



U.S. Department of Justice
999 North Capitol Street, NE
Washington, DC 20531
via email: PREACompliance@usdoj.gov

April 24, 2025

re: 2025 Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex Unit PREA audit report deficiencies

To the PREA Resource Center:

Trans Pride Initiative (TPI) is filing this comment letter concerning the final Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) audit report for the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex conducted by auditor Matthew Taylor and Corrections Consulting Services, LLC, formerly PREA Auditors of America. The onsite portion of the audit was conducted from January 22 to January 24, 2025, no interim report appears to have been produced, and the final report was published on February 28, 2025.

TPI has been working with incarcerated persons since 2013, mainly trans and queer persons in the Texas prison system.¹ During that time, we believe we have gained an understanding of the Texas prison system that is sufficient to enable us to comment substantively on PREA audits, especially where the treatment of trans and queer persons is concerned. Based on that understanding, we believe that this audit fails to meet the spirit or letter of PREA audit requirements for reasons that will be provided below. **Thus TPI asserts that this audit report does not reflect compliance with the PREA standards.**

PREA auditors have an exceptional amount of power in the PREA certification process. Texas must submit an annual certification that jails and prisons operating under state jurisdiction are in full compliance with the PREA standards or face a reduction in certain federal grant funds.² The certification of full compliance is issued by the governor, PREA § 115.501 requires that “the Governor shall consider the results of the most recent agency audits,” and the Department of Justice (DOJ) notes that those audits are “to be a primary factor in determining State-level ‘full

1. PREA identifies LGBTI as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex persons. TPI is much more affirming and comprehensive in our understanding of vulnerabilities and marginalization, and as such we include under the PREA “LGBTI” umbrella all non-cisgender non-hetero-normative persons. We believe this is the only interpretation consistent with the spirit of PREA.
2. The requirements are defined at 34 USC § 30307, <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title34-section30307&num=0&edition=prelim>.



compliance.’’³ Thus audits reflecting full compliance with PREA standards are in the best interest of state certification and full funding for prison operations, even when running counter to the PREA legislative objective of zero tolerance of sexual abuse and sexual harassment.

Audit quality and the resulting assessments are key factors in addressing problems hampering work toward the goals of the PREA legislation. DOJ’s PREA Management Office is responsible for PREA audit oversight, which includes evaluation of auditor performance and development of auditor skills and thoroughness with the objective of “ensuring the high quality and integrity of PREA audits.”⁴ This effort includes audit assessment, review, mentoring, remediation, and where necessary discipline. TPI’s primary purpose in submitting this letter is to contribute information to the audit oversight process in any or all of these efforts to address problems in achieving the legislative goals of PREA.

TPI’s secondary purpose in submitting this comment letter is to provide relevant information for the PREA Management Office in their review of Texas’ certifications of full compliance, and for the National PREA Resource Center for use in auditor performance assessment.⁵ Although audit deficiencies will not cause the audit to be overturned or denied, TPI believes information in this report should raise serious questions about the state’s certification of full compliance, past and present.

TPI has documented a total of 38 incidents of violence against persons housed at the Lynam and Fort Stockton units. Of the total documented incidents, 20 involved noncompliance with some element of the PREA standards.⁶ TPI has exchanged approximately 72 letters with 16 individuals at these facilities between March 17, 2017, and June 23, 2023.

Although TPI does not have as much data for the Lynam-Fort Stockton Complex as we do for some other TDCJ facilities, we feel there is sufficient data available to question compliance in some areas and to indicate the most recent PREA audit is deficient.

All comment letters prepared by TPI for PREA audits of Texas prison facilities may be viewed at <https://tpride.org/blog/category/prison-comm/prea-issues/>.

-
3. U.S. Department of Justice, “National Standards To Prevent, Detect, and Respond to Prison Rape,” *Federal Register* 77, no. 119 (June 20, 2012): 37188, <https://www.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/PREA-Final-Rule.pdf>.
 4. U.S. Department of Justice, PREA Management Office, *PREA Auditor Handbook*, Version 2.1, November 2022: 91, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/PREA%20Auditor%20Handbook%20V2.1%20-%20December%202022.pdf>.
 5. The National PREA Resource Center is joint governmental and public nonprofit entity, so the views and opinions of the PRC are considered to represent the views and opinions of the DOJ as well.
 6. These data are all available at the Trans Pride Initiative web site. General information and all incidents of violence are available via our Prison Data Explorer (https://tpride.org/projects_prisondata/index.php), and specific PREA related data for each facility is available via our auditor data tool (https://tpride.org/projects_prisondata/prea.php).



In this report, excerpts from the PREA standards are highlighted in purple to make them easier to recognize. Excerpts from PREA auditor tools and guidelines are highlighted in green.

Contents

Summary of Deficiencies.....	4
Request for Action.....	5
TPI Data.....	6
Discussion of Audit Deficiencies.....	6
General Audit Information Issues.....	6
Audit Report Language.....	6
Facility Characteristics.....	6
Summary of Facility Audit Findings.....	7
Onsite Audit Period.....	8
Facility Information.....	8
PREA Standards Compliance Assessment Issues.....	12
PREA § 115.11, Zero Tolerance.....	12
PREA § 115.13 Supervision and Monitoring.....	13
PREA § 115.15 Preface, Defining Cross-Gender.....	16
PREA § 115.15, Cross-Gender Viewing and Searches.....	20
PREA § 115.18, Facility Upgrades and Technologies.....	22
PREA § 115.21, Evidence Protocol and Forensic Medical Examinations.....	22
PREA § 115.31, Employee Training.....	24
PREA § 115.33, Incarcerated Persons Education.....	24
PREA § 115.41, Screening for Risk of Victimization and Abusiveness.....	24
PREA § 115.42, Use of Screening Information.....	26
PREA § 115.43 Preface, TDCJ “Protective Custody” Designations.....	29
PREA § 115.43, Protective Custody.....	35
PREA § 115.64, Staff First Responder Duties.....	37
PREA § 115.67, Protection Against Retaliation.....	38
PREA § 115.68, Post-Allegation Protective Custody.....	39
PREA § 115.72, Evidentiary Standard for Administrative Investigations.....	39
PREA § 115.83, Ongoing Medical and Mental Health Care.....	41
PREA § 115.401, Frequency and Scope of Audits.....	42
PREA § 115.402, Auditor Qualifications.....	42
Conclusion.....	44



Summary of Deficiencies

Table 1 of this comment letter provides a summary of deficiencies identified in this audit report, described in the main body of this comment letter. Audit deficiencies include the reporting of questionable information, reporting of false information, use of problematic problematic language, and apparent failures to comply with minimum audit requirements. In addition, this comment letter documents questionable information in the discussion of at least 11 standards, false information for at least five standards, that one standard was assessed as exceeding compliance with absolutely no justification, and vague or inappropriate discussion of at least eight standards. Based on these deficiencies, it appears that compliance is questionable for at least eight standards, there is an indication of compliance is not met for three standards, and the report documents a failure to comply with two standards with no corrective action required.

Request for Action

TPI requests that, at a minimum, the following actions be taken:

- That this audit report be considered deficient, and not be considered to support state compliance for the purpose of PREA § 115.501 certification of state compliance.
- That additional measures be taken to train and assist the auditor in compliance considerations and supporting documentation.
- That auditors give serious consideration to information about PREA compliance concerns provided by incarcerated persons in interviews, and to provide justification for dismissing such information.
- That highly problematic language in the Auditor Compliance Tool that ignores trauma and encourages sexual violence in regards to transgender, nonbinary, and gender nonconforming populations be amended to eliminate bias, stigmatizing constructs, and discrimination.
- That at a minimum, PREA §§ 115.64 and 115.67 be considered to need corrective action at the next audit.
- That at a minimum, additional information be provided to support a finding of compliance for all remaining compliance issues mentioned in this comment letter.



Table 1. Summary of Deficiencies

Audit Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	(see definitions at bottom)							
Problematic audit report overall.	X	X	X	X	X			
Fails to adhere to person-first language guideline (see page 6).			X					
Genders of persons at facility misrepresented (see page 6).		X						
Fails to identify any corrective actions (see page 7).	X							
Time spent onsite less than minimum requirement (see page 7).	X							
Facility information appears inaccurate (see page 8).	X	X						
Random interviews fail to meet minimum requirement (see page 8).	X							
Target interviews fail to meet minimum requirement (see page 8).		X						
PREA § 115.11, zero tolerance deficiencies (see page 12).	X							
PREA § 115.13, supervision and monitoring deficiencies (see page 12).	X					X		
PREA § 115.15, viewing and search deficiencies (see page 16).		X	X		X	X		
PREA § 115.18, facility deficiencies (see page 22).						X		
PREA § 115.21, SANE exam deficiencies (see page 22).	X				X		X	
PREA § 115.31, staff training deficiencies (see page 24).	X			X				
PREA § 115.33, incarcerated person training deficiencies (see page 24).	X							
PREA § 115.41, screening deficiencies (see page 24).	X		X				X	
PREA § 115.42, screening data use deficiencies (see page 26).	X				X	X		
PREA § 115.43, protective custody deficiencies (see page 29).		X				X		
PREA § 115.64, first responder deficiencies (see page 37).		X			X			X
PREA § 115.67, retaliation deficiencies (see page 38).		X			X			X
PREA § 115.68, victim protective custody deficiencies (see page 39).	X				X	X		
PREA § 115.72, evidence deficiencies (see page 39).	X				X			
PREA § 115.83, ongoing medical deficiencies (see page 41).		X			X	X		
PREA § 115.401, audit scope deficiencies (see page 42).	X					X		
PREA § 115.402, audit qualification deficiencies (see page 42).	X						X	

1: Discussion contains questionable information.

2: Discussion contains false information.

3: Discussion contains problematic language indicating bias.

4: Exceeds standard given, discussion supporting assessment insufficient.

5: Discussion is vague, confusing, inaccurate, incomplete, or inappropriate.

6: Discussion indicates standard compliance questionable.

7: Discussion indicates standard compliance not met.

8: Discussion documents standard compliance not met.



Discussion of Audit Deficiencies

General Audit Information Issues

Audit Report Language

The DOJ has provided guidelines to use person-first language such as “persons in confinement” or “confined person.” Regardless whether or not the DOJ continues to support this now or in the future, person-first language is strongly supported by TPI, and we believe a failure to use for the most part person first language constitutes a failure to comply with at least the spirit of the PREA standards, if not PREA requirements for the use of professional and respectful language. The use of person-first language is discussed in the 2022 Auditor Handbook, and the handbook notes that the PREA Management Office and the PREA Resource Center “are shifting the way we identify people who are incarcerated by using person-first language.”⁷ This audit report ignores this shift by continuing to use terms like “offender” and “inmate” throughout this report. The word “offender” is used 18 times in the report, and the word “inmate” is used almost 1,000 times. Although use of the word “inmate” may be considered acceptable in some places because that is the term TDCJ currently uses, continued use of the derogatory terms “offender” and “inmate” throughout an audit report more than two years after this guidance was issued is not acceptable. There is no excuse for every new document completed under the aegis of the PREA compliance system to not follow person-first practices.

Facility Characteristics

The audit report states that the population at the Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex consists of “mens/boys,” when in fact this is false (as well as ungrammatical), and the audit report failed to identify any populations such as transgender or intersex populations. The audit report documents that at least one transgender person was housed at the complex at the time of the onsite audit (and failed to indicate such in the facility characteristics), so the complex houses cisgender males, possibly transgender females, and possibly other persons who may not belong to either of those two populations. This exhibits a failure to comply with PRC guidance effective November 13, 2024, and announced as early as September 19, 2024, that requires identification of genders housed at facilities beyond dismissive binary-only categories.⁸ The Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex and the auditor may falsely classify transgender women and other non-male persons as “male,” but that is not an accurate description of the populations housed at the unit for PREA assessment purposes. This not only erases the existence of trans persons, this type of misclassification and erasure encourages violence against trans persons, including sexual abuse and sexual harassment. Refusal to affirm a person’s gender dehumanizes the person, and

7. U.S. Department of Justice, PREA Management Office, *PREA Auditor Handbook*, Version 2.1, November 2022: 1 - 2, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/PREA%20Auditor%20Handbook%20V2.1%20-%20December%202022.pdf>.

8. PREA Resource Center, OAS Updates and Q&A. *Webinars* web page, September 19, 2024: 14:29 – 17:14, <https://vimeo.com/1014881110>.



dehumanization is a significant step in excusing and justifying institutional and individual harm and violence. Further, this misapplication of the PREA standards allows the audit to ignore violations under 115.15, cross-gender pat-down searches of female persons, as well as other PREA standards. To identify transgender females as “males” —or to identify transgender males as “females”—is an act of violence that not only denies the identity of transgender women and transgender men and nonbinary persons, but also encourages violence, sexual harassment, and sexual abuse of transgender persons by dismissing our core identity.

Summary of Facility Audit Findings

The audit report identifies one standard as exceeded and 36 as being met. The audit found that zero corrective actions were required. The 2022 Auditor Handbook states that “the PREA audit was built on the assumption that full compliance with every discrete provision would, in most cases, require corrective action.” The fact that the audit report identified no need for any corrective actions—in spite of ample evidence in this report that corrective actions should have been required—should also be considered in the assessment of a deficient audit. We also point to the discussion of PREA § 115.402 and evidence of conflicts of interest.

The audit report made the dubious claim that the Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex exceeded standard PREA § 115.31, and provided no clear support for the claim. TPI’s experience indicates that the facility most likely does not include appropriate training tailored to the genders of the persons incarcerated within the complex. The only hint that might be taken as somewhat exceeding minimal compliance is that training is stated as conducted every year, then the same statement is contradicted by stating some years staff to not receive training.

As per the PRC, an assessment of a standard being exceeded must be clearly documented as substantially surpassing the material requirements of compliance:

Where an auditor determines that a facility exceeds the requirements of a Standard, the auditor must clearly and specifically explain how the facility meets and then substantially exceeds the requirements of the Standard, and the evidence must justify and support the finding. . . . It is not sufficient for the auditor to describe the facility as meeting the requirement of the Standards and then select “Exceeds Standard” for the Overall Determination.⁹

This report failed to adequately justify this “exceeds” assessment.

Onsite Audit Period

The audit report notes that the onsite portion of the audit was from January 22 to January 24, 2025. However, for a facility with more than 1,900 persons, just the interviews with incarcerated persons and staff are estimated to take three days, or 30.3 hours. Thus it appears that this audit was conducted without allowing sufficient time to meet all the audit obligations. In addition to

9. PREA Resource Center, “Common Terminology,” <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/audit/common-terminology>.



the interviews, other tasks were required to competently complete the audit. As per the 2022 Auditor Handbook:

In addition to the time estimated to complete the interviews with persons confined in the facility and staff, auditors must also account for a thorough site review (observations, tests of critical functions, and informal conversations with individuals confined in the facility and staff), supplemental documentation selection and review, and in-briefs and out-briefs with facility/agency staff. The time required for a thorough site review will range depending on the size of the facility, the complexity of the facility and its processes, and the number of support staff involved. Auditors must allow adequate time to perform all the required activities necessary to complete a thorough site review.¹⁰

Support Staff Information documents that the auditor received assistance from one non-certified support person during the audit. The 2022 Auditor Handbook states that “[u]nder no circumstances may individuals who are not DOJ-certified auditors participate or engage in the **substantive work** of a formal PREA audit unless acting under the direction of a DOJ-certified auditor.”¹¹ This appears to mean that non-certified assistants cannot be solely responsible for the conduct of the interviews, meaning this does not reduce the amount of time required for interviews. The 2022 Auditor Handbook includes extensive discussion about interviews, and in all cases refers to the auditor as the person who must conduct each interview.¹²

Facility Information

This section of the audit report provides basic information about the facility and the persons housed there. This includes population characteristics at the complex on the first day of the onsite audit and staff levels. This section also includes a breakdown of random and targeted interviews with incarcerated persons and staff and document review information. An overview of the interview information is provided in Table 2. Problems with the audit interviews and other facility information are discussed as needed below.

Total housed, random and targeted interviews. The report documents that the audit included targeted interviews with 24 persons. That appears to meet the minimum requirement overall, but due to problems with the numbers comprising the target groups (such as counting interviews with target groups that were documented as not existing at the complex), this accounting of the targeted interviews is questionable. Due to problems with what should be straightforward data and documentation, TPI asserts that it is not possible to determine

10. U.S. Department of Justice, PREA Management Office, *PREA Auditor Handbook*, Version 2.1, November 2022: 78, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/PREA%20Auditor%20Handbook%20V2.1%20-%20December%202022.pdf>.

11. U.S. Department of Justice, PREA Management Office, *PREA Auditor Handbook*, Version 2.1, November 2022: 8, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/PREA%20Auditor%20Handbook%20V2.1%20-%20December%202022.pdf>.

12. U.S. Department of Justice, PREA Management Office, *PREA Auditor Handbook*, Version 2.1, November 2022: 58 - 78, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/PREA%20Auditor%20Handbook%20V2.1%20-%20December%202022.pdf>.



whether or not the interview requirements were in fact met. It certainly appears to have not been met in certain target areas.

Table 2. Population Characteristics and Interviews

Population Characteristic*	Persons Present	Interviews Required	Interviews Completed
18/34/39 — Total housed at unit	1981	Random: 20 Targeted: 20	Random: 21 Targeted: 24
19/40 — Persons with a physical disability	470	at least: 1	4
20/41 — Persons with cognitive or functional disability	0	at least: 1	1
21/42 — Persons blind or visually impaired	70	at least: 1	3
22/43 — Persons deaf or hard-of-hearing	16	at least: 1	0
23/46 — Persons Limited English Proficient	137	at least: 1	8
24/47 — Persons identifying as lesbian, gay, or bisexual	19	at least: 2	2
25/48 — Persons identifying as transgender or intersex	0	at least: 3	1
26/49 — Persons who reported sexual abuse in facility	1	at least: 4	1
27/50 — Persons who reported prior sexual victimization	37	at least: 3	4
28/51 — Persons placed in segregated housing for risk of sexual victimization	2	at least: 2	0

* The numbers at left refer to the audit report facility information numbers providing the information.

Persons with a cognitive or functional disability. The audit report states that there were zero incarcerated persons with a cognitive or functional disability at the Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex on the first day of the onsite audit, yet also states that one person with a cognitive or functional disability was interviewed for the audit. Based on this contradictory information, it cannot be determined if the complex provided false or erroneous information, if the auditor provided false or erroneous information, how many persons meeting this target population were actually present, or whether the audit met the minimum interview requirement.

Persons who are deaf or hard-of-hearing. The audit report states that there were 16 incarcerated persons who are deaf or hard-of-hearing at the complex on the first day of the onsite audit, but that zero persons in this target population were interviewed by the auditor (with the claim in the interview section that there were “none here”). According to Table 2 in the 2022 Auditor Handbook, the minimum number of interviews for a unit with the overall



population of the Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex should have been at least one.¹³ Based on the information in the audit report, the audit thus failed to include the minimum number of interviews required for this target population.

Persons identifying as transgender or intersex. The audit report states that there were zero incarcerated persons identifying as transgender or intersex at the Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex on the first day of the onsite audit, yet the audit report notes that one of zero persons in this target population was interviewed by the auditor. Discussions in the audit report refer to transgender persons in the plural, stating specifically, for example, that “interviews with transgender/intersex inmates” and “the inmates reported,” indicated there were actually multiple transgender or intersex persons interviewed, possibly as part of the random interviews. Based on this contradictory information, it cannot be determined if the complex provided false or erroneous information, if the auditor provided false or erroneous information, how many persons meeting this target population were actually present, or whether the audit met the minimum interview requirement.

Persons who were ever placed in segregated housing or isolation due to risk of sexual victimization. The audit report states that there were two persons who had been placed in segregated housing or isolation for risk of sexual victimization at Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex on the first day of the onsite audit, but that none were interviewed. According to Table 2 in the 2022 Auditor Handbook, the minimum number of interviews for a unit with the overall population of this complex should have been two.¹⁴ The audit thus failed to include the minimum number of interviews required for this target population.

In addition, we can be almost certain that two persons placed in segregated housing due to risk of sexual victimization is an under-count. This represents a major failure to document and audit segregated housing, or protective custody under PREA. This also indicates a failure to investigate and understand how segregated housing is defined confusingly (and appears to be purposefully manipulated by TDCJ to cause confusion) and a failure to perform due diligence in confirming such a claim that either zero or only two persons housed at the complex had ever been placed in segregated housing or isolation for risk of sexual victimization. This will be discussed further under PREA § 115.43.

Items 80 – 85 provide totals for sexual violence allegations and investigations for the last 12 months. These numbers are summarized in Table 3. Problems that TPI finds with these numbers are discussed in below the table.

13. U.S. Department of Justice, PREA Management Office, *PREA Auditor Handbook*, Version 2.1, November 2022: 65, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/PREA%20Auditor%20Handbook%20V2.1%20-%20December%202022.pdf>.

14. U.S. Department of Justice, PREA Management Office, *PREA Auditor Handbook*, Version 2.1, November 2022: 65, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/PREA%20Auditor%20Handbook%20V2.1%20-%20December%202022.pdf>.



Table 3. Sexual Violence Investigations and Outcomes

	Sexual Abuse by		Sexual Harassment by	
	Staff	Incarcerated Person	Staff	Incarcerated Person
Allegations	6	8	1	6
Administrative investigations	6	8	1	6
Ongoing	0	0	0	0
Unfounded	1	1	0	0
Unsubstantiated	3	7	1	6
Substantiated	2	0	0	0
Criminal Investigations	1	5	0	0
Ongoing	0	0	0	0
No Action (inferred)	1	5	0	0
Referred	0	0	0	0
Indicted	0	0	0	0
Convicted	0	0	0	0
Acquitted	0	0	0	0

Item 83 provides the outcomes for administrative investigations of sexual abuse allegations during the previous 12 months. **Item 80** shows incarcerated persons reported 14 allegations of sexual abuse by staff and other incarcerated persons. Per **item 83**, administrative investigations found two substantiated (both allegations against staff), 10 unsubstantiated, and two unfounded. That is, 83% of the allegations were found to have less than a 51% chance of having occurred. According to PREA § 115.72, the agency “shall impose no standard higher than a preponderance of the evidence in determining whether allegations of sexual abuse or sexual harassment are substantiated,” yet only 17% of the allegations were found substantiated. This indicates a failure of the administrative investigations to adequately assess evidence in allegations of sexual abuse, and a failure of the audit to identify this problem and pursue an explanation of what appears to be a failure to properly investigate allegations.

Item 85 provides the outcomes for administrative investigations of sexual harassment allegations during the previous 12 months. **Item 81** shows incarcerated persons reported seven allegations of sexual harassment by staff and other incarcerated persons. Per **item 85**, administrative investigations found none substantiated and all seven unsubstantiated. That is, 100% of the allegations were found to have less than a 51% chance of having occurred. According to PREA § 115.72, the agency “shall impose no standard higher than a preponderance of the evidence in determining whether allegations of sexual abuse or sexual harassment are substantiated,” yet not one of the allegations were found substantiated. This indicates a failure of the administrative investigations to adequately assess evidence in allegations of sexual harassment, and a failure of the audit to identify this problem and pursue an explanation of what appears to be a failure to properly investigate allegations.



PREA Standards Compliance Assessment Issues

PREA § 115.11, Zero Tolerance

- (a) An agency shall have a written policy mandating zero tolerance toward all forms of sexual abuse and sexual harassment and outlining the agency's approach to preventing, detecting, and responding to such conduct.
- (b) An agency shall employ or designate an upper-level, agency-wide PREA coordinator with sufficient time and authority to develop, implement, and oversee agency efforts to comply with the PREA standards in all of its facilities.
- (c) Where an agency operates more than one facility, each facility shall designate a PREA compliance manager with sufficient time and authority to coordinate the facility's efforts to comply with the PREA standards.

PREA § 115.11 primarily considers policy at the Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex and the agency overall. Policy is certainly essential to reaching such goals, but policy alone is inadequate, and how policy is implemented may even increase harm. TPI has seen many instances where an agency or responsible entity states something to the effect “that does not happen because we have policy against it” or “because we have training against it.” This excuse covers up and may even encourage violence such as sexual abuse and sexual harassment by providing a means of covering up such violence. The 2022 Auditor Handbook addresses this negative potential by stating that:

The PREA audit is not only an audit of policies and procedures. It is *primarily* an audit of practice. The objective for the auditor is to examine enough evidence to make a compliance determination regarding the audited facility's *actual practice*. *Policies and procedures do not demonstrate actual practice*, although they are the essential baseline for establishing practice and should be reviewed carefully [emphasis added].¹⁵

Negative effects of policy are also seen where claims that sexual violence is “investigated” are accompanied by clear indications that the investigations have little or no merit due to the extremely high rate of dismissal. This can also serve to cover up—and may even encourage—violence such as sexual abuse and sexual harassment by providing a means of simply ignoring such violence through improper investigations.

Due to our work in general with persons in TDCJ custody, TPI has doubts that this complex fully complies with PREA § 115.11.

PREA § 115.13 Supervision and Monitoring

PREA § 115.13 requires the unit to maintain adequate staff to operate effectively and to “protect [incarcerated persons] against sexual abuse.” TDCJ has long shown that they cannot hire or

15. U.S. Department of Justice, PREA Management Office, *PREA Auditor Handbook*, Version 2.1, November 2022: 46, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/PREA%20Auditor%20Handbook%20V2.1%20-%20December%202022.pdf>.



maintain adequate staffing levels at many of their units. Many units in the system are operating at less than 50 percent security staff, some as low as 30 percent. TPI has received reports from a number of units, including many over the 12 months preceding this audit, that incarcerated persons may not even see a security staff person for hours at a time, and that one staff person may be the only assigned staff person for an entire building or wing. Although positions may be filled during an audit, that may not be the case on days when the unit is not being audited.

In addition to our experience and data related to staffing issues, the Texas Sunset Advisory Committee audited TDCJ as a whole in 2024 and provided even more damning conclusions. The following are some excerpts from the commission report that pertain to the L yn a u g h - F o r t S t o c k t o n C o m p l e x .

[T]he uncomfortable reality the Sunset review found is some of Texas' prisons are located in places where hiring sufficient correctional staff is nearly impossible. As that reality is unlikely to change, TDCJ is forced to spend significantly on transporting staff around the state and maintaining facilities that hold thousands of vacant, unusable beds. Furthermore, while difficulty hiring correctional staff isn't unique to this state, the agency has not done enough to mitigate this problem. Serious and systemic deficiencies in human resources functions, which form the backbone of effective agency operations, contribute to agencywide hiring and retention problems, with more than half of TDCJ divisions at a vacancy rate of at least 20 percent in fiscal year 2023.¹⁶

[TDCJ] has experienced crisis-level vacancy rates among correctional staff for several years in many of its facilities.¹⁷

While correctional best practice is that staff vacancy rates remain below 10 percent, in fiscal year 2023, TDCJ's vacancy rate among correctional staff was nearly 28 percent agencywide and much higher at certain facilities. At the end of that year, 22 facilities had more than 40 percent of correctional positions vacant, including six facilities with more than half of correctional positions vacant. . . . These vacancy rates are even higher for just COs, with some units operating with up to 70 percent of CO positions unfilled. Agency data indicate vacancy rates have progressively worsened at certain facilities over the last ten years. For example, Sunset staff analyzed a random sample of CO shift turnout rosters from one facility and found it frequently operates with a vacancy rate over 60 percent after accounting for employees on leave or otherwise absent from work. Moreover, Sunset staff learned some facilities have operated with as little as 25 percent of the staff they need on a given day. In practice, this forces TDCJ staff to supervise thousands of inmates with fewer than half of the security staff they need, which has potentially dire consequences for staff, inmates, and others.¹⁸

16. Texas Sunset Advisory Commission, *Sunset Staff Report: Texas Criminal Justice Entities*, September 2024: 1, <https://www.sunset.texas.gov/public/uploads/2024-09/Texas%20Criminal%20Justice%20Entities%20Staff%20Report%209-26-24.pdf>.

17. Texas Sunset Advisory Commission, *Sunset Staff Report: Texas Criminal Justice Entities*, September 2024: 23, <https://www.sunset.texas.gov/public/uploads/2024-09/Texas%20Criminal%20Justice%20Entities%20Staff%20Report%209-26-24.pdf>.

18. Texas Sunset Advisory Commission, *Sunset Staff Report: Texas Criminal Justice Entities*, September 2024: 24, <https://www.sunset.texas.gov/public/uploads/2024-09/Texas%20Criminal%20Justice%20Entities%20Staff%20Report%209-26-24.pdf>.



TDCJ Units with the Highest Vacancy Rates, FYs 2014-23

Unit	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	FY 23
D	13.92%	16.63%	18.68%	22.28%	25.83%	31.61%	45.86%	47.09%	52.72%	55.43%
E	20.05%	27.19%	16.19%	22.15%	28.87%	29.84%	38.86%	43.44%	52.59%	53.55%
G	20.83%	27.01%	11.45%	20.63%	28.72%	31.43%	36.77%	41.62%	48.52%	52.77%
B	27.39%	16.67%	16.24%	30.70%	31.82%	44.91%	41.67%	43.46%	51.69%	53.89%
W	15.71%	17.84%	8.70%	8.74%	11.16%	15.65%	15.78%	27.85%	43.78%	49.90%
J	11.53%	17.13%	10.14%	17.38%	28.15%	27.57%	32.74%	35.61%	45.14%	47.98%
C	24.36%	16.85%	6.88%	20.15%	14.34%	12.04%	25.37%	44.11%	47.40%	51.74%
A	1.53%	3.89%	9.16%	7.50%	19.92%	23.16%	32.68%	42.24%	59.09%	56.57%
R	13.56%	8.47%	9.40%	10.17%	25.66%	5.08%	16.10%	32.48%	41.96%	48.68%
O	40.14%	21.35%	12.43%	27.69%	23.22%	36.43%	36.29%	52.55%	51.85%	48.67%

Figure 1: Facilities with the top 10 staffing shortages. Source: Texas Sunset Advisory Commission. (September 2024). Sunset Staff Report: Texas Criminal Justice Entities, page 25.

Forty percent of respondents to Sunset’s correctional staff survey said they feel unsafe in TDCJ facilities, and many facilities are so critically understaffed they cannot operate by the agency’s own safety standards. TDCJ’s staffing plans identify the roles minimally necessary to operate each facility safely, called “Priority One” positions, an example of which is described in the *Correctional Housing Rovers* textbox on the following page. Some portion of Priority One positions routinely go unfilled in several critically understaffed facilities. Priority Two positions, which further aid in the safe functioning of the facility and typically support inmate rehabilitation programming and recreation, often go entirely unfilled in these facilities.¹⁹

Correctional Housing Rovers: Each inmate housing area, such as a cellblock or wing of a dormitory, has a certain number of officers, informally called “housing rovers,” dedicated to security functions. Whenever these Priority One positions are left unfilled, rovers assigned to nearby housing areas must cover the unfilled areas — sometimes totaling hundreds of inmates at a time. Functionally, this means inmates are not being supervised as closely as TDCJ has deemed minimally necessary to ensure the safety and security of facilities, impacting both staff and inmates. Reducing inmate supervision and assistance with basic needs can lead to increases in violence, self-harm, and other dangerous incidents. Furthermore, in the event of such an incident, an officer’s nearest help might be a building away, out of earshot and behind security doors.²⁰

19. Texas Sunset Advisory Commission, *Sunset Staff Report: Texas Criminal Justice Entities*, September 2024: 40, https://www.sunset.texas.gov/public/uploads/2024-09/Texas%20Criminal%20Justice%20Entities%20Staff%20Report_9-26-24.pdf.

20. Texas Sunset Advisory Commission, *Sunset Staff Report: Texas Criminal Justice Entities*, September 2024: 41, https://www.sunset.texas.gov/public/uploads/2024-09/Texas%20Criminal%20Justice%20Entities%20Staff%20Report_9-26-24.pdf.



A Sunset staff analysis found facilities are more dangerous now than a decade ago. . . . [I]n fiscal year 2023 the agency recorded more than 2,000 adverse events, surpassing a pre-COVID-19 high, and these events have been rising as a percentage of the inmate population over the last 10 years. Even while the inmate population decreased, the amount of contraband such as drugs, weapons, and cellphones found in TDCJ facilities has increased significantly over the last 10 years, which can contribute to conflict and violence in prisons. Nearly 70 percent of respondents to Sunset’s correctional staff survey indicated they have experienced or witnessed an adverse event, nearly half of whom said they are exposed to these events daily or weekly. A majority of respondents indicated adverse events make their jobs more difficult and negatively impact their physical or mental health. Also at risk for these events are others who work in facilities, including food and laundry service staff, chaplains, medical providers, employees of the Windham School District and the Board of Pardons and Paroles, vendors, and volunteers.²¹

Vacancies inhibit TDCJ’s ability to fulfill its statutory mission, and large proportions of staff in various divisions reported in Sunset surveys working beyond their normal hours. . . .

Overworked and exhausted staff tend to be less operationally aware and effective, potentially compromising safety in facilities and elevating burnout across the agency. Many critically understaffed TDCJ facilities have a rotating schedule of monthly mandatory overtime due to staffing shortages. Separately, as discussed in Issue 1, some correctional staff and parole staff must travel on a rotating basis to assist understaffed facilities or offices, either for the day or for up to two weeks at a time, which many view as disruptive to their families and personal lives. Internal policy prohibits staff from working more than 16 hours a day or 10 days in a row. However, since fiscal year 2019, documented violations of the 10-day rule doubled and violations of the 16-hour rule increased more than tenfold to 9,000 violations per month on average. Moreover, nearly half of correctional staff Sunset surveyed said they are not regularly afforded breaks on duty despite these long shifts and are often on their feet and in areas without climate control. While some staff proactively seek overtime, half of the respondents to Sunset’s correctional staff survey said the amount of extra time they must work negatively impacts officer safety, and more than 40 percent of respondents said it negatively impacts the safety of inmates and the public.²²

During the review, Sunset staff repeatedly heard from employees about a culture trickling down from upper levels of agency leadership of “doing more with less” and “making it work,” coupled with a reluctance to report bad news up the chain of command. Under this dynamic, the crush of tasks described above creates a lose-lose scenario for officers and other staff who risk punishment for admitting failure to complete all required tasks, feel they must deceive supervisors or falsify recordkeeping, and wind up having to make high-stakes prioritization decisions. For example, some COs in understaffed facilities reported feeling conflicted about whether to leave their post to intervene on behalf of a coworker during an incident with an inmate, risking punishment if another incident were to occur on their own abandoned post. Placing this pressure on staff is

21. Texas Sunset Advisory Commission, *Sunset Staff Report: Texas Criminal Justice Entities*, September 2024: 41, https://www.sunset.texas.gov/public/uploads/2024-09/Texas%20Criminal%20Justice%20Entities%20Staff%20Report_9-26-24.pdf.

22. Texas Sunset Advisory Commission, *Sunset Staff Report: Texas Criminal Justice Entities*, September 2024: 41 – 42, https://www.sunset.texas.gov/public/uploads/2024-09/Texas%20Criminal%20Justice%20Entities%20Staff%20Report_9-26-24.pdf.



unfair, can be detrimental to morale, and may result in decisions that entail higher risk or do not align with the best interests of the facility, department, or agency.²³

The actual number of correctional officers who are available to work on a particular day varies due to illness or other types of leave so daily data points include staff who are initially assigned to work a shift, staff who actually cover that shift, and staff who work beyond the assigned shift. The number of unfilled positions at a facility might change significantly during a shift as staff does not show up for a shift, staff is asked to stay beyond their original shift, or staff is sent over from other facilities. TDCJ does track some information about the deployment of correctional officers to short-staffed units through its staffing command center, but individual prisons often only report these nuances on paper shift rosters, and the agencywide staffing data available to agency leadership often do not reflect the daily reality at prisons. Without this granular level of data, and due to the agency's reliance on a paper-based roster system, TDCJ cannot accurately assess and address its staffing challenges at different prisons.²⁴

Due to the serious concerns about TDCJ staffing and management system-wide, TPI has doubts that this complex fully complies with PREA § 115.13.

PREA § 115.15 Preface, Defining Cross-Gender

Before addressing cross-gender viewing and searches under PREA § 115.15, it is essential to understand what “cross-gender” means for the purposes of PREA compliance. And in understanding what cross-gender means, we must first consider what gender itself means, again, for the purposes of PREA compliance. With these definitions provided, we can then consider the appropriate understanding of gender in regards to PREA § 115.15.

In a general and over-simplistic (and still biased) view, gender can be seen as predominately consisting of “male” and “female,” with “male” including cisgender males and transgender males, and “female” including cisgender females and transgender females. However, gender also includes persons who consider themselves to be specifically “nonbinary” (a gender that is not constrained by social stereotypes around what constitute “male” and “female”), a different gender, or a combination of genders.

For PREA compliance, it matters not at all how the social, political, religious, or other constructed frameworks of prison staff, incarcerated persons, or PREA auditors try to narrow or eliminate these to dismiss a person's deeply felt identity in preference to one's own bias. What does matter is that **failing to recognize these identities leads to the infliction of trauma and the encouragement of sexual violence, and as such undermines PREA compliance.**

23. Texas Sunset Advisory Commission, *Sunset Staff Report: Texas Criminal Justice Entities*, September 2024: 45 – 46, https://www.sunset.texas.gov/public/uploads/2024-09/Texas%20Criminal%20Justice%20Entities%20Staff%20Report_9-26-24.pdf.

24. Texas Sunset Advisory Commission, *Sunset Staff Report: Texas Criminal Justice Entities*, September 2024: 63, https://www.sunset.texas.gov/public/uploads/2024-09/Texas%20Criminal%20Justice%20Entities%20Staff%20Report_9-26-24.pdf.



Because the PREA standards, and especially the PREA auditor tools in their current state, add a conflicting term “opposite gender” that ultimately serves no purpose other than to provide an opening for abusive conduct and exemption of transgender and gender nonconforming persons, we must also define this term, as well as advocate for its removal. “Opposite gender” is a term that means the “further side” of a thing or the “reverse” of someone or something. The implication of an “opposite” when applied to a single concept such as “gender” is to create a mutually exclusive dichotomy, thus eliminating other possibilities. In considerations of PREA compliance, the use of “opposite” in terms of gender itself **is a violence that erases any other possible genders, and that may be misconstrued to even eliminate everything other than the two “opposites” of cisgender males and cisgender females.**

The term “opposite gender” is only used in one provision of the PREA standards, § 115.15(d), where discussing policies and procedures that enable persons “to shower, perform bodily functions, and change clothing without nonmedical staff of the opposite gender viewing” private body parts, and “opposite gender” announcements. Yet the PREA auditor tools amplify the concept of “opposite” genders, an action that deliberately and intentionally serves to diminish the consideration of the PREA standards as applied to transgender, nonbinary, and gender nonconforming persons. The term is unnecessary, and in fact PREA purposes would be better served by the use of “cross gender” to address the abusive and offensive “curiosity” with transgender persons’ genitals that cisgender persons seem to have.

The DOJ provides a comment in a discussion of staff genders that clearly sets out how PREA § 115.15 should be viewed in terms of addressing the overall goals of the PREA standards:

facilities should make an individualized determination based on the gender identity of the staff member and not solely based on the staff member’s sex assigned at birth, the gender designation of the facility or housing unit to which the staff member is assigned, the related and required job duties of the specific staff member, the limits to cross-gender viewing and searches in PREA Standard 115.15, and the goal of the PREA Standards **to prevent trauma and sexual abuse** [emphasis added].²⁵

Even if this is about staff gender, it is important to note the perspective, and that this statement cites the overall objective of PREA: “to prevent trauma and sexual abuse.” There are some important points to make concerning this overall PREA objective.

- To claim that a transgender man is a woman for any part of 115.15 compliance does not prevent trauma, and **in many cases may actively cause trauma and may encourage sexual harassment and sexual abuse.**
- To claim that a transgender woman is a man for any part of 115.15 compliance does not prevent trauma, and **in many cases may actively cause trauma and may encourage sexual harassment and sexual abuse.**

25. FAQ | “How should transgender staff and non-binary staff be classified. . . .” Frequently Asked Questions, National PREA Resource Center, May 1, 2023, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/frequently-asked-questions/how-should-transgender-staff-and-non-binary-staff-be-classified-purposes>.



- To claim that a nonbinary person is a man or a woman for any part of 115.15 compliance does not prevent trauma, and **in many cases may actively cause trauma and may encourage sexual harassment and sexual abuse.**

Once again, the biases of the staff, other incarcerated persons, or the auditor are not themselves at issue in the assessment of this standard. What is at issue is what reduces trauma and sexual violence. Erasing and dismissing identities does neither.

The primary term used in the PREA standards is “cross-gender,” and this should be understood as its most simple and obvious meaning of being of a different gender. To insist that “cross-gender” means the same as “opposite-gender” is engaging in harmful duplicity that has no purpose but to diminish or erase consideration of the safety of transgender, nonbinary, and gender nonconforming persons.

With this in mind, we can state that regardless of whether a person is assigned to a facility designated as “male” or “female,” if that person identifies as transgender, then viewing and searches by persons of a gender different from the incarcerated person’s self-identified gender are cross-gender searches, and may be noncompliant with PREA standards.

Failure to recognize this fact in an audit is a failure to properly assess whether or not cross-gender searches and viewing are occurring at a facility. A blanket practice of misclassifying transgender females as “males,” transgender males as “females,” or nonbinary transgender persons according to any stereotype is inappropriate, is noncompliant with PREA § 115.15, and willful disregard of this fact may constitute violence against transgender persons.

The DOJ has stated support for this position by noting that:

[a]gencies or facilities that conduct searches **based solely on the gender designation of the facility** without considering other factors such as the gender identity or expression of the individual [incarcerated person] or the [incarcerated person’s] preference regarding the gender of the person conducting the search, **would not be compliant with Standard 115.15** [emphasis added].²⁶

It should be emphasized that this does not state “may not be compliant,” it states “would not be compliant.”

At this point, we can proceed to the guidance in the Auditor Compliance Tool,²⁷ which fails to encourage progress toward zero-tolerance, fails to prevent trauma, and **in many cases may actively cause trauma and may encourage sexual harassment and sexual abuse.**

In the audit site review comments for PREA § 115.15(a), the Auditor Compliance Tool provides the following highly problematic language:

26. “FAQ | Can you please clarify the parameters of conducting a search of a transgender, . . .” Frequently Asked Questions, National PREA Resource Center, October 24, 2023, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/frequently-asked-questions/can-you-please-clarify-parameters-conducting-search-transgender-or>.

27. TPI strongly advises modification of the Auditor Compliance Tool to eliminate the bias it encourages. The tool is available at: <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/ACTPrisonJail.pdf>.



Note: the Standard use [sic] the term “cross-gender,” but for the purposes of clarity in the site review instructions we use both “cross-gender” and “opposite-gender” when referring to viewing or searches of persons confined in the facility by staff of the opposite gender.²⁸

This redefines “cross-gender” as “opposite-gender,” which effectively, at a minimum, erases the existence of nonbinary and some gender nonconforming persons, and implies on the one hand that only persons who adhere to stereotypes of what constitutes “male” and “female” norms are worth considering in this standard, and on the other hand can allow auditors to claim only physical characteristics meet “opposite-gender” descriptions. This instruction undermines PREA claims of zero tolerance for sexual violence as it applies to transgender, nonbinary, and gender nonconforming persons; and it promotes the application of harmful stereotypes for these same populations.

The Auditor Compliance Tool audit site review comments for PREA § 115.15(b) and (c) refer to the provision (a) guidelines, here encouraging a false and discriminatory treatment specifically of transgender females. At a minimum, the site review comments must address that “female” here includes transgender and cisgender females. Otherwise, the insistence of the review comments on the crudely reductive “opposite gender” language serves to allow or even encourage the dismissal of transgender females as somehow not “opposite.” Doing so, again, **may actively cause trauma and may encourage sexual harassment and sexual abuse.**

The Auditor Compliance Tool audit site review comments for PREA § 115.15(d) again insists on diminishing the humanity of transgender persons by insisting on the use of “opposite gender.” Here and earlier, the instructions state that this is “for the purposes of clarity,” which indicates the clarity of discrimination only. There is nothing that insistence on such terminology “clarifies” except an intent to deliberately dismiss the consideration of harm to, and encourage erasure and sexual abuse of, transgender, nonbinary, and gender nonconforming persons. This is continued and underscored by statements such as “staff of both genders,” which very clearly erases all but the narrow gender binary stereotypes.

Understanding these ways that the Auditor Compliance Tool contributes to the infliction of trauma and encourages sexual harassment and sexual violence, we move on to the auditor’s assessment of this standard.

PREA § 115.15, Cross-Gender Viewing and Searches

Please see the PREA § 115.15 Preface, above, for additional information about serious issues with how PREA implementation instructions undermine the goals of PREA compliance for transgender, nonbinary, and gender nonconforming persons.

28. PREA Resource Center. Auditor Compliance Tool, Facility: Prison / Jail. Available at: <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/ACTPrisonJail.pdf>.



(a) The facility shall not conduct cross-gender strip searches or cross-gender visual body cavity searches (meaning a search of the anal or genital opening) except in exigent circumstances or when performed by medical practitioners.

Purpose: To limit intimate bodily contact of inmates by staff and enable bodily privacy for both [cisgender and transgender] male and [cisgender and transgender] female [and nonbinary and gender nonconforming incarcerated persons] in order to prohibit abuse and trauma that might arise from that contact or viewing.²⁹

Due to the insistence in the audit report that the complex houses only “mens/boys” in spite of documenting that transgender persons were housed at the complex during the audit, this provision cannot have been appropriately assessed. Based on this fact, it cannot be determined whether or not the complex met compliance with this provision or not.

(b) As of August 20, 2015, or August 20, 2017 for a facility whose rated capacity does not exceed 50 [incarcerated persons], the facility shall not permit cross-gender pat-down searches of female [incarcerated persons], absent exigent circumstances. Facilities shall not restrict female [incarcerated persons'] access to regularly available programming or other out-of-cell opportunities in order to comply with this provision.

Concerning PREA § 115.15(b), if the facility allows cisgender males and transgender males and nonbinary staff to conduct pat-down searches of transgender females, then the facility permits cross-gender pat-down searches of female incarcerated persons. Cisgender males and transgender males, as well as nonbinary persons, are not the same gender as cisgender females and transgender females. All pat-down searches of incarcerated cisgender females and transgender females by cisgender males or transgender males constitute pat-down searches of female incarcerated persons by male staff.

The audit report states that TDCJ “does not house female [incarcerated persons] at either the Lynam or Fort Stockton Units,” but the gender of the at least one transgender person housed within the complex during the onsite portion of the audit is not provided, so this statement cannot be substantiated. We also do not know if other transgender persons housed at the complex during the audit period may have been female. Based on these facts, it cannot be determined whether or not the complex met compliance with this provision or not.

(c) The facility shall document all cross-gender strip searches and cross-gender visual body cavity searches, and shall document all cross-gender pat-down searches of female [incarcerated persons].

The failure by the audit report to document that the complex houses transgender females and nonbinary transgender persons also results in deficient assessment of PREA § 115.15(c), requiring that the facility document all cross-gender strip searches and cross-gender visual

29. PREA Resource Center, “Prevention Planning, § 115.15, 115.115, 115.215, 115.315 Limits to Cross-Gender Viewing and Searches,” *PREA Standards in Focus*, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/115.15.pdf>.



body cavity searches, and document all cross-gender pat-down searches of female incarcerated persons. Based on this fact, it cannot be determined whether or not the complex met compliance with this provision or not.

(d) The facility shall implement policies and procedures that enable [incarcerated persons] to shower, perform bodily functions, and change clothing without nonmedical staff of the opposite gender viewing their breasts, buttocks, or genitalia, except in exigent circumstances or when such viewing is incidental to routine cell checks. Such policies and procedures shall require staff of the opposite gender to announce their presence when entering an [incarcerated persons] housing unit.

Concerning PREA § 115.15(d), which TPI points out incorrectly discusses “opposite” gender viewing (see the PREA § 115.15 Preface, above), the refusal to acknowledge the gender of transgender persons also results in a failure to appropriately assess compliance with this standard, and likely a failure of the complex to meet this standard.

TPI would like to point out that also of relevance to PREA § 115.15(d) is that in circumstances requiring constant or near constant observation (which in TDCJ includes both CDO, or constant direct observation, and SOS, or security observation status, neither of which are covered in the audit report), the facility is likewise accountable for compliance with PREA § 115.15(d). Per the National PREA Resource Center FAQ:

[A] cross gender staff can be assigned to suicide watch, including constant observation, so long as the facility has procedures in place that enable an [incarcerated person] on suicide watch to avoid exposing himself or herself to nonmedical cross gender staff. This may be accomplished by substituting same gender correctional staff or medical staff to observe the periods of time when an [incarcerated person] is showering, performing bodily functions, or changing clothes. It may also be accomplished by providing a shower with a partial curtain, other privacy shields, or, if the suicide watch is being conducted via live video monitoring, by digitally obscuring an appropriate portion of the cell. Any privacy accommodations must be implemented in a way that does not pose a safety risk for the individual on suicide watch. The privacy standards apply whether the viewing occurs in a cell or elsewhere.

The exceptions for cross gender viewing under exigent circumstances or, for [incarcerated persons] who are not on constant observation, when incidental to routine cell checks apply to suicide watch as well. Because safety is paramount when conducting a suicide watch, if an immediate safety concern or [] conduct makes it impractical to provide same gender coverage during a period in which the [incarcerated person] is undressed, such isolated instances of cross gender viewing do not constitute a violation of the standards. Any such incidents should be rare and must be documented.³⁰

Based on these facts, it cannot be determined whether or not the complex met compliance with this provision or not.

30. “FAQ | How do the requirements of standard 115.15(d) apply to inmates who have been, . . .” Frequently Asked Questions, National PREA Resource Center, December 18, 2015, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/frequently-asked-questions/how-do-requirements-standard-11515d-apply-inmates-who-have-been-placed>.



(e) The facility shall not search or physically examine a transgender or intersex [incarcerated person] for the sole purpose of determining the [incarcerated person's] genital status. If the [incarcerated person's] genital status is unknown, it may be determined during conversations with the [incarcerated person], by reviewing medical records, or, if necessary, by learning that information as part of a broader medical examination conducted in private by a medical practitioner.

It is important to note that in spite of claiming no transgender persons were housed within the complex in the population characteristics, and despite claiming that one transgender person was interviewed in the interview documentation, the audit report discussion of this provision references interviews with **multiple transgender and/or intersex persons**, further confirming incorrect, vague, confusing, or false information about the number of transgender and intersex persons housed at the complex.

Based on these serious audit deficiencies, it cannot be stated that the audit substantiated a claims that the Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex meets the PREA § 115.15 standard.

PREA § 115.18, Facility Upgrades and Technologies

The audit report failed to assess this standard, inappropriately referring to the TDCJ agency audit for coverage of upgrades to facilities and technologies at the Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex.

PREA § 115.21, Evidence Protocol and Forensic Medical Examinations

(a) To the extent the agency is responsible for investigating allegations of sexual abuse, the agency shall follow a uniform evidence protocol that maximizes the potential for obtaining usable physical evidence for administrative proceedings and criminal prosecutions.

In 2019, during the 86th session of the Texas Legislature, the time period for which forensic medical examinations are considered a right afforded victims of sexual abuse was extended from 96 to 120 hours. This is codified under the Texas Criminal Code § 56A.052(a), stating:

A victim, guardian of a victim, or close relative of a deceased victim of an offense under Section 21.02, 21.11, 22.011, 22.012, 22.021, or 42.072, Penal Code, is entitled to the following rights within the criminal justice system: . . . (5) for the victim, the right to: . . . (B) a forensic medical examination as provided by Subchapter G.

.....

SUBCHAPTER G. FORENSIC MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM

.....

Art. 56A.303. FORENSIC MEDICAL EXAMINATION.

.....

(b-1) A law enforcement agency shall refer a victim of a sexual assault for a forensic medical examination, to be conducted in accordance with Subsection (a), if a sexual assault is reported to



a law enforcement agency **within 120 hours after the assault**. . . . A law enforcement agency may make the same referral with respect to any victim of a sexual assault who is not a minor and who does not report the sexual assault within the 120-hour period required by this subsection if the agency believes that a forensic medical examination may further a sexual assault investigation or prosecution [emphasis added].³¹

Based on annual PREA reports, it appears that the agency may have complied with this requirement for a short time in 2019 after the statute went into effect, but subsequent annual reports indicate noncompliance.³² This appears to also fail PREA § 115.21(a) requirement that the agency “follow a uniform evidence protocol that **maximizes** the potential for obtaining usable physical evidence for administrative proceedings and criminal prosecutions” (emphasis added). Based on this evidence, it appears highly doubtful that the complex is compliant with this provision.

It should be pointed out that simplistic reliance on any use of a time frame without consideration of what is medically and evidentiarily warranted would constitute a failure to meet compliance with this standard.

(c) The agency shall offer all victims of sexual abuse access to forensic medical examinations, whether on-site or at an outside facility, without financial cost, where evidentiarily or medically appropriate. Such examinations shall be performed by Sexual Assault Forensic Examiners (SAFEs) or Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners (SANEs) where possible. If SAFEs or SANEs cannot be made available, the examination can be performed by other qualified medical practitioners. The agency shall document its efforts to provide SAFEs or SANEs.

The audit report documents that only one SANE exam was done in the last 12 months, meaning 93% of the 14 reports of sexual abuse did not involve a SANE exam. The discussion of PREA § 115.64 notes that eight of the 14 reports were made “within a time period that still allowed for the collection of physical evidence,” apparently within 96 hours. No information was provided justifying this low number of SANE exams, or why seven out of eight were not conducted even though they were reported within an “appropriate time frame,” or why others reported outside had no evidentiary reason for a SANE, so it cannot be determined whether or not the complex was compliant with this provision, and it certainly appears that the complex failed to comply.

In addition, TDCJ OIG-7.13 states that staff will “determine if a forensic medical examination will be offered.” It appears that policy SPPOM-05.01 makes the same statement in section 1.F. PREA § 115.21(c) states that **all** survivors of sexual abuse shall be offered access to forensic medical examinations; and PREA § 115.21(e) allows the survivor to request a forensic medical examination. OIG-7.13 and SPPOM-05.01 indicate that is not being done either at the agency level or at the Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex, but instead staff are deciding whether to offer

31. Texas Code of Criminal Conduct § 56A.303 (2019, revised 2021 and 2023), <https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/Docs/CR/htm/CR.56A.htm>.

32. PREA Ombudsman and Office of Inspector General, *Safe Prisons/Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Program, Calendar Year 2019*, July 2020: 28, https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/documents/PREA_SPP_Report_2019.pdf.



the survivor access to a forensic medical examination.³³ Based on this conflicting information, it is not possible to determine if the complex is compliant with this provision or not.

Due to these several apparent deficiencies, this audit report does not substantiate compliance with PREA § 115.21, and it is not possible to determine whether or not the complex is compliant or not.

PREA § 115.31, Employee Training

Concerning § 115.31(b), if training does not include use of preferred names and pronouns of transgender persons, then training is not tailored to the gender of the persons incarcerated at the facility. If the training does not recognize the actual affirming gender of transgender persons, which may be different from the gender designation of the unit to which they are assigned, then training is not tailored to the gender of persons at the facility.

The audit report assessed the complex as “substantially exceeds” the PREA § 115.31 standard, but provided no substantiation of such a claim.

PREA § 115.33, Incarcerated Persons Education

TPI has little means of monitoring compliance with PREA § 115.33, which covers education of incarcerated persons concerning PREA issues, however, the number and extent of misunderstandings about PREA we receive in reports indicates as a whole, TDCJ training in this area is a failure.

PREA § 115.41, Screening for Risk of Victimization and Abusiveness

(a) All [incarcerated persons] shall be assessed during an intake screening and upon transfer to another facility for their risk of being sexually abused by other [incarcerated persons] or sexually abusive toward other [incarcerated persons].

(b) Intake screening shall ordinarily take place within 72 hours of arrival at the facility.

The audit report documents that “[m]ost [incarcerated persons] interviewed reported receiving a risk screening within 72 hours of enter [sic] the facility,” which appears to mean that some reported not receiving their risk screening within 72 hours. That indicates noncompliance with this standard, and possible data manipulation by staff at the complex who claimed that all did receive the required risk screening. No further investigation into the reports of failure to provide intake screening within 72 hours is documented in the report, so it cannot be substantiated that the complex is in compliance with this standard.

(c) Such assessments shall be conducted using an objective screening instrument.

33. TPI does not have access to policy OIG-7.13, we are reporting what we understand to be true. However, the version of SPPOM 05.01 that we have, dated July 2014, has the same statement in section 1.F.: “The OIG investigator will determine whether a forensic medical examination is required.” This, too, is counter to PREA § 115.21.



TPI notes that an “objective” screening tool does not guarantee an effective and thus nondiscriminatory screening tool. For example, the Static-99R screening tool discriminates by claiming persons who have had same gender relations are more apt to commit sexual violence. Such conclusory scoring would not comply with the essential features described by the DOJ that risk factors must be scored based on “reasonably informed assumptions,” and that “weighted inputs lead to presumptive outcome determinations” rather than agency or individual bias.³⁴ In addition, actual practice in applying the screening tool can result in intentional or unintentional bias. As per DOJ comments for this standard, “[e]ffective and professional communication requires a basic understanding of sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, and how sex is assigned at birth. It also requires staff to be aware of their own gaps in knowledge and cultural beliefs, and how these factors may impact the ability to conduct effective interviews and assessments.”³⁵

(d) The intake screening shall consider, at a minimum, the following criteria to assess [incarcerated persons] for risk of sexual victimization:

- (1) Whether the [incarcerated person] has a mental, physical, or developmental disability;
- (2) The age of the [incarcerated person];
- (3) The physical build of the [incarcerated person];
- (4) Whether the [incarcerated person] has previously been incarcerated;
- (5) Whether the [incarcerated person’s] criminal history is exclusively nonviolent;
- (6) Whether the [incarcerated person] has prior convictions for sex offenses against an adult or child;
- (7) Whether the [incarcerated person] is or is perceived to be gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, intersex, or gender nonconforming;
- (8) Whether the [incarcerated person] has previously experienced sexual victimization;
- (9) The [incarcerated person’s] own perception of vulnerability; and
- (10) Whether the [incarcerated person] is detained solely for civil immigration purposes.

TPI asserts that TDCJ PREA compliance policy excludes persons who identify as gender nonconforming and possibly nonbinary. According to the TDCJ *Safe Prisons/PREA Plan* and the PREA Standards, the term transgender refers to “a person whose gender identity (i.e., internal sense of feeling male or female,) is different from the person’s assigned sex at birth.” This implies an old and limited definition of “transgender” that does not include nonconforming and nonbinary persons. PREA and the Safe Prisons Plan technically address this by including “gender nonconforming” in their discussions. The PREA Final Rule notes that:

34. “FAQ | What is meant by the term “objective screening instrument” in PREA Standard 115, . . .” Frequently Asked Questions, National PREA Resource Center, May 10, 2021, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/frequently-asked-questions/what-meant-term-objective-screening-instrument-prea-standard-11541>.

35. “FAQ | Does standard § 115.41 (§ 115.241, § 115.341) require facilities to, . . .” Frequently Asked Questions, National PREA Resource Center FAQ, October 21, 2016, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/frequently-asked-questions/does-standard-11541-115241-115341-require-facilities-affirmatively>.



The standards account in various ways for the particular vulnerabilities of [incarcerated persons] who are LGBTI or whose appearance or manner does not conform to traditional gender expectations. The standards require training in effective and professional communication with LGBTI and gender nonconforming [incarcerated persons] and require the screening process to consider whether the [incarcerated person] is, or is perceived to be, LGBTI or gender nonconforming. The standards also require that post-incident reviews consider whether the incident was motivated by LGBTI identification, status, or perceived status.

The PREA standards require under § 115.41(d) that screening for risk of sexual victimization shall consider several factors, including “(7) Whether the [incarcerated person] **is or is perceived to be** gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, intersex, or **gender nonconforming**” (emphasis added). If TDCJ risk screening markers include only LGBXX (unknown code), TRGEN, and INTSX, to be compliant with this requirement, it appears that gender nonconforming and nonbinary persons must be included in one of these categories, with TRGEN being the category generally most appropriate for risk assessment. TPI notes that SPPOM-03.01 screening in Section II for “Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex (LGBTI), and Gender Non-conforming” persons does not provide a coding entry for gender nonconforming persons. Questions 9 and 10 on Attachment E only include lesbian, gay, bisexual, heterosexual, transgender, and intersex. Section IV follow-up questions only address the “perceived to be” portion of this requirement, not the “is” portion. Therefore, it is not clear how TDCJ identifies persons in these classes, or how these criteria are applied for PREA § 115.42 purposes. This appears to indicate TDCJ policy makes it easy to exclude considerations of vulnerability for gender nonconforming and nonbinary persons.

Due to evidence of noncompliance documented in the audit report and not further investigated —such as evidence that not all persons were screened within 72 hours, that the screening instrument in use by TDCJ is highly likely to contain biases, and that some required screening considerations are not provided—TPI asserts that this audit report indicates compliance has not been met with PREA § 115.41.

PREA § 115.42, Use of Screening Information

Purpose [per the Standards in Focus]: To reduce the risk of inmate-on-inmate sexual abuse and sexual harassment (referred to throughout the remainder of this document as “sexual abuse” or “sexual victimization”) by:

- Maintaining separation between inmates at risk of being sexually victimized and inmates at risk of being sexually abusive;
- Using intake screening information from § 115.41 to inform all inmate housing, bed, work, education, and program assignments: and
- Providing additional protections for transgender and intersex inmates, based on the unique risks these populations face while incarcerated.³⁶

36. PREA Resource Center, “Screening for Risk of Sexual Victimization and Abusiveness, § 115.42, 115.142, 115.242, 115.342, Use of Screening Information,” *PREA Standards in Focus*, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites>



(a) The agency shall use information from the risk screening required by § 115.41 to inform housing, bed, work, education, and program assignments with the goal of keeping separate those [incarcerated persons] at high risk of being sexually victimized from those at high risk of being sexually abusive.

For PREA § 115.42, the DOJ has clarified that the manner of separation will depend on the circumstances of confinement, providing examples:

- In facilities that are comprised of only a single dormitory for housing, persons at risk for victimization should generally be housed on the opposite side from persons who have been screened as a risk for being abusive;
- In facilities with cells in a single housing unit, persons should be housed vulnerable persons should be housed in different cells from persons who are potentially abusive;
- In facilities that include multiple housing units, vulnerable persons should be assigned to different housing units from persons who are potentially abusive.³⁷

TPI receives routine complaints from transgender persons incarcerated in TDCJ that these guidelines are not followed. Our correspondents report they are housed in housing units or even in the same cell with persons who are a danger to them (including danger of sexual harassment and sexual abuse) because the other persons in the same housing unit or cell are antagonistic toward transgender persons specifically, LGBTI persons in general, or non-affiliated or “solo” persons who are vulnerable to exploitation. The antagonism may be due to personal or religious hatred, but it can also be due to affiliation with organizations that have rules against or that stigmatize any fraternization or association—including sharing a cell—with a transgender person or any LGBTI person. TPI does not contend that TDCJ does not have a screening process or use the screening information, but that both as currently implemented are inadequate to properly achieve the separation required under PREA § 115.42. Simply having policy addressing these requirements is not sufficient. The policy must be efficacious at achieving its purpose.

(b) The agency shall make individualized determinations about how to ensure the safety of each [incarcerated person].

(c) In deciding whether to assign a transgender or intersex [incarcerated person] to a facility for male or female [incarcerated persons], and in making other housing and programming assignments, the agency shall consider on a case-by-case basis whether a placement would ensure the [incarcerated person's] health and safety, and whether the placement would present management or security problems.

[/default/files/library/115.42%20SIF_0.pdf](#).

37. “FAQ | What does ‘separate’ mean in the context of the screening standards, which, . . .” Frequently Asked Questions, National PREA Resource Center FAQ, December 2, 2016, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/node/5166>.



Concerning PREA § 115.42(c), TPI notes that based on reporting to us, we have heard of only a single transgender or intersex incarcerated person NOT housed according to their gender assigned at birth in TDCJ, and our information indicates that person has had genital surgery. Thus TDCJ appears to have, in practice, a blanket rule of making housing assignments for transgender and intersex persons based on genital configuration, not on a case-by-case basis.

The DOJ has stated that an auditor:

must examine a facility or agency's actual practices in addition to reviewing official policy. A PREA audit that reveals that all transgender or intersex [incarcerated persons] in a facility are, in practice, housed according to their external genital status [as is true at the L yn a u g h - F o r t S t o c k t o n C o m p l e x a n d a c r o s s T D C J f a c i l i t i e s] raises the possibility of non-compliance. The auditor should then closely examine the facility's actual assessments to determine whether the facility is conducting truly individualized, case-by-case assessments for each transgender or intersex [incarcerated person]. The auditor will likely need to conduct a comprehensive review of the facility's risk screening and classification processes, specific [incarcerated person] records, and documentation regarding placement decisions.³⁸

The PREA Standards in Focus provides specific instructions to auditors:

Examining a facility's actual practices, in addition to reviewing official policy. For example, a PREA audit that reveals that all transgender and/or intersex inmates are, in practice, housed according to their genital status raises the possibility of non-compliance, even if the agency's policies are consistent with all of the requirements in § 115.42. The auditor must conduct a comprehensive review of the agency's screening and reassessment processes, and examine specific inmate records/files to determine if individualized, case-by-case housing and programming assignments of transgender and/or intersex inmates are being made.³⁹

(d) Placement and programming assignments for each transgender or intersex [incarcerated person] shall be reassessed at least twice each year to review any threats to safety experienced by the [incarcerated person].

TPI has often heard from incarcerated transgender persons throughout TDCJ that the twice yearly assessments by UCC are cursory and ineffective. Reports generally convey that many staff make it clear they are simply there to check off the items they are required to ask, and many persons note that if they report issues, those are either dismissed or ignored, or addressed by locking the person in restrictive housing, likely with little or no property, for a week or more while an "investigation" is conducted then found unsubstantiated at best. The process appears seldom conducive to meeting the spirit of the PREA standard, and instead may offer staff opportunities to discourage reports of sexual victimization risks. TPI feels it is inadequate to

38. "FAQ | Does a policy that houses transgender or intersex inmates based exclusively on, . . ." Frequently Asked Questions, National PREA Resource Center FAQ, March 24, 2016, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/frequently-asked-questions/does-policy-houses-transgender-or-intersex-inmates-based-exclusively>.

39. PREA Resource Center, "Screening for Risk of Sexual Victimization and Abusiveness, § 115.42, 115.142, 115.242, 115.342, Use of Screening Information," PREA Standards in Focus, https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/115.42%20SIF_0.pdf.



simply parrot policy in support of meeting this standard, as is done by this auditor, and it must be supported by genuine investigation into the efficacy of the process for incarcerated transgender and intersex persons.

In addition, the audit report documents that this requirement is in the TDCJ Safe Prisons/PREA Plan, but does not say if there was any auditing to determine if the complex carries out this requirement in practice. Thus compliance with this provision cannot be determined.

(f) Transgender and intersex [incarcerated persons] shall be given the opportunity to shower separately from other [incarcerated persons].

TPI notes that for two-person cells where the shower is in the cell, if one of the persons is transgender or intersex and one is not, that housing is not in compliance with 115.42(f).⁴⁰ If both persons are transgender or intersex, such housing may comply with this standard if both persons housed in the cell agree that the housing arrangement is acceptable, but only for as long as both persons housed in the cell agree that the arrangement is acceptable.

In addition, full compliance with PREA § 115.42(f), as per the DOJ, requires that facilities “adopt procedures that will afford transgender and intersex [incarcerated persons] the opportunity to disrobe, shower, and dress apart from other [incarcerated persons],” not simply have a minimally compliant “separate” shower.⁴¹ This audit report only documented partial compliance that “transgender and intersex [incarcerated persons] are given the opportunity to shower separately.” That does not document actual compliance with this provision.

Based on the dearth of investigation into these matters and the failure to document compliance in practice on at least two provisions, TPI asserts that it cannot be determined whether or not the complex is compliant with this standard.

PREA § 115.43 Preface, TDCJ “Protective Custody” Designations

PREA § 115.43 covers the separation or segregation of persons at high risk for sexual victimization, and the section uses several terms that provide opportunities for manipulation of the standard. These include “protective custody,” “segregated housing,” and “involuntary segregated housing.” None of these are specifically defined in PREA § 115.5 general definitions, nor are definitions provided in the FAQ available online via the National PREA Resource Center. The PREA Final Rule⁴² also does not provide definitions for these terms. In discussing this section, the Final Rule appears to use “segregated housing” and “involuntary segregated housing” to refer somewhat more generally to any type of separate housing for safety reasons,

40. This generally would be the case even if the unit claims that opportunities for separate showers are provided because during lock downs and even periods of staff shortages, those opportunities are some of the first to be overlooked or set aside.

41. “FAQ | Standard 115.42, ‘Use of Screening Information,’ requires that transgender, . . .” Frequently Asked Questions, National PREA Resource Center FAQ, April 23, 2014, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/frequently-asked-questions/standard-11542-use-screening-information-requires-transgender-inmates-be>.

42. Federal Register (2012): vol. 77 no. 119, Fed. Reg. page 37106-37232 (June 20, 2012).



and “protective custody” and “involuntary protective custody” as separate housing for the purpose of providing immediate safety.⁴³ However, the discussion makes it clear that all these terms refer to separating the person from endangerment by placement in separate housing, and that all of these are considered “protective custody.” For the sake of consistency, TPI will refer here to all separation for investigations of alleged sexual abuse or due to assessment as being at risk for sexual abuse to be “protective custody.” If the person being segregated agrees with the segregation, that segregation will be “voluntary protective custody”; if the person being segregated does not agree with the segregation, that segregation will be “involuntary protective custody.” TPI also asserts that due to the requirement at PREA § 115.41(d)(9) that the incarcerated person’s own views of vulnerability taken into account, considerations of whether separate housing is “voluntary” or “involuntary” may change over time as the person’s views about the need for protective custody changes. This can be important for persons provided TDCJ “safekeeping designation” because in many cases, persons will initially agree and want the designation, but later wish to be released from safekeeping designation due to the limits on education, training, work, and program opportunities. At that point, safekeeping becomes involuntary protective custody. Requests to be released from safekeeping designation are not always granted, and when not granted, documentation requirements under PREA § 115.43 should be triggered.

The following discussion provides definitions and descriptions of a number of types of protective custody in use in TDCJ. All of these should be considered “protective custody” for PREA § 115.43 and PREA § 115.68 purposes because all can be used to separate persons at risk of sexual victimization or after reporting sexual victimization.

Protective safekeeping: “Protective safekeeping” is defined in the TDCJ *Classification Plan* as being “for [incarcerated persons] who require the highest level of protection in a more controlled environment than other general population [persons], due to threats of harm by others or a high likelihood of victimization.” This designation is more fully discussed in the *Protective Safekeeping Plan*, a document that is not made public and to which TPI does not have access. Protective safekeeping is also identified as custody levels P6 and P7, with P7 having more restrictions. We should point out that one way TDCJ makes this confusing can be seen in this definition, where they compare persons in protective safekeeping to “other general population” persons. This allows TDCJ to claim even protective safekeeping is not actually “segregation” because it is “general population.” However, TDCJ protective safekeeping is very separate, and there are only about three units in the TDCJ system with housing designated for protective safekeeping.⁴⁴

43. Federal Register (2012): vol. 77 no. 119, Fed. Reg. page 37154-37155 (June 20, 2012).

44. TPI also notes that a 2016 PREA audit report documents that starting November 1, 2015, “TDCJ no longer uses the term ‘Protective Custody’ and now refers to these areas as ‘Protective Safe Keeping.’” Agency staff would likely claim the change eliminated confusion about the nature of the housing, but TPI strongly asserts that this is simply a means of obscuring actual conditions, much the way other types of abusive segregation have been renamed from “solitary confinement” to “administrative segregation” to “restrictive housing” over the years to obscure the abusive nature of solitary confinement. Ralph P. Woodward, “TDCJ Rufus H. Duncan Unit, PREA



This designation, based on reports from the one person with a P6 designation that we have been in contact with, is mainly used for persons who are politicians and other high-profile figures, persons with law enforcement history, and persons who have testified against powerful syndicates or cartels. This person did not mention anyone being in there due to a risk of sexual victimization, although there certainly could be. TDCJ protective safekeeping is absolutely separate from all other TDCJ populations, with no mixing outside P6 and P7. As far as TPI is aware, protective safekeeping is never recommended for only a risk of sexual victimization. We have never heard of any person being designated as “protective safekeeping” due to sexual violence or risk of sexual violence. This contrasts with TDCJ responses to PREA auditors that tend to indicate this is the only “protective custody” meeting PREA § 115.43 requirements.⁴⁵ All TDCJ classification discussions we are aware of related to separation due to the potential for sexual victimization focus on “safekeeping status” (P2 through P5), not “protective safekeeping” (P6 and P7).

TPI has seen many audit reports that appear to simply accept TDCJ’s implied or stated claims that the only legitimate PREA § 115.43 “protective custody” in the system is TDCJ protective safekeeping. That is far from true. TPI believes such statements should be considered deliberate and intentional efforts to manipulate PREA data collection, PREA audits, and PREA compliance.

Safekeeping status: Safekeeping designation or status is defined in the TDCJ Classification Plan as:

a status assigned to [incarcerated persons] who require separate housing within general population due to threats to their safety, vulnerability, a potential for victimization, or other similar reasons. [Incarcerated persons] in safekeeping are also assigned a principal custody designation, including safekeeping Level 2-P2 [minimum custody], safekeeping Level 3-P3 [minimum custody], safekeeping Level 4 -P4 [medium custody], and safekeeping Level 5-P5 [closed custody].

Safekeeping status is sought by incarcerated persons who experience vulnerabilities, including vulnerabilities related to sexual violence. However, safekeeping status is provided only in relatively few cases, and some people experience sexual violence over and over and are refused safekeeping status because of the length of their incarceration, their body size, or in some cases

Audit Report Final,” March 23, 2016: 15, https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/documents/prea_report/Duncan_Unit_2016-02-26.pdf.

45. This appears to be an agency-wide position. In a response letter dated August 17, 2022, from TBCJ PREA Ombudsman Cassandra McGilbra (letter not further identified for privacy considerations, but a redacted copy may be provided if needed), McGilbra stated that “[t]he PREA Ombudsman Office concluded our investigative review on August 17, 2022, and found no violations of PREA Standard § 115.43. [Incarcerated person] [name redacted] was never assigned to **Protective Safekeeping** or **Restrictive Housing** preventing [her] from participating in available TDCJ jobs, education, or programs” (emphasis in the original). This indicates TDCJ only considers persons in housing designated as protective safekeeping or restrictive housing for PREA § 115.43 compliance, which TPI asserts is insufficient. We also note that restrictive housing is nearly always in a disciplinary environment, and is usually taken to refer to persons identified as potential abusers.



for specious reasons such as being “too intelligent.”⁴⁶ Once in safekeeping, incarcerated persons see reduced access to job opportunities, educational and training programs, and other benefits that may be offered to persons not in safekeeping status.⁴⁷ In one example, TPI advocated for a transgender woman who was denied educational opportunities due to her safekeeping status, even though she tried for several years to be released from safekeeping status. When TPI filed a complaint, we were told that her safekeeping status did not prevent her from entering the education program, and that she had been accepted for the program, but could not access it because there was no housing for her on any unit where that program was offered.⁴⁸ The more complete explanation was that there was no *safekeeping* housing on the units where the program was offered. Perhaps in a warped sense of logic it may be said that safekeeping was not the reason she was denied, but it is entirely disingenuous to claim that safekeeping status did not prevent her from entering the program. Her safekeeping status was finally relinquished after our complaint (and after she voluntarily de-identified as transgender in the system so she could access the program), and she entered the program. That was the only impediment to her participation in that program. TDCJ’s insistence that “housing availability” instead of the safekeeping designation kept her from the program should be considered deliberate manipulation to avoid PREA documentation and data requirements.

On paper, safekeeping persons may be able to access all the benefits of general population, but in practice the safekeeping population is often segregated in abusive ways at meals, recreation, and other unit movement and programs; and in some cases they are kept from some or all work assignments, this apparently being unit-level practice at some facilities, depending on the administration of the moment. Further, safekeeping housing is often in restrictive housing areas, meaning those housed there are subjected to the same disciplinary environment as persons in separate—or sometimes the same—sections or cell blocks who are there for

46. Some reports from our correspondents note that they are told they do not qualify for safekeeping because they are “too smart” or similar reasons. *Zollicoffer v. Livingston* (4:14-cv-03037) also documents the extensive measures TDCJ goes to in avoiding safekeeping designation: <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4394368/zollicoffer-v-livingston/>.

47. Note that just as TDCJ confusingly describes “protective safekeeping” as “general population,” safekeeping designation is also considered “general population” even though safekeeping housing is separate from general population because housing sections are designated for safekeeping persons only.

Also, in a response letter dated August 17, 2022, from TBCJ PREA Ombudsman Cassandra McGilbra (letter not further identified for privacy considerations), McGilbra stated in addressing restrictions on a safekeeping designated individual, that “the agency also has a responsibility of making decisions for [] housing, jobs, and programming [for incarcerated persons] based on sound correctional practices to ensure the [incarcerated person] is overall safe from being victimized or abusive,” which serves to document that individuals in safekeeping may experience (TPI would suspect always experience) limitations to privileges and opportunities.

48. In a response letter dated August 17, 2022, from TBCJ PREA Ombudsman Cassandra McGilbra (letter not further identified for privacy considerations), McGilbra stated that “[t]he PREA Ombudsman found the McConnell Unit’s position not to remove [redacted] from Safekeeping was within the agency’s guidelines.” This provides a definitive statement that TDCJ refuses safekeeping designation removal, meaning safekeeping designation can be involuntary.



disciplinary reasons.⁴⁹ These prohibitions and disciplinary conditions are sometimes used to harass persons with safekeeping designations, who are often identified as “snitches” and “punks” and other derogatory terms. Safekeeping persons may be denied access to educational opportunities, training programs, and other benefits, sometimes by claiming the denial is not because of the safekeeping designation but for other reasons such as housing, as noted above.

TDCJ also seems to claim that safekeeping designation is not “protective custody” under PREA § 115.43, and that only “protective safekeeping” is “protective custody.” This claim is absolutely not consistent with practice or even the definition of the housing designation. TPI also knows of persons who were placed in safekeeping over their objections. And some who initially agreed to the designation may later see no need for continued safekeeping designation. Certainly a person’s understanding of their own vulnerability and need for safekeeping can change over time. If the person on safekeeping does not agree they have a continuing need for safekeeping status, then they are in involuntary protective custody, and the documentation requirements under PREA must be met.

Likewise, TDCJ seems to claim that safekeeping as a whole is not “involuntary protective custody,” apparently because in most cases, people request or agree to be placed in safekeeping designation—at least initially. However, it is certainly not something a person can easily request or volunteer for and be assigned, and in many cases requests for removal of the safekeeping designation are denied, sometimes even after outside advocacy for removal of the safekeeping designation.

Thus safekeeping designation is definitely a type of “protective custody” under the PREA standards, and may be considered “involuntary protective custody” requiring documentation and on-going assessments of continuing need for PREA compliance.

Lockup for reporting sexual violence: TDCJ seems to go to some effort to indicate only “protective safekeeping” (custody classification P6 and P7) constitutes “protective custody” or “involuntary protective custody” for PREA purposes, and TDCJ protective safekeeping can constitute PREA protective custody but appears to be seldom used for that in actual practice. As explained above, “safekeeping designation” is definitely “protective custody” under PREA when related to addressing risk for sexual violence, and may also constitute “involuntary protective custody.” Likewise, lockup for reporting sexual violence is “protective custody”

49. TPI has received a number of complaints that minimum custody level safekeeping persons and general population persons with a “cool bed score” are housed with medium and close custody persons in restrictive housing sections that are designated for safekeeping and for persons requiring temperature control. Texas Government Code 501.112 prohibits such mixed classifications “unless the structure of the cellblock or dormitory allows the physical separation of the different classifications.” It appears this practice is considered not a violation of TGC 501.112 because persons housed in these areas are locked in their cells much of the time, and must be escorted when leaving the cell (standard restrictions in this type of housing, which are disciplinary in nature). This abusive treatment of safekeeping and cool bed persons appears to be surreptitious disciplinary actions meant to discourage requests for safekeeping and suits about excessive heat. Housing in disciplinary environments should certainly be considered in assessments related to PREA protective custody compliance areas.



under PREA, and often constitutes “involuntary protective custody” under PREA. In almost every report we have had documenting a TDCJ response to a report of sexual abuse, if the report is not ignored, the person reporting is placed in a separate cell and isolated for an Inmate Protection Investigation (IPI).⁵⁰ This probably generates documentation that “all available alternatives” have been reviewed, but in practice it is an automatic action that is done even if the person reporting states definite reasons that they are in no further danger. TPI has even documented this happening when someone reported sexual abuse at a different unit and there was no conceivable danger at the current unit. In these cases, there is certainly no legitimate evaluation of “all available alternatives,” regardless of staff claims or policy. IPI lockups also routinely last for more than 24 hours, and are often handled as disciplinary actions, with the person being strip searched and their property taken (the latter is often the consequence of being locked up immediately, without being allowed to pack their property, so ostensibly they are not “denied” their property, although that and property loss are effects of the action). Since IPI lockups are usually in the same areas as restrictive housing, they also routinely entail the same security restrictions that apply to those being held for disciplinary reasons. Such lockups may be called “restrictive housing,” “transient housing,” and other terms. Clearly such treatment discourages reports of sexual victimization.

TPI also points out that in the Final Rule, the DOJ makes it clear that such lockups and other segregated housing for reporting sexual abuse is included under PREA § 115.68, which is often the driver behind these initial placements in segregated housing and requirements for PREA § 115.43 compliance:

Section 115.66 in the proposed rule (now renumbered as § 115.68) provided that any use of segregated housing to protect an [incarcerated person] who is alleged to have suffered sexual abuse shall be subject to the requirements of § 115.43.⁵¹

Protective Management: Some PREA audit reports for TDCJ facilities have mentioned a housing designation called “protective management.” The housing designation is described as segregated housing for protection. TPI has not ever seen this phrase in any other context, although we do believe there are several additional segregation categories not covered here. We mention this here because it appears to be directly related to PREA compliance with PREA §§ 115.43 and 115.68, but is not always covered in audit report assessments. It appears that this “protective management” designation should also be considered to be PREA protective custody, and sometimes may constitute involuntary protective custody.

This discussion shows that without a doubt, TDCJ “protective safekeeping” is absolutely not the only classification that meets the “protective custody” definition under the PREA standards, nor is it the only classification that can be considered “involuntary protective custody.” This discussion should also show the extent of the manipulation that TDCJ administration has

50. This term has varied over time. What is currently called an IPI was until about 2022 identified as an OPI for “offender protection investigation,” and in the past has been known as an LID, or “life in danger” investigation.

51. Federal Register (2012): vol. 77 no. 119, Fed. Reg. page 37154 (June 20, 2012).



engaged in to deliberately misrepresent PREA compliance and mislead PREA auditors, in some cases with what should be considered fully knowledgeable participation of the auditors. Without a doubt, protective custody and involuntary protective custody are sometimes necessary and of great benefit to survivors of sexual abuse and those threatened with sexual violence. But TDCJ manipulates this practice for the benefit of the agency—and without necessary transparency, often causes great harm and compounds the sexual violence a survivor has experienced by adding personal and systemic violence from the staff and agency.

PREA § 115.43, Protective Custody

PREA § 115.43 concerns segregation practices for persons at high risk of sexual victimization, and due to potentially confusing language in the standards—and the way TDCJ has created deliberate confusion around what constitutes segregation in TDCJ—the requirements must be considered carefully. Each provision is discussed separately here.

(a) [Incarcerated persons] at high risk for sexual victimization shall not be placed in involuntary segregated housing unless an assessment of all available alternatives has been made, and a determination has been made that there is no available alternative means of separation from likely abusers. If a facility cannot conduct such an assessment immediately, the facility may hold the [incarcerated person] in involuntary segregated housing for less than 24 hours while completing the assessment.

This provision covers housing that is both separate due to a risk of sexual violence, and that is considered involuntary. This is not limited to any specific housing category or classification or location, it includes any separation for a PREA concern that is not done with the concurrence of the person being separated. In TDCJ, this can include all types of transit and restrictive housing, SOS, CDO, any type of “lockup,” “protective management,” and all other types of separation such as safekeeping and protective safekeeping (see the section above concerning TDCJ types of protective custody). Such separation must be supported by an assessment that there is no other safe alternative to separation from a likely abuser within 24 hours, and PREA § 115.43(d) provides the specifics that must be included in the documentation of that assessment.

Regardless of policy, reports to TPI indicate that placement in involuntary segregation due to immediate endangerment seldom considers any other options outside segregation, often involuntary. This practice in effect serves to punish persons for reporting endangerment and to discourage reporting. Concerning high risk of sexual victimization that is not imminent but may be an ongoing risk due to a person’s presentation or other factors, TDCJ often fails to separate by providing safekeeping designation to persons who repeatedly experience sexual violence at multiple facilities, nearly always claiming a unit transfer will solve the issues.

The audit report states that not one person was ever during the 12-month audit period determined to be at risk of sexual victimization indicates serious failures of the screening process and use of screening information as well.



(b) [Incarcerated persons] placed in segregated housing for this purpose shall have access to programs, privileges, education, and work opportunities to the extent possible. If the facility restricts access to programs, privileges, education, or work opportunities, the facility shall document:

- (1) The opportunities that have been limited;
- (2) The duration of the limitation; and
- (3) The reasons for such limitations.

This provision does not limit segregation to being involuntary, so it covers all segregated housing for the purpose of separating persons at risk of victimization from potential abusers. Again, this is not limited to any specific housing category or classification or location, it includes any separation, voluntary or involuntary, of a person at risk for victimization from potential abusers. This includes all types of transit and restrictive housing, SOS, CDO, any type of “lockup,” “protective management,” “safekeeping designation,” “protective safekeeping,” and all other types of separation. All such placements must document restrictions to “programs, privileges, education, or work opportunities” per the specified requirements.

(c) The facility shall assign such [incarcerated persons] to involuntary segregated housing only until an alternative means of separation from likely abusers can be arranged, and such an assignment shall not ordinarily exceed a period of 30 days.

This provision is limited to involuntary segregation, again encompassing any type of transit and restrictive housing, SOS, CDO, any type of “lockup,” “protective management,” and all other types of separation where the incarcerated person does not specifically volunteer for that housing. In general, any such involuntary segregation for risk of sexual violence should be for no more than 30 days.

(d) If an involuntary segregated housing assignment is made pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section, the facility shall clearly document:

- (1) The basis for the facility’s concern for the [incarcerated person’s] safety; and
- (2) The reason why no alternative means of separation can be arranged.

This provision defines the documentation required for PREA § 115.43(a) placements in involuntary segregated housing. In the past, most audit reports referred to TDCJ protective safekeeping as the only relevant housing for this documentation. It must be assumed that without specific investigation into all the types of PREA protective custody, this obfuscation continues. This discussion is not sufficient to consider the Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex compliant with this provision.

(e) Every 30 days, the facility shall afford each such [incarcerated person] a review to determine whether there is a continuing need for separation from the general population.

This provision does not state that it is only for involuntary segregation, and because other provisions specify where applicable to involuntary segregated housing, this provision must be



read as encompassing all segregation for risk of sexual victimization. Thus all persons held in any type of segregated housing, voluntary or involuntary, for risk of sexual victimization from potential abusers—including safekeeping, protective safekeeping, all types of transit and restrictive housing, SOS, CDO, any type of “lockup,” “protective management,” and all other types of separation—are to be reviewed every 30 days to determine if there is a continuing need for separation.

Based on the lack of substantiation of compliance in this audit report, TPI asserts that it cannot be determined whether or not the complex complies with PREA § 115.43.

PREA § 115.64, Staff First Responder Duties

- (a) Upon learning of an allegation that an [incarcerated person] was sexually abused, the first security staff member to respond to the report shall be required to:
- (1) Separate the alleged victim and abuser;
 - (2) Preserve and protect any crime scene until appropriate steps can be taken to collect any evidence;
 - (3) If the abuse occurred within a time period that still allows for the collection of physical evidence, request that the alleged victim not take any actions that could destroy physical evidence, including, as appropriate, washing, brushing teeth, changing clothes, urinating, defecating, smoking, drinking, or eating; and
 - (4) If the abuse occurred within a time period that still allows for the collection of physical evidence, ensure that the alleged abuser does not take any actions that could destroy physical evidence, including, as appropriate, washing, brushing teeth, changing clothes, urinating, defecating, smoking, drinking, or eating.

The audit report documents that in only 10 of the 14 instances where sexual abuse was reported did first responders separate the victim and abuser and apparently comply with the other requirements of this provision. Further, the interview with the one person housed in the complex who had reported sexual abuse during the audit period revealed that “staff did not take immediate action to protect the alleged victim from the alleged perpetrator, separate the individuals involved and preserve and protect any potential evidence.” No reason for the lack of an appropriate response was provided. Based on this evidence, the Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex certainly was not compliant with this provision. Even with this clear admission of noncompliance, however, the audit did not require corrective action.

The audit report documents that in eight of the 14 instances where sexual abuse was reported, the allegation was made within a time period that allowed for the collection of physical evidence (presumably within 96 hours). Yet the audit report documents in the discussion of PREA § 115.21 that only one forensic medical exam was conducted. No other statement about the collection of physical evidence was made in this audit report. Based on this evidence, the Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex was not compliant with this provision.



Based on this evidence, it appears certain that the Lynaugh-Fort Stockton complex was not compliant with this standard and that the audit failed to request corrective action, as required.

PREA § 115.67, Protection Against Retaliation

(a) The agency shall establish a policy to protect all [incarcerated persons] and staff who report sexual abuse or sexual harassment or cooperate with sexual abuse or sexual harassment investigations from retaliation by other [incarcerated persons] or staff, and shall designate which staff members or departments are charged with monitoring retaliation.

(b) The agency shall employ multiple protection measures, such as housing changes or transfers for [incarcerated person] victims or abusers, removal of alleged staff or [incarcerated person] abusers from contact with victims, and emotional support services for [incarcerated persons] or staff who fear retaliation for reporting sexual abuse or sexual harassment or for cooperating with investigations.

Agencies can demonstrate that they take retaliation seriously by communicating proactively with inmates and staff about retaliation concerns; by explaining the steps in place to prevent and address retaliation; and by using the perspectives of inmates and staff to develop or revise agency policies that focus on retaliation.⁵²

The audit report documented that the only person to have reported sexual abuse and not been transferred by the time the audit was conducted (a common tactic throughout the agency, which helps eliminate victims from PREA audits at facilities where their experiences are most relevant) reported that they “did not feel protected against retaliation from other [incarcerated persons] or staff for having reported an incident of sexual abuse.” The audit report gave no relevance to this information, and provided no evidence that any investigation into the reasons for this statement was done.

Additionally, per the narrative under PREA § 115.68, the person interviewed who reported sexual abuse noted “he was placed in a higher custody level as a result of reporting the incident.” In TDCJ, a higher custody level is more restrictive custody (i.e., G2 minimum custody to G4 medium custody), so **this audit report documents retaliation for reporting sexual abuse.**

The only conclusion that can be drawn from this is that Lynaugh-Fort Stockton is not compliant with this provision.

The remaining discussion of compliance with this standard simply referred to policy and generalizations by staff.

Based on the information provided, as well as the absolute lack of investigation and information concerning the direct experience indicated noncompliance, it can only be concluded that this audit report documents noncompliance with the PREA § 115.67 standard.

52. PREA Resource Center, “115.67, Agency Protection Against Retaliation,” *PREA Standards in Focus*, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/SIF%20115.67%20FINAL%20%28updated%29.pdf>.



PREA § 115.68, Post-Allegation Protective Custody

Any use of segregated housing to protect an [incarcerated person] who is alleged to have suffered sexual abuse shall be subject to the requirements of § 115.43.

The standard response in TDCJ, if there is a response, when someone reports an incident of sexual violence or a risk of sexual victimization is to place the person reporting in transit or restrictive housing for an IPI (which requires PREA § 115.43 consideration, in some cases via PREA § 115.68), and that placement generally lasts several days to sometimes weeks (although the designation often changes during that time to obscure the extended stay in segregated housing). Such housing also involves separation from and loss of property, as well as loss of opportunities, even though very often a cell change to a different section could address the issue while the investigation is ongoing. It is highly unlikely that of the 14 reports of sexual abuse, none were placed in segregated housing involuntarily during the preceding 12 months. Most people reporting such treatment to TPI indicate the placement in such segregated housing is often done involuntarily to discourage reports of sexual violence.

As with the discussion under PREA § 115.43, TDCJ engages in manipulation of what constitutes “protective custody” by making misleading statements about what “protective safekeeping” and “safekeeping designation” are. Also, in TPI’s experience, TDCJ automatically places all or almost all persons who report sexual violence in involuntary protective custody (restricted housing for inmate protection investigation, or IPI) regardless of whether there are alternatives to such placement or not. TPI receives regular reports of persons not wanting to report incidents due to not wanting to be placed in segregation.

It is not at all clear why this audit report would state for this standard that the person interviewed who reported sexual abuse noted “he was placed in a higher custody level as a result of reporting the incident.” As noted above for PREA § 115.67, a higher custody level is more restrictive custody, so this documents retaliation, but it has nothing to do with restrictive housing.

Based on the information provided in this audit report, it cannot be determined whether or not L ynough-Fort Stockton Complex is compliant with this standard.

PREA § 115.72, Evidentiary Standard for Administrative Investigations

The agency shall impose no standard higher than a preponderance of the evidence in determining whether allegations of sexual abuse or sexual harassment are substantiated.

PREA § 115.72 requires that no standard of evidence higher than a preponderance of the evidence (greater than a 50 percent chance of occurrence—essentially equal to a coin toss) be used in substantiating an allegation of sexual abuse.

It is difficult to understand why anyone would consider a claim that the preponderance of evidence standard was truthfully stated when out of 14 reports of sexual abuse, only two had a greater chance of occurring than a 50/50 chance. This claims that 12 of 14 reports did not have



even a coin toss's chance of having occurred. Such low rates of substantiation indicate serious manipulation of the evidence on the part of the investigators, and a failure to appropriately consider the preponderance of evidence standard.

Due to the extremely low rates of substantiated allegations, as reported in the most recent PREA Ombudsman report for calendar year 2023, it is highly unlikely that a preponderance of evidence standard is used anywhere in TDCJ. In that report, for allegations against staff, only 7% of 505 sexual abuse allegations were substantiated, 1% of 86 sexual harassment allegations were substantiated, and 0% of 147 voyeurism allegations were substantiated.⁵³ These dismal accountability ratings are actually an improvement over the prior year. Amazingly, TDCJ seriously claims that more than one in three (186 of 505, or 37%) of the allegations of staff on incarcerated persons sexual abuse were false reports, a statement truly beyond belief.⁵⁴

For allegations against other incarcerated persons, only 1.4% of 426 allegations of “nonconsensual sexual acts” were substantiated, and only 2.9% of 421 reports of “abusive sexual contact” were substantiated.⁵⁵ Regardless of one's concerns about possible false reporting, these extremely low rates of substantiation indicate a preponderance of evidence is not the standard being used anywhere in the TDCJ system.

For the Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex, the audit report noted that for allegations against staff, 33% of six sexual abuse allegations were substantiated (actually extremely high for allegations in TDCJ), 0% of one sexual harassment allegations were substantiated (and that only one allegation was even documented is pretty unbelievable), and voyeurism allegations were not reported. For allegations against other incarcerated persons, 0% of eight allegations of sexual abuse were substantiated, and 0% of six allegations of sexual harassment were substantiated.

Regardless of one's concerns about possible false reporting, these unbelievably low rates of substantiation indicate a preponderance of evidence is not the standard being used, that it is likely not all allegations are being appropriately reported or investigated, and that those that are being investigated are being manipulated or badly investigated.

It is truly astounding that data like this is not a red flag for an audit, and that these numbers were just accepted indicates a definite issue with the audit report. Due to what can be seen from this report, it appears unacceptable that the Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex was assessed as being “fully compliant” with the PREA § 115.72 standard.

53. Texas Department of Criminal Justice, *Safe Prisons/Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Program Annual Report, Calendar Year 2023*, Texas Department of Criminal Justice, December 2024: 26, https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/documents/PREA_SPP_Report_2023.pdf.

54. Texas Department of Criminal Justice, *Safe Prisons/Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Program Annual Report, Calendar Year 2023*, Texas Department of Criminal Justice, December 2024: 26, https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/documents/PREA_SPP_Report_2023.pdf.

55. Texas Department of Criminal Justice, *Safe Prisons/Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Program Annual Report, Calendar Year 2023*, Texas Department of Criminal Justice, December 2024: 26 – 29, https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/documents/PREA_SPP_Report_2023.pdf.



Based on this evidence, TPI asserts that it cannot be determined whether or not the complex is compliant with this standard.

PREA § 115.83, Ongoing Medical and Mental Health Care

(a) The facility shall offer medical and mental health evaluation and, as appropriate, treatment to all [incarcerated persons] who have been victimized by sexual abuse in any prison, jail, lockup, or juvenile facility.

(b) The evaluation and treatment of such victims shall include, as appropriate, follow-up services, treatment plans, and, when necessary, referrals for continued care following their transfer to, or placement in, other facilities, or their release from custody.

(c) The facility shall provide such victims with medical and mental health services consistent with the community level of care.

The audit report documents that one incarcerated person experiencing sexual abuse by staff was interviewed and asked questions about compliance with PREA § 115.83, but the audit report provides no information about that interview concerning these provisions. TPI has heard from multiple persons across TDCJ that mental health care staff refuse to provide any counseling related to sexual violence. The failure to provide interview responses related to these items indicates either a failure to ask relevant questions during the interview, or a failure to provide important responses in the audit report. Based on this lack of information, it cannot be determined whether or not Lyaugh-Fort Stockton Complex is compliant with these provisions, especially provision (c) requiring services “consistent with the community level of care.”

(e) If pregnancy results from the conduct described in paragraph (d) of this section, such victims shall receive timely and comprehensive information about and timely access to all lawful pregnancy-related medical services.

In discussing this provision, the audit report provides information that indicates the auditor has not received adequate training, nor does the auditor have adequate information about transgender persons. The audit report makes a false statement that “the requirements of this provision were not applicable because this was a male facility,” but some transgender men can become pregnant, so this response tells far more about the lack of training and knowledge of the auditor than it does about compliance with this standard.

(f) [Incarcerated] victims of sexual abuse while incarcerated shall be offered tests for sexually transmitted infections as medically appropriate.

The audit report documents that the person who was interviewed as a victim of sexual abuse stated that they were “not told about or offered any information related to tests for sexually transmitted infection prophylaxis.” No information was offered in the audit report to contradict that indication.

Based on these deficiencies in the audit report, TPI asserts that it cannot be determined whether or not the Lyaugh-Fort Stockton Complex is compliant with this standard.



PREA § 115.401, Frequency and Scope of Audits

(m) The auditor shall be permitted to conduct private interviews with [incarcerated persons], residents, and detainees.

TPI has received reports that these random and targeted interviews include TDCJ staff observing and listening to the responses provided to auditors, and in some cases interviewees have been warned of retaliation if they do not provide “appropriate” responses. Where this occurs, this is a violation of PREA § 115.401(m). Per the 2022 Auditor Handbook:

The purpose of conducting one-on-one interviews with persons confined in the facility is to provide a safe space where they can freely discuss their experiences in and perspectives of the facility on sensitive issues related to sexual safety.⁵⁶

PREA § 115.402, Auditor Qualifications

(c) No audit may be conducted by an auditor who has received financial compensation from the agency being audited (except for compensation received for conducting prior PREA audits) within the three years prior to the agency’s retention of the auditor.

(d) The agency shall not employ, contract with, or otherwise financially compensate the auditor for three years subsequent to the agency’s retention of the auditor, with the exception of contracting for subsequent PREA audits.

The 2022 Auditor Handbook places a strong emphasis on the audit process being important to engendering and maintaining public trust in the PREA process.

Because PREA auditors are DOJ-certified, they are in a unique position of public trust with the ability to impact public confidence in the integrity of the PREA audit function. Many stakeholders rely on this audit process and its results, including federal, state, local, and private agencies that operate or oversee confinement facilities; facility staff; treatment and service providers; community-based advocacy organizations; courts; attorneys; and people in confinement and their families.⁵⁷

TPI believes that for at least three reasons, this audit does not contribute to this role of maintaining public trust. Influence or potential influence by the contracting entity appears to undermine public trust due to potential, if not actualized, conflicts of interest. General cronyism within prison systems exerts undue influence on auditors, a “fox guarding the hen house” situation that fails to promote public trust. And, auditor bias is apparent across the scope of this and other PREA auditor reports, indicating protection of the status quo is the purpose, not

56. U.S. Department of Justice, PREA Management Office, *PREA Auditor Handbook*, Version 2.1, November 2022: 59, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/PREA%20Auditor%20Handbook%20V2.1%20-%20December%202022.pdf>.

57. U.S. Department of Justice, PREA Management Office, *PREA Auditor Handbook*, Version 2.1, November 2022: 14, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/PREA%20Auditor%20Handbook%20V2.1%20-%20December%202022.pdf>.



auditing PREA compliance. The following provides details about how these are eroding public trust in the PREA process.

DOJ-certified PREA auditors have a responsibility to avoid any conflicts of interest, or the appearance of any such conflict. Conflicts of interest may adversely impact an auditor's ability, or perceived ability, to conduct high quality, reliable, objective, and comprehensive audits. Therefore, auditors should avoid any personal or financial arrangements that could create a conflict of interest, or the appearance of a conflict of interest, that would lead a reasonable person to question their objectivity during the conduct of a PREA audit.⁵⁸

It appears that all Texas prisons are audited through contract with Corrections Consulting Services, LLC (CCS). In the past, CCS only provided PREA audits, and as such potential for conflicts of interest were limited. However, in approximately 2022, CCS started providing a wider range of services, including what are listed on the web site as "accreditation support," "policy and procedure review," "security audits," "staff training," and "technology integration" in addition to "PREA auditing." This expansion means that PREA auditors under contract to CCS may be auditing work by other CCS staff or subcontractors, a definite conflict of interest. In addition, the increase in services could increase direct or indirect or inferred pressure from CCS on PREA auditors to find facilities in full compliance to encourage contracts for additional services. It is difficult to understand why this is allowed as it appears to be an obvious conflict of interest that undermines public trust.

General cronyism within and across prison systems also serves as a basis for conflicts of interest potentially affecting all PREA auditors with current or past connections to the prison system. It is extremely common for prison as well as law enforcement staff to develop an "us against them" mentality that results in the view that what prison staff do and the decisions they make must be defended against all outside questioning. And too many PREA auditors are insiders refusing to meaningfully critique the status quo of the prisons they operate. More is published about this in police culture, but it is clearly woven throughout the fabric of prison staff culture as well.

At the Academy, he was indoctrinated into an "us versus the world" mentality and learned just how deep such dehumanization ran. He said he learned the "colloquial terms for people you encounter, such as 'doper,' 'skell' [short for skeleton], 'mope,' and 'thug.'" He said he understands now how they carry "clear racial undertones," but explained that "it doesn't take long for a recruit to be totally enmeshed into their new cop identity." As a young officer, he embraced police culture, which he now describes as cult-like.⁵⁹

Arguably, such clique or prison culture identities may constitute a kind of "personal relationship" identified as a potential conflict in the 2022 Auditor Handbook.

58. U.S. Department of Justice, PREA Management Office, *PREA Auditor Handbook*, Version 2.1, November 2022: 19, <https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/PREA%20Auditor%20Handbook%20V2.1%20-%20December%202022.pdf>.

59. Michael J. Moore, "What an Ex-Cop Learned in Prison About Police Culture," *The Nation*, December 31, 2020, <https://www.thenation.com/article/politics/toxic-culture-police-prison/>.



PREA § 115.402(c) and (d) prohibit an auditor from receiving financial compensation from the agency being audited within three years prior to and after the audit, which is warranted but not sufficient. Due to the “we protect our own” mentality common among persons affiliated with prison operations, TPI believes that auditors should be barred from receiving any financial compensation directly or indirectly from any prison operator or associated agency, at least for the last three years, due to this potential conflict of interest. Additionally, audit funding must be separate from the system being audited to avoid this conflict of interest.

Of the nine PREA audits (not including this one) with final reports available in the PRC audit database, not one includes a corrective action. By contrast, the 2022 Auditor Handbook states that “the PREA audit was built on the assumption that full compliance with every discrete provision would, in most cases, require corrective action” (page 41).⁶⁰ The directory appears to only include audits conducted since September 2022.

Perhaps these audits are influenced by the deep connections this auditor has to the prison industrial complex. The auditor is on staff at the incredibly problematic Arizona Department of Corrections, and has been under the influence of that environment since 1998.

Such potential for conflicts of interest do not engender public trust, but instead strongly indicate a pay-for-compliance service that is focused on protection of the status quo, profit for the prime contractor, and easy compliance, not accountability. Even if the letter of the PREA standard is followed, the spirit of avoiding conflicts of interest that degrade public trust is not.

Conclusion

TPI has been working with incarcerated persons since 2013, mainly trans and queer persons in the Texas prison system. During that time, we believe we have gained an understanding of the Texas prison system that is sufficient to enable us to comment substantively on PREA audits, especially where the treatment of trans and queer persons is concerned. Based on that understanding, we believe that this audit fails to meet the spirit or letter of PREA audit requirements for reasons that will be provided below. **Thus TPI asserts that this audit report does not reflect compliance with the PREA standards.**

Table 1 of this comment letter provides a summary of deficiencies identified in this audit report, described in the main body of this comment letter. Audit deficiencies include the reporting of questionable information, reporting of false information, use of problematic problematic language, and apparent failures to comply with minimum audit requirements.

60. TPI does not currently have the means of determining the percentage of full compliance audits conducted under contract with CCS, but recent research into one prominent auditor of Texas facilities, Lynni O’Haver, indicates that Ms. O’Haver has not identified a single item requiring corrective action at a Texas facility. We would suggest the PREA Resource Center publish online a means of looking up audit result summaries (including the number of standards exceeded, met, and requiring corrective actions) by auditor and auditor employer in the interest of transparency concerning potential auditor and auditor employer integrity.



In addition, this comment letter documents questionable information in the discussion of at least 11 standards, false information for at least five standards, that one standard was assessed as exceeding compliance with absolutely no justification, and vague or inappropriate discussion of at least eight standards. Based on these deficiencies, it appears that compliance is questionable for at least eight standards, there is an indication of compliance is not met for three standards, and the report documents a failure to comply with two standards with no corrective action required.

TPI requests that, at a minimum, the following actions be taken:

- That this audit report be considered deficient, and not be considered to support state compliance for the purpose of PREA § 115.501 certification of state compliance.
- That additional measures be taken to train and assist the auditor in compliance considerations and supporting documentation.
- That auditors give serious consideration to information about PREA compliance concerns provided by incarcerated persons in interviews, and to provide justification for dismissing such information.
- That highly problematic language in the Auditor Compliance Tool that ignores trauma and encourages sexual violence in regards to transgender, nonbinary, and gender nonconforming populations be amended to eliminate bias, stigmatizing constructs, and discrimination.
- That at a minimum, PREA §§ 115.64 and 115.67 be considered to need corrective action at the next audit.
- That at a minimum, additional information be provided to support a finding of compliance for all remaining compliance issues mentioned in this comment letter.

[repeat request for redress]

I hope that these issues can be addressed in the interest of increasing the safety of all trans and queer persons, and in the interest of more full compliance with PREA standards requiring “zero tolerance toward all forms of sexual abuse and sexual harassment” and legitimate efforts to prevent, detect, and respond to such conduct.

Sincerely,

Nell Gaither, President
Pronouns: she/her/hers
Trans Pride Initiative



cc: TDCJ ED Bryan Collier
TBCJ PREA Ombudsman Cassandra McGilbra
Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex Senior Warden Benny Bundy
Lynaugh-Fort Stockton Complex PREA Manager Melissa Gutierrez
PREA auditor Matthew Taylor
Pete Flores, Chair, Senate Committee on Criminal Justice
Sam Harless, Chair, House Committee on Corrections
Venton Jones, Vice-Chair, House Committee on Corrections
Dick Durbin, Senate Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Crime and Counterterrorism
Sheldon Whitehouse, Senate Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Federal Courts,
Oversight, Agency Action, and Federal Rights
Lucy McBath, House Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Crime and Federal Government
Surveillance
Mary Gay Scanlon, House Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on the Constitution and
Limited Government