

REPORT TO CONGRESS
ON THE ACTIVITIES AND OPERATIONS
OF THE
PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION
FOR 1992



Public Integrity Section
Criminal Division
United States Department of Justice

Submitted Pursuant to
Section 603 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978

REPORT TO CONGRESS
ON THE
ACTIVITIES AND OPERATIONS
OF
THE PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION
FOR 1992



**Public Integrity Section
Criminal Division
U.S. Department of Justice**

**Submitted Pursuant to
Section 529 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978**

INTRODUCTION

This Report to the Congress, prepared as required by Section 529 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, details the activities and operations of the Public Integrity Section and provides statistics concerning the nationwide federal effort against corruption for calendar year 1992.

The Public Integrity Section was established in 1976. The Section was given the responsibility for overseeing the federal effort to combat corruption through the prosecution of elected and appointed public officials at all levels of government. The Section is also responsible for supervising the handling of investigations and prosecutions of election crimes. Its attorneys prosecute selected cases against federal, state, and local officials, and are available as a source of advice and expertise to prosecutors and investigators.

In 1992, the Public Integrity Section also supervised the administration of the Independent Counsel provisions of the Ethics in Government Act which expired without reauthorization at the end of the year. In addition, the Section serves as the Justice Department's center for the handling of issues that may arise from time to time regarding public corruption investigations and prosecutions.

The Section maintains a staff of approximately 25 to 30 attorneys including experts in election law, the laws prohibiting conflicts of interest and bribery, the Independent Counsel provisions of the Ethics in Government Act, and the statutes providing federal jurisdiction over corruption at the state and local levels. As can be seen from the cases detailed in Part II of this Report, the Section handled a number of significant cases in 1992. Gerald E. McDowell served as Chief of the Section until his appointment as Chief of the Criminal Division's Fraud Section in March of 1992. Michael J. Shepard was appointed Chief of the Public Integrity Section in June of 1992.

Part I of this Report describes the operations and functions of the Public Integrity Section, highlighting major activities; Part II details the cases prosecuted by the Section; and Part III presents data on the national effort to combat public corruption during 1992, based on the Section's annual nationwide survey of United States Attorneys.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

OPERATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION

A.	Responsibility for Litigation	1
1.	Recusals	1
2.	Sufficiency of Local Resources	2
3.	Sensitive or Multi-District Cases	2
4.	Federal Agency Referrals	3
B.	Special Section Priorities	3
1.	Independent Counsel Matters	3
2.	Election Crimes	4
3.	Conflict of Interest Crimes	6
C.	Technical Assistance	6
1.	Advice and Training	6
2.	Consultation	7
3.	Legislative Activity	7
4.	General Assistance and Supervision	7

PART II

PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION INDICTMENTS, PROSECUTIONS AND APPEALS IN 1992

FEDERAL JUDICIAL BRANCH	8
FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE BRANCH	9
FEDERAL EXECUTIVE BRANCH	10
STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT	23
ELECTION CRIMES	31

PART III

FEDERAL PROSECUTIONS OF CORRUPT OFFICIALS

List of Tables	34
Table I	35
Table II	36
Table III	38

PART I

OPERATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION

A. Responsibility for Litigation

Most of the Public Integrity Section's resources are devoted to litigation and supervision of investigations involving alleged abuses of the public trust. Decisions to undertake particular investigations and prosecutions are made on a case-by-case basis, based on the following considerations:

1. Recusals

As can be seen from the statistical charts at the end of this Report, the vast majority of federal corruption prosecutions are handled by the United States Attorney's Office in the district where the offense occurred. However, corruption cases, perhaps more than routine criminal prosecutions, raise unique problems of public perception. In conducting government corruption investigations and prosecutions, it is particularly important that the appearance as well as the reality of fairness and impartiality be maintained. Therefore, if the United States Attorney has had a significant business, social, political, or other relationship with any subject or principal witness in a corruption case, it is generally inappropriate for the United States Attorney or his or her office to conduct the investigation and prosecution. Cases in which the conflict is substantial are usually referred to the Public Integrity Section for prosecution or direct supervision.

Cases involving federal judges and other judicial officers always require the recusal of the United States Attorney's Office because the attorneys in the Office are likely to have to appear before the judge and have professional dealings with the court during and after the investigation. Thus, as a matter of established Department of Justice policy, all such cases are handled by the Public Integrity Section. For example, during 1991 and 1992, the Section handled the prosecution and appellate proceedings of United States District Judge Robert F. Collins. Judge Collins was convicted of bribery, obstruction of justice, and conspiracy and was sentenced to 82 months' imprisonment followed by two years' supervised release.

Conflict of interest considerations similar to those that arise when the subject of an investigation is a federal judge often arise when the target of the investigation is a federal investigator, prosecutor, or other employee who works in or closely with a United States Attorney's Office. Such cases may also require recusal of the Office, and are frequently referred to the Public Integrity Section, where they constitute a significant portion of its case load. For example, during 1992, Section attorneys obtained a conviction in a matter involving an agent of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) who was convicted

on two felony counts arising out of his false statements and testimony concerning a government informant. The previously close working relationship between the INS agent and the United States Attorney's Office would have made an investigation by that Office awkward at best, and would have undermined the appearance of fairness and impartiality that must support every federal prosecution.

2. Sufficiency of Local Resources

When the available prosecutorial resources in the United States Attorney's Office are insufficient to undertake a significant corruption case, and the United States Attorney requests the Section's assistance, the Public Integrity Section historically has provided experienced federal prosecutors, skilled in the nuances of corruption cases, to serve as co-counsel. For example, the Section was asked by the United States Attorney's Office for the Central District of Illinois to assist with a voter fraud case. As co-counsel, the Section was able to offer its understanding and expertise in the area of election fraud. On April 13, 1992, the defendant in this matter was sentenced to 46 months in prison.

The Section's participation in cases at the request of the United States Attorney also serves as valuable training to prosecutors in the field, who learn through working with Section attorneys about the applicable statutes and the investigative techniques most useful in corruption cases.

3. Sensitive or Multi-District Cases

In addition to cases in which there are formal recusals or in which manpower is requested or needed, the Public Integrity Section may become involved at the request of the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division in highly sensitive matters and in matters that extend beyond district lines. Sensitive cases include those which, because of their importance, require close coordination with senior Department of Justice officials, require a significant amount of coordination with other federal agencies in Washington, involve classified materials, or are so politically controversial on a local level that they are most appropriately handled out of Washington. When an investigation crosses district lines, the Public Integrity Section can provide coordination among various United States Attorney's Offices, or, when appropriate, can assume operational responsibility for the entire investigation.

As an example of such a matter, the Section continued a commitment begun in 1988 to Operation ILLWIND, a major, multi-district defense procurement fraud and corruption investigation. The convictions in 1992 resulting from this wide-ranging investigation are described later in this report.

4. Federal Agency Referrals

Referrals from the federal agencies are an important part of the Section's workload. Ever since the Inspectors General were authorized for various agencies, the Section has worked closely with them, encouraging their investigations, coordinating joint investigations between the FBI and Inspectors General and ensuring that their cases receive prompt prosecutive attention. The Section also invests time in training the agencies' investigators in the statutes involved in corruption cases and the investigative approaches that work best in such cases. As a result of its efforts, many of the Section's cases are referrals directly from the agencies. As one example of how successful such cases can be, an investigation referred by the Department of Justice Inspector General's Office has resulted in several convictions stemming from "Operation Byte," an ongoing investigation of manipulation of the central computer system of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). 1992 convictions included an INS Data Entry Supervisor who was sentenced to 18 months in prison and 3 years' supervised release.

The Section has also focused particular attention on referrals from the various intelligence agencies; matters involving these agency employees often are particularly sensitive, requiring high level clearances and the application of specialized statutes.

B. Special Section Priorities

1. Independent Counsel Matters

Since the Ethics in Government Act was passed, the Public Integrity Section has been responsible for supervising the administration of the Independent Counsel provisions of the Act, codified at 28 U.S.C. §§ 591-599. Both the procedures and time limits of the Independent Counsel provisions are strict, and these matters are usually very sensitive. Therefore, they are handled as the highest priority of the Section. At the same time, the legal issues involved in analyzing these matters are often extremely complex and novel, and attorneys handling the preliminary investigations are required to come to difficult conclusions about these sensitive matters without the benefit of fully developed facts with which prosecutors in corruption matters are accustomed to dealing. The number of Independent Counsel matters handled by the Section has increased steadily over the past several years, to the point that handling such matters has become a significant portion of the Section's workload.

Under the Independent Counsel provisions, if specific information from a credible source is received by the Justice Department alleging that any of certain specified high government officials has committed a crime, the Attorney General must request that a special panel of federal judges appoint an Independent Counsel, unless preliminary investigation, limited to 90 days, establishes there are no reasonable grounds to believe that further investigation or prosecution is warranted. The Public Integrity Section is responsible for supervising the initial investigation, and preparing a recommendation to the Attorney

General as to whether the Independent Counsel provisions have been triggered and whether any further investigation is warranted.¹

In addition to its work on preliminary investigations under the statute, the Section also serves as the principal liaison between the ongoing independent counsels and the Department of Justice, some of which have absorbed substantial Section resources. The Section has handled independent counsel inquiries concerning legal issues, Departmental policies, requests for documents, and interviews of Departmental personnel.

2. Election Crimes

The Section's Election Crimes Branch coordinates the Department's efforts to respond effectively to federal crimes involving the electoral process. These include:

- * Crimes involving the voting process (*i.e.*, "voter frauds");
- * Campaign financing crimes, including criminal violations arising under the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA); 2 U.S.C. § 431 *et seq.*;
- * Violations of various federal laws dealing with patronage crimes and offenses arising under the Federal Hatch Act; and
- * Matters involving illegal lobbying with appropriated funds.

The Election Crimes Branch performs the following functions in this regard:

a. Field Support and Consultation. The Branch gives advice and assistance to the United States Attorneys' Offices regarding the application of federal criminal laws to election fraud and campaign-financing abuses. During 1992, the Branch assisted the United States Attorneys' Offices with significant election-fraud investigations in Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Tennessee, Texas, and West Virginia. The Branch also supervises the Department's use of the federal conspiracy and false statements statutes (18 U.S.C. §§ 371 and 1001) to address aggravated schemes to subvert the federal campaign-financing requirements of the FECA. Finally, the Branch reviews and provides advice and consultation on all major election-fraud investigations and criminal cases brought under federal law throughout the country, as required by Departmental procedures.

¹The Independent Counsel Act expired on December 15, 1992. The Department expects the Act to be reauthorized.

b. Education and Training. In order to promote greater awareness of election crimes and the Department's prosecutive responsibility in this area, the Branch provides lectures at training seminars held for prosecutors, investigators, and election officials. During 1992, the Branch participated in 13 federal and state-sponsored training activities.

c. Legislation. The Branch reviews all proposed legislation which would affect the election process or the regulation of campaigns, and frequently plays a significant role in formulating the Department's position in these areas. In 1992, the Branch continued to assist the Department in its efforts to obtain the enactment of the Department's Anti-Corruption Act (proposed 18 U.S.C. § 225), which contains strong election-crime provisions drafted by the Branch in 1989. Further, the Branch was involved in significant legislative initiatives in 1992 dealing with the Hatch Act, the National Voter Registration Act, the Uniformed and Absent Citizens Absentee Voting Act; and the numerous bills proposing amendments to the FECA.

d. Litigation. The Branch at times assumes operational responsibility for the prosecution of significant cases involving voter frauds and campaign financing crimes. In 1992, the Section prosecuted cases in Arkansas, New Mexico, Texas, and Illinois. The litigation activities of the Branch were limited during 1992 by fiscal constraints.

e. Inter-Agency Liaison. The Branch is the formal liaison between the Justice Department and the Federal Election Commission (FEC), with which the Department shares enforcement jurisdiction over violations of the FECA. The Branch also serves as the Department's point of contact with the United States Office of Special Counsel (OSC). The OSC has jurisdiction over noncriminal violations of the Hatch Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 7324 et seq. and 1501 et seq., which may also involve criminal patronage abuses which are within the Department's jurisdiction.

f. International Cooperation. During 1992, the Branch became involved in official exchanges of expertise in election administration and voter fraud prevention with emerging democracies from around the world. These activities were conducted under the auspices of the Clearinghouse Division of the Federal Election Commission and the United States Information Agency.

g. National Election Day Watch Program. The Branch is responsible for ensuring that an Assistant United States Attorney is appointed in each judicial district to serve as the District Election Officer, and for providing assistance to these prosecutors in responding to election complaints in their district. During 1992, the Branch implemented, and then supervised, the Department of Justice's nationwide "Election Day Watch" program for the 1992 presidential elections; recruited, appointed and trained 173 District Election Officers covering all of the nation's 93 judicial districts, and prepared anti-fraud initiatives for several varieties of federal electoral abuses.

3. Conflict of Interest Crimes

Conflicts of interest is a wide-ranging and complex area of law, with many layers of administrative responsibility. The Public Integrity Section's role comes into play with respect to a narrow group of conflict matters, those allegations which involve criminal misconduct. Investigation of these allegations is coordinated with the FBI or the Inspector General for the agency concerned, or both.

The Conflicts of Interest Crimes Branch also has a number of legislative responsibilities, a role that has been particularly significant in recent years with the surge of interest in more effective legislation governing government ethics. The Branch develops and reviews legislative proposals relating to criminal conflicts of interest, but also devotes considerable resources to the review of non-criminal legislative proposals that overlap, sometimes in a subtle manner not envisioned by a bill's drafters or sponsors, with the criminal statutes. The principal objective is to assure that the impact of proposed legislation on criminal law enforcement is recognized and is consistent with policy reflected in the criminal statutes. Responsibilities of the Branch include formulating policy, drafting legislation and correspondence, reviewing legislative activity of other executive branch agencies, preparing congressional testimony, and providing technical advice to Department officials.

Coordination with other government offices is a crucial role of the Conflicts of Interest Crimes Branch, to ensure that our efforts are complementary and consistent. The Office of Government Ethics plays the most important role in that effort. The Branch also frequently provides instruction to investigators with the various offices of Inspectors General and the Branch's Director serves on the faculty of the Advanced Financial Fraud Training Program of the Financial Fraud Institute.

C. Technical Assistance

In addition to its litigation responsibilities, the Section provides technical assistance and support services to law enforcement officials at all levels of government.

1. Advice and Training

The Public Integrity Section is staffed with specialists who have considerable experience in prosecuting corruption cases. When not operationally involved in a case, Section attorneys are available to advise investigators and prosecutors on substantive questions, investigative methods, indictment drafting, and motions.

In 1992, the Section continued to devote substantial efforts to the formal training of investigators and prosecutors. For several years, the Section has sponsored an annual four-day training seminar for prosecutors and agents involved in public corruption investigations and prosecutions. The Section again held a seminar in 1992, co-sponsored by the Attorney General's Advocacy Institute. The seminar was an outstanding success, providing intensive

training to approximately 200 prosecutors and investigators. The seminar provided legal training in the statutes most commonly used in corruption cases, guidance in the use of the complex and difficult investigative techniques necessary to investigate corruption, and advice from experienced prosecutors on conducting corruption trials.

2. Consultation

In order to achieve a degree of national uniformity among corruption prosecutions, the Section reviews certain investigations and indictments proposed by the United States Attorneys' Offices, as directed by the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division. Consultation with the Section before federal prosecution may proceed is currently required in all election-related cases, and in corruption cases brought under the Hobbs Act.

3. Legislative Activity

A major responsibility of the Public Integrity Section is the review and coordination of legislation affecting the prosecution of public officials. The Section is often called upon to provide comments on proposed legislation, to draft testimony for congressional hearings, and to respond to congressional inquiries.

4. General Assistance and Supervision

Departmental supervision of prosecutions is often important in public corruption cases, which are frequently controversial, complex, and highly visible. Section attorneys occasionally are called upon to conduct a careful review of such sensitive cases, evaluating the quality of the investigative work and the adequacy of the proposed indictments. The presence of Public Integrity Section attorneys helps to ensure that these important public corruption cases are properly developed and brought to trial, since the Section can often identify problems early on and either provide needed assistance, or, if necessary, assume operational responsibility for the prosecution.

The Section has considerable expertise in the supervision and oversight of the use of undercover operations in serious corruption cases. During 1992, the Section Chief served on the FBI's Undercover Review Committee. Additionally, a number of the Section's senior prosecutors have experience in both the practical and legal problems and the valuable investigative benefits involved in such operations. Thus, the Section has the ability to employ effectively this sensitive investigative technique and to advise law enforcement personnel on its use.

Finally, the Section provides numerous other miscellaneous support services to United States Attorneys in connection with corruption cases. Much of this support comes in the form of serving as liaison with other components of the Department in order to expedite approval of such procedures as immunity requests, Title III wiretapping orders, and witness protection program applications.

PART II

PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION INDICTMENTS, PROSECUTIONS AND APPEALS IN 1992

As described above, the participation of the Public Integrity Section in the prosecution of public corruption cases ranges from sole responsibility for the entire case to approving an indictment or providing advice on the drafting of charges. This portion of the Report describes each case handled by the Section, or in which it shared substantial operational responsibility with a United States Attorney's Office. Related cases are grouped together, set off by double lines. The public corruption cases handled every year solely by the United States Attorneys' Offices are reflected in the statistics set forth in Part III of this Report.

This section of the Report is divided according to the level of government affected by the corruption. The prosecutions and indictments reported below reflect the Section's work during 1992 and the status of its cases as of December 31, 1992. This section of the Report also provides statistics on the number of matters closed without prosecution during 1992, and the number of matters open at the end of the year.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL BRANCH

During 1992, the Public Integrity Section closed nine matters involving judicial corruption without indictment. Seven such matters were under investigation at the end of 1992. During 1992, the Section handled the following cases involving judicial corruption:

United States v. Collins and Ross, Eastern District of Louisiana

On September 10, 1992, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit affirmed the convictions and sentences of United States District Judge Robert F. Collins and co-defendant John H. Ross. The defendants raised nine issues on appeal, challenging various aspects of trial and sentencing. In a 65 page opinion, the Court of Appeals ruled in favor of the government on each issue.

Collins and Ross had been convicted in 1991 of bribery, obstruction of justice and conspiracy to commit bribery, to obstruct justice, and to defraud the United States. The indictment charged that Collins and Ross shared \$100,000 in bribe money given to them by Gary Young, a defendant who had pled guilty to drug trafficking charges before Collins. In

return for the \$100,000, Collins promised to give Young favorable consideration at sentencing. Collins was sentenced to 82 months' imprisonment followed by two years of supervised release. Ross was sentenced to 88 months' imprisonment followed by two years of supervised release.

United States v. Derryberry, United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

On April 29, 1992, the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit affirmed the district court decision requiring Quentin M. Derryberry, an attorney and United States Trustee in Bankruptcy, to pay \$8,500 in restitution to a bankrupt estate. The issue on appeal was whether, after the Sixth Circuit reversed defendant Derryberry's conviction for embezzlement from the bankrupt estate, but affirmed the sentence, the award of restitution could be supported only by the defendant's conviction for perjury.

Derryberry, with the assistance of an individual named Merle C. Weber, collected funds from creditors of the bankrupt estate ostensibly for use in paying for investigation and litigation of claims the estate might have against certain parties. The money was not used for this purpose, but instead was used personally by Derryberry and Weber. Derryberry put \$8,500 of the \$13,880 collected into his personal checking account and spent it. During a subsequent hearing in Bankruptcy Court, Derryberry testified that he never had possession of any of the funds. This testimony formed the basis for the perjury count of which Derryberry was convicted.

FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

During 1992, the Public Integrity Section closed four investigations involving allegations of corruption or misconduct within or involving the legislative branch. As of December 31, 1992, 11 such matters were pending in the Section. Also during 1992, the Section prosecuted the following cases involving the legislative branch:

OPERATION ILLWIND

The Public Integrity Section was involved with a number of cases stemming from "Operation ILLWIND," the Department of Justice's wide-ranging investigation of fraud in the defense contracting industry, and the industry's efforts to buy influence through illegal campaign contributions and gratuities to Members of Congress. Trial attorneys in the Public Integrity Section prosecuted these cases, with the assistance of attorneys from the Fraud Section and the United States Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of Virginia. Following is a description of a 1992 prosecution growing out of this investigation:

United States v. Lynch, Eastern District of Virginia

On May 22, 1992, Don L. Lynch pled guilty to conspiracy to cause a false statement to be made to the Federal Election Commission and conspiracy to make a false statement to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). The investigation revealed that Sperry Corporation and its successor company, Unisys, arranged for a number of consultants, including Lynch, to be paid inflated prices for consulting work, with the understanding that the extra money would be used at the direction of Unisys to make campaign contributions to influential Members of Congress.

In addition, Lynch knowingly made false statements to the IRS by overreporting the gross income of one of his companies, in an amount totalling \$106,000, and by deducting from the taxable corporate income as a legitimate business expense the amount of \$106,000 which was paid to other consultants and used in part by them for campaign contributions.

On August 13, 1992, Lynch was sentenced to one year unsupervised probation and a fine of \$1,000.

FEDERAL EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The Public Integrity Section closed 134 matters involving allegations of corruption or misconduct within the executive branch during 1992. As of December 31, 1992, 139 such matters were pending in the Section. Also during 1992, the Section prosecuted the following cases involving executive branch corruption and misconduct:

OPERATION BYTE

The Public Integrity Section has obtained a number of convictions stemming from "Operation Byte," an ongoing investigation of manipulation of the central computer system of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). The investigation is being conducted jointly by the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice and the United States Border Patrol. Following are descriptions of 1992 prosecutions growing out of this investigation:

United States v. Mackey, Southern District of Florida

On September 16, 1992, Patricia A. Mackey, a former Data Entry Supervisor at the Miami District Office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), pled guilty to an

Information charging her with accepting bribes and fraudulently altering data in the INS computer system.

Between 1988 and March 1992, in return for bribes from middlemen, Mackey inserted false information about more than 350 illegal aliens directly into the INS computer system. As a result of Mackey's actions, INS employees, Border Patrol Agents and others attempting to check the immigration status of these aliens falsely were led to believe that the aliens were Lawful Permanent Residents entitled to all of the corresponding immigration benefits, including the issuance by the INS of an Alien Registration Receipt Card (also known as a "green card"), unrestricted travel to and from the United States and the right to seek legal employment in the United States.

On November 17, 1992, Mackey was sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment and three years' supervised release.

United States v. Lee, Southern District of New York

On July 16, 1992, Jong Bok Lee pled guilty to an Information charging him with conspiracy to fraudulently obtain Alien Registration Receipt cards and to make false statements on Social Security applications.

From 1988 until March 1992, Lee participated as a broker in the scheme described above, obtaining money and biographical information from aliens who were not Lawful Permanent Residents, and passing information and funds to a co-conspirator in the Miami area. Lee also arranged for illegal aliens to obtain Social Security cards to which they were not lawfully entitled, authorizing them to work in the United States.

United States v. Kim, Southern District of Florida

On June 25, 1992, Seong Nahm Kim pled guilty to an Information charging him with conspiracy to fraudulently obtain Alien Registration Receipt cards and to defraud the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) in connection with his participation in the INS computer scheme described above.

On December 18, 1992, Kim was sentenced to three years' probation including 150 days of home confinement, 300 hours of community service, and a \$5,000 fine.

United States v. Nho, Southern District of Florida

On June 26, 1992, Daniel Nho pled guilty to an Information charging him with conspiracy to fraudulently obtain Alien Registration Receipt cards and to defraud the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and the Social Security Administration.

From 1988 until March 1992, Nho participated as a broker in the above mentioned INS scheme and also arranged for illegal aliens to obtain Social Security cards to which they were not lawfully entitled, authorizing them to work in the United States.

United States v. Saintil, Southern District of Florida

On June 25, 1992, Villa Saintil pled guilty, in connection with the above mentioned INS scheme, to an Information charging him with bribing Data Entry Supervisor Patricia A. Mackey to insert false information into the INS computer system.

On November 5, 1992, Saintil was sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment.

OTHER FEDERAL EXECUTIVE BRANCH PROSECUTIONS

United States v. Abbott, Eastern District of Virginia

On December 30, 1992, former Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) employee Michael J. Abbott pled guilty to falsifying a college transcript in order to qualify for a promotion.

At CIA headquarters, Abbott was in charge of an engineering unit which used sophisticated computer-based graphics, printing, and reprographic equipment to produce and reproduce documents containing colors and gold seals. Seeking a promotion, Abbott represented to his supervisor that he had a bachelor of science degree in electronic engineering. Abbott then manipulated computer graphics equipment to create a bogus certified college transcript, which he submitted to his personnel office in support of his application for promotion.

United States v. Alvarado, Southern District of Texas

On December 9, 1992, Arnulfo Alvarado was indicted in connection with two incidents in which Alvarado obtained Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) documents from a corrupt INS Immigration Inspector and then sold the documents to government agents posing as Mexican nationals seeking entry into the United States.

Alvarado was charged with the possession of INS documents which he knew were falsely made and with paying a gratuity to the Immigration Inspector from whom he obtained the documents. The Inspector was cooperating in an ongoing investigation of INS personnel and document vendors in Brownsville, Texas.

United States v. Ashby, District of Arizona

On February 21, 1992, Richard N. Ashby, the Resident Agent-in-Charge of the United States Customs Office of Enforcement in Yuma, Arizona, was indicted on charges of mail fraud and conflict of interest.

Over the three and a half year period charged in the indictment, Ashby regularly withdrew funds from his office's Imprest Fund under the pretext of paying Customs informants, but never paid the informants the money. The indictment also charged that, during this period, Ashby requested, authorized and approved informant payments to his wife.

United States v. Becnel, Central District of California

On February 7, 1992, Marjorie Becnel pled guilty to two counts of submitting false statements to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).

Becnel was indicted on September 26, 1991, in connection with a scheme to loot a million dollar settlement fund administered by the EEOC. Becnel is a close friend of Vildred Davis, the sister of John Milton, the EEOC attorney who created the scheme. Milton was in charge of distributing a settlement fund to victims of discrimination by a Chicago trucking company. Becnel solicited friends and relatives to submit false claims to the EEOC for a share of the settlement fund. Milton would approve these false claims, and each claimant received a check from the fund for approximately \$6,000. The false claimants were allowed to keep \$1,000, and kicked back the remainder of the money to Davis and Milton. Milton is currently serving a 37 month sentence for his part in the scheme.

On April 28, 1992, Becnel was sentenced to five years' probation and required to pay restitution in the amount of \$12,979.92 for her participation in the scheme.

United States v. Davis, Central District of California

On April 27, 1992, a jury convicted Vildred Davis for her participation in the scheme described above to loot an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) fund of approximately \$88,000. Davis was convicted of one count of conspiracy, two counts of making a false statement and two counts of using a false social security number. She was acquitted of one count of obstruction of justice.

On November 9, 1992, Davis was sentenced to serve two consecutive eighteen month sentences with all but six months of each sentence suspended. She also was placed on five years' probation upon her release and ordered to pay \$27,565.37 in restitution.

On October 23, 1992, Fox was sentenced to 55 months' imprisonment, three years' supervised release, 300 hours of community service and ordered to make full restitution.

United States v. Ellinger, Eastern District of Virginia

On March 4, 1992, Kelly Sue Ellinger, a time-and-attendance (T&A) clerk employed by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), pled guilty to computer fraud and felony theft of government funds. Ellinger used the CIA's computer-based T&A recordkeeping system to add over 200 overtime hours to her own T&A records. As a result, between September 1989 and November 1991, Ellinger fraudulently received over \$3,000 in overtime pay.

On the same day, Ellinger was sentenced to three years' probation and 150 hours of community service. She was also ordered to make full restitution and pay a \$500 fine.

United States v. Evans, Eastern District of Virginia

On July 16, 1992, former Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) secretary Wilhemenia Evans pled guilty to embezzling over \$4,000 in CIA funds and falsifying a document to conceal the embezzlement.

In connection with an office move, Evans was assigned to order, take delivery on, and pay for new office furniture. For that purpose she was permitted to draw cash advances from the CIA. From August 1987 through January 1988, Evans obtained over \$4,000 in advances which she did not use to pay for furniture, but instead embezzled and converted to her own use, creating bogus paperwork to hide her actions.

On October 2, 1992, Evans was sentenced to one year of probation, including one month of home confinement.

United States v. Fuentes and Computer Dynamics, Incorporated, Eastern District of Virginia

On January 15, 1992, Ralph Alan Fuentes and Computer Dynamics, Incorporated (CDI) pled guilty to separate criminal Informations, each charging conspiracy to defraud the United States. Fuentes pled guilty to a conspiracy to defraud the Federal Election Commission (FEC), the Internal Revenue Service, and the Department of Defense. CDI pled guilty to a conspiracy to defraud the FEC.

In 1985, Fuentes, then the President and sole owner of CDI, purchased a recreational vehicle from a government contracting officer responsible for overseeing a CDI contract with

the Navy. Fuentes caused the issuance of a CDI corporate bonus check for \$10,000 to a CDI employee, and a CDI corporate check to himself for \$12,000. The total sum of \$22,000 was then given to another individual who acted as a "straw" purchaser of the vehicle. In order to conceal the manner in which the vehicle was purchased, Fuentes caused the amount of \$20,304.57 to be reflected in CDI's records as a bonus to the employee, representing the \$10,000 payment and taxes payable as a result of the bonus. That amount was subsequently submitted to the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) as an allowable overhead contract cost under a CDI contract with the Navy.

In December 1986, Fuentes caused CDI bonus checks to be issued to seven corporate employees, with the understanding that each employee would contribute \$2,000 to the Tribble re-election campaign. The bonuses were reflected in the records of CDI as tax deductible corporate officer and employee compensation, and were subsequently submitted to DCAA as allowable overhead contract costs under a CDI contract with the Navy.

On April 7, 1992, Fuentes was sentenced to a two-year suspended sentence, a \$50,000 fine, and three years' probation, during which he was required to perform ten hours of community service each week. CDI was sentenced to a \$25,000 fine.

United States v. Garcia, District of Arizona

On April 8, 1992, Willie Garcia, a Border Patrol Agent for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), was indicted on charges of obstruction of justice and making false declarations.

The obstruction of justice charge arose out of the false testimony that Garcia gave when he was called as a government witness during the trial of Hermelinda Aguilar. Aguilar, who was facing heroin distribution charges, had been an informant for the Border Patrol and had worked closely with Garcia. Contrary to the information that he had given the Assistant United States Attorney, Garcia testified that Aguilar had been working as a drug informant on the heroin transactions for which she was being prosecuted. Based on Garcia's testimony, the trial judge dismissed the case against Aguilar.

The false declarations charge arose out of Garcia's testimony before the federal grand jury investigating the allegations against him. Garcia again falsely testified that Aguilar had given him information about the heroin transaction which was the subject of the charges against her.

On August 21, 1992, a federal jury returned a verdict of guilty on all counts. On November 2, 1992, Garcia was sentenced to 30 months' imprisonment.

United States v. Gieniec, Central District of California

On April 13, 1992, a jury found former Deputy United States Marshal Joseph M. Gieniec guilty of receiving illegal gratuities from Lyons International Security, Inc., a security guard company that had a contract with the United States Marshal's Office in Los Angeles.

The jury found Gieniec guilty of accepting \$2,500 cash from Lyons Security. The jury also found that Lyons Security made two payments on Gieniec's home mortgage. Gieniec previously was convicted on all counts in 1989, but the conviction was reversed by the Ninth Circuit based on an erroneous jury instruction.

On June 5, 1992, Gieniec was sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment. On October 15, 1992, Gieniec was arrested at his home by the Santa Ana, California Police Department after a domestic dispute. The police seized two handguns and a variety of ammunition, and charged Gieniec with spousal abuse. As a result, Gieniec's probation was revoked and he was sentenced to an additional 12 months' imprisonment and two years' probation.

Gieniec was the third person convicted as a result of the investigation of the relationship between Lyons Security and the Los Angeles Marshal's Office.

United States v. Halstead, Northern District of Florida

On May 29, 1992, former Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) finance officer John Gary Halstead pled guilty to felony theft of government funds.

While employed by the CIA, Halstead was responsible for receiving and processing packages from overseas containing operational funds in the form of cash and other forms of money. Halstead took one such package containing over \$3,000 in cash and a personal check in the amount of \$650, and destroyed the paperwork concerning the package's arrival. When his actions were discovered, Halstead resigned from the CIA and paid the money back.

On August 6, 1992, Halstead was sentenced to one month of home confinement and three years' probation, and was ordered to pay a \$1,000 fine.

United States v. James, Northern District of Ohio

On June 16, 1992, Robert James, a former Legalization Adjudicator for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, was sentenced to serve 12 months' imprisonment for his conviction of two counts of bribery. James admitted accepting over \$15,000 in bribes from

Emilie Silva and Carlos Miranda to issue numerous employment authorization cards to illegal aliens brought to James by Silva and Miranda.

United States v. Miranda, Northern District of Ohio

On June 16, 1992, Carlos Miranda pled guilty to conspiracy to obtain fraudulent immigration documents for illegal aliens by bribing former Immigration and Naturalization Service Legalization Adjudicator Robert James. Miranda admitted to paying over \$15,000 to James in return for James issuing employment authorization cards to Mexican aliens who were not eligible to receive the cards.

On September 30, 1992, Carlos Miranda was sentenced to 15 months' imprisonment and ordered to make restitution to certain aliens he had defrauded.

United States v. Silva, Northern District of Ohio

On January 8, 1992, Emilie Silva pled guilty to conspiracy to obtain fraudulent immigration documents for illegal aliens. She admitted paying over \$15,000 in bribes to former Immigration and Naturalization Service Legalization Adjudicator Robert James in return for James issuing employment authorization cards to dozens of illegal aliens who were not eligible to receive the cards. Silva charged the aliens approximately \$700 each for her services, paid James only \$100 each and kept the difference.

On March 24, 1992, Emilie Silva was sentenced to serve 15 months' imprisonment for her conviction.

United States v. Jordan, Northern District of Texas

On December 2, 1992, Joel E. Jordan, a Special Agent with the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), was indicted on charges of bribery, interstate travel in aid of unlawful activity and using the wires to execute a scheme to defraud the DEA of his honest services.

The charges arose out of Jordan's acceptance of a \$3,000 cash payment from a cooperating individual in return for Jordan's assistance in planning and carrying out illegal drug deals and drug rip-offs involving the sale of artificial drugs. As part of the scheme, Jordan provided advice on how to transport drugs and money through airports without detection, provided advice on how to exchange drugs and money and agreed to check the names of drug dealers in the DEA computer system. Jordan also agreed to use his badge to scare away a drug dealer during a transaction if necessary.

United States v. Moton, Eastern District of Virginia

On May 6, 1992, Earnell M. Moton pled guilty to felony theft of government funds in the form of unearned overtime pay.

Moton was a GS-7 shift worker employed by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), who received premium pay for overtime and for hours worked at night and on Sundays and holidays. From June to October 1989, Moton submitted time-and-attendance (T&A) reports claiming that he had worked 336 hours which he had not in fact worked. For part of that time Moton, an avid athlete, had actually been attending semi-professional football training camp. As a result of his false T&A reports, Moton received over \$4,000 in unearned pay. When the investigation began, Moton resigned from the CIA and made partial restitution.

On July 24, 1992, Moton was sentenced to two years' supervised probation including four months on work-release detention. Moton was also ordered to provide 100 hours of community service and pay the balance due in restitution (\$1,903.30).

United States v. Porter, District of Columbia

On October 22, 1992, Donald M. Porter pled guilty to theft of government property. Porter, an applications clerk for the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), was responsible for processing applications and fees received by the ICC. From May 1991 through February 1992, Porter cashed for personal use approximately forty-four checks and money orders, amounting to over \$8,000, which were sent to the ICC as processing fees. Additionally, Porter received from an ICC regulated entity \$370 in cash which was intended for payment of an ICC fee. Porter retained the cash for his own personal use.

United States v. Primerana, Southern District of New York

On October 14, 1992, Frank T. Primerana, a former Special Agent with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Criminal Investigation Division, was indicted and charged with making false statements, obstruction of justice, and making false statements as an IRS agent. All charges arose out of Primerana's fabricating, in a memorandum of interview, a confession by William A. Nachman, the target of Primerana's investigation, and falsely ascribing authorship of the memorandum to a Special Agent of the Drug Enforcement Administration. The false memorandum was used to gain approval of the IRS and the Department of Justice to prosecute Nachman on tax charges, and was introduced in the grand jury that indicted Nachman. Nachman died before trial.

United States v. Rab, District of Maryland

On November 9, 1992, K. Shahid Rab, formerly an architect with the United States Veterans Administration (VA), pled guilty to acting as an agent for another entity before a federal agency while employed by the United States. Rab admitted that, while employed by the VA, he represented Larsen Engineers Inc. before the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in connection with an application for a contract to act as technical assistance manager for a construction project in Bangladesh. The USAID project involved the building of storage facilities for contraceptives and other family planning commodities. Larsen's contract was worth approximately \$930,000.

While employed by the VA, Rab made two trips to Bangladesh to represent Larsen before USAID, including a trip in February 1989 for which he was paid \$2,090 by Larsen for travel expenses. Prior to the effective date of his resignation from the VA in March 1989, Rab received salary from Larsen totaling \$5,603; during this same period of dual employment, he earned \$5,540 from the VA. The contractor data sheet filed with USAID by Larsen falsely listed Rab as having left the VA in November 1988.

United States v. Romello, Eastern District of Virginia

On October 2, 1992, Joseph P. Romello, a former employee of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), pled guilty to an Information charging him with conspiracy, and making a false statement in connection with procurement activities of the CIA and other agencies in the United States intelligence community. Romello defrauded the CIA and the government of over \$1.2 million. The CIA stated that it had not had a case of this magnitude in its 45-year history.

Romello created fraudulent contract requirements and caused a "subcontractor" to submit bids and other information leading to the award of a subcontract for computer equipment. Romello then certified that \$708,000 worth of equipment had been received even though it did not exist. Once payment was made to the subcontractor by the CIA for the nonexistent equipment, Romello arranged with the subcontractor to have more than \$500,000 transferred back to him.

The Information also charged that Romello caused a fraudulent request for a subcontract to be issued for the procurement of an \$485,020 alternative maintenance study knowing that the amount was excessive. Romello then obtained \$200,000 from the same subcontractor as Romello's share of the proceeds for this maintenance study.

On December 4, 1992, Romello was sentenced to 41 months' imprisonment and three years of supervised release. In addition, Romello was ordered to pay restitution in the amount of \$758,000.

United States v. San Martin, Eastern District of Louisiana

On July 31, 1992, Jimmy Lorenzo San Martin pled guilty to a one count Information charging him with destroying governmental property.

Vinicio Ramirez, the service manager in charge of a Guatemalan computer company, in cooperation with an ongoing criminal investigation by the USAID Office of Investigations, placed a surveillance camera at a meeting attended by San Martin. After a brief conversation between San Martin and Ramirez, San Martin observed the camera and destroyed it.

On October 7, 1992, San Martin was sentenced to three years' probation, 100 hours of community service and ordered to pay \$1,200 restitution.

United States v. Silverman, Central District of California

On July 22, 1992, Michael David Silverman, a physical scientist with the Minerals Management Service of the United States Department of the Interior (DOI) in Camarillo, California, pled guilty to one count of making false statements and one count of making a false claim in connection with a fraudulent travel voucher that Silverman submitted to the DOI.

Silverman's office was relocated from Los Angeles to Camarillo, California. On a travel voucher for expenses of moving closer to the new location, Silverman claimed \$12,000 as reimbursement for a penalty fee that he claimed to have paid when he terminated a residential lease agreement. Among the attachments to the voucher were a purported lease and a receipt for the penalty fee. The lease and receipt were false, and Silverman did not actually incur any termination fee.

On November 9, 1992, Silverman, was sentenced to four months' home detention, 1,000 hours of community service, and a \$5,000 fine.

United States v. Stiles, District of Oregon

On April 20, 1992, Joseph Stiles, a convicted drug dealer, pled guilty to an Information charging him with Interstate Travel in Aid of Racketeering (ITAR), with a predicate act of bribery.

The ITAR plea arose from Stiles' role in attempting to bribe Stephen Proski, a Bureau of Prisons official who was the warden of the federal prison camp in Phoenix, Arizona. Stiles told a cooperating federal prisoner that Proski accepted bribes for assisting incarcerated felons in obtaining desirable locations to serve their sentences. In a subsequent investigation, an undercover agent, posing as an attorney for the cooperating federal prisoner, contacted Stiles in an effort to have Proski facilitate the inmate's transfer to a prison camp. Stiles made numerous representations that Proski could help the cooperating prisoner; he also negotiated with the undercover agent the amount of money that the prisoner would pay for his transfer and, in order to finalize the bribe, travelled from San Francisco to Phoenix to introduce the agent to Proski.

Although there was insufficient evidence to prove Proski's participation in the bribery scheme promoted by Stiles, Proski resigned when he was confronted with evidence of Stiles' scheme.

On September 8, 1992, Stiles was sentenced to 41 months' imprisonment.

United States v. Tutse Tonwe and Valerie Glover Tonwe, District of Delaware

On March 3, 1992, Tutse Tonwe was sentenced to 33 months' imprisonment and his wife, Valerie Glover Tonwe, was sentenced to 37 months' imprisonment for their participation in a scheme to obtain work permits for illegal aliens. The pair also received three years' probation each.

Valerie Glover Tonwe had pled guilty to one count of conspiracy and one count of bribery and Tutse Tonwe was found guilty by a jury of conspiracy and Interstate Travel in Aid of Racketeering (ITAR). The Tonwes' scheme involved the payment of \$72,000 in bribes to a Legalization Adjudicator in the INS District Office in Baltimore, Maryland who reported the bribe and cooperated in the investigation. The Tonwe's participation in the scheme included assisting in the laundering of the bribe payments so that the conspiracy would not be discovered.

On October 7, 1992, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit affirmed the judgments in United States v. Valerie Glover Tonwe and United States v. Tutse Tonwe.

United States v. Tarla, District of Columbia

On March 17, 1992, Thomas R. Tarla pled guilty to one count of making false claims in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 287. Tarla was formerly a criminal investigator for the Department of State, Office of the Inspector General and a criminal investigator for the Department of Commerce, Office of the Inspector General.

The case arose out of Tarla's submission of false vouchers and false receipts claiming reimbursement for lodging expenses during his temporary detail to the Department of State, and following his transfer to the Department of State from the Department of Commerce. Tarla claimed to have paid approximately \$10,690 in rent to a friend for lodging at that friend's home in Alexandria, Virginia. In fact, Tarla only paid the friend a total of approximately \$1,080.

On May 14, 1992, Tarla was sentenced to two years' probation including two months' home detention, 100 hours of community service, restitution to the government in the amount of \$9,610 and a \$1,000 fine.

United States v. Whitfield, District of Columbia

On March 18, 1992, Jack G. Whitfield pled guilty to an Information charging him with theft of government property, and receipt of stolen government property.

Whitfield, a landscape contractor, was arrested after he purchased fifty cases of camera film, which he believed to be stolen from the United States' Government, from an undercover agent of the Department of Justice's Office of the Inspector General. The film is valued at approximately \$30,000. Prior to his arrest, Whitfield had offered to purchase the same amount of stolen film every week for as long as the film could be supplied. Whitfield subsequently admitted that for a period of about six months in 1991, he purchased approximately \$115,000 worth of film that he knew had been stolen from the government by an employee of the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia. That employee also pled guilty for his participation in the scheme.

On June 2, 1992, Whitfield was sentenced to 15 months' imprisonment and three years' supervised release.

United States v. Parker, District of Columbia

On January 15, 1992, Norman Parker, a supplies specialist with the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia, pled guilty to an Information charging him with theft from the Government. Parker admitted to charging approximately \$120,000 worth of Polaroid film to the United States Attorney's Office, and then selling the film. Pursuant to a plea agreement, Parker cooperated with the United States in its investigation of the matter.

On March 12, 1992, Parker was sentenced to five years' probation and ordered to pay \$10,000 in restitution. Parker was also ordered to perform 100 hours of community service.

United States v. Williams, District of Columbia

On January 15, 1992, Jerome Williams, a former Business Opportunity Specialist for the Small Business Administration (SBA), was sentenced to three months' home confinement and ordered to pay a fine of \$3,000 as conditions of a two-year term of probation.

In October 1991, Williams pled guilty to one count of providing a false statement to the United States by falsifying his employment history in an employment application he made to the General Services Agency (GSA) after leaving the SBA. Williams admitted that he misrepresented his employment history when he applied to the GSA in order to conceal the fact that he had worked for and had accepted a \$3,000 gratuity from Engineering and Economics Research, Inc. (EER), an SBA contractor for which he performed official duties as an SBA employee. On his job application, William falsely stated that he had left the SBA in February 1987 when in fact he resigned on June 1, 1987. He also falsely stated that he had been employed by Ross & Company from February 1987 until August 1988, when in fact he was employed by EER.

STATE AND LOCAL CORRUPTION

In 1992, the Public Integrity Section closed five investigations involving corruption affecting state and local government. At the end of 1992, 20 such matters were open. Also during 1992, the Section prosecuted the following cases involving state and local corruption.

OPERATION BOPTROT

The Public Integrity Section prosecuted a number of cases stemming from "Operation Boptrot," the Department of Justice's wide-ranging investigation of corruption in the Kentucky state legislature. The Public Integrity Section prosecuted these cases, in conjunction with attorneys from the United States Attorney's Office for the Eastern and Western Districts of Kentucky. Following are descriptions of 1992 prosecutions growing out of this investigation:

United States v. Blandford, Eastern District of Kentucky

On November 12, 1992, Donald J. Blandford, the Speaker of the Kentucky House of Representatives was indicted and charged with conducting the affairs of his office through a pattern of racketeering activity, conspiring and attempting to obtain property under color of official right, and making false statements to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The indictment charged that Blandford used his office to obtain money for his personal benefit. Blandford conspired with lobbyist and former legislator William McBee to obtain \$1,500 from Riverside Downs horse racing track in return for Blandford's opposition to a piece of horse racing legislation. Blandford accepted three payments of \$500 each from McBee and when interviewed by the FBI, gave a false explanation for the money he received from McBee. Blandford also attempted to obtain the money from Riverside Downs in return for his official acts.

The indictment also charged that Blandford conducted his office as a RICO enterprise. The predicate RICO acts are the Hobbs Act offenses involving Riverside Downs, and three mail fraud offenses (in 1984, 1986, and 1987). The mail fraud offenses arose from Blandford siphoning money from his campaign accounts for his personal benefit and the personal benefit of his girlfriend.

United States v. Bronger, Eastern District of Kentucky

On July 22, 1992, Kentucky State Representative Jerry Bronger was indicted and charged with conspiracy to violate the Hobbs Act. Bronger pled guilty to the charge on the day of indictment.

Bronger conspired with others to obtain a total of \$2,000 from Riverside Downs racetrack in return for Bronger's opposition to a specific piece of legislation that would be economically harmful to Riverside Downs. Bronger received three cash payments from Riverside lobbyist and former legislator Bill McBee.

United States v. Crupper, Eastern District of Kentucky

On June 8, 1992, Kentucky State Representative Clay Crupper was indicted and charged with violating the Travel Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1952. On June 9, 1992, Crupper resigned his legislative seat. Crupper pled guilty to the charge on June 12, 1992.

Crupper admitted that, while attending the Jockey Guild convention in Las Vegas, received \$400 from John Hall, a representative of Riverside Downs Harness Racetrack in return for Crupper's support of legislation being promoted by Riverside Downs.

United States v. Garrett, Western District of Kentucky

On August 31, 1992, former Kentucky State Senator Helen Garrett was indicted and charged with engaging in a mail fraud scheme to deprive the citizens of Kentucky of her honest services. Garrett received a \$2,000 payoff from Riverside Downs Harness Racetrack in return for Garrett's promise to use her official position to support legislation favored by Riverside Downs.

Garrett pled guilty to the charge on September 4, 1992.

United States v. Guy, Eastern District of Kentucky

On September 3, 1992, a federal grand jury returned a one count indictment against Buel E. Guy, the Administrative Assistant to Kentucky Speaker of the House Donald J. Blandford. The indictment charged Guy with making a false statement to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).

Guy made false statements to FBI Special Agents during an interview. Guy received \$1,000 from then-legislator William McBee in connection with Guy's actions in getting a piece of horse racing legislation passed by the Kentucky General Assembly. McBee was paying the money on behalf of Dueling Grounds race track. When interviewed by the FBI, Guy denied receiving any money from McBee or Dueling Grounds.

Guy pled guilty to the charge on September 22, 1992.

United States v. Hall, Western District of Kentucky

On April 28, 1992, former Kentucky State Senator and subsequent representative of Riverside Downs Harness Racetrack John Hall was indicted and charged with violating the Hobbs Act and the Travel Act.

United States v. Layman, Eastern District of Kentucky

On June 11, 1992, former Kentucky State Representative Ronnie Layman was indicted and charged with violating the Hobbs Act and with making false statements to the FBI. On June 12, 1992, Layman pled guilty to both counts in the indictment and announced his withdrawal from the 1992 campaign for Kentucky State Senator.

Layman admitted that, in December 1990, he received \$400 from John Hall, a representative of Riverside Downs Harness Racetrack in return for Layman's agreement to support legislation being promoted by Riverside Downs. When confronted by the FBI about his actions, Layman made false statements to explain his conduct.

The indictment charged that Hall, while a State Senator, solicited approximately \$4,850 from Riverside Downs Harness Racetrack in return for Hall's support for legislation favored by the racetrack. While at the December 1990 Jockey Guild convention in Las Vegas, Hall paid approximately \$1,500 to several legislators in return for their support of the Riverside Downs legislation. Hall and the other legislators subsequently returned to Kentucky and performed official acts on behalf of Riverside Downs.

Hall pled guilty to the charges on May 5, 1992.

United States v. McBee, Eastern and Western Districts of Kentucky

On June 24, 1992, former Kentucky State Representative William K. McBee was indicted by federal grand juries in the Eastern and Western Districts of Kentucky. The Eastern District indictment charged McBee with conspiring to violate the Hobbs Act and one count of conspiring to violate the Travel Act. The Western District indictment charged McBee with a Hobbs Act conspiracy. The charges were consolidated in the Eastern District of Kentucky. On June 26, 1992, McBee pled guilty to all charges against him.

McBee pled guilty to engaging in four separate criminal schemes between 1987 and 1992. First, in 1987, McBee and other state legislators travelled to Las Vegas, Nevada for a Jockey Guild Convention. At the time, McBee was a Kentucky State Representative and co-chairman of the Business Organizations and Professions (BOP) committee of the legislature. In Las Vegas, McBee received money from a representative of the Jockey Guild, then distributed the money to other BOP members on behalf of the Jockey Guild and the thoroughbred racing industry, with the intent to influence the official acts of the BOP members after they returned to Kentucky.

Second, McBee admitted to engaging in a conspiracy between January and March 1992, to obtain property from Riverside Downs Harness Racetrack for the benefit of members of the Kentucky legislature. At the time, McBee was a lobbyist for Riverside Downs.

McBee also pled guilty to a conspiracy to fix an arbitration proceeding involving Riverside Downs. McBee conspired with Jay Spurrier to pay a \$20,000 bribe to former Gubernatorial aide Bruce Wilkinson, in return for an arbitration decision that favored Riverside Downs.

Finally, McBee pled guilty to a conspiracy to accept money in return for helping Dueling Grounds racetrack obtain a racing license. At the time, McBee was co-Chairman of the BOP committee. In return for his assistance, McBee received \$30,000 from Spurrier, who was acting on behalf of Dueling Grounds. McBee kept a portion of the money.

United States v. Spurrier, Eastern District of Kentucky

On May 20, 1992, John W. Spurrier, III, was indicted on two conspiracy counts. Spurrier is a lobbyist and former member of the Kentucky Harness Racing Commission (KHRC). On May 22, 1992, Spurrier pled guilty to both counts.

Spurrier, while a member of the KHRC, conspired to violate the Hobbs Act by obtaining approximately \$13,000 from Riverside Downs Harness Racetrack in return for influencing the official acts of Spurrier and other members of the KHRC.

Spurrier also pled guilty to conspiracy to deprive the citizens of Kentucky of the honest services of Bruce Wilkinson, an aide to the Governor of Kentucky in violation of the wire fraud statute. Spurrier and unindicted co-conspirator William McBee received \$50,000 from Riverside Downs to influence the outcome of an arbitration proceeding involving Riverside Downs. They paid \$20,000 of the money to Bruce Wilkinson.

United States v. Wilkinson, Eastern District of Kentucky

On July 27, 1992, Bruce Wilkinson was indicted on charges that he conspired to commit extortion in violation of the Hobbs Act and engaged in a scheme to commit mail fraud. Wilkinson was the Director of Boards and Commissions in the office of then-Governor Wallace Wilkinson. He also is Governor Wilkinson's nephew.

The indictment charged that in November 1991, Bruce Wilkinson agreed with John Spurrier, III, to use his official position to fix an arbitration matter involving two Kentucky horse racing tracks in return for \$20,000. Spurrier and then-legislator William K. McBee solicited \$50,000 from Riverside Downs Harness Racetrack, one of the tracks affected by the arbitration. The arbitrator subsequently ruled in favor of Riverside Downs. Spurrier and McBee arranged for \$20,000 to be paid to Wilkinson. Bruce Wilkinson received this money in return for his agreement to fix the arbitration.

OTHER STATE AND LOCAL CORRUPTION

United States v. Aucoin, Bertolino and Condon, United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

On June 22, 1992, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit affirmed the convictions of Walton Aucoin, William Condon, and Steven Bertolino. These three defendants were convicted in August 1990, of operating an illegal gambling business and RICO. The indictment alleged that in connection with their sports bookmaking business, they had sought and received assistance from New Orleans District Attorney Harry Connick and others. Aucoin was sentenced to 15 months' imprisonment. Bertolino and Condon were each sentenced to six months' imprisonment.

Two co-defendants, Iris Ethridge and Darlene Aucoin, pled guilty to aiding and abetting and received probation.

United States v. Crnkovich, District of Idaho

On March 12, 1992, Franklin D. Crnkovich, the Sheriff of Shoshone County, Idaho was indicted on charges that he conducted the affairs of his office through a pattern of racketeering activity, including conspiring with others to obstruct the enforcement of Idaho criminal gambling laws, aiding and abetting two illegal gambling businesses, accepting bribes from one of the illegal gambling businesses, and accepting bribes from the operators of two houses of prostitution. The indictment also charges Sheriff Crnkovich with conspiring to obstruct state law enforcement of Idaho gambling statutes and with aiding and abetting the operation of those illegal gambling businesses.

On November 6, 1992, the trial judge declared a mistrial in the case against Crnkovich because the jury was unable to reach a unanimous verdict as to any of the four counts against him.

United States v. David Field, Merrill Field, and Terry Douglas, District of Idaho

On March 12, 1992, Terry Douglas and Merrill Field pled guilty to obstruction of state or local law enforcement and operating an illegal gambling business, and David Field, Merrill Field's son, pled guilty to operating an illegal gambling business. Douglas operated one illegal gambling business and Merrill and David Field operated a second illegal gambling business in Shoshone County. These businesses involved the distribution of video poker machines to approximately 50 bars in the county which used the machines for illegal gambling, the proceeds of which were split between the bar operator and either Douglas or the Fields. Their illegal gambling businesses were protected by the Shoshone County Sheriff, Franklin Crnkovich, who received money from Merrill Field or Douglas.

On November 24, 1992, Merrill Field and Terry Douglas were each sentenced to three years' probation, including six months' home confinement, and ordered to perform 200 hours of community service. Field, who had already forfeited \$200,000 to the government pursuant to his plea agreement as the profit from the gambling business, was not ordered to pay a fine but was required to pay the costs of his probation and electronic monitoring. Douglas, who had also forfeited \$200,000 to the government, was also ordered to pay a \$4,000 fine. David Field was given a sentence of three years' probation, including two months' home confinement, a \$2,000 fine, and he was ordered to pay the costs of his probation and electronic monitoring.

United States v. Fox, District of Columbia

On July 15, 1992, H. Lawrence Fox, a former senior partner in the law firms of Winston & Strawn and Bishop Cook Purcell & Reynolds pled guilty to charges arising from

defrauding his clients and his law firms of approximately \$1.5 million. Fox was charged in a two count Information with mail fraud and tax evasion.

From November 1986 through June 1991, Fox diverted money to himself, his family and his friends in order to channel payments to the Keefe Company, a political consulting firm, and then instructing the Keefe Company to make certain payments for his benefit by submitting vendor invoices purporting to be for client expenses which in fact were for personal expenses; and by filing expense reports claiming personal expenses as business expenses. The money Fox obtained was used to pay for three Jaguars, jewelry, trips to Europe and the Caribbean, and other luxury items as well as to pay for renovations, interior decorating services and furnishings for his homes in Alexandria, Virginia and Nags Head, North Carolina.

United States v. McGill, United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

On May 13, 1992, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit affirmed the 1990 conviction of Thomas L. McGill, Jr., on one felony count of evasion of payment of federal income taxes and two misdemeanor counts of willful failure to pay taxes. The Court reversed McGill's conviction on two additional felony evasion counts. The United States Supreme Court subsequently denied McGill's petition for a writ of certiorari.

In February 1991, McGill was sentenced, following jury verdicts, to five years' probation for nonpayment of his federal income taxes over the span of a decade. McGill was also ordered to pay all taxes, penalties and interest owed, to provide 500 hours per year of community service, and to pay the costs of prosecution.

United States v. Martin, Middle District of Alabama

On March 5, 1992, Robert C. Martin, formerly the Assistant Commander of the Montgomery, Alabama, Police Department Narcotics Unit, pled guilty to a felony Information charging him with theft concerning programs receiving federal funds.

During 1988 and 1989, Martin took in excess of \$5,000 from the Narcotics Unit's petty cash fund. The purpose of this fund is to pay informants for their cooperation in drug investigations. Martin took cash from the fund and falsely documented that the money was being used to pay informants for information in drug investigations. Martin then used the money for his own personal purposes.

On May 26, 1992, Martin was sentenced to three months' imprisonment followed by three months' home confinement and three years' supervised release.

United States v. Pruitt, Eastern District of North Carolina

On September 9, 1992, Winston A. Pruitt pled guilty to a two-count Information charging operation of an illegal gambling business and destruction or removal of property to prevent seizure.

Pruitt conducted an illegal bookmaking operation out of an apartment in Greenville, North Carolina. The bookmaking operation involved betting on college and professional sports games. In addition, Pruitt received information that his bookmaking operation might be the target of a search warrant on Super Bowl Sunday, 1992. Based on this information, Pruitt removed documents and other gambling paraphernalia believing a search of his premises was imminent.

On December 7, 1992, Pruitt was sentenced to six months' home confinement and three years' probation. Pruitt was fined \$5,000.

United States v. Lancaster, Matthews, Owens and Aldridge, Eastern District of North Carolina

On July 13, 1992, Joseph Lancaster, Ray Matthews, Frank Owens and Edward Aldridge each pled guilty to separate Informations charging operation of illegal gambling businesses. Lancaster and Matthews conducted an illegal bookmaking operation out of the back office of a used car lot located in Greenville, North Carolina. Owens conducted a similar operation out of an apartment. Each of these operations involved betting on college and professional sports games. Aldridge conducted an illegal lottery business out of his residence in Greenville, North Carolina.

The pleas were entered as part of an ongoing investigation into public corruption in Pitt County, North Carolina.

On November 23, 1992, Lancaster, Matthews and Owens were sentenced to three years' probation following four months in the Community Corrections Center in Raleigh, North Carolina, and four months' home confinement with electronic monitoring. Matthews and Owens were also fined \$5,000 plus interest. On November 30, 1992, Edward Aldridge received a sentence identical to Lancaster, Matthews and Owens.

ELECTION AND CAMPAIGN FINANCING CRIMES

United States v. Calendaria and Sanchez, District of New Mexico

On March 19, 1992, Elodia Gloria Calendaria and Floralee Sanchez pled guilty to Informations charging violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1973i(c) for having falsely registered several people to vote. Calendaria and Sanchez were the director and assistant director, respectively, of a state-funded dental clinic and day care center and were also deputy registration officers in Bernalillo County, New Mexico. Sanchez pled guilty to falsely registered employees of the clinic to vote by stating that they resided at the clinic. Calendaria pled guilty to helping a family friend to register falsely.

On May 15, 1992, Calendaria and Sanchez were each sentenced to six months' home detention and three years' probation. Both defendants were ordered to refrain from participation in political activities while serving their sentences.

United States v. Cole, Central District of Illinois

On January 17, 1992, a jury found Davis Cole guilty of voting fraud involving absentee ballots. Cole was a successful candidate for Precinct Committeeman in Springfield, Illinois, in the March 1990, Democratic primary. During the primary, Cole had voters apply for absentee ballots, had some voters supply false addresses in their applications so as to entitle them to vote in his precinct, and then collected the absentee ballots and voted them himself. He also provided compensation to some voters for turning over their absentee ballots.

On April 13, 1992, Cole was sentenced to 46 months' imprisonment. Prior to trial, Cole was arrested for his part in an assault by four men upon a government witness who was threatened at gun point and told not to testify against Cole. As a result, the Magistrate revoked Cole's bond and Cole was detained.

United States v. Jaffe, Jr., Pozza and McBrearty, Western District of Texas

On November 6, 1992, Jaffe Group, Inc., Morris Douglas Jaffe, Jr., Patricia Pozza and Mary Ella McBrearty were acquitted on all counts after a two day trial of charges alleging a scheme to make illegal corporate campaign contributions to political action committees (PACs) supporting candidates for federal office, while concealing the source of such contributions from the Federal Election Commission (FEC). Patricia Pozza and Mary Ella McBrearty served as corporate counsel for Jaffe Group, Inc.

The indictment charged that on several occasions during 1988, Jaffe and Pozza solicited selected employees of the corporation to make political contributions to PACs supporting candidates for federal office, with the understanding that the employees would be reimbursed for their contributions through unearned performance "bonuses" paid by Jaffe Group, Inc. After the contributions were made, the employees were given fictitious "bonuses" to reimburse them for their contributions, thereby concealing from the FEC the fact that the actual source of the contributions was the Jaffe Group, Inc. Federal law requires accurate reporting as to the identities of contributors to candidates for federal office, and expressly prohibits corporate campaign contributions.

United States v. Parham and Johnson, Eastern District of Arkansas

On March 11, 1992, Theortres Parham and Thomas Charles Johnson were indicted on charges of absentee ballot fraud in the November 1990 general election in Phillips County, Arkansas. Parham was a Deputy Registrar for Phillips County and a candidate for Mayor of the City of Helena, Arkansas. Johnson was a Deputy Registrar who assisted Parham in soliciting absentee votes in the election. The two were charged with conspiring to vote more than once and to give false information as to their names for the purpose of establishing eligibility to vote. They were also charged with voting more than once and with multiple counts of giving false information to establish eligibility to vote.

Parham and Johnson conspired to obtain voters' signatures on blank Applications for Absentee Ballots. They then completed the Applications, often listing false reasons for the voters' purported absences from the polls and requesting that the ballots be mailed to a single address. After the ballots were sent to this address by the County Clerk's office, Parham, Johnson and their co-conspirators forged the signatures of the voters on the Voter Statements, completed the ballots, and returned them to the County Clerk for counting in the election, all without the knowledge or permission of the persons in whose names they were submitted.

On September 10, 1992, Parham and Johnson were convicted after a jury trial of conspiring to vote more than once and to give false information as to name for the purpose of establishing eligibility to vote. Both defendants were acquitted on substantive counts of voting more than once and giving false information as to name.

United States v. Boards and Steele, Eastern District of Arkansas

On November 6, 1992, Regener Levon Boards and Brenda Sue Steele were convicted by a jury of absentee ballot fraud in the November 1990 general election in Phillips County, Arkansas. Boards was convicted of giving false information as to name for the purpose of establishing eligibility to vote, and of conspiring to vote more than once and to give false

information as to name. Steele was convicted of giving false information as to name for the purpose of establishing eligibility to vote and acquitted of conspiracy.

Boards and Steele participated in a scheme whereby they obtained voters' signatures on blank Applications for Absentee Ballots and forged other voters' signatures on the forms. They then completed the Applications, directing that the ballots be mailed to a post office box, and often listing false reasons for the voters' purported absences from the polls. After the ballots were sent to this address by the County Clerk's office, a co-conspirator forged the signatures of the voters on the Voter Statements, completed the ballots, and returned them to the County Clerk for counting in the election, all without the knowledge or permission of the persons in whose names they were submitted.

LIST OF TABLES

- TABLE I Federal Prosecutions of Corrupt Public Officials:
Year Ended December 31, 1992
- TABLE II Progress Over The Last Two Decades
Federal Prosecutions of Corrupt Public Officials:
January 1, 1973 to December 31, 1992
- TABLES III Federal Prosecutions of Corrupt Public Officials:
Convictions by District
January 1, 1983 to December 31, 1992

TABLE 1
FEDERAL PROSECUTIONS OF CORRUPT PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Year Ended December 31, 1992

Federal Officials

Indicted	624
Convicted	532
Awaiting Trial	139

State Officials

Indicted	81
Convicted	92
Awaiting Trial	24

Local Officials

Indicted	232
Convicted	211
Awaiting Trial	91

Others Involved

Indicted	252
Convicted	246
Awaiting Trial	126

Total

Indicted	1189
Convicted	1081
Awaiting Trial	380

7 Districts Did Not Respond

TABLE II
PROGRESS OVER THE LAST TWO DECADES
FEDERAL PROSECUTIONS OF CORRUPT PUBLIC OFFICIALS

<u>FEDERAL OFFICIALS</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>
- Indicted	60	59	53	111	129	153	114	123	198	158	460
- Convicted	48	51	43	101	94	91	102	131	159	147	424
- Awaiting Trial on December 31	2	1	5	1	32	42	21	16	23	38	58
<hr/>											
<u>STATE OFFICIALS</u>											
- Indicted	19	36	36	59	50	55	56	72	87	49	81
- Convicted	17	23	18	35	38	56	31	51	66	43	65
- Awaiting Trial on December 31	0	0	5	30	33	20	29	28	36	18	26
<hr/>											
<u>LOCAL OFFICIALS</u>											
- Indicted	85	130	139	194	157	171	211	247	244	257	270
- Convicted	64	87	94	100	164	127	151	168	211	232	226
- Awaiting Trial on December 31	2	4	15	98	62	72	63	82	102	58	61
<hr/>											
<u>OTHERS INVOLVED</u>											
- Indicted	27	80	66	27	199	171	198	285	279	349	265
- Convicted	15	52	56	24	144	144	135	252	294	249	257
- Awaiting Trial on December 31	14	0	2	70	83	71	65	87	70	72	77
<hr/>											
<u>TOTALS</u>											
- Indicted	191	305	294	391	535	530	579	727	808	813	1076
- Convicted	144	213	211	260	440	418	419	602	730	671	972
- Awaiting Trial on December 31	18	5	27	199	210	205	178	213	231	186	222

TABLE II
PROGRESS OVER THE LAST TWO DECADES
FEDERAL PROSECUTIONS OF CORRUPT PUBLIC OFFICIALS

<u>FEDERAL OFFICIALS</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
- Indicted	408	563	596	651	629	695	615	803	624	7182
- Convicted	429	470	523	545	529	610	583	665	532	6277
- Awaiting Trial on December 31	77	90	83	118	86	126	103	149	139	1210
<hr/>										
<u>STATE OFFICIALS</u>										
- Indicted	58	79	88	102	66	71	96	115	81	1356
- Convicted	52	66	71	76	69	54	79	77	92	1079
- Awaiting Trial on December 31	21	20	24	26	14	18	28	42	24	442
<hr/>										
<u>LOCAL OFFICIALS</u>										
- Indicted	203	248	232	246	276	269	257	242	232	4310
- Convicted	196	221	207	204	229	201	225	180	211	3498
- Awaiting Trial on December 31	74	49	55	89	79	122	98	88	91	1364
<hr/>										
<u>OTHERS INVOLVED</u>										
- Indicted	262	267	292	277	303	313	208	292	252	4412
- Convicted	257	240	225	256	240	284	197	272	246	3839
- Awaiting Trial on December 31	97	97	84	135	109	109	71	67	126	1506
<hr/>										
<u>TOTALS</u>										
- Indicted	931	1157	1208	1276	1274	1348	1176	1452	1189	17260
- Convicted	934	997	1026	1081	1067	1149	1084	1194	1081	14693
- Awaiting Trial on December 31	269	256	246	368	288	375	300	346	380	4522

TABLE III
FEDERAL PROSECUTIONS OF CORRUPT PUBLIC OFFICIALS
CONVICTIONS OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS BY JUDICIAL DISTRICTS
1983-1992

	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	Total
Alabama, Northern	7	15	12	3	4	0	8	1	0	3	53
Alabama, Middle	6	5	2	7	3	8	9	0	0	4	44
Alabama, Southern	12	16	6	8	6	9	8	3	2	0	70
Alaska	6	8	9	10	6	0	6	1	0	1	47
Arizona	4	3	4	4	5	11	27	4	8	8	78
Arkansas, Eastern	9	2	3	2	1	5	3	0	6	2	33
Arkansas, Western	4	4	0	6	4	5	0	3	1	2	29
California, Northern	3	9	39	12	3	19	9	2	6	13	115
California, Eastern	0	20	25	28	18	32	30	23	22	20	218
California, Central	17	52	2	38	47	15	52	57	34	35	349
California, Southern	3	7	22	5	9	6	13	6	6	5	82
Colorado	13	9	4	11	11	0	14	10	13	N/A	85
Connecticut	15	8	7	7	9	15	12	8	4	10	95
Delaware	1	3	0	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	11
District of Columbia	N/A	34	16	30	13	19	25	50	23	N/A	210
Florida, Northern	1	6	3	7	4	3	5	9	6	4	48

*N/A indicates that the district did not provide statistics.

	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	Total
Florida, Middle	13	23	8	8	20	24	40	19	28	23	206
Florida, Southern	8	8	5	3	14	16	36	42	14	21	167
Georgia, Northern	20	9	9	21	19	33	27	19	21	17	195
Georgia, Middle	10	4	8	12	2	4	16	10	19	4	89
Georgia, Southern	8	14	6	3	2	7	8	5	1	N/A	54
Guam	1	14	11	12	10	N/A	9	2	0	3	62
Hawaii	2	6	0	N/A	4	6	0	6	2	1	27
Idaho	2	2	1	6	4	2	1	1	0	2	21
Illinois, Northern	16	57	35	33	29	119	96	80	18	53	536
Illinois, Central	3	24	3	4	3	4	5	1	1	1	49
Illinois, Southern	2	0	7	2	0	0	1	3	0	1	16
Indiana, Northern	0	4	8	4	8	9	16	9	2	2	62
Indiana, Southern	0	3	5	13	17	7	14	6	6	2	73
Iowa, Northern	1	3	3	6	2	2	2	6	3	2	30
Iowa, Southern	1	3	3	6	2	5	7	4	2	2	35
Kansas	3	9	9	10	7	9	6	0	1	0	54
Kentucky, Eastern	0	7	3	8	5	4	6	12	5	1	51
Kentucky, Western	1	0	2	10	5	6	4	12	7	0	47
Louisiana, Eastern	19	9	4	7	6	18	15	36	6	2	122

	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	Total
Louisiana, Middle	5	0	2	2	5	7	9	14	0	0	44
Louisiana, Western	0	0	4	6	5	5	6	8	4	3	41
Maine	1	1	2	5	0	4	4	3	8	7	35
Maryland	10	8	14	5	27	31	27	2	14	15	153
Massachusetts	8	17	9	35	12	49	15	15	1	N/A	161
Michigan, Eastern	18	21	7	43	20	11	14	27	8	13	182
Michigan, Western	2	3	6	5	5	3	0	12	8	3	47
Minnesota	6	3	2	8	12	9	21	9	3	N/A	73
Mississippi, Northern	0	0	8	13	13	12	14	3	0	2	65
Mississippi, Southern	N/A	20	1	1	21	17	10	9	7	13	99
Missouri, Eastern	1	1	12	6	13	12	16	1	8	2	72
Missouri, Western	9	8	1	9	6	3	6	13	9	5	69
Montana	4	4	0	5	6	5	4	17	0	1	46
Nebraska	1	6	8	4	5	9	4	0	3	1	41
Nevada	2	1	9	2	3	3	2	0	5	0	27
New Hampshire	1	1	3	2	0	N/A	1	1	2	1	12
New Jersey	30	14	6	7	N/A	N/A	34	20	8	13	132
New Mexico	8	3	3	8	3	2	N/A	6	0	6	39
New York, Northern	N/A	2	11	14	14	15	N/A	17	13	12	98

	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	Total
New York, Southern	49	64	108	35	63	39	65	29	68	N/A	520
New York, Eastern	14	28	35	17	10	82	28	24	16	7	261
New York, Western	5	13	1	5	11	11	7	19	11	5	88
North Carolina, Eastern	8	16	5	0	3	8	7	3	16	0	66
North Carolina, Western	6	13	9	3	3	3	5	2	1	1	46
North Carolina, Middle	1	6	5	11	7	5	9	4	6	3	57
North Dakota	4	0	0	0	0	6	6	4	2	2	24
Ohio, Northern	11	17	21	22	27	19	23	36	21	15	212
Ohio, Southern	4	10	16	7	21	29	28	26	13	21	175
Oklahoma, Northern	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	7	14
Oklahoma, Western	25	33	4	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	69
Oklahoma, Eastern	14	9	1	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	33
Oregon	6	8	3	1	2	0	6	5	0	5	36
Pennsylvania, Eastern	19	35	25	23	39	48	24	27	34	14	288
Pennsylvania, Middle	25	16	9	5	4	6	13	4	6	4	92
Pennsylvania, Western	3	12	6	5	4	7	16	4	8	8	73
Puerto Rico	2	10	16	6	7	10	3	7	3	12	76
Rhode Island	2	8	1	1	6	2	1	6	4	0	31
South Carolina	22	9	14	29	15	28	8	7	0	20	152
South Dakota	2	11	3	14	6	3	2	9	0	2	52

	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	Total
Tennessee, Eastern	15	5	3	5	4	4	6	21	4	0	67
Tennessee, Middle	2	1	10	5	4	8	3	23	1	1	58
Tennessee, Western	85	12	28	7	16	20	30	33	6	4	241
Texas, Northern	9	7	2	11	12	15	10	0	0	1	67
Texas, Southern	11	12	2	14	7	23	21	9	3	6	108
Texas, Eastern	8	4	5	3	5	8	3	1	3	0	40
Texas, Western	11	21	8	0	7	3	11	11	2	9	83
Utah	5	0	7	2	1	N/A	6	6	0	0	27
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	4
Virgin Islands	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	10	0	0	14
Virginia, Eastern	N/A	3	0	25	38	30	55	32	51	26	260
Virginia, Western	3	3	0	0	2	3	0	2	5	7	25
Washington, Eastern	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	N/A	6
Washington, Western	3	3	0	0	2	N/A	1	12	7	1	29
West Virginia, Northern	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	10
West Virginia, Southern	2	12	6	7	5	9	12	13	3	1	70
Wisconsin, Eastern	13	10	7	1	13	7	7	7	4	7	76
Wisconsin, Western	5	0	1	2	6	2	3	0	0	0	19
Wyoming	2	1	0	1	0	2	3	5	1	1	16