



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	
Purpose of Report	1
Bernard Warner, Secretary	2
Overview and Background	3
Major Accomplishments	5
Governor Certification	5
Penalty Grant Funds	8
PREA Unit	8
PREA Implementation Team	8
Audits	10
Research and Data	
Offender Population Overview	13
Prevention	
Education	14
Vulnerability Assessments	15
PREA Risk Assessment	16
Detection	
Staff Reporting	18
Offender Reporting	19
Outside WADOC Reporting	21
Reporting Process Improvements	22
Response	
Investigations	23
Demographic Data: Substantiated Cases	28
Other Data: Substantiated Cases	32
Demographic Data: Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Cases	35
Incident Review	38
Discipline	
Offenders	39

Staff	44
Victim Advocacy	43
Additional System Implementation	
Contract Monitoring	45
Moss Group and Grant Work	45
Jail Assessments	48
Contracted Facilities	
American Behavior Health Systems	48
Rehabilitation Administration (Juveniles)	48
Snohomish County Department of Corrections	49
Yakima County Departments of Corrections	49
Clark County Department of Corrections	49
Corrections Corporation of America	49
Pioneer Human Services	50
2013 Corrective Action Plan Status Update	51
2013 Strategic Plan Status Update	53
2014 Corrective Action Plan	54
2014 Strategic Plan	55
Facility and Division Reports	
Airway Heights Corrections Center (AHCC)	57
Cedar Creek Corrections Center (CCCC)	60
Clallam Bay Corrections Center (CBCC)	62
Coyote Ridge Corrections Center (CRCC)	65
Larch Corrections Center (LCC)	68
Monroe Correctional Complex (MCC)	71
Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women (MCCCW)	74
Olympic Corrections Center (OCC)	77
Stafford Creek Corrections Center (SCCC)	80
Washington Corrections Center (WCC)	83
Washington Corrections Center for Women (WCCW)	86
Washington State Penitentiary (WSP)	89

Work Release Facilities	92
Ahtanum View Work Release	95
Bellingham Work Release	96
Bishop Lewis Work Release	97
Brownstone Work Release	98
Eleanor Chase House Work Release	99
Helen B. Ratcliff Work Release	100
Longview Work Release	101
Madison Inn Work Release	102
Olympia Work Release	103
Peninsula Work Release	104
Progress House Work Release	105
RAP House/Lincoln Park Work Release	106
Reynolds Work Release	107
Tri-Cities Work Release	108
Community Corrections Division	109
Health Services Division	111
Substance Abuse Recovery Unit & Offender Change Division	114
Aggregate Data	118

## PURPOSE OF REPORT

The Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Federal Standard 115.88 requires that each facility collect and review data "...in order to assess and improve the effectiveness of sexual abuse prevention, detection, and response policies, practices, and training." This report works to meet this standard as well as:

- Identify corrective action taken to address problem areas in the past year
- Compare PREA related data to previous year's data
- Share positive steps the Washington Department of Corrections (WADOC) has taken to implement PREA in collaboration with other agencies
- Identify problem areas to be addressed in the future
- Set goals for PREA and WADOC in 2015





STATE OF WASHINGTON  
**DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

P.O. Box 41100  
Olympia, Washington 98504-1100

October 2015

Dear Stakeholder:

The Washington Department of Corrections (WADOC) has been recognized throughout the nation as a leader in PREA implementation and cultural integration. This has been accomplished by dedicated staff throughout the agency, maintaining as integral goals the provision of support services to all survivors of sexual abuse, the reduction in sexual violence across the agency and the enhancement of safe, and secure environments for offenders, staff, contractors and visitors through these efforts.

PREA implementation is not just about sexual safety. It impacts the overall safety of our facilities. For example, conducting a vulnerability assessment to identify areas of risk for sexual victimization can also identify areas where staff or offenders may be assaulted, gang activity can occur, or contraband can be introduced. Many of the PREA standards can impact more than just sexual abuse.

WADOC has interpreted the federal PREA standards as a foundation rather than best practices. Our goal is to develop strategies and practices that build on that foundation, continuously improving prevention, detection, response, investigation across the agency, not just in the facilities that are specifically addressed by the standards. Any level of sexual misconduct anywhere within the agency is not acceptable.

In reviewing major accomplishments, it is clear that WADOC strives to go above and beyond minimum requirements. A comprehensive pre-assessment and pre-audit system was implemented in order to prepare facilities for Department of Justice (DOJ) certified audits. As a result, four prisons and four work release facilities successfully completed their DOJ certified audits, scoring 100% compliance without the need for any corrective action.

WADOC has worked to provide and improve training and support systems by expanding services and partnering with other agencies. We have continued to work with the Office of Crime Victim Advocacy and the Washington Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs to enhance victim advocacy services. We expanded venues for offenders to report PREA incidents to include TTY access for those with hearing impairments and worked with the Colorado Department of Corrections to establish an independent external reporting system. WADOC has also contracted with The Moss Group under a Bureau of Justice Administration demonstration grant to complete sexual safety assessments in one prison and one work release which has enhanced implementation and cultural integration.

WADOC has worked diligently to incorporate PREA into our culture and will continue this work. We will endeavor to keep people safe – those who work within the correctional system, those who are housed within the correctional system, and those who live in our communities.

I am proud of these accomplishments and am confident that established strategies coupled with staff dedication will continue to enhance these efforts.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dan Pacholke".

Dan Pacholke  
Secretary

## OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND

Historically, sexual assault and abuse inside of the correctional system was not taken as seriously as sexual assault and abuse in the community. Some have even felt that rape in prison was inevitable or even deserved as a consequence for the crime(s) committed by the offender. Recently, the attitude towards sexual assault and abuse in prison has changed to an understanding that sexual assault and abuse is a crime – not a punishment for a crime. Sexual assault and abuse within a confinement facility can have severe consequences for victims, affect the security of the facility and the well-being of the communities where the offenders will return.

The Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) was a law enacted at the presidential level in 2003. PREA was a statement designed to eliminate rape in confinement settings. The legislation mandated national standards be developed and implemented across the country. The standards went into effective in August of 2012 and cover prevention planning, responsive planning, training and education, screening for risk, reporting, official response, investigations, discipline, medical and mental health care, data collection and audits.

The Washington Department of Corrections (WADOC) works to implement PREA as part of the overall mission ‘to improve public safety’ and the vision of ‘working together for safe communities.’ Throughout the PREA implementation process in WADOC’s 12 prison facilities and 16 work releases, staff have worked to make clear connections between the overall safety and security of facilities and the inclusion of PREA policies and practices.

The following are a portion of the WADOC’s expansive definitions that can be found on the agency website. These definitions are far more expansive and comprehensive than those that are included in the federal PREA legislation. WADOC has chosen to include more comprehensive definitions in order to better protect inmates from sexual assault, abuse and harassment while incarcerated.

Staff: Department employees, contract staff, volunteers, and any other person providing services in the Department facilities or offices.

Victim: For all sexual misconduct defined under PREA, the victim is always an offender under the jurisdiction of the Department.

Aggravated Sexual Assault: A sexual act perpetrated by either staff or an offender that occurred within the previous 120 hours and involve penetration or exchange of body fluids.

Offender on Offender Sexual Assault: Contact between genitalia, between genitalia and anus, or between mouth and genitalia; penetration; coerced sexual activity in response to pressuring, offer of protection, payment of debt, etc.; and/or threatening an offender with sexual misconduct.

Offender on Offender Sexual Abuse: Sexual contact (not to the level of sexual assault) between two or more offenders without consent or when the offender is unable to consent or refuse (e.g. intentional touching either directly or through clothing).

Staff on Offender Sexual Misconduct: Engaging in sexual intercourse with an offender, intentional touching, kissing, voyeurism, exchange of personal correspondence or information, discouraging or preventing other from making good faith reports of staff sexual misconduct, etc.

Staff on Offender/Offender on Offender Sexual Harassment: Deliberate or repeated, unsolicited statements or comments of a sexual nature, including demeaning references to gender or derogatory comments about body or clothing; repeated profane or obscene language/gestures of a sexual nature.

Consensual, non-coerced sexual activity between offenders is prohibited by WADOC rule, but is not defined as a violation of PREA policies. Sexual acts perpetrated by offenders on staff (without the consent of the staff member) and sexual harassment of a staff member by an offender does not fall under the PREA definitions but can be addressed through separate procedures.





## MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Sexual Safety Assessments by The Moss Group to better evaluate and move beyond compliance
- 100% compliance on first year audits
- Continuation of the PREA Implementation Team looking beyond compliance and working on strategies to enhance prevention, detection, response and investigation
- Updated pat search training deployed and completed by custody staff throughout the agency
- Continued collaboration with jail facilities in their work toward compliance
- Preparation activities in those prison and work release facilities that have yet to be audited along with development of a system to monitor continued compliance
- Innovation Team Award presented to the PREA Implementation Team

## GOVERNOR CERTIFICATION

Each year, the governor has to certify compliance for all applicable agencies within his/her operational control and any private facility/agency contracted to house offenders. In Washington, those direct agencies are the Department of Corrections and the Juvenile Justice Rehabilitation Administration (JJRA). The only private facility that falls under WADOC is American Behavioral Health Systems (ABHS).

The governor has three options: certify compliance; don't certify but commit to continuing moving toward compliance; or, don't certify and don't commit to compliance. In 2014, the governor did not certify compliance but indicated that we were working toward compliance. However, in May 2015 Governor Inslee signed certification regarding full compliance with the National Standards to Prevent, Detect and Response to Prison Rape.

*National standards regarding Prison Rape Elimination have created a far safer environment for our offender population. It gave the offender population an avenue to report acts of rape and sexual harassment. PREA guided the agency into developing a process to investigate instances of potential rape/harassment of offenders. This system, while creating additional work, also positively changes our facilities. We have a no tolerance line that is set in stone.*

*- Lisa Rohrer, Classification & Case Management Administrator.*

JAY INSLEE  
Governor



STATE OF WASHINGTON  
Office of the Governor

May 15, 2015

Karol Mason, Assistant Attorney General  
PREA Management Office  
Bureau of Justice Assistance  
810 Seventh Street NW  
Washington, DC 20531

Dear Assistant Attorney General Mason:

The state of Washington is proud to certify its compliance with National Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Standards. Included with this cover letter is a PREA Standards Certification form, signed by Washington Governor Jay Inslee. Also included are two letters that were submitted to the Governor's Office from the directors of the executive agencies tasked with administering confinement facilities for youth—the Washington Department of Social and Health Services—and adults—the Department of Corrections. These two letters each contain lists of the confinement facilities under the operational control of those agencies.

Please advise our office if there are additional materials that we can provide you. Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Taylor K. Wonhoff".

Taylor K. Wonhoff  
Assistant Legal Counsel

**Certification Regarding Adoption and Full Compliance with  
the National Standards to Prevent, Detect, and Respond to Prison Rape  
2015**

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §15607(e)(2), I certify to the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ):

As the date of signature of this certification (in no case later than May 15, 2015), the State/jurisdiction named below has adopted, and is in full compliance with, the National Standards to Prevent, Detect, and Respond to Prison Rape, 28 C.F.R. Part 115.

If, after the date of signature of this certification, credible information should come to the attention of the undersigned (or his or her successor) that casts reasonable doubt on the accuracy of this certification as of the date of signature, the same shall conduct a reassessment and determine whether this certification was accurate as of the date of signature. If the certification is determined not to have been accurate, the undersigned or a designee will:

1. Within 15 days, notify DOJ via the email address below of the existence of the inaccuracy; and
2. Within 15 days of providing such notice,
  - a. Submit an Assurance signed by the Chief Executive (using the form provided by DOJ) indicating that the State/jurisdiction will expend not less than 5% of its covered DOJ grant funds for FY 2015 to adopt, and achieve full compliance with, the National Prison Rape Standards (28 C.F.R Part 115), so as to ensure that a certification may be submitted in future years; or
  - b. Agree to return 5% of its covered DOJ grant funds for FY 2015 as calculated by DOJ.

  
Signature of Chief Executive

Washington  
Name of State/jurisdiction

Jay Inslee  
Printed name of Chief Executive

5/15/15  
Date

**This form must be received by the Department of Justice, PREA Management Office, by May 15, 2015. A signed, electronic version of this form may be sent to: [PREACompliance@usdoj.gov](mailto:PREACompliance@usdoj.gov).**

*A false statement in this certification or in the grant application that it supports may be subject to criminal prosecution, including under 18 U.S.C. § 1001 and 42 U.S.C. § 3795a. DOJ grants, including certifications provided in connection with such grants, are subject to review by the DOJ component that issued the grant and/or by the DOJ Office of the Inspector General.*

## **PENATLY GRANT FUNDS**

As a penalty for not being certified compliant with PREA standards, specific grants lost 5% of their funding. The three grants impacted by this penalty are: The Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Grant Program (JAG); Services, Training, Officers and Prosecutors (STOP) Violence Against Women Formula Grant; and, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency's Prevention Act's Title II Formula Grants. These funds were reallocated to new initiatives designed to work towards compliance.

The decision made by the Governor's Office and Department of Commerce was to allocate funding from the JAG and STOP grants for DOC use and the Juvenile Justice funding for JJRA use to support PREA compliance. WADOC decided to use the JAG funding for a PREA Compliance Specialist focused on supporting facilities that have yet to be audited and to develop a system for maintaining compliance in facilities who have already passed their audit. The STOP grant funds were used to enhance victim advocacy services in all prison facilities to include staff training and education for offenders. Information technology will also be used to collaborate with jails and juvenile facilities to develop/enhance their advocacy support systems.

## **PREA UNIT**

The PREA Unit is located at WADOC Headquarters and has a total of 5 staff members. The PREA Coordinator leads the unit, triages all agency PREA allegations, and oversees implementation across the agency. The Secretary Senior supports the PREA Coordinator and the unit by coordinating activities, ensuring each staff member has the materials needed to complete their work and tracks law enforcement notifications. The Office Assistant 3 transcribes the PREA hotline calls each day, sends out case assignments and follows up with facilities when more information is required.

In November of 2014, the unit added a Corrections Specialist 4 and a Research Analyst 3. The Corrections Specialist 4 oversees training related to PREA, works with facilities to support their efforts to become compliant with federal standards and assists with various agency wide projects in relation to implementing the standards. The Research Analyst 3 collects and analyzes agency wide data, assists facilities with data collection and presentation for audits, creates new ways to document data and information, identifies trends and assists in strategic planning.

## **PREA IMPLEMENTATION TEAM**

The PREA Implementation Team was designed to help the WADOC become and remain compliant with the federal PREA standards through ongoing, transparent and collaborative efforts. This multidisciplinary team is comprised of stakeholders from all disciplines across the agency. Its focus is to work towards the agency mission of improving public safety by reviewing the federal PREA standards and applying them in mindful, meaningful ways to implement a strategy of zero tolerance towards sexual misconduct.

Team members conduct onsite pre-audits of each facility to assess readiness for the federal audit and provide support in becoming compliant with federal standards. The team meets monthly to collaborate and problem solve, strategizing ways to ensure continued compliance and process improvement. Active members also contributed to the completion of this report.

The following staff served on the PREA Implementation Team during 2014:

<b>Team Member</b>	<b>Title</b>
Beth Schubach	PREA Coordinator & PREA Implementation Team Lead
Bart Alplanalp	Chief Psychologist
Joseph Michael Agloro	Corrections Specialist
Megan Allsen	Research Analyst
Karina Austin	Administrative Assistant
Jeff Bailey	Correctional Program Manager
Cathy Baker	Secretary Senior
Steven Baxter	Investigator
Jason Bennett	Correctional Program Manager
Kevin Bowen	Correctional Program Manager
Barbara Braid	Nursing Services Director
Felice Davis	Correctional Program Manager
Brenda DeShazer	Corrections Specialist
Debra Dobson	Administrative Assistant
Helen Donatacci	Corrections Specialist
Brad Dudley	Management Analyst
Jacqueline Fluaitt	Corrections Specialist
George Gilbert	Investigator
Anne Guzman	Administrative Assistant
Ronald Haynes	Associate Superintendent
Michelle Henderling	Corrections Specialist
Tracy Hixson	Corrections Specialist
Barbara Kopecky	Corrections Specialist
Roland Lanoue	Corrections Specialist
Miles Lawson	Corrections Specialist
Susan Leavell	FOSA Program Administrator
Thomas L'Heureux	Disciplinary Hearings Officer
Vicki Loete	Corrections Specialist
Kevin Milovac	Correctional Unit Supervisor
Lori Ramsdell-Gilkey	Law Enforcement Notification Program Manager
Lori Scamahorn	Corrections Specialist
Belinda Stewart	Correctional Program Administrator
Carrie Trogdon-Oster	Work Release Oversight Program Administrator
Courtney Watson	Corrections Specialist
Autumn Witten	Policy & Procedure Program Manager



P  
R  
E  
A  
  
T  
E  
A  
M

## AUDITS

Federal PREA standards mandate all agencies conduct audits in one-third of their facilities each year by Department of Justice (DOJ) trained and certified auditors. During 2014, WADOC had DOJ audits conducted in 4 prison and 4 work release facilities. Each facility received 100% compliance. Those facilities audited include:

Washington Corrections Center for Women	Madison Inn Work Release
Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women	Bishop Lewis Work Release
Cedar Creek Corrections Center	Helen B. Ratcliff Work Release
Stafford Creek Corrections Center	Reynolds Work Release

Audits assess operational compliance with standard requirements, and how well PREA prevention, reporting, response, and investigation strategies are engrained into the culture of each facility. This is only accomplished through the work and dedication of staff at all levels within the facility; each embracing the agency’s zero tolerance of sexual abuse and assault. It also recognizes that staff understand an offender’s right to be free from sexual misconduct as well as retaliation for reporting allegations or participating in related investigations.

The DOJ audit cycle runs from August to August, beginning with the anniversary of the date the standards went into effect. The audit schedule for the remaining facilities is:

**August 2014 – August 2015**

Airway Heights Corrections Center	Brownstone Work Release
Clallam Bay Corrections Center	Eleanor Chase Work Release
Olympic Corrections Center	Peninsula Work Release
Washington Corrections Center	Progress House Work Release
	Rap House / Lincoln Park Work Release

**August 2015 – August 2016**

Coyote Ridge Corrections Center	Ahtanum View Work Release
Larch Corrections Center	Bellingham Work Release
Monroe Correctional Complex	Longview Work Release
Washington State Penitentiary	Olympia Work Release
	Tri-Cities Work Release

Focused preparation for a DOJ audit begins at least 18 months in advance. Steps include:

- A comprehensive on-site pre-assessment to identify any deficiencies and begin the documentation gathering process;
- Focus groups with staff and offenders to ensure a thorough understanding of standard-related roles and procedures as well as the audit process itself;
- A thorough vulnerability assessment to identify any weaknesses or areas of risk in physical plant, staffing, and/or operational procedures;
- A pre-audit conducted by members of the PREA Implementation Team to evaluate compliance and consistency of documentation, conduct interviews of staff and offenders to gauge their understanding of PREA, and evaluate physical plant barrier and areas of risk.
- Submission of all documentation to the identified DOJ auditors followed by an on-site review of procedures and physical plant coupled with interviews of staff and offenders.
- Receipt of a comprehensive audit report from the DOJ auditor within 30 days of the completion of the on-site audit.

The PREA Implementation Team is in the process of developing systems to assess and monitor continued compliance with standards in the years between DOJ audits.

*During the audits at Peninsula, Progress House and RAP/Lincoln Work Releases, the auditors indicated that our residents felt safe at each facility.*

*– Jason Altig, Corrections Specialist*

## RESEARCH AND DATA

Data included in this report was collected from many sources. The Offender Management Network Information (OMNI) provided data on unfounded and unsubstantiated offender victims and offender suspects. Databases created and maintained by the HQ PREA Unit provided data on PREA cases, findings, substantiated offender victims, offender suspects, and staff suspects, as well as how allegations were reported, the number of days it took to close a case and law enforcement/prosecution notification. Each facility was provided with their data and wrote their facility report.

Our current database systems have some limitations that do not allow us to gather all data of interest. The OMNI database is designed to allow only one suspect per case so if an allegation involves two suspects, two separate PREA cases have to be created. In contrast, an allegation that involves two victims will only results in one PREA cases.

WADOC investigates all allegations of sexual abuse and/or assault even if the identity of the victim and/or suspect is unknown. The amount of data available regarding PREA in WADOC is growing and more avenues are being created to ensure that the most accurate up-to-date data is being shared. In 2015, the HQ PREA Unit will look at including more OMNI reports, incorporating more data fields in investigation reports and creating new ways to share data with stakeholders.



*PREA, like any one of the safety and security programs we manage, not only aligns with, but compliments sound security practices. Ensuring a safe and secure environment is essential to promoting positive offender change, and is a paramount duty of any correctional agency.*

*– Tomas Fithian, Security and Emergency Management Administrator*



## OFFENDER POPULATION OVERVIEW

The following is a snapshot of the offender population within WADOC as of 12/31/2014. This information is the basis against which demographic information from PREA investigations is compared.

<b>Offender Population Data as of 12/31/2014</b>	
Total Incarcerated Populations	18,035
Population Breakdown	
Offenders in Prison	16,697
Offenders in Work Release	686
Offenders in in-state rented beds	652
Gender	
Male	92.3%
Female	7.7%
Race	
White	71.7%
Black	18.3%
American Indian/Alaska Native	4.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.6%
Other	1.1%
Unknown	0.8%
Hispanic Origin	12.7%
Other Information	
Average Age	38
Average Length of Stay for Offenders Released in the past year	23.9 months
Offenders on Active Supervision in the Community	16,626

*Our legal system is complicated because we deal with diverse human situations. PREA awareness and reporting takes extra work, but I have seen first-hand positive outcomes from both our awareness and our PREA reporting system. Combatting injustice is rarely cheap or easy. – Vicky Neufeld, Supervisor, Bellingham Work Release*

## PREVENTION

### EDUCATION

The PREA Implementation Team continues work to enhance education for staff and offenders. PREA orientation is provided to offenders who enter WADOC and includes a video created in collaboration with Just Detention International with information specific to Washington State. This video has been distributed and utilized in all WADOC facilities. There is also includes a Spanish version for offenders with limited English proficiency. The English and Spanish videos are closed captioned for deaf or hard-of-hearing offenders. Interpreters are also available to answer questions.

There has been a push to provide more visual information for offenders and staff regarding access to the PREA hotline, victim advocacy and the reporting processes. In addition, PREA Implementation Team members have developed and shared various tools such as a jeopardy game and pocket guide

Staff, contractors and volunteers are required to complete annual online PREA training. In addition, specialized training was updated and provided to all staff who conduct PREA investigations.

In preparation for federal audits, many facilities have increased staff and offender education and initiated conversations about how PREA affects our work. Town hall meetings have been held with offenders and PREA has been the subject of place safety musters for staff.

WADOC has worked hard to increase knowledge and professionalism in relation to LGBTI offenders. PREA annual training starts the conversation for staff and works to increase understanding of the needs these offenders. A new training was created to include the proper way to conduct a pat search of transgender and intersex offenders and more training is being developed in order to continue to the conversation.



The agency has worked to create policies and procedures that meet federal standards with regard to LGBTI offenders in confinement settings. When an offender identifies as transgender or intersex, a multidisciplinary team consisting of management, medical/mental health, classification, programming/education and custody staff meet to review housing to ensure the safety and security of the offender and the facility. The LGBTI offender's opinion of their safety is taken into consideration before a final housing decision is made. Housing and program assignments are reassessed every six months to review the offender's adjustment with regard to housing, programming, social skills, interactions with other offenders, community support, etc.

Moving forward, WADOC is developing additional ways to adequately address the specific needs of LGBTI offenders. For example, PREA Risk Assessment information is being expanded and clarified to better identify and address the risks of these individuals while incarcerated. WADO has partnered with the Moss Group, a forerunner in PREA implementation, to develop training to enhance cultural awareness and help staff better communication with and understand the needs of LGBTI offenders. Addressing the needs of the LGBTI community within our facilities is a component of the overall strategic plans being developed to enhance sexual safety in our facilities.



## **VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS**

Vulnerability assessments are a systems approach to improving safety and security. This process defines, identifies and prioritizes vulnerability in facility structure and procedures related to an increase in risk of PREA incidents. When completing these assessments, facilities focus on four specific areas:

1. Defining areas within a facility where sexual assaults have occurred or where there is a higher risk that a sexual assault could occur.
2. Looking closely at high risk areas, blind spots, and potential weaknesses in processes/procedures.
3. Prioritizing vulnerabilities in order to ensure we mitigate or eliminate the most serious vulnerabilities.
4. Implementing strategies and measures to deal with the most serious issues through corrective action plans.

During the vulnerability assessments, stakeholders with an array of experience and expertise are encouraged to be engaged in the process. This allows different perspectives and ideas to form the final product. While these vulnerability assessments are geared toward PREA related incidents, they can help to identify areas where other incidents can happen such as fights, assaults and introduction of contraband.



## PREA RISK ASSESSMENT

Upon arrival to prison, each offender receives an initial PREA Risk Assessment (PRA). This assessment looks at different factors that may contribute to the potential for an individual to be a victim or predator. The assessment includes current and past crime(s), age, stature, behavior characteristics, past discipline and the offender's perception of his/her vulnerability. The PRA results are used to determine housing, job and program assignments. Each offender receives a new risk assessment when they are transferred or if there is a need (i.e., substantiated PREA allegation, certain infractions, and/or behavior changes). The table below details, by prison and work release facility, the number of offenders who score as a potential victim, potential predator or if there is no risk identified. For those identified as "not screened" or "in-work," the assigned counselor was contacted for follow-up to ensure completion of the assessment. Typically, a counselor simply forgot to close out the assessment or completed the wrong category of assessment.

*I have worked in a few spots here at WCCW. PREA and the ability to make offenders feel comfortable in coming forward may add paperwork but I feel it provides for a safer environment. The women that have a genuine complaint feel that they have a means to turn to someone to be able to speak. This makes for a safer environment for staff and offenders. – Andrea Baccetti, Grievance Coordinator*

**PREA Risk Assessment Outcomes by Facility**

<b>Prison Facility</b>	<b>Population as of 12/31/2014</b>	<b>Potential Victim</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>	<b>Potential Predator</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>	<b>No Risk Identified</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>	<b>Not Screened or In-Work</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
AHCC	2181	399	18.29	59	2.71	1719	78.82	4	0.18
CBCC	897	69	7.69	43	4.79	784	87.40	1	0.11
CCCC	473	14	2.96	3	0.63	455	96.19	1	0.21
CRCC	2022	298	14.74	73	3.61	1646	81.40	5	0.25
LCC	465	4	0.86	2	0.43	458	98.49	1	0.22
MCC	2435	489	20.08	112	4.60	1825	74.95	9	0.37
MCCCW	319	5	1.57	1	0.31	313	98.12	0	n/a
OCC	394	10	2.54	2	0.51	382	96.95	0	n/a
SCCC	1940	220	11.34	54	2.78	1664	85.77	2	0.10
WCC	1605	171	10.65	45	2.80	1387	86.42	2	0.12
WCCW	847	33	3.90	9	1.06	803	94.81	2	0.24
WSP	2594	248	9.56	124	4.78	2216	85.43	6	0.23
<b>Total</b>	<b>16172</b>	<b>1960</b>	<b>12.12</b>	<b>527</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>13652</b>	<b>84.42</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0.20</b>
<b>Work Release</b>	<b>Population as of 12/31/2014</b>	<b>Potential Victim</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>	<b>Potential Predator</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>	<b>No Risk Identified</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>	<b>Not Screened or In-Work</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
Ahtanum View	57	1	1.75	0	n/a	56	98.25	0	n/a
Bellingham	22	1	4.55	0	n/a	21	95.45	0	n/a
Bishop Lewis	55	1	1.82	0	n/a	53	96.36	1	1.82
Brownstone	58	1	1.72	0	n/a	57	98.28	0	n/a
Clark County	24	0	n/a	0	n/a	24	100.00	0	n/a
Eleanor Chase	30	0	n/a	0	n/a	30	100.00	0	n/a
Lincoln Park	26	4	15.38	0	n/a	22	84.62	0	n/a
Longview	54	2	3.70	0	n/a	52	96.30	0	n/a
Madison Inn	22	0	n/a	0	n/a	22	100.00	0	n/a
Olympia	23	2	8.70	0	n/a	21	91.30	0	n/a
Peninsula	55	1	1.82	0	n/a	54	98.18	0	n/a
Progress House	68	1	1.47	0	n/a	67	98.53	0	n/a
Rap House	18	2	11.11	0	n/a	16	88.89	0	n/a
Helen B. Ratcliff	38	1	2.63	0	n/a	37	97.37	0	n/a
Reynolds	85	2	2.35	1	1.18	82	96.47	0	n/a
Snohomish	4	1	n/a	0	n/a	3	75.00	0	n/a
Tri-Cities	30	1	3.33	0	n/a	29	96.67	0	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>669</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>646</b>	<b>96.56</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.15</b>

## DETECTION

The agency has developed a PREA reporting process for staff and offenders to make sure all allegations of sexual misconduct are reported.

### STAFF REPORTING

When a staff member receives information about an allegation or incident of sexual misconduct, they are required to immediately and directly report the information. Staff who work in a prison notify the Shift Commander and work release staff notify the Work Release/Residential Program Administrator or Duty Officer. All other staff are required to notify their Appointing Authority. Staff may report allegations of a highly sensitive nature (e.g., allegations against the shift commander or in which the person may have a conflict of interest) directly to the Appointing Authority or Duty Officer. Allegations made against the Appointing Authority are reported to the next higher authority. Failure to report suspected sexual misconduct may result in disciplinary action.

### OFFENDER REPORTING

Offenders are provided with multiple venues through which they can report an allegation of sexual misconduct. These include:

- Verbal reports, kites and written statements to staff
- Confidential PREA hotline
- Grievances
- Legal mail addressed to the State Attorney General, the Office of the Governor, law enforcement, and/or the WADOC PREA Coordinator
- Third party reports through family, friends or community members
- Confidential reporting to the Colorado Department of Correction



This table demonstrates the different reporting methods used to report PREA allegations by offenders in 2013 and 2014. Verbal reporting accounted for 59.66% of the total allegations received. The confidential PREA Hotline accounted for 11.91% of total allegations received. Forty-seven of all allegations reported were done so anonymously. Only the first reporting method is documented; however, allegations may be reported multiple times.

<b>Allegation Reporting Methods 2014</b>		
<b>Reporting Method</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
Verbal	374	636
Hotline	97	127
Grievance	51	86
Kite	50	84
Written	42	56
Discovery	41	42
Phone	10	12
Unknown	9	11
Confidential Information	11	7
Other	9	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>1066</b>



*I believe PREA has made staff and offenders more cognizant of PREA related issues and the importance that our agency has put on removing all PREA related issues from our institutions. I believe it make the offender population feel safer in general, knowing that everyone is watching out for PREA related issues and incidents, and that each incident can be reported and will be investigated.*  
 – Shawn Burns, Classification Counselor 3

This table shows the number of verbal reports received by position of the staff member receiving the allegation. Mental Health and Classification Counselors account for 38.52% of all verbal reports. This is likely due to the fact that these staff are responsible for affirmatively asking offenders about PREA related issues as a part of the intake information collection in relation to mental health treatment and/or completion of the risk assessments.

<b>Breakdown of Verbal Reports</b>		
<b>Staff Type</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
Mental Health Staff	85	127
Classification Counselor	53	118
Correctional Officer	52	82
Sergeant	37	78
Correctional Unit Supervisor	26	42
Lieutenant	16	34
Medical Staff	9	26
Unknown	18	23
Contract Staff	23	21
CCO	11	19
Other	11	18
Jail Staff	0	7
Sex Offender Treatment Specialist	9	7
Hearing Officer	3	6
Corrections Specialist	0	5
I & I Staff	9	9
Appointing Authority	0	3
CCS	3	3
A/C Cook	0	2
Correctional Program Manager	0	2
Intake Staff	0	2
Program Administrator	0	2
Facility Risk Management Team	5	0
Correctional Industries	4	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>636</b>



The following table details the reporter in all substantiated cases. In 67.53% of substantiated cases, the victim is most likely to be the reporter. An offender (other than the victim) has been the reporter in 10.38% of substantiated cases. There was one unknown reporter who may have reported by anonymous kite or letter

<b>Reporter in Substantiated Cases</b>	
	<i>f</i>
Victim	52
Another Offender	8
Correctional Officer	6
End of Sentence Review Board	3
Other Staff	3
Other	2
Confidential Informant	2
Unknown	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>77</b>

## **OUTSIDE WADOC REPORTING**

The Washington Department of Corrections responds to all allegations of sexual misconduct that allegedly occurred within a WADOC facility but were reported to another jurisdiction. Allegations are reviewed and those determined to fall within the scope of PREA are investigated by trained staff.

Reports are also received about sexual misconduct occurring in other jurisdictions, which are then promptly forwarded to the administrator of the applicable facility. While WADOC does not investigate allegations that occurred in another jurisdiction, there is an attempt to capture the information in the offender’s risk assessment to ensure the risk for potential victimization or predation is correctly assessed. This works to increase the safety and security of offenders, staff and facilities.

In order to become compliant with PREA standards requiring an avenue for offenders to report to a public or private entity or office that is not part of the agency, WADOC collaborating with Colorado Department of Corrections. Offenders are able to report via a Report of Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Allegation form which is available in areas accessible to all offenders. An offender can choose to remain anonymous by not identifying him/herself on the form before placing it in an envelope and dropping it in the grievance box. Grievance staff forward the form to the mailroom. When the form is received by the Colorado DOC, they immediately forward it to the WADOC PREA Coordinator.

Only three offenders utilized the Colorado DOC reporting process where the allegation generated a PREA investigation. Five other offenders used Colorado as a reporting venue but the allegations were either determined to not be PREA or appended to an existing case.

These tables document the type of reporting avenues used for reporting outside of WADOC. A majority of allegations are received from jail entities with information predominantly relayed verbally to staff within those agencies.

<b>Outside Reporting Sources</b>	
	<i>f</i>
Jail	14
Community	6
Other	5
Police Department	2
JJRA	2
Colorado DOC	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>

<b>Outside Reporting Received</b>	
	<i>f</i>
Verbal	20
Hotline	7
Written	4
Unknown	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>

## REPORTING PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS

With an understanding of possible communication barriers for offenders, WADOC has developed ways to make reporting PREA allegations more accessible. Offenders who have limited English proficiency are able to call the confidential PREA hotline and leave a message in any language. A language line service as well as certified agency interpreters are used to assist in the translation of these messages. Access to the phone line was also expanded to include TTY service to ensure equal access by deaf and hard of hearing offenders. Additionally, a variety of educational material and presentation systems have been implemented to include the ability to use a language line for orientation and a specially designed brochures for offenders with low comprehension levels. WADOC is also exploring the use of cassette recorders for illiterate offenders to report PREA allegations and for use in corresponding with the agency PREA Coordinator.



## **RESPONSE**

WADOC responds to all allegations of sexual misconduct in order to ensure proper support, services and protection are provided to named victims, applicable evidence is collected and maintained, suspects are separated from named victims, and applicable authorities are notified. This maximizes the effectiveness and integrity of the investigation while supporting the overall mission and vision of the agency to improve public safety by working together for safe communities. Any allegation that appears to be criminal in nature is referred to local Law Enforcement for possible criminal investigation and prosecution.

After the initial allegation is received by the facility, the following actions take place:

- Emergency medical and mental health treatment are provided;
- Evidence is collected in accordance with established procedures and protocols;
- Immediate steps are taken to ensure the protection of reporters and alleged victims;
- Priority notification is made to initial response providers as applicable (e.g., appointing authorities, law enforcement, child or adult protective services, etc.)
- Housing assignments are reviewed to provide separation between named victim and suspect;
- Confidentiality is maintained by providing information only as needed to individuals for security and management decisions; and,
- Follow up medical treatment and mental health services are arranged as needed.

The agency has developed a PREA triage process that is overseen by the agency PREA Coordinator and allows for each allegation received to be consistently evaluated in accordance with established PREA policies. Any information determined not to fall within the definition of PREA is returned to the Appointing Authority for local action as needed.

When an allegation is determined to be PREA, an investigation is initiated and sent to the applicable Appointing Authority. As necessary, the HQ PREA Unit follows up with the facility to ensure required notifications are completed and documented.

## **INVESTIGATIONS**

The appropriate Appointing Authority oversees the investigation which is assigned to a neutral, trained staff member to serve as the investigator. The PREA investigator then:

- Collects facts and records observations by interviewing employees, offenders, contractors, volunteers or any other individual who may have knowledge of the allegation;

- Reviews evidence and collects any new evidence;
- Ensures mental health services are available to any offender participating in an investigation who has experienced trauma of a sexual nature, whether in an institutional setting or in the community; and
- Collaborates with the Appointing Authority to ensure all allegations are investigated and addressed in the final report.

Throughout the investigation process, designated staff monitor reporters and alleged victims for possible retaliation from staff and/or other offenders. Any individual who cooperates with an investigation (e.g., witnesses) is instructed to report concerns regarding retaliation to the Appointing Authority. The Appointing Authority is responsible for taking appropriate measures to address all related concerns.

After the investigation is completed, the Appointing Authority determines whether the allegation is substantiated, unsubstantiated or unfounded. All substantiated or unsubstantiated cases of offender-on-offender sexual assault/abuse and staff sexual misconduct are reviewed by a local multidisciplinary team consisting of facility management, supervisors, investigators and medical/mental health practitioners. This group reviews cases for policy compliance, causal factors and systemic issues. Cases that are administratively closed (admin. closure) are those that are not under WADOC jurisdiction, duplicate cases, cases opened in error or determined to not be PREA after further investigation.

This table illustrates the total amount of internal administrative investigations from 2005 - 2014. Although the number of investigations conducted continues to climb, the increase is attributed to a better understanding of PREA through enhanced training and education, more effective reporting and tracking processes, heightened offender confidence in the investigation process, and expanded support services for victims.

<b>Investigations</b>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Admin. Closure</b>
2005	88	8
2006	103	10
2007	108	4
2008	235	16
2009	537	48
2010	800	87
2011	639	87
2012	646	109
2013	796	105
2014	1077	184

When this data was pulled, 28 PREA cases were still open from 2014. Of those that were closed, 55% were unfounded, 17.36% were unsubstantiated and 7.33% were substantiated. One hundred eighty seven were administratively closed. Of those administratively closed, 155 occurred outside of WADOC jurisdiction, 11 were duplicate cases, 11 were opened in error, and seven were determined to be not PREA after further investigation.

<b>Investigation Findings</b>	
	<i>f</i>
Unfounded	599
Unsubstantiated	187
Administratively Closed	184
Substantiated	79
Currently Open	28
<b>Total</b>	<b>1077</b>

There were a total of 893 investigations in 2014. Of those, 30.79% were offender-on-offender sexual assault, 25.41% were offender-on-offender sexual harassment and 9.18% were offender-on-offender sexual abuse. Offender-on-offender cases account for 65.39% of all investigations. Staff-on-offender sexual misconduct cases were 24.18% of all investigations, 10.07% were staff-on-offender sexual harassment and .33% were staff-on-offender other misconduct. This shows that staff-on-offender cases account for 34.60% of all investigations.

<b>Allegation Type</b>	
	<i>f</i>
Offender on Offender Sexual Assault	275
Offender on Offender Sexual Harassment	227
Staff on Offender Sexual Misconduct	216
Staff on Offender Sexual Harassment	90
Offender on Offender Sexual Abuse	82
Staff on Offender Other Misconduct	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>893</b>

It is WADOC's goal that PREA investigations be completed promptly. However, many investigations are complex and there are times in which an extension is needed in order to produce a thorough report. Of the total number of closed cases, not including those closed administratively, 31.63% were completed within 0-30 days, 35.11% were completed within 31-60 days, 18.30% were completed within 61-90 days and 14.94% took 91 or more days to complete.

<b>Days to Complete Investigations</b>				
<b>Days</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>%</b>
0-30	190	27.78	274	31.64
31-60	246	35.96	304	35.10
61-90	119	17.40	158	18.24
91+	129	18.86	130	15.01
<b>Total</b>	<b>684</b>		<b>866</b>	

*Not only has PREA made our Work Release facilities safer environments for offenders, it has provided us with the opportunity to standardize many of our Work Release systems across the state.*

*– David Gilkey, Work Release/Residential Program Administrator*

A thorough analysis of PREA investigatory types and findings allows WADOC to analyze trends and systemic issues on both an agency and local level. Below, PREA investigations have been separated by type and facility/division as well as an overview of all types of cases and findings. Aggravated sexual assault cases are included in sexual assault as the difference is only included to assist staff in determining the correct response to each allegation. Correctional Industries and Medical would not have any offender-on-offender cases as they always go back to the facility where the incident occurred instead of being assigned to a division.

<b>PREA Case Findings by Facility/Division</b>					
	<b>Substantiated</b>	<b>Unsubstantiated</b>	<b>Unfounded</b>	<b>Open</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Chemical Dependency</b>	8	4	7	0	<b>19</b>
<b>Community Corrections</b>	0	2	8	1	<b>11</b>
<b>Correctional Industries</b>	0	3	0	0	<b>3</b>
<b>Medical</b>	2	2	13	0	<b>17</b>
<b>Offender Change</b>	0	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
<b>Work Releases</b>	2	13	7	0	<b>22</b>
<b>AHCC</b>	12	28	41	8	<b>89</b>
<b>CBCC</b>	9	1	37	0	<b>47</b>
<b>CCCC</b>	1	1	3	0	<b>5</b>
<b>CRCC</b>	0	25	47	1	<b>73</b>
<b>LCC</b>	0	5	3	1	<b>9</b>
<b>MCC</b>	16	37	127	1	<b>181</b>
<b>MCCCW</b>	3	2	11	1	<b>17</b>
<b>OCC</b>	3	4	13	1	<b>21</b>
<b>SCCC</b>	6	1	71	0	<b>78</b>
<b>WCC</b>	2	2	75	3	<b>82</b>
<b>WCCW</b>	7	14	65	1	<b>87</b>
<b>WSP</b>	8	45	57	3	<b>113</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>586</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>875</b>

<b>Substantiated PREA Case Findings by Allegation Type and Facility/Division</b>						
	<b>ISH</b>	<b>IASC</b>	<b>ISA</b>	<b>SSH</b>	<b>SSM</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Chemical Dependency</b>	2	2	0	0	4	<b>8</b>
<b>Community Corrections</b>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Correctional Industries</b>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Medical</b>	0	0	0	1	1	<b>2</b>
<b>Offender Change</b>	0	0	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
<b>Work Releases</b>	1	0	0	0	1	<b>2</b>
<b>AHCC</b>	10	2	0	0	0	<b>12</b>
<b>CBCC</b>	4	0	5	0	0	<b>9</b>
<b>CCCC</b>	0	0	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>CRCC</b>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>LCC</b>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>MCC</b>	11	2	1	0	1	<b>15</b>
<b>MCCCW</b>	0	2	0	0	1	<b>3</b>
<b>OCC</b>	3	0	0	0	0	<b>3</b>
<b>SCCC</b>	2	0	0	0	3	<b>5</b>
<b>WCC</b>	2	0	0	0	1	<b>3</b>
<b>WCCW</b>	3	1	1	0	2	<b>7</b>
<b>WSP</b>	3	0	3	1	1	<b>8</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>79</b>

<b>Unsubstantiated PREA Case Findings by Allegation Type and Facility/Division</b>						
	<b>ISH</b>	<b>IASC</b>	<b>ISA</b>	<b>SSH</b>	<b>SSM</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Chemical Dependency</b>	3	0	0	0	1	<b>4</b>
<b>Community Corrections</b>	0	0	0	0	2	<b>2</b>
<b>Correctional Industries</b>	0	0	0	0	3	<b>3</b>
<b>Medical</b>	0	0	0	1	1	<b>2</b>
<b>Offender Change</b>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Work Releases</b>	1	3	3	2	4	<b>13</b>
<b>AHCC</b>	14	5	6	3	0	<b>28</b>
<b>CBCC</b>	0	0	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>CCCC</b>	0	1	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>CRCC</b>	10	4	11	0	0	<b>25</b>
<b>LCC</b>	1	0	3	0	1	<b>5</b>
<b>MCC</b>	15	7	10	0	5	<b>37</b>
<b>MCCCW</b>	0	0	0	0	2	<b>2</b>
<b>OCC</b>	1	0	1	0	2	<b>4</b>
<b>SCCC</b>	0	0	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>WCC</b>	0	0	1	0	1	<b>2</b>
<b>WCCW</b>	7	2	3	0	2	<b>14</b>
<b>WSP</b>	10	2	24	7	2	<b>45</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>189</b>

Unfounded PREA Case Findings by Allegation Type and Facility/Division						
	ISH	IASC	ISA	SSH	SSM	Total
<b>Chemical Dependency</b>	0	0	0	0	7	<b>7</b>
<b>Community Corrections</b>	0	0	0	1	7	<b>8</b>
<b>Correctional Industries</b>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Medical</b>	0	0	0	2	10	<b>12</b>
<b>Offender Change</b>	0	0	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
<b>Work Releases</b>	2	0	0	1	4	<b>7</b>
<b>AHCC</b>	11	4	14	0	12	<b>41</b>
<b>CBCC</b>	9	2	17	4	5	<b>37</b>
<b>CCCC</b>	1	0	1	0	1	<b>3</b>
<b>CRCC</b>	8	6	16	12	5	<b>47</b>
<b>LCC</b>	1	0	0	0	2	<b>3</b>
<b>MCC</b>	32	8	48	8	31	<b>127</b>
<b>MCCCW</b>	3	1	1	0	6	<b>11</b>
<b>OCC</b>	4	2	4	1	2	<b>13</b>
<b>SCCC</b>	14	3	24	12	19	<b>72</b>
<b>WCC</b>	7	9	32	9	18	<b>75</b>
<b>WCCW</b>	26	9	9	4	17	<b>65</b>
<b>WSP</b>	3	4	20	16	14	<b>57</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>586</b>



## DEMOGRAPHIC DATA: SUBSTANTIATED CASES

Of cases that have closed, there were 63 offender on offender substantiated PREA investigations and 16 staff on offender substantiated PREA investigations completed in 2014. Data below shows demographic information for substantiated cases. Staff and offender suspects are displayed separately.

The data shows that females are more likely to be a suspect in a substantiated case after age 34 with 80% of females being older than 34 compared to males who have 50.94% of suspect offenders in substantiated cases under the age of 34. Female



offender suspects account for 15.87% of suspects in substantiated cases. White offenders account for 69.84% of suspects in substantiated cases. This compares to the overall prison population data where white offenders are 71.7% of the population.

Substantiated Offender Suspect Age			
Age Group	Male	Female	Total
18 – 24	12	0	12
25 – 29	5	2	7
30 – 34	10	0	10
35 – 39	4	1	5
40 – 44	3	3	6
45 – 54	13	4	17
55+	6	0	6
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>63</b>

Substantiated Offender Suspect Gender	
Gender	f
Female	10
Male	53
<b>Total</b>	<b>63</b>

Substantiated Offender Suspect Race			
Race	Male	Female	Total
White	36	8	44
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	2	4
Asian	1	0	1
Black	13	0	13
Other	1	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>63</b>

*I firmly believe that speaking with all the offenders regularly about the PREA policy and expectations gives many offenders confidence that they can come forward and trust DOC to handle any issues that come up in a caring and professional manner – and these meetings may actually prevent some offenders from acting out inappropriately when they see how committed we are to eliminating that behavior.*  
 – Harold Archibald, Classification Counselor 3

This data demonstrates that male staff over 44 are more likely to be a suspect in a substantiated staff PREA cases while female staff suspects in substantiated cases represent all age groups except 18-24. However, more female staff suspects in substantiated cases (70%) are 40 or older. Female staff account for 62.50% of all staff suspects in substantiated PREA cases. Eighty percent of female staff suspects in substantiated cases are White while Hispanic/Latino male staff suspects in substantiated cases are the most represented at 33.33%. Of those staff who were suspects in substantiated PREA incidents, 68.75% were employed at the facility for less than a year.

<b>Substantiated Staff Suspect Age</b>			
<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
18 – 24	0	0	0
25 – 29	0	1	1
30 – 34	0	1	1
35 – 39	0	1	1
40 – 44	0	3	3
45 – 54	3	2	5
55+	1	2	3
Unknown	2	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>

<b>Substantiated Staff Suspect Gender</b>	
	<b>f</b>
Female	10
Male	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>

<b>Substantiated Staff Suspect Race</b>			
<b>Race</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
White	1	8	9
Hispanic/Latino	2	0	2
Asian	0	1	1
Black	1	1	2
Unknown	2	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>

<b>Staff Time at Facility</b>	
	<b>f</b>
Less than 6 months	6
6 months to less than 1 year	5
1 year to less than 5 years	2
5 years to less than 10 years	1
More than 10 years	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>

<b>Substantiated Staff Positions</b>		
<b>Position</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
A/C cook	1	1
Certified Nursing Assistant	1	0
Correctional Unit Supervisor	0	1
Chaplain	0	0
Classification Counselor	0	0
Community Corrections Officer	0	0
Community Corrections Supervisor	0	0
Contact Staff	9	5
Correctional Industries	2	0
Correctional Officer	14	3
Corrections Specialist	0	0
Food Services Manager	0	1
Health Services Manager	0	0
Hearing Officer	0	0
Intern	0	0
IT Specialist	0	0
Lieutenant	0	0
Librarian	0	0
Licensed Practical Nurse	1	0
Maintenance	0	0
Mental Health	1	0

<b>Substantiated Staff Positions</b>		
Nurse	0	0
Office Assistant/Clerical	1	1
Other (YOP, ISRB, city police)	0	0
Physician	0	0
Physician Assistant	0	0
Program Specialist	0	0
Psychologist/Associate	0	0
Recreation	0	0
Sergeant	0	1
Sex Offender Treatment Counselor	1	0
Unknown	0	0
Volunteer	0	2
Warehouse	2	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>16</b>

The data presented for victims of substantiated investigations include both offender-on-offender and staff-on-offender cases. Data shows that victims are distributed across all age categories. White offenders of all genders are more likely to be victims of PREA with 71.42% of all substantiated PREA case victims being white. Black offenders account for 12.50% of victims in substantiated PREA cases and make up 18.1% of the prison population. Five male victims' ages and race were unknown and two female victims' race were unknown. A victim's age or race may be unknown in a substantiated PREA case because there was other evidence that supported the allegation without identifying the victims (e.g., self-admission by the suspect or statement(s) made to a large group of offenders but none identified as the victim).

<b>Substantiated Victim Age</b>				
<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Transgender</b>	<b>Total</b>
18-24	12	4	0	<b>16</b>
25-29	10	5	0	<b>15</b>
30-34	11	2	0	<b>13</b>
35-39	6	1	0	<b>7</b>
40-44	11	4	0	<b>15</b>
45-54	12	2	1	<b>15</b>
55+	5	0	0	<b>5</b>
Unknown	5	0	0	<b>5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>91</b>

<b>Substantiated Victim Gender</b>	
<b>Gender</b>	<b>f</b>
Female	18
Male	72
Transgender	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>91</b>

<b>Substantiated Victim Race</b>				
<b>Race</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Transgender</b>	<b>Total</b>
White	52	12	1	<b>65</b>
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	2	0	<b>4</b>
Chicano/Spanish	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
Hispanic	3	1	0	<b>4</b>
Asian	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
Black	9	0	0	<b>9</b>
Unknown	5	2	0	<b>7</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>91</b>

### **OTHER DATA: SUBSTANTIATED CASES**

For each substantiated case, the Department of Justice (DOJ) requires a Survey of Sexual Victimization to be completed. This survey looks at many different variables related to the allegation and investigation. The data from these surveys are then sent to the DOJ in a summary report. The following is data from the survey is that which is not already included in other sections of this report and looks at whether or not video monitoring was available in the location where the incident occurred. In 37.5% of the cases, there was video monitoring. There was no video monitoring in 50% of the cases. Those cases that were both yes and no are due to multiple locations identified and at least one location had video monitoring and at least one did not.

<b>Substantiated Case Location Subject to Video Monitoring</b>	
Yes	30
No	40
Both	3
Unknown	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>

The next table looks at the time of day in which a substantiated incident occurred. This data is unknown in 46 of the cases as specific information is often not available and relies on those involved in the incident to recall a time in which the incident occurred. An incident may have happened at more than one time. Moving forward, there will be added attention focused on getting this sort of specific data in relation to PREA allegations by focusing on data collection during the investigation rather at the conclusion.

<b>Time of Day Substantiated Cases Occurred</b>	
Morning	13
Afternoon	19
Evening	6
Overnight	0
Unknown	46
<b>Total</b>	<b>84</b>

The number of substantiated PREA cases that involved physical injury is noted in the following table. Four cases (or 5% of substantiated cases) involved some sort of physical injury to the victim.

<b>Injury Sustained by Victim in Substantiated Cases</b>	
Yes	4
No	75
Unknown	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>

The survey also tracks what services were provided to the victim after the allegation was reported. In 31 of the cases, it was reported that the victim was not provided any services. This will be addressed in 2015 to ensure data is being collected accurately and that victims are offered services after they report an allegation. A victim may have been provided more than one service.

<b>Services Provided to Victim(s) After Allegation was Reported in Substantiated Cases</b>	
Mental Health Treatment	44
Medical Exam	8
None	31
Offered but Declined Treatment	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>85</b>

The Survey of Sexual Victimization also looks at the movement of the victim or separation from the suspect after an allegation is made. A victim may meet more than one of the categories. Twenty-nine of the victims were separated from the alleged perpetrator while 27 remained in the same housing assignment. In 2015, there will be more of a focus on how offender victims are housed after reporting an allegation.

<b>Movement of Victim/Separation from Suspect After Allegation was Reported in Substantiated Cases</b>	
Transferred to Another Facility	5
Separated from Perpetrator	29
None, remained in same housing	27
Other	4
No Victim Identified	4
Staff member resigned or no longer employed at facility	2
Confined to Own Cell	2
Placed in Segregation for Other Reason	4
Placed in COU	3
Change in Work Assignment	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>83</b>

Another piece of data identified in the survey is the type of pressure or physical force that was used by the perpetrator in substantiated offender-on-offender cases. In 69.23% of cases, sexual harassment was used by the perpetrator. The perpetrator physically threatened or harmed the victim in 12.3% of the cases.

<b>Type of Pressure or Physical Force Used by Perpetrator in Substantiated Cases</b>	
Sexual Harassment	45
None	5
Physically Threatened or Harmed	8
Surprised the Victim with Unwanted Touching, Grabbing, or Groping	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>

The following data shows the nature of substantiated incidents for offender and staff suspect cases. For offender suspect cases, sexual harassment has the highest number of incidents. In staff suspect cases, both sexual relationships and/or exchanging letters, showing pictures, or offering gifts/special privileges had the highest number of incidents.

<b>Nature of Incidents for Substantiated Offender Suspect Cases</b>	
	<b><i>f</i></b>
Attempted Sexual Assault	1
Indecent Exposure	1
Unwanted Touching	9
Sexual Harassment	45
Physical force or threat of resulting in nonconsensual sexual act	5
Pressure or coercion resulting in nonconsensual sexual act	1
Threats of Sexual Assault	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>

Nature of Incidents for Substantiated Staff Suspect Cases	
	<i>f</i>
Sexual Relationship	6
Unwanted Touching	1
Wrote Letters, Showed Pictures, or Offered Gifts/Special Privileges	6
Met Off-Site	1
Sexual Harassment	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>



#### DEMOGRAPHIC DATA: UNSUBSTANTIATED/UNFOUNDED CASES

Currently, data is not available regarding staff suspects in PREA investigations that are determined to be unfounded or unsubstantiated. In an effort to expand available data, the gender of the accused staff will be collected beginning in 2015.

Available data demonstrates that all ages are represented as a suspect in a PREA case that is found to be unsubstantiated/unfounded. The highest age group for females is 25 – 29 representing 32.78% of female PREA suspects and the highest age group for males as 45 – 54 with 20.69% of male PREA suspects. White offenders represent 67.32% of all suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases and black offenders represent 24.25% of all suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases. White offenders represent 71.7% of the total prison population and black offenders represent 18.1% of the total prison population.

Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Offender Suspect Age		
Age Group	Male	Female
18 – 24	39	8
25 – 29	48	20
30 – 34	60	5
35 – 39	41	7
40 – 44	36	8
45 – 54	71	11
55+	48	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>61</b>

Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Offender Suspect Gender	
	<i>f</i>
Female	61
Male	343
<b>Total</b>	<b>404</b>

Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Offender Suspect Race		
Race	Male	Female
White	234	38
Black	86	12
North American Indian	12	7
Asian	6	0
Unknown	3	0
Other	2	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>61</b>

Victims in unsubstantiated or unfounded investigations represent all age groups for both males and females. Females account for 14.16% of victims in unsubstantiated or unfounded investigations. North American Indian offenders account for 4.20% of victims in unsubstantiated or unfounded investigations while White offenders represent 77.55% of such victims.

Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Victim Age		
Age Group	Male	Female
18 – 24	93	14
25 – 29	99	14
30 – 34	97	15
35 – 39	119	17
40 – 44	56	14
45 – 54	110	21
55+	38	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>612</b>	<b>101</b>

Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Victim Gender	
	<i>f</i>
Female	101
Male	612
<b>Total</b>	<b>713</b>

Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Victim Race		
Race	Male	Female
White	485	68
Black	91	12
North American Indian	16	14
Unknown	9	0
Asian	8	4
Other	3	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>612</b>	<b>101</b>





During the formal incident review of all substantiated offender-on-offender sexual abuse/assault and staff-on-offender sexual misconduct investigations, the location of the incident is evaluated with regard to staffing plans, procedures and policy. The following table shows the types of locations identified in substantiated PREA investigations. One case may document multiple locations if there are multiple allegations or occurrences of the misconduct. Cell or dorm room have the highest frequency with 30 incidents with the second most common location being the dayroom with 12 incidents. This demonstrates that PREA incidents are more likely to happen in an offender's living area and may be due to the fact that offenders spend a majority of their time in these areas.

In 2015, more attention will be given to identifying vulnerable locations within institutions. A pilot project is scheduled to be implemented at the Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) where mapping software will be employed to look at all allegation types and findings related to PREA allegations as well as other violent incidents. This program will providing real time information and allow WSP to narrow information to specific units/locations within the facility.

*PREA has given the offenders a source of information and tools to help them protect themselves from staff and offenders. They can now safely go about their programing with the knowledge that they have the ability to report any and all misconduct by other offenders or staff. It gives us a guide line to follow to maintain a professional work environment.*

*– Sgt. Matthew Huckabone, Monroe Correctional Complex*

<b>Incident Locations</b>		
	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
Cell/Dorm	25	30
Dayroom	15	12
Community	11	6
Other	6	5
Walkway	3	5
Unknown	11	5
Kitchen	2	5
Yard	0	4
Work Area	5	4
Dining Hall	1	4
Bathroom	8	4
Program Area	7	3
Janitor Closet	0	3
Chapel	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>92</b>

## **INCIDENT REVIEW**

WADOC has implemented several levels of incident review in order to timely and effectively respond to identified issues. When an allegation is received, it is checked for issues related to confidentiality, reporting and physical plant. These issues are forwarded the facility for review/action and tracked by the PREA Coordinator. Below you will see a list of issues addressed in 2013 and 2014.

<b>Supplemental Issues</b>		
	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
Failure to report per policy	51	38
Breach of confidentiality	10	4
Report of retaliation	5	0
Physical plant issue	3	0
Failure to provide notification per policy	10	6
Failure to follow established procedure	2	5
Other misconduct reported	4	1
Issue with DOC PREA Hotline	19	3
Issue reported relative to staff training	5	0
Other systemic/supplemental issue	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>57</b>

<b>Local PREA Review Committees</b>		
<b>Facility/Division</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Number of Additional Actions Recommended</b>
AHCC	10	0
CBCC	8	6
CCCC	2	2
CRCC	28	0
LCC	3	0
MCC	77	36
MCCCW	6	5
OCC	7	5
SCCC	8	4
WCC	1	1
WCCW	15	0
WSP	57	14
Community Corrections	5	1
Health Services	5	3
(all) Work Release	18	3
Chemical Dependency	7	7
Correctional Industries	2	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>87</b>

The review of incidents, vulnerability assessments, and conversations regarding culture, are all factors in the analysis of sexual safety within our facilities and community corrections offices. We have a better understanding of who is at risk, and what processes and services can be implemented or expanded to decrease or eliminate that risk. This allows us to have a more comprehensive understanding of PREA within WADOC. It also helps inform agency strategic planning to continuously enhance education, prevention, response and investigation practices.

## **DISCIPLINE**

### Offenders

Washington Department of Corrections works to hold staff and offender perpetrators accountable. This is done by continuing to address procedural issues that are discovered regarding offender discipline while ensuring fair and impartial due process procedures are maintained. For example, it was discovered that some infractions were being dismissed if the actual investigation report was not attached to the infraction, which would be the practice with most other types of investigations. Due to the confidential nature and information restrictions associated with PREA investigations, a two-fold solution was implemented. Sample infractions reports were developed in association with training to help staff write appropriate infractions reports without disclosing victim information in the body of the infraction. There was also a system

created whereby the actual investigation report is made available for review only by the Disciplinary Hearing Officer in a secure location.

There are five infractions related to PREA investigations. The below table details the number of infractions written during this reporting period distributed by prison facility with the associated hearing outcome. Only facilities having written applicable infractions are indicated in each infraction table.

A 549 infraction is defined as “Providing false or misleading information during any stage of an investigation of sexual misconduct, as defined in DOC policy on Response to and Investigation of Sexual Misconduct.” The Monroe Correctional Complex (MCC), Washington Corrections Center for Women (WCCW) and the Washington Corrections Center (WCC) have not guilty findings on at least one of their 549 hearings. WSP had one reduced to a 554 which is “Damaging or destroying state property or any other item of value of which is ten dollars or more and that is not the personal property of the offender.” After additional review, it was discovered that the 549 infraction was incorrectly applied and the offender was found guilty of the appropriate infraction based on the incident (not PREA).

<b>549 Infraction by Facility</b>					
<b>Facility</b>	<b>Guilty</b>	<b>Not Guilty</b>	<b>Cleared</b>	<b>Reduced</b>	<b>Total</b>
AHCC	4	0	0	0	<b>4</b>
CCCC	1	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
CBCC	3	0	0	0	<b>3</b>
CRCC	2	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
LCC	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
MCCCW	2	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
MCC	11	1	0	0	<b>12</b>
OCC	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
SCCC	0	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
WCCW	5	2	0	0	<b>7</b>
WCC	1	1	0	0	<b>2</b>
WSP	7	0	0	1 (554)	<b>8</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1 (554)</b>	<b>42</b>

A 635 infraction is defined as “sexual assault on another offender.” There were no 635 infractions written in 2014 at any facility.

A 636 infraction is defined as “Attempted sexual assault of another offender.” Only CBCC issued this infraction with three of the violations being dismissed and one violation resulting in a guilty finding by the hearings officer.

A 637 infraction is defined as “Abusive sexual contact with another offender.” Three facilities issued offenders this infraction in 2014. MCC and WCCW each issued one that resulted in a guilty finding. AHCC issued a total of three infractions with two being reduced to a 355 (horseplay, roughhousing or any other unauthorized physical contact between inmates) and one reduced to a 659 (sexual harassment).

A 659 infraction is defined as “Sexual harassment.” This may include infractions that were written when an offender sexually harassed staff which would not fall under PREA. All prison facilities have issued at least one 659 infraction.

659 Infractions by Facility					
Facility	Guilty	Not Guilty	Cleared/ Dismissed	Reduced (to)	Total
AHCC	32	6	0	7 (202)	45
CCCC	5	3	0	1 (202)	9
CBCC	17	7	2	5 (202)	31
CRCC	29	0	5	10 (202) 3 (353) 1 (102) 1 (328)	49
LCC	3	1	0	2 (202)	6
MCCCW	2	0	0		2
MCC	72	5	6	4 (202) 1 (353) 1 (663)	89
OCC	8	0	0	1 (202)	9
SCCC	28	1	8	4 (202) 1 (353)	42
WCCW	11	1	0	0	12
WCC	34	7	2	1 (304) 1 (353)	45
WSP	48	13	0	4 (202) 4 (353) 3 (663) 1 (304)	74
<b>Total</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>38 (202)</b> <b>10 (353)</b> <b>4 (663)</b> <b>2 (304)</b> <b>1 (102)</b> <b>1 (328)</b>	<b>413</b>



Offenders who are suspects in substantiated PREA investigations are subject to appropriate discipline. The following is the sanction detail associated with all infractions resulting from these investigations. It should be noted that one substantiated investigation may result in more than one violation or charge and thus be associated with more than one sanction. Isolation/Segregation is the most common sanction applied as a result of these investigations occurring in 34.24% of all hearings. This table shows that 11 offenders received no infraction, 3 were found not guilty and 3 were dismissed resulting in 17 cases or 23.28% of substantiated cases where an offender received no sanctions. This issue is being addressed in collaboration with the Disciplinary Hearings Unit.

<b>Offender Sanctions for Substantiated Cases</b>	
	<b><i>f</i></b>
Isolation/Segregation	25
Confined to Cell	12
No Infraction Written	11
Loss of Privileges	7
Loss of Good Conduct Time	5
Warning	4
Dismissed	3
Not Guilty	3
Extra Work	1
Arrested	1
Transferred to Another Facility	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>

In 2015, the Disciplinary Sanctions policy (320.150) will be reviewed to ensure PREA infractions are handled correctly and that disciplinary hearing officers are able to confidentially review PREA investigations prior to the hearing. Continued consultation with the Attorney General’s Office is also a part of the strategic plan for the upcoming training year.

Staff

Staff discipline in substantiated cases, as well as identified procedural issues, is left to the discretion of the Appointing Authority. The HQ PREA Unit tracks the sanctions applied to substantiated staff perpetrators.

Staff who are suspects in a substantiated Sexual Misconduct or Sexual Harassment investigation are also subject to discipline. A staff member may receive more than one type of sanction. During 2014, staff members resigned or were terminated more than any disciplinary sanction imposed. As WADOC defines “staff” as all employees, contractors, volunteers and any other person providing services in department facilities, data detailed below includes information regarding all categories. Contractors whose

services were terminated or whose contract was not renewed are included in the “terminated” category.

<b>Staff Sanctions for Substantiated Cases</b>	
	<i>f</i>
Terminated	7
Resigned	6
Corrective Counseling	1
Referred to Prosecution	2
Arrested	1
Verbal Reprimand	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>

*Our staff have done great work to embed PREA standards into their daily work and culture.  
- Douglas Cole, Superintendent, Cedar Creek Corrections Center*

The following data reflects the number of PREA investigations referred to law enforcement officials and/or prosecutors for those cases that appeared to be criminal in nature and the results of those referrals.

<b>Law Enforcement Notification</b>		
Accepted	Denied	Total
3	30	34*

<b>Prosecution Referral</b>		
Accepted	Denied	Total
0	2	2

<b>Licensing Notification</b>
4 cases were reported to applicable licensing agencies

\* One allegation was referred to law enforcement but not tracked because the allegation was determined to have occurred at a jail.

Allegations that involved staff members who hold some sort of professional license may be reported to the applicable licensing body. Allegations that break policy or expectations of the licensure to include unethical behavior and inappropriate relationships are reported for review. WADOC is not generally informed of the outcome of these reports.

## **VICTIM ADVOCACY**

During 2014, the partnerships established between Community Sexual Assault Programs (CSAP) and WADOC facilities continued to be enhanced as staff from multiple agencies worked hand in hand to provide support services to incarcerated survivors of sexual assault/abuse. This partnership has resulted in a greater understanding of advocacy services to assist victims while increasing safety both in facilities and following the offender’s release into the community. Facilities have collaborated with partnered CSAP’s to better understand the dynamics of sexual victimization in incarcerated settings, strengthen protocols regarding forensic medical examinations, and streamline offender access to available services.

WADOC's partnership with the Office of Crime Victim Advocacy (OCVA) and the Washington Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs (WCSAP) has continued to reinforce and expand services available for offenders. On January 1, 2014, a toll-free telephone line was launched providing offender access to a victim services specialist. Calls are triaged and initial support services are provided to offenders who make use of this line. If additional support is indicated, the offender's call can be transferred to a designated, specially training victim advocate from the CSAP paired with the facility in which the offender is housed. The following details the use of this telephone line by offenders during 2014.

<b>OCVA Hotline Use by WADOC Offenders</b>			
<b>Month</b>	<b>Total Calls on Hotline</b>	<b># PREA Related</b>	<b>Percentage PREA Related</b>
January	1	1	100%
February	9	8	88.89%
March	15	9	60%
April	7	5	71.43%
May	8	6	75%
June	3	3	100%
July	9	7	77.78%
August	18	13	72.22%
September	20	18	90%
October	26	14	53.85%
November	17	11	64.71%
December	9	9	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>73.24%</b>

The second phase of this partnership was also implemented in 2014 which provided for specially trained victim advocates to be present during a forensic medical examination. Prior to an offender being transported to a designated hospital, the partnered advocate is contacted and arrangements are made to meet the offender at the hospital. Hospitals have been included in building this process to ensure an understanding of all roles and continuity of services while maintaining public safety. Also during this year, penalty grant funds associated with the Governor's declaration that Washington State was not yet compliant with all PREA standards, were reallocated to expanding the understanding of victim advocacy services to incarcerated survivors. These funds were also targeted to build a collaboration between WADOC, the Juvenile Justice Rehabilitation Administration (JJRA), and local, regional and tribal jails to expand and enhance advocacy services available to any individual incarcerated in the state.





The partnership between WADOC, OCVA and WCSAP will continue into 2015 when the third and final stage of advocacy support services will be implemented. This phase will involve providing on-site advocacy services to incarcerated survivors.

## **ADDITIONAL SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION**

### **CONTRACT MONITORING**

PREA standards require that WADOC include language in each contract about the contracted entity's requirement to comply with the PREA standards. The standards also require that any new contracts or contract renewals include provision for WADOC to monitor the contracted entity to ensure they are complying with the standards.

WADOC contracts with multiple local, regional and tribal jails to house offenders who violate conditions while on community supervision. It was determined that these contracts do not fall under the provisions of these standards as the jails house offenders only for short periods of time and are paid only per diem. However, WADOC does include the provision that entities achieve compliance with the PREA standards and that contracts may be terminated for failure to meet and demonstrate this compliance. The agency is working collaboratively with these jails and with the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC) to build operational and cultural implementation of the standards.

The following agencies are under contract with WADOC to house offenders for the longer periods of time:

- American Behavior Health Systems – Provides residential substance abuse treatment for offenders on community supervision.
- Clark County Jail I – Provides work release opportunities for offenders within 6 months of final release.
- Juvenile Justice Rehabilitation Administration – Provides housing for youthful offenders who were sentenced as adults.
- Snohomish County Jail – Providing work release opportunities for offenders within 6 months of final release.
- Yakima County Jail – Provides housing for up to three hundred DOC felony offenders.
- 

We have implemented a system of self-assessments, site visits, and DOJ audit review to ensure these facilities achieve and maintain compliance with PREA standards to ensure the safe housing of its offenders.

### **MOSS GROUP AND GRANT WORK**

The Department of Corrections was awarded a PREA Program Demonstration Project Grant by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to strengthen compliance with the standards, improve overall sexual safety within agency facilities, and enhance communication through all levels within the agency. The grant award period is from

October 2013 to September 2015 and involves several consultant-led, consecutive components

- Cultural and sexual safety assessments in a range of correctional settings including a prison, a work release, and an inpatient treatment facility
- Review of and revision to staff training options to enhance sexual safety
- Managerial training and culture change support for the facility leadership teams
- The development of a PREA toolkit that is tailored to Washington State.

A contract was established with The Moss Group (TMG) to provide consultant services relative to this grant. TMG is a Washington D.C based organization with vast and diverse correctional experience. They are one of the leading experts in the implementation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act in a correction settings.

By April 2015, cultural and sexual safety assessments will be completed at:

- Brownstone Work Release in Spokane
- Monroe Correctional Complex – Washington State Reformatory
- American Behavioral Health Systems residential treatment center in Spokane

These assessments will consist of a review of policy, procedure, and practice in eleven domains:

- Leadership and Culture
- Community Involvement and Public Relations
- Human Resources
- Operational Issues
- Orientation / Education
- Classification
- Training
- Investigations
- Medical / Mental Health
- Program Services
- Incident Review, Evaluation, Assistance

In addition to the recommendations for each of the individual facilities, the following information was included in TMG's sexual safety assessment report regarding systemic recommendations:

*'WDOC, under the leadership of Secretary Bernard Warner, has clearly identified PREA implementation and sexual safety as priorities. Strong leadership from the top of the Department ensures continued focus in both implementation of PREA Standards as well as cultural change to support safety. Systemic recommendations based on themes across all three assessments (ABHS - Spokane, BWR and WSR) include the following ten areas:*

1. *Develop leadership, communication and technical assistance strategies to support ongoing implementation and sustainability of sexual safety practices.*
2. *Enhance prevention and reporting processes including updates to staffing plans, clarifying policy, adding reporting mechanisms, and developing strategies to respond to hotline reports.*
3. *Enhance policy specific to cross gender supervision.*
4. *Enhance training offerings by adding a variety of training delivery platforms that include in-classroom training in addition to computer-based training. Develop first responder training and ensure training for staff when transferred from a male to a female facility or vice versa.*
5. *Review human resource background check practices.*
6. *Review investigation processes through completing an investigation system mapping, refining specialized training for investigators, providing technical assistance to local teams specific to investigation management, and enhancing policy and documentation.*
7. *Review PREA Risk Assessment (PRA) items for clarity, enhancement of practice in the use of PRA in inmate placement, and enhancement in confidentiality.*
8. *Clarify information provided to inmates specific to medical and mental health services available without financial cost specific to PREA incidents.*
9. *Enhance policy specific to the consideration of mental health in discipline, sanctioning, and the use of therapy or program resources designed to address underlying motivations for abuse.*
10. *Support ABHS-Spokane in PREA implementation efforts.'*

Designated facility and agency leaders are in the process of completing managerial training and cultural change support workshops conducted by TMG. The information from these workshops will help shape one of the two toolkits to be developed as part of the grant. The toolkit will be disseminated throughout the agency as well as to our partners to share lessons learned in the implementation of the PREA federal standards. The second toolkit is aimed at basic PREA implementation strategies to be share with city, county, regional and tribal jails who implementing the standards.

Another element of this grant is an evaluation of PREA related training curricula with planned revisions to new hire training, enhanced training for first responders and the development of training concerning effective communication with LGBTI offenders.

## **JAIL ASSESSMENTS**

As part of the larger PREA Program Demonstration Project Grant, a temporary position was created in order to evaluate the level of compliance with PREA within Washington State jails. Site visits were conducted to review self-reported compliance along with facility tours to observe the level of compliance in operation.

Findings were shared with the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC) at their fall conference highlighting status, barriers, and best practices. A final report is expected in 2015 in conjunction with deliverables associated with the BJA PREA Program Demonstration Project Grant.

*Humans inherently want to feel safe. The general public often discards criminals as causing safety issues, not experiencing personal safety issues themselves. PREA emphasis in our state has helped offenders realize that we care about their safety and will do everything possible to protect them from victimization and educating them to heighten their own personal sexual safety awareness. I'm proud of the work of Washington DOC in regard to sexual safety because increased offender safety = reduced offender stress = increased staff safety.*

*– Dan White, Superintendent*

## **CONTRACTED FACILITIES**

### **AMERICAN BEHAVIORLA HEALTH SYSTEMS (ABHS)**

WADOC contracts with American Behavior Health Systems (ABHS), a private agency, to provide chemical dependency treatment to specific offenders. ABHS serves offenders who are on community supervision for short-term stays of 28-45 days and offenders under the Drug Offense Sentence Alternative (DOSA) rules who may stay for up to 180 days. PREA data for ABHS can be found under the Substance Abuse Recovery Unit.

ABHS completed a self-assessment on all of their facilities to determine their compliance with PREA standards. They also completed a DOJ audit in their Chehalis facility and received a compliance rating of 100% without the need for corrective action. ABHS is scheduled their remaining DOJ audits for September 2015 and February 2016. In addition, ABHS will complete their own investigations and compile their own data starting in 2015.

### **REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION (RA)**

The Rehabilitation Administration operates multiple facilities for housing juveniles who have been adjudicated through the court system. WADOC contracts with JJRA to house offenders under the age of 18 who have been sentenced as adults. These offenders are housed at Green Hill School and Echo Glen Children's Center.

Echo Glen Children’s Center completed their DOJ audit in October 2014 with a final report to be issued in 2015 after completion of all noted corrective action. A DOJ audit is tentatively planned for Green Hill School in the spring of 2016.

The following data was collected from the RA PREA 2015 Annual Data and Compliance Report. The abbreviations in the data are as follows: Staff-on-Youth Sexual Abuse (SSA), Staff-on-Youth Sexual Harassment (SSH), Youth-on-Youth Sexual Abuse (YSA) and Youth-on-Youth Sexual Harassment (YSH). (Note: Youth-on-Youth Sexual Harassment data was not collected in 2013.)

<b>Comparison of Allegations per Facility 2013-2014</b>								
<b>Facility</b>	<b>2013</b>				<b>2014</b>			
	SSA	SSH	YSA	YSH	SSA	SSH	YSA	YSH
Echo Glen	0	0	4	n/a	3	0	4	4
Green Hill	0	0	1	n/a	4	0	0	4

### **SHOHOMISH COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

WADOC contracts with Snohomish County (DOC) for work release beds for offenders transitioning from prison. The Snohomish County DOC completed a DOJ audit in December 2014 receiving a 100% compliance without the need for corrective action.

### **YAKIMA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

WADOC contracts with the Yakima County DOC to provide overflow beds for female offenders transferred from Washington Corrections Center for Women. The agency will complete their self-assessment and DOJ audit in 2015.

### **CLARK COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

WADOC contracts with Snohomish County (DOC) for work release beds for offenders transitioning from prison. Their DOJ audit is scheduled for some time between July 2015 and June 2016.

### **CORRECTIONS CORPORATION OF AMERICA**

WADOC maintains a contract with Correctional Corporation of America (CCA) to meet potential overcrowding demand within WADOC facilities. CCA is a publically traded real estate investment trust and the nation’s largest owner of partnership correction and detention facilities.

The current contract requires that CCA be compliant with PREA standards. If CCA fails to comply, WADOC is authorized to terminate the housing contract following notice and a reasonable opportunity to correct issues.

## PIONEER HUMAN SERVICES

WADOC contracts with Pioneer Human Services (PHS) to provide a long term in-patient treatment facility for substance abuse and mental health disorders that may contribute to the offender's re-offense cycle. PHS also offers relapse prevention, time-management, life skills, nutrition classes and an aftercare composition upon the offender's release.

Less than 50% of PHS's population is offenders and does not fall under the PREA Community Confinement standards. However, WADOC will continue to monitor bed allocations and require demonstrated compliance with standards should the population allotments rise above that level.



*PREA gives us these checks and balances to follow. By having set guidelines and repercussion for anything that may violate the PREA standards, we are making the environment safer for both offenders and staff. PREA has given power to offenders to come forward and talk about the hard truths that happen in prisons across the state. We are given the opportunity to prevent prison rape and sexual assault.*

*– Sandra Baxter, Correctional Officer*

## **2013 CORRECTIVE ACTION STATUS UPDATE**

In the 2013 Annual Report, issues were identified along with planned resolution. The following reflects the status of required corrective action.

### **Allegation Reporting**

*Insufficient data elements available to provide sufficient detail regarding how an allegation is received.*

The Data Collection Checklist was designed to be completed at the end of each PREA investigation. The form includes detailed information on how the allegation was received. In addition, more data was added to OMNI in order to capture additional information related to PREA. In 2015, the HQ PREA Unit will continue to gather data related to receiving allegations.

### **Investigation Data**

*Insufficient information documented from each investigation to identify risk areas/time within a facility.*

The Data Collection Checklist was designed to be completed at the end of each PREA investigation and includes information about the incident unit and location. In 2015, a pilot project will be launched to map PREA and violent incidents to better identify areas of high risk.

*Incomplete data available regarding offender victim and perpetrator security threat group involvement, classification level, height/weight, crime of conviction etc.*

A request was created to include this data in our PREA OMNI screen. In 2015, the HQ PREA Unit will continue to work with Information Technology to implement this measure.

*Data regarding demographic information for agency staff (gender, age, race, years of service, position held) not available for comparison with demographic information obtained from investigations.*

The PREA Unit will collaborate with Human Resources and Information Technology to develop a system whereby identified staff information can be obtained while maintaining system security.

*Location information not provided regarding unsubstantiated and unfound investigation to assist with identified of areas of risk within the facility.*

The Data Collection Checklist was created to be filled out at the end of each investigation which includes alleged incident unit and location. In 2015, a pilot project will be launched to map PREA and violent incidents to better identify areas of high risk.

*Incomplete data regarding sanctions for substantiated offender on offender investigation of sexual misconduct; inconsistencies in handling of related infractions issued.*

The HQ PREA Unit hired a Research Analyst 3 position who oversees the process by reaching out to the facility when an infraction has not been written and solving any issues that arise. Training was developed for Disciplinary Hearing Officers and Appointing Authorities to be distributed in 2015.

### **Performance Measures**

*Lack of available of data regarding completion of PREA Risk Assessments within policy specified timeframes.*

The issue was discussed with Information Technology and determined that the OMNI system is too limited to be able to meet this need. Instead, facility Correctional Program Managers or other designated staff check for overdue PREA Risk Assessments on a regular basis.

*Lack of review of PREA Risk Assessment against substantiated investigations to internally validate assessment elements.*

The HQ PREA Unit hired a Research Analyst 3 who will analyze PREA Risk Assessment data and work with Planning and Research Division to validate the tool as a whole. In 2015, a committee will look at the PREA Risk Assessment and identify changes needed to accurately identify potential victims and predators. Work with Planning and Research will continue.

*Inability to obtain information from electronic training system to determine compliance rates for PREA-related training.*

There are issues with the Learning Management System which will not allow the program to provide consistent and reliable compliance data. Many facilities have created their own tracking system to comply with federal standards.

*Inability to obtain comprehensive information regarding compliance with PREA offender orientation requirements.*

Facilities have developed their own internal process for documenting PREA orientation compliance for offenders.





## 2013 STRATEGIC PLAN STATUS UPDATE

In the 2013 Annual PREA Report, strategic plan items were listed as goals for 2014. The below table shows the goal and the 2014 resolution.

2013 Goal	2014 Resolution
Implement processes to ensure access to DOC PREA hotline by hearing impaired offenders and family/friends with expansion to include TTY access.	TTY was implemented for the PREA hotline.
Review and revise all PREA-related training to ensure current and applicable to participants. Ensure training is responsive to identified needs and issues.	In progress. Working with the Moss Group on reviewing and developing training.
Develop strategic plan to implement results of PREA grant assessments by the Moss Group in applicable facilities; revise and/or develop training as indicated; develop strategic plan to carry lessons learned across agency facilities.	Statewide Implementation Team looking into implementing recommendations. In collaboration with the Moss Group, WADOC is working to create PREA Toolkits.
Complete PREA vulnerability assessments in all prison and work release facilities according to schedule; completion by June 2015. Facilities to identify risk areas and processes and develop applicable actions plans to address.	On track to finish by June 2015.
Work to strengthen relationships with law enforcement for assistance in investigation processes and training and referral when allegations appear criminal in nature.	Facilities have held meetings with local law enforcement
Establish workgroup to review policies and processes regarding LGBTI offenders, formalize recommendations and implement identified training.	In progress
PREA Implementation Team to identify best practices throughout implementation and audit process for incorporation into policy and training as indicated / needed.	Ongoing. Best practices are shared through PREA Implementation Team members on SharePoint.
Continue to develop working relationships with external stakeholders such as the PREA Resource Center and victim advocacy groups.	Ongoing. Working with a steering committee and the JAG grant to increase relationship with victim advocacy groups.
Expand offender access to community based victim advocacy services into Phase 3 of the agreement with the Office of Crime Victim Advocacy.	A project position was created to work with the Office of Crime Victim Advocacy and facilities are making progress with Phase 3, having victim advocates on site.

## 2014 CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN

The following issues were identified by in 2014 with resolution planned for 2015.

Issue	Planned Resolution
The PREA Risk Assessment is not always completed accurately or consistently.	Review of current PREA Risk Assessment and guide to identify areas of concern, make changes and redeploy to applicable staff.
The audit proof documentation gathering is time consuming and not always done correctly.	Providing access to agency level documents in a SharePoint site developed to also provide innovative ideas working through the DOJ audit process.
Unclear role/responsibilities with investigation involved a vulnerable adult.	Work with the Department of Health Services-Adult Protective Services to identify specific responsibilities and roles.
No way to track housing reviews for transgender and intersex offenders.	Create a process to identify initial and follow up housing reviews and steps to take when a review is upcoming or late.
Offenders and staff have limited knowledge on the available victim advocacy services.	Distribute information and training to staff. Identify areas where information can be shared with offenders. Train classification counselors to connect offenders with services when they answer affirmatively to specific questions on the PREA Risk Assessment. Add it to the response checklist
Local Review Committees are not be conducted the same across the agency	Identify best practices. Refine policy and practices.
Discipline is not consistent across the agency.	Analyze discipline data and identify issues. Work with disciplinary hearing officer, identified staff and facilities to address issues.
Evidence Control and Management is not consistent across the agency.	Refine training and distribute across agency

*The implementation of the many mandates of PREA has positively affected the Statewide Offender Grievance Program. The creation of PREA policies that require an immediate review of all offender complaints that list alleged PREA violations has streamlined the process of these types of complaints and ensured that they are reviewed and investigation from one source instead of multiple locations. The PREA policies have eliminated much of the workload issues for grievance coordinators statewide and create an effective means of screening and investigations grievance complaints alleging a PREA allegation.*

- Norm Caldwell, Grievance Program Manager

## 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN

The following is a list of goals to be completed in 2015.

1	Streamline the triage process
2	Implement a process to track law enforcement and licensing referrals
3	Agency level team to incorporate law enforcement and prosecutors to identify gaps in the process and build on relationships to increase the number of criminal investigations leading to successful prosecutions
4	Implement recommendations from The Moss Group Sexual Safety Assessment Report
5	Successful completion of DOJ audits in remaining facilities
6	Develop a system to monitor continued compliance in facilities that have completed DOJ audits
7	Complete and share toolkits developed as a strategy in the DOJ PREA Program Demonstration Project Grant
8	Develop/revise training identified to address deficiencies/enhance implementation
9	Expand the pool of DOJ certified auditors within WADOC
10	Finalize the on-site access process for victim advocacy services
11	Participate in DOJ certified auditor training and complete a mock audit at the Twin Rivers Unit of the Monroe Correctional Complex to assess compliance levels and identify gaps/deficiencies
12	Start a pilot at WSP to look at mapping incidents of PREA and violence within the West Complex
13	Develop a plan for implementation of trauma informed care
14	Create a plan for ongoing staff notifications, identifying the intent of the PREA standard and how facilities will continue to comply.

## FACILITY AND DIVISION REPORTS

The following are reports from facilities and divisions regarding their work toward PREA compliance. Each report also includes a reflection of PREA related investigations in 2014 indicating steps taken to alleviate issues raised by allegations. The table below addresses the allegation acronyms and definitions that will be used throughout the reports.

<b>Allegation Definitions</b>	
ISH	Offender on Offender Sexual Harassment
IASC	Offender on Offender Sexual Abuse
ISA	Offender on Offender Sexual Assault
SSH	Staff Sexual Harassment
SSM	Staff Sexual Misconduct

## AIRWAY HEIGHTS CORRECTIONS CENTER

Airway Heights Corrections Center (AHCC) is located west of Spokane and has been open since 1992. We house an estimated 2,100 offenders in medium, long term minimum, and camp custodies. AHCC employs approximately 720 staff and has many volunteers and contract staff involved in various programs.



In preparation for our federal audit, we held meetings with staff in individual areas of the facility to provide specific PREA training. We conducted town-hall meetings with offenders to educate them on the reporting and investigative processes. Additional posters and signs with PREA information were posted for the offender population. Processes were modified to ensure each PREA standard was met. We updated information for the limited English speaking offender population. Vulnerability assessments were completed for all buildings within the facility to identify high risk areas. A corrective action plan was developed to identify priorities for work orders, and/or process changes to mitigate risks.

During 2014, 89 PREA cases were opened at AHCC. Staff-on-offender sexual misconduct comprised 17.97% of the cases; and all were determined unfounded. Ten of twelve offender-on-offender substantiated cases were sexual harassment allegations. Of the 89 cases, the age of the suspect was highest between 45-54 years of age. For substantiated cases of offender-on-offender allegations, each age category for victims are similar except ages 30-34 and 40-44 having no victims reported during this time. In substantiated cases, the majority of suspects and victims were white. In unsubstantiated/unfounded cases, 57.40% offender suspects were white and 75.92% offender victims were white. In unsubstantiated/unfounded cases, the largest age group listed as a suspect is 45-54 years of age. The largest age categories for offender victims is 18-29 years of age.

The highest number of substantiated cases occurred in the offender living areas. The local PREA Review Committee continues to review and analyze data from substantiated and unsubstantiated cases to identify physical plant issues and/or staff practices that may contribute to risk. AHCC area of vulnerability remains to be in the cells, and is a large portion of unsubstantiated allegations.

In the 2013 PREA Annual Report, AHCC listed goals in the annual report as completing vulnerability assessments, and complete training for staff. Both of these goals were met in 2014. AHCC's goals for 2015 are:

- Correct deficiencies noted in the corrective action plan on vulnerability assessments
- Improve education and training to offenders on victim advocacy, and outside reporting resources.

- Continue to increase knowledge of limited English speaking offenders in reporting and investigative process for PREA.
- Continue to work on sustainable PREA practices and documentation retention without a staff assigned to a PREA position.
- Increase training with health services and custody in use of the PREA response kits and evidence collection.

AHCC had one health services case that is included in the following data.

Total PREA Cases			
Allegation	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded
ISH	10	14	11
IASC	2	5	4
ISA	0	6	14
SSH	0	3	0
SSM	0	0	13

Days to Complete Investigation	
Days	f
0-30	49
31-60	16
61-90	11
91+	6
Open	7

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Age	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
18-24	3	4	3	9
25-29	1	5	3	9
30-34	2	8	0	5
35-39	0	2	1	7
40-44	0	7	0	5
45-54	4	15	2	7
55+	2	5	2	1
Unknown	0	8	1	11

<b>Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	7	31	9	41
Black	3	7	1	1
North American Indian	0	4	0	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	2	0	0
Other	1	1	0	0
Unknown	0	9	2	12

### **Staff-on-Offender Cases**

Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable

<b>Victims</b>	
<i>Age</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
18 – 24	1
25 – 29	5
30 – 34	4
35 – 39	1
40 – 44	1
45 – 54	1
55+	2
Unknown	1

<b>Victims</b>	
<i>Race</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	10
Black	5
Unknown	1

## CEDAR CREEK CORRECTIONS CENTER

Cedar Creek Corrections Center (CCCC) is a minimum custody prison located in the Capital Forest, southwest of Olympia, Washington. CCCC houses approximately 480 adult male offenders in two dormitory style living units. Offenders at CCCC have four years or less to serve on their sentence. CCCC employs about 140 full time staff.



In 2014, CCCC successfully completed their DOJ PREA Audit and exceeded 4 of the standards. CCCC continues to gather documents in order to show compliance with DOJ standards.

Cedar Creek Corrections Center completed a vulnerability assessment in 2014 and have begun working on an LED lighting project to increase visibility. The facility has also increased the number of trained staff PREA investigators. Camera system upgrades are in process with contract documents created.

CCCC did not have any substantiated staff-on-offender cases in 2014. There was one unsubstantiated offender-on-offender sexual assault case that was alleged to have occurred in 1992. During the investigation, it was found that an investigation and adjudication had taken place in 1992.

In 2015, CCCC has set goals for maintaining PREA compliance and will continue to work on the identified corrective action. The camera infrastructure project will be completed and additional camera placements will be made. Phase 1 of the lighting improvements will be completed and Phase 2 will begin. The vulnerability assessment will be updated and PREA training will be maintained for all employees, contract staff and volunteers.

Total PREA Cases			
Allegation	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded
ISH	0	0	1
IASC	0	1	0
ISA	1	0	1
SSH	0	0	0
SSM	0	0	1

Days to Complete Investigation	
Days	f
0-30	0
31-60	4
61-90	1
91+	0



Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Age	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
18-24	0	0	0	2
25-29	0	1	0	0
30-34	0	0	0	0
35-39	0	1	0	0
40-44	0	1	1	0
45-54	0	0	0	0
55+	1	0	0	0
Unknown	0	1	0	1

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Race	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
White	0	3	1	2
Black	1	0	0	0
North American Indian	0	0	0	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	1	0	1

### Staff-on-Offender Cases

Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable.

Victims	
Age	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
18 – 24	0
25 – 29	0
30 – 34	0
35 – 39	1
40 – 44	0
45 – 54	0
55+	0
Unknown	0

Victims	
Race	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
White	0
Black	1
Unknown	0

## CLALLAM BAY CORRECTIONS CENTER

Clallam Bay Corrections Center (CBCC), situated near the Strait of Juan de Fuca on the northern end of the Olympic Peninsula, sits 2 miles from the town of Clallam Bay, Washington, and is surrounded by pristine forests and rivers. Today, Clallam Bay Corrections Center houses up to 900 offenders comprised of 400 medium custody and up to 500 close and maximum custody offenders.



In August, 2014, the facility hired a new PREA Liaison to assist the facility in taking the next step towards compliance with the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) requirements. Clallam Bay Corrections Center's audit is currently scheduled for June, 2015.

CBCC established a systematic response to meeting PREA audit requirements:

1. Identify those standards which are critical when responding to allegations of sexual assault/abuse and ensure the facility has established procedures and training in place to address those incidents.
2. Identify the staff who are critical to the successful implementation of those standards and ensure they are trained in the requirements of the standards and in appropriate response.
3. Train all staff in the fundamental responsibilities of responding to incidents of sexual abuse/assault in a way that meets the needs of the victim while maintaining the integrity of investigations and evidence collection.
4. Establish methods of documenting information pertinent to PREA in a way that provides on-going data, notification of impending due dates, offender screening requirements, training compliance for offenders and staff, and historical information specific to Clallam Bay Corrections Center.
5. Incorporate remaining PREA Standards into facility operations through training, Operational Memorandum updates, Post Order updates, etc.
6. Develop system of sustaining the requirements of the standards by assigning each one to the appropriate employee position and incorporate that standard(s) into their Professional Development Plan.

As agency and local data continues to provide insight for improvement, and our understanding of the PREA standards grow, CBCC has identified four (4) areas of need to nurture the PREA culture at the facility:

1. Continue to train staff and offenders in a way that is responsive; that is, as understanding and empathy develop and personal stigmas/fears shrink, engage staff and offenders in a way that continues personal growth.

2. Complete another vulnerability assessment that is more comprehensive and detailed to identify not only potential issues, but to identify on the assessment where incidents have occurred so these areas can be aggressively targeted.
3. The Local PREA Review Committee draws input from the investigator, supervisors, PREA Liaison, Medical and MH staff, Intelligence, and Executive Staff. A new local process is that the PREA Liaison tours the incident area, reviews for any issues and takes photographs and / or video of the area so that the committee can make a better assessment.
4. Identify those standards which are critical when responding to allegations of sexual assault/abuse and ensure the facility has established procedures and training in place to address those incidents.

There are three (3) primary goals planned for 2015:

1. Complete the incorporation of the PREA Standards into facility operations through training, Operational Memorandum updates, Post Order updates, etc.
2. Complete implementation of the system of sustaining the requirements of the standards by assigning each standard(s) to the appropriate employee position and incorporate that standard(s) into their Position Description.
3. Complete the process to establish the PREA Vulnerability Assessment as a living document that continually evolves and is the vehicle by which the facility continually improves.

<b>Total PREA Cases</b>			
<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Substantiated</b>	<b>Unsubstantiated</b>	<b>Unfounded</b>
ISH	4	0	9
IASC	0	0	2
ISA	5	1	17
SSH	0	0	4
SSM	0	0	5

<b>Days to Complete Investigation</b>	
<b>Days</b>	<b>f</b>
0-30	7
31-60	31
61-90	3
91+	4

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Age	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
18-24	2	4	5	9
25-29	0	2	2	4
30-34	1	6	1	2
35-39	1	4	1	4
40-44	1	0	0	1
45-54	3	6	1	5
55+	1	3	0	1
Unknown	0	4	0	2

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Race	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
White	8	20	7	21
Black	1	3	2	2
North American Indian	0	1	0	1
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	1	1	1
Other	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	4	0	3

### Staff-on-Offender Cases

Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable.

Victims	
Age	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
18 – 24	0
25 – 29	3
30 – 34	1
35 – 39	2
40 – 44	0
45 – 54	2
55+	1
Unknown	0

Victims	
Race	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
White	3
Black	4
Unknown	2

## COYOTE RIDGE CORRECTIONS CENTER

Coyote Ridge Correction Center (CRCC) is located in Connell, Washington and opened in 1990. Following significant expansion in 2009, it became one of the larger prisons in the state of Washington. It houses approximately 2,500 adult male offenders in medium, long term minimum, and MI2 minimum living units which include ambulatory offenders (assisted living/nursing). The facility employs over 700 staff and has 450 contract staff and volunteers that support and mentor the offender population.



In 2014, CRCC had two staff members represent the facility on the Statewide Implementation Team as well as 14 staff on the Local PREA Review Committee. The local review committee looks into cases and develops plans and processes to mitigate any issues that arise. Although we have not had any substantiated cases, the team works together to address unsubstantiated cases to ensure the safety and security of the facility.

There were 77 PREA cases opened in 2014. Zero were substantiated cases, 29 were unsubstantiated (37.66%) and 48 were unfounded (62.33%). The majority of the allegations were offender-on-offender sexual assault (35.06%) and offender-on-offender sexual harassment (23.37%). In offender-on-offender cases, 49.09% of suspects and 70.90% of victims were white while 30.90% of suspects and 1.80% of victims were black. Age does not seem to be a factor.

CRCC has worked diligently towards compliance with federal PREA standards. A vulnerability assessment was completed in late 2014 along with corrective action plans to mitigate vulnerable areas. In 2015, CRCC will work to establish a local PREA Compliance Manager position. This position will manage all aspects of PREA within the facility and ensure that the facility complies with all federal standards. The goal of CRCC is to make PREA commonly known within the facility and to ensure that both staff and offenders know the importance of keeping all safe and free from sexual abuse.

CRCC had one health services and three correctional industries cases that are included in the following data.

Total PREA Cases			
Allegation	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded
ISH	0	10	8
IASC	0	4	6
ISA	0	11	16
SSH	0	1	12
SOM	0	0	1
SSM	0	3	5

Days to Complete Investigation	
Days	f
0-30	44
31-60	22
61-90	5
91+	6
Open	1

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Age	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
18-24		4		2
25-29		4		9
30-34		5		6
35-39		6		8
40-44		4		6
45-54		10		10
55+		12		3
Unknown		10		11

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Race	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
White		27		39
Black		17		1
North American Indian		0		2
Unknown		11		13

### Staff-on-Offender Cases

Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable.

Victims	
<i>Age</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
18 – 24	9
25 – 29	3
30 – 34	5
35 – 39	2
40 – 44	0
45 – 54	1
55+	1

Victims	
<i>Race</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	10
Black	11
Unknown	0

## LARCH CORRECTIONS CENTER

Larch Corrections Center (LCC) opened in 1956 and has a current operating capacity of 480 offenders. LCC is a minimum custody facility with dorm style housing units, located on a relatively remote 40-acre site approximately 20 miles northeast of Vancouver, Washington. The site is leased from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). LCC has approximately 120 employees and provides offenders work and vocational opportunities, as well as educational and offender change programs.



LCC, through frequent education of staff and offenders and promotion of a professional facility culture, has established an environment where PREA is taken seriously. We have increased awareness of safe reporting mechanisms and available services to victims. We provide:

- PREA education for staff and offenders.
- Systems for and awareness of incident prevention and detection.
- Offender orientation, screening, assessment, and classification.
- Monitoring of sexually predatory offenders and vulnerable offenders.
- Enforcement of rules regarding sexual abuse and sexualized behavior of offenders.
- Promotion of a staff culture that ensures all allegations are taken seriously and appropriate reporting procedures are followed.
- Prompt and thorough PREA investigations.
- Multiple options for offenders to report alleged sexual misconduct.
- Place Safety Musters that often include PREA as a topic of discussion.

Since 2005, LCC has taken an active role in working to educate staff and offenders about PREA. Larch has worked to create a culture shift where all staff and offenders recognize that a facility that promotes zero tolerance of staff sexual misconduct and offender to offender sexual misconduct is a safer facility.

In 2014, LCC had no substantiated cases, 6 unsubstantiated cases and 4 unfounded cases.

Most data shows that unsubstantiated PREA incidents occur primarily in living units; however, additional areas of concern identified include the kitchen, recreation, maintenance and program areas where there may be limited supervision. LCC's efforts to minimize risk include increasing random and frequent area walkthroughs, and modifying physical plant as funding allows to improve visibility by adding more convex



mirrors in vulnerable areas, installing camera systems and removing doors where feasible.

LCC uses the Local PREA Review Committee to examine all substantiated and unsubstantiated cases. The committee takes this role seriously and discusses the particulars of each case to consider possible changes in practice, policy, procedures, training and physical plant.

In 2015, LCC will continue to improve awareness, prevention and detection, through staff and offender education. Two significant goals are to promote a professional culture and the procurement of camera systems in vulnerable areas.

LCC had two health services cases that are included in the following data.

Total PREA Cases			
Allegation	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded
ISH	0	1	1
IASC	0	0	0
ISA	0	3	0
SSH	0	0	0
SSM	0	2	3

Days to Complete Investigation	
Days	f
0-30	1
31-60	0
61-90	3
91+	6
Open	1

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Age	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
18-24		1		1
25-29		0		0
30-34		1		3
35-39		1		0
40-44		1		0
45-54		1		0
55+		0		0
Unknown		0		1

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Race	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
White		4		3
Black		1		0
Asian/Pacific Islander		0		1
Unknown		0		1

**Staff-on-Offender Cases**

Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable.

Victims	
Age	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
18 – 24	2
25 – 29	1
30 – 34	0
35 – 39	0
40 – 44	0
45 – 54	2
55+	0

Victims	
Race	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
White	2
Black	3
Unknown	

## MONROE CORRECTIONAL COMPLEX

The Monroe Correctional Complex (MCC) is comprised of five facilities: Washington Reformatory Unit, Special Offender Unit, Twin Rivers Unit, Minimum Security Unit and the Intensive Management Unit. MCC has a population of nearly 2,500 offender and approximately 1,200 staff. The complex provides three major services for Washington's correctional system: housing and treatment for acutely mentally ill offenders, housing and treatment for sex offenders and primary referral and treatment center for complex health-related issues.



During 2014, MCC allocated a temporary Corrections Specialist 3 position to help prepare for the PREA DOJ audits.

In order to take PREA reports seriously, counselors are regularly checking with offender and asking questions regarding PREA. Staff members are working hard to ensure a safe environment for other staff, visitors, volunteers and offenders.

Educating offenders about PREA starts with offender orientation that is given to each new offender and includes a discussion of the zero tolerance policy, definitions of words used, available advocacy groups and reporting methods. A video is used to help emphasize each area. Posters make reporting numbers available and serve as reminders for the offenders.

Staff on all shifts are given PREA quizzes on meeting standards for compliance at least monthly. PREA topics are included in each place safety muster and additional information is available for staff. MCC is working on improving infrastructure as part of the requirements for the vulnerability assessment.

Executive management provides clear leadership to ensure that PREA issues remain an area of focus with regard to implementation of PREA standards as well as cultural change to support safety.

The Local PREA Review Committee continues to meet weekly to review all PREA investigations. Team members consist of executive leaders and management from several disciplines. Members are rotated throughout MCC each quarter to provide education to all managers. Recommendations are made from the committee and forwarded to the affected area of the facility when needed.

The PREA Response Team has attended bi-quarterly meeting and two deployments through this reporting period as part of their training. Members have completed evidence handling training and documentation requirements. PREA kits were received and discussed for supply recommendations. Members were given an opportunity to

meet with the Victim Advocates during their deployment to the local hospital. MCC also met with victim advocates and provided them with a tour of the facility.

The overall number of PREA cases for 2014 have increased by 9.1%. Many of these cases stemmed from offenders at the Special Offenders Unit. Of all MCC PREA Cases, 8.90% were substantiated, 19.37% were unsubstantiated and 71.72% were unfounded. Staff related PREA cases accounted for 29.31%. One staff sexual misconduct case was substantiated.

Due to an increase in the workload of additional cases, MCC has seen an increase in cases taking 31-90 days to complete. Of all the PREA cases, 73.82% are completed within 90 days. There was one case remaining open at the end of the year.

MCC had two chemical dependency and seven health services cases included in the following data.

Total PREA Cases			
Allegation	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded
ISH	11	15	32
IASC	3	7	8
ISA	1	10	48
SSH	1	0	11
SSM	1	5	38

Days to Complete Investigation	
Days	f
0-30	5
31-60	66
61-90	70
91+	49
Open	1

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Age	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
18-24	3	13	2	18
25-29	1	18	3	23
30-34	3	20	1	8
35-39	2	13	0	31
40-44	1	8	4	7
45-54	4	18	5	20
55+	1	13	0	5
Unknown	0	17	0	8

<b>Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	13	75	15	99
Black	2	25	0	7
North American Indian	0	1	0	3
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	1	0	1
Unknown	0	18	0	10

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Age</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
18-24	0		0	4
25-29	0		0	5
30-34	0		0	15
35-39	0		0	11
40-44	0		1	9
45-54	1		1	7
55+	1		0	3

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	2		2	33
Black	0		0	18
North American Indian	0		0	1
Asian/Pacific Islander	0		0	1
Other	0		0	1

## MISSION CREEK CORRECTIONS CENTER FOR WOMEN

Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women (MCCCW) is a minimum security re-entry institution, located in a remote area south of Bremerton, Washington, four miles outside of Belfair city limits. MCCCW maintains an average daily population of 312 female offenders who participate in therapeutic and academic programming. MCCCW is dedicated to the transition of adult female offenders from higher custody settings to either a Work Release program or direct release to the community.



A PREA compliance Manager position was built and occupied from mid-February to mid-May in preparation for the Federal PREA Audit. The assigned CUS has kept the PREA Compliance Manager duties as a collateral duty to ensure compliance is continuing to be met between audits.

In preparations for the DOJ Audit, MCCCW introduced several ways for staff and offenders to become educated about PREA. All staff were required to respond via email to any PREA audit questions they could potentially be asked. A PREA pocket guide was made and placed at the entrance of the institution so anyone could take one and be informed. A database was built to ensure anyone that enters MCCCW has received PREA training and a background check. A spreadsheet was built to assign staff to each standard to ensure the standard is continuing to be met and documents uploaded after the federal audit. Town meetings were held with offenders to go over PREA information and potential questions that they may be asked by auditors. Ultimately, Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women passed their federal PREA audit with 100% compliance.

After looking at PREA related issues within the facility, MCCCW made some changes. Windows were added to doors that previously had no windows and mirrors were strategically placed where blind spots were. More emphasis was placed on staff to offender ratios, ensuring that guidelines were followed. Offender shower curtains were altered to ensure that staff can verify that one offender is in the shower at a time while maintaining the offender's privacy. Office furniture was rearranged as needed to alleviate blind spots, doors were removed that were not needed and staff presence was increased when the chain comes in on Mondays.

A couple of procedures were implemented as a result of a Local PREA Review Committee. One of those was that after offenders watch the initial PREA video when entering the facility, staff verbally explain what substantiated, unsubstantiated, and unfounded results of a PREA investigation mean. Another is that the Hearing Office receives an email of the outcome of an investigation that results in an infraction to ensure that the hearing officer has all the information needed before the hearing. Reminders were sent to the shift commanders to have all victims seen by mental health when there are multiple incidents. Reminders to custody staff were sent out to ensure that the bathrooms are being monitored during tier checks.

There have been a few allegations of PREA and sexual encounters in the Gym area which has a zone officer but not an officer assigned solely to that area. The Recreation Specialist works Tuesday – Saturday from 1100- 1930. In 2015, MCCCW has the goal of getting more coverage in the Gym to deter these types of incidents.

Total PREA Cases			
Allegation	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded
ISH	0	0	3
IASC	2	0	1
ISA	0	0	1
SSH	0	0	0
SSM	1	2	7

Days to Complete Investigation	
Days	f
0-30	3
31-60	9
61-90	5
91+	0

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Age	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
18-24	0	0	0	1
25-29	2	1	1	1
30-34	0	0	0	1
35-39	0	0	0	1
40-44	0	3	1	1
45-54	0	1	0	0
55+	0	0	0	0

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Race	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
White	1	2	1	4
Black	0	1	0	0
North American Indian	1	1	0	0
Other	0	1	1	1

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Age</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
18-24	0		0	2
25-29	0		0	2
30-34	0		0	2
35-39	0		0	1
40-44	0		1	0
45-54	0		0	0
55+	1		0	0
Unknown	0		0	2

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	0		1	5
Black	1		0	2
Unknown	0		0	2



## OLYMPIC CORRECTIONS CENTER

Olympic Corrections Center (OCC) is a minimum custody facility that supports offenders' reentry, vocational, educational, and chemical dependency treatment needs. It is comprised of three separate living units, each with its own focus. The Hoh Unit is a transition unit for offenders. The Clearwater Unit primarily supports the Department of Natural Resources. The Ozette Unit is the Therapeutic Community Unit along with a 28 bed Secured Housing Unit. The facility's mantra is 'Full Productive Day,' and each offender is expected to work, go to school if needed, and program in areas that will provide better chances of success upon release to the community.



In 2014, a temporary Correctional Specialist project position was approved and filed for a 10 month period. This position was put in place to help the facility become compliant with PREA policies, procedures and practices in preparation for the federal audit. The Olympic Corrections Center has taken many steps towards gaining and maintain compliance with the federal standards. An increase in staff and offender awareness was the first goal. Many emails, messages and discussions took place outlining the policy requirements and familiarizing staff with the standards. Managers were charged with working with their staff and offenders to ensure a strong knowledge base. A continuation of information sharing and learning was accomplish through Place Safety Musters, policy and other PREA information being televisions daily on the offender's camp channel. There continues to be an expectation that Executive staff model appropriate behavior and share knowledge. Managers continue to communicate expectations of policy and federal standard compliance with their staff and offenders.

At the end of 2014, OCC started working on a facility vulnerability assessment. This assessment will be a resource to help identify and prioritize any problematic areas related to physical plant issues. For example, blind spots corrected by installation of mirrors and /or a change in surveillance settings.

OCC has expanded the usage of Local PREA Review Committees to include all PREA cases regardless of allegation type. This has provided an opportunity to utilize the tool and develop corrective action plans for cases other than abuse. This also assisted in raising management awareness of locations and circumstances that may create other vulnerabilities.

In 2015, OCC will continue to work with staff and offenders to ensure policy and procedures are understood and followed, federal guidelines are met and information is shared across the facility and department. As budget allows, surveillance cameras, mirrors and a reduction of blind/trouble spots will be addressed

Total PREA Cases			
Allegation	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded
ISH	3	1	4
IASC	0	0	2
ISA	0	1	4
SSH	1	0	1
SSM	0	2	2

Days to Complete Investigation	
Days	f
0-30	3
31-60	8
61-90	5
91+	5

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Age	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
18-24	0	2	0	0
25-29	0	1	1	1
30-34	0	5	0	2
35-39	0	0	1	0
40-44	0	2	1	4
45-54	1	0	0	1
55+	0	0	0	0
Unknown	2	2	0	4

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Race	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
White	2	7	3	8
Black	0	2	0	0
North American Indian	0	1	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
Unknown	1	2	0	4

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Age</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
18-24	0		0	0
25-29	0		0	2
30-34	0		0	0
35-39	0		0	0
40-44	0		1	1
45-54	0		0	1
55+	1		0	0
Unknown	0		0	1

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	1		1	3
Black	0		0	1
Unknown	0		0	1

## STAFFORD CREEK CORRECTIONS CENTER

Stafford Creek Corrections Center (SCCC) is located five miles west of the community of Aberdeen, Washington near the Pacific Coastline of Grays Harbor County. The 1,972 multi-custody facility is on a 210-acre site.

In 2014, SCCC successfully passed their DOC PREA Audit with 100% compliance. SCCC had a temporary position created whose only focus was getting the facility in compliance PREA standards in an effort to pass the PREA audit. SCCC is now in the process of separating the PREA standards by area and making area managers responsible for ensuring PREA processes continue to be followed in their area and documents retained in the appropriate PREA standard files.



The Local PREA Review Committee convenes after each substantiated and unsubstantiated PREA case. We review the investigation for policy compliance, causal factors and facility process/procedures using the Local PREA Investigative Review Checklist. Recommendations are made to the Superintendent on any issues identified in the review. An example of a recommendation from the local review committee would be when the committee identified multiple blind spots in the back kitchen area and recommended cameras and mirrors be strategically located throughout the area. Work orders were submitted and the recommendation was added to the facility Corrective Action Plan.

During 2014, 12.5% (10) of PREA investigations were completed past 90 days. This was mainly due to the transition of staff in and out of the IIU who assign the PREA investigations. However, since the PREA audit, the duties of the staff member responsible expanded to assist in the flow of cases. The expanded role in completing and forwarding notification letters to involved offenders and in tracking assigned cases has helped to resolve any outstanding cases.

In 2015, SCCC's goal is to maintain compliance with PREA standards by ensuring staff are aware that PREA is ongoing and continuing to collect PREA related data to inform our work.

SCCC had one health services case that is included in the following data.

Total PREA Cases			
Allegation	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded
ISH	3	0	14
IASC	0	0	3
ISA	0	1	24
SSH	0	0	13
SSM	3	0	19

Days to Complete Investigation	
Days	<i>f</i>
0-30	33
31-60	27
61-90	10
91+	10

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Age	Suspects		Victims	
	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
18-24	1	4	0	9
25-29	1	5	0	3
30-34	0	5	1	7
35-39	0	3	1	7
40-44	1	5	0	2
45-54	0	9	2	5
55+	0	4	0	3
Unknown	0	7	0	5

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Race	Suspects		Victims	
	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	3	22	3	31
Black	0	11	0	5
North American Indian	0	2	0	0
Other	0	1	0	0
Unknown	0	7	0	5

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Age</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
18-24	0		0	1
25-29	0		0	6
30-34	1		0	3
35-39	0		1	13
40-44	1		2	0
45-54	1		0	4
55+	0		0	1
Unknown	0		0	4

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	3		1	23
Black	0		2	5
Unknown	0		0	4

## WASHINGTON CORRECTIONS CENTER

The Washington Corrections Center (WCC) serves as the reception and diagnostic center for male offenders. It also has two housing units, Cedar and Evergreen. Evergreen Unit houses offenders with less than 9 months to serve and Cedar Unit is long term housing.



In preparation for the upcoming Federal Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Audit; Washington Corrections Center has developed Corrective Actions Plans based on the vulnerability assessment that was completed. WCC implemented a new process for tracking the completion of PREA Risk Assessments for all offenders entering the facility.

WCC is also in the process of updating and overhauling the camera system for the facility. This will increase coverage in areas that were not monitored by video before. WCC will also be remodeling Minor Control. The meetings discussing and planning these events were set up to discuss safety, security and PREA considerations for the installation/construction period as well as the final placement of cameras.

Washington Corrections Center has made available for all staff, training from National Institute of Corrections on Communicating Effectively and Professionally with LGBTI Offenders which has led to more discussion on staff professionalism. WCC has set a process in place where a specific counselor meets with all transgender offenders as soon as they enter the facility. The counselor discusses with the offender their needs and asks the offender where they would feel safest being housed. This counselor works with the offender through the whole process of determining their parent facility start to finish. WCC has also set up each unit to have the ability to utilize a shower curtain for transgender and intersex offenders, which allows for greater flexibility with housing any offender.

WCC had a total of 84 PREA cases in 2014. Of those, 63.09% were offender related and 38.75% were staff related. Substantiated cases accounted for 4.76% and unsubstantiated cases accounted for 2.38%. WCC's Local PREA Review Committee meets monthly or when needed to review applicable cases. During 2014, the committee met to discuss the high number of sexual harassment allegations that came from one unit. After the committee met, a corrective action plan was determined that offenders in that unit would receive additional information about sexual harassment when the PREA orientation was conducted for new offenders.

Vulnerability assessments were completed for every building at WCC and correction action plans were created. Corrective action items included adding windows to doors, motion sensor lights in offices, gates/fences being built, restricting keys and changing post orders and facility processes.

WCC worked with the PREA Coordinator, the Juvenile Justice Rehabilitation Administration, and the Attorney General's Office to discuss the federal standards regarding Youthful Offenders. It was determined that WCC would have one full tier in the Intensive Management Unit clear at all times for housing youthful offenders as well as one yard across from the sergeant's office to be utilized by youthful offenders. WCC housed 39 youthful offenders with an average stay of 14.1 days in 2014.

The facility is currently working with SafePlace Victim Advocates and Providence St. Peter Hospital, to become a cohesive working team to handle any sexual assaults that may occur. Several meetings have been held and we are working to smooth the process before an incident happens. In 2015, WCC plans to hold a mock exercise in coordination with SafePlace and Providence St. Peter Hospital.

WCC had two medical cases that are included in the following data.

Total PREA Cases			
Allegation	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded
ISH	2	0	7
IASC	0	0	9
ISA	0	1	34
SSH	0	0	9
SSM	2	1	19

Days to Complete Investigation	
Days	f
0-30	32
31-60	40
61-90	6
91+	5
Open	1

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Age	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
18-24	0	5	0	11
25-29	1	9	0	7
30-34	1	4	0	8
35-39	0	0	0	6
40-44	0	6	0	4
45-54	0	7	0	9
55+	0	4	0	5
Unknown	0	16	2	1



<b>Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	1	22	0	45
Black	0	9	0	1
North American Indian	1	2	0	3
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	2	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	16	2	2

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Age</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
18-24	0		0	3
25-29	1		1	2
30-34	0		1	3
35-39	0		0	10
40-44	1		0	2
45-54	0		0	6
55+	0		0	0
Unknown	0		0	3

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	2		1	20
Black	0		1	5
Asian/Pacific Islander	0		0	1
Unknown	0		0	3

## WASHINGTON CORRECTIONS CENTER FOR WOMEN

Washington Corrections Center for Women (WCCW) is Washington State's only major correctional facility for adult women. WCCW serves as both the women's Reception Diagnostic Center and Correction Housing for maximum, close, medium and minimum custody offenders with a current population averaging 860 offenders. WCCW's operational capacity is 764. WCCW continuously seeks out innovative programming and has incorporated gender responsiveness and trauma informed care into our culture.



WCCW passed their federal DOJ PREA Audit with 100% compliance and 3 three areas where noted as exceeding the standards.

WCCW continues to take substantial steps to reduce the likelihood that offenders are subject to sexual misconduct, whether it's by staff members or other offenders. We have worked closely with headquarters to change department policies and procedures in order to align with federal guidelines and PREA standards. WCCW identified how we could do more to address the specific needs of sexual misconduct victims. General PREA education was implemented for all staff upon hire and as part of annual in-service training including; trauma informed self-care, PREA reporting requirements, gender responsiveness and specialized training for staff who may conduct PREA investigations. WCCW continuously worked to ensure that all PREA investigations continue to be conducted thoroughly and in a timely manner. WCCW increased the number of trained PREA investigators and the 39.77% of cases are completed within 30 days.

Beginning with offender orientation, WCCW educated offenders regarding the multiple venues to report instances of sexual misconduct. One of the venues is the PREA hotline that is available 24 hours a day. The publication of the PREA hotline is highly visible in all living units and throughout the facility. In 2014, every unit held a town hall meeting where they talked about PREA and anonymous reporting. Prior to the audit, a sergeant worked on PREA vulnerability assessments and to ensure compliance with the standards.

WCCW implemented numerous changes to protect victims of sexual misconduct. This includes but is not limited to; enhancing reports by educating staff on prevention, protection and response, victim access to Mental Health for crisis and ongoing treatment, and access to victim advocates. To ensure compliance between the audits, WCCW created a spreadsheet to track all the documents supporting each standard and identified a staff member to upload documents as they come in.

In 2015, WCCW will continue to work with Rebuilding Hope of Pierce County to move towards providing in person victim advocacy for offenders. WCCW will also work on revising vulnerability assessments to ensure that the facility is maintaining compliance.

WCCW has come to understand victimization and have responded by applying trauma informed practices throughout the facility. WCCW also recognizes that when a sexual assault occurs in a facility, it's not just a perpetrator and a victim who are impacted—there is a ripple effect from that act of violence and dysfunction that affects the safety and security of everyone. WCCW seeks to continuously educate staff and create a culture that is supportive of growth for staff and offenders. WCCW has seen and believe in the culture shift that can occur in a trauma informed environment and hope that through implementation rate of vicarious trauma in staff will decline as well.

WCCW had one health services case that is included in the following data.

Total PREA Cases			
Allegation	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded
ISH	3	7	26
IASC	1	2	9
ISA	1	3	9
SSH	0	0	4
SSM	2	2	18

Days to Complete Investigation	
Days	f
0-30	35
31-60	28
61-90	19
91+	5
Open	1

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Age	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
18-24	0	7	1	4
25-29	0	17	1	10
30-34	0	5	1	7
35-39	1	6	0	8
40-44	1	6	1	9
45-54	3	10	1	12
55+	0	2	0	5
Unknown	0	3	0	1

<b>Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	4	32	2	36
Black	0	12	0	7
North American Indian	1	6	2	10
Other	0	3	1	2
Unknown	0	3	0	1

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Age</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
18-24	0		0	3
25-29	0		0	0
30-34	0		1	3
35-39	0		1	5
40-44	0		0	3
45-54	1		0	6
55+	0		0	1
Unknown	1		0	2

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	0		2	14
Black	1		0	3
North American Indian	0		0	3
Asian/Pacific Islander	0		0	1
Unknown	1		0	2

## WASHINGTON STATE PENITENTIARY



The Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) is located in Walla Walla, Washington and houses approximately 2,500 adult male offenders in minimum, medium, close and maximum custody units. There are about 1,100 staff employed at the facility in a wide range of job classes including custody, counselors, medical/mental health, support services, correctional industries, etc. Volunteers are involved in religious programs, Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotic Anonymous meetings, assisting veterans with military issues and toastmasters, to name a few. There are also groups that assist offenders in the process of reintegrating back into society.

In January of 2014, a full-time Corrections Specialist position was dedicated to the management of the facility PREA program which has previously been a secondary responsibility. In the fall of 2014, an additional half-time Corrections Specialist was added to assist in the implementation process.

WSP has taken many efforts toward becoming compliant with federal PREA standards. PREA investigators have received updated training and new investigators have been identified and trained. The time to complete PREA investigations has been reduced and an investigation checklist was created. WSP has also worked with their victim advocacy group, YWCA, to provide advocates a tour of WSP. Staff roles in regards to PREA was discussed with specific groups such as medical, mental health, counselors, executive staff, etc.

PREA Risk Assessments were monitored to ensure completion. Shift commanders were trained on reporting responsibilities and response strategies. A process was established to track contract staff background checks and ensure they receive PREA information. PREA information was also included in operational meetings.

The Local PREA Review Committee meets monthly to review substantiated and unsubstantiated allegations. As a result, several offender separations were put into place, food service staff were instructed on safety measures, and a door was permanently removed from a mop closet.

Looking forward, the facility is in the process of finalizing vulnerability assessments which includes a corrective action plan to address areas of concern. Additional work needs to be accomplished with the victim advocates to include touring Providence St. Mary's Medical Center and meeting with the SANE nurse to ensure all participants understand their role. A meeting with local law enforcement to discuss roles and responsibilities is also a goal. WSP will continue to work to ensure compliance with the PREA standards and ingrain PREA into the culture of the facility – not because it's the law but because it's the right thing to do.

The data below titled, “Days to Complete Investigation,” shows that WSP has made a significant improvement in completing investigations in a timely manner. The majority of investigations are completed within 60 days of the allegations with many being completed under 30 days.

WSP had two medical cases that are included in the following data.

Total PREA Cases			
Allegation	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded
ISH	3	10	3
IASC	0	2	4
ISA	3	24	20
SSH	1	7	16
SSM	2	2	15

Days to Complete Investigation	
Days	f
0-30	46
31-60	33
61-90	11
91+	22
Open	2

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Age	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
18-24	1	4	0	7
25-29	0	4	0	10
30-34	1	4	2	8
35-39	3	8	0	11
40-44	0	3	1	6
45-54	1	6	3	12
55+	0	6	0	7
Unknown	0	28	0	2

<b>Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	1	24	6	49
Black	5	9	0	6
North American Indian	0	2	0	5
Other	0	0	0	1
Unknown	0	28	0	2

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Age</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
18-24	0		0	1
25-29	0		0	5
30-34	0		2	15
35-39	1		1	3
40-44	0		0	8
45-54	0		0	5
55+	1		0	2
Unknown	0		0	1

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	2		2	24
Black	0		1	13
Asian/Pacific Islander	0		0	1
North American Indian	1		0	0
Other	0		0	1
Unknown	0		0	1

## WORK RELEASE FACILITIES

The Washington State Department of Corrections operates 17 work release facilities across the state. Of those, 10 are co-ed facilities. During 2014, 22 PREA investigations were initiated in work release facilities. Of those, two investigations resulted in substantiated findings. One of the substantiated allegation was for offender-on offender behavior. The other investigation was for staff sexual misconduct. The contract staff involved no longer worked for the contractor at the time the allegation was reported.

All investigation are reviewed by the Work Release Local PREA Review Committee, regardless of finding, to identify potential policy and process gaps and discuss best practices that prevent PREA activities. As a result of the Local PREA Review Committee discussions, some of the action steps taken include an additional emphasis regarding PREA, reporting and professional boundaries now take place at the new contract staff Work Release Academy. As funding allows, additional security camera systems are being installed. A request for additional security cameras in the work release facilities was submitted and has not been approved or denied at this time.

Some best practices identified by work release staff includes modifying staffing models for graveyard shift, addressing boundaries with staff and contract staff and upgrading existing camera system to ensure cameras are recording at all time.

Total PREA Cases			
Allegation	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded
ISH	1	1	2
IASC	0	3	0
ISA	0	3	0
SSH	0	2	1
SSM	1	4	4

Days to Complete Investigation	
Days	<i>f</i>
0-30	4
31-60	11
61-90	3
91+	4



Work Release PREA Cases		
Location	Allegation	Finding
WR Ahtanum View	SSM	Unsubstantiated
WR Ahtanum View	SSM	Unsubstantiated
WR Bellingham	SSM	Unfounded
WR Bellingham	SSM	Unsubstantiated
WR Bishop Lewis	SSM	Unsubstantiated
WR Bishop Lewis	SSM	Unfounded
WR Bishop Lewis	ISH	Unfounded
WR Bishop Lewis	SSH	Unfounded
WR Longview	ISH	Unfounded
WR Longview	ISA	Unsubstantiated
WR Madison Inn	ISH	Substantiated
WR Olympia	SSM	Unfounded
WR Olympia	ISH	Unsubstantiated
WR Peninsula	SSH	Unsubstantiated
WR Peninsula	SSH	Unsubstantiated
WR Rap House	IASC	Unsubstantiated
WR Rap House	IASC	Unsubstantiated
WR Ratcliff	SSM	Substantiated
WR Reynolds	SSM	Unfounded
WR Reynolds	ISA	Unsubstantiated
WR Reynolds	ISA	Unsubstantiated
WR Tri-Cities	IASC	Unsubstantiated

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
Age	Suspects		Victims	
	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded
18-24	0	1	0	2
25-29	0	1	0	1
30-34	1	1	0	0
35-39	0	3	0	0
40-44	0	1	0	2
45-54	0	0	1	4
55+	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	2	0	0

<b>Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	0	3	1	7
Black	1	3	0	1
North American Indian	0	1	0	1
Unknown	0	2	0	0

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Age</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
18-24	0		1	3
25-29	0		0	1
30-34	0		0	1
35-39	0		0	3
40-44	1		0	0
45-54	0		0	2
55+	0		0	0
Unknown	0		0	1

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	1		0	7
Black	0		0	2
Asian/Pacific Islander	0		0	1
Other	0		1	0
Unknown	0		0	1

## AHTANUM VIEW WORK RELEASE



Ahtanum View Work Release (AVWR) is a 60 bed co-ed facility for adult felons. It opened in October 1972, expanded in 1978 and moved to its current location in May 2010. Since its inception, it has become an intricate part of both the business and law enforcement communities in Yakima. Offenders are eligible to transfer to AVWR from a major institution when they are within six months of their release date. All offenders work in the Yakima area, pay room and board, restitution, legal fees, and family support when applicable. AVWR offers a comprehensive program that focuses on managing

offender transition from prison to the community. DOC, working in partnership with Pioneer Human Services, provides offender accountability, a safe and secure environment and quality programming to support and encourage offender change. AVWR's goal is to effectively intervene in the risk an offender may pose to the community while assisting the offender to become a more positive, productive member of the community.

In 2014, AVWR had two PREA investigations which were both unsubstantiated. Both allegations involved staff-on-offender sexual misconduct. Both staff were non-permanent status and both were dismissed.

Any substantiated or unsubstantiated investigation automatically goes to the Work Release Local PREA Review Committee which typically consists of multiple supervisors, the Appointing Authority and support staff. The Local PREA Review Committee analyzes the completed investigations and has a discussion about the contributing facts, policy compliance and changes, if necessary. A budget request has been submitted requesting additional security cameras throughout the facility. The Local PREA Review Committee recommended obtaining additional cameras at the facility as both allegations took place in parts of the facility that are out of range of surveillance cameras. Additionally, the review committee suggest that contract staff include kitchen visits during non-serving hours as part of their facility walk-throughs.

A vulnerability assessment for AVWR was completed in 2014. The assessment further supported the request for additional cameras in the facility. The budget request for cameras has not been approved or denied at this time.

While this is a co-ed facility, a majority of the contact between male and female offenders is mitigated given the design of the facility. Staff are well aware of those areas where contact between male and females is unavoidable. Heightened awareness by staff is exercised in those locations.

Ahtanum View Work Release is scheduled for their Department of Justice PREA Audit in November 2015. At this time, the facility is on track to be prepared for the upcoming audit.

## **BELLINGHAM WORK RELEASE**

Bellingham Work Release (BWR) is a 25 bed facility in Whatcom County that houses 21 male and 4 female residents. The program prepares residents for release to Whatcom, Skagit, Island and Snohomish Counties. Residents have opportunities to reconnect with their family members in the area, to gain employment and access to chemical dependency treatment. The facility is located near downtown Bellingham. The DOC contract with the Community Work Trade Associated to operate and manage the facility.

PREA Risk Assessments are completed on all residents at the time of arrival to Bellingham Work Release. During orientation, the facility Community Corrections Officer completes a Transfer PREA Risk Assessment to determine if there has been any change in identified risk since the last screening. Housing assignments are based upon pre-arrival Risk Assessment results and are changed as needed based upon the Transfer Risk Assessment. The Community Corrections Officer reviews and update the Risk Assessment within 30 days of orientation to verify no changed in vulnerability have occurred since arrival at the facility.

In 2014, BWR had two PREA investigation which were unsubstantiated/unfounded. Both allegation involved staff-on-offender sexual misconduct. Any substantiated or unsubstantiated allegations automatically go to the Work Release Local PREA Review Committee. The Local PREA Review Committee typically consists of multiple supervisors, the Appointing Authority and support staff. The Local PREA Review Committee analyzes the completed investigations that occurred and has a discussion about the contributing facts, policy compliance and changes, if any that need to be made. The Local PREA Review Committee recommended obtaining additional cameras and upgrading current camera system as the system had malfunction at the time of the alleged behavior and no footage was recorded. Additionally, the staff model for graveyard shift has changed after recommendations made by the Local PREA Review Committee.

A vulnerability assessment for BWR was completed in 2014. The assessment further supported the request for additional cameras in the facility. A budget request has been submitted requesting additional security cameras throughout the facility but has not been approved or denied at this time.

Bellingham Work Release is scheduled for their Department of Justice PREA Audit in April 2016. At this time, the facility is on track to be prepared for the upcoming audit.

## BISHOP LEWIS WORK RELEASE

Bishop Lewis House Work Release (BLWR) is a 69 bed facility for adult male felons located in the Frist Hill neighborhood of Seattle. DOC offenders are eligible to transfer to Bishop Lewis from one of the major institutions when they are within six months of their release date. The facility houses up to eight county boarders. While housed at BLWR, DOC offenders are still considered state inmates but are expected to obtain employment, and/or enter an approved educational program, and participate in appropriate treatment group to include, on-site- chemical dependency services, AA/NA groups, and a fathering program.



In 2014, BLWR had four PREA investigations with were all unsubstantiated or unfounded. Any substantiated or unsubstantiated allegations automatically go to the Work Release Local PREA Review Committee. The Local PREA Review Committee typically consists of multiple supervisors, the Appointing Authority and support staff. The Local PREA Review Committee analyzes the completed investigations that occurred and has a discussion about the contributing facts, policy compliance and changes, if any that need to be made. Prior to the PREA allegations, a budget request was submitted requesting additional security cameras throughout the facility. The Local PREA Review Committee recommended obtaining additional cameras.

The Bishop Lewis House Work Release vulnerability assessment was completed in 2014. The assessment further supported the request for additional cameras in the facility. The budget request for cameras has not been approved or denied at this time.

In 2014, Bishop Lewis had its first Department of Justice PREA Audit. Staff worked tirelessly to gather all documented required for the audit. With the hard work and education of all staff, BLWR passed their audit with a score of 100%!

## BROWNSTONE WORK RELEASE

The Brownstone Work Release is a DOC state owned facility that houses 80 male offenders. Chemical dependency treatment is available on site for offenders. In the community, offenders may attend Responsible Renters, re-licensing program, Moral Reconciliation Therapy, Parenting: Nurturing Fathers, Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous and Domestic Violence Perpetrators program.



Offenders who may be at risk of sexual assault are screened prior to transfer and during intake. If necessary, a plan is put into place for monitoring and follow up. Details of that plan are included in the offender facility plan. Housing assignments are completed according to vulnerability and reviewed prior to allowing any offender room changes. Behaviors are documented on a Resident Observation Report reviewed by the assigned Community Corrections Officer (CCO) and Community Corrections Supervisor (CCS), to determine if further action is needed. Offenders receive orientation the week they arrive at the facility by both contract and DOC staff.

Facility walk-throughs are completed on a regular basis by Pioneer Human Services staff and DOC staff. Any deficiencies are documented and addressed according to priority. Additionally, the facility has a security camera monitoring system which is utilized to enhance safety and security by monitoring offenders and staff. Offenders have access to the Offender Grievance Program and complaints are managed within time frames.

In 2014, Brownstone Work Release did not have any PREA allegations. However, if there were any substantiated or unsubstantiated allegations they would automatically go to the Work Release Local PREA Review Committee. The Local PREA Review Committee typically consists of multiple supervisors, the Appointing Authority and support staff. The Local PREA Review Committee analyzes the completed investigations that occurred and has a discussion about the contributing facts, policy compliance and changes, if any that need to be made.

Brownstone Work Release is scheduled for their Department of Justice PREA Audit in May 2015. At this time, the facility is on track to be prepared for the upcoming audit.

## ELEANOR CHASE HOUSE WORK RELEASE

The Eleanor Chase House Work Release is a state owned facility that houses 40 female offenders. Offenders participate in chemical dependency treatment, a child visitation program and group and individual counseling. Offenders are encouraged to participate in community programs such as parenting and self-esteem classes, Responsible Renters, re-licensing programs, Moral Reconciliation Therapy, Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous and Domestic Violence Prevention Programs.



Offenders who may be at risk of sexual assault are screened prior to transfer and during intake. If necessary, a plan is put into place for monitoring and follow up. Details of that plan are included in the offender facility plan. Housing assignments are completed according to vulnerability and reviewed prior to allowing any offender room changes.

Behaviors are documented on a Resident Observation Report reviewed by the assigned Community Corrections Officer (CCO) and Community Corrections Supervisor (CCS), to determine if further action is needed. Offenders receive orientation the week they arrive at the facility by both contract and DOC staff.

Facility walk-throughs are completed on a regular basis by Pioneer Human Services staff and DOC staff. Any deficiencies are documented and addressed according to priority. Additionally, the facility has a security camera monitoring system which is utilized to enhance safety and security by monitoring offenders and staff. Offenders have access to the Offender Grievance Program and complaints are managed within time frames.

In 2014, Eleanor Chase Work Release did not have any PREA allegations. However, if there were any substantiated or unsubstantiated allegations they would automatically go to the Work Release Local PREA Review Committee. The Local PREA Review Committee typically consists of multiple supervisors, the Appointing Authority and support staff. The Local PREA Review Committee analyzes the completed investigations that occurred and has a discussion about the contributing facts, policy compliance and changes, if any that need to be made.

Eleanor Chase Work Release is scheduled for their Department of Justice PREA Audit in May 2015. At this time, the facility is on track to be prepared for the upcoming audit.

## HELEN B. RATCLIFF WORK RELEASE

The Helen. B. Ratcliff Work Release (HBR) is a 25 bed adult female state work release program in the Beacon Hill area of Seattle. THE HBR provides weekly in house AA/NA meetings for the offenders. A local church provides weekly Bible studies for those who wish to attend. HBR participates in a quarterly Adopt-A-Street neighborhood clear up and hosts the Seattle Work Release Advocacy Group.



HBR is unique in that it has a Residential Parenting Program (RPP). This program allows mothers and newborns to remain together after the child's birth in prison. There are two RPP rooms designed especially for a mother and baby's needs. HBR also has a Child Visitation Program that allows moms to have progressively longer visits with their children in the facility, up to overnight visits.

PREA standards for Work Release include a commitment to provide a safe and healthy environment for offenders and staff. Additionally, there is a zero tolerance for any form of sexual assault, abuse or harassment. Prevention strategies in 2014 included PREA standard training and background checks for all staff, volunteers, contractors and visitors. PREA posters are displayed and brochures available to offenders, staff and community members as well as sharing of the toll-free telephone like to the Office of Crime Victim's Advocacy. PREA orientation and PREA Risk Assessments are being done for all work release offenders.

In 2014, HBR had one PREA investigation. The allegation was staff-on-offender sexual harassment and substantiated. The involved staff member quit prior to the allegations being made. The case was reviewed by the Work Release Local PREA Review Committee. The Local PREA Review Committee consists of multiple supervisors, the Appointing Authority and support staff. The Local PREA Review Committee analyzes the completed investigations that occurred within the past 90 days. The purpose of this committee is to review the investigations and have a discussion about the contributing factors, policy compliance and changes, if any that need to be made. In this case, the Local PREA Review Committee suggested reviewing boundaries and the issues of staff compromise with facility staff.

A vulnerability assessment for HBR has been completed. Strategies based on the findings include updates to the camera system to reduce blind spots in the facility. A budget request was submitted requesting additional security cameras throughout the facility. The budget request has not been approved or denied at this time.

In 2014, Helen B. Ratcliff Work Release completed its first Department of Justice PREA Audit. Staff worked tirelessly to gather all documentation required for the audit. With the hard work and dedication of all staff HBR passed their audit with a score of 100%.



## LONGVIEW WORK RELEASE

The Longview Work Release (LWR) is a 60 bed facility that houses 54 males and 6 females. This is a regional work release and serves offenders from Cowlitz, Lewis, Clark, Pacific, Skamania, and Wahkiakum counties. Offenders are allowed to come to work release when they are six months away from their release date. Offenders are allowed to participate in programs such as chemical dependency and mental health treatment, stress and anger management and parenting classes. This facility is centrally located in Cowlitz county and offenders have ample access to community based treatment provides, employment opportunities, local transportation and the local DOC office. Offenders are required to find suitable employment, develop a release plan that will reduce their risk to reoffend and work on building pro-social relationship with friends, family and community members.



There are joint staff meetings with Pioneer Human Services and state staff which address any updates/changes to PREA policies and procedures. Staff are familiar with how to properly report an alleged PREA incident and any changes associated with reported is related to staff immediately. Staff try to limit contact between male and female offenders by monitoring offender interactions and reporting any potential issues to the contract director and Community Corrections Supervisor (CCS). Staff do pat searches in front of a security camera. Offenders that are potential victims have monitoring plans in place and regularly check in with staff to report any issues/concerns. All staff are required to go through the DOC PREA training annually and PREA investigators are required to attend updated training regarding PREA investigations.

In 2014, LWR had two PREA investigations which were determined to unsubstantiated or unfounded. One of the cases involved some work release residents assaulting another resident who was scheduled to release the next day. The case was reviewed by the Work Release PREA Local Review Committee. The Local PREA Review Committee consists of multiple supervisors, the Appointing Authority and support staff. The Local PREA Review Committee analyzes the completed investigations that occurred within the past 90 days. The purpose of this committee is to review the investigations and have a discussion about the contributing factors, policy compliance and changes, if any that need to be made. The Local PREA Review Committee recommended obtaining additional cameras. The Local Review Committee also suggested that staff and contract staff keep a closer eye on residents close to release in order to prevent any future assault of this nature.

The Longview Work Release vulnerability assessment was completed in 2014. The assessment further supported the request for additional cameras in the facility. The budget request for cameras has not been approved or denied at this time.

Longview Work Release is scheduled for their Department of Justice PREA Audit in April 2016. At this time, the facility is on track to be prepared for the upcoming audit.

## MADISON INN WORK RELEASE



The Madison Inn Work Release (MIWR) is a 25 bed adult male state work release program in Central District of Seattle. Madison Inn hosts a daytime outpatient treatment (OP) group and guest speakers and community partners provide opportunities for the offenders to learn and develop additional skills. Madison Inn also promotes family-friendly events to support reunification. The primary goal is for offenders to learn and assimilate social norms in order to build a sense of belonging and ownership within the

community. Residents use their new skills and/or tools to develop positive change for a clean and pro-social lifestyle.

PREA standards for Work Release include a commitment to provide a safe and healthy environment for offenders and staff. Additionally, there is a zero tolerance for any form of sexual assault, abuse and harassment. Prevention strategies for 2014 included PREA standard training and background checks for all staff, volunteers, contractors and visitors. PREA posters are displayed and brochures are available to offenders, staff and community members as well as sharing of the toll-free telephone line to the Office of Crime Victim Advocacy. PREA orientation and PREA Risk Assessments are being done for all Work Release offenders.

In 2014, MIWR had one PREA investigation which was determined to be substantiated. The incident took place off-site in a class and was reported by the class instructor. Class procedures and protocols for handling this type of situation and reporting of allegations was reviewed. The Work Release Local PREA Review Committee received the case. The Local PREA Review Committee consists of multiple supervisors, the Appointing Authority and support staff. The Local PREA Review Committee analyzes the completed investigations that occurred within the past 90 days. The purpose of this committee is to review the investigations and have a discussion about the contributing factors, policy compliance and changes, if any that need to be made.

A budget request has been submitted requesting additional security camera updates throughout the facility. The budget request for cameras has not been approved or denied.

In 2014, the Madison Inn Work Release had its first Department of Justice PREA Audit. Staff worked tirelessly to gather all documentation required for the audit. With the hard work and dedication of all staff, MIWR passed their audit with 100%!

## OLYMPIA WORK RELEASE

The Olympia Work Release is a 25 bed facility that house 19 males and 6 females. This a regional work release and serves offenders from Thurston, Lewis, Pacific and Grays Harbor counties. Offenders are allowed to come to work release when they are six months away from their release date. Offenders are allowed to participate in programs such as chemical dependency and mental health treatment, stress and anger management, and parenting classes.



This facility is located in West Olympia and offender have ample access to community based treatment provides, employment opportunities, local transportation and the local Olympia field offices. This program offers offenders an opportunity to gradually transition back into the community while still being held accountable for their actions. They are required to find suitable employment, develop a release plan that will help them reduce their risk to reoffend and work on building pro-social relationships with friends and family members.

There are joint staff meeting with Beginning Alliance and state staff to discuss any update/changes to PREA policies and procedures. Staff are familiar with how to properly report an alleged PREA incident and any changes associated with reported is related to staff immediately. Staff try to limit contact between male and female offenders by monitoring offender interactions and reporting any potential issues to the contract director and Community Corrections Supervisor (CCS). Staff do pat searches in front of a security camera. Offenders that are potential victims have monitoring plans in place and regularly check in with staff to report any issues/concerns. All staff are required to go through the DOC PREA training annually and PREA investigators are required to attend updated training regarding PREA investigations.

In 2014, Olympia Work Release has two PREA investigations which were unsubstantiated/unfounded. Any substantiated or unsubstantiated allegations automatically go to the Work Release Local PREA Review Committee. The Local PREA Review Committee consists of multiple supervisors, the Appointing Authority and support staff. The Local PREA Review Committee analyzes the completed investigations that occurred within the past 90 days. The purpose of this committee is to review the investigations and have a discussion about the contributing factors, policy compliance and changes, if any that need to be made. The Local PREA Review Committee recommended obtaining additional cameras.

The Olympia Work Release vulnerability assessment was completed in 2014. The assessment further supported the request for additional cameras in the facility. The budget request for cameras has not been approved or denied at this time.

Olympia Work Release is scheduled for their Department of Justice PREA Audit in April 2016. At this time, the facility is on track to be prepared for the upcoming audit.

## PENINSULA WORK RELEASE



The Peninsula Work Release is a 60 bed facility that housed 54 males and 6 females. This is a regional work release and serves offenders from Kitsap, Mason, Jefferson and Clallam counties. Offenders are allowed to come to work release when they are six months away from their release date. Offenders are allowed to participate in programs such as chemical dependency and mental health treatment, stress and anger

management, and parenting classes. This facility is located in Kitsap County and offenders have ample access to community based treatment providers, employment opportunities, local transportation and the Port Orchard and Bremerton field offices. This program offers offenders an opportunity to gradually transition back into the community while still being held accountable for their actions. They are required to find suitable employment, develop a release plan that will help them reduce their risk to reoffend and work on building pro-social relationships with friends and family members.

There are joint staff meetings with Pioneer Human Services and state staff which address any updates/changes to PREA policies and procedures. Staff are familiar with how to properly report an alleged PREA incident and any changes associated with reporting is related to staff immediately. Staff try to limit contact between male and female offenders by monitoring offender interactions and reporting any potential issues to the contract director and Community Corrections Supervisor (CCS). Staff do pat searches in front of a security camera. Offenders who are potential victims have monitoring plans in place and regularly check in with staff to report any issues/concerns. All staff are required to go through the DOC PREA training annually and PREA investigators are required to attend updated training regarding investigations.

In 2014, Peninsula Work Release had two PREA investigations which were both unsubstantiated. Any substantiated or unsubstantiated allegations automatically go to the Work Release Local PREA Review Committee. The Local PREA Review Committee consists of multiple supervisors, the Appointing Authority and support staff. The Local PREA Review Committee analyzes completed investigations that occurred within the past 90 days. The purpose of this committee is to review the investigations and have a discussion about contributing factors, policy compliance and changes, if any are necessary. The Local PREA Review Committee recommended obtaining additional cameras and modifying the staffing plan for food service workers. A budget request has been submitted requesting additional security cameras throughout the facility.

The Peninsula Work Release vulnerability assessment was completed in 2014. The assessment further supported the request for additional cameras in the facility. The budget request for cameras has not been approved or denied at this time.

Peninsula Work Release is scheduled for their Department of Justice PREA Audit in February 2015. At this time, the facility is on track to be prepared for the upcoming audit.

## PROGRESS HOUSE WORK RELEASE

The Progress House Work Release (PHWR) houses 69 male offenders and 6 female offenders. Programming opportunities includes chemical dependency, Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, religious services, and programs at the Tacoma Community Justice Center. Offenders are still considered state inmates but are expected to obtain employment, and/or enter an approved educational program. The mission of PHWR is to provide a safe environment and quality program services which create opportunities for personal growth that empower offenders to successfully transition to the community.



There are joint staff meetings with Progress House Association and state staff which address any updates/changes to PREA policies and procedures. Staff are familiar with how to properly report an alleged PREA incident and any changes associated with reporting is related to staff immediately. Staff try to limit contact between male and female offenders by monitoring offender interactions and reporting any potential issues to the contract director and Community Corrections Supervisor (CCS). Staff do pat searches in front of a security camera. Offenders that are potential victims have monitoring plans in place and regularly check in with staff to report any issues/concerns. All staff are required to go through the DOC PREA training annually and PREA investigators are required to attend updated training regarding investigations.

In 2014, Progress House Work Release did not have any PREA allegations. However, if there were any substantiated or unsubstantiated allegations they would automatically go to the Work Release Local PREA Review Committee. The Local PREA Review Committee typically consists of multiple supervisors, the Appointing Authority and support staff. The Local PREA Review Committee analyzes completed investigations and has a discussion about the contributing facts, policy compliance and changes, if any are necessary.

The Progress House Work Release vulnerability assessment was completed in 2014. The assessment suggested obtaining additional cameras in the facility. A budget request has been submitted requesting additional security cameras throughout the facility. The budget request for cameras has not been approved or denied at this time.

Progress House Work Release is scheduled for their Department of Justice PREA Audit in February 2015. At this time, the facility is on track to be prepared for the upcoming audit.

## RAP HOUSE/LINCOLN PARK WORK RELEASE



The Rap House/Lincoln Park Work Release facilities house 41 male offenders and 9 female offenders who are seriously mentally ill. Resident at these facilities are required to participate in mental health therapy. Programming opportunities include chemical dependency, AA/NA, stress and anger management, and Thinking for a Change. The emphasis is for residents to manage medication and continue with mental health treatment as they transition to the community.

There are joint staff meetings with Pioneer Human Services and state staff which address any updates/changes to PREA policies and procedures. Staff are familiar with how to properly report an alleged PREA incident and any changes associated with reporting is related to staff immediately. Staff try to limit contact between male and female offenders by monitoring offender interactions and reporting any potential issues to the contract director and Community Corrections Supervisor (CCS). Staff do pat searches in front of a security camera. Offenders who are potential victims have monitoring plans in place and regularly check in with staff to report any issues/concerns. All staff are required to go through the DOC PREA training annually and PREA investigators are required to attend updated training regarding investigations.

In 2014, Rap House/Lincoln Park Work Release had two PREA investigations which were both unsubstantiated/unfounded. Any substantiated or unsubstantiated allegations automatically go to the Work Release Local PREA Review Committee. The Local PREA Review Committee typically consists of multiple supervisors, the Appointing Authority and support staff. The Local PREA Review Committee analyzes completed investigations and have a discussion about contributing facts, policy compliance and changes, if necessary.

The Rap House/Lincoln Park Work Release vulnerability assessment was completed in 2014. The assessment suggested obtaining additional cameras in the facility. A budget request has been submitted requesting additional security cameras throughout the facility. The budget request for cameras has not been approved or denied at this time. For offenders who are potentially vulnerable to being victimized, staff ensure that they are housed appropriately using the PREA Risk Assessments. Rap House/Lincoln Park Work Release has an onsite psychology associate who assists in assessing potential housing conflicts.



Rap House/Lincoln Park Work Release is scheduled for their Department of Justice PREA Audit in February 2015. At this time, the facility is on track to be prepared for the upcoming audit.

## REYNOLDS WORK RELEASE

Reynolds Work Release (RWR) is the largest work release in Washington State. RWR is a 99 bed all male facility. There are two programs at the facility: one is for offenders transitioning from a major institution back into the community via work release; and, the second is for offenders whose DOSA sentence is revoked and they are eligible for work release instead of going directly to a prison facility. This allows them to attempt to regain a positive footing in the community. These offenders usually come to a facility from the local jails.



While housed at Reynolds Work Release offenders are still considered state inmates but are expected to obtain employment and attend programming that addresses their risk/needs areas. Programming at the facility includes chemical dependency treatment, men's peer to peer groups as well as attending outside treatment in the community. The goal of the work release facility are to integrate offenders back into the community safely and to reunite with family and/or community support prior to full release.

There are joint staff meetings with Pioneer Human Services and state staff which address any updates/changes to PREA policies and procedures. Staff are familiar with how to properly report an alleged PREA incident and any changes associated with reporting is related to staff immediately. Pat searches are conducted in front of a security camera. All staff are required to complete the PREA overview, PREA annual training and PREA investigators attend investigator training and any required updates.

Offenders who are potential victims have monitoring plans in place and regularly check in with their Community Corrections Officers. Single rooms are provide based on the vulnerability assessments and private restroom facilities are available to ensure safety.

In 2014, RWR had three PREA investigations which were unsubstantiated/unfounded. Any substantiated or unsubstantiated allegations automatically go to the Work Release Local PREA Review Committee. The Local PREA Review Committee typically consists of multiple supervisors, the Appointing Authority and support staff. The Local PREA Review Committee analyzes the completed investigations and has a discussion about contributing facts, policy compliance and changes, if necessary. The Local PREA Review Committee recommended obtaining additional cameras. A budget request has been submitted requesting additional security cameras throughout the facility.

The Reynolds Work Release vulnerability assessment was completed in 2014. The assessment further supported the request for additional cameras in the facility. The budget request for cameras has not been approved or denied at this time.

In 2014, Reynolds Work Release had its first Department of Justice PREA Audit. Staff worked tirelessly to gather all documented required for the audit. With the hard work and dedication of all staff. Reynolds Work Release passed their audit with a score of 100%.

## TRI-CITIES WORK RELEASE

Tri-Cities Work Release (TCWR) was designed and built as a work release facility and opened at the current location in June of 1999. It houses up to 24 male and 6 female offenders. It is located one block south of the Columbia River in downtown Kennewick. It is the only agency work release facility staffed solely by Washington Department of Corrections employees.



Most offenders find employment in food services, agribusiness and construction. Offender utilize workforce job training and experience programs and Columbia Basin College for GED classes, higher education and vocational training. There is an active referral network for employment services addressing barriers for employment. Tri-Cities Work Release partners with the Work Source Center and Goodwill Industries in assisting resident with employment opportunities.

Offenders at TCWR can be assessed for chemical dependency and participate in Intensive Outpatient Treatment and Outpatient Treatment at the facility. They attend 12-step (AA/NA) meetings in the community. The supervisor and Community Corrections Officer (CCO) were training in Effective Practices in Correctional Settings (EPICS), a cognitive-behavioral approach to addressing offender behavior. These skills are utilized in many interactions with facility residents.

In 2014, TCWR had one PREA investigation which was unsubstantiated. Any substantiated or unsubstantiated allegations automatically go to the Work Release Local PREA Review Committee. The Local PREA Review Committee typically consists of multiple supervisors, the Appointing Authority and support staff. The Local PREA Review Committee analyzes completed investigations and has a discussion about the contributing facts, policy compliance and changes, if necessary. The Local PREA Review Committee recommended obtaining additional cameras. A budget request has been submitted requesting additional security cameras throughout the facility.

The Tri-Cities Work Release vulnerability assessment was completed in 2014. The assessment further supported the request for additional cameras in the facility. The budget request for cameras has not been approved or denied at this time.

Tri-Cities Work Release is scheduled for their Department of Justice PREA Audit in September 2015. At this time, the facility is on track to be prepared for the upcoming audit.



## COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS DIVISION

The Community Corrections Division consists of 89 field offices, community justice centers and outstations across the state of Washington with responsibility to supervise approximately 17,000 offenders in the community. Community Correction Officers (CCO) meet with offenders in field offices, at offenders' homes, schools and places of employment. We offer evidence based offender change programs and cognitive behavioral interventions including Thinking for a Change, Chemical Dependency, domestic violence treatment, sex offender treatment and mental health treatment. Work Crews provide an opportunity for offenders to give back to the community by cleaning up litter and clearing public areas and is funded through state, county and municipal contracts. We have community partnerships to assist with transition to include the Department of Veteran Affairs and local community colleges, some of which offer offenders GED preparation, Life Skills to Work, and Go2Work classes. We partner with law enforcement and have outstations in many local police departments and tribal authorities.

DOC's Strategic Plan 2011 – 2017 includes a commitment to provide a safe and healthy environment for offenders and staff. Additionally, there is zero tolerance for any form of misconduct. Prevention strategies for 2015 – 2016 include:

- Continue to monitor that updated posters and brochures are up and available in staff and public areas.
- Require volunteers and contract staff to review policies and sign acknowledgement of PREA information. Ensure contract staff with offender contact attend NEO and/or have access to PREA training in LMS.
- Continue to use Local PREA Investigation Review Committees
- Include PREA policy reviews at Section Supervisors meetings with expectation that the information be reviewed during unit staff meetings.
- Specific to Work Crew: follow updated protocols that require a minimum of two offenders working together in pairs at all times.

CCD supervisors are encouraged to take PREA investigation training and many have also attended the PREA investigator booster class.

Total PREA Cases			
Allegation	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded
ISH	0	1	0
IASC	0	0	0
ISA	0	0	0
SSH	0	0	1
SSM	0	2	7

Days to Complete Investigation	
Days	<i>f</i>
0-30	1
31-60	2
61-90	3
91+	5
Open	1

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
	Suspects		Victims	
<i>Age</i>	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/Unfounded</i>	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/Unfounded</i>
18-24		0		0
25-29		0		0
30-34		0		0
35-39		0		1
40-44		0		0
45-54		1		0
55+		0		0
Unknown		0		0

Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases				
	Suspects		Victims	
<i>Race</i>	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/Unfounded</i>	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/Unfounded</i>
White		1		1

### Staff-on-Offender Cases

Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable.

Victims	
<i>Age</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/Unfounded</i>
18 – 24	1
25 – 29	3
30 – 34	0
35 – 39	1
40 – 44	0
45 – 54	4
55+	1
Unknown	0

Victims	
<i>Race</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/Unfounded</i>
White	7
Black	1
Asian/Pacific Islander	2

## HEALTH SERVICES DIVISION

The Health Services Division is responsible for providing for the health care needs of the offender population in the Washington State Department of Corrections. Through recruitment, community partnership and continuous review and redeployment of staffing resources, Health Services continues to evolve to ensure that appropriate resources are available to safely and efficiently provide high quality health care to offenders.

Health Services has worked closely with the PREA facility audit teams during this past year to ensure all processes for investigating alleged incidents were followed according to WADOC PREA policies. Health Services staff were engaged and supportive of the pre-audit teams that toured the facilities prior to the DOJ PREA audits. Health Services have been very vigilant with regard to training and orientating staff according to PREA policies.

All new hires and contract Health Services staff are required to take all PREA orientation courses before they are allowed inside the secure perimeter of a facility. Health Services staff are also required to take PREA training for Health Services. Any PREA incidents that are referred for investigation by the PREA Unit at HQ may serve as a learning opportunity for Health Services staff. Such opportunities this year allowed one-on-one training emphasizing appropriate incident reporting, assisting with realigning staff to mitigate concerns regarding allegations. PREA is routinely discussed with Health Services Managers to allow for conversation about any concerns, issues, audits or training to ensure overall compliance, understanding and cooperation with facility requirements and policy.

Health Services Administrators for both commands have established well organized Local PREA Review Committees that include Health Services Administrators, Chief of Psychology, Nursing administration, the Health Services Manager of the facility at which the alleged PREA incident occurred and other members as appropriate for the case. The committee convenes as needed to review cases and support the Appointing Authority in their decision. To date, the process and configuration of committee members has been effective and timely.

Health Services PREA Cases by Location			
Location	Allegation	Finding	Appointing Authority
AHCC	SSM	Unfounded	Currey, Mary Jo
CRCC	SSH	Unsubstantiated	Currey, Mary Jo
LCC	SSM	Unfounded	Hernandez, Eric
LCC	SSM	Unsubstantiated	Hernandez, Eric
MCC	SSM	Unfounded	Hernandez, Eric
MCC	SSM	Unfounded	Hernandez, Eric
MCC	SSH	Substantiated	Hernandez, Eric
MCC	SSH	Unfounded	Hernandez, Eric
MCC	SSM	Unfounded	Hernandez, Eric
MCC	SSM	Unfounded	Hernandez, Eric
MCC	SSM	Unfounded	Hernandez, Eric
SCCC	SSH	Unfounded	Hernandez, Eric
WCC	SSM	Unfounded	Hernandez, Eric
WCC	SSM	Substantiated	Hernandez, Eric
WCCW	SSM	Unfounded	Hernandez, Eric
WSP	SSM	Unfounded	Currey, Mary Jo
WSP	SSM	Unfounded	Currey, Mary Jo

Total PREA Cases			
Allegation	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Unfounded
SSH	1	1	2
SSM	1	1	11

Days to Complete Investigation	
Days	<i>f</i>
0-30	5
31-60	5
61-90	4
91+	3

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Age</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
18-24	0		0	1
25-29	0		1	1
30-34	0		0	1
35-39	0		0	5
40-44	1		1	1
45-54	0		0	5
55+	1		0	1
Unknown	0		0	0

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	2		2	10
Black	0		0	4
Asian/ Pacific Islander	0		0	1

## **SUBSTANCE ABUSE RECOVERY UNIT/ OFFENDER CHANGE DIVISION**

The Substance Abuse Recovery Unit (SARU) provides treatment for offenders diagnosed with a substance abuse disorder. Treatment is delivered in prisons, work releases, field offices and community justice centers. The DOC also contracts with American Behavioral Health Systems (ABHS) to provide Inpatient and Long Term Residential Treatment in the community for offenders sentenced to DOSA or community supervision and diagnosed with a substance use disorder.

In 2014, a plan was put in place to with new PREA investigators trained to complete investigations for cases out of ABHS. In the past, DOC staff have conducted the investigations but the goal is to have trained PREA investigators from ABHS conduct their own investigations as of June 1, 2015. DOC staff will continue to conduct all investigations related to Spectrum Health Systems in DOC facilities.

The SARU has worked in partnership with ABHS to establish policies and procedures to ensure offenders are receiving services that are sexually safe and that staff respond in accordance with PREA standards when reports/allegations have been received.

The ABHS facility in Chehalis completed a DOJ PREA audit and passed with 100% compliance. DOJ audits are scheduled for September 2015 for ABHS' Spokane and Cozza facilities.

The contractor has worked diligently to ensure proper reporting signs are visible, and all offenders are informed of PREA reporting and guidelines upon entry into the facility. In 2014, ABHS provided treatment to 2,479 offenders and all other providers combined served 4,717 offenders for a total of 7,198 unique offenders.

The Offender Change Division's Appointing Authority reviews each PREA report and renders a finding. All findings are reviewed with the contractors. These reviews present opportunities for conversation and continued infrastructure building for sexual safety in contractor and DOC facilities. The changes made include additional cameras, peer-to-peer PREA orientation review, PREA orientation upon admission, sexual safety reviews for staff, staff PREA orientation, and, contractor report and investigation policy and procedure development. ABHS has added a PREA coordinator position responsible for PREA related situations, investigations and ensuring sexual safety is preserved.

The Offender Change Division and SARU meet with the contractor agency administrator, investigator and Human Resources representative to review applicable PREA cases as the Local PREA Review Committee. During the meeting, the initial allegation/report is reviewed and highlights from the investigation are discussed as opportunities to develop an action plan. The Local PREA Review Committee is held at the conclusion of each investigation and has been received well by the contractors. The SARU continues to develop processes to ensure offender sexual safety. It is important that SARU continue to identify areas of improvement and work with the contractors to ensure offender's sexual safety is actualized and maintained.

<b>Substance Abuse Recovery Unit PREA Cases by Location</b>		
<b>Location</b>	<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Finding</b>
ABHS Chehalis	ISH	Substantiated
ABHS Spokane	SSM	Substantiated
ABHS Spokane	IASC	Substantiated
ABHS Spokane	ISH	Substantiated
ABHS Chehalis	SSM	Unfounded
ABHS Chehalis	SSM	Unsubstantiated
ABHS Chehalis	ISH	Unsubstantiated
ABHS Chehalis	SSM	Unfounded
ABHS Spokane	SSM	Substantiated
ABHS Spokane	SSM	Unfounded
ABHS Spokane	IASC	Substantiated
ABHS Spokane	ISH	Unsubstantiated
ABHS Spokane	ISH	Unsubstantiated
Auburn Office	SSM	Unfounded
Community	SSH	Unfounded
Creative Changes	SSM	Substantiated
Spectrum	SSM	Substantiated
MCC CD	SSM	Unfounded
MCC CD	SSM	Unfounded

<b>Total PREA Cases</b>			
<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Substantiated</b>	<b>Unsubstantiated</b>	<b>Unfounded</b>
ISH	2	3	0
IASC	2	0	0
ISA	0	0	0
SSH	0	0	0
SSM	4	1	7

<b>Days to Complete Investigation</b>	
<b>Days</b>	<b>f</b>
0-30	3
31-60	8
61-90	2
91+	6

<b>Offender-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
<i>Age</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
18-24	0	0	0	1
25-29	0	2	1	0
30-34	1	1	1	0
35-39	2	0	0	1
40-44	1	0	1	1
45-54	0	0	1	0
55+	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0	0

<b>Offender on Offender PREA Cases</b>				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>	<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	2	3	3	2
Black	1	0	1	0
North American Indian	1	0	0	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	1

<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Age</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
18-24	0		2	2
25-29	0		1	0
30-34	1		1	4
35-39	0		0	0
40-44	1		0	0
45-54	2		0	1
55+	0		0	1
Unknown	0		0	0



<b>Staff-on-Offender PREA Cases</b>				
Data for staff suspects in unsubstantiated/unfounded cases is unavailable				
<i>Race</i>	<b>Suspects</b>		<b>Victims</b>	
	<i>Substantiated</i>		<i>Substantiated</i>	<i>Unsubstantiated/ Unfounded</i>
White	0		2	6
Black	0		1	2
Native American Indian	0		1	0
Asian/ Pacific Islander	1		0	0
Other	2		0	0
Unknown	1		0	0

## AGGREGATE DATA

The following tables demonstrate high level PREA data. The purpose of this data is to provide a breakdown of PREA data related to investigations.

<b>PREA Case Findings by Type of Facility</b>		
	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Community Corrections</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>12</b>
Substantiated	2	0
Unsubstantiated	7	3
Unfounded	14	8
Open	0	1
<b>Prison Facilities</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>837</b>
Substantiated	85	69
Unsubstantiated	221	169
Unfounded	322	577
Open	0	22
<b>Residential Treatment Center</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>13</b>
Substantiated	7	6
Unsubstantiated	10	3
Unfounded	3	3
Open	0	1
<b>Work Release Facilities</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>22</b>
Substantiated	4	2
Unsubstantiated	7	11
Unfounded	9	7
Open	0	2
<b>WADOC Total</b>	<b>691</b>	<b>884</b>
Substantiated	98	77
Unsubstantiated	245	186
Unfounded	348	595
Open	0	26

<b>Case Finding by Allegation</b>		
	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Offender-on-Offender Sexual Assault</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>274</b>
Substantiated	14	11
Unsubstantiated	111	67
Unfounded	104	192
Open	0	4
<b>Offender-on-Offender Sexual Abuse</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>82</b>
Substantiated	16	10
Unsubstantiated	37	24
Unfounded	32	48
Open	0	0
<b>Offender-on-Offender Sexual Harassment</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>227</b>
Substantiated	35	42
Unsubstantiated	51	62
Unfounded	50	121
Open	0	2
<b>Staff Sexual Misconduct</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>211</b>
Substantiated	26	14
Unsubstantiated	38	23
Unfounded	120	158
Open	0	16
<b>Staff Sexual Harassment</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>90</b>
Substantiated	7	2
Unsubstantiated	10	10
Unfounded	40	74
Open	0	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>691</b>	<b>884</b>

<b>Number of Days to Close Investigations by Type of Facility</b>		
	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Community Corrections</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>12</b>
0-30 Days	0	1
31-60 Days	6	2
61-90 Days	4	3
90 + Days	13	5
Open	0	1
<b>Prison Facilities</b>	<b>629</b>	<b>837</b>
0-30 Days	189	264
31-60 Days	235	285
61-90 Days	107	149
90 + Days	98	116
Open	0	23
<b>Residential Treatment Center</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>
0-30 Days	1	2
31-60 Days	2	6
61-90 Days	1	2
90 + Days	16	5
Open	0	1
<b>Work Release Facilities</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>22</b>
0-30 Days	7	4
31-60 Days	3	11
61-90 Days	7	3
90 + Days	3	2
Open	0	2
<b>WADOC Total</b>	<b>692</b>	<b>887</b>
0-30 Days	197	271
31-60 Days	246	304
61-90 Days	119	157
90 + Days	0	128
Open	0	27

## SUBSTANTIATED VICTIM DATA

<b>Substantiated Staff Suspect Investigations</b>		
Victim Gender		
	2013	2014
Male	25	9
Female	7	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>16</b>

<b>Substantiated Staff Suspect Investigations</b>		
Victim Race		
	2013	2014
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	0
Black	8	3
North American Indian	6	1
Other	0	1
White	17	11
Unknown	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>16</b>

<b>Substantiated Staff Suspect Investigations</b>		
Victim Age		
	2013	2014
18-24	1	3
25-29	7	3
30-34	7	3
35-39	9	2
40-44	4	4
45-54	4	1
55+	0	0
Unknown	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>16</b>

<b>Substantiated Offender Suspect Investigations</b>		
Victim Gender		
	2013	2014
Male	70	63
Female	18	12
Transgender	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>76</b>

<b>Substantiated Offender Suspect Investigations</b>		
Victim Age		
	2013	2014
18-24	22	13
25-29	10	12
30-34	16	10
35-39	10	5
40-44	4	11
45-54	24	15
55+	0	5
Unknown	2	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>76</b>

<b>Substantiated Offender Suspect Investigations</b>		
Victim Race		
	2013	2014
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	1
Black	10	6
North American Indian	4	3
Other	0	4
White	71	54
Unknown	2	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>76</b>

## UNSUBSTANTIATED/UNFOUNDED VICTIM DATA

Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Staff Suspect Investigations		
Victim Gender		
	2013	2014
Male	38	217
Female	196	36
Unknown	0	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>269</b>

Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Staff Suspect Investigations		
Victim Race		
	2013	2014
Asian/Pacific Islander	7	8
Black	57	73
North American Indian	6	5
Other	4	2
White	148	163
Unknown	12	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>269</b>

Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Offender Suspect Investigations		
Victim Gender		
	2013	2014
Male	70	395
Female	358	65
Unknown	0	47
<b>Total</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>507</b>

Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Offender Suspect Investigations		
Victim Race		
	2013	2014
Asian/Pacific Islander	8	4
Black	46	30
North American Indian	19	25
Other	3	4
White	310	390
Unknown	42	54
<b>Total</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>507</b>

Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Staff Suspect Investigations		
Victim Age		
	2013	2014
18-24	15	32
25-29	49	37
30-34	45	53
35-39	31	53
40-44	30	23
45-54	52	43
55+	12	12
Unknown	0	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>269</b>

Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Offender Suspect Investigations		
Victim Age		
	2013	2014
18-24	67	75
25-29	85	76
30-34	68	59
35-39	55	83
40-44	39	47
45-54	76	88
55+	38	32
Unknown	0	47
<b>Total</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>507</b>

## SUBSTANTIATED SUSPECT DATA

Due to an issue with 2013 data, only 2014 data is included in this section

<b>Substantiated Staff Suspect Investigations</b>		
Suspect Gender		
	2013	2014
Male		6
Female		10
<b>Total</b>		<b>16</b>

<b>Substantiated Staff Suspect Investigations</b>		
Suspect Race		
	2013	2014
Asian/Pacific Islander		1
Black		2
North American Indian		0
Other		2
White		9
Unknown		2
<b>Total</b>		<b>16</b>

<b>Substantiated Offender Suspect Investigations</b>		
Suspect Gender		
	2013	2014
Male		53
Female		10
Unknown		1
<b>Total</b>		<b>64</b>

<b>Substantiated Offender Suspect Investigations</b>		
Suspect Race		
	2013	2014
Asian/Pacific Islander		1
Black		13
North American Indian		4
Other		1
White		44
Unknown		1
<b>Total</b>		<b>64</b>

<b>Substantiated Staff Suspect Investigations</b>		
Suspect Age		
	2013	2014
18-24		0
25-29		1
30-34		1
35-39		1
40-44		3
45-54		5
55+		3
Unknown		2
<b>Total</b>		<b>16</b>

<b>Substantiated Offender Suspect Investigations</b>		
Suspect Age		
	2013	2014
18-24		12
25-29		7
30-34		10
35-39		5
40-44		6
45-54		17
55+		6
Unknown		1
<b>Total</b>		<b>64</b>

### UNSUBSTANTIATED/UNFOUNDED SUSPECT DATA

Due to an issue with 2013 data, only 2014 data is included in this section.  
Data is not collected for staff suspects in unsubstantiated and unfounded cases.

<b>Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Offender Suspect Investigations</b>		
Suspect Gender		
	2013	2014
Male		343
Female		61
Unknown		101
<b>Total</b>		<b>505</b>

<b>Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Offender Suspect Investigations</b>		
Victim Race		
	2013	2014
Asian/Pacific Islander		6
Black		98
North American Indian		19
Other		6
White		272
Unknown		104
<b>Total</b>		<b>505</b>

<b>Unsubstantiated/Unfounded Offender Suspect Investigations</b>		
Suspect Age		
	2013	2014
18-24		47
25-29		68
30-34		65
35-39		48
40-44		44
45-54		82
55+		50
Unknown		101
<b>Total</b>		<b>505</b>