

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 BOP's 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 oversee agency implementation of the law, regulations, and BOP policy. The agency provides annual training for all staff on PREA generally and to specialized staff on topics specific to their PREA responsibilities.

Standards 115.87 and 115.88, which are detailed below, delineate specific data monitoring and collection requirements. This document summarizes 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) 2018. Factors such as motivation and other possible contributing factors are reported when available. This report includes comparisons to data from the CY 2017 report.
- II. Inmate-on-Inmate Abuse Data Collected: The BOP has **122** institutions. In some cases, multiple facilities are co-located, comprising a correctional complex. In addition, the agency contracts with **11** privately operated low security facilities and **180** Residential Reentry Centers (RRC).
- III. Overview of Data: During the CY 2018 data collection period, **102** BOP facilities, **8** privately operated contract facilities, and **5** RRC facilities had at least one sexual abuse allegation. Of the **508** total inmate-on-inmate sexual abuse allegations, **489** occurred at BOP facilities, **14** at privately operated low security facilities, and **5** at RRCs. The table which begins on page 3 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 Sexually Abusive Behavior Data		
Minimum Security Level Facilities	Allegations	Substantiated
FPC Alderson (F)	2	0
FPC Bryan	1	0
Minimum Security Level Total	3	0
Low Security Level Facilities	Allegations	Substantiated
FCI Aliceville (F)	3	0
FCI Allenwood Low	1	0
FCI Ashland	3	0
FCI Bastrop	4	0
FCI Beaumont Low	10	0
FCI Butner Low	6	0
FCI Coleman Low	3	0
FCI Danbury	4	1
FCI Dublin (F)	2	1
FCI Elkton	10	0
FCI Englewood	6	1
FCI Forrest City Low	5	0
FCI Fort Dix	4	0
FCI La Tuna	3	0
FCI Loretto	2	0
FCI Miami	2	0
FCI Oakdale II	1	0
FCI Petersburg Low	1	0
FCI Sandstone	1	0
FCI Seagoville	7	1
FCI Tallahassee (F)	7	1
FCI Terminal Island	1	0
FCI Texarkana	5	0
FCI Waseca	2	1
FCI Yazoo City Low	3	0
Low Security Level Total	96	6
Medium Security Level Facilities	Allegations	Substantiated
FCI Allenwood Medium	2	0
USP Atlanta	2	0
FCI Beckley	2	0
FCI Berlin	1	0
FCI Butner Medium I	9	1
FCI Butner Medium II	12	0
FCI Coleman Medium	3	0
FCI Cumberland	1	0
FCI Edgefield	11	0
FCI Estill	3	0
FCI Fairton	10	1
FCI Florence	2	0
FCI Forrest City Medium	2	0
FCI Gilmer	5	0
FCI Greenville	7	1
FCI Hazelton	9	0
FCI Herlong	2	0
FCI Jesup	4	0
USP Leavenworth	5	0
USP Lumpoc	3	0
FCI Manchester	1	0
FCI Marianna	3	0
USP Marion	6	0
FCI McDowell	2	0
FCI McKean	1	0
FCI Memphis	2	0
FCI Mendota	5	0
FCI Otisville	6	0
FCI Oxford	1	0
FCI Pekin	6	0
FCI Petersburg Medium	7	0
FCI Pollock Medium	1	1
FCI Schuylkill	2	0
FCI Sheridan	5	0
FCI Talladega	7	1
FCI Terre Haute	4	0
FCI Three Rivers	1	0
FCI Victorville Medium I	2	0
FCI Victorville Medium II	3	0
FCI Williamsburg	3	0

	Allegations	Substantiated
FCI Yazoo City	4	0
Medium Security Level Total	167	5
High Security Level Facilities	Allegations	Substantiated
USP Allenwood	10	0
USP Atwater	2	0
USP Beaumont	7	0
USP Big Sandy	2	0
USP Canaan	7	0
USP Coleman I	2	0
USP Coleman II	19	0
USP Florence	7	0
USP Hazelton	1	0
USP Lewisburg	3	0
USP McCreary	1	0
USP Pollock	3	0
USP Terre Haute	26	3
USP Tucson	25	1
USP Victorville	8	2
USP Yazoo City	8	0
High Security Level Total	131	6
Administrative Security Level Facilities	Allegations	Substantiated
MDC Brooklyn	10	1
FMC Butner	12	3
FMC Carswell (F)	7	1
MCC Chicago	1	0
FMC Devens	11	1
FMC Fort Worth	2	0
MDC Guaynabo	6	0
FDC Honolulu	2	0
FDC Houston	3	0
FMC Lexington	12	1
MDC Los Angeles	2	0
FDC Miami	2	0
MCC New York	2	0
FTC Oklahoma City	2	0
FDC Philadelphia	6	1
FMC Rochester	4	2
MCC San Diego	5	2
FDC Seatac	2	0
Administrative Security Level Total	91	12
Privately Operated Low Security Facilities	Allegations	Substantiated
Adams County	3	0
Big Spring Cedar Hill	0	0
Big Spring Flightline	2	0
D. Ray James	1	0
Giles W. Dalby	0	0
Great Plains	2	0
McRae	1	0
Moshannon Valley	1	0
Reeves III	1	0
Rivers	2	0
Taft	0	0
Privately Operated Low Security Facilities Total	14	0
Residential Reentry Centers (RRC)	Allegations	Substantiated
Centerstone (Marion, IL)	1	0
Dismas Charities (Clarksburg, WV)	1	0
Dismas House (St. Louis, MO)	1	0
Rock Valley Community Programs (Janesville, WI)	1	1
Volunteers of America (Baltimore, MD)	1	0
RRC Total	5	1
Grand Totals		
	Allegations	Substantiated
Bureau of Prisons Facilities:	489	29
Privately Operated Low Security Facilities:	14	0
Residential Reentry Centers	5	1

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.
- RRC totals are for victims who are in BOP jurisdiction, not other residents of the RRC (i.e., State inmates)

- IV. Inmate-on-Inmate Incident-Based Assessment for Substantiated Cases: There were 29 substantiated cases of inmate-on-inmate sexually abusive behavior in BOP facilities during this reporting period and 1 substantiated case in an RRC. Provided below is specific information on the type of incident, location, details of the case, and dynamics of the case, arranged alphabetically by institution name. This is followed by a chart listing the problems identified and corrective actions taken, if any, for all substantiated cases of sexual abuse.

MDC Brooklyn:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Act
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. Details: The black male assailant admitted to raping the white male victim, stating that he could not tolerate being around a sex offender due to his own experience of being raped as a child. The forensic medical examination corroborated sexual abuse occurred.

FCC Butner I (Medium):

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. Details: The American Indian male assailant admitted to rubbing his penis on the white male victim's buttocks while the victim slept. The victim then extorted the assailant for commissary items to stay silent about the incident. The assailant is the individual who reported the incident and extortion.

FMC Butner:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit
3. Details: The white male assailant was found to have grabbed the groin of the white male victim while waiting to depart the unit for dinner. The assailant admitted to touching the victim in a "joking" manner.

FMC Butner:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Harassment
2. Location: Housing Unit TV room
3. Details: The black male assailant was found to have made sexual proposals to a white male victim. Inmate witnesses corroborated similar behavior by the assailant toward other inmates as well.

FMC Butner:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Harassment
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. Details: The white male assailant admitted to telling a black male victim that he was "well-hung." He made similar comments to another black male victim as well.

FMC Carswell:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit
3. Details: The black female assailant was found to have grabbed the white female victim's breast while she worked as an inmate companion. An inmate witness corroborated the allegation.

FCI Danbury:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Harassment
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. Details: The black female assailant was found to have sexually harassed, through sexual proposals, masturbation, and sexual gestures, the white female victim. Inmate witnesses corroborated some of the instances of sexually abusive behavior.

FMC Devens:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. Details: While both inmates were clothed, the black male assailant was found to have thrust his groin against the buttocks of the white male victim. An inmate witness corroborated the allegation.

FCI Dublin:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit
3. Details: The white female assailant admitted to pinching the breasts, grabbing the vaginal and inner thigh areas, and swiping her finger between the buttocks of the white female victim while she was clothed. She stated this was horseplay and part of the behavior was just a game. Inmate witnesses supported the allegation.

FCI Englewood:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Act
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. Details: The white male assailant was found to have coerced consent for oral sex from the white male victim through threats to plant contraband. The assailant initially denied sexual activity with the victim, then later claimed it was consensual.

FCI Fairton:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Harassment
2. Location: Recreation & Food Service
3. Details: The black male assailant was found to have sexually harassed, through sexual comments and proposals, the white male victim. An inmate witness supported the allegation. The assailant denied the harassment, but admitted to writing the victim a threatening letter.

FCI Greenville:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit
3. Details: The 3 assailants, an American Indian male and 2 white males, were found to have touched the buttocks of the white male victim on multiple occasions. They admitted to "smacking" his buttocks regularly, despite being asked by the victim to stop. The assailants classified this behavior as "joking fun."

FMC Lexington:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Special Housing Unit Cell
3. Details: The Asian Pacific Islander male assailant admitted to repeatedly asking to touch the breasts and to grabbing them without consent of the white transgender woman victim.

FDC Philadelphia:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Harassment
2. Location: Housing Unit
3. Details: The white male assailant was found to have sexually harassed, through multiple sexual proposals, the white male victim. Inmate witnesses supported the allegation.

FCC Pollock (Medium):

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Act
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. Details: The black male assailant was found to have coerced consent for anal sex from the Hispanic male victim. The victim indicated that the assailant was a much larger individual and he feared physical harm if he fought against the assault.

FMC Rochester:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Harassment
2. Location: Housing Unit
3. Details: The black male assailant was found to have sexually harassed, through sexual proposals and threats, the white male victim. A threatening letter left in the victim's cell matched the assailant's handwriting.

FMC Rochester:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit
3. Details: The white male assailant was found to have pinched the nipples and grabbed the buttocks and groin of the white transgender woman victim. An inmate witness supported the allegation.

MDC San Diego:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Harassment
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. Details: The Hispanic male assailant was found to have sexually harassed, through sexual threats while rubbing the leg of, the Hispanic male victim.

MDC San Diego:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit Common Area
3. Details: The black transgender woman assailant admitted to grabbing the buttocks of the white male victim. The assailant stated that she was "only playing with" the victim.

FCI Seagoville:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Harassment
2. Location: Food Services
3. Details: The black male assailant was found to have sexually harassed the two white male victims by repeatedly making sexual comments regarding wanting to lick, penetrate, and smell their buttocks. Inmate witnesses supported the allegation.

FCI Talladega:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Harassment
2. Location: Special Housing Unit
3. Details: The black male assailant was found to have sexually harassed, through exposing his penis, making sexual comments, and sending a threatening letter, to the black male victim while he was in his cell and the assailant was working as an orderly. The assailant admitted to the threatening letter after staff noted that his handwriting matched the letter.

FCI Tallahassee:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit TV Room
3. Details: The black female assailant admitted to grabbing the white female victim's head and forcing it in an up and down motion on the assailant's crotch while she was clothed. Inmate witnesses supported the allegation.

FCC Terre Haute (High):

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Harassment
2. Location: Special Housing Unit Cell
3. Details: The black male assailant was found to have sexually harassed, through threats to rape, the black male victim. The assailant admitted to saying, "I'm going to fuck you," though he stated this was not intended to be sexual.

FCC Terre Haute (High):

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Act
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. Details: The black male assailant admitted to a forceful, aggressive sexual encounter that included the assailant penetrating the black transgender woman victim's anus with his fingers. While the assailant acknowledged that the victim was tearful and repeatedly stated no, the assailant claimed the event was consensual.

FCC Terre Haute (High):

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Act
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. Details: The black male assailant was found to have repeatedly forced the white male victim to engage in anal sex. The medical examination noted anal reddening due to the trauma.

FCC Tucson (High):

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Act
2. Location: Housing Unit & Food Services
3. Details: The white male assailant admitted to repeatedly raping the white male victim 2-3 times a week and up to five times a day for the prior month. The assailant stated, "I did it because he is a sex offender." The presence of semen was noted during the medical examination.

FCC Victorville (High):

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Act
2. Location: Special Housing Unit Cell
3. Details: The black male assailant was found to have coerced consent from the black male victim for oral sex. The assailant alleged the oral sex was consensual.

FCC Victorville (High):

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Act
2. Location: Special Housing Unit Cell
3. Details: The Hispanic male assailant was found to have forcefully anally penetrated the white male victim. The medical examination revealed anal injuries.

FCI Waseca:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Contact
2. Location: Housing Unit Cell
3. Details: The black transgender male assailant was found to have groped the buttocks and made sexual threats to the black female victim. An inmate witness supported the allegation.

Rock Valley Community Programs RRC:

1. Type of Incident: Sexual Harassment
2. Location: Kitchen
3. Details: The black male assailant was found to have sexually harassed, through sexual proposals and threats, the black female victim.

Incident Reviews for Substantiated Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Abuse Data (excludes sexual harassment)		
Minimum Level Facility	Problem Identified	Corrective Action
No Substantiated Cases CY 2018	N/A	N/A
Low Level Facility	Problem Identified	Corrective Action
FCI Dublin	The perpetrator admitted to "horseplay." There were inmate witnesses to the abusive behavior. It was recommended that the inappropriateness of horseplay be reiterated to inmates and staff.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well. Inmates in the Unit were shown a video on the topic of zero tolerance, and the Institution PREA Compliance Manager spoke to inmates and staff about zero tolerance for sexually abusive behavior, to include what might be considered "horseplay."
FCI Englewood	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator initially denied the behavior then indicated it was consensual. The perpetrator's knowledge of the victim's bisexual sexual orientation and borderline intellectual functioning were considered possible motivating factors to the abuse.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well.
FCI Tallahassee	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator admitted the allegation and there was an inmate witness to the abusive behavior.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well.
FCI Waseca	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator was transgender. Staff believe he was posturing with this behavior to establish dominance among the inmates. There was an inmate witness.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well.
Medium Level Facility	Problem Identified	Corrective Action
FCI Butner I	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator admitted to the behavior.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well.

FCI Greenville	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrators admitted to “joking fun” with the abusive behavior.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well.
FCI Pollock	No problems identified or recommendations made.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well.
High Level Facility	Problem Identified	Corrective Action
USP Terre Haute	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator admitted to a forceful, but consensual act. The victim’s transgender identification was deemed a motivating factor.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well.
USP Terre Haute	No problems identified or recommendations made. The medical examination supported the allegation of sexual assault.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well.
USP Tucson	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator admitted to the sexual assault. The victim’s status as a sex offender was a motivating factor.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well.
USP Victorville	No problems identified. The transgender status of the victim may have been a motivating factor. While not identified as a problem, it was recommended that staff in the Special Housing Unit (SHU) receive training regarding LGBTI inmates’ risk for victimization.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well. SHU staff were trained to monitor LGBTI inmates to prevent and/or detect possible sexual victimization.
USP Victorville	No problems identified. The medical examination supported the allegation of sexual assault. It was recommended that SHU staff receiving training on monitoring inmates with a history of sexual victimization.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well. SHU staff were trained to closely monitor inmates with a history of sexual victimization to prevent and/or detect sexual victimization.

Administrative Facility	Problem Identified	Corrective Action
MDC Brooklyn	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator admitted to the abusive behavior and the medical examination supported the allegation of sexual assault. The victim's status as a sex offender was a motivating factor.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well.
FMC Butner	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator admitted to the behavior. Both the victim and perpetrator had a serious mental illness. This may have been a contributing factor to the perpetrator's behavior.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well.
FMC Carswell	No problems identified or recommendations made. There was an inmate witness.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well.
FMC Devens	No problems identified or recommendations made. There was an inmate witness. A motivating factor may have been a previous consensual sexual relationship between the victim and perpetrator. Additionally, both inmates were sex offenders in the treatment program.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well.
FMC Lexington	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator admitted to the abusive behavior. The transgender status of the victim may have been a motivating factor. The perpetrator had a serious mental illness. Both inmates were sex offenders.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well.
FMC Rochester	No problems were identified, though it was recommended that additional cameras be installed. One victim was transgender which may have been a motivating factor. The perpetrator had a serious mental illness.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well. Camera coverage was enhanced in the Unit to deter and detect abuse.

MCC San Diego	No problems identified or recommendations made. The perpetrator admitted to the incident but stated it was meant in a joking manner. The perpetrator was transgender.	A thorough review of the incident was conducted. No physical barriers enabled abuse and there were no noted issues with monitoring technology. Staffing levels in the area were adequate, as well.
---------------	---	--

V. 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	2	0
Low Level (Includes Private Facilities)	33	6
Medium Level	41	5
High Level	16	6
Administrative Level	18	12
Residential Reentry Centers	5	1

Total Facilities (Includes Private Facilities & RRCs)	115	30
---	-----	----

b. Institutions are operated at five security levels that differ in terms of security barriers, types of housing, and 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 and/or mental health 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 2017, minimum, low, medium and administrative security levels saw an increase in reported allegations (3, 32, 39, and 17 respectively in CY 2017). Administrative facilities saw an increase in substantiated cases (4 in CY 2017), compared to a decrease in Low and Medium security facilities (9 for both security levels in CY 2017). The overall number of substantiated inmate-on-inmate cases increased slightly from CY 2017 (26 in CY 2017).

VI. Staff-on-Inmate Incident-Based Assessment: Data for this category is provided in annual aggregate form in the below table. 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 2018, there were 8 substantiated cases in this category, 1 of which occurred at a halfway house and 1 of which occurred at a contract facility. Please note that investigative cases must be closed prior to inclusion in this report.

Additionally, this report encompasses cases that were closed by March 31, 2019, as this is when the data for the report was obtained.

Facility	Number of Allegations	Number of Substantiated Cases	Ongoing Investigative Cases
BOP	545	6 (1.1%)	419
Residential	30	1 (3.3%)	14
Reentry Centers			
Private Facilities	18	1 (5.6%)	0

VII. Overview of Information for BOP-Managed Facilities:

- a. No single factor appears to underlie the incidents reviewed above, nor did the incidents as a whole appear to have been motivated by race; ethnicity; gender identity; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or intersex (LGBTI) identification, status, or perceived status; gang affiliation; or other group dynamics at the facility. In three of 29 substantiated cases (10.3%), the victim’s transgender status may have been a risk factor.
- b. Based on the locations in which the incidents occurred, physical layouts/barriers did not appear to contribute to the incidents. It appears that monitoring technology worked effectively, did not contribute to incidents, and was utilized where available during investigations. Contrary to prior years, monitoring technology did not assist in any of the substantiated cases. This may be due to inmates being aware of camera locations. Additionally, more than half of the substantiated cases occurred in inmate’s cells where cameras are not present. Sexual offenders continue to represent a higher number of victims (41.3%) and perpetrators (31%) in substantiated cases. This is not unexpected since these types of offenses are often a marker for both increased risk of victimization and increased risk of abusiveness. The inmate perpetrator admitted to engaging in some form of sexually abusive behavior or harassment in thirteen (44.8%) of the substantiated incidents, and in eleven (37.9%) of the substantiated cases there were inmate witnesses who came forward during the investigation. It is notable that this year medical examinations assisted in substantiating 4 cases (1.4%).
- c. Staffing levels did not appear to have caused or contributed to the sexual abuse cases.

VIII. Conclusion: It appears that the agency’s adherence to a strict zero tolerance policy for sexually abusive behavior, as well as the continued emphasis of this policy with staff and inmates, has resulted in an overall culture that is less accepting of abusive or even questionable behavior. Inmates are more likely to report possible sexually abusive behavior when it occurs, as is reflected by an increase in allegations in 2018. Behavior or comments

that may have resulted in discomfort to the victim, but ultimately did not meet the definitions for PREA, may have been reported in part due to the belief that institution staff would not tolerate it and would properly investigate and address it. As with 2017, a significant number of inmate witnesses came forward to corroborate allegations and provide eyewitness statements to investigators. More inmates than in previous years admitted to engaging in inappropriate behavior. This may be due to the perpetrators recognizing that inmate witnesses are more likely to cooperate. It also may be attributed to investigators conducting thorough investigations that substantiate some aspects of the case resulting in the perpetrator having to change his story over time, ultimately leading to acknowledgement of the behavior.

Hugh J. Hurwitz
Acting Director



Date:

6/26/19