

---

# PREA Annual Report 2017



Since the passage of the Prison Rape Elimination Act in 2003, and through the adoption of PREA National Standards in 2012, and Department of Homeland Security PREA Standards in 2014, CoreCivic has maintained a commitment to a zero tolerance policy for sexual abuse and sexual harassment.

Training and education serve as critical components of CoreCivic efforts to prevent sexual abuse. As CoreCivic expands into Community Corrections, staff at our new facilities have undergone the comprehensive PREA training that has been a key element in the company mission to provide the best possible environment for inmates/detainees and residents and staff.

Corrective measures are developed following reviews of PREA incidents, and these measures are outlined within this report. During calendar year 2017, a total of sixteen (16) CoreCivic Safety facilities and Eight (8) CoreCivic Community facilities successfully completed the PREA audit process. Once again, these results affirm the CoreCivic commitment to creating a culture of reporting and addressing all forms of sexual abuse and sexual harassment.

It is our responsibility to respect and uphold the rights and welfare of inmates/detainees and residents in our care. Preventing sexual abuse is a critical component of that responsibility.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Patrick Swindle".

Patrick Swindle  
Executive Vice President and Chief Corrections Officer



# 2017 PREA Annual Report

---

## SCOPE OF THE 2017 PREA ANNUAL REPORT

This report is compiled in accordance with the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) National Standards published in August 2012 and the United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Standards published in March of 2014. DOJ Standards 115.87 and 115.287 provide direction for the collection of data. DOJ Standards 115.88 and 115.288, and DHS Standard 115.88, outline the responsibility for the review and assessment of collected data to improve the effectiveness of policies, practices and training for sexual abuse prevention, detection, and response.

This report provides a review of the incident-based and aggregated data for calendar year 2017 and a comparison of aggregated data for calendar years 2015, 2016 and 2017. This report provides corrective actions developed to further reduce sexual abuse and sexual harassment within CoreCivic facilities.

### United States Department of Justice (DOJ) PREA Standard 115.6 — Definitions Related To Sexual Abuse

#### **Sexual abuse includes—**

1. Sexual abuse of an inmate, detainee, or resident by another inmate, detainee, or resident; and
2. Sexual abuse of an inmate, detainee, or resident by a staff member, contractor, or volunteer.

#### **Sexual abuse of an inmate, detainee, or resident by another inmate, detainee, or resident includes any of the following acts, if the victim does not consent, is coerced into such act by overt or implied threats of violence, or is unable to consent or refuse:**

1. Contact between the penis and the vulva or the penis and the anus, including penetration, however
2. Contact between the mouth and the penis, vulva, or anus;
3. Penetration of the anal or genital opening of another person, however slight, by a hand, finger, object, or other instrument; and
4. Any other intentional touching, either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or the buttocks of another person, excluding contact incidental to a physical altercation.

**Sexual abuse of an inmate, detainee, or resident by a staff member, contractor, or volunteer includes any of the following acts, with or without consent of the inmate, detainee, or resident:**

1. Contact between the penis and the vulva or the penis and the anus, including penetration, however
2. Contact between the mouth and the penis, vulva, or anus;
3. Contact between the mouth and any body part where the staff member, contractor, or volunteer has the intent to abuse, arouse, or gratify sexual desire;
4. Penetration of the anal or genital opening, however slight, by a hand, finger, object, or other instrument, that is unrelated to official duties or where the staff member, contractor, or volunteer has the intent to abuse, arouse, or gratify sexual desire;
5. Any other intentional contact, either directly or through the clothing, of or with the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or the buttocks, that is unrelated to official duties or where the staff member, contractor, or volunteer has the intent to abuse, arouse, or gratify sexual desire;
6. Any attempt, threat, or request by a staff member, contractor, or volunteer to engage in the activities described in paragraphs (1)-(5) of this section;
7. Any display by a staff member, contractor, or volunteer of his or her uncovered genitalia, buttocks, or breast in the presence of an inmate, detainee, or resident, and
8. Voyeurism by a staff member, contractor, or volunteer. (Voyeurism by a staff member, contractor, or volunteer means an invasion of privacy of an inmate, detainee, or resident by staff for reasons unrelated to official duties, such as peering at an inmate who is using a toilet in his or her cell to perform bodily functions; requiring an inmate to expose his or her buttocks, genitals, or breasts; or taking images of all or part of an inmate's naked body or of an inmate performing bodily functions).

**Sexual Harassment includes:**

1. Repeated and unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or verbal comments, gestures, or actions of a derogatory or offensive sexual nature by one inmate, detainee, or resident directed toward another; and
2. Repeated verbal comments or gestures of a sexual nature to an inmate, detainee, or resident by a staff member, contractor, or volunteer, including demeaning references to gender, sexually suggestive or derogatory comments about body or clothing, or obscene language or gestures

## **United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS) PREA Standard 115.6 Definitions Related To Sexual Abuse and Assault**

**For purposes of this part, the term Sexual abuse includes:**

1. Sexual abuse and assault of a detainee by another detainee; and
2. Sexual abuse and assault of a detainee by a staff member, contractor, or volunteer.

**Sexual abuse of a detainee by another detainee includes any of the following acts by one or more detainees, prisoners, inmates, or residents of the facility in which the detainee is housed who, by force, coercion, or intimidation, or if the victim did not consent or was unable to consent or refuse, engages in or attempts to engage in:**

1. Contact between the penis and the vulva or anus and, for purposes of this paragraph (1), contact involving the penis upon penetration, however slight;
2. Contact between the mouth and the penis, vulva, or anus;
3. Penetration, however slight, of the anal or genital opening of another person by a hand or finger or by any object;
4. Touching of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thighs or buttocks, either directly or through the clothing, with an intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person; or
5. Threats, intimidation, or other actions or communications by one or more detainees aimed at coercing or pressuring another detainee to engage in a sexual act.

**Sexual abuse of a detainee by a staff member, contractor, or volunteer includes any of the following acts, if engaged in by one or more staff members, volunteers, or contract personnel who, with or without the consent of the detainee, engages in or attempts to engage in:**

1. Contact between the penis and the vulva or anus and, for purposes of this paragraph (1), contact involving the penis upon penetration, however slight;
2. Contact between the mouth and the penis, vulva, or anus;
3. Penetration, however slight, of the anal or genital opening of another person by a hand or finger or by any object that is unrelated to official duties or where the staff member, contractor, or volunteer has the intent to abuse, arouse, or gratify sexual desire;
4. Intentional touching of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thighs or buttocks, either directly or through the clothing, that is unrelated to official duties or where the staff member, contractor, or volunteer has the intent to abuse, arouse, or gratify sexual desire;
5. Threats, intimidation, harassment, indecent, profane or abusive language, or other actions or communications, aimed at coercing or pressuring a detainee to engage in a sexual act;
6. Repeated verbal statements or comments of a sexual nature to a detainee;
7. Any display of his or her uncovered genitalia, buttocks, or breast in the presence of an inmate, detainee, or resident, or
8. Voyeurism, which is defined as the inappropriate visual surveillance of a detainee for reasons unrelated to official duties. Where not conducted for reasons relating to official duties, the following are examples of voyeurism: staring at a detainee who is using a toilet in his or her cell to perform bodily functions; requiring an inmate detainee to expose his or her buttocks, genitals, or breasts; or taking images of all or part of a detainee's naked body or of a detainee performing bodily functions.

## INVESTIGATIONS

In all instances of alleged PREA violations that may constitute a criminal act, CoreCivic provides timely notification and works closely with appropriate law enforcement agencies and the government partner. In such cases, CoreCivic invites law enforcement agencies to carry out the official investigation on-site and make the final determination as to the validity of the alleged PREA violation(s). For internal administrative investigation of PREA incidents, CoreCivic utilizes Investigators trained in gathering evidence and interviewing victims of sexual abuse. Training is in accordance with PREA Standard 115.34. Following an investigation, each PREA Incident will be determined to have been either:

- **Substantiated:** An allegation that was investigated and determined to have occurred.
- **Unsubstantiated:** An allegation that was investigated and the investigation produced insufficient evidence to make a final determination as to whether or not the incident occurred, or
- **Unfounded:** An allegation that was investigated and determined not to have occurred.
- **Ongoing or Pending:** An Investigation has not been completed.

All substantiated allegations of sexual abuse or sexual harassment result in the appropriate disciplinary actions taken against the Employee, Contractor, Volunteer, or Inmate, and where appropriate referral for prosecution.

## DATA COLLECTION

CoreCivic utilizes an Incident Report Database to record and track all PREA Incidents from the initial report through the investigative and review process.

Two sets of data tables have been provided for 2017. The first set is in accordance with the DOJ Standards for Adult Prisons and Jails, and the DHS PREA Standards. The second set consists of data for CoreCivic Community Corrections facilities in accordance with DOJ Standards for Community Confinement Facilities.

For those tables containing data for Prisons and Jails there are notations indicating whether a facility houses detainees through agreements with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Facilities housing ICE detainees fall under the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Sexual Abuse and Assault Prevention Standards issued in 2014. DHS Standards differ from DOJ Standards in that DHS Standards do not have a separate definition for Sexual Harassment and include acts commonly defined as Sexual Harassment within the definitions of Sexual Abuse. In 2017, CoreCivic operated six (6) facilities with exclusively ICE detainee populations. These facilities are Elizabeth Detention Center, Eloy Detention Center, Laredo Processing Center, Stewart Detention Center, South Texas Family Residential Center, and T. Don Hutto Residential Center. Five (5) additional facilities (Central Arizona Florence Correctional Complex, Cibola County Correctional Center, Otay Mesa Detention Center, Torrance County Detention Facility and Northeast Ohio Correctional Center operated in 2017 with mixed populations of inmates/detainees falling under the authority of both DOJ and DHS/ICE Standards.

Bartlett State Jail, Bradshaw State Jail, Lindsey State Jail, and Willacy State Jail Contracts in Texas were all phased out of operation in 2017. The Eden Detention Center Texas, along with the Torrance County Detention Center in New Mexico were also closed in 2017. Where applicable, data from the partial year of operation from those facilities was included in this report.

In 2017, CoreCivic Community added the Oklahoma Transitional Center in Oklahoma. The Arapahoe Transitional Center, Commerce Center, Adams Transitional Center, and Henderson Transitional Center in Colorado were also added in 2017 to CoreCivic Community. Those facilities are included in this 2017 Annual Report. In CoreCivic Safety, the Cibola County Correctional Center re-opened in 2017 with a population of County, United States Marshal (USMS) inmates and ICE detainees.

2017 PRISONS/JAILS EMPLOYEE ON INMATE/DETAINEE-SEXUAL ABUSE						
FACILITY	ADP	SUBSTANTIATED	UNSUBSTANTIATED	UNFOUNDED	PENDING	Total
Adams	2198		2	3		5
Bartlett	379					0
Bent County	1385		1			1
Bradshaw	1287					0
CAFCC*	3847			1		1
Cibola	449					0
Cimarron	1613	2	1	3		6
Citrus	579		1	3		4
Coffee	2621		2	1		3
Crossroads	690	2				2
Crowley	1675		1			1
Davis	1629			1		1
Eden	234					0
Elizabeth (ICE)	292	1		1		2
Eloy (ICE)	1376	1	2	8		11
Hardeman	1968		6	2		8
Houston (ICE)	912	1		7		8
Jenkins	1144	2		1		3
La Palma	2943			2		2
Lake City	880			3	1	4
Lake Erie	1763		1	1		2
Laredo (ICE)	303					0
Leavenworth	690					0
Lindsey	639		4			4
Marion County Jail II	1234	1				1
McRae	1595					0
Metro	1024		1	1		2
Nevada Southern	755		2	2		4
Northeast Ohio *	690		1			1
Northwest New Mexico	970		1	1		2
Otay Mesa *	1381		3	2		5
Red Rock	1916		1	1		2
Saguaro	1666		1			1
Silverdale	955		1			1
South Central	1628	1	5	7		13
STFRC (ICE)	994			1		1
Stewart (ICE)	1816			1		1
T.Don Hutto (ICE)	491		1		1	2
Tallahatchie	1481	1				1
Torrance *	455					0
Trousdale	2458	7	2	3		12
Webb	288			1		1
West TN	420		1		1	2
Wheeler	2641	1	6			7
Whiteville	1498		2	1		3
Willacy	704					0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>58555</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>130</b>

2017 PRISONS/JAILS INMATE/DETAINEE ON INMATE/DETAINEE-SEXUAL ABUSE						
FACILITY	ADP	SUBSTANTIATED	UNSUBSTANTIATED	UNFOUNDED	PENDING	Total
Adams	2199	0	0	0	0	0
Bartlett	379	0	4	0	0	4
Bent County	1385	1	3	3	0	7
Bradshaw	1287	1	1	0	0	2
CAFCC*	3847	8	20	2	0	30
Cibola	449	0	0	1	0	1
Cimarron	1613	1	9	1	0	11
Citrus	579	0	1	0	0	1
Coffee	2621	0	9	1	0	10
Crossroads	690	1	1	0	0	2
Crowley	1675	0	1	0	0	1
Davis	1629	0	3	2	0	5
Eden	234	0	0	0	0	0
Elizabeth (ICE)	292	2	3	1	0	6
Eloy (ICE)	1376	2	13	0	0	15
Hardeman	1968	0	4	3	0	7
Houston (ICE)	912	1	2	1	0	4
Jenkins	1144	0	1	5	0	6
La Palma	2943	0	3	1	0	4
Lake City	880	0	0	0	0	0
Lake Erie	1763	0	3	0	0	3
Laredo (ICE)	303	1	0	0	0	1
Leavenworth	690	0	0	0	0	0
Lindsey	639	0	2	0	0	2
Marion County Jail II	1234	0	1	1	0	2
McRae	1595	0	0	0	0	0
Metro	1024	1	1	3	0	5
Nevada Southern	755	0	2	0	0	2
Northeast Ohio *	690	1	3	1	0	5
Northwest New Mexico	970	0	0	1	0	1
Otay Mesa *	1381	0	10	2	0	12
Red Rock	1916	0	0	1	0	1
Saguaro	1666	0	0	0	0	0
Silverdale	955	0	6	1	0	7
South Central	1628	1	10	3	0	14
STFRC (ICE)	994	0	0	0	0	0
Stewart (ICE)	1816	0	4	2	0	6
T.Don Hutto (ICE)	491	0	2	0	0	2
Tallahatchie	1481	0	0	1	0	1
Torrance *	455	0	0	0	0	0
Trousdale	2458	0	11	7	1	19
Webb	288	0	0	0	0	0
West TN	420	0	0	0	0	0
Wheeler	2641	0	8	1	0	9
Whiteville	1498	0	5	1	1	7
Willacy	704	0	1	0	0	1
<b>Totals</b>		<b>21</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>216</b>

\*Also houses ICE Detainees

In 2017, the Central Arizona Detention Center (CADDC) was combined with the nearby Florence facility. The complex is now named the Central Arizona Florence Correctional Complex (CAFCC).



2017 PRISONS/JAILS EMPLOYEE ON INMATE-SEXUAL HARASSMENT						
FACILITY	ADP	SUBSTANTIATED	UNSUBSTANTIATED	UNFOUNDED	PENDING	Total
Adams	2199		1			1
Bartlett	379		1			1
Bent County	1385					0
Bradshaw	1287					0
CAFCC*	3847					0
Cibola	449					0
Cimarron	1613	1				1
Citrus	579	1	2	1		4
Coffee	2621		8	2		10
Crossroads	690					0
Crowley	1675					0
Davis	1629					0
Eden	234					0
Hardeman	1968	1	1	1		3
Jenkins	1144					0
La Palma	2943		1	1		2
Lake City	880				1	1
Lake Erie	1763					0
Leavenworth	690					0
Lindsey	639	1				1
Marion County Jail II	1234			1		1
McRae	1595					0
Metro	1024			1		1
Nevada Southern	755		1			1
Northeast Ohio *	690		2	1		3
Northwest New Mexico	970	1		3		4
Otay Mesa *	1381	1	1			2
Red Rock	1916					0
Saguaro	1666	1				1
Silverdale	955					0
South Central	1628		1	2		3
Tallahatchie	1481			1		1
Torrance *	455					0
Trousdale	2458		1			1
Webb	288					0
West TN	420					0
Wheeler	2641			2		2
Whiteville	1498		2	1		3
Willacy	704					0
<b>Totals</b>		<b>7</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>47</b>

\*Also houses ICE Detainees

In 2017, the Central Arizona Detention Center (CADC) was combined with the nearby Florence facility. The complex is now named the Central Arizona Florence Correctional Complex (CAFCC).

2017 PRISONS/JAILS INMATE ON INMATE-SEXUAL HARASSMENT						
FACILITY	ADP	SUBSTANTIATED	UNSUBSTANTIATED	UNFOUNDED	PENDING	Total
Adams	2199	0	0	0	0	0
Bartlett	379	0	0	0	0	0
Bent County	1385	0	4	0	0	4
Bradshaw	1287	0	0	0	0	0
CAFCC*	3847	8	5	0	0	13
Cibola*	449	0	0	0	0	0
Cimarron	1613	0	4	0	0	4
Citrus	579	0	2	0	0	2
Coffee	2621	2	16	1	0	19
Crossroads	690	0	0	0	0	0
Crowley	1675	0	0	0	0	0
Davis	1629	0	0	0	0	0
Eden	234	0	0	0	0	0
Hardeman	1968	0	4	0	0	4
Jenkins	1144	0	0	1	0	1
La Palma	2943	0	0	2	0	2
Lake City	880	0	0	0	0	0
Lake Erie	1763	0	0	0	0	0
Leavenworth	690	1	1	0	0	2
Lindsey	639	0	0	0	0	0
Marion County Jail II	1234	0	0	0	0	0
McRae	1595	0	1	0	0	1
Metro	1024	0	2	1	0	3
Nevada Southern	755	1	4	0	0	5
Northeast Ohio *	690	0	2	2	0	4
Northwest New Mexico	970	0	0	1	0	1
Otay Mesa *	1381	0	0	0	0	0
Red Rock	1916	0	0	0	0	0
Saguaro	1666	0	0	0	0	0
Silverdale	955	0	0	0	0	0
South Central	1628	1	18	2	0	21
Tallahatchie	1481	0	0	0	0	0
Torrance *	455	0	0	0	0	0
Trousdale	2458	0	2	1	0	3
Webb*	288	0	2	0	0	2
West TN	420	0	0	0	0	0
Wheeler	2641	1	2	0	0	3
Whiteville	1498	0	3	0	0	3
Willacy	704	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Totals</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>97</b>

\*Also houses ICE Detainees

In 2017, the Central Arizona Detention Center (CADC) was combined with the nearby Florence facility. The complex is now named the Central Arizona Florence Correctional Complex (CAFCC).

### CoreCivic Safety PREA Totals\*:

Type of report	Total cases	Percentage of total volume
Inmate on Inmate Sexual Abuse	216	44%
Employee on Inmate Sexual Abuse	130	27%
Inmate on Inmate Sexual Harassment	97	20%
Employee on Inmate Sexual Harassment	47	9%
<b>Total cases</b>	<b>490 cases</b>	

### CoreCivic Safety Yearly Comparisons\*:

Substantiated	2015	2016	2017	% Change from 2016
IOI Sexual Abuse	20	29	21	-28%
EOI Sexual Abuse	19	13	20	54%
IOI Sexual Harassment	15	19	14	-26%
EOI Sexual Harassment	5	3	7	133%
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>-3%</b>

\*Does not account for pending cases at time of report.

The overall number of substantiated incidents in 2017 decreased by 3% from 2016. This can be attributed to population reduction and continued improvement in staff PREA Training. Substantiated Employee on Inmate Sexual Abuse increased by 54% from 2016 due primarily to one facility having one single incident with 5 separate victims. If this case had just one victim, the overall reduction of substantiated cases would have been 9% from 2016. Another important metric to note is the decline in unfounded allegations of Employee on Inmate Sexual Abuse, which is down 21% from last year. Unsubstantiated Employee on Inmate Sexual Abuse cases are also down significantly, showing a 46% drop from last year. Ongoing training to both employees and inmates, as well as awareness efforts and institutionalization of PREA Standards have likely contributed to the reduction.

Unsubstantiated	2015	2016	2017	% Change from 2016
IOI Sexual Abuse	179	189	147	-22%
EOI Sexual Abuse	73	91	49	-46%
IOI Sexual Harassment	100	73	72	-1%
EOI Sexual Harassment	52	29	22	-24%
<b>Total</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>-24%</b>

Unfounded	2015	2016	2017	% Change from 2016
IOI Sexual Abuse	42	51	46	-10%
EOI Sexual Abuse	51	73	58	-21%
IOI Sexual Harassment	18	21	11	-48%
EOI Sexual Harassment	31	19	17	-11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>-20%</b>

<b>TOTAL INCIDENTS</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>610</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>-21%</b>
------------------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------

## DATA REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT

The data presented in this Annual Report demonstrates that the total number of PREA incidents reported annually remained relatively steady in 2015 and 2016. For 2017, the total number of incidents decreased by 20% from 610 total incidents in 2016 to 486 total incidents in 2017. This decrease, can be attributed to a variety of factors including facility leadership, a focus on continued training, the effectiveness of the CoreCivic audit preparation process, and population reduction. Decreases were seen in all categories (Substantiated, Unsubstantiated and Unfounded).

### Highest Volume facilities 2017:

Facility	2016 number of reports	2017 number of reports	Percentage change from 2016 to 2017
South Central	52	51	-1.9%
CAFCC	46	44	-4%
Coffee	38	42	+10%
Trousdale	29	35	+21%
Eloy	33	26	-21%

### ANALYSIS:

#### South Central Correctional Center:

South Central remained steady in the overall Total Number of Reports in 2017 as compared with 2016. An increase was seen in the Inmate on Inmate Sexual Harassment category, however the facility did see a decrease in in the number of reports in every other category in 2017.

South Central Correctional Center			
2016		2017	
EOI Sexual Abuse	14	EOI Sexual Abuse	13
IOI Sexual Abuse	17	IOI Sexual Abuse	14
EOI Sexual Harassment	7	EOI Sexual Harassment	3
IOI Sexual Harassment	14	IOI Sexual Harassment	21
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>

#### Central Arizona Florence Correctional Complex (CAFCC):

In 2017, the Central Arizona Detention Center (CADC) was combined with the nearby Florence facility. The complex is now named the Central Arizona Florence Correctional Complex (CAFCC). As a result of the combination of properties, the statistics for 2017 are slightly different. Taking into consideration total reports from both facilities in 2016, the 2017 numbers show an overall decrease by two reports for the year.

CADC/Florence and CAFCC			
CADC 2016		CAFCC 2017	
EOI Sexual Abuse	4	EOI Sexual Abuse	1
IOI Sexual Abuse	14	IOI Sexual Abuse	30
EOI Sexual Harassment	1	EOI Sexual Harassment	0
IOI Sexual Harassment	13	IOI Sexual Harassment	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>
Florence 2016			
EOI Sexual Abuse	2		
IOI Sexual Abuse	9		
EOI Sexual Harassment	0		
IOI Sexual Harassment	3		
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>		
<b>2016 Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>2017 Total</b>	<b>44</b>

**Coffee Correctional:**

Coffee saw a significant drop in the number of Employee on Inmate cases this year, down 66 percent from last year. They did, however, see an increase in Inmate on Inmate Harassment cases, which were up 171 percent over last years' totals. Cumulative numbers for Coffee Correctional did rise by two cases all together in 2017.

Coffee Correctional			
2016		2017	
EOI Sexual Abuse	9	EOI Sexual Abuse	3
IOI Sexual Abuse	16	IOI Sexual Abuse	10
EOI Sexual Harassment	6	EOI Sexual Harassment	10
IOI Sexual Harassment	7	IOI Sexual Harassment	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>

**Trousdale Turner Correctional Center:**

Trousdale opened as a new facility in 2016. The ADP of 1,703 in 2016 was lower in comparison with the ADP of 2,548 in 2017 due to the phased in start-up of the facility in 2016. It is important to note that there are five victims listed in one substantiated incident involving an employee. This one incident accounts for five substantiated cases, although it happened on one occasion. The data shows that the total number of reports remained relatively the same year to year despite the increase in the population. Significantly, there was a decrease in the number of Employee on Inmate Sexual Abuse allegations.

Trousdale Turner Correctional Center			
2016		2017	
EOI Sexual Abuse	16	EOI Sexual Abuse	12
IOI Sexual Abuse	13	IOI Sexual Abuse	19
EOI Sexual Harassment	0	EOI Sexual Harassment	1
IOI Sexual Harassment	0	IOI Sexual Harassment	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>

**Eloy Detention Center:**

Eloy Detention Center tallied a drop in PREA cases this year, showing an overall 21 percent drop in reports. There was a notable drop in employee involved cases, down six reports from last year.

Eloy Detention Center			
2016		2017	
EOI Sexual Abuse	17	EOI Sexual Abuse	11
IOI Sexual Abuse	16	IOI Sexual Abuse	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>

## CoreCivic Community Facilities 2017 PREA Reporting

2017 TOTALS	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded	Pending	TOTAL
Employee on Inmate Sexual Abuse	10	10	5	2	27
Employee on Inmate Sexual Harassment	0	5	0	0	5
Inmate on Inmate Sexual Abuse	2	12	2	0	16
Inmate on Inmate Sexual Harassment	1	4	0	0	5
<b>TOTAL INCIDENTS:</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>53</b>

Of the total 53 incidents:

- Substantiated: 13 cases (25%)
- Unsubstantiated: 31 cases (58%)
- Unfounded: 7 cases (13%)
- Pending: 2 cases (4%)

Facility	ADP	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded	Total
Adams TC	23				0
Arapahoe	118				0
Austin RRC	84		1	1	2
Austin Trans.	397	1	4	1	6
Boulder	62	1			1
CAI Boston Ave	111				1 pending
CAI Ocean View	362		6	3	9
Carver Center	278		1		1
Centennial	102		1		1
Cheyenne	94				0
Columbine	57				0
Commerce	22				0
Corpus Christi	145	1	2		3
Dahlia	113		3		3
Dallas Trans.	293		3		3
El Paso MUF	274	1			1
El Paso Trans.	175		1		1
Fort Worth	196		3	1	4
Fox Facility	76			1	1
Longmont	61		1		1
OK City	108	2			2
Tulsa	256	2	2		5 (1 pending)
Turley Center	160	4	3		7
Ulster	78	1			1
<b>Total PREA Cases in Community facilities 2017:</b>					<b>53</b>

## 2017 CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

During calendar year 2017, a total of eighteen (18) CoreCivic Safety facilities and eleven (11) CoreCivic Community facilities were audited by certified PREA Auditors certified by the Department of Justice and/or ICE. These facilities are as follows:

### CORECIVIC SAFETY

Bent County Correctional Center-Colorado  
Citrus County Detention Facility-Florida  
Central Arizona Florence Correctional Complex-Arizona  
Davis Correctional Facility (audited in November 2017; Final Report Pending)-Oklahoma  
Eloy Detention Center (DHS Standards)-Arizona  
Hardeman County Correctional Facility-Tennessee  
Houston Processing Center (DHS Standards)-Texas  
La Palma Detention Facility-Arizona  
Lake City Correctional Facility (audited in December 2017; Final Report Pending)-Florida  
Leavenworth Detention Center-Kansas  
Marion County Jail II-Indiana  
Metro-Davidson Detention Facility-Tennessee  
Nevada Southern Detention Center-Nevada  
Northwest New Mexico Correctional Facility-New Mexico  
Saguaro Correctional Center-Arizona  
Stewart Detention Center (DHS Standards)-Georgia  
Trousdale Turner Correctional Center (Audited in July 2017; Final Report Issued 2018)-Tennessee  
Whiteville Correctional Facility-Tennessee

### CORECIVIC COMMUNITY

Adams Transitional Center-Colorado  
Boston Ave-California  
Boulder Community Treatment Center (audited in December 2017; Final Report Pending)-Colorado  
Centennial-Colorado  
Cheyenne Transitional Center (audited September 2017; Final Report Pending) - Wyoming  
Commerce Transitional Center-Colorado  
Dallas Transitional Center (Texas)  
Fox Facility-Colorado  
Ft. Worth Transitional Center-Texas  
Longmont Community Treatment Center (audited in December 2017; Final Report Pending)-Colorado  
Ocean View-California

Internal audits, combined with the DOJ and DHS Audits provided valuable information needed to identify areas in the performance of PREA Standards that required corrective action. These audits, when layered with PREA Incident Reviews conducted at the facility level resulted in the following improvements in 2017. (Note: Full details of Corrective Actions taken by the above facilities to achieve full compliance with PREA Standards can be found by visiting the page for that facility on the CoreCivic web-site <https://www.corecivic.com/>.)

**Camera Installation and Upgrades**— Multiple facilities reported that PREA Incident Reviews and audits resulted in the addition of mirrors to eliminate blind spots and improve supervision of inmates/detainees/residents. As part of continuing efforts to enhance inmate/detainee/resident safety and prevent sexual abuse, CoreCivic maintains an aggressive camera upgrade program in both Safety and Community facilities.

**Full Surveillance System conversions:**

Elizabeth Detention Center  
Central Arizona Florence Correctional Complex (East)  
La Palma Correctional Center  
Leavenworth Detention Center  
McRae Correctional Center  
Torrance County Detention Center

**Surveillance System Upgrades:**

Carver Center  
Cimarron Correctional Facility  
Eloy Detention Center  
T. Don Hutto Residential Center  
South Central Correctional Center  
Stewart Detention Center  
Trousdale Turner Correctional Center  
Tulsa Transitional Center  
Turley Residential Center

**115.21 Evidence Protocol and Forensic Medical Examinations**— This Standard calls for a facility to have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with a Rape Crisis Center or Community based agency to provide a victim advocate to accompany an inmate to a forensic examinations (SAFE/SANE). While MOUs were found in place, it was felt that content in the 2014-2015 was out of date and that drafting new MOUs would provide a launching point for facility leadership to engage in a dialogue with community agencies.

**115.22 Policies to ensure Referrals of Allegations for Investigation and 115.71 Criminal and Administrative Agency Investigations**— This Standard requires that each facility ensure that allegations of sexual abuse or sexual harassment are referred for investigation to an agency with legal authority to conduct criminal investigations, unless the allegation does not involve potentially criminal behavior. As with Standard 115.21, this was recognized as another avenue to develop partnerships with local law enforcement.

**115.51 Inmate Reporting**— This Standard requires that each facility provide at least one way for inmates to report abuse or harassment to a public or private entity or office that is not part of the agency, and that is able to receive and immediately forward inmate reports of sexual abuse and sexual harassment to agency officials, allowing the inmate to remain anonymous upon request. Postings were upgraded throughout CoreCivic facilities to ensure that the posted telephone numbers were in service and that reporting inmates/ detainees/residents received a timely response.



## GOING FORWARD

In Summary, 2017 was a positive year in the continuing effort to reduce the total number of PREA Incidents. The goal to reduce this number was set forth in our 2016 PREA Annual Report. The total number of incidents decreased by 20% from 610 total incidents in 2016 to 486 total incidents in 2017. Significantly, the number of Substantiated Incidents saw a decrease of 3% from 2016 to 2017. As we progress through 2018, we expect that training, auditing, and communication will contribute towards a continuation of this downward trend. As always the goal is to provide a safe environment for staff, visitors, residents, inmates, detainees, and the general public. As CoreCivic expands into Community Corrections and creates new Reentry Programs we see an opportunity to lead by example and strengthen our commitment to creating a culture of reporting and addressing all forms of sexual abuse and sexual harassment.