



Respecting human rights has always been an intrinsic part of CoreCivic's operations. From the first moment an individual enters one of our facilities, they should have no question that they are safe, secure, and that their basic human rights are being upheld. This is especially true for matters such as sexual assault or abuse.

The importance of the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) of 2003 can't be overstated. It, along with the additions of the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) PREA National Standards in 2012 and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Standards in 2014, created a benchmark for the safe and secure operation of correctional facilities across the country.

Since the inception of PREA, CoreCivic has made it a priority to codify these standards and incorporate them into our best practices and operating procedures. As such, we continue to facilitate a full schedule of internal audits conducted by trained CoreCivic staff as well as certified PREA auditors to ensure that we are holding ourselves to the highest standard of accountability.

In 2021 CoreCivic made significant strides in our effort to protect both our employees and those in our care, which included updating our Human Rights Policy. We also had the privilege of hosting the National PREA Coordinators Conference in Nashville this year, showcasing our commitment to the ethical treatment of justice-involved individuals across the nation.

No matter the reason a person enters a correctional facility, they should know that they are safe and in good hands. At CoreCivic, we're doing our part to make that happen.

Patrick Swindle

Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer



#### SCOPE OF THE 2021 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 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 2021 and a comparison of aggregated data for calendar year 2020. In addition, this report provides corrective action developed to eliminate sexual abuse and sexual harassment within CoreCivic facilities.

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

#### Sexual abuse includes—

- 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:

- Contact between the penis and the vulva or the penis and the anus, including penetration, however slight;
- 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:

- Contact between the penis and the vulva or the penis and the anus, including penetration, however slight;
- 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:

- 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
- 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.

#### <u>United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS) PREA Standard</u> 115.6 Definitions Related To Sexual Abuse

#### 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
- 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 facilitates investigations on-site, and assists in providing medical care and advocacy for victims of sexual abuse. CoreCivic staff do not conduct criminal investigations, however for internal administrative investigation of PREA incidents, investigators are trained in gathering evidence and interviewing victims of sexual abuse. Training is conducted 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 more likely than not 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.
- Unfounded: An allegation that was investigated and determined not to have occurred.
- Pending: An Investigation has not been completed.

All substantiated allegations of sexual abuse or sexual harassment result in appropriate disciplinary actions taken against the Employee, Contractor, Volunteer or Inmate. Termination shall be the presumptive disciplinary action sanction for staff who have engaged in sexual abuse and CoreCivic encourages criminal prosecution for all substantiated cases.





#### DATA COLLECTION

CoreCivic uses an Incident Report Database to record and track all PREA Incidents from the initial report made at the facility level through the investigative and review process. Data is gathered consistent with the definitions found in the United States Department of Justice PREA Standards and the Department of Homeland Security Standards for ICE facilities. This data is also used to respond to the Annual Department of Justice Survey of Sexual Victimization that is forwarded to select facilities.

Tables have been provided in this report that contain combined aggregated 2021 data for facilities under both DOJ Prison/Jail Standards and DHS Standards. In addition, tables are provided with data for CoreCivic Community Corrections facilities under DOJ Standards for Community Confinement Facilities. The tables containing the data for Department of Justice Prisons and Jails have notations indicating whether a facility also housed detainees through agreements with Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Facilities housing exclusively 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 that would be defined as Sexual Harassment within the definitions of what the DOJ considers Sexual Abuse.

In 2021, CoreCivic operated nine (9) facilities with exclusively ICE detainee populations under DHS PREA Standards. These facilities were the Elizabeth Detention Center, Eloy Detention Center, Houston Processing Center, La Palma Correctional Center, Laredo Processing Center, Stewart Detention Center, T. Don Hutto Detention Center, Adams County Correctional Center and the South Texas Family Residential Center.

The Central Arizona Florence Correctional Complex, Eden Detention Center and the Nevada Southern Detention Center manage United States Marshal Service (USMS) inmates under DOJ PREA Standards, as well as populations of ICE detainees that fall under DOJ Standards. The Torrance County Detention Facility operates as an ICE facility under DHS Standards with a small population of USMS and local county inmates under DOJ Standards. The Cibola County Correctional Center, Otay Mesa Detention Center, and Webb County Detention Center have separate contracts with both the USMS and ICE, and therefore manage inmates/detainees under both sets of Standards.

As the result of a Presidential Executive Order, the United Sates Marshals Service (USMS) did not renew contracts at the West Tennessee Detention Facility and the Leavenworth Detention Center. West Tennessee closed in September of 2021 while Leavenworth closed in December of 2021. In November of 2021 operation of the Northwest New Mexico Correctional Center was turned back over to the New Mexico Department of Corrections. At the end of 2021 a phase out of the population at the Marion County Jail II began and the facility was closed in January of 2022. Numbers for all four of these facilities are included in this report.

In April of 2021, CoreCivic Community Corrections, re-opened the Turley Center in Oklahoma as a Residential Reentry Center (RRC) housing residents from the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP). The Ulster Facility, and Fox Facility in Denver, Colorado both closed in 2021. The Henderson Transitional Center in Colorado was also phased out of operation as a CoreCivic facility.



## 2021 DATA REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT: CoreCivic Safety

2021 PRISONS/JAILS INMATE/DETAINEE ON INMATE/DETAINEE-SEXUAL ABUSE								
FACILITY	ADP***	SUBSTANTIATED	UNSUBSTANTIATED	UNFOUNDED	PENDING	TOTAL		
Adams (ICE)	841	0	0	0	0	0		
Bent County	1,088	0	6	0	0	6		
CAFCC*	3,269	7	7	2	0	16		
Cibola**	735	0	2	1	0	3		
Cimarron	1,018	0	4	0	0	4		
Citrus*	702	2	7	4	0	13		
Coffee	2,218	0	6	3	0	9		
Crossroads	684	0	2	3	0	5		
Crowley	1,450	0	2	0	0	2		
Davis	1,663	1	3	0	0	4		
Eden*	691	0	0	1	0	1		
Elizabeth (ICE)	95	0	1	0	0	1		
Eloy (ICE)	662	0	4	1	0	5		
Hardeman	1,894	2	11	7	0	20		
Houston (ICE)	256	0	0	1	0	1		
Jenkins	1,018	0	1	3	0	4		
La Palma (ICE)	1,460	0	2	4	0	6		
Lake City	845	0	1	0	0	1		
Lake Erie	1,585	1	7	1	0	9		
Laredo (ICE)	147	0	1	0	0	1		
Leavenworth	787	0	0	3	0	3		
Lee Adjustment	734	0	0	1	0	1		
Marion County Jail II	1,128	0	15	4	0	19		
McRae	1,592	0	0	0	0	0		
Nevada Southern*	641	2	2	2	0	6		
Northeast Ohio	1,596	1	10	3	0	14		
Northwest New Mexico	397	1	0	1	0	2		
Otay Mesa**	1,031	1	3	6	0	10		
Red Rock	1,937	0	0	1	0	1		
Saguaro	1,511	0	0	2	0	2		
South Central	1,564	2	10	2	0	14		
STFRC (ICE)	535	0	1	0	0	1		
Stewart	872	1	3	1	0	5		
T.Don Hutto (ICE)	181	0	0	0	0	0		
Tallahatchie	1,209	0	2	4	0	6		
Torrance**	310	0	2	2	0	4		
Trousdale	2,384	1	22	14	0	37		
Webb**	190	0	0	1	0	1		
West TN*	341	0	1	1	0	2		
Wheeler	2,201	1	7	4	0	12		
Whiteville	1,502	0	5	1	0	6		
Totals		23	150	84	0	257		

(ICE) means only ICE detainees under DHS standards

<sup>\*</sup>Also housed ICE detainees under DOJ standards

<sup>\*\*</sup>Housed inmates under DOJ standards and DHS detainees under DHS standards

<sup>\*\*\*</sup>ADP is Average Daily Population





FACILITY	ADP	SUBSTANTIATED	UNSUBSTANTIATED	UNFOUNDED	PENDING	TOTAL
Adams (ICE)	841	0	0	0	0	0
Bent County	1,088	1	1	1	0	3
CAFCC*	3,269	1	1	4	0	6
Cibola**	735	1	1	2	0	4
Cimarron	1,018	0	0	0	0	0
Citrus*	702	0	1	1	0	2
Coffee	2,218	2	1	2	0	5
Crossroads	684	2	0	6	0	8
Crowley	1,450	0	1	0	0	1
Davis	1,663	3	1	2	0	6
Eden*	691	0	3	5	0	8
Elizabeth (ICE)	95	0	0	0	0	0
Eloy (ICE)	662	1	2	2	0	5
Hardeman	1,894	0	5	0	0	5
Houston (ICE)	256	0	0	0	0	0
Jenkins	1,018	0	2	7	0	9
La Palma (ICE)	1,460	0	0	3	0	3
Lake City	845	0	0	0	0	0
Lake Erie	1,585	0	0	1	0	1
Laredo (ICE)	147	1	0	0	0	1
Leavenworth	787	1	3	12	0	16
Lee Adjustment	734	0	0	3	0	3
Marion County Jail II	1,128	0	0	0	0	0
McRae	1,592	0	0	0	0	0
Nevada Southern*	641	0	4	12	0	16
Northeast Ohio	1,596	0	7	4	0	11
Northwest New Mexico	397	0	3	1	0	4
Otay Mesa**	1,031	0	0	6	0	6
Red Rock	1,937	2	3	2	0	7
Saguaro	1,511	1	0	1	0	2
South Central	1,564	5	0	9	0	14
STFRC (ICE)	535	0	0	0	0	0
Stewart	872	1	3	0	0	4
T.Don Hutto (ICE)	181	0	0	0	0	0
Tallahatchie	1,209	0	6	0	0	6
Torrance**	310	0	0	2	0	2
Trousdale	2,384	0	1	0	0	1
Webb**	190	0	1	0	0	1
West TN*	341	0	0	1	0	1
Wheeler	2,201	2	2	3	0	7
Whiteville	1,502	1	0	3	0	4
Totals		25	52	95	0	172

(ICE) means only ICE detainees under DHS standards

<sup>\*</sup>Also housed ICE detainees under DOJ standards

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star\star}\textsc{Housed}$  inmates under DOJ standards and DHS detainees under DHS standards

<sup>\*\*\*</sup>ADP is Average Daily Population





2021 PRISONS/JAILS INMATE/DETAINEE ON INMATE/DETAINEE-SEXUAL HARASSMENT								
FACILITY	ADP	SUBSTANTIATED	UNSUBSTANTIATED	UNFOUNDED	PENDING	TOTAL		
Adams (ICE)	841	0	0	0	0	0		
Bent County	1,088	0	1	0	0	1		
CAFCC*	3,269	2	8	2	0	12		
Cibola**	735	0	1	0	0	1		
Cimarron	1,018	0	0	0	0	0		
Citrus*	702	2	6	1	0	9		
Coffee	2,218	0	6	0	0	6		
Crossroads	684	0	1	3	0	4		
Crowley	1,450	0	0	0	0	0		
Davis	1,663	0	6	1	0	7		
Eden*	691	1	2	2	0	5		
Elizabeth (ICE)	95	0	0	0	0	0		
Eloy (ICE)	662	0	0	0	0	0		
Hardeman	1,894	0	13	1	0	14		
Houston (ICE)	256	0	0	0	0	0		
Jenkins	1,018	0	1	3	0	4		
La Palma (ICE)	1,460	0	1	2	0	3		
Lake City	845	0	0	0	0	0		
Lake Erie	1,585	0	0	0	0	0		
Laredo (ICE)	147	0	0	0	0	0		
Leavenworth	787	0	0	1	0	1		
Lee Adjustment	734	0	0	0	0	0		
Marion County Jail II	1,128	0	0	0	0	0		
McRae	1,592	0	0	0	0	0		
Nevada Southern*	641	1	2	1	0	4		
Northeast Ohio	1,596	0	3	1	0	4		
Northwest New Mexico	397	1	0	0	0	1		
Otay Mesa**	1,031	0	0	0	0	0		
Red Rock	1,937	0	1	0	0	1		
Saguaro	1,511	0	1	0	0	1		
South Central	1,564	0	4	2	0	6		
STFRC (ICE)	535	0	0	0	0	0		
Stewart	872	0	0	0	0	0		
T.Don Hutto (ICE)	181	0	0	0	0	0		
Tallahatchie	1,209	1	4	0	0	5		
Torrance**	310	0	0	0	0	0		
Trousdale	2,384	0	4	2	0	6		
Webb**	190	0	0	0	0	0		
West TN*	341	0	1	2	0	3		
Wheeler	2,201	0	2	3	0	5		
Whiteville	1,502	0	1	3	0	4		
Totals		8	69	30	0	107		

<sup>(</sup>ICE) means only ICE detainees under DHS standards

<sup>\*</sup>Also housed ICE detainees under DOJ standards

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star\star}\textsc{Housed}$  in mates under DOJ standards and DHS detainees under DHS standards





FACILITY	ADP	SUBSTANTIATED	UNSUBSTANTIATED	UNFOUNDED	PENDING	TOTAL
Adams (ICE)	841	0	0	0	0	0
Bent County	1,088	0	1	0	0	1
CAFCC*	3,269	0	3	6	0	9
Cibola**	735	0	0	0	0	0
Cimarron	1,018	0	0	1	0	1
Citrus*	702	0	4	1	0	5
Coffee	2,218	0	0	0	0	0
Crossroads	684	0	2	3	0	5
Crowley	1,450	0	0	0	0	0
Davis	1,663	0	0	3	0	3
Eden*	691	0	0	1	0	1
Elizabeth (ICE)	95	0	0	0	0	0
Eloy (ICE)	662	0	0	0	0	0
Hardeman	1,894	0	4	1	0	5
Houston (ICE)	256	0	0	0	0	0
Jenkins	1,018	0	3	2	0	5
La Palma (ICE)	1,460	0	1	1	0	2
Lake City	845	0	0	0	0	0
Lake Erie	1,585	0	1	0	0	1
Laredo (ICE)	147	0	0	0	0	0
Leavenworth	787	0	3	9	0	12
Lee Adjustment	734	0	0	1	0	1
Marion County Jail II	1,128	0	0	0	0	0
McRae	1,592	0	0	0	0	0
Nevada Southern*	641	0	5	0	0	5
Northeast Ohio	1,596	0	0	0	0	0
Northwest New Mexico	397	0	0	0	0	0
Otay Mesa**	1,031	0	0	1	0	1
Red Rock	1,937	0	0	0	0	0
Saguaro	1,511	2	0	1	0	3
South Central	1.564	0	0	0	0	0
STFRC (ICE)	535	0	0	0	0	0
Stewart	872	0	0	0	0	0
T.Don Hutto (ICE)	181	0	0	0	0	0
Tallahatchie	1,209	0	1	0	0	1
Torrance**	310	0	0	0	0	0
Trousdale	2,384	0	0	1	0	1
Webb**	190	0	0	0	0	0
West TN*	341	0	1	1	0	2
Wheeler	2,201	0	3	1	0	4
Whiteville	1,502	0	0	3	0	3
Totals	.,002	2	32	37	0	71

<sup>(</sup>ICE) means only ICE detainees under DHS standards

<sup>\*</sup>Also housed ICE detainees under DOJ standards

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star\star}\textsc{Housed}$  in mates under DOJ standards and DHS detainees under DHS standards



# 2021 DATA REVIEW AND ANALYSIS CORECIVIC SAFETY

EOI= Employee on Inmate

IOI=Inmate on Inmate

#### CoreCivic Safety PREA Totals 2021:

TYPE OF REPORT	TOTAL CASES	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL VOLUME
EOI Sexual Abuse	172	28%
EOI Sexual Harassment	71	12%
IOI Sexual Abuse	257	42%
IOI Sexual Harassment	107	18%
Total cases	607 cases	

#### CoreCivic Safety Yearly Comparisons by Disposition:

SUBSTANTIATED		2018	2019	2020	2021
IOI Sexual Abuse		53	53	39	23
EOI Sexual Abuse		19	26	20	25
IOI Sexual Harassment		19	12	7	8
EOI Sexual Harassment		5	3	1	2
	Total	96	94	67	58

UNSUBSTANTIATED		2018	2019	2020	2021
IOI Sexual Abuse		181	209	134	150
EOI Sexual Abuse		48	75	66	52
IOI Sexual Harassment		89	77	86	69
EOI Sexual Harassment		30	35	44	32
	Total	348	396	330	303

UNFOUNDED		2018	2019	2020	2021
IOI Sexual Abuse		59	115	72	84
EOI Sexual Abuse		75	123	120	95
IOI Sexual Harassment		27	23	23	30
EOI Sexual Harassment		26	24	47	37
	Total	187	285	262	246

	2018	2019	2020	2021
TOTAL INCIDENTS	631	775	659	607
Pending	10	10	10	0
GRAND TOTAL	641	785	669	607

2021 volume decrease from 2020: 9.2%



#### **Highest Volume facilities 2021:**

RANK	FACILITY	AVERAGE DAILY POP	TOTAL PREA CASES	SUBSTANTIATED CASES
1	Trousdale Turner	2,384	45	1
2	Hardeman	1,894	44	2
3	Central Arizona Florence Correctional Complex (CAFCC)	3,269	43	10
4	South Central	1,564	34	7
5	Leavenworth	787	32	1
6	Nevada Southern	641	31	3

FACILITY	2019 NUMBER OF REPORTS	2020 NUMBER OF REPORTS	2021 NUMBER OF REPORTS	PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM 2020 TO 2021
Trousdale Turner	38	24	45	87.5%
Hardeman	36	53	44	-17%
CAFCC	75	34	43	26%
South Central	45	31	34	10%
Leavenworth	18	35	32	-8.5%
Nevada Southern	27	17	31	82%

#### Rates of Incidence:

FACILITY	AVERAGE DAILY POP	TOTAL PREA VOLUME	INCIDENCE RATE PER 100	TOTAL SUBSTANTIATED	ACTUAL SUBSTANTIATION RATE
Trousdale	2,384	45	1.89	1	.042
Hardeman	1,894	44	2.32	2	.106
CAFCC	3,269	43	1.32	10	.306
South Central	1,564	34	2.17	7	.448
Leavenworth	787	32	4.07	1	.127
Nevada Southern	641	31	4.84	3	.468

Incidence Rate = (n / Total population at risk) x 100

#### Penetrative assault allegations:

For the purpose of the table below, "Serious Sexual Assault Allegations" include any allegation of attempted, forced, or coerced penetration of any bodily orifice by any object (except mouth-to-mouth kissing).

FACILITY	TOTAL CASES	TOTAL SERIOUS SEXUAL ASSAULT ALLEGATIONS	OUTCOME OF SERIOUS SEXUAL ASSAULT ALLEGATIONS
Trousdale	45	22	None involved staff. 1 substantiated.
Hardeman	44	14	None involved staff. 2 inmate-involved cases were substantiated.
CAFCC	43	8	1 involved staff. 3 were substantiated .
South Central	34	12	involved staff. Several were unfounded after inmates admitted to abusing the PREA reporting system.
Leavenworth	32	3	None involved staff.
Nevada Southern	31	1	None involved staff.



#### HIGHEST VOLUME FACILITY ANALYSIS

TROUSDALE TURNER CORRECTIONAL CENTER				
	2019	2020	2021	
EOI Sexual Abuse	5	4	1	
IOI Sexual Abuse	30	2	37	
EOI Sexual Harassment	1	1	1	
IOI Sexual Harassment	2	17	6	
Total	38	24	45	

Trousdale is a multi-security level facility with a 2021 Average Daily Population (ADP) of 2,384. Trousdale had a significant increase in the volume of cases from calendar year 2020 (45 in 2021 up from 24 in 2020). The 2021 figure is comparable to 2019 when there were a total of 38 cases. The 2020 total can be attributed in part to restricted movement during COVID-19 lockdowns

HARDEMAN COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY						
	2019 2020 2021					
EOI Sexual Abuse	5	14	5			
IOI Sexual Abuse	16	19	20			
EOI Sexual Harassment	3	10	5			
IOI Sexual Harassment	12	10	14			
Total	36	53	44			

Hardeman is a medium security facility. There were no substantiated cases involving staff members. 34 of the 44 cases involved inmates only. The ADP at Hardeman went from 1842 in 2020 to 1894 in 2021.

CENTRAL ARIZONA FLORENCE CORRECTIONAL COMPLEX							
	2019 2020 2021						
EOI Sexual Abuse	11	7	6				
IOI Sexual Abuse	34	6	16				
EOI Sexual Harassment	8	7	9				
IOI Sexual Harassment 22 14 12							
Total	75	34	43				

The Central Arizona Florence Correctional Complex (CAFCC) is the largest facility within CoreCivic. The Complex was formerly two separate facilities that were merged in 2017. As result, the volume of cases is directly attributable to the high ADP. ADP did drop from 3,623 in 2020 to 3,269 in 2021. It should be noted that nine (9) of the 10 substantiated cases were Inmate on Inmate cases that did not involve employees, contractors, or volunteers. The facility hit a peak of 75 cases in 2019 (largely due to one inmate with 34 cases) and has showed a steady decrease in volume over the past two years.





SOUTH CENTRAL CORRECTIONAL CENTER				
	2019	2020	2021	
EOI Sexual Abuse	12	8	14	
IOI Sexual Abuse	18	11	14	
EOI Sexual Harassment	10	3	0	
IOI Sexual Harassment	5	9	6	
Total	45	31	34	

At South Central, there was virtually no change in ADP in 2021. At that facility, 7 of the 34 cases were substantiated. 5 of the substantiated cases involved staff members kissing inmates, including one Correctional officer who was involved with 2 different inmates. South Central is a medium security facility, each with an ADP of 1,564.

LEAVENWORTH DETENTION CENTER					
2019 2020 2021					
EOI Sexual Abuse	7	19	16		
IOI Sexual Abuse	6	12	3		
EOI Sexual Harassment	1	4	12		
IOI Sexual Harassment	4	0	1		
Total	18	35	32		

The Leavenworth Detention Center was closed at the end of calendar year 2021. The ADP decreased from 884 in 2020 to 787 prior to the closure in 2021. Most notable is that 25 of the 32 cases were closed as unfounded, indicating that the investigation proved that the incident did not occur or does not meet the definition of abuse or harassment as defined in the PREA Standards. The facility saw a disproportionately large amount of Voyeurism cases. Ten of their 32 cases were Voyeurism allegations; 9 of which were closed unfounded and one was closed unsubstantiated.

NEVADA SOUTHERN DETENTION CENTER						
	2019 2020 2021					
EOI Sexual Abuse	10	3	16			
IOI Sexual Abuse	10	4	6			
EOI Sexual Harassment	7	6	5			
IOI Sexual Harassment	0	4	4			
Total	27	17	31			

Nevada Southern Detention Center had 3 substantiated cases in 2021, none of which involved staff members. The majority of complaints were allegations of inappropriate pat searches conducted outside of the kitchen as inmate workers were being searched for contraband. Those searches were able to be confirmed as appropriate by video review. Of the 16 allegations of abuse by employees, 12 were closed as unfounded, indicating that there was no violation of policy or procedure.



#### **CORECIVIC** COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

CoreCivic Community Corrections includes halfway houses, residential reentry centers, and facilities that fall under the definition of Community Confinement in PREA Standards.

UNF= Unfounded UNS-Unsubstantiated SUB=Substantiated

#### **CoreCivic Community PREA Totals:**

2020 TOTALS	UNF	UNS	SUB	TOTAL	TOTAL
Employee on Inmate Sexual Abuse	13	9	5	27	60%
Employee on Inmate Sexual Harassment	0	4	1	5	11%
Inmate on Inmate Sexual Abuse	1	4	1	6	13%
Inmate on Inmate Sexual Harassment	2	3	2	7	16%
Total	16	20	9	45 hada	
Percentage	36%	44%	20%	45 total cases	

2021 TOTALS	UNF	UNS	SUB	TOTAL	TOTAL
Employee on Inmate Sexual Abuse	2	10	3	15	37%
Employee on Inmate Sexual Harassment	1	1	3	5	12%
Inmate on Inmate Sexual Abuse	3	4	5	12	29%
Inmate on Inmate Sexual Harassment	2	6	1	9	22%
Total	8	21	12	44 4-4	-1
Percentage	20%	51%	29%	41 total cases	

	UNF	UNS	SUB	TOTAL
2019	19	29	24	72
2020	16	20	9	45
2021	8	21	12	41

Total volume in 2020 is down 38 percent (27 cases) from 2019. Total volume in 2021 is down 9 percent (4 cases) from 2020.



#### Totals by Facility:

FACILITY	ADP	SUBSTANTIATED	UNSUBSTANTIATED	UNFOUNDED	Total
Adams Trans.	76	0	2	0	2
Arapahoe	77	0	1	1	2
Austin RRC	54	0	2	0	2
Austin Trans.	334	3	5	3	11*
Boston Ave	82	0	0	0	0
Centennial	61	0	0	0	0
Cheyenne	62	1	0	0	1
Commerce	80	0	0	0	0
Corpus Christi	84	0	0	0	0
Dahlia	77	0	0	0	0
Dallas Trans.	261	4	5	1	10*
El Paso MUF	210	0	2	1	3
El Paso Trans.	170	1	0	1	2
Fort Worth	206	1	2	0	3
Fox Facility	40	0	0	0	0
Ghent	22	0	0	0	0
Henderson	3	0	0	0	0
James River	50	0	0	0	0
Longmont	55	2	0	0	2
Ocean View	200				
Oklahoma Reentry (OROC)	112	0	0	0	0
South Raleigh	66	0	0	0	0
Turley	19	0	3	0	3
Ulster	6	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	2378	12	22	7	
Total PREA Cases in Community	facilities 20	21:			41

<sup>\*</sup>See analysis below

AUSTIN TRANSITIONAL CENTER					
	2019	2020	2021		
EOI Sexual Abuse	0	3	2		
IOI Sexual Abuse	2	2	8		
EOI Sexual Harassment	2	1	1		
IOI Sexual Harassment	0	0	0		
Total	4	6	11		

Austin Transitional Center is the largest of all CoreCivic Community facilities, with an Average Daily Population (ADP) of 334 residents. Because of their size, it is anticipated that this facility has more PREA reports than any other location. ATC had a total of 11 cases in 2021. Three of those cases were substantiated, with one of those involving an employee. Three cases were unfounded and five were unsubstantiated.

DALLAS TRANSITIONAL CENTER			
	2019	2020	2021
EOI Sexual Abuse	0	0	1
IOI Sexual Abuse	1	1	2
EOI Sexual Harassment	0	0	1
IOI Sexual Harassment	1	3	6
Total	2	4	10

Dallas Transitional is the second largest CoreCivic Community facility with an ADP of 261 residents. DTC had a total of 10 PREA incidents reported in 2021. Four of those cases were substantiated and two of those involved employees. One case was unfounded and 5 were closed unsubstantiated.



#### **2021 PREA AUDITS**

During calendar year 2021, a total of eighteen (18) CoreCivic Safety (non-ICE) facilities, eight (8) CoreCivic immigration facilities, and seven (7) Community Corrections facilities had on-site audits conducted by PREA Auditors certified by the United States Department of Justice. These facilities, and partner agency, are as follows:

#### **CORECIVIC SAFETY (NON-ICE) DOJ STANDARDS**

- Saguaro Correctional Center Hawaii Department of Public Safety and Idaho Department of Corrections
- Trousdale Turner Correctional Center Tennessee Department of Corrections
- Red Rock Correctional Center Arizona Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation & Reentry
- Central Arizona Florence Correctional Complex United States Marshals Service
- Coffee Correctional Facility Georgia Department of Corrections
- Otay Mesa Detention Center United States Marshals Service
- Crossroads Correctional Center Montana Department of Corrections
- Webb County Detention Facility United States Marshals Service
- Northwest New Mexico Correctional Center New Mexico Department of Corrections
- Tallahatchie County Correctional Facility United States Marshals Service; South Carolina Department of Corrections, and Vermont Department of Corrections
- West Tennessee Detention Center United States Marshals Service
- Eden Detention Center United States Marshals Service
- Lake Erie Correctional Institution Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction
- Crowley County Correctional Facility Colorado Department of Corrections
- Wheeler Correctional Facility Georgia Department of Corrections
- Bent County Correctional Facility Colorado Department of Corrections
- Torrance County Detention Facility United States Marshals Service
- South Cent Correctional Facility Tennessee Department of Corrections

#### **CORECIVIC SAFETY (ICE) DHS STANDARDS**

An additional eight (8) Safety facilities had audits conducted utilizing Department of Homeland Security Standards

- Elizabeth Detention Center Immigration and Customs Enforcement
- Houston Processing Center Immigration and Customs Enforcement
- Laredo Processing Center Immigration and Customs Enforcement
- South Texas Family Residential Center Immigration and Customs Enforcement
- Stewart Detention Center Immigration and Customs Enforcement
- T. Don Hutto Detention Center Immigration and Customs Enforcement
- Cibola County Correctional Center Immigration and Customs Enforcement
- La Palma Correctional Center Immigration and Customs Enforcement

#### **CORECIVIC COMMUNITY**

- Oklahoma Reentry Opportunity Center (OROC) formerly Carver Center Oklahoma
   Department of Corrections and Federal Bureau of Prisons
- Cheyenne Transitional Center Wyoming Department of Corrections
- Longmont Community Treatment Center Boulder County Colorado
- Austin Residential Reentry Center Federal Bureau of Prisons
- Arapahoe Community Treatment Center Arapahoe County and Colorado Department of Public Safety
- El Paso Multi Use Facility Texas Department of Criminal Justice
- El Paso Transitional Center Texas Department of Criminal Justice



#### **2021 CORRECTIVE ACTION**

CoreCivic Internal audits, combined with the DOJ and DHS Audits by certified PREA Auditors provided valuable information needed to identify areas that required correc—tive action. These audits, when layered with Sexual Abuse Incident Reviews conducted at the facility level resulted in the following improvements being made to the CoreCivic PREA Program:

**POLICY AND PROCEDURE**: In January of 2021, the revised 14-2 CC Policy Sexual Abuse Prevention and Response in Community Corrections was issued. The policy enables facilities to comply with Federal Bureau of Positions PREA directives for BOP Residential Reentry Centers.

**TROUSDALE**: In February of 2021, a DOJ PREA Standards audit was held at the Trousdale Turner Correctional Center in Tennessee. The Auditor found several area of non-compliance requiring corrective action. In an effort to focus on the issues at this facility, the corrective action was incorporated into the CoreCivic Field Optimization Team (FOT) process. The FOT process is managed by a senior leader with CoreCivic who assigns tasks to facility staff and company subject matter experts to resolve problems. In addition weekly meetings and an intensive onsite presence assisted the facility in coming back into compliance. A new PREA Compliance Manager appointed in 2021, which has increased stability for the PREA program there.

**INVESTIGATOR TRAINING:** In June of 2021, CoreCivic held Investigator Training for facility investigators. This session included several hours of training related to sexual abuse, interviewing, and evidence gathering.

**PREA TRAINING**: Presentations on compliance with PREA Standards were provided at the CoreCivic Facility Leadership Conference in April of 2021. Training was also provided for Transcor leadership as well. Also in April, the Director of PREA Investigations conducted virtual training sessions for Trinity Food service staff. PREA Compliance Manager training was held virtually in each quarter in 2021.

**CAMERA INSTALLATION AND UPGRADES**: As part of continuing efforts to enhance inmate/detainee and resident safety and prevent sexual abuse, CoreCivic maintains a camera upgrade program in both Safety and Community facilities. Cameras were added at Trousdale and Tallahatchie. The Milestone system was upgraded at Austin Transitional Center and Austin RRC.

**LAKE CITY**: As a result of the PREA Audit conducted at the facility in December of 2020, shower renovations in housing units were completed to enhance privacy for inmates. The renovations eliminated the possibility of cross gender viewing from the upper range in the housing units.

**FOOD SERVICE**: To eliminate potential blind spots in the kitchen and food preparation areas, a cooperative effort with Food service operations resulted in new Plexiglas doors being installed on freezers and coolers allowing greater visibility. FSC PREA staff also conducted training with food service managers as well as line staff level staff on PREA expectations.

(Note: Full details of Corrective Actions taken by facilities to achieve full compliance with PREA Standards following PREA Audits in 2021 can be found by visiting the page for that facility on the CoreCivic website: <a href="www.CoreCivic.com">www.CoreCivic.com</a>)