Accepting Anything of Value, Appearance of an Inappropriate Relationship, Failure to Follow Policy, and Inattention to Duty were sustained against the subject. The allegation of Cigarettes/Tobacco Introduction was not sustained. The subject resigned from the BOP prior to receiving discipline. (OIA-2021-02894)

- **Failure to Follow Policy; Endangering the Safety of Others; Endangering the Safety of an Inmate**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer parked his personal vehicle at the Training Center, and the vehicle, which had no top or doors, had edged weapons, live ammunition, and tactile gear stored inside. Reportedly, there were inmates present in the immediate area who were performing landscaping duties. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegations of Endangering the Safety of an Inmate, Endangering the Safety of Others, and Failure to Follow Policy. The subject resigned prior to receiving discipline. (OIA-2021-07641)

- **Misuse of Government Computers**

A local investigation revealed a male Religious Services Assistant used his government computer to show an inmate a map of the local area. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegation of Misuse of Government Computers, and the subject was terminated during his probationary period. (OIA-2021-05372)

Representative Case Summaries

- **Use/Abuse of Illegal Drugs/Alcohol**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Systems Officer improperly used controlled medications. A urinalysis test performed on the subject indicated he tested positive for Hydrocodone and Hydromorphone. The subject took full responsibility for taking the medication, noting he developed back problems and thought the medications he was taking were nerve blockers, not narcotic medication. The subject resigned prior to receiving discipline. (OIA-2021-04373)

- **Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions**

A local investigation revealed a female Correctional Officer refused a mandatory overtime assignment. Her refusal was supported by the institutional duty roster and the mandatory roster. The subject received a written reprimand. (OIA-2021-00826)

- **Conduct Unbecoming a Correctional Worker; Failure to Follow Policy; Unprofessional Conduct; Threatening an Inmate/Verbal Abuse**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer showed another staff member confiscated inmate medications and stated that he was “stocking up” for a cell, meaning that of a specific inmate who had allegedly threatened staff. The subject admitted to conducting a cell search of that specific cell and having a subsequent conversation with the inmate housed within. The subject admitted to placing the confiscated inmate medications on the desk and telling that inmate that he should not make false claims against staff, because the next officer may write him up for possession of pills or medications like the ones on the desk. Additionally, the subject admitted to storing confiscated pill bottles, stamps, an MP3 player, inappropriate photographs, and unauthorized pornography in the Officer’s Station desk without completing a confiscation form. The subject resigned prior to receiving discipline. (OIA-2021-05421)

- **Breach of Computer Security; Failure to Follow Policy; Unauthorized Electronic Device Introduction**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer admitted to having his cellular telephone on his person, while inside the secure perimeter of the institution. The subject also admitted to connecting his cellular telephone to the unit workstation. The subject resigned prior to the completion of the disciplinary process. (OIA-2021-07289)

- **Inattention to Duty**

A local investigation revealed a female Correctional Officer at a privatized facility was inattentive to her duties while she was assigned as the armed escort at an outside hospital, providing coverage for an inmate. When being interviewed, the staff member said she had taken medication that made her drowsy; however, she denied falling asleep. The staff member said she had just propped her head against the wall while sitting in a chair. However, two photographs provided by nursing staff indicated the subject was in a chair outside the hospital room, leaning against the wall, with her body covered and her eyes closed. The subject's employment was terminated. (OIA-2021-05421)

Representative Case Summaries

- **Absent Without Leave; Failure to Follow Leave Procedures**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer failed to report to work for his assigned shift, nor did the officer call and request leave. The Lieutenant called the subject several times with negative results. The subject received a 3-day suspension. (OIA-2021-05421)

- **Unprofessional Conduct; Workplace Violence**

A local investigation revealed two male Cook Foremen engaged in a verbal confrontation, in which both admitted to cursing at each other in the presence of inmates and other staff. Therefore, the allegation of Unprofessional Conduct was sustained against both subjects. There was insufficient evidence to sustain the allegation of Workplace Violence, as the investigation revealed that the two subjects did not lay hands on one another. While one of the subject did throw a bottle of water, video footage revealed that the bottle was thrown at the ground and not at the other subject. Further, the water bottle did not hit the other subject. Both subjects received written reprimands. (OIA-2021-05421)

- **Physical Abuse of Inmates; Failure to Report a Violation of Rules/Regulations; Conduct Unbecoming a Correctional Worker**

A local investigation revealed a male Food Service Officer at a privatized facility was observed by another Food Service Officer striking inmates as a form of informal discipline. Specifically, the subject admitted to participating in “fixing” inmates, also referred to as “Juego (the game)” or “la discipliana,” where the inmate is punched one to three times in the upper torso as a form of punishment. The subject admitted to allowing inmates call him “Papa,” and admitted to participating in “fixing” inmates on at least three occasions. Additionally, the subject admitted to observing another staff member participate in “Juego,” and did not report it. That second subject was added to the case but resigned prior to providing a statement. During the course of the investigation, two other subjects also admitted to observing staff participate in “Juego” and did not report. One of those subjects resigned and did not provide statement, and the other subject received a written reprimand for the sustained allegation of Failure to Report a Violation of Rules/Regulations. The allegations of Physical Abuse of Inmates, Conduct Unbecoming a Correctional Worker, and Failure to Report a Violation of Rules/Regulations were sustained against the original subject, who was terminated. (OIA-2022-00083)

- **Failure to Follow Supervisor’s Instructions**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Systems Officer refused his augmentation and did not report to his reassigned post in a Housing Unit. There was sufficient evidence to sustain the allegation of Failure to Follow Supervisor’s Instructions. The discipline was combined with two cases where the same allegation was sustained on the subject, and the subject received a 6-day suspension. (OIA-2021-05568)

- **Breach of Computer Security; Failure to Follow Policy**

A local investigation revealed a male Electrical Worker Foreman plugged his Apple iPhone into the workstation located in the outside perimeter Officer’s Station. The subject received a written reprimand. (OIA-2021-05568)

Table 11: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2020
With 76.68 Percent Closed
(5,270 Total Opened)

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	646	1,507	106	2,259
Abuse of Inmates	16			16
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	11			11
Introduction of Contraband	19	50		69
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	4	66		70
Bribery	4	0		4
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	91			91
Investigative Violations		33		33
Personnel Prohibitions		360	10	370
Unauthorized Release of Information	5	8		13
Inattention to Duty	129	123		252
Breach of Security	34	34		68
Unprofessional Conduct	41	126		167
Failure to Follow Policy	165	211		376
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions		336		336
Other On-Duty Misconduct	127	160		287
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			96	96

Table 11: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2019
With 76.57 Percent Closed
(4,421 Total Opened)

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	461	1,476	155	2,092
Abuse of Inmates	33			33
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	15			15
Introduction of Contraband	15	38		53
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	9	69		78
Bribery	2	2		4
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	78			78
Investigative Violations		35		35
Personnel Prohibitions		344	10	354
Unauthorized Release of Information	7	5		12
Inattention to Duty	74	123		197
Breach of Security	22	24		46
Unprofessional Conduct	25	136		161
Failure to Follow Policy	101	192		293
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions		369		369
Other On-Duty Misconduct	80	139		219
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			145	145

Table 12: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2018
With 88.05 Percent Closed
(4,670 Total Opened)

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	766	1,713	226	2,705
Abuse of Inmates	47			47
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	23			23
Introduction of Contraband	39	58		97
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	15	98		113
Bribery	13	1		14
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	114			114
Investigative Violations		56		56
Personnel Prohibitions		390	16	406
Unauthorized Release of Information	8	15		23
Inattention to Duty	134	184		318
Breach of Security	44	51		95
Unprofessional Conduct	44	195		239
Failure to Follow Policy	166	242		408
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions		267		267
Other On-Duty Misconduct	119	156		275
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			210	210

**Table 13: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2017
With 93.03 Percent Closed
(4,392 Total Opened)**

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	970	1,981	204	3,155
Abuse of Inmates	48			48
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	15			15
Introduction of Contraband	35	80		115
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	12	159		171
Bribery	11	0		11
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	148			148
Investigative Violations		74		74
Personnel Prohibitions		419	14	433
Unauthorized Release of Information	14	15		29
Inattention to Duty	142	207		349
Breach of Security	84	81		165
Unprofessional Conduct	65	220		285
Failure to Follow Policy	237	297		534
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions		213		213
Other On-Duty Misconduct	159	216		375
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			190	190

Table 14: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2016 With 95.98 Percent Closed (5,128 Total Opened)				
Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	947	2,120	257	3,324
Abuse of Inmates	43			43
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	19			19
Introduction of Contraband	50	82		132
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	17	260		277
Bribery	20	3		23
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	145			145
Investigative Violations		71		71
Personnel Prohibitions		397	16	413
Unauthorized Release of Information	15	14		29
Inattention to Duty	134	254		388
Breach of Security	75	90		165
Unprofessional Conduct	65	222		287
Failure to Follow Policy	246	328		574
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions		176		176
Other On-Duty Misconduct	118	223		341
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			241	241

Table 15: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2015
With 96.85 Percent Closed
(5,206 Total Opened)

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	914	2,178	327	3,419
Abuse of Inmates	38			38
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	23			23
Introduction of Contraband	42	86		128
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	17	249		266
Bribery	16	1		17
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	154			154
Investigative Violations		92		92
Personnel Prohibitions		499	20	519
Unauthorized Release of Information	16	11		27
Inattention to Duty	132	232		364
Breach of Security	70	84		154
Unprofessional Conduct	83	240		323
Failure to Follow Policy	203	289		492
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions		178		178
Other On-Duty Misconduct	120	217		337
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			307	307

Table 16: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2014
With 98.60 Percent Closed
(5,201 Total Opened)

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	971	2,057	315	3,343
Abuse of Inmates	26			26
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	23			23
Introduction of Contraband	47	60		107
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	20	311		331
Bribery	17	2		19
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	155			155
Investigative Violations		94		94
Personnel Prohibitions		373	28	401
Unauthorized Release of Information	14	11		25
Inattention to Duty	153	296		449
Breach of Security	86	95		181
Unprofessional Conduct	96	251		347
Failure to Follow Policy	231	238		469
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions		155		155
Other On-Duty Misconduct	103	171		274
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			287	287

Types of Misconduct

Abuse of Inmates

- Physical Abuse of Inmates
- Excessive Use of Force
- Threatening an Inmate/Verbal Abuse
- Retaliation

Sexual Abuse of Inmates

- Aggravated Sexual Abuse - §2241
- Sexual Abuse/Sexual Abuse of a Ward - §2242/2243
- Abusive Sexual Contact - §2244
- Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature

Introduction of Contraband

- Soft Item Introduction
- Weapons Introduction
- Escape Paraphernalia Introduction
- Money Introduction
- Marijuana Introduction
- Heroin & Derivatives Introduction
- Cocaine Introduction
- Other Unspecified Drugs Introduction
- Alcoholic Beverages Introduction
- Unauthorized Electronic Device Introduction
- Creatine/Weightlifting Supplement Introduction
- Cigarettes/Tobacco Introduction

Discrimination

- Discrimination

Fiscal Improprieties

- Time and Attendance Irregularities
- Abuse of Sick Leave
- Voucher Falsification
- Theft/Misuse of Government Funds
- Theft/Misuse of Government Property
- Misuse of Government Computers
- Improper Procurement Procedures
- Failure to Pay Government Charge Card
- Misuse of Travel Charge Card

Fiscal Improprieties (Cont.)

- Misuse of Purchase Charge Card
- Misuse of SmartPay 2 Credit Card
- Theft/Misuse of Employees' Club Funds
- Theft/Misuse of AFGE/Union Funds
- Theft of Inmate Funds
- Theft/Destruction of Inmate Property
- Theft/Misuse of Contractor Funds
- Theft/Misuse of Contractor Property
- Failure to Account for Inmate Funds/Property
- Theft of Employee Funds/Property
- Misuse of UNICOR Resources
- Contract Fraud

Bribery

- Bribery

Inappropriate Relationship With Inmates

- Soliciting/Accepting Anything of Value
- Offering/Giving Anything of Value
- Improper Contact With an Inmate/Inmate's Family
- Appearance of an Inappropriate Relationship
- Misuse of Inmate Labor
- Preferential Treatment of Inmates
- Conduct Unbecoming a Correctional Worker

Investigative Violations

- Concealing a Material Fact
- Refusing to Cooperate
- Lying During an Investigation
- Providing a False Statement
- Altering/Destroying Evidence/Documents
- Refusing to Submit to a Search
- Interfering With/Impeding an Investigation
- Advising Someone to Violate Policy
- Conducting an Unauthorized Investigation
- Lack of Candor

Personnel Prohibitions

Threatening/Intimidating Employees (relates to personnel actions)
Failure to Report Violation of Rules/Regulations
Falsification of Employment Records
Misuse of Official Position/Badge
Inappropriate Supervisor/Subordinate Relationship
Engaging in Prohibited Personnel Practices
Use/Abuse of Illegal Drugs/Alcohol
Absent Without Leave
Failure to Follow Leave Procedures Retaliation
Refusing to Take a Drug Test

Unauthorized Release of Information

Unauthorized Release of Information Violation
of FOIA/Privacy Acts

Other On-Duty Misconduct

Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature^{1, 2}
Inattention to Duty¹
Failure to Respond to an Emergency
Failure to Properly Supervise Inmates
Breach of Security¹
Breach of Computer Security^{1, 3}
Falsification of Documents
Unprofessional Conduct¹
Failure to Follow Policy¹
Gambling/Promotion of Gambling
Endangering the Safety of an Inmate
Endangering the Safety of Others
Providing False Information Other Than During an Official Investigation
Insubordination
Accidental Discharge of a Firearm
Soliciting/Sale of Goods on Government Property Job
Favoritism
Workplace Violence
Failure to Meet Performance Standards
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions¹
Fraudulent Workers' Compensation Claims
Conduct Unbecoming a Management Official

Off-Duty Misconduct

Arrest and Conviction
Failure to Report Arrest Failure
to Pay Just Debts
Failure to Obtain Outside Employment Approval
DWI/DUI
Domestic Violence
Traffic Citation
Carrying an Unregistered/Concealed Firearm
Discreditable Behavior
Falsification of Records/Documents
Other Citation (Hunting, etc.)
Conflict of Interest
Other Off-Duty Misconduct

¹ Due to the frequency of this type of misconduct, it is identified distinctly throughout this report.

² The data for Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature (Non-Inmate Related) is combined with Unprofessional Conduct throughout this report.

³ The data for Breach of Computer Security is combined with Breach of Security throughout this report.

Monitoring Assignments

Alderson, WV.....	(Sean Kearney)	Leavenworth, KS	(Jerry Cramer)
Aliceville, AL.....	(Cody Kizzier)	Lee, VA.....	(Joy Walters)
Allenwood, PA.....	(Damon Sayers)	Lewisburg, PA	(Sean Kearney)
Ashland, KY.....	(Ron Corriveau)	Lexington, KY	(Pete Farrington)
Atlanta, GA	(John Squires)	Lompoc, CA	(John Squires)
Atwater, CA	(Mark Tucker)	Loretto, PA	(Robert Sorensen)
Bastrop, TX.....	(Warren Hawkins)	Los Angeles, CA.....	(John Squires)
Beaumont, TX.....	(Joy Walters)	Manchester, KY	(Ron Corriveau)
Beckley, WV	(Sean Kearney)	Marianna, FL	(John Squires)
Bennettsville, SC.....	(Pete Farrington)	Marion, IL.....	(Damon Sayers)
Berlin, NH	(Pete Farrington)	Mendota, CA.....	(John Squires)
Big Sandy, KY	(John Squires)	McCreary, KY	(Joy Walters)
Big Spring, TX.....	(Robert Sorensen)	McDowell, WV.....	(Sean Kearney)
Brooklyn, NY	(Andy Tietjen)	McKean, PA	(Pete Farrington)
Bryan, TX.....	(Jerry Cramer)	Memphis, TN.....	(Wade Jensen)
Butner, NC	(Ron Corriveau)	Miami (FDC & FCI), FL	(Robert Sorensen)
Canaan, PA.....	(Kevin Myers)	MXRO, MD.....	(Kevin Myers)
Carswell, TX	(Joy Walters)	Milan, MI.....	(Kevin Myers)
Chicago, IL.....	(Pete Farrington)	Montgomery, AL	(Wade Jensen)
Coleman, FL.....	(Wade Jensen)	Morgantown, WV	(Ron Corriveau)
Cumberland, MD.....	(Cody Kizzier)	New York, NY.....	(Ron Corriveau)
Danbury, CT.....	(Wade Jensen)	NCRO, KS	(Damon Sayers)
Devens, MA	(Pete Farrington)	NERO, PA	(Brian Cregan)
Dublin, CA	(Louis Thomas)	Oakdale, LA.....	(Warren Hawkins)
Duluth, MN	(Damon Sayers)	Oklahoma, OK.....	(Damon Sayers)
Edgefield, SC	(Cody Kizzier)	Otisville, NY.....	(Kevin Myers)
El Reno, OK	(Louis Thomas)	Oxford, WI.....	(Cody Kizzier)
Elkton, OH	(Kevin Myers)	Pekin, IL	(Damon Sayers)
Englewood, CO	(John Squires)	Pensacola, FL.....	(Peter Farrington)
Estill, SC.....	(Pete Farrington)	Petersburg, VA	(Robert Sorensen)
Fairton, NJ.....	(Kevin Myers)	Philadelphia, PA	(Andy Tietjen)
Florence, CO	(Dustin Quercia)	Phoenix, AZ.....	(Jerry Cramer)
Forrest City, AR	(Cody Kizzier)	Pollock, LA.....	(Louis Thomas)
Fort Worth, TX.....	(Jerry Cramer)	Ray Brook, NY	(Warren Hawkins)
Fort Dix, NJ.....	(Robert Sorensen)	Rochester, MN.....	(Mark Tucker)
Gilmer, WV	(Robert Sorensen)	Safford, AZ.....	(Jerry Cramer)
Grand Prairie, TX.....	(Jerry Cramer)	San Diego, CA	(Louis Thomas)
Greenville, IL	(Damon Sayers)	Sandstone, MN	(Warren Hawkins)
Guaynabo, PR.....	(Warren Hawkins)	Schuylkill, PA.....	(Pete Farrington)
Hazelton, WV	(Brian Cregan)	Seagoville, TX.....	(Louis Thomas)
Herlong, CA	(Sean Kearney)	SeaTac, WA	(Joy Walters)
Honolulu, HI.....	(Mark Tucker)	Sheridan, OR.....	(Mark Tucker)
Houston, TX.....	(Warren Hawkins)	SCRO, TX.....	(Jerry Cramer)
Jesup, GA	(Dustin Quercia)	SERO, GA	(Brian Cregan)
La Tuna, TX	(Jerry Cramer)	Springfield, MO.....	(Joy Walters)

Monitoring Assignments

Talladega, AL.....(Kevin Myers)
Tallahassee, FL..... (Damon Sayers)
Terminal Island, CA..... (Warren Hawkins)
Terre Haute, IN (Dustin Quercia)
Texarkana, TX.....(Robert Sorensen)
Thomson, IL(Jerry Cramer)
Three Rivers, TX.....(Wade Jensen)
Tucson, AZ..... (Brian Cregan)
Victorville, CA.....(Mark Tucker)
Waseca, MN(Louis Thomas)
WXRO, CA(Mark Tucker)
Williamsburg, SC (Warren Hawkins)
Yankton, SD(Louis Thomas)
Yazoo City, MS..... (Sean Kearney)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK