

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

**Office of Internal Affairs
Report for Fiscal Year 2019**



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.....	43
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2018	43
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2017	44
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2016	45
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2015	46
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2014	47
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2013	48
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2012	49
Types of Misconduct	50
OIA Special Agent Monitoring Assignments.....	54

Executive Summary of Findings

This report from the Office of Internal Affairs (OIA) for Fiscal Year 2019 provides information concerning the types and frequency of misconduct that occurs within the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) 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 Staff (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; and 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 19 include the following:

- There was a 12.24 percent decrease in the total number of misconduct allegations reported in Fiscal Year 2019, as compared with Fiscal Year 2018. The rate of reported misconduct allegations specifically for BOP employees decreased 7.26 percent from Fiscal Year 2018.
- There was a 5.43 percent decrease in the number of cases opened in Fiscal Year 2019, as compared with Fiscal Year 2018.
- Cases classified as Classification 1 offenses showed a decrease of 13.5 percent; cases classified as Classification 2 offenses showed a decrease of 15.4 percent; and cases classified as Classification 3 offenses showed an increase of 5.06 percent.
- The most frequently reported type of misconduct in Fiscal Year 2019 was Unprofessional Conduct. Failure to Follow Policy and Personnel Prohibitions placed second and third, respectively.

Executive Summary of Findings

- The category of reported misconduct showing an increase from Fiscal Year 2018 is as follows: Personnel Prohibitions (3.90 percent).
- The categories of reported misconduct showing the largest decrease from Fiscal Year 2018 are as follows: Other On Duty Misconduct – Inmate (16.80 percent); Physical Abuse (13.30 percent); Other On Duty Misconduct (5.23 percent).
- During Fiscal Year 2019, two cases involved Patriot Act violations. As of December 20, 2019, two cases remained open pending investigation. No cases involving Patriot Act violations were sustained.
- The most frequently sustained categories of misconduct among BOP employees with a sustained decision as of December 20, 2019, were Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions and Personnel Prohibitions.
- As of December 20, 2019, the most frequently sustained category of misconduct among both male and female BOP employees was Personnel Prohibitions. For those BOP employees with a sustained decision as of December 20, 2019, the rate was highest among Correctional Services staff.
- As of December 20, 2019, 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 Inattention to Duty.
- There were five sustained allegations of Physical Abuse as of December 20, 2019, stemming from five separate incidents. Two subjects were BOP employees; one employee resigned as a result of the sustained allegation and the other received an oral reprimand. The remaining three subjects were contractors at a privatized facility; one contractor was terminated, one received a three- day suspension, and one received a five day suspension. None of the subjects were criminally prosecuted.
- During Fiscal Year 2019, 426 allegations of Introduction of Contraband were reported. As of December 20, 2019, nine of these allegations were sustained. There were nine individuals involved in the sustained allegations of Introduction of Contraband.
- During Fiscal Year 2019, 542 allegations of Sexual Abuse were either reported to the OIA or detected during the course of an investigation. As of December 20, 2019, eight 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 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~." 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 2019, the OIA reviewed 437 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 allegation(s) do not rise to a level of staff misconduct.

During Fiscal Year 2019, the OIA opened 179 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 2019).

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 2019, the OIA opened 1,633 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 2019).

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~" (not to be confused with OIA's main resource mailbox, "BOP-DIR/Internal Affairs~"). The subject of your e-mail message should include the OIA case number and the facility mnemonic code (e.g., 2019-00001 - 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).

Do not send an e-mail that exceeds 14.0 MB in size (including attachments).

Affidavit files should include the "Warning and Assurance to Employee Required to Provide Information" (BP-A194.012), if applicable, as well as the 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 2019, the OIA opened 4,421 cases involving 5,477 BOP employees, 22 contract employees working in BOP facilities, 54 Public Health Service (PHS) employees working in BOP facilities, one volunteer working in BOP facilities, 67 contract/residential reentry center employees, 87 employees working in privatized facilities, and five other individuals.

These 4,421 cases represent a slight 5.3 percent decrease from the 5,837 cases opened during Fiscal Year 2018. The rate of reported misconduct among BOP employees decreased 7.26 percent from Fiscal Year 2018.

The 4,421 cases opened during Fiscal Year 2019 were classified as follows:

Classification 1	971
Classification 2	1,168
Classification 3	2,282

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.

** Unless otherwise noted, the figures for this report (Fiscal Year 2019) were generated on November 4, 2019.

Reported Misconduct

Cases classified as Classification 1 offenses showed a decrease of 13.5 percent, while cases classified as Classification 2 offenses showed a decrease of 15.4 percent. Cases classified as Classification 3 offenses showed an increase of 5.06 percent.

Table 1: Types of Reported Misconduct - Fiscal Year 2019					
Types of Misconduct	Number of Reported Allegations				
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL	% Change from 2018
Total	4,835	4,250	452	9,537	-12.24
Abuse of Inmates	906			906	-13.30
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	542			542	-14.38
Introduction of Contraband	313	113		426	-13.77
Discrimination	1	2		3	-25.00
Fiscal Improprieties	104	250		354	-21.68
Bribery	83	4		87	-4.40
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	498			498	-18.23
Investigative Violations		84		84	-21.50
Personnel Prohibitions		960	35	995	+1.84
Unauthorized Release of Information	80	29		109	-41.71
Inattention to Duty	288	344		632	-21.88
Breach of Security	124	140		264	-32.31
Unprofessional Conduct	712	511		1,223	-12.33
Failure to Follow Policy	554	461		1,015	-16.94
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions		776		776	+29.12
Other On-Duty Misconduct	630	576		1,206	-8.64
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			417	417	-21.47

Table 1 provides a breakdown of those categories of misconduct reported during Fiscal Year 2019.

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 2019, two cases involved potential Patriot Act violations. As of December 20, 2019, these two cases remained open pending investigation.

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

NOTES

All figures in this section relate to cases, which were opened during Fiscal Year 2019 and were closed as of December 20, 2019. 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 2019.

4,421 cases were opened during Fiscal Year 2019. As of December 20, 2019, 1,125 (25.4 percent) were closed. The remaining 3,296 cases (74.6 percent) were still open pending investigation.

Of the 1,125 cases closed: 1,007 (89.5 percent), were investigated at the institution level (“local investigation”) with authorization and monitoring provided by the OIA; 94 (8.4 percent) were OIA on-site investigations; and 24 (2.1 percent) were investigated by the OIG.

Of the 1,125 cases closed, 286 (25.4 percent) were sustained. Misconduct was sustained against 256 BOP employees, one contractor working in a BOP facility, one PHS employee working in a BOP facility, eight

contract/residential reentry center employees, and 30 contractors working in privatized facilities.

BOP Employees

Out of 35,481 active-duty BOP employees, there were 5,477 BOP employees identified as subjects of alleged misconduct in cases opened during Fiscal Year 2019. As of December 20, 2019, the cases had been closed for 18.3 percent of those employees. Of the 18.3 percent (or 1,003 employees), 25.5 percent (256) had a sustained decision (0.72 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 December 20, 2019. The most frequently sustained categories of misconduct were 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 2019 With 25.5 Percent Closed				
Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	49	218	25	292
Abuse of Inmates	2			2
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	6			6
Introduction of Contraband	1	7		8
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	2	12		14
Bribery	0	0		0
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	11			11
Investigative Violations		5		5
Personnel Prohibitions		70	3	73
Unauthorized Release of Information	1	0		1
Inattention to Duty	10	7		17
Breach of Security	1	1		2
Unprofessional Conduct	2	24		26
Failure to Follow Policy	9	17		26
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	70		70
Other On-Duty Misconduct	4	5		9
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			22	22

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 December 20, 2019, the following actions were taken for those BOP employees with a sustained finding in Fiscal Year 2019 (including findings on allegations that were made in prior fiscal years):

Written Reprimand	64
Resignation	51
Suspension	96
No Action.....	12
Retirement.....	18
Termination.....	32
Combined With Action in another OIA Matter	10
Demotion	9
Other	5

The specific types of misconduct most frequently sustained against those individuals for whom no disciplinary action was taken were Personnel Prohibitions and Failure to Follow Policy.

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 December 20, 2019. The most frequently sustained category of misconduct among male BOP employees was Personnel Prohibitions. The most frequently sustained category of misconduct among female BOP employees was Personnel Prohibitions.

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Table 3: Types of Sustained Misconduct for Male BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2019 With 25.5 Percent Closed				
Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Abuse of Inmates	1			1
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	4			4
Introduction of Contraband	1	3		4
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	1	10		11
Bribery	0	0		0
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	7			7
Investigative Violations		3		3
Personnel Prohibitions		40	0	40
Unauthorized Release of Information	1	2		3
Inattention to Duty	7	5		12
Breach of Security	1	1		2
Unprofessional Conduct	1	20		21
Failure to Follow Policy	8	14		22
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	47		47
Other On-Duty Misconduct	4	3		7
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			14	14

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

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Table 4: Types of Sustained Misconduct for Female BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2019 With 25.5 Percent Closed				
Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Abuse of Inmates	1			1
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	1			1
Introduction of Contraband	2	4		6
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	1	2		3
Bribery	0	0		0
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	4			4
Investigative Violations		2		2
Personnel Prohibitions		28	0	28
Unauthorized Release of Information	0	0		0
Inattention to Duty	3	2		5
Breach of Security	1	0		1
Unprofessional Conduct	1	4		5
Failure to Follow Policy	1	3		4
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	23		23
Other On-Duty Misconduct	0	2		2
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			8	8

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 December 20, 2019, 256 BOP employees identified as misconduct subjects during Fiscal Year 2019 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 2019 With 25.5 Percent Closed			
Discipline	Total Employees	Number of Employees With Sustained Misconduct	Rate Per 100 Total Employees
Human Resources	469	3	0.64
Mechanical Services	2,419	12	0.50
Psychology Services	1,134	4	0.35
Recreation	781	4	0.51
CEOs Office and Staff	782	1	0.13
Food Service	1,700	7	0.41
Computer Services	234	0	0.00
Correctional Services	16,070	157	0.98
Health Services/Safety	2,601	13	0.50
Unit Management	2,811	12	0.43
Religious Services	311	6	0.97
Records/Inmate Systems	1045	5	0.48
Education & Vocational Training	1,018	4	0.39
Financial Management	1,452	9	0.62
Central Office/Staff Training Centers	1,836	4	0.22
UNICOR	505	3	0.59
Inmate Services	470	1	0.21
Other*	168	11	6.55

* "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 67 contract/residential reentry center employees identified as misconduct subjects in Fiscal Year 2019. As of December 20, 2019, OIA closed cases for 52.2 percent of those 67 contractors. Of the 52.2 percent (or 35 contractors), 22.9 percent (or 8 contractors) had a sustained decision.

There were no drug treatment contractors identified as misconduct subjects during Fiscal Year 2019.

Table 6: Sustained Misconduct – Residential Reentry Center Employees / Drug Treatment Contractors – FY 2019			
Allegation	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty
Inappropriate Relationship with Inmates	4		
Investigative Violations		0	
Unauthorized Release of Information	0	0	
Inattention to Duty	0	0	
Failure to Follow Policy	1	0	
Other On-Duty Misconduct	2	0	
Off-Duty Misconduct		1	

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Contractors in Privatized Facilities

There were 87 contractors working in privatized facilities identified as misconduct subjects during Fiscal Year 2019. As of December 20, 2019, OIA closed cases for 83.9 percent of those 87 contractors. Of the 83.9 percent (or 73 contractors), 41.1 percent (30) 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 2019 With 71.0 Percent Closed				
Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Abuse of Inmates	3			3
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	0			0
Introduction of Contraband	1	2		3
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	1	0		1
Bribery	1	0		1
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	3			3
Investigative Violations		1		1
Personnel Prohibitions		1	0	1
Unauthorized Release of Information	1	0		1
Inattention to Duty	3	0		3
Breach of Security	0	0		0
Unprofessional Conduct	0	5		5
Failure to Follow Policy	1	0		1
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions			0	0
Other On-Duty Misconduct	4	0		4
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			3	3

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Contractors and Volunteers Working in BOP Facilities

There were 22 contractors and one volunteer working in BOP facilities identified as misconduct subjects during Fiscal Year 2019.

As of December 20, 2019, OIA closed cases for seven contractors. One contract employee had a sustained decision.

As of December 20, 2019, a decision had not been made for the one volunteer with an allegation of misconduct.

Table 8: Sustained Misconduct - Contract Employees/Volunteers – FY 2019			
Allegation	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty
Introduction of Contraband	1	0	
Inappropriate Relationship with Inmates	0		
Inattention to Duty	0	0	
Breach of Security	0	0	
Other On-Duty Misconduct	0	0	
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			0

Closed/Sustained Misconduct

PHS Employees Working in BOP Facilities

Of the approximately 700 PHS employees working in BOP facilities, 54 were identified as misconduct subjects during Fiscal Year 2019. As of December 20, 2019, OIA closed 16.7 percent of cases involving those 54 PHS employees. Of the 16.7 percent (or 9 PHS employees), one had a sustained decision.

Table 9: Sustained Misconduct – PHS Employees – FY19			
Allegation	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty
Breach of Security	0	0	
Unprofessional Conduct	0	0	
Failure to Follow Policy	0	0	
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			1

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 2019, 906 allegations of Physical Abuse of Inmates were either reported to the OIA, or detected during the course of an investigation. As of December 20, 2019, OIA closed cases for 20.3 percent (or 184) 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).

Five allegations of Physical Abuse reported during Fiscal Year 2019 were sustained as of December 20, 2019, stemming from five separate incidents.

Two inmates involved sustained minor/slight injury. Three inmates involved sustained minor/no injury.

Two subjects with a sustained allegations of Physical Abuse of Inmates were BOP employees. One BOP employee resigned prior to completion of the disciplinary process and one received an oral reprimand.

The remaining three subjects with sustained allegations of Physical Abuse of Inmates were contractors at a privatized facility. One contractor was terminated as a result of the sustained allegation. One contractor received a three-day suspension and one received a five-day suspension as a result of the sustained allegation.

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 2019, 426 allegations of Introduction of Contraband were either reported or detected during the course of an investigation. As of December 20, 2019, OIA closed cases for 12.0 percent (or 51) of those allegations. Of the 12.0 percent, 17.7 percent (9) were sustained:

Table 10: Introduction of Contraband		
Type of Contraband	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related
Soft Item	0	0
Weapons*	0	4
Unauthorized Electronic Device	0	5
Cigarettes/Tobacco	0	
Other Unspecified Drugs	0	0

*4 Handguns

There were nine individuals involved in the sustained allegations of Introduction of Contraband. Eight of these individuals were BOP employees (four male and four female). Five of the BOP employees worked in Correctional Services, two worked in Health Services/Safety, and one worked in Financial Management. One of the individuals with a sustained allegation 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 or 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 2019, 542 allegations of Sexual Abuse were either reported to the OIA or detected during the course of an investigation. Of the 542 allegations, 509 involved BOP employees, six involved PHS employees working in a BOP facility, 17 involved contract staff working in residential reentry facilities, eight 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 134 allegations reported, and Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature between male staff and male inmates, with 132 allegations reported.

As of December 20, 2019, eight allegations of Sexual Abuse reported during Fiscal Year 2019 were sustained; 171 were not sustained; 363 allegations were pending.

Representative Case Summaries

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

- **Physical Abuse of an Inmate – Minor/Slight Injury and Unprofessional Conduct**

A local investigation revealed a male staff at a private facility used profanity and attempted to close the food slot on the arms of two inmates. The inmates' allegations were corroborated by video surveillance and statements made by staff. The staff member kept trying to close the food port and ended up slamming the inmates' arms in it. The allegations of Unprofessional Conduct and Physical Abuse of Inmates were sustained against the staff member. The subject received a three-day suspension.

(OIA-2019-05374)

- **Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature – Female Staff/Male Inmate, Appearance of an Inappropriate Relationship, Lying During an Investigation, and Improper Contact with an Inmate/Inmate's Family**

An OIG investigation revealed two female staff at a private facility allowed inmates to bring cell phones into the institution and engaged in multiple contacts with inmates via the contraband cell phones. One subject admitted to developing close inappropriate relationships with several inmates. In addition, she lied during her initial interview, denying her involvement in any wrongdoing. Subsequent to her interview, she resigned. The Northern District of Texas accepted the case, she was arrested several days later and pled guilty to Misprison of a Felon. She was sentenced to six months incarceration. The other subject initially denied all allegations, but later admitted to kissing at least one inmate and communicating with others via the cell phones. Criminal prosecution was declined and the subject resigned prior to completion of the disciplinary process.

(OIA-2019-04945)

- **Sexual Abuse of Inmates – Male Staff/Female Inmate**

An OIA investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer committed sexual abuse on three female inmates. The three inmates reported sexual encounters involving sexual intercourse and/or oral sex with the officer. The officer confirmed he did have sexual encounters with all three of the inmates. He admitted to sexual intercourse with one inmate on one occasion, and admitted to sexual intercourse with another inmate on over 10 occasions. He confessed to performing and receiving oral sex with the third inmate. Sexual Abuse of a Ward was sustained and the subject retired prior to completion of the disciplinary process.

(OIA-2019-03613)

Representative Case Summaries

- **Introduction of Contraband – Weapons Introduction (Handgun)**

A local investigation revealed a female Correctional Officer introduced a handgun into the institution. The officer was not interviewed regarding this investigation due to her resignation. Several staff witnesses, CCTV, and supporting documents were used to provide a preponderance of evidence. The officer placed her bag on the conveyor to be screened. The screening officer noticed what appeared to be a pistol. The weapon removed from her bag was a 45. Caliber Springfield Armory with 6 rounds in the magazine. The subject resigned during the investigation.

(OIA-2019-03121)

- **Introduction of Contraband – Unauthorized Electronic Device Introduction**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer introduced an unauthorized electronic device into the facility. A lieutenant alleged he saw the officer talking into his watch telephone. The Correctional Officer had an iPod watch telephone and admitted bringing it into the institution. The subject received a written reprimand.

(OIA-2019-03842)

- **Inappropriate Relationship with an Inmate – Improper Contact with an Inmate/Inmate's Family and Misuse of Government Computers**

An OIG investigation revealed a female Material Handler Supervisor engaged in an inappropriate relationship with a male inmate. The inmate initially denied an inappropriate relationship until he was confronted with a sexually explicit letter discovered in his property. He admitted the female staff wrote the letter, however, denied a sexual relationship. A search of staff's BOP computer hard drive identified the electronic version of the sexually explicit letter; the same letter located in the inmate's property. She admitted writing several letters, using BOP computers to type and print the letters while on duty. She denied having a sexual relationship with the inmate. Criminal prosecution was denied and the subject resigned prior to completion of the disciplinary process.

(OIA-2019-04947)

- **Appearance of an Inappropriate Relationship and Inattention to Duty**

An OIG investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer showed favoritism to a female inmate by allowing her to spend long periods of time in his office and he abandoned his post to speak to the inmate. The OIG was not able substantiate the allegations that the officer had an inappropriate physical relationship with the inmate, provided the inmate contraband food items,

Representative Case Summaries

destroyed inmate property, or put money on the inmate's account. The subject resigned prior to completion of the disciplinary process.

(OIA-2019-04217)

- **Appearance of an Inappropriate Relationship and Misuse of Inmate Labor**

An OIG investigation revealed a female staff at a privatized facility brought in school supplies for her child's science project and had a male inmate complete the school science project. The inmate stated he agreed to do the work because he loves doing art. The staff member claimed the inmate did not receive anything in return for the work. The subject received a two-day suspension.

(OIA-2019-00337)

- **Unauthorized Release of Information and Failure to Follow Policy**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer violated policy and released unauthorized information. He admitted he provided a piece of paper with handwritten detailed information regarding staff's actions in the Special Housing Unit on a particular date, and the names and titles of staff. The inmate reported the officer provided him with a written statement based on what he saw that day. Unauthorized Release of Information and Failure to Follow Policy were sustained and the subject resigned prior to completion of the disciplinary process.

(OIA-2019-01522)

- **Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions, Refusing to Cooperate, and AWOL**

A local investigation revealed a female Staff Psychologist failed to follow supervisory instructions regarding leave usage and was absent without approved leave. The Staff Psychologist did not follow specific instructions given to her by her supervisor and an Associate Warden, regarding requesting leave. She did not cooperate with the investigation as she failed to show for a scheduled interview. Leave without pay was not approved and she accumulated 608.5 hours of AWOL. The subject was terminated.

(OIA-2019-05249)

- **Endangering the Safety of an Inmate and Failure to Properly Supervise Inmates**

A local investigation revealed a male Recreation Specialist failed to properly supervise inmates and endangered the safety of inmates by abandoning his post. The Supervisor of Education stated she saw the Recreation Specialist in the main corridor, exiting a unit, while she was waiting to enter the Special Housing Unit. She asked the Recreation Specialist where he was assigned and he told her the gym. During that time, a medical emergency was called because an inmate passed out in the gym. He admitted he left his assigned post in the gym and went to the unit to retrieve some payroll information from one of the inmate basketball commissioners. He also admitted it was his responsibility to stay on his assigned

Representative Case Summaries

post. The subject received a 5-day suspension.
(OIA-2019-01069)

- **Inattention to Duty**

A local investigation revealed that after an inmate was arrested for violating conditions of his supervised release, it was determined two female Classification and Computation Specialists were responsible for the inmate being released 27 days early. The error was found once the inmate was returned to custody. Both admitted to incorrectly giving the inmate credit for time served, while the inmate was not incarcerated. Both received written reprimands.
(OIA-2019-00639)

- **Refusing to Take a Drug Test, Advising Someone to Violate Policy, Use/Abuse of Illegal Drugs/Alcohol, Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions, Conduct Unbecoming a Management Official**

A local investigation revealed a male Lieutenant failed to provide a urine sample after being instructed to provide one. He asked a subordinate to "pee in a cup" for him, as he told the subordinate he had taken his wife's pain medication and had a urine cup in his coat pocket. The Lieutenant requested sick leave and left the institution after being instructed to wait in an office. He left without providing the sample. He later admitted to taking Tylenol with Codeine that was not prescribed to him. The subject resigned prior to completion of the disciplinary process.
(OIA-2019-00196)

- **Inattention to Duty and AWOL**

A local investigation revealed a male SIS Technician departed his post to go to the institution parking lot. He did not get permission and failed to contact a supervisor to notify them he was leaving his post or of his location. He was in the parking lot from 2:00 p.m., until 3:45 p.m., and never returned to his assigned post. Additionally, he was on a TAD assignment and was required to listen to fifty (50) minutes of inmate telephone calls each hour. A review of Trufone records showed he did not monitor any phone calls that day. Discipline was combined and the subject received a seven-day suspension.
(OIA-2019-02077)

- **Theft/Misuse of Government Property, Improper Contact with an Inmate/Inmate's Family, Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature**

An OIA investigation revealed insufficient evidence a male Maintenance Worker Supervisor engaged in any type of sexual encounter or sexual conversation with female inmates as reported by the inmates. He denied any sexual contact or conversations with the inmates and

Representative Case Summaries

no evidence was discovered to dispute his denial. The sexual allegations were not reported until years after they allegedly occurred. He denied he ever called inmates bitch, or provided them with candy, food, face cream or any other unauthorized item. The OIA investigation revealed he removed a transmission fluid changer from the institution recycle shed and transported it to his residence. He stated the machine remained at his residence and he admitted he was aware he was not permitted to take the machine. The investigation also revealed sufficient evidence he talked to a female inmate over the phone after her release from the BOP, and met her in the local community after she was released but on supervised release status. He also admitted he spoke with her on the phone and he met her at a truck stop in Mississippi. He stated while she was incarcerated, she showed him her bare breasts. Even though the inmate denied she exposed her breast to the male staff, he confessed the incident occurred. The subject resigned prior to completion of the disciplinary process. (OIA-2019-03689)

- **Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature, Unprofessional Conduct, Failure to Report a Violation of Rules/Regulations**

An OIA investigation revealed a male halfway house employee patted, hugged and kissed staff without their approval. In addition, the OIA investigation revealed sufficient evidence he advised staff to report staff misconduct only to him. Several staff stated he engaged in inappropriate behavior and reported he touched, hugged, kissed, massaged and jokingly hit staff without their approval. He failed to report allegations of staff misconduct that were reported directly to him. The subject was terminated. (OIA-2019-01989)

- **Unprofessional Conduct**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer made a statement during a shift briefing, in the presence of other officers and a Lieutenant. In this statement the officer referred to another officer as a “bitch.” Several staff stated they heard him make this statement. He willingly admitted to making the statement and stated he regrets the situation and wished it had never happened. The subject received a letter of reprimand. (OIA-2019-02405)

- **Unprofessional Conduct**

A local investigation revealed a male Electronics Technician used profanity when requesting the front lobby door be opened. Staff alleged he stated, “open the fucking door,” and called a staff member a bitch. He admitted he stated, “open the fucking door,” but denied calling anyone a bitch. The subject received a written reprimand. (OIA-2019-00976)

Representative Case Summaries

- **Unprofessional Conduct**

A local investigation revealed a male Utility Systems Operator Supervisor stated “fuck you” to a Lieutenant after being told to turn the lights on in the area he was assigned to work. He then went to the Lieutenant's Office and cursed loudly stating, “I don't have to do what you tell me to do, you can't make me do shit. You're not my boss, you can't do shit to me. I'm not the one to mess with.” He was ordered to leave the office multiple times due to his behavior, which he eventually complied. He admitted he told the Lieutenant he could not tell him what to do and he could not “do crap” to him. He denied ever using profanity during the incident, but witness statements confirmed he used profanity. The subject received a written reprimand.

(OIA-2019-00563)

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

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer used prescription medication not prescribed to him. Independent lab results from Quest Diagnostics Incorporated revealed a positive urine test for Codeine. The subject was placed on a last chance agreement.

(OIA-2019-00725)

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

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer reported to work after his assigned shift and was charged Absent Without Leave due to not being in an approved leave status. He admitted he was later told to work a morning watch shift as mandatory, but he did not stay and work the mandated overtime. The subject received a 2-day suspension.

(OIA-2019-02346)

- **Falsification of Records/Documents and Theft/Misuse of Government Funds**

An OIG investigation revealed a male Human Resource Specialist provided false information and used forged documents to obtain retirement and disability benefits he was not entitled to from the OWCP, VA, and SSA. He was arrested and charged with 7 counts of wire fraud and one count of identity theft. He pled guilty to one count of wire fraud. He was sentenced to 37 months incarceration and ordered to pay restitution. The subject medically retired.

(OIA-2019-05252)

Representative Case Summaries

- **Failure to Report Arrest and Arrest and Conviction**

The OIA was notified by the Security & Background Investigation Section that a female Correctional Officer was arrested by US Army Criminal Investigation Command, Fort Dix CID Office and charged with Wire Fraud, Larceny: Military Property More Than \$500, False Pretense: More Than \$500. It was determined the officer failed to report the arrest. The subject resigned prior to completion of the disciplinary process.
(OIA-2019-01451)

- **DWI/DUI**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer was arrested after drinking and driving. The officer stated he consumed five beers over a five-hour period and was driving home when he was stopped for “failure to signal.” Voluntary roadside maneuvers were conducted and based on the results he was arrested and chose to take a breathalyzer test. The breathalyzer test resulted in a blood alcohol level of .168. He was charged with DUI and pled guilty. He was sentenced to 18 months of probation, and ordered to attend a MADD class and pay fine/court costs of \$1671.50. The subject received a one-day suspension.
(OIA-2019-03094)

- **Discreditable Behavior**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer was pulled over for having expired insurance and was subsequently arrested for having a warrant for failing to appear for an outstanding traffic ticket. He paid a \$350.00 for his outstanding citations and was subsequently released. The subject received a one-day suspension.
(OIA-2019-00187)

- **Falsification of Documents, Inattention to Duty, and Failure to Follow Policy**

A local investigation revealed a male probationary Correctional Officer failed to sign his post orders, failed to make log entries in TRUSCOPE during his shift, and logged he conducted a cell search which CCTV revealed he did not. The subject was removed during his probationary period.
(OIA-2019-06106)

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

A local investigation revealed a male Electrical Worker Foreman plugged his cell phone into a government computer. He admitted he plugged his phone into the USB port on the government computer at the powerhouse, creating several Symantec Endpoint security breach notifications. The subject received a written reprimand.
(OIA-2019-05748)

Representative Case Summaries

- **Unprofessional Conduct**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Counselor admitted he got angry and made the following statement to all the officers present in the Special Housing Unit and in the Lieutenant's Office, "you all got that pussy." Several witnesses stated the Counselor was unprofessional towards them in Special Housing Unit by stating, "I remember when I held those keys, staff came first never inmates. I'm sorry if your pussy is hurt because you want to get relieved. Fuck this, I got 36 days left, I'll be sharpening knives, drinking beer, and pissing foam, fuck this, I'll be back after 2 o'clock." Several lieutenants also stated the Counselor came into the Lieutenant's Office and made the statement, "you all got that pussy," to the officers in the SHU. The subject retired prior to completion of the disciplinary process.

(OIA-2019-03937)

- **Improper Contact with an Inmate/Inmate's Family and Conduct Unbecoming a Correctional**

A local investigation revealed a male halfway house employee used his personal phone to contact an inmate for purposes other than accountability. The inmate also alleged the halfway house employee called her an excessive amount of times and offered to pick her up from work. The employee admitted to contacting the initial inmate, and several other inmates from his personal phone to check their status while in the community for accountability purposes. The subject was terminated.

(OIA-2019-03462)

- **Workplace Violence and Unprofessional Conduct**

A local investigation revealed two employees at a private facility pushed one another and pointed fingers at one another. Staff witnessed them pushing and shoving each other as they engaged in an argument. One was heard saying, "don't fucking touch me," as they both used profanity. They both admitted to "horseplay" while they were working in the front lobby by the staff entrance, but witness statements contradicted the "horseplay," due to profanity and physical interactions. Both subjects received a five-day suspension.

(OIA-2019-03426)

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

A local investigation revealed a female Correctional Officer admitted she was instructed by her supervisor to work mandatory overtime, but failed to work the mandate. The subject received a written reprimand.

(OIA-2019-04144)

Representative Case Summaries

- **Misuse of Travel Charge Card**

A local investigation revealed a male Training Instructor used his Government Travel card to purchase a bottle of liquor in the amount of \$22. He self-reported he accidentally used his Government Travel card to purchase the bottle of alcohol. No action was taken against the subject.

(OIA-2019-03704)

- **Conduct Unbecoming a Correctional Worker and Misuse of Government Computers**

An OIG investigation revealed a female Recreation Specialist permitted an inmate in her office, alone with her, on several instances. She admitted the inmate would come into her office to check on her. However, she maintained she did not engage in any inappropriate contact with the inmate. She admitted to conducting a search of real estate listings for the inmate on her work computer, but stated she was unsure if it was prohibited. The subject resigned prior to completion of the disciplinary process.

(OIA-2019-03357)

- **Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer made an unprofessional comment of a sexual nature to another staff member. Specifically, the male officer stated he was going home sick and another officer joking stated, “what, do I stink?” The male officer replied, “yeah, maybe you should close your legs,” but stated he was joking. The subject received a two-day suspension.

(OIA-2019-03085)

- **Sexual Abuse of Inmates – Female Staff/Male Inmate**

A joint OIA/OIG investigation revealed a female Material Handler Supervisor was involved in an inappropriate relationship with an inmate. She was found in the commissary with the inmate, who was nude. She sent sexually suggestive text messages to the inmate and failed to report the inmate possessed and utilized a cell phone from inside the institution. She admitted she developed a personal relationship with the inmate and she had been communicating with him utilizing a cell phone that she obtained from another inmate. She admitted she was in the commissary with the inmate, and also admitted to kissing and fondling the inmate. She provided the inmate a condom to be used on a sex toy that he made, but denied using the sex toy. The sex toy and condom wrapper were both recovered from the commissary. In addition, photographs retrieved from the phone included a photograph of the homemade sex toy found in the commissary. The subject resigned prior to completion of the disciplinary process.

(OIA-2019-02408)

Representative Case Summaries

- **Failure to Pay Government Charge Card**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer used his government travel card as directed to pay for his hotel and food while on official travel. He admitted he made no attempt to make any payments towards his travel card and still owed \$666.00 on his travel card. The subject received a one-day suspension.

(OIA-2019-02863)

- **Sexual Abuse of Inmates – Male Staff/Male Inmates, Offering/Giving Anything of Value and Misuse of Government Computers**

An OIG investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer made sexual comments, authored and passed vulgar letters, and inappropriately touched an inmate. He also misused BOP computer systems. The officer admitted to the OIG that he made sexual comments to the inmate; authored and passed vulgar letters to the inmate, inappropriately touched the inmate on the upper part of the back of his leg; and he misused BOP computer systems to monitor the same inmate's phone calls. He denied to the OIG that he engaged in sexual intercourse or conducted inappropriate pat down searches of the inmate. The OIG reviewed his use of BOP computer systems and determined that he inappropriately monitored phone calls without proper justification. He admitted to the OIG that he did so to protect his inappropriate relationship with the inmate. Prosecution was declined and the subject resigned prior to completion of the disciplinary process.

(OIA-2019-04478)

- **Altering/Destroying Evidence/Documents, Misuse of Government Computers, Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature, and Failure to Follow Policy**

An OIA investigation revealed a male staff at a private facility used his work desktop computer to go to multiple unauthorized web sites and on-line dating sites. He also used his work desktop computer to download and store sexually explicit photos of nude and semi-nude females. He admitted these activities occurred during his assigned hours of work and these activities were prohibited by policy. The investigation further revealed he deleted his internet browser history and the explicit photos once he became aware of the investigation. Despite his attempt to delete his internet browsing history and delete the inappropriate photos, investigators were able to recover 48 pages of internet browsing history and 19 explicit photos from his hard drive. The subject was terminated.

(OIA-2019-03622)

Table 11: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2018
With 60.84 Percent Closed
(4,670 Total Opened)

Types of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	540	1,117	110	1,767
Abuse of Inmates	21			21
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	22			22
Introduction of Contraband	21	39		60
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	9	50		59
Bribery	9	1		10
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	79			79
Investigative Violations		35		35
Personnel Prohibitions		257	10	267
Unauthorized Release of Information	7	16		23
Inattention to Duty	85	105		190
Breach of Security	30	50		80
Unprofessional Conduct	24	106		130
Failure to Follow Policy	100	130		230
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	176		176
Other On-Duty Misconduct	133	152		285
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			100	100

Table 12: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2017
With 80.72 Percent Closed
(4,392 Total Opened)

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	1,299	3,376	138	4,813
Abuse of Inmates	67			67
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	43			43
Introduction of Contraband	62	159		221
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	27	369		396
Bribery	24	6		30
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	228			228
Investigative Violations		144		144
Personnel Prohibitions		746	30	776
Unauthorized Release of Information	26	22		48
Inattention to Duty	177	349		526
Breach of Security	113	276		389
Unprofessional Conduct	122	363		485
Failure to Follow Policy	331	502		833
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	344		344
Other On-Duty Misconduct	79	96		175
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			108	108

Table 13: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2016
With 84.58 Percent Closed
(5,128 Total Opened)

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	770	1,963	214	2,947
Abuse of Inmates	35			35
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	25			25
Introduction of Contraband	39	85		124
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	16	244		260
Bribery	19	3		22
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	126			126
Investigative Violations		86		86
Personnel Prohibitions		373	16	389
Unauthorized Release of Information	14	13		27
Inattention to Duty	89	211		300
Breach of Security	68	164		232
Unprofessional Conduct	66	219		285
Failure to Follow Policy	193	292		485
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	166		166
Other On-Duty Misconduct	80	107		187
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			198	198

Table 14: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2015
With 94.60 Percent Closed
(5,206 Total Opened)

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	876	2,068	306	3,250
Abuse of Inmates	37			37
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	31			31
Introduction of Contraband	37	87		124
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	16	228		244
Bribery	21	2		23
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	146			146
Investigative Violations		85		85
Personnel Prohibitions		471	21	492
Unauthorized Release of Information	16	11		27
Inattention to Duty	129	211		340
Breach of Security	65	181		246
Unprofessional Conduct	90	258		348
Failure to Follow Policy	180	271		451
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	173		173
Other On-Duty Misconduct	108	90		198
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			285	285

Table 15: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2014
With 97.75 Percent Closed
(5,201 Total Opened)

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	946	2,002	309	3,257
Abuse of Inmates	26			26
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	36			36
Introduction of Contraband	42	65		107
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	19	300		319
Bribery	19	2		21
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	151			151
Investigative Violations		88		88
Personnel Prohibitions		368	30	398
Unauthorized Release of Information	16	11		27
Inattention to Duty	142	280		422
Breach of Security	94	110		204
Unprofessional Conduct	92	281		373
Failure to Follow Policy	218	218		436
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	153		153
Other On-Duty Misconduct	91	126		217
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			279	279

Table 16: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2013
With 99.24 Percent Closed
(5,503 Total Opened)

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	935	1,938	363	3,236
Abuse of Inmates	33			33
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	36			36
Introduction of Contraband	52	63		115
Discrimination	1	0		1
Fiscal Improprieties	18	211		229
Bribery	21	1		22
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	164			164
Investigative Violations		105		105
Personnel Prohibitions		392	21	413
Unauthorized Release of Information	23	17		40
Inattention to Duty	123	235		358
Breach of Security	82	159		241
Unprofessional Conduct	114	250		364
Failure to Follow Policy	186	222		408
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	150		150
On-Duty Misconduct	82	133		215
Off-Duty Misconduct			342	342

Table 17: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2012
With 99.84 Percent Closed
(5,580 Total Opened)

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Total	940	1,950	335	3,225
Abuse of Inmates	34			34
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	38			38
Introduction of Contraband	47	58		105
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	13	229		242
Bribery	14	1		15
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	158			158
Investigative Violations		114		114
Personnel Prohibitions		407	25	432
Unauthorized Release of Information	11	12		23
Inattention to Duty	86	179		265
Breach of Security	108	144		252
Unprofessional Conduct	124	282		406
Failure to Follow Policy	204	228		432
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	173		173
Other On-Duty Misconduct	103	123		226
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			310	310

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
Aliceville, AL.....
Allenwood, PA.....
Ashland, KY.....
Atlanta, GA.....
Atwater, CA.....
Bastrop, TX.....
Beaumont, TX.....
Beckley, WV
Bennettsville, SC
Berlin, NH
Big Sandy, KY
Big Spring, TX
Brooklyn, NY.....
Bryan, TX
Butner, NC.....
Canaan, PA
Carswell, TX.....
Chicago, IL
Coleman, FL.....
Cumberland, MD.....
Danbury, CT.....
Devens, MA.....
Dublin, CA
Duluth, MN.....
Edgefield, SC.....
El Reno, OK.....
Elkton, OH
Englewood, CO.....
Estill, SC.....
Fairton, NJ
Florence, CO.....
Forrest City, AR
Fort Worth, TX
Fort Dix, NJ
Gilmer, WV.....
Grand Prairie, TX
Greenville, IL
Guaynabo, PR.....

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C); (b)(7)(F)

Hazelton, WV
Herlong, CA
Honolulu, HI
Houston, TX.....
Jesup, GA.....
La Tuna, TX.....
Leavenworth, KS
Lee, VA
Lewisburg, PA.....
Lexington, KY.....
Lompoc, CA
Loretto, PA
Los Angeles, CA.....
Manchester, KY
Marianna, FL
Marion, IL.....
Mendota, CA
McCreary, KY.....
McDowell, WV
McKean, PA
Memphis, TN.....
Miami (FDC & FCI), FL
MXRO, MD
Milan, MI.....
Montgomery, AL
Morgantown , WV
New York, NY
NCRO, KS
NERO, PA.....
Oakdale, LA
Oklahoma, OK
Otisville, NY
Oxford, WI.....
Pekin, IL.....
Pensacola, FL.....
Petersburg, VA
Philadelphia, PA
Phoenix, AZ
Pollock, LA.....

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C); (b)(7)(F)

Monitoring Assignments

Ray Brook, NY.....
Rochester, MN
Safford, AZ.....
San Diego, CA.....
Sandstone, MN.....
Schuylkill, PA
Seagoville, TX
SeaTac, WA
Sheridan, OR
SCRO, TX.....
SERO, GA
Springfield, MO
Talladega, AL
Tallahassee, FL
Terminal Island, CA
Terre Haute, IN.....
Texarkana, TX.....
Thomson, IL.....
Three Rivers, TX
Tucson, AZ.....
Victorville, CA.....
Waseca, MN
WRO, CA.....
Williamsburg, SC
Yankton, SD
Yazoo City, MS.....

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C); (b)(7)(F)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK