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Foreword

Since its origin almost 10 years ago, the National Major Gang Task Force has worked diligently to provide service and useful information to the criminal justice professionals who manage gangs and security threat group members in America’s prisons and jails. This survey was conducted to continue that commitment to service.

We believe the survey is a significant work not only for the many things it says now, but also for the data it generated that can be further developed when additional resources are available. One need only compare the information in this report with the pioneer work done by Camp and Camp in the first such comprehensive study published in 1985 to see the exponential growth of gangs in correctional systems. A more than ten fold increase in the number of gangs reported confirms what many correctional administrators already know, that gangs and STG’s are on the rise in virtually every large and small correctional system across the U.S. and Canada.

The National Major Gang Task Force is committed to assisting Security Threat Group Coordinators and correctional administrators in their efforts to manage these groups more effectively, and where possible eliminate their influence. We believe that sharing the information contained in this report takes us one step closer to that goal.

For more information about the National Major Gang Task Force please visit our web site at www.NMGTF.org, or call 317-322-0537.
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<td>First Meeting of the National Major Gang Task Force at the University of Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>First Annual NMGTF conference at Hartford, Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
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<td>NMGTF establishes Training Division at EKU, Tommy Norris, Federal Bureau of Prisons (Retired) becomes first Director</td>
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<td>6th Annual Training Conference held in Indianapolis, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Dale Welling retires as Executive Director. Ed Cohn, Indiana Department of Correction (Retired) succeeds him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7th Annual Training Conference held at Foxwoods Resort in Mashantucket, Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First free standing office for the NMGTF established in Indianapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Task Force publication “From the Street to the Prison: Understanding and Responding to Gangs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job task analysis of Institution Security Threat Group Coordinator completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Members of the Association of State Correctional Administrators were asked by Executive Director to appoint a State Coordinator to the Task Force from each state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First State Coordinators meeting held at EKU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th Annual Training Conference held in Atlanta, Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Gang Survey completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online certification program for security threat group coordinators</td>
</tr>
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Introduction

Inmate gangs are of concern to many correctional systems and jails across the United States. These groups perpetrate violence, extortion, and a range of illicit operations involving such goods and services as drugs, gambling, and prostitution (Decker, 2001). Accordingly, gangs can pose a major threat to institutional security and programming. Despite the significance of this topic, not enough research has addressed the nature and extent of the inmate gang problem or the control efforts of prison and jail officials (Fleisher & Rison, 1999; Jacobs, 2001).

In an earlier study, Caltabiano (1981) found evidence for the existence of 47 separate gangs in 24 of 45 state correctional systems that furnished data. Likewise, Camp and Camp (1985) found 114 gangs in 33 of the 49 systems surveyed; these gangs consisted of over 12,600 members. Three jurisdictions reported over 2,000 members, and one jurisdiction reported 5,300 members. Camp and Camp estimated that gang members comprised three percent of the total inmate population in state and federal institutions. Knox (2000) estimated that, on average, approximately one-quarter of all male inmates in state prisons in 1999 were gang members; he set the proportion at one-third for maximum security facilities. Camp and Camp recommended the conduct of frequent follow-up surveys to monitor the extent and nature of the prison gang problem.

Researchers have also studied the gang control efforts of correctional officials. For instance, Fong and Buentello (1991) surveyed security personnel in the Texas Department of Corrections to ascertain indicators of prison gang development as perceived by these staff (e.g., requests for protective custody, gang-related tattoos, contraband violations, etc.). Camp and Camp (1985) included survey items covering staff identification and documentation of gang members, information sharing, and specific control strategies (also see Camp & Camp, 1988). Similarly, Knox (2000) included survey items about rules prohibiting gang recruitment, provision of gang training for staff, staff negotiations with gang members, and specific control strategies (e.g., inmate transfers, segregation, phone and mail monitoring, etc.). Good descriptions of contemporary control strategies can be found in the works of Carlson (2001) and Decker (2001; Fleisher & Decker, 2001).

The survey research presented in this bulletin was performed to further understanding of inmate gangs and the efforts of prison and jail officials to control gang activities. Because the term “gang” can be
defined in a variety of ways and because disparate definitions of major terms among respondents can confound survey research, we substituted the term “security threat group” (STG) for purposes of our survey. Drawing on their work in Massachusetts, Toller and Tsagaris (1996) define a STG as “two or more inmates, acting together, who pose a threat to the security or safety of staff/inmates, and/or are disruptive to programs, and/or threaten the orderly management of the facility/system.”

Toller and Tsagaris’ (1996) definition was incorporated into the instructions accompanying our survey instrument. Since that definition stipulates the number of inmates at two or more, any use of it as a proxy for gangs will result in an overestimate of the number of inmates with gang involvements; clearly, some STGs do not qualify as gangs. At the same time, we prefer the term STG over the term gang because, for purposes of this study, we were less concerned about what a collection of inmates is called, or about the absolute size of the group, than about the extent to which officials perceive groupings of inmates as a threat to safety, security, and institutional order.

Method

Survey and Procedure

The mail survey instrument used in this research was modeled after the one used by Camp and Camp (1985) and based upon input from board members of the National Major Gang Task Force (NMGTF). This input, along with results from a pilot test, guided efforts to refine the instrument prior to its full-scale administration during January and February 2002.

The instrument consisted of items grouped into four basic categories. The first of these categories was meant to provide a brief statistical profile of the responding jurisdiction’s staff, inmate, and STG populations. The second category of items addressed incidents of violence against both staff and inmates, including STG-related incidents, during calendar year 2001. The third category sought information about a variety of strategies or tools to manage or control STG activities. The final category asked respondents to identify and describe specific STGs operating in their jurisdictions and also to describe the criteria according to which STGs get identified.

Surveys were mailed to adult correctional systems at the federal and state levels in January 2002. Surveys were sent to each of the 50 states, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the District of Columbia, Puerto
Rico, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Canada.\textsuperscript{1} Then during February 2002, 37 additional surveys were sent to some of the largest jails in the nation.\textsuperscript{2} Survey materials were mailed directly to each correctional system or jail’s top-level administrator (i.e., a commissioner, director, superintendent, etc.). These persons were asked to give the survey to the individual in the system who was in charge of STG-related matters or who was most knowledgeable of those matters so that it could be completed and returned.

The procedure for survey administration adhered to the total design method (TDM) developed by Dillman (1978). The TDM is an established protocol for maximizing survey response rates. After appropriate reminders and follow-ups, this procedure resulted in an overall response rate of 78.7 percent. The rate was somewhat greater for correctional systems (84.2% or 48 of 57 systems responding) than for jails (70.3% or 26 of 37 jails responding). Nonetheless, both rates are quite acceptable for generalizing conclusions by the standards of social science.

**Profile of Responding Jurisdictions**

The number of prison inmates in the systems that responded to the survey ranged from a reported 384 (U.S. Virgin Islands) to 160,000 (California), with an average of 25,400 inmates. The number of jail inmates in responding jurisdictions ranged from 536 (Hennepin Co., Minnesota) to 19,200 (Los Angeles Co. Sheriff’s Department), with an average of 4,700 inmates. In the prison systems that responded, the number of full-time staff ranged from a reported 202 (Guam) to 48,380 (California); the average was 8,461 staff. In responding jail systems, the number of staff ranged from 220 (Arlington Co., Virginia) to 12,251 (New York City Department of Corrections); the average was 1,600 staff.
Results

This section presents the major descriptive findings from the survey. The presentation is broken down according to the four categories of the instrument mentioned above.

Statistical Data

1. Respondents from all but four of the prison systems that furnished data and those from all except six responding jails indicated that their system recognizes the existence of STGs.

2. The median number of different STGs estimated per prison system was 25 (Mean = 132.5, SD = 236.8). The median for jails was considerably lower – 14 per jail (Mean = 27.2, SD = 42.0).

3. The median number of inmates estimated to be involved in STGs per correctional system was 1,575 (Mean = 2,789.2, SD = 3,469.4), whereas the median number of jail inmates was estimated at 300 (Mean = 1,245, SD = 2,443.0). Breakdowns for the specific jurisdictions appear in Tables 1 and 2. In prison systems, an average of 13.4 percent of all inmates per system were estimated to be involved in STGs; the figure for jails was 15.6 percent of all inmates per jail. Proportions for individual jurisdictions are reported in the tables and prison percentages are mapped in Figure 1.

4. Respondents were asked to estimate the number of inmates in particular STG categories, and these data are summarized in Figure 2 for prisons and in Figure 3 for jails. As can be seen from these figures, jails contained a higher proportion of associate members (43% of jail STG members), while prisons contained a higher proportion of confirmed members (over 51% of STG prison inmates).
Table 1
Estimated Inmate Population and STG Population by Correctional System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction/ System</th>
<th>Estimated Total Inmate Population</th>
<th>Estimated No. of STG-Involved Inmates</th>
<th>Estimated % of Inmates Involved in STGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama DOC</td>
<td>26,972</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska DOC</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona DOC</td>
<td>28,036</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas DOC</td>
<td>11,886</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California DOC</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>10,133</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Corrections Service</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado DOC</td>
<td>17,267</td>
<td>5,928</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut DOC</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware DOC</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>does not recognize STG’s</td>
<td>has not estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Bureau of Prisons</td>
<td>132,325</td>
<td>15,488</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida DOC</td>
<td>69,941</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam DOC</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>does not recognize STG’s</td>
<td>has not estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii DOC</td>
<td>3,748</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho DOC</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana DOC</td>
<td>20,966</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa DOC</td>
<td>7,939</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas DOC</td>
<td>8,486</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky DOC</td>
<td>15,851</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana DOC</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland DOC</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts DOC</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan DOC</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota DOC</td>
<td>6,596</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi DOC</td>
<td>17,059</td>
<td>3,439</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri DOC</td>
<td>28,772</td>
<td>does not recognize STG’s</td>
<td>has not estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska DOC</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada DOC</td>
<td>9,989</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire DOC</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey DOC</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico DOC</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York DOC</td>
<td>does not recognize STG’s</td>
<td>has not estimated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina DOC</td>
<td>33,360</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota DOC</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio DOC</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma DOC</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon DOC</td>
<td>11,132</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania DOC</td>
<td>36,810</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico Adm. of Corr.</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>does not recognize STG’s</td>
<td>has not estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island DOC</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota DOC</td>
<td>2,878</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee DOC</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas DOC</td>
<td>14,3302</td>
<td>9,219</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont DOC</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Virgin Islands</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>does not recognize STG’s</td>
<td>has not estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia DOC</td>
<td>32,435</td>
<td>does not recognize STG’s</td>
<td>has not estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DOC</td>
<td>15,313</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia DOC</td>
<td>3,372</td>
<td>does not recognize STG’s</td>
<td>has not estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin DOC</td>
<td>20,901</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction/ System</td>
<td>Estimated Total Inmate Population</td>
<td>Estimated No. of STG-Involved Inmates</td>
<td>Estimated % of Inmates Involved in STGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Co., Arlington, VA Sheriff’s Dept.</td>
<td>5,654</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA, City of DOC</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>System does not recognize STG’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD Div. of Pretrial Det. &amp; Serv.</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Co., Chicago Sheriff’s Dept.</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dade Co., Miami DOC</td>
<td>6,803</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Co., Dallas, TX Sheriff’s Dept.</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson Co., Nashville, TN Sheriff’s Dept.</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso Co., El Paso, TX Detention Facility</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton Co., Atlanta, GA Sheriff’s Dept.</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Co., Columbus, OH Sheriff’s Dept.</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>System does not recognize STG’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Co., Houston, TX Sheriff’s Dept.</td>
<td>6,919</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin Co., Minneapolis, MN Sheriff’s Dept.</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>System does not recognize STG’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Co., Kansas City, MO DOC</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Co., Seattle, WA Dept. of Detention</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Co., Los Angeles, CA Sheriff’s Dept.</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa Co., Phoenix, AZ Sheriff’s Dept.</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)
Estimated Inmate Population and STG Population by Jail System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction/ System</th>
<th>Estimated Total Inmate Population</th>
<th>Estimated No. of STG-Involved Inmates</th>
<th>Estimated % of Inmates Involved in STGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marion Co., Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td></td>
<td>System does not recognize STG’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg Co., Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah Co., Portland, OR</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>System does not recognize STG’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City, NY DOC</td>
<td>13,761</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA, City of Prison System</td>
<td>7,646</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski Co., Little Rock, AR</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Co., San Diego, CA</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Co., Boston, MA</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC DOC</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td></td>
<td>System did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Co., Detroit, MI</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1
Estimated % of Inmates Involved in STGs in State Correctional Systems

Systems not represented on this map are:
- Canadian Correctional Services: 11.7%
- Federal Bureau of Prisons: 11.7%
- Guam DOC: System does not recognize STG’s
- Puerto Rico Adm. of Corrections: System does not recognize STG’s
- US Virgin Islands: System does not recognize STG’s

States with no color represent those who did not respond to the survey.
Figure 2
Estimated Number of Inmates in STG Categories: Correctional Systems

Confirmed Members
n= 52,769, 51.20%

Suspected Members
n= 29,691, 28.81%

Associate Members
n= 17,373, 16.86%

Drop-Out Members
n= 3,236, 3.14%

Figure 3
Estimated Number of Inmates in STG Categories: Jail Systems

Confirmed Members
n= 8,341, 27.67%

Suspected Members
n= 6,023, 19.98%

Associate Members
n= 13,126, 43.54%

Drop-Out Members
n= 2,657, 8.81%
Incidents of Violence (For Calendar Year 2001)

1. The average number of STG-related incidents of violence directed toward staff was 15 per prison system and approximately 10 per jail system (see Table 3). In prison systems, 26.9 percent of all violent incidents directed toward staff were estimated to have been STG-related; the comparable percentage for jails was 23.2.

2. The average number of STG-related incidents of violence directed toward inmates was approximately 73 per correctional system and just slightly greater (about 75) per jail (see Table 3). About 27 percent of all violent incidents directed toward prison inmates were estimated to be STG-related, compared to 32.5 percent of such incidents directed toward jail inmates.

3. A total of 10 STG-related homicides were reported by prison systems, and jail officials reported 1 such homicide.

Table 3
STG-Related Incidents of Violence Directed Toward Staff and Inmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Incidents Toward Staff</th>
<th>Incidents Toward Inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Systems</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Systems</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management Strategies/Tools

1. Over 76 percent of the prison system respondents and 44 percent of the jail officials who responded said their systems had policy-oriented strategies aimed at controlling STGs. Figures 4 and 5 illustrate the specific types of policy-oriented control strategies utilized. As can be seen from Figure 4, 31 (86.1%) of the responding prison systems utilized specific STG policies and procedures, and the same number used STG validation or confirmation strategies. Figure 5 shows that in jails the most commonly found strategy was the establishment of a central monitoring unit (81.8% of reporting jails).
Figure 4
Type of STG Policy-Oriented Control Strategies Used by Correctional Systems
(N=36 systems)

- Central monitoring unit or office responsible for monitoring: n=28, 77.8%
- Policy and procedures for STGs (including due process rights, staff responsibilities, etc.): n=31, 86.1%
- STG validation or confirmed member validation: n=31, 86.1%
- STG prohibition policy and procedure: n=26, 72.2%
- Other*: n=10, 27.8%

Figure 5
Type of STG Policy-Oriented Control Strategies Used by Jail Systems
(N=11 jails)

- Central monitoring unit or office responsible for monitoring: n=9, 81.8%
- Policy and procedures for STGs (including due process rights, staff responsibilities, etc.): n=7, 63.6%
- STG validation or confirmed member validation: n=6, 54.5%
- STG prohibition policy and procedure: n=3, 27.2%
- Other*: n=1, 9.1%

* Other indicates responses that were not significant independently.
2. Just over 60 percent of the prison system officials and nearly 62 percent of the jail officials who responded said their systems had programmatic STG control strategies in place. As can be seen from Figure 6, in excess of 80 percent of the responding systems were segregating STG participants, searching inmates’ persons and cells, and employing mail and phone monitoring. Disciplinary sanctions, custody upgrades, protective custody assignments, prosecution for criminal acts, intra-state transfers of inmates, and urinalysis were also quite common across the responding prison systems. Over two-thirds of the responding jails were using segregation, protective custody assignments, disciplinary sanctions, inmate and cell searches, custody upgrades, and mail monitoring to control STG activities (see Figure 7).

3. Data pertaining to additional STG management initiatives are presented in Table 4. As can be seen from the table, over 70 percent of both prison and jail system respondents said that their jurisdictions offered training related to STGs, had staff who were responsible exclusively for monitoring STG activities, and had routine exchanges of information between agencies about STGs. The prison systems surveyed were more likely than jails to have policies forbidding recruitment of STG members and central locations for dealing with STG matters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Strategy/Tool</th>
<th>Prison Systems Having</th>
<th>Jail Systems Having</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules or policies prohibiting recruitment of STG members</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service staff training on STGs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service staff training on STGs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated staff responsible solely for monitoring STG activity</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central location for handling all STG-related activity</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide gang investigator association</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine exchange of information about STGs with other agencies</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6
Type of STG Programmatic Control Strategies Used by Correctional Systems
(N=29 systems)

Type of programmatic control strategy

Figure 7
Type of STG Programmatic Control Strategies Used by Jail Systems
(N=16 jails)

Type of programmatic control strategy

* Other indicates responses that were not significant independently.
4. Given the importance of interagency exchange of information in STG management, the final item in Table 4 was studied in greater detail. In both correctional and jail systems, the most frequent means of information exchange included face-to-face interactions, phone calls, computerized (e-mail and/or Internet) exchanges, and publications; memorandums were also used, but less commonly so.

5. All of the correctional system officials who responded said that their systems routinely exchange information with law enforcement agencies, over 92 percent said they exchange information with other state correctional agencies, and over 70 percent indicated exchanging information with the Federal Bureau of Prisons and with jails. Likewise, all of the jail officials who responded said that their systems routinely exchange information with law enforcement agencies. Over 92 percent said they exchange information with other jails at the county level and with state correctional systems.

STG Identification

1. Survey respondents were asked to identify each STG operating in their particular system, and then for each, to estimate the number of inmates involved and describe the racial composition. Together, the prison and jail officials who responded identified over 1,600 STGs operating in their systems. The total estimated membership of these STGs was 113,627 inmates.

2. Of the systems that responded, all except 14 reported having 1,000 plus STG members. The California corrections system alone reported 10,133 members. The Federal Bureau of Prisons reported 15,488 members.

3. Across both the prisons and jails that responded, the top ten most frequently identified STGs included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correctional Facilities</th>
<th>Jail Systems</th>
<th>Correctional Facilities and Jail Systems Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crips</td>
<td>Crips</td>
<td>Crips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Gangster Disciples</td>
<td>Bloods</td>
<td>Bloods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloods</td>
<td>Black Gangster Disciples</td>
<td>Black Gangster Disciples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aryan Brotherhood</td>
<td>Latin Kings</td>
<td>Aryan Brotherhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Supremacists</td>
<td>Aryan Brotherhood</td>
<td>White Supremacists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Kings</td>
<td>Tiny Rascals Gang</td>
<td>Latin Kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicelords</td>
<td>Mexican Mafia</td>
<td>Vicelords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folks</td>
<td>NETA</td>
<td>Folks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Mafia</td>
<td>Surenos</td>
<td>Mexican Mafia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KKK</td>
<td></td>
<td>KKK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fols</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The number and percentage of STGs falling into the various racial categories is presented in Table 5 for prisons, jails, and prisons and jails combined. It can be seen that nearly 38 percent of the prison STGs that were reported (or could be categorized) and over 42 percent of the jail STGs were African American in composition. While almost one-third of the prison STGs were classified as white, the same was true for just 13 percent of jail STGs; nearly one-quarter of jail STGs were categorized as Hispanic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Category</th>
<th>Prisons No. (%)</th>
<th>Jails No. (%)</th>
<th>Combined No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>553 (37.8)</td>
<td>172 (42.5)</td>
<td>725 (38.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>482 (32.9)</td>
<td>52 (12.8)</td>
<td>534 (28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>201 (13.7)</td>
<td>98 (24.2)</td>
<td>299 (16.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>52 (3.6)</td>
<td>36 (8.9)</td>
<td>88 (4.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>147 (10.0)</td>
<td>33 (8.1)</td>
<td>180 (9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28 (1.9)</td>
<td>14 (3.5)</td>
<td>42 (2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported/Unknown</td>
<td>116 (NA)</td>
<td>7 (NA)</td>
<td>123 (NA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Figures 8 and 9 describe the frequency with which various validation criteria were reported by the prison and jail system respondents as being used for purposes of designating a group of inmates as a STG. It can be seen that the bulk of these criteria were in use by two-thirds or more of the prison systems that responded. By contrast, lower proportions of the jail systems that responded used the criteria, although substantial proportions of jails used most criteria.

6. Relatively few of the prison (28.6%) and jail (11.1%) systems that responded said that their validation process for identifying STGs was exclusively a quantitative objective one. Most said that the process was subjective and based on qualitative considerations (50.0% of the prison systems and 38.9% of the jails) or that it involved both objectivity and subjectivity (35.7% of the prison systems and 55.6% of the jails).
Figure 8
Validation Criteria Used by Correctional Systems to Designate Groups as STG’s
(N=43 systems)

- **Intent or purpose of the group**: 36 systems (83.7%)
- **Organizational structure of the group**: 33 systems (76.7%)
- **Specific violent acts or intended acts of violence that can be attributed to the group**: 35 systems (81.4%)
- **Specific illegal acts, to include the intention or conspiracy to commit such acts that can be associated with the group**: 33 systems (76.7%)
- **Demographics of the group to include size, location, patterns of expansion or decline of group membership**: 29 systems (67.4%)
- **Propensity for violence by the group**: 32 systems (74.4%)
- **The degree of threat to the facility/system security**: 6 systems (14.0%)

Other *

Validation criteria

Figure 9
Validation Criteria Used by Jail Systems to Designate Groups as STG’s
(N=20 jails)

- **Intent or purpose of the group**: 10 systems (50%)
- **Organizational structure of the group**: 11 systems (55%)
- **Specific violent acts or intended acts of violence that can be attributed to the group**: 12 systems (60%)
- **Specific illegal acts, to include the intention or conspiracy to commit such acts that can be associated with the group**: 11 systems (55%)
- **Demographics of the group to include size, location, patterns of expansion or decline of group membership**: 8 systems (40%)
- **Propensity for violence by the group**: 9 systems (45%)
- **The degree of threat to the facility/system security**: 10 systems (50%)
- **Other**: 6 systems (30%)

Validation criteria
7. Figures 10 and 11 describe the frequency with which various validation criteria were reported by the prison and jail system respondents as being used for purposes of identifying a specific inmate as a STG member. As can be seen, substantial proportions of the prison and jail systems that responded were utilizing these criteria.

8. As with criteria used to identify STG groups, relatively few of the prison (20.9%) and jail (21.1%) systems that responded said that their validation process for identifying STG inmates was entirely a quantitative objective process. Most said that the process was subjective and based on qualitative considerations (41.9% of the prison systems and 31.6% of the jails) or that it involved both objective and subjective considerations (41.9% of the prison systems and 52.6% of the jails).

![Figure 10](image-url)

**Figure 10**
Validation Criteria Used by Correctional Systems to Identify Whether an Inmate is an STG Member (N=43 systems)

*Other indicates responses that were not significant independently.*
9. The final item on the survey asked the respondents to identify what they saw as the top three STG-related concerns facing their systems. The most frequent response category (mentioned in one-quarter of all the responses from prison systems and over 19% of all responses from jails) pertained to violence, threats to safety and security/control, and interpersonal conflicts. The response mentioned second most in prison systems (over 13% of all responses) involved drugs and other contraband; however, this concern was identified in less than 3 percent of the responses from jail officials. The third most cited concern in prison systems (12.5% of responses) related to assessment, identification, and classification of STG inmates. Just over 14 percent of the responses from jail officials also listed this concern. Interestingly enough, less than five percent of prison officials’ responses and only 3.8 percent of responses from jail officials identified a lack of funds, staff, or other resources as being among the top three concerns related to STGs.

* Other indicates responses that were not significant independently.
Summary

The prison and jail officials who responded to our survey identified over 1,600 STGs in their jurisdictions. These STGs were estimated to consist of some 113,627 inmates. On average across prison systems, 13.4 percent of all inmates were estimated to be involved in STGs; the comparable proportion for jails was 15.6 percent. Although these figures are considerably greater than those reported by Camp and Camp (1985), it should be kept in mind that our survey instrument was oriented toward STGs rather than gangs per se and that this orientation is likely to produce substantially larger estimates of volume.

The most frequently identified STGs in both prison and jail settings included the Crips, Bloods, Gangster Disciples, Latin Kings, and Aryan Brotherhood. Almost 38 percent of prison STGs and over 42 percent of jail STGs were categorized as being African American. About a third of prison STGs and just 13 percent of jail STGs were classified as white. More jail STGs were categorized as Hispanic (24.2%) than white, which is likely a reflection of the specific jails selected for inclusion in the study. Another contrast between jails and prisons is that the STG populations in the jails surveyed contained larger proportions of associate members, whereas prison system STG populations were comprised of greater proportions of confirmed members.

Both prison and jail systems reported substantially more STG-related incidents of violence against inmates than against staff members. Likewise, in both prisons and jails, between approximately one-quarter and one-third of all violent incidents were STG-related, whether directed against staff or inmates. The prisons and jails surveyed reported 11 STG-related homicides for 2001, and only one of these was reported by a jail.

Prison system respondents were more likely than jail official respondents to indicate that their jurisdictions had policy-oriented strategies for the control of STGs, such as membership validation procedures and STG prohibition policies. However, prisons and jails were about equally likely to have programmatic control strategies in place, such as mail and phone monitoring and segregation of STG members. Most jurisdictions surveyed also said they offered pre- and in-service training related to STGs, had staff members designated to monitoring STG activities, and routinely exchanged information with other justice system agencies about STGs.

Most prison system respondents indicated that their systems were using specific validation criteria
for designating a grouping of inmates as a STG. These criteria included the supposed intent or purpose of the group, its organizational structure, acts of violence or other illegal behaviors, and the perceived degree of security threat posed; fewer of the jails that responded were utilizing these criteria. Most validation processes being used were described by both prison and jail respondents as either subjective in nature, or as involving a combination of subjectivity and objectivity.

Most prisons and jails were also relying on certain criteria for purposes of identifying particular inmates as STG members. These criteria included self-admissions, possession of STG paraphernalia, information from internal investigations, information concerning inmate correspondence, inmate tattoos, information form outside agencies and confidential informants, as well as individual and group photos. As in the case of validation processes for identifying a group as a STG, most of the processes for the identification of individual inmates as STG members were reported to be either subjective or a combination of subjectivity and objectivity.

This research achieved a reasonably good response rate and has provided some insights into the nature and extent of STGs operating in the nation’s prisons and jails. It has also provided insights about the control strategies being used by prison and jail officials. At the same time, the findings reported here have been entirely descriptive in nature.6 Future research should continue to monitor patterns of STG activity in prison and jail settings, since these patterns are likely to undergo shifts over time. In future surveys on this topic, it might be fruitful to study particular prisons (instead of prison systems) as the unit of analysis and to gather data on such variables as facility security levels, as well as overall racial and age compositions, so that data related to STGs could be broken down and examined by these variables. It would also be useful to study STGs by inmate gender.
Endnotes

1. The decision to include Canada and the U.S. territorial prison systems was made by the NMGTF because these systems take an active part in ACA and NMGTF matters.

2. Purposive sampling was used to identify large jails.

3. Results from prison systems include data from Guam, Puerto Rico, and Canada. The total number of inmates from these particular systems was 28,238, or about 2.1 percent of all inmates reported by all of the responding systems.

4. Blank spaces in the tables are indicative of missing data that was not provided. Correctional systems from which no surveys were returned included the Colorado Division of Adult Parole, Georgia DOC, Illinois DOC, Maine DOC, Montana DOC, the Ontario Ministry of Corrections, South Carolina DOC, Utah DOC, and Wyoming DOC. Jail systems from which surveys were not received were located in Mobile Co., AL; San Francisco Co., CA; Denver, CO; Chicago, IL (DOC); Jefferson Co., KY; New Orleans, LA; Trenton, NJ; Bernalillo Co., NM; Las Vegas, NV; Hamilton Co., OH; Oklahoma Co., OK; and Milwaukee Co., WI.

5. Two NMGTF Board Members and one State Coordinator were consulted in order to collapse the 1,600 plus STG categories into more general categories, thereby making the findings more interpretable and manageable. After much discussion and review of the data, a decision was made to collapse the specific STGs into six racial categories. NMGTF members used their best judgment to determine the racial category of an STG any time the respondents themselves had not provided this information.

6. At this writing, inferential analyses of the data set are being performed, and we intend to report findings in a future publication.
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Appendix A
Survey Instrument
CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM SECURITY THREAT GROUP (STG) SURVEY

Name of Correctional System: ____________________________________________ Date survey completed: ____________________________

Name of contact person completing survey: __________________________ Phone #: _________________ Email: ____________________________

Instructions

Since the term “gang” can be interpreted in so many ways, for the purposes of this survey we are using the term “security threat group” (STG), and have defined this group as: TWO (2) OR MORE INMATES, ACTING TOGETHER WHO POSE A THREAT TO THE SECURITY OR SAFETY OF STAFF/INMATES AND/OR ARE DISRUPTIVE TO PROGRAMS AND/OR TO THE ORDERLY MANAGEMENT OF THE FACILITY/SYSTEM.

To facilitate and organize the data gathering process, we have divided this survey into four sections: 1) statistical information, 2) incidents of violence, 3) management strategies/tools, and 4) identification of security threat groups. Please respond to each of the items in each section by providing the necessary information in the spaces provided. If you do not know the exact information required by the item, please give your best estimate.

I. Statistical Information

A. Does your correctional system recognize the existence of STGs? ____ Yes    ____ No (If No, please skip to question I F.)

B. Since what year have STGs existed in your system? ________

C. Please estimate the number of different STGs in your correctional system:  __________ STGs

D. Please estimate the total number of inmates involved in STGs in your correctional system:  ____________ inmates

E. Please estimate the number of inmates who are in each of the following STG categories:
   ________ confirmed members           ________ suspected members           ________ associate members
   ________ drop outs

F. Please indicate the total number of inmates in your correctional system: _________ inmates

G. Please indicate the total number of full-time personnel that are employed in your correctional system: ______ personnel

II. Incidents of Violence (All responses apply to calendar year 2001.)

A. Please indicate the total number of all violent incidents directed toward staff: _______ incidents

B. Please indicate the total number of STG-related (directly or indirectly) violent incidents directed toward staff: _______ incidents (If your system does not recognize STGs, please skip to question III A.)

C. Please indicate the total number of all violent incidents directed toward inmates: _______ incidents

D. Please indicate the total number of STG-related (directly or indirectly) violent incidents directed toward inmates: _______ incidents

E. Please indicate the total number of STG-related (directly or indirectly) homicides: _______ homicides

III. Management Strategies/Tools

A. Does your system possess a STG policy-oriented control strategy? ____ Yes    ____ No (If No, please skip to question III C.)
B. Please indicate which STG policy-oriented control strategies your correctional system utilizes by placing a check mark in the appropriate blank (Check all that apply.)

________ central monitoring unit or office responsible for monitoring STGs
________ policy and procedure for STGs (including due process rights, staff responsibilities, etc.)
________ STG validation or confirmation policy and procedure
________ STG prohibition policy and procedure
________ other(s) - please specify
_____________________________________________________________________________

C. Does your system possess a STG **programmatic** control strategy? ____ Yes    ____ No (If No, please skip to question IV A.)

D. Please indicate which STG programmatic control strategies your correctional system utilizes by placing a check mark in the appropriate blank (Check all that apply.)

________ segregation
________ within-state transfer

________ disciplinary sanction
________ out-of-state transfer

________ custody upgrade
________ mail monitoring

________ protective custody
________ telephone monitoring

________ criminal prosecution
________ urinalysis

________ no contact visits
________ no furlough privileges

________ strip searches of inmate and cell
________ work or program limitations

________ other(s) - please specify
_____________________________________________________________________________

E. Does your system possess disciplinary rules or policies that specifically prohibit recruitment of STG members? ____ Yes     ____ No

F. Do your staff receive formal **pre-service** training regarding STGs? ______ Yes     ______ No

G. Do your staff receive formal **in-service** training regarding STGs? ______ Yes    ______ No

H. Does your correctional system have designated staff whose sole responsibility is to monitor STG activity? ______ Yes    ______ No

I. If you responded “Yes” to the previous question, is there a career path for these staff? ______ Yes    ______ No

J. Does your correctional system have a centralized location for handling all STG-related activity (e.g., statistics, monitoring, validation, etc.)? ______ Yes    ______ No

K. Please indicate the manner in which your STG validation system is being managed by placing a checkmark in the appropriate blank.

________ manual (all information is hardcopy)

________ electronic (all information is electronic and kept on computers)

________ both manual and electronic

________ other (please specify)
L. Does your state have a state-wide gang investigator association? ______ Yes     ______ No

M. If you responded “Yes” to the previous question, how many people are members of this association? ______ members.

N. If you responded “Yes” to item L, does this association have an annual convention or conference? ______ Yes ______ No

O. Does your correctional system routinely exchange information on STGs with other agencies? ______ Yes ______ No

P. If you responded “Yes” to item O, please indicate the means of exchange by checking the appropriate blank(s). (Check all that apply.)

________ face-to-face
________ telephone
________ email/Internet
________ reports, publications
________ memorandum
________ other (please specify)

Q. If you responded “Yes” to item O, please indicate the type of agencies your correctional system routinely exchanges information with by checking the appropriate blank(s). (Check all that apply.)

________ other state correctional systems
________ Federal Bureau of Prisons
________ county jail facilities
________ municipal jail and detention facilities
________ law enforcement agencies
________ other (please specify)
### IV. Identification of STGs

A. In the spaces provided below, please do the following:
1) list the name of each of the STGs operating in your system;
2) indicate the approximate number of inmates who belong to each listed STG, and
3) indicate the racial composition of each of the STGs by placing one or more check marks in the appropriate blanks. Where applicable, provide more specific information about the racial composition of the STG in the appropriate blanks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of STG</th>
<th>Number of inmates in STG</th>
<th>Racial Composition of STG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B1. Please indicate which of the validation criteria below are used by your correctional system to designate a group as an STG by placing a check mark in the appropriate blank(s). (Check all that apply).

- [ ] intent or purpose of the group
- [ ] organizational structure of the group
- [ ] specific violent acts or intended acts of violence that can be attributed to the group (e.g., assaults, murders, conspiracy to commit murder, etc.)
- [ ] specific illegal acts, to include the intention or conspiracy to commit such acts that can be associated with the group (e.g., extortion, protection, racketeering, etc.)
- [ ] demographics of the group to include size, location, patterns of expansion or decline of group membership
- [ ] propensity for violence by the group
- [ ] the degree of threat to the facility/system security
- [ ] other (please specify)
- [ ] other (please specify)
B2. Please check the type of validation process in which the criteria you checked above (in section B1) are utilized.

- ______ objective (based on a point system where quantitative scores are assigned to validation criteria)
- ______ subjective (based on a system where qualitative information obtained from validation criteria is used)
- ______ both objective and subjective
- ______ other (please specify)

C1. Please check which of the validation criteria below are used by your correctional system to identify whether a specific inmate is an STG member. (Check all that apply.)

- ______ self admission by inmate
- ______ identified STG tattoo
- ______ possession of STG paraphernalia
- ______ information from outside law enforcement agency
- ______ information from internal investigation
- ______ information from confidential informant
- ______ inmate correspondence or outside contacts
- ______ individual or group STG picture
- ______ other (please specify)

C2. Please check the type of validation process in which the criteria you checked above (in section C1) are utilized.

- ______ objective (based on a point system where quantitative scores are assigned to validation criteria)
- ______ subjective (based on a system where qualitative information obtained from validation criteria is used)
- ______ both objective and subjective
- ______ other (please specify)

What do you see as the top three STG-related concerns (in rank order) facing your correctional system?

1. 

2. 

3. 

When finished with this survey, please mail it in the enclosed pre-paid self-addressed envelope.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your cooperation is appreciated. If you have any questions or comments concerning this survey, please contact:

James B. Wells, Ph.D  
Director, Center for Criminal Justice Education & Research  
Department of Correctional & Juvenile Justice Studies  
College of Justice & Safety  
521 Lancaster Avenue  
Richmond, KY 40475  
Phone: (859) 622-1158  
Email: corwells@acs.eku.edu
NMGTTF State Coordinators

Alabama – Steve Watson
Alaska – Thomas Reimer
Arkansas – James Gibson
Arizona – Todd Gerrish
Bureau of Prisons – Frank Wilson
California – Modesto Chavez
Colorado – Tom Sullivan
Connecticut – Luis Irizarry
Delaware – Jim Lupinetti
District of Columbia - TBD
Florida – Michele Jordan
Georgia – Jack Holliday
Hawaii – Larry Myers
Idaho – Tim Higgins
Illinois – Rick Harrington
Indiana – Greg Walton
Iowa - TBD
Kansas – Roger Bonner
Kentucky – Sharon Veech
Louisiana – Johnny Creed
Maine - TBD
Maryland – Carolyn Atkins
Massachusetts – Mark Reilly
Michigan – Robert Mulvaney
Minnesota – Donald Rothstein
Mississippi – Kenneth North
Missouri - TBD
Montana – Michael Micu
Nebraska – Scott Strode
Nevada – Geoff Swann
New Hampshire - TBD
New Jersey - TBD
New Mexico – Daniel Lucero
New York State – Michael Hogan
North Carolina - TBD
North Dakota – Pat Branson
South Dakota - TBD
Ohio – Phil Vermillion
Oklahoma – Dan Reynolds
Oregon – Benny Ward
Pennsylvania – Ken Smith
Puerto Rico – Osvaldo Alvaredo
Rhode Island – Robert Catlow
South Carolina – Eddie O’Cain
Tennessee – Eric Qualls
Texas – Larry Ching
Utah – Eric Varoz
Vermont – Gary Dillon
Virginia – Lawrence Dury
West Virginia – Joseph Coy
Wisconsin – Joel Wagner
Wyoming – Kenneth Keller
Correctional Service Canada – Julie Keravel
Ministry of Correctional Services – Paul Downing
Thanks to the NMGTF Corporate Sponsor, Verizon, for their continuing support.