



## FARMVILLE DETENTION CENTER

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR  
508 WATERWORKS ROAD  
FARMVILLE, VIRGINIA 23901

June 16, 2021

### MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

RE: Annual Review of Farmville Detention Center Detainee Supervision Guidelines

In accordance with DHS PREA standard 115.13 and ACA standard 4-ALDF-2A-14, the Farmville Detention Center conducted a thorough and comprehensive staffing analysis during the month of May 2021. This staffing analysis was executed by the Director of Detention, Deputy Director of Detention Services, and PSA Compliance Manager. Data used in this analysis was compiled and tabulated from June 1, 2020 until May 31, 2021. In establishing appropriate and adequate staffing levels for detainee supervision and determining the availability of video monitoring to protect detainees against sexual abuse the following components were assessed:

1. Generally Accepted Detention and Correctional Practices.

**Findings:** The Farmville Detention Center (FDC) operates under a direct supervision model and therefore a detention officer is always present in the housing units to provide constant supervision and monitoring which enables for the prevention, detection, deterrence, and response to inappropriate detainee behavior. Additionally, the facility has three cameras in each housing unit which are strategically located in such a manner that allows for sufficient surveillance and oversight. Video from cameras currently have an archived history of 30 to 35 days. The facility also houses detainees in the Restricted Housing Unit, Protective Custody Housing Unit, and Medical Base. These areas are also continuously staffed with a detention officer and likewise, these areas also have adequate video monitoring to enhance the safety of detainees by providing additional oversight and observation capabilities. Areas of the facility that offer programs, services, and other operational functions such as Health Care, Processing, Visitation, Food Service, Video Tele-Court, Asylum hearings, Barbershop, Law Library, Chapel, Multipurpose Center, and Indoor and Outdoor Recreation are also continuously staffed with detention officers to provide custody, control, and constant supervision of detainees during out of housing unit activities and events. To assist in direct detainee supervision and oversight there are a total of 182 cameras strategically located in all sections and areas of the facility.

Ordinarily, the minimum manning posted for day shift, 0600 hours until 1800 hours, is 27 detention officers, 2 control center officers for video monitoring, 2 processing officers, 7 recreation officers, and 2 supervisors acting as Shift Commander and Assistant Shift Commander. Likewise, minimum manning for night shift, 1800 hours until 0600 hours, is 23 detention officers, 2 control center officers for video monitoring, 2 processing officers, and 2 supervisors performing the responsibilities of Shift Commander and Assistant Shift Commander. However, due to COVID-19, FDC has periodically adjusted its minimum manning requirements for both day shift and night shift and these modifications to staffing were based on the facility's average daily population and number of general population housing units open. The average minimum manning for day shift was 22 detention officers with no adjustments made to control center, processing, recreation, and supervisor staffing. For night shift the average minimum manning was 19 detention officers and with no alterations made

to control center, processing, and supervisor staffing. The facility has a rated bed capacity of 732 and the average daily detainee population during the period under analysis was 157.97. Operating under COVID-19, the security staff to detainee ratio was determined to be 1 to 4.51 during day shift and 1 to 6.32 during night shift. These ratios were determined by factoring the minimum manning for both shifts and the overall staff to detainee ratios are much lower taking into account administrative support staff, medical staff, and food service staff. Any deviation from posting minimum manning is an extremely rare occurrence, which requires the approval of the Chief of Security or Director of Detention. An assessment of FDC's current correctional practices with specific emphasis of direct detainee supervision, video monitoring capabilities, and staff to detainee supervision ratios provides no justification or need to adjust staffing levels or existing correctional practices based off this annual staffing analysis.

2. Any Judicial Findings of Inadequacy.

**Findings:** The Farmville Detention Center has not received any judicial findings of inadequacy.

3. The Physical Layout of Facility.

**Findings:** The Farmville Detention Center is one main building, divided into two sections. The front section of the facility comprises of administrative offices, Visitation, Video Tele-Court, Processing, Food Service, Laundry, the Restricted Housing Unit, Medical Department, and a separate detached building used for Asylum hearings. The rear section of the facility comprises of nine dormitory housing units, a Protective Custody general population housing unit, Barbershop, Commissary, Law Library, Chapel, Multipurpose Center, and Indoor Recreation. Outdoor Recreation is located on the north end of the facility and contains four recreation areas where detainees receive four hours of outdoor recreation. Dorm 1 has a bed capacity of 100; Dorm 4 has a bed capacity 98; Dorm 5 has a bed capacity of 102; Dorms 2 and 3 have a bed capacity of 46 and 44 respectively; Dorm 6 has a bed capacity of 80; and Dorms 7, 8, and 9 each have a bed capacity of 84. Finally, the Protective Custody general population housing unit has a capacity of 10 beds with the Restricted Housing Unit having a capacity of 14 beds, and Medical Base having the capacity of 14 beds. Facility operations closely monitors available bed capacity daily to prevent ICE from surpassing the total capacity of 732 general population housing unit beds.

Security, control, and safety of the detainee population is paramount to the mission of the Farmville Detention Center and as previously stated the facility operates under the direct supervision paradigm requiring a detention officer to be posted in all areas of the facility where detainees are present or allowed access. To assist and augment sound correctional practices of constant supervision FDC has state of the art video monitoring with 182 cameras strategically located throughout the facility. Past deficiencies in video coverage have been examined and adjustments to camera angles and placement have been made to diminish identified blind spots. FDC is currently upgrading its entire video monitoring system and within the next year all existing analog cameras will be replaced with digital cameras that possess superior pixel quality and higher resolution. Additionally, the new video monitoring system will have a much larger archived history capacity that will far surpass the current storage range of 30 to 35 days. This technological upgrade will enhance FDC's ability to prevent, detect, and respond to allegations of sexual abuse because facility investigators will be able to review recorded footage long after an incident occurred.

Policy and procedure have been established to allow for detainees to shower, perform bodily functions, and change clothing without being viewed by staff of the opposite gender. These procedures include opposite gender announcements when entering the housing units and cameras that cover the bathrooms are pixel distorted thus safeguarding the privacy of detainees. Additionally, each individual detainee showering stall has curtains installed to prevent any staff member from viewing detainees showering. Furthermore, the facility handbook and detainee education provided during intake informs residents that they are required to be dressed when outside their bunk area. The annual review and analysis of the existing physical layout of the facility concluded that no changes to policies, procedures, and practices, or structural improvements need to be implemented to enhance the overall safety of the detainee population as it specifically pertains to preventing sexual harassment, abuse, or assault.

4. The Composition of the Detainee Population.

**Findings:** During the twelve-month reporting period, June 1, 2020, through May 31, 2021, the Farmville Detention Center processed 77 detainees as new arrivals to the facility. In accordance with DHS PREA standard 115.41, no detainees were identified as at risk for abusiveness or victimization based on the facility's established screening instrument and no detainees self-identified as being gay or bisexual or self-identified as being transgender, intersex, or gender nonconforming. An assessment on the composition of the detainee population with specific emphasis on vulnerable residents does not justify or support the need to further adjust current security staffing levels to enhance the sexual safety of detainees based on the annual staffing analysis conducted in May 2021.

5. Prevalence of Substantiated and Unsubstantiated Incidents of Sexual Abuse.

**Findings:** During the twelve-month reporting period, the Farmville Detention Center conducted one Prevention of Sexual Abuse (PSA) investigation. This investigation concluded with an unsubstantiated outcome. The investigative finding of this allegation of sexual abuse was a critical factor in determining whether the Farmville Detention Center needed to adjust or modify the facility's current security staffing plan. The results of the investigation conducted by the Farmville Police Department and the internal administrative investigation completed by the facility determined that the preponderance of evidence did not support the facts of a substantiated finding, nor did they support an unfounded conclusion based off the nature of the allegation made by the detainee against the staff member. Both investigations strongly supported the conclusion that the detainee was motivated in making his allegation against the staff member because he reported he had assaulted [REDACTED] earlier in the day, which resulted in his placement in administrative segregation. Furthermore, investigation determined the detainee was retaliating against the staff member because he perceived [REDACTED] involvement in dealing with Covid-19 at the facility was insufficient and negligent. Finally, inconsistencies in the statements provided by the detainee during the investigation severely placed his credibility and integrity as a true victim of sexual abuse into question. The area of the facility where the allegation was made occurred in a medical examination room and cameras are not present due to patient privacy and confidentiality requirements. Investigations determined the detainee most likely exploited the absence of video monitoring and the lack of any witnesses during the medical examination as an ideal opportunity to manufacture an allegation that would be difficult to substantiate and prove. While conducting the annual staffing analysis in May 2021, the Director of Detention examined this one sexual abuse allegation and the investigative outcome and determined no justification existed to adjust current security staffing levels.

6. Outcome and Recommendations of Sexual Abuse Incident Review Reports.

**Findings:** The facility conducted one sexual abuse incident review during the period under analysis and prepared and submitted a written report to the Field Office Director for transmission to the ICE PSA Coordinator. The result of this incident review concluded that no deficiencies in Farmville Detention Center policy and procedures existed as it pertains to prevention, detection, and response protocols for detainee victims of sexual abuse. FDC initiated appropriate measures during its response to the alleged incident and employed a multi-disciplinary team approach to adhere to the requirements of the DHS PREA standards and needs of the detainee reporting victimization. An assessment on the one sexual abuse incident review conducted during the reporting period determined that the current security staffing plan is adequate and does not justify an increase in existing staffing levels to enhance the sexual safety of the detainee population.

7. Other Relevant Factors: Length of Time Detainees Spend at Farmville Detention Center.

**Findings:** The average length of stay for a detainee at the Farmville Detention Center has been calculated to be 60.36 days. The short duration of a detainee's stay at the Farmville Detention Center was analyzed and determined to be a possible contributing factor to the extremely low prevalence of detainee reports of incidents involving sexual harassment, abuse, and assault. Other contributing factors include the implementation of a direct supervision model, use of video monitoring technology, and an unwavering commitment to protect the sexual safety of the detainee population, which is an essential component of the mission of the Farmville Detention Center.

8.

[REDACTED] Also attached to this memorandum, is Table 1: Comparative Descriptive Analysis of Collected Data from Annual Reviews of Farmville Detention Center Detainee Supervision Guidelines.

A copy of this report has been forwarded to the ICE PSA Coordinator and ICE Field Office Director.



Director of Detention  
Farmville Detention Center



Dep. Director of Detention Services  
Farmville Detention Center



PSA Compliance Manager  
Farmville Detention Center



**Table 1: Comparative Descriptive Analysis of Collected Data from Annual Reviews of Farmville Detention Center Detainee Supervision Guidelines.**

	6/17 thru 5/18	6/18 thru 5/19	6/19 thru 5/20	6/20 thru 5/21
Total Facility Cameras	185	174	176	182
Minimum Manning Day Shift	40	40	40	35 (Mean)
Minimum Manning Night Shift	31	29	29	25 (Mean)
General Population Bed Capacity	700	722	732	732
Average Daily Population	669.39	711.36	589.72	157.97
Day Shift Staff to Detainee Ratio	16.73	17.78	14.74	4.51
Night Shift Staff to Detainee Ratio	21.59	24.53	20.34	6.32
Total Admissions	3,824	3,948	2,665	77
Admissions Identified at Risk for Victimization or Abusiveness	218	222	159	0
Admissions with Sex Offense Convictions	165	144	90	0
Admissions Self-Identified as Past Victims of Sexual Abuse	34	63	49	0
% Admissions Identified at Risk for Victimization or Abusiveness	5.70%	5.62%	5.97%	0
% Self-Identified as Past Victims of Sexual Abuse in at Risk Category	15.59%	28.38%	30.81%	0
% Self-Identified as Past Victims of Sexual Abuse in Total Admissions	0.89%	1.60%	1.84%	0
Detainees Self-Identified as Gay or Bisexual	19	39	20	0
% Detainees Self-Identified as LGBTI in Total Admissions	0.49%	0.99%	0.83%	0
Detainees Self-Identified as Transgender, Intersex, or Gender Nonconforming	0	0	2	0
Prevention of Sexual Abuse Investigations	5	1	1	1
Unfounded Prevention of Sexual Abuse Investigations	4	1	1	0
Unsubstantiated Prevention of Sexual Abuse Investigations	1	0	0	1
Substantiated Prevention of Sexual Abuse Investigations	0	0	0	0
Sexual Abuse Incident Reviews Conducted with Prepared Written Report	1	0	0	1
Average Length of Stay	54.92	56.11	58.10	60.36

**Location of Sexual Abuse Allegation During Current Annual Review (June 1, 2020 through May 31, 2021):**

1. November 17, 2020 Medical Examination Room



**FARMVILLE DETENTION CENTER**

508 WATERWORKS ROAD  
FARMVILLE, VIRGINIA 23901

January 6, 2021

**MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD**

RE: Annual Review of PSA Investigations and Sexual Abuse Incident Reviews for 2020

In accordance with DHS PREA standard 115.86 and the 2011 ICE PBNDS, 2.11: Sexual Abuse and Assault Prevention and Intervention, an annual review of all PSA investigations initiated in 2020 was completed on January 5, 2021. This annual review was prepared by the Deputy Director of Detention Services and the Prevention of Sexual Assault Compliance Manager.

During the calendar year, the Farmville Detention Center conducted one PSA investigation resulting from a detainee reporting that he had experienced sexual harassment or abuse. This one investigation concluded with an outcome of an unsubstantiated finding.

An abstract of this investigation is provided below to include the Review Committee's assessment and recommendations to improve the facility's sexual abuse intervention, prevention, and response efforts. When preparing this annual report and review of aggregate data, personally identifying information has been omitted as stipulated and required by the 2011 ICE PBNDS. ICE Officials have been provided the complete Report of Investigation on this allegation.

At approximately 1420 hours on November 17, 2020 the PSA Compliance Manager received a phone call from the Director of Detention informing him that a detainee contacted his lawyer and the ICE hotline declaring the [REDACTED] touched his body and testicles "on" (sic) an uncomfortable way. Prior to making these calls, the detainee was placed on ASPI status in the RHU at 1019 hours because [REDACTED] submitted a written statement declaring that around 0930 hours, he squeezed [REDACTED] lower abdomen while [REDACTED] was conducting an eye exam.

The PSA Compliance Manager conducted interviews of the detainee, [REDACTED]. When interviewed, the detainee stated the [REDACTED] "gently" massaged his testicles and penis for approximately 30 seconds while they were in the examination room alone. Detainee denied assaulting [REDACTED] by squeezing [REDACTED] lower abdomen with his hand.

Based off the information provided by the detainee, the facility followed established protocol and contacted the Farmville Police Department. Between 0805 hours and 1011 hours on November 20, 2020, a detective from the Farmville Police Department conducted interviews of the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and the detainee making allegation. Upon conclusion of his interviews, the detective briefed the Director of Detention on the status of his investigation and intent to present the information he acquired during his interviews to the local Commonwealth Attorney for resolution. At 1055 hours the detective contacted the



Director and informed him there was sufficient probable cause to believe the [REDACTED] was the victim of misdemeanor simple assault and the detainee making the allegation against [REDACTED] was the suspect. The Director was also informed that [REDACTED] indicated [REDACTED] did not wish to prosecute and as a result the Farmville Police Department had suspended any further investigation into the incident.

At 1057 hours the Director notified ICE Officials about the conclusion of the Farmville Police Department's investigation and the intent of the facility to resume its administrative investigation. The Director informed ICE that the detective conducting the criminal investigation, in concurrence with the Commonwealth Attorney, found numerous inconsistencies in the statements provided by detainee when questioned. The Detective conducting the investigation documented this observation in his report, which states:

- After all of the interviews were completed, I conferred with the Deputy Commonwealth's Attorney regarding the details of this case. She agreed that when considering and comparing all of the statements, it seems that detainee is making his allegations of ICE policy breach out of an attempt to retaliate against the [REDACTED] and not out of an attempt to present himself as the victim of an actual criminal, sexual assault. She also agreed that there was Probable Cause to charge detainee with Misdemeanor Simple Assault if [REDACTED] was willing to cooperate. [REDACTED] informed me that [REDACTED] did not wish to pursue a charge against detainee, as long as ICA transferred him immediately away from the Farmville detention facility. Detective also detailed in his report that detainee did not express that he feels he had been physically or sexually abused, assaulted, or molested by [REDACTED] nor did he allege that any breach of law took place.

The results of the investigation concluded with a final determination of an UNSUBSTANTIATED finding. The preponderance of evidence acquired during the Farmville Police Department's external investigation and the facility's internal administrative investigation do not support the facts of a substantiated finding nor do they support an unfounded conclusion. The Director of Detention, Deputy Director of Detention Services, and PSA Compliance Manager concur with this finding based off the following facts, information, and evidence.

First, the [REDACTED] denied conducting an inspection of the detainee's genitals and said that [REDACTED] made no physical contact whatsoever with detainee's testicles and penis. The [REDACTED] clearly annotated on the history and physical (H&P) form in the examination section that [REDACTED] did not exam his genitals. If the detainee's allegation is to be believed, it would mean that [REDACTED] fraudulently and willfully doctored an official medical record, which is a crime and would result in the forfeiture of [REDACTED] medical license and credentials. Furthermore, if the detainee's allegation is to be believed, it would mean [REDACTED] intentionally violated Armor Correctional Health Services policy and protocol by failing to have a male staff member present during a genital inspection, which would be justifiable grounds for immediate termination from employment with Armor Correctional Health Services and any possible future employment as a [REDACTED]

Second, the Farmville Police Department detective along with the Deputy Commonwealth's Attorney concluded that detainee's credibility is questionable based on inconsistencies with his statements. Specifically, they document that it appears the detainee made the allegation against [REDACTED] to retaliate against [REDACTED] for reporting to security that he assaulted [REDACTED] which resulted in his placement in segregation. They concluded the detainee was retaliating against [REDACTED] because he believed [REDACTED] was negligent in [REDACTED] response and handling of Covid-19. The Detective stated in his report that during his interview detainee did not declare or express that he felt he was physically or sexually abused, assaulted, or molested by [REDACTED]. Both the detective and the Deputy Commonwealth's Attorney believed that detainee made his allegation not out of an attempt to present himself as a victim of an actual criminal, sexual assault but rather took advantage of a perceived breach of policy to retaliate against the [REDACTED]



The absence of a second person as a witness at detainee's H&P examination provided the perfect opportunity to make an allegation that would be difficult to substantiate and prove.

a) Completion of Sexual Abuse Incident Review.

A Sexual Abuse Incident Review was conducted on December 3, 2020 by the following personnel: Deputy Director of Detention Services, Deputy Director of Programs, Deputy Director of Training, Chief of Security, Health Service Administrator, Director of Nursing, and Prevention of Sexual Assault Compliance Manager. Upon completion of the review, the facility produced a written report and response which was forwarded to ICE.

b) Recommendations on Changes in Facility Policy or Practice.

**Findings:** The Review committee did not conclude that any changes in policy or practice could have helped the prevention, detection, or response to sexual abuse in this investigation. The justifications behind this decision are detailed below.

**Prevention and Detection:** The Medical and Mental Health treatment section of the facility consists of 5 examination rooms, 2 counseling offices, and a Dentist's office. Each of these 8 rooms have a window on the door, which allows for viewing inside. Cameras cannot be added to these rooms because they would violate patient privacy and confidentiality requirements. Up to 100 detainees are seen by Medical and Mental Health daily for appointments, which includes sick calls, history and physical exams, LPC counseling sessions, dental appointments, urgent care, diabetic insulin injections, and mandatory screenings of detainees participating in the voluntary work program. Armor Correctional Health Services patient privacy policy obligates an individual of the same sex as the detainee be present during a genital or rectal exam conducted by Health Care personnel of the opposite sex. As proof of strict compliance with this practice, Medical staff are required to document this on health care forms for verification. Without an increase in security or medical staffing levels it is impracticable to implement the requirement for second individual to be present during all basic health examinations or mental health screenings—outside physical examinations of the genitals or rectum. The high volume of detainees seen daily by the Medical Department prevents this from occurring; and furthermore, Armor Correctional Health Services policies and the 2011 ICE PBNDS do not mandate this practice.

A review of the hallway camera showed that the [REDACTED] was in the medical room with the detainee by [REDACTED] for 3 minutes and 59 seconds before the [REDACTED] returns. While the detainee is in the medical room the door is open and several medical and security staff are observed walking past the room frequently. The likelihood the [REDACTED] would engage in sexual misconduct with the potential of a witness walking by the room or entering is questionable for any reasonable person to conclude. As stated previously, cameras cannot be installed in medical and mental health rooms due to patient privacy and confidentiality requirements. The Director of Detention has determined that security and health care staffing levels are sufficient to detect sexual abuse in the medical department. Although investigation concluded with an UNSUBSTANTIATED finding, it was determined detainee most likely made allegation of sexual abuse against [REDACTED] to retaliate against [REDACTED].

**Response:** The Review committee concluded that the facility acted in accordance with policy and PREA protocol procedures when responding to the abuse reported by detainee. The Facility followed established protocol and used a multi-disciplinary team approach during its response. The Detainee was separated from the [REDACTED] and law enforcement was contacted for



interviews and potential evidence gathering. The Detainee was offered emotional support services and counseling but indicated he would contemplate whether he wanted those services. The Detainee was advised of the results of the investigation and was also advised of his right to be free from retaliation for reporting. The Facility was unable to monitor for retaliation because detainee was transferred on November 24, 2020. The Superintendent of Caroline Detention Facility was notified of detainee's allegation as required by DHS PREA standard: 115.65.

- c) Whether the incident or allegation was motivated by race; ethnicity; gender identity, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or intersex identification, status, or perceived status or gang affiliation, or was motivated or otherwise caused by other group dynamics at the facility.

**Findings:** The review committee concluded a possible motive behind the detainee's allegation of being sexually abused by the [REDACTED] arose from the fact that he wished to retaliate against [REDACTED] for submitting a disciplinary report stating he squeezed [REDACTED] stomach during the examination. Additionally, the Farmville Police Department investigation and the facility administrative investigation believed the detainee also wished to retaliate against the [REDACTED] because he thought [REDACTED] response to Covid-19 was negligent. The absence of a second person as a witness at detainee's H&P provided the perfect opportunity for him to make an allegation of sexual abuse that would be difficult to substantiate and prove. Review committee determined that allegation was not motivated by race, ethnicity, gender identity, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or intersex identification status, or perceived status, or gang affiliation, or was motivated or otherwise caused by other group dynamics at the facility.

The results and findings of this annual review have been forwarded to the ICE Field Office Director as required by the DHS PREA Standards.



Deputy Director of Detention Services  
Farmville Detention Center



PSA Compliance Manager  
Farmville Detention Center