

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
Survey of Sexual Victimization, 2016 – 2018

B. Statistical Methods

1. Universe and Respondent Selection

The SSV collects information on allegations and substantiated incidents of sexual victimization that occur in correctional facilities. BJS estimates that there are 6,879 facilities covered by the Act.

The Act requires that BJS collect data from a sample of at least 10% of correctional facilities covered under PREA. Because of the low numbers of reported sexual victimizations to correctional authorities and the centralized authority at the jurisdiction level that governs responses to the BJS surveys, the SSV elected to conduct a complete enumeration at the system level – including the Federal Bureau of Prisons, all state departments of correction, all state juvenile justice systems, and each branch of the U.S. military. In each of these cases, both the information systems and the authority to report are centralized. Moreover, this annual enumeration minimizes burden on the respondents (rather than selecting a sample from the more than 1,800 facilities operated by these systems). (See table 2 for number of facilities and reporting units in 2015.)

Table 2. Estimated number of facilities and reporting units in 2015 covered by the Prison Rape Elimination Act

Facility type	Form	Facilities		Reporting units	
		Universe	Sampled	Universe	Sampled
Total		6,879	3,306	5,147	1,574
Prisons					
Public – federal system	SSV-1	98	98	1	1
Public – state systems	SSV-2	1,293	1,293	50	50
Private	SSV-4	542	155	542	155
Jails					
Public – local jurisdictions	SSV-3	3,116	~700	2,904	700
Private	SSV-4	44	15	44	15
Other adult facilities					
Indian country jails	SSV-4	57	25	57	25
Military systems	SSV-4	46	46	4	4
ICE	SSV-4	24	24	24	24
Juvenile facilities					

Public – state systems	SSV-5	401	401	51	51
Public – local	SSV-6	659	271	659	271
Private	SSV-6	792	259	792	259
Indian country	SSV-6	19	19	19	19

In the case of the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), each year headquarters provides a list of facilities operated or used exclusively by ICE. Forms are sent to headquarters or to the individual facilities, as requested each year by the ICE officials coordinating the data collection from their facilities.

Finally, local jail jurisdictions, jails in Indian country, private prisons, private jails, and local and private juvenile facilities are completely decentralized. Each of these are sampled using the most current frames available. For each type of sampled facility and jurisdiction, a detailed description (including coefficients of variation and variance estimates) has been provided. (See Attachment 5.)

A brief summary is provided, below:

Federal and state prisons

Each year, the Bureau of Prisons and the 50 state departments of correction submit information based on reports of sexual victimization among all state and federal facilities for a complete enumeration without the need for sampling.

Private prisons

The private prison sample draws from the most recent Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities (SFACF), conducted every 5-6 years by BJS. The 2012 CSFACF will be used for the 2016, 2017, and 2018 samples. Each year, as the CSFACF ages, it is adjusted for any openings and closings as they are discovered (for example, via internet searches of private correctional companies).

In 2015, a sample of 125 privately operated state and federal prison facilities was drawn from the 462 private prisons identified in the 2012 Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities and updated with closings and new prisons as they become known. After the 2015 sample was drawn, an additional 80 private prisons were identified. Thirty of these met the size

threshold for certainty selection and were added to the sample, for a total sample of 155 private prisons from a universe of 542 private prisons. A 30% sample of facilities is needed (as opposed to the 10% mandated by PREA) to create more precise estimates of sexual victimization in private facilities. (See Attachment 5.)

As with previous samples, facilities will be sorted by average daily population (ADP) in the 12-month period ending June 30, 2012. Facilities with ADPs greater than 450 inmates (n=104) will be selected with certainty because of their size. The remaining 51 facilities will be sorted by region (i.e., Northeast, Midwest, South, or West), state, and ADP, and sampled systematically with probability proportional to size.

Public jails

The public jail sample for 2016 will be drawn from the 2015 Deaths in Custody collection (using the Annual Summary on Inmates under Jail Supervision). The Deaths in Custody file for the preceding year of collection has been used as the sampling frame for SSV since 2007, and will also be used as the 2017 and 2018 public jail sampling frames.

In 2016, a sample of 700 publicly operated jail facilities will be selected. As with private state and federal prisons, a sample greater than 10% is needed to provide more precise estimates of sexual victimization. Although the 2016 sample has not been selected yet, we expect the sample to follow the 2015 sampling procedures:

In 2015, the largest jail jurisdictions in 46 states (including the District of Columbia) were selected to meet the PREA requirement that at least one jail per state is selected each year. Another 111 jail jurisdictions with ADPs greater than or equal to 1,000 inmates were selected with certainty. The remaining 543 were selected using a stratified systematic random sample as follows. The remaining 2,747 jail jurisdictions on the frame were grouped into three strata. The first stratum contained 1,452 jails with an ADP of 81 or fewer inmates; the second stratum included 834 jails with an ADP of 82 to 261 inmates; and the third stratum included 461 jails with an ADP of 262 to 999 inmates. The cumulative sqrt(f(y)) method was used to determine noncertainty stratum boundaries (Cochran, *Sampling Techniques*, 1997 edition, p. 129). Jail jurisdictions in these three strata were sorted by region, state, and ADP and selected systematically with probability proportional to their size. In 2015, 178 facilities were selected from the first stratum, 195 from the second, and 170 from the third stratum.

Private jails

Similar to the public jail sample, the private jail sample in 2016 will be drawn from the most recent Deaths in Custody file (2015). Like the public jail sample, the Deaths in Custody file will also be used as the 2017 and 2018 sampling frames.

In 2015, a sample of 15 privately operated jails was selected based on data reported in the 2014 Deaths in Custody Annual Summary on Inmates under Jail Supervision. Five (5) privately operated facilities identified after the DCRP data collection closed were added to the 39 facilities in the sampling frame. As in prior years, these 44 private facilities were sorted by region, state, and ADP, and 15 jails were systematically sampled with probability proportional to size. The same procedures will be used for the 2016-2018 private jail sample.

Given the large standard errors, estimates for private jails are combined with public jails. The separate sample is used to ensure inclusion of private jails in the SSV; in addition, summary counts of reported allegations and substantiated incidents for each sampled private jail are listed in the annual BJS report. This meets the reporting requirement under PREA to reveal counts by facility name.

Other prisons and jails

BJS collects a report from the main branches of the military each year to cover all facilities run by the Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force.¹ Similarly, all facilities operated by the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) are included each year. In 2016, officials from ICE headquarters will coordinate the data collection from each of the 24 facilities operated or used exclusively by ICE. BJS intends to use these procedures for 2016-18.

Jails in Indian country are sampled each year using the Annual Survey of Jails in Indian Country (ASJIC) as the sampling frame. The ASJIC includes all known Indian country correctional facilities operated by tribal authorities or the Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior. In 2015, 25 of the 57 jails in Indian country that housed adult inmates were selected. Seven were sampled with certainty (with an ADP of 83 or more), while the

¹ The Coast Guard does not have its own facilities, relying instead on those operated by other branches of the Armed Forces, primarily the Navy.

remaining 18 were sorted by state and ADP and sampled with probability proportionate to size. BJS intends to use the same sampling procedures for 2016-18. Those housing exclusively juveniles are excluded from these counts and described below.

Private and local juvenile facilities

For private and local juvenile facilities in the 2016 and 2018 samples, BJS will use the prior-year Juvenile Residential Facility Census (JRFC, 2015 and 2017, respectively), conducted by the Census Bureau for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency. For the 2017 sample, BJS will use the 2016 Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP), also conducted by the Census Bureau in years in which the JRFC is not conducted.

The 2016 SSV will include all state operated juvenile residential placement facilities used to house juveniles and youthful offenders, regardless of age or reason for placement. As defined in the CJRP, residential placement facilities included detention centers, training schools, long-term secure facilities; reception or diagnostic centers; group homes or halfway houses; boot camps; ranches; forestry camps, wilderness or marine programs, or farms; runaway or homeless shelters; and residential treatment centers for juveniles. In the 2015 SSV, all states and the District of Columbia operated a total of 401 juvenile facilities, and data for these facilities were collected from 51 central reporters. BJS intends to employ the same procedures for 2016-18.

Non-state, non-tribal juvenile facilities will be sampled in 2016-18 based on the sample design used for the 2015 SSV. In 2015,

1. 36 locally operated facilities and 48 privately operated facilities were sampled with certainty because they were the largest in their respective states.
2. 49 detention facilities, 21 local facilities, and 52 private facilities were sampled with certainty due to their size.
3. 125 detention facilities were sampled with probabilities proportionate to size from 4 strata based on geographic region.
4. 40 other local facilities were sampled with probabilities proportionate to size from 2 strata defined by commitment status.

5. 159 other private facilities were sampled with probabilities proportionate to size, after sorting by region and state.

Finally, the 2015 sample included the 19 tribal juvenile facilities identified in the 2015 Survey of Jails in Indian Country, bringing the total number of non-state facilities in the 2015 sample to 549. (See Attachment 5 for further details for the 2015 sample and expected corresponding coefficients of variation.)

2. Procedures for Collecting Information

Each system or facility will receive a letter (see Attachment 6) and a copy of the appropriate SSV forms, following OMB approval (expected to be sent in May 2017 for both adults and youth). The U.S. Census Bureau will provide each respondent with the appropriate version of the SSV forms. Respondents will transcribe data from their administrative records to the standardized forms or submit their data on the Web. The Census Bureau will follow up with non-respondents first by fax, and then phone calls and emails after the expiration of the return date on the form. Typically, Census is successful in obtaining over 99% of the responses. The remaining non-respondents are forwarded to BJS, and BJS follows up with personal calls to obtain the information. BJS has been successful in this endeavor. (See response rate discussion below).

3. Methods to Maximize Response Rates

Every effort is being made to make the survey materials clear and straightforward. The SSV questionnaires have been designed to make collection of the data as concise and easy for the respondents as possible. Some examples include uniform definitions of terms and concepts as well as counting rules for items to be reported. Additionally, the SSV uses some questions that have been used previously in other surveys and are known to be easily reported by most respondents.

Over the course of collection, Census Bureau staff have learned that state reporters were including incidents that occurred in privately or locally operated prisons in their counts of sexual victimization even though the survey instructions state that these incidents should be excluded. Since privately and locally operated prisons are sampled separately from state prison systems, the inclusion of incidents occurring in these facilities by state systems leads to synthetically inflated estimates.

To correct for this issue, two *yes/no* follow-up questions were added to the 2009 SSV summary state adult and juvenile forms to minimize the burden associated with the Census Bureau making follow-up calls to all 50 state reporters:

13. Did any of the allegations reported in Items 2, 5, 8, or 11 occur in a privately operated facility?

14. Did any of the allegations reported in Items 2, 5, 8, or 11 occur in a facility operated and administered by local government?

Only when a state responds “yes” to either question does the Census Bureau follow up to determine how many incidents occurred in non-applicable facilities. The erroneous inclusions are then subtracted from the state totals. These questions will be included in questionnaires for 2016-18.

Table 3 (page 7) summarizes reporting capabilities of correctional authorities, by type of reported sexual victimization for collection year 2014.² This table demonstrates significant capacity to report data using uniform definitions and survey categories among state and federal prison systems and state juvenile systems. However, local jails and local and private juvenile facilities show lower levels of conformity to data standards.

In 2014, all federal and state adult prison system authorities were able to report on nonconsensual sexual acts, abusive sexual contact, staff sexual misconduct, and staff sexual harassment. All but 2% were able to report on inmate-on-inmate sexual harassment. All sampled jail facility authorities were able to report on nonconsensual sexual acts; 1% were unable to report on staff sexual harassment, and less than 0.5% were unable to report on all other types of victimization. Reporting of nonconsensual sexual acts separate from abusive sexual contacts remains difficult for local jails (with 23% unable able to report separately in 2014).

Juvenile authorities have improved their capacity to report SSV data. In 2014, all state systems and locally or privately operated juvenile facilities were able to report data on nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contact). Difficulties remain, however, in that 4% of state juvenile systems were unable to report youth-on-youth sexual harassment, and 2% were unable to report either staff sexual misconduct or staff sexual harassment. Local and private juvenile facilities fared slightly better. All were able to report data on staff sexual misconduct, more than 99.5% were able to report on staff sexual harassment, and 98% were able to report on youth-on-youth sexual harassment.

BJS provides detailed appendix tables in each report that contain notes on

² Results for SSV 2012-2014 from adult correctional facilities are scheduled for publication in 2017.

all deviations for applicable facilities and systems. BJS believes that such reporting limitations do not impair the ability to draw accurate estimates of sexual victimization by type. Moreover, reporting capabilities are likely to continue improving with the adoption of the PREA standards, which mandate that systems and facilities record and report data consistent with the BJS survey. (See Attachment 3, Sec. 115.87, Data Collection.)

Overall, participation is expected to exceed 98% in 2016-2018 collection years. In 2014, all 50 state departments of correction and the Federal Bureau of Prisons, all 51 state juvenile systems, and all military and ICE facilities responded. Among the 700 public jail jurisdictions sampled in 2014, 4 did not respond to the survey. One (out of 25) sampled Indian country jails and 1 (out of 143) sampled private adult facilities did not respond. For juvenile facilities, 1 local facility (out of 249) and 11 (out of 271) private facilities did not respond. (Counts exclude facilities that closed or no longer housed juvenile offenders.)

Table 3. Reporting capabilities of correctional authorities to provide data, by type of sexual victimization, 2014

Type of victimization	Adult		Juvenile	
	Prisons	Jails	State	Local/Private
Nonconsensual sexual acts				
Full reporting	90 %	75 %	96 %	76 %
Partial*	0	2	0	1
Includes abusive sexual contact	8	22	4	22
Partial and includes abusive sexual contact	2	1	0	< 0.5
Unable to report	0	0	0	0
Abusive sexual contact				
Full reporting	90 %	77 %	96 %	77 %
Combined with nonconsensual sexual acts	10	23	4	23
Unable to report	0	< 0.5	0	0
Inmate-on-inmate sexual harassment				
Full reporting	94 %	95 %	96 %	95 %
Partial*	4	5	0	3
Unable to report	2	< 0.5	4	2
Staff sexual misconduct				
Full reporting	98 %	82 %	98 %	82 %

Partial*	2	1	0	< 0.5
Includes sexual harassment	0	16	2	17
Partial and includes sexual harassment	0	< 0.5	0	0
Unable to report	0	< 0.5	2	0
Staff sexual harassment				
Full reporting	100 %	83 %	96 %	83 %
Combined with sexual misconduct	0	16	2	17
Unable to report	0	1	2	< 0.5

* Systems or facilities which report only on incidents that were completed or substantiated.

Table 4 (pages 8-9) summarizes item non-response on the SSV adult and juvenile incident reports. Overall, these data show high response rates for critical items:

- On the adult incident forms in 2013-14, item non-response rates greater than 5% were observed for the following items:
 - item 3, where incident occurred (13.2% for staff-on-inmate victimization);
 - item 4, (new) video monitoring of location of incident (12.9% inmate-on-inmate and 20.9% staff-on-inmate);
 - item 5, time of occurrence (18.1% inmate-on-inmate, 23.7% staff-on-inmate);
 - item 13a, type of injury (6.2% inmate-on-inmate);
 - item 13b, treatment received by injured victim (23.3% inmate-on-inmate);
 - item 16, change in victim housing (5.0% staff-on-inmate); and
 - item 39, how long staff had been employed (11.9% staff-on-inmate).

- On the juvenile incident forms in 2013-14, item non-response rates were highest for the following items:
 - item 4, (new) video monitoring of location of incident (18.6% youth-on-youth and 13.4% for staff-on-youth);
 - item 5, time of occurrence (13.2% youth-on-youth, 20.0% staff-on youth);
 - item 7, gender of first victim (5.8% youth-on-youth);
 - item 8, age of first victim (7.1% youth-on-youth);
 - item 9, race of first victim (7.1% youth-on-youth, 13.9% staff-on-youth);
 - item 11, age of second victim (6.3% youth-on-youth, 7.7% staff-on-youth);
 - item 12, race of second victim (7.3% youth-on-youth);
 - item 13, whether victim was injured (7.3% youth-on-youth);
 - item 13b, treatment of injured victim (15.4% youth-on-youth);
 - item 28, use of force by staff (5.2%);

- item 31, age of first staff perpetrator (7.0% staff-on-youth);
- items 35 and 35, age and race of second staff perpetrator (25% for each);
- item 36, type of staff perpetrator (5.2%); and
- item 39, how long staff had been employed (11.9%).

Table 4. Non-response by item and type of incident, 2014

Item	<u>Adult (SSV-IA)</u>	<u>Juvenile (SSV-IJ)</u>
	Percent non-response	Percent non-response
1. Date		
Month	0.1 %	0.0 %
Day	0.5	0.0
Year	0.0	0.0
2. Facility		
	0.0	0.0
3. Where		
Inmate/youth	2.8 %	5.5 %
Staff	13.2	2.6
4. Video		
Inmate/youth	12.9 %	18.6 %
Staff	20.9	13.4
5. Time		
Inmate/youth	18.1 %	13.2 %
Staff	23.7	20.0
6. # of victims		
Inmate/youth	1.3 %	6.4 %
Staff	0.3	0.0
7. Victim #1 gender		
Inmate/youth	2.4 %	5.8 %
Staff	0.8	0.0
8. Victim #1 age		
Inmate/youth	2.5 %	7.1 %
Staff	0.9	1.7
9. Victim #1 race		
Inmate/youth	3.4 %	7.1 %
Staff	2.4	13.9
10. Victim #2 gender		
Inmate/youth	2.2 %	2.1 %
Staff	2.1	3.8
11. Victim #2 age		
Inmate/youth	3.5 %	6.3 %
Staff	2.1	7.7
12. Victim #2 race		
Inmate/youth	3.9 %	7.3 %
Staff	4.2	3.8
13. Victim injury		
Inmate/youth	2.1 %	7.3 %
Staff	2.2	3.5
13A. Type of victim injury		

Table 4. Non-response by item and type of incident, 2014

Item	<u>Adult (SSV-IA)</u>	<u>Juvenile (SSV-IJ)</u>
	Percent non-response	Percent non-response
Inmate/youth	6.2 %	0.0 %
Staff	0.0	0.0
13B. Treatment received		
Inmate/youth	23.3 %	15.4 %
Staff	0.0	0.0
14. Who reported		
Inmate/youth	0.6 %	0.8 %
Staff	1.2	0.0
15. Medical follow up		
Inmate/youth	0.3 %	0.8 %
Staff	2.4	1.7
16. Victim housing change		
Inmate/youth	0.8 %	2.1 %
Staff	5.0	0.0
17. Type		
Inmate/youth	0.0 %	0.0 %
Staff	0.0	0.0
18. # of inmate perps		
	0.0 %	0.6 %
19. Perp #1 gender		
	0.5	0.4
20. Perp #1 age		
	1.7	1.8
21. Perp #1 race		
	1.9	1.3
22. Perp #2 gender		
	1.6	0.0
23. Perp #2 age		
	3.3	3.8
24. Perp #2 race		
	4.5	3.8
25. Nature		
	1.5	0.1
26. Use of force		
	1.0	1.6
27. Sanctions		
	0.9	2.7
28. Use of force		
	0.0 %	5.2 %
29. # of staff perps		
	1.1	1.7
30. Perp #1 gender		
	3.1	1.7
31. Perp #1 age		
	3.9	7.0
32. Perp #1 race		
	2.8	4.3
33. Perp #2 gender		
	0.0	0.0
34. Perp #2 age		
	0.0	25.0
35. Perp #2 race		
	3.6	25.0
36. Type		
	1.7	5.2

Table 4. Non-response by item and type of incident, 2014

Item	<u>Adult (SSV-IA)</u>	<u>Juvenile (SSV-IJ)</u>
	Percent non-response	Percent non-response
37. Position	3.1	2.6
38. Sanctions	1.1	0.9
39. Time on job	11.9	6.1

While some of these rates may be considered high, the need to track these characteristics outweighs deletion of these items from the SSV. Moreover, based on data from SSV 2011 in prisons and jails and 2007-11 in juvenile systems and facilities, most substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization involve a single victim (95%) or a single perpetrator (91%); and most incidents of staff-on-inmate sexual victimization involve a single victim (94%) or a single perpetrator (98%). Many item specific non-response rates reflect an absence of information, even following completion of an investigation. Item non-response rates are likely to improve with the adoption of the PREA standards, which mandate that systems and facilities record and report data consistent with the BJS survey. (See Attachment 3, Sec. 115.87, Data Collection.)

Three items (items 7, 8, and 9 in SSV-1) relating to inmate-on-inmate sexual harassment were added to the summary forms in 2013. (See Attachment 2 for corresponding items in forms SSV-2, SSV-3, SSV-4, SSV-5, and SSV-6.) These items and related definitions were added to align the SSV with the PREA standards. In 2014, 98% of adult correctional systems and virtually all local and private jails and other adult correctional facilities were able to answer these items (see table 3 above). During the same period, 96% of juvenile correctional systems and 98% of local and private juvenile correctional facilities were able to answer these items.

Past changes to the incident forms include modification of some response categories to provide more detailed descriptions based on information written in past “Other – specify” text fields. With the conversion of common detailed descriptions to response categories, the expectation was that the use of “Other – specify” fields would be reduced. Overall this expectation was met. The proportion of respondents using “Other – specify” decreased for each of the expanded Items. Most notably, 8.2% of respondents wrote in the place where the incident occurred in 2014, compared to 23% in 2012.

The PREA standards issued in May 2012 (28 C.F.R. Part 115) have extensive requirements related to the treatment of inmates who are transgender or intersex. To be compliant, correctional authorities need to know the sexual status of inmates. PREA standards specific to transgender and intersex prisoners include 115.15 (e) and (f), limits to cross-gender viewing; 115.31

(9), employee training; 115.41 (7), screening for risk; 115.42 (c), use of screening information; and 115.86, sexual abuse reviews. As such, correctional authorities must track both victims and perpetrators who may be considered transgender or intersex.

To help ensure compliance, the SSV began tracking these persons in the 2013 survey through two additional response categories related to the gender of victims and inmate/youth perpetrators. (See forms SSV-IA and SSV-IJ, items 7 and 10 for victims and items 19 and 22 for perpetrators.) These categories include “transgender” and “intersex.” The PREA-specified definitions are provided on the forms (see page 5 of SSV-IA and SSV-IJ.)

Two new items were also added to the incident forms in response to requests from external users to enhance our understanding of the circumstances surrounding incidents of sexual victimization. The first (item 4) relates to video monitoring of the place where the incident occurred. While this item had a relatively higher non-response rate, the results are still very informative. The second (item 39) relates to length of time staff perpetrator worked at the facility.

Finally, on both the summary and incident forms, text was added to the definitions of sexual victimization to ensure that respondents understood that the SSV definitions and the PREA definitions are consistent.

4. Final Testing of Procedures

Items previously approved for collection in 2013-2015 will not change.

Proposed changes for SSV 2016 to 2018 will be limited to minor wording changes.

Wording changes for Summary Forms relate to the INCLUSION and EXCLUSION statements for SSV-3 and SSV-4. Due to changes to how multi-jurisdictional facilities are handled in the sampling frame (DCRP), multi-jurisdictional facilities may receive either the SSV-3 or the SSV4. The INCLUSION and EXCLUSION statements will be adjusted on each of these forms to reflect this change. See Attachment 2 for marked-up forms.

The first proposed change for the Incident Forms (SSV-IA and SSV-IJ) relates to the form title. Each year a few respondents complete the Incident Form for allegations that were unfounded, unsubstantiated, or still under investigation. In order to reduce respondent burden and improve data quality, we propose to change the title of these forms to Substantiated Incident Form. See Attachment 2 for marked-up forms.

The second proposed change for the Incident Forms relates to respondent error in completing perpetrator information. While incident and victim questions are the same regardless of the type of incident, perpetrator questions for inmate-on-inmate victimizations (Section A) differ from those for staff-on-inmate victimizations (Section B). Each year we receive forms with perpetrator information entered in the wrong

section. Again, to reduce respondent burden and improve data quality, BJS proposed to enhance the instructions directing respondents to the sections on inmate/youth and staff perpetrators. See Attachment 2 for marked-up forms.

Based on external consultations and contact with past data providers, BJS and Census have established that jurisdictions and facilities will be able to respond to the revised SSV summary and incident forms.

5. Contacts for Statistical Aspects of Data Collection

BJS takes responsibility for the overall design and management of the survey, including sampling procedures, development of the questionnaires, and the analysis and publication of the data. The BJS contacts are –

Allen Beck, Senior Statistical Advisor
Bureau of Justice Statistics
810 Seventh St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 307-0349
Allen.Beck@usdoj.gov

Ramona Rantala, Statistician
Bureau of Justice Statistic
810 Seventh St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 307-6170
Ramona.Rantala@usdoj.gov

The Economic Reimbursable Surveys Division at the Census Bureau is the collection agent and is responsible for the collection of all data. The Economic Statistical Methods Division is responsible for drawing the samples. The Census Bureau contacts are –

Greta Clark, Survey Statistician
Criminal Justice Statistics Branch
Economic Reimbursable Surveys Div.
U.S. Census Bureau
4600 Silver Hill Road
Washington, DC 20233-6800
(301) 763-2586
Greta.B.Clark@census.gov

Suzanne Dorinski, Mathematical Statistician
Economic Statistical Methods Division
U.S. Census Bureau
4600 Silver Hill Road
Washington, DC 20233-6800
(301) 763-4869
Suzanne.Marie.Dorinski@census.gov