



**U.S. Department of Justice**  
**Office of the Deputy Attorney General**

---

*Kendra L. Wharton*  
*Associate Deputy Attorney General*

*Washington, D.C. 20530*

April 2, 2025

The Honorable Doug Collins  
Acting Special Counsel  
Office of the Special Counsel  
1730 M. Street, N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20036-4505

Re: OSC DI-24-001399; INVESTIGATION REGARDING A WHISTLEBLOWER  
ALLEGATION OF VIOLATION OF LAW, RULE, OR REGULATION AND  
GROSS MISMANAGEMENT AT THE FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL  
INSTITUTION THREE RIVERS, THREE RIVERS, TEXAS.

Dear Acting Special Counsel Collins:

On January 13, 2025, Associate Deputy Attorney General Bradley Weinsheimer responded to the Special Counsel's request for investigation of a whistleblower allegation that Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) officials at Federal Correctional Institution Three Rivers (FCI Three Rivers) may have engaged in conduct that constitutes a violation of law, rule, or regulation and gross mismanagement. Specifically, a federal employee at FCI Three Rivers alleged that BOP employees failed to update Inmate Financial Responsibility Program (IFRP) assignments, load court-ordered financial obligations into BOP's SENTRY database, and collect those financial obligations from reincarcerated inmates.

As reflected in Mr. Weinsheimer's response and the corresponding investigation report, which are enclosed, BOP's investigation did not substantiate that a violation of law, rule, or regulation occurred at FCI Three Rivers. Rather, the investigation confirmed that the allegation of wrongdoing was predicated on the whistleblower's misunderstanding of an auto-generated report from BOP's SENTRY database. The investigation report summarized BOP's conclusions and identified actions that would be taken as a result of the investigation.

On February 19, 2025, the Office of the Special Counsel requested a supplemental report by April 7, 2025, regarding certain proposed actions in the investigation report and additional data relating to BOP's review of the list of inmates who were alleged to have financial obligations that were not properly entered into SENTRY.

The requested information is enclosed for your consideration. I trust you will find this responsive to your concerns.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kendra Wharton". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Kendra" and last name "Wharton" clearly distinguishable.

Kendra L. Wharton  
Associate Deputy Attorney General

Enclosures

**United States Department of Justice  
Federal Bureau of Prisons**

**Supplemental Report of  
Investigation**

OSC File Number DI-24-001399

**Subject:** INVESTIGATION REGARDING A WHISTLEBLOWER ALLEGATION OF VIOLATION OF LAW, RULE, OR REGULATION AND GROSS MISMANAGEMENT AT THE FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION THREE RIVERS, THREE RIVERS, TEXAS.

**SYNOPSIS**

This investigation was initiated following a whistleblower complaint that officials at the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Federal Bureau of Prisons (FBOP), Federal Correctional Institution Three Rivers (FCI Three Rivers), Three Rivers, Texas, may have engaged in conduct that constitutes a violation of law, rule, or regulation and gross mismanagement. The resulting investigation concluded the allegations revealed no violation of laws, rules, or regulation, or gross mismanagement of any program, and the report summarizing the investigation provided the following conclusions and proposed actions.

**Conclusions:**

The whistleblower alleged the DSCC was failing to change the SENTRY FRP status of returning [inmates] who had previously completed a term of incarceration at FBOP to unassigned. As a result, [REDACTED] asserted, FBOP Case Managers and Correctional Counselors were failing to identify new court-ordered financial obligations, input such information into the SENTRY database, establish new financial plans, and/or document the inmates' refusals to do so. The allegation this error resulted from human failure to revert the FRP status to "unassigned" is not supported by the investigation. Rather, the allegations were predicated on a misunderstanding of the "unassigned" code and its limited use within the FRP SENTRY module. This misunderstanding can be corrected with training to improve understanding and limitation of this roster across the FBOP. Additionally, the list of 2,517<sup>1</sup> [inmates] identified will be provided to the Regional Directors for distribution to the respective institutions as appropriate, for review and action if needed, as well as having reminders issued to the Unit Teams to enter an appropriate IFRP assignment into SENTRY at the initial classification and review that assignment at all subsequent regularly scheduled Program Reviews.

**Action taken or planned as a result of the investigation**

(A) Changes in agency rules, regulations, or practices.

---

<sup>1</sup>This number appears to have been in error, as the list provided identified closer to 2600 inmates, and it is this greater number the facilities confirmed underwent audit.

The investigation did not disclose need for change to any rules or regulations. In practice, however, the limitations of readily available rosters provided solely as an aid to management will be accentuated in training and it will be made clear the rosters are not intended to be the sole source in identifying [inmates] who need FRP reviews.

(B) Restoration of any aggrieved employee.

Not applicable.

(A) Disciplinary action against any employee.

Not applicable

(C) Referral to the Attorney General of any evidence of criminal violation.

Not applicable

(D) Other.

The allegations provided a detailed, multi-step audit of a class of [inmates] – those whose FRP status pre-date their date of incarceration – that is not easily replicated and which might assist prison management staff in identifying [inmates] in their custody who may have had errors and/or omissions in their initial classification and/or program reviews. The list of these [inmates] will be provided to the Regional Directors for distribution as appropriate, for review and action if needed. Additionally, reminders will be issued to the Unit Teams to enter an appropriate IFRP assignment into SENTRY at the initial classification and review that assignment at all subsequent regularly scheduled Program Reviews.

### **REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

Following review of the final Report of Investigation, the Office of Special Counsel requested additional/updated information regarding the action taken or planned as a result of the investigation stated at subpart (A), and regarding two actions stated at subpart (D). The specific requests, followed immediately by the associated information obtained, follow.

- 1. The report stated that “the limitations of readily available rosters provided solely as an aid to management will be accentuated in training and it will be made clear the rosters are not intended to be the sole source in identifying [inmates] who need IFRP reviews.” Please describe how employee training will be accentuated and when it was or will be implemented.*

Following submission of the original report, this issue was discussed with the Regional Correctional Programs Administrator, the Assistant Administrators, and the Senior Correctional Programs Specialist responsible for Correctional Programs National training. In trainings by each in their respective roles, they will emphasize the importance of staff conducting the proper reviews during initial classification/program review meetings for all program areas, to include for FRP assignments, the use of rosters only to aid in identifying inmates who need to be teamed or assignment needed to be reviewed; and the importance of looking at the file and SENTRY during the review process to ensure the information is accurate.

Informational meetings with institution staff were then held on February 25 and 26, 2025. In accord with the above, the agenda included a section for FRP in which the National FRP Coordinator discussed

initial classification/program in reviewing FRP assignment and obligations and emphasized the need to review the Judgment and Commitment orders and other documents in all cases as well as SENTRY FRP module information, to ensure all obligations are loaded and FRP assignment is accurate.

Finally, the FRP regional/institution coordinators' meeting has been outlined, and when the meeting and dates are approved, it will include specific advice on the proper use and limitations of the rosters.

2. *The report stated that "reminders will be issued to the Unit Teams to enter an appropriate IFRP assignment into SENTRY at the initial classification and review that assignment at all subsequent regularly scheduled Program Reviews." Please describe the reminders, how employees will receive them, and when they were or will be implemented.*

In addition to the measures undertaken at 1. above, each Regional Director was instructed to and has verified that a reminder has been pushed down through their channels to each institution, with delivery ultimately to the FRP Coordinators and other appropriate staff. The reminders were delivered by phone call and/or email, and included various regional requirements for ongoing reminders to be given at monthly staff meetings, for the provision of additional training on the topic, and/or additional regional oversight through monthly and/or bi-weekly check-ins on timely and accurate IFRP entries.

3. *The report stated that the whistleblower's list of [inmates] that may have financial obligations from the judgement underlying their current incarceration which have not been entered into SENTRY "will be provided to the Regional Directors for distribution as appropriate, for review and action if needed." Please describe the results of BOP's review of this list and any related further audit of the IFRP.*

Each Regional Director was sent the list of inmates sorted by institution and who were housed at institutions within their region at the time the list was generated. Each institution conducted an audit of those resident inmates, and in the case of inmates who had since been moved to a different institution, forwarded that information to the new institution for inclusion on the receiving institution's list. In all, the SENTRY records of the identified inmates were checked against their judgment and convictions, Pre-Sentence Reports, and other sources of information about their financial obligations. The audit revealed the following:

- a. *The total number of identified [inmates] whose IFRP assignments needed to be updated in order to accurately reflect their IFRP status:*

358 inmate IFRP assignments of nearly 2600 files reviewed required an update to accurately reflect their IFRP status.

- b. *The total number of identified [inmates] whose financial obligations were not timely entered into SENTRY and the total amount of these obligations<sup>2</sup> at the time of entry:*

---

<sup>2</sup> All monetary figures are rounded to the nearest whole dollar.

The financial obligations of 432 inmates had not been timely entered into SENTRY, with the obligations on the late entries totaling \$2,456,641.

- c. The total number of identified [inmates] whose financial obligations were not timely entered into SENTRY where the obligations were no longer collectable, and the total amount of these obligations:*

The obligations of 63 inmates which had not been timely entered were no longer collectible, totaling \$69,960.

- d. The total number of identified [inmates] whose financial obligations were not timely entered into SENTRY and refused to enter into an IFRP, and what negative consequences, if any, were imposed:*

22 inmates initially refused to enter into an IFRP contract. They were counseled, placed in FRP Refuse status, and had their custody classifications updated to reflect poor programming/living skills. Depending on their current housing assignments and other considerations, if they remain in refuse status, the Unit Team may determine to impose a \$25 commissary spending limit, no special purchases, no preferred housing, will not be considered for a furlough, no work detail outside secure perimeter, no Unicor work, and inability to receive First Step Act Time credits. By the time of this writing, at least one of those 22 inmates had entered into an FRP contract.

**United States Department of Justice  
Federal Bureau of Prisons**

OSC File Number DI-24-001399  
Staff Name Key

---

EX1: [REDACTED], Senior Correctional Program Specialist

EX2: [REDACTED], Chief, Inmate Monitoring Section

EX3: [REDACTED], Chief, Systems Development Branch