

The Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (PREA; Public Law 108-79), was enacted to address sexual abuse in prison and jails. In addition to setting mandatory standards for the detection, prevention, and punishment of sexual abuse or rape in prisons, PREA requires all correctional facilities to collect and report detailed information regarding sexual victimization of inmates.

On August 20, 2012 (updated June 4, 2015), the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) published internal policy implementing the PREA regulations promulgated by the Attorney General. The policy emphasizes the zero tolerance for sexual abuse or harassment of any type by staff or inmates in the BOP. The BOP's National and Regional PREA Coordinators and institution PREA compliance managers continue to oversee agency implementation of the law and regulations and BOP policy. The agency also continues to provide annual training for all staff on PREA generally.

Standards 115.87 and 115.88, which are detailed below, delineate specific data monitoring and collection requirements. This document summarizes the information that will be provided to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) by the BOP in accordance with PREA.

- I. Scope of Assessment: This report provides a review of the incident-based and aggregate data collected for calendar year (CY) 2015. Factors such as motivation and other possible contributing factors are reported when available. This report includes comparisons to data from the CY 2014 report.
- II. Inmate-on-Inmate Abuse Data Collected: The BOP includes **122** facilities and satellite camps. During CY 2014, there were **121** facilities. In some cases, multiple facilities are co-located, comprising a correctional complex. In addition, the agency utilizes **14** Large Secure Contract (LSC) facilities, all of which are low security.
- III. Overview of Data: During the CY 2015 data collection period, **95** BOP facilities and **12** LSC contract facilities had at least one sexual abuse allegation. There were a total of **365** inmate-on-inmate sexual abuse allegations at BOP facilities and **40** at LSC facilities. The following table presents the allegation details individually by facility and aggregated by security level.

§ 115.87 DATA COLLECTION

(a) The agency shall collect accurate, uniform data for every allegation of sexual abuse at facilities under its direct control using a standardized instrument and set of definitions.

(b) The agency shall aggregate the incident-based sexual abuse data at least annually.

(c) The incident-based data collected shall include, at a minimum, the data necessary to answer all questions from the most recent version of the Survey of Sexual Violence conducted by the Department of Justice.

(d) The agency shall maintain, review, and collect data as needed from all available incident-based documents, including reports, investigation files, and sexual abuse incident reviews.

(e) The agency also shall obtain incident-based and aggregated data from every private facility with which it contracts for the confinement of its inmates.

(f) Upon request, the agency shall provide all such data from the previous calendar year to the Department of Justice no later than June 30.

§ 115.88 DATA REVIEW FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION

(a) The agency shall review data collected and aggregated pursuant to § 115.87 in order to assess and improve the effectiveness of its sexual abuse prevention, detection, and response policies, practices, and training, including by:

(1) Identifying problem areas;

(2) Taking corrective action on an ongoing basis; and

(3) Preparing an annual report of its findings and corrective actions for each facility, as well as the agency as a whole.

(b) Such report shall include a comparison of the current year's data and corrective actions with those from prior years and shall provide an assessment of the agency's progress in addressing sexual abuse.

(c) The agency's report shall be approved by the agency head and made readily available to the public through its Web site or, if it does not have one, through other means.

(d) The agency may redact specific material from the reports when publication would present a clear and specific threat to the safety and security of a facility, but must indicate the nature of the material redacted.

Inmate-on-Inmate Assault Data		
Minimum Security Level Facilities	Allegations	Substantiated
FPC Alderson (F)	5	1
FPC Duluth	1	0
FPC Pensacola	1	1
Minimum Security Level Total	7	2
Low Security Level Facilities	Allegations	Substantiated
FCI Allenwood Low	4	0
FCI Ashland	1	0
FCI Bastrop	3	1
FCI Beaumont Low	4	0
FCI Big Spring	2	0
FCI Butner Low	2	0
FCI Danbury (F)	3	0
FCI Dublin (F)	3	0
FCI Elkton	3	1
FCI Englewood	2	0
FCI Fort Dix	10	0
FCI Fort Worth	9	1
FCI La Tuna	2	0
FCI Lompoc	1	0
FCI Loretto	1	0
FCI Miami	7	0
FCI Milan	1	0
FCI Oakdale I	2	0
FCI Oakdale II	1	1
FCI Petersburg	3	0
FCI Sandstone	2	0
FCI Seagoville	3	0
FCI Tallahassee (F)	3	1
FCI Terminal Island	1	0
FCI Waseca (F)	1	0
Low Security Level Total	74	5
Medium Security Level Facilities	Allegations	Substantiated
FCI Allenwood Medium	1	0
USP Atlanta	2	0
FCI Beaumont Medium	3	0
FCI Beckley	3	0
FCI Bennettsville	1	0
FCI Butner Medium I	10	0
FCI Butner Medium II	1	0
FCI Coleman Medium	3	0
FCI Cumberland	2	0
FCI Edgefield	1	0
FCI El Reno	3	0
FCI Estill	3	0
FCI Fairton	5	0
FCI Florence	3	0
FCI Forrest City Medium	4	0
FCI Gilmer	3	0
FCI Hazelton	4	0
FCI Herlong	1	0
FCI Jesup	2	0
USP Lompoc	3	0
FCI Marianna	3	0
USP Marion	5	1
FCI McDowell	2	0
FCI Memphis	2	0
FCI Otisville	3	0
FCI Oxford	1	0
FCI Pekin	2	0
FCI Petersburg	11	0
FCI Phoenix	2	0
FCI Pollock Medium	4	0
FCI Ray Brook	1	0
FCI Sheridan	5	1
FCI Talladega	1	0
FCI Terre Haute	1	0
FCI Tucson	2	0
FCI Victorville Medium I	4	0
FCI Victorville Medium II	4	0
FCI Williamsburg	9	0
Medium Security Level Total	120	2
High Security Level Facilities	Allegations	Substantiated

USP Allenwood	7	0
USP Atwater	4	0
USP Beaumont	5	0
USP Big Sandy	2	0
USP Canaan	2	0
USP Coleman I	5	0
USP Coleman II	31	0
USP Florence	1	0
USP Hazelton	1	0
USP Lee	10	0
USP Lewisburg	6	2
USP McCreary	6	0
USP Pollock	3	0
USP Terre Haute	16	0
USP Tucson	20	1
USP Victorville	2	0
USP Yazoo City	2	0
High Security Level Total	123	3
Administrative Security Level Facilities	Allegations	Substantiated
MDC Brooklyn	2	0
FMC Carswell (F)	5	1
MCC Chicago	3	1
FMC Devens	8	0
MDC Guaynabo	2	0
FDC Houston	1	0
FMC Lexington (F)	8	0
MDC Los Angeles	1	0
FTC Oklahoma City	5	1
FDC Philadelphia	4	0
FMC Rochester	1	0
FDC Seatac	1	0
Administrative Security Level Total	41	3
LSC Facilities	Allegations	Substantiated
Adams County	1	0
Big Spring	13	1
Cibola	1	0
D. Ray James	2	0
Eden	2	0
Giles W. Dalby	5	0
Great Plains	2	0
Moshannon Valley	2	0
Reeves I & II	4	0
Reeves III	1	1
Rivers	5	0
Taft	2	0
LSC Total	40	2
Grand Totals		
Bureau of Prisons Facilities:		
Total Number of Allegations	365	15
LSC Facilities:		
Total Number of Allegations	40	2

Key/Notes:

- (F)=Female Institution
- Minimum security level facilities are stand-alone camps; if an institution has a satellite camp or federal satellite low, the reporting numbers are combined.

IV. Inmate-on-Inmate Incident-Based Assessment for Substantiated Cases: There were 17 substantiated cases of inmate-on-inmate sexual abuse during this reporting period. Specific information on the type of incident, location, details of the case, and dynamics of the case is provided below:

FPC Alderson:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit Restroom

3. Details: The black female assailant admitted touching the white female victim's breast without consent.

FCI Bastrop:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Act
2. Location: Recreation Office
3. Details: The black male assailant was found to have performed oral sex on the white male victim without consent.

Big Spring (LSC):

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Act
2. Location: Housing Unit
3. Details: The Hispanic male inmate-victim reported to staff that he had been sexually assaulted in his housing unit.

FMC Carswell:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Harassment
2. Location: Housing Unit
3. Details: The black female assailant admitted to making repeated sexual comments toward a black female victim.

MCC Chicago:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Act
2. Location: Special Housing Unit Cell
3. The white male assailant was found to have threatened and sexually assaulted the Hispanic male victim.

FCI Elkton:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit Common Area
3. Video footage revealed the black male assailant touched the white male victim's buttocks without consent.

FCI Fort Worth:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Food Service Area
3. The black male assailant admitted to touching the white male victim without consent; including hugging, grabbing the buttocks, and placing his hands down the victim's shirt.

USP Lewisburg:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Act
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. The black male assailant admitted to threatening and sexually assaulting the white male victim.

USP Lewisburg:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Act
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. The black male assailant admitted to punching and sexually assaulting the black male victim.

USP Marion:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Harassment
2. Location: Housing Unit
3. The white male assailant admitted to flashing his genitalia and making requests for sexualized stories involving children from multiple male victims in the unit.

FCI Oakdale II:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Act
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. The white male assailant was found to have sexually assaulted the white male victim.

FTC Oklahoma City:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Act
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. The black male assailant was found to have sexually assaulted the black transgender victim.

FPC Pensacola:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Harassment
2. Location: Housing Unit
3. The white male assailant admitted to making repeated sexual comments toward the black male victim.

Reeves County III (LSC):

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit

3. Details: A Hispanic male inmate twisted another Hispanic inmate's arm and shoved it into his genital area.

FCI Sheridan (Satellite Camp):

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. The Hispanic male assailant admitted to touching the genitals of the white male victim without consent.

FCI Tallahassee:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit Shower
3. The Hispanic female assailant admitted touching the Hispanic female victim's breasts without consent.

USP Tucson:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. The black male assailant admitted to touching the white male victim's buttocks without consent.

Substantiated Inmate-on-Inmate Assault Data				
Minimum Level Facility	Allegations	Substantiated	Problem Identified	Corrective Action
FPC Alderson	5	1	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator admitted to touching the victim on her breast.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers contributed to or raised issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate as well.
FPC Pensacola	1	1	There are no housing unit officers or cameras located in the housing units of this minimum security level facility. The perpetrator admitted to sexually harassing the victim.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. Increase staff rounds of all housing units and purchase and place cameras in general population housing units.

Low Level Facility	Allegations	Substantiated	Problem Identified	Corrective Action
FCI Bastrop	3	1	Unsupervised access to the inmate orderly office in the recreation department may have affected staff's ability to detect the abuse. Additionally, the department is large, creating lengthy times between staff rounds. There was an inmate witness in this case.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. Convert what was formerly the inmate orderly office into a secured storage space and purchase and place additional cameras in the recreation department.
Big Spring (LSC)	13	1	No problems identified or recommendations made. Another inmate overheard sexual activity occurring.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers contributed to or raised issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate as well.
FCI Elkton	3	1	No problems identified or recommendations made. Video footage supported the victim's claims.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers contributed to or raised issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate as well.
FCI Ft. Worth	9	1	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator admitted to touching the victim.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers contributed to or raised issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate as well.
FCI Oakdale II	1	1	No problems identified or recommendations made.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers contributed to or raised issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate as well.
Reeves III (LSC)	1	1	No problems identified, but one recommendation was made. Staff observed the perpetrator touching the victim.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers contributed to or raised issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate as well. It was recommended that the PREA Compliance Manager be informed of case details earlier in the process.

FCI Tallahassee	3	1	Increased staff vigilance regarding unauthorized inmates in housing units was recommended. The perpetrator admitted to touching the victim's breasts without her consent.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers contributed to or raised issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate as well. Staff training regarding monitoring unauthorized inmate entry into housing units and the importance of conducting irregular rounds was recommended.
Medium Level Facility	Allegations	Substantiated	Problem Identified	Corrective Action
USP Marion	5	1	No problems identified, though additional staff training was recommended. The perpetrator admitted to exposing his genitalia and requesting sexualized stories involving children.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers contributed or raised issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate as well. Additional training for staff regarding investigating sexual harassment allegations was recommended.
FCI Sheridan	5	1	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator admitted to touching the victim on his penis.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers contributed to or raised issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate as well.
High Level Facility	Allegations	Substantiated	Problem Identified	Corrective Action
USP Lewisburg	6	2	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator admitted to assaulting the victim.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers contributed to or raised issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate as well.
			No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator admitted to assaulting the victim.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers contributed to or raised issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate as well.
USP Tucson	20	1	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator admitted to touching the victim's buttocks without consent.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers contributed or raised issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate as well.

Administrative Facility	Allegations	Substantiated	Problem Identified	Corrective Action
FMC Carswell	5	1	No problems identified, but it was recommended that cameras be added to the housing unit. The perpetrator admitted to making sexual comments to the victim.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers contributed or raised issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate as well. Additional cameras are being considered for the housing unit.
MCC Chicago	3	1	No problems identified or recommendations made.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers contributed to or raised issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate as well.
FTC Oklahoma	5	1	No problems identified or recommendations made.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers contributed to or raised issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate as well.

V. Staff-on-Inmate Incident-Based Assessment: Data for this category is provided in annual aggregate form. In addition, staff incidents are not part of the administrative record review for inmates and are received, assessed, and processed by the Office of Internal Affairs. Thus, facility security-level is not noted, and only the year-end totals are provided in this report. During 2015, there were 9 substantiated cases in this category, 2 of which occurred in contract facilities.

Staff-on-Inmate Incident-Based Data

Facility	Number of Allegations	Number of Substantiated Cases
BOP	452	7 (1.5%)
LSC	41	2 (4.9%)

VI. Assessment By Security Level (Inmate-on-Inmate) :

a. Breakdown of sexual abuse allegations by security level:

Security Level	Number of Institutions with Reported Allegations	Substantiated Inmate-on-Inmate Incidents
Minimum Level	3	2
Low Level (Includes LSC Facilities)	37	7
Medium Level	38	2
High Level	17	3
Administrative Level	12	3
Total Facilities (Includes LSC Facilities)	107	17

b. Institutions are operated at five different security levels that can differ in terms of security barriers, types of housing, or staff-to-inmate ratio. Administrative facilities are institutions with special missions, such as the detention of pretrial offenders, the treatment of inmates with serious or chronic medical problems, or the containment of extremely dangerous, violent, or escape-prone inmates. These facilities are capable of housing inmates of all security levels. In comparison to CY 2014, minimum, low, medium and high security level facilities saw an increase in reported allegations. There are no identifiable factors which caused the numbers to increase at these four levels, though an increased focus on PREA training for all disciplines in CY 2015 may have resulted in even greater attention to allegations.

VII. Overview of Information:

- a. A single factor does not appear to underlie the incidents reviewed above, nor did the incidents appear to have been motivated by race; ethnicity; gender identity; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or intersex identification, status, or perceived status; gang affiliation; or other group dynamics at the facility.
- b. Based on the locations in which the incidents occurred, physical layouts/barriers may have been a contributing in one of the seventeen incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual abuse. In one of the seventeen incidents, technology served as supporting documentation to the allegation as the incident was substantiated by video surveillance. Additionally, in ten of the incidents, the inmate perpetrator admitted to engaging in some form of sexually abusive behavior or harassment.
- c. Staffing levels did not appear to have caused or contributed to the sexual abuse cases.

- VIII. Conclusion: Based on the review and findings noted throughout the report, it appears staff and inmate training regarding sexually abusive behavior intervention and prevention has achieved the desired results of increasing appropriate reporting and processing of allegations.

Thomas R. Kane
Acting Director

Thomas R. Kane

DATE:

6-29-16