Introduction

Local Law 33 Intro of 2025 amended the New York City Administrative Code § 9-156, modifying the reporting framework for the required data. The updated law expanded the scope of required reporting categories and metrics. Due to these changes in reporting parameters, direct comparisons and percentage changes from the previous reporting period could not be calculated.

Prison Rape Elimination Act & BOC Minimum Standards

The Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (PREA Public Law 108-79) established federal mandates to identify and prevent prison rape in correctional facilities within the jurisdictions of federal, state, local, and native territories across the United States. Public Law 108-79 was signed into law on September 4, 2003.

The United States Department of Justice adopted the National Standards to Prevent, Detect, and Respond to Prison Rape (the PREA Standards), which became effective on August 20, 2012. In addition to establishing mandatory standards for prevention, detection and response to prison sexual abuse and sexual harassment, the PREA Standards require all correctional facilities to conduct sexual abuse incident reviews and collect uniform data using standardized definitions. Agencies must ensure that data collection includes allegations of sexual abuse and sexual harassment at facilities under its direct control. This incident-based sexual abuse information must be aggregated and made readily available to the public at least annually.

In 2016, the New York City Board of Correction ("the Board" or "BOC") implemented Sexual Abuse and Sexual Harassment Minimum Standards which mirror the federal PREA Standards. Pursuant to the Board's Minimum Standards §5-40 "Data Collection and Review," the New York City Department of Correction ("the Department") shall provide the Board with a semiannual report. This report reviews sexual abuse and sexual harassment allegations reported within the past six months (January 2025 through June 2025), analyzes emerging trends, and assesses the corrective action contemplated or initiated at the facility level and department wide. It is important to note that allegations of sexual abuse and sexual harassment are preliminary and subject to change as these cases develop. Data discussed in allegation categories are not final, as they are ongoing or pending resolution. Data used in this report reflect the most current information available at the time of publication. To avoid identifying unique instances of incidents which may risk reidentification, certain data is reported as a symbol.

Allegations of sexual abuse and harassment are based on the definitions provided by the Department of Justice and reporting requirements as specified in the National Standards to Prevent, Detect, and Respond to Prison Rape, under 28 CFR part 115 under the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003. (See Appendix A).

Zero Tolerance Policy

The New York City Department of Correction has a zero-tolerance policy regarding sexual abuse and sexual harassment. The Department continues to enforce this policy by stenciling a "Break the Silence" message, along with the telephone numbers for reporting allegations in jail housing areas, court holding pens, and corridors. There are various measures in place for victims to report allegations of sexual abuse and harassment, including but not limited to the confidential PREA reporting hotline, access to 311, and PREA informational posters strategically placed near the phone banks. These posters list designated points of contact to make reports and detail how to report an incident. In addition, all Department staff are responsible for taking measures to prevent sexual assault and harassment and for reporting incidents. The Department conducts in-person PREA orientation to all newly admitted individuals in custody. This allows individuals to ask the PREA Facility Compliance Unit staff questions during the orientation or privately at its conclusion. The PREA Facility Compliance Unit, the PREA Special Investigation Unit (PREA SIU), and the LGBTQ+ Affairs Unit work closely together to provide support to all PIC, especially those who are most vulnerable.

The Department takes every allegation of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment seriously and investigates each complaint thoroughly. All efforts are made to properly record, evaluate, and fully investigate all allegations made by people in custody. The Department's Special Investigations Unit (SIU) handles all PREA-related allegations, initiating an investigation within the first 72 hours. PREA SIU Investigators interview alleged victims, separate individuals from identified alleged perpetrators, collect relevant evidence, afford alleged victims mental health, ministerial and victim services, and conduct a preliminary investigation.

The Department continues to engage in efforts to address the number of allegations received and concerns of the incarcerated population. These include the identification of appropriate housing for individuals in custody, especially those who may be vulnerable to victimization. The Department houses individuals based on gender identity: transgender, gender non-binary, and intersex individuals. These individuals are afforded a specialized housing process and housing options that take into account heightened levels of vulnerability for this population. The PREA Facility Compliance Unit and the LGBTQ+ Affairs Unit provide support throughout all facilities and coordinate closely to protect individuals identified as particularly vulnerable. The PREA Facility Compliance Unit conducts monthly retaliation monitoring for individuals who have submitted PREA-related complaints. These efforts support the Department's goal of achieving full compliance with all PREA standards while maintaining a safe and secure environment for all staff and persons in custody.

PREA Training

The Department provides PREA training for all staff during recruit training at the Academy and orientation on-boarding; contractors and volunteers who will have contact with individuals in custody are also trained during the on-boarding process. Refresher training is mandated every two years. PREA training includes instruction on recognizing the signs of sexual abuse and what steps to take when an allegation is made, as well as effectively communicating the importance of PREA compliance. PREA SIU investigative staff receive additional in-service training, including cross-training with the NYPD Evidence Collection Unit, and instruction from subject matter experts and law enforcement partners that offer training in human trafficking and enhanced interviewing skills.

Case Status Overview		
Case Status	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Total Cases Open During Reporting Period	80	
Opened During Reporting Period	73	
Opened Prior to Reporting Period	7	
Total Closed During Reporting Period	69	
Opened During Reporting Period	31	
Opened Prior to Reporting Period	38	
Total Cases Pending at Close of Reporting Period	49	
Opened During Reporting Period	42	
Opened Prior to Reporting Period	7	

Section One: Allegations of Sexual Abuse & Sexual Harassment

The data in this section is related to alleged incidents of sexual abuse and harassment for which a case was open during the reporting period, including incidents that occurred during the reporting period and incidents that occurred prior to the reporting period, and including incidents that may have closed during the reporting period.

Open Investigations by Incident Type		
Type of	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Investigation	#	%
Staff on PIC	16	20%
Sexual Abuse	13	16%
Sexual Harassment	3	4%
Among PIC	64	80%
Sexual Abuse	57	71%
Sexual Harassment	7	9%
Total	80	100%

1. The date on which the incident occurred and whether the incident took place between the times 7:00 AM and 3:00 PM, 3:00 PM and 11:00 PM, and 11:00 PM and 7:00 AM.¹

Alleged Incidents by Time of Day		
Time	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Tillle	#	%
0700x1500	39	49%
1500x2300	25	31%
2300x0700	13	16%
Unknown Time	3	4%
Total	80	100%

-

¹ The date of the incident cannot be reported in the aggregate.

2. Whether the allegation is of sexual abuse or sexual harassment as defined in subdivision b of this section.

Alleged Incidents by Type		
Tuno	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
туре	Type # %	
Sexual Abuse	70	88%
Sexual Harassment	10	12%
Total	80	100%

3. The date the incident was reported.

This information cannot be reported in the aggregate.

4. The gender identity of the alleged victim.

Alleged Incidents by Gender of Victim		
Reported	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Gender	#	%
Male	50	62%
Female	12	15%
Trans Man	~~	~~
Trans Woman	16	20%
Non-Binary	~~	~~
Intersex	0	0%
Unknown	0	0%
Total	80	100%

5. Whether the alleged victim at the time of the incident was between the ages of 18-25, 26-35, 36-40, 41-60, or over 60, when such individuals are in department custody.

Alleged Incidents by Age of Victim		
T:	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Time	#	%
18-25	15	19%
26-35	36	45%
36-40	14	17%
41-60	~~	~~
>60	~~	~~
Total	80	100%

6. The race of the alleged victim.²

Alleged Incidents by Race of Victim		
Race/Ethnicity	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
	#	%
Asian	~~	~~
Black	39	55%
Hispanic	26	27%
Other	8	10%
White	~~	~~
Total	80	100%

7. Whether the alleged victim had been in custody for more than 24 hours and who, during such confinement, received treatment for a mental illness, not including incarcerated individuals seen by mental health staff on no more than two occasions during their confinement and assessed on the latter of those occasions as having no need for further treatment in any city correctional facility.³

² Race is voluntarily reported to the Department by each individual in custody. The Department makes no representation as to the completeness or accuracy of this data.

³ Correctional Health Services is precluded from sharing the protected health information outlined in New York City LL21 §9-156(b)7 with the Department of Correction by New York State Public Health Law §§ 18 and 27-F, New York State Mental Hygiene Law § 33.13, and section 543 of the Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 290dd-2, and its implementing regulations, 42 CHR Part 2.

Time in Custody	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025
Alleged Victims in Custody less than 24 hours	0
Alleged Victims in Custody more than 24 hours	80
Total	80

8. The gender identity of the alleged perpetrator.

Alleged Incidents by Gender Identity of Perpetrator		
Reported	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Gender5	#	%
Male	56	70%
Female	11	14%
Trans Man	~~	~~
Trans Woman	9	11%
Non-Binary	~~	~~
Intersex	0	0%
Unknown	~~	~~
Total	80	100%

9. Whether the alleged perpetrator was an incarcerated individual or staff.

Alleged Incidents by Perpetrator		
Dornotrator	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Perpetrator	#	%
Staff	16	20%
Incarcerated Individuals	64	80%
Total	80	100%

10. If the alleged perpetrator was staff, the number of previous allegations against such staff that were substantiated and the outcome of each investigation.

There were no instances during this reporting period in which staff identified as alleged perpetrators had prior allegations that were substantiated. Accordingly, there are no investigation outcomes to report.

11. If the alleged perpetrator was staff, the number of previous allegations against such staff that were unsubstantiated.

There were three instances in which staff identified as alleged perpetrators had a history of prior unsubstantiated allegations.

12. If the alleged perpetrator was staff, the number of previous allegations against such staff which are still pending.

Status of Previous Allegations Against Staff Perpetrators		
Status	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Status	# %	
Substantiated	0	0
Unsubstantiated	0	0
Pending	3	100%
Total	3	100%

13. The facility in which the incident occurred.

Alleged Incidents by Facility		
Facility	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
racility	#	%
AMKC	~~	~~
BHPW	0	0%
BKDC	0	0%
EMTC	8	10%
GRVC	16	20%
NIC	~~	~~
OBCC	17	21%
RESH	0	0%
RMSC	14	17%
RNDC	12	15%
WF	~~	~~
Other	0	0%
Total	80	100%

14. Whether the incident occurred in a service area or housing area.

Incidents by Area		
Type of Area	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Type of Area	# %	
Service Area	12	15%
Housing Area	68	85%
Total	80	100%

15. If the incident occurred in a housing area, the housing area type.

Incidents by Housing Area Type		
Housing Area Types	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Housing Area Types	#	%
General Population	42	62%
Mental Health ⁴	12	18%
New Admission	7	10%
Protective Custody	7	10%
Restrictive Housing	0	0%
Total	68	100%

16. Whether video camera surveillance recorded the incident.

Video Evidence		
Outcome	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Outcome # %		%
Captured	70	87%
Not Captured	10	12%
Total	80	100%

⁴ Includes all forms of mental health housing, including mental observation, PACE, and CAPS.

17. The type of sexual abuse or harassment.

Alleged Incidents by Type		
Typo	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Туре	#	%
Staff on PIC	16	20%
Sexual Abuse	13	16%
Sexual Harassment	3	4%
Among PIC	64	80%
Abusive Sexual Contact	20	25%
Non-Consensual Sex Act	37	46%
Sexual Harassment	7	9%
Total	80 100%	

18. Whether the alleged victim is known to identify as lesbian, gay or bisexual, or if the identity is undisclosed.

Alleged Incidents by Sexual Orientation of Victim		
Sexual Orientation	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Sexual Orientation	#	%
Lesbian	~~	~~
Gay	14	17%
Bi-sexual	~~	~~
Other/Undisclosed	56	70%
Total	80	100%

19. Whether DNA or any other physical evidence was obtained.

DNA or any other physical evidence was obtained		
Evidence Collection	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Evidence Conection	#	%
DNA	22	28%
Other Physical Evidence	1	1%
None	57	71%
Total	80	100%

20. Whether a sexual assault kit was administered, declined or not applicable.

Sexual Offence Evidence Collection Kit		
Outcome	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Outcome	# %	
Administered	23	29%
Declined ⁵	N/A	N/A
Not Applicable	57	71%
Total	80	100%

21. If a sexual assault kit was deemed not applicable, whether that determination was the result of a delay in reporting, due to the type of abuse alleged to have occurred, or any other reason.⁵

A determination as to whether a sexual assault kit is applicable is made by the receiving hospital staff.

22. Whether the case was referred to the Department of Investigation (DOI), the date of such referral, and whether the department of investigation referred it back to the department of correction to investigate.⁶

Department of Investigation Referral		
Referred	Jan 2025 - Jun 2025	
Kelerred	# %	
DOI Clearance Provided	13	16%
DOI Clearance Denied	3	4%
Not Applicable	64	80%
Total	80	100%

⁵ This information is not shared with the Department pursuant to New York State Public Health Law §§ 18 and 27-F, New York State Mental Hygiene Law § 33.13, and section 543 of the Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 290dd-2, and its implementing regulations, 42 CHR Part 2.

⁶ All allegations involving staff are referred to DOI upon receipt of the complaint for clearance to proceed with an investigation.

Section two: Substantiated, Unsubstantiated, & Unfounded Allegations

The data in this section is related to investigations of allegations of sexual abuse and sexual harassment that for which an investigation was closed during the preceding six-month period.

23. The date the investigation was closed.

The date of closing cannot be reported in the aggregate.

24. Whether the Department determined that the incident was substituted, unsubstantiated, or unfounded.

Case Conclusion by Determination			
Determination	Jan 2025 -	Jan 2025 – Jun 2025	
Determination	#	%	
Substantiated	4	6%	
Unsubstantiated	40	58%	
Unfounded	25	36%	
Total	69	100%	

25. Whether the allegation was referred to a District Attorney's office.

Total Cases Referred to the DA's Office			
Outcome	Jan 2025 -	Jan 2025 – Jun 2025	
Outcome	# %		
Referred	40	58%	
Not Referred	29	42%	
Total	69	100%	

26. Whether the alleged victim was notified regarding the outcome of the investigation.

Total Investigation Outcome Notifications			
Status	Jan 2025 – Jun 2025		
Status	# %		
Notified	69	100%	
Not Notified	0	0	
Total	69	100%	

27. Whether the alleged victim was referred to trauma or sexual assault crisis services following the incident.

Referrals to trauma or sexual assault crisis services may occur as part of the clinical response or victim support process; in such cases, specific information regarding individual referrals may be considered protected health information and is not shared with the Department.

28. Whether the alleged perpetrator and alleged victim were separated from physical contact during pendency of the investigation.

Separation Outcomes			
Jan 2025 – Jun 2025			
Outcome	# %		
Separation	48	70%	
No Separation ⁷	21	30%	
Total	69	100%	

29. For substantiated allegations, if the perpetrator was a staff person, whether during the pendency of the investigation such staff person resigned, was suspended, placed on modified duty, assigned to a post without contact with incarcerated individuals, assigned to a post with restricted contact with incarcerated individuals, placed on administrative leave, or administered any other form of discipline.

Staff Involved Substantiated Cases			
Staff	Jan 2025 – Jun 2025		
Disciplinary	#	%	
Outcomes	п	70	
Resigned	0	0%	
Suspended	0	0%	
Modified Duty	0	0%	
No Contact Post	0	0%	
Admin Leave	0	0%	
Other Discipline	1	1%	
Not Applicable	68	99%	
Total	69	100%	

⁷ Individuals may not be separated if either the alleged victim or the alleged perpetrator is unknown or not identified.

_

30. For substantiated allegations, whether the allegation was referred for disciplinary action, including whether the Department declined to file disciplinary charges, or if disciplinary or if disciplinary charges were filed, the outcome of such disciplinary proceeding and whether the alleged staff perpetrator resigned or retired in lieu of charges or as part of a negotiated plea.

Staff Involved Substantiated Cases			
Referred Disciplinary	Jan 2025 – Jun 2025		
Actions	#	%	
Declined to Discipline	0	0%	
Charges Filed	1	33%	
Resigned/Retired in	0	0%	
Lieu of Charges			
NPA	0	0%	
Other	0	0%	
Total	1	100%	

31. For substantiated allegations that were not referred to a District Attorney's office, the reason the allegation was not referred to such an office.

All substantiated allegations were referred to the appropriate District Attorney's office for review and potential prosecution.

Section Four: Assessment

During this reporting period, the Department experienced a measurable decline in PREA-reportable incidents, despite an increase in the average daily population (ADP). A total of 73 PREA-reportable cases were initiated during this cycle, representing a 16% decrease from the 87 cases initiated in the previous six-month period. Among the reported cases, there was a 6.4% decrease in PIC-on-PIC allegations (from 63 to 59), and a more significant 42% decrease in staff-on-PIC allegations (from 24 to 14).

The Department adheres to the federal definitions under PREA when determining whether an allegation qualifies as a reportable incident. Each complaint is subject to an initial screening process, during which trained PREA Unit supervisors assess the facts presented to determine whether the case meets reporting criteria. Complaints that do not meet the PREA standard are recorded and addressed through alternate internal mechanisms, such as referrals to the

Department's Office of Constituent and Grievance Services, the LGBTQ+ Affairs Unit, or Health + Hospitals/Correctional Health Services, as applicable.

All sexual misconduct complaints receive a preliminary review within 72 hours of the report being made and are documented internally, regardless of investigative outcome and whether they are deemed to be PREA-reportable.

Following the preliminary review process, 73 complaints were determined to fall under the scope of PREA and were subject to the federally mandated 90-day investigative timeline. These investigations are conducted by PREA SIU and result in findings of substantiated, unsubstantiated, or unfounded, as defined by the Federal PREA Standards (defined in Appendix B).

Of the 69 PREA-reportable sexual abuse and sexual harassment investigations closed during this reporting period, which include cases initiated in prior reporting periods, four cases (6%) were substantiated. 41 cases (59%) were unsubstantiated, and 24 cases (35%) were unfounded. These trends are largely consistent with the previous reporting period, which saw five substantiated cases, 53 unsubstantiated, and 32 unfounded.

With respect to timeliness, 83% (57 out of 69) of the closed PREA-reportable cases were resolved within the required 90-day period. The remaining 12 cases (17%) had extenuating circumstances (e.g., sexual assault kit processing, or referral for external investigation such as the District Attorney's office or DOI) that required them to remain open beyond the 90-day period pending a final determination from those external entities. As of the end of the reporting period, five PREA-reportable cases remain open beyond the 90-day threshold and are on administrative hold for additional investigative actions, and 16 cases remain under active review by external investigative bodies, which may delay case closure beyond the Department's control.

These trends reflect the Department's continued efforts to respond promptly and thoroughly to all allegations of sexual victimization, maintain transparency in investigative outcomes, and uphold compliance with both local and federal standards.

Corrective Action

The Department remains committed to strengthening its response to allegations of sexual abuse and sexual harassment through continuous improvement to investigative practices, resource investment, and accountability. During the current reporting period, PREA SIU prioritized not only timely case resolution but also the long-term sustainability of its operations.

To that end, the Department expanded the SIU PREA team by hiring additional investigative staff to address caseload demands and improve overall responsiveness. Additionally, the Department

is investing in roles within the SIU PREA team that enhance the agency's ability to track trends, identify patterns of concern, and produce more sophisticated data-driven assessments of risk and compliance.

SIU PREA staff continue to receive ongoing professional development and cross-training opportunities, including collaboration with local law enforcement agencies, and subject matter experts in trauma-informed investigations. These trainings are intended to strengthen investigative skills, promote interagency coordination, and ensure staff are equipped to manage sensitive and high-impact cases effectively.

Further, the Department has refined internal reporting mechanisms and maintained regular compliance monitoring at the facility level. Coordination among the PREA Facility Compliance Unit, the LGBTQ+ Affairs Unit, and PREA SIU has remained central to ensuring that vulnerable populations receive appropriate support and are safely housed.

Collectively, these measures reflect the Department's ongoing commitment to ensuring that all that PREA compliance remains an operational priority.

Appendix A

Definitions of Sexual Victimization

The New York City Department of Correction (DOC) utilizes uniform definitions as provided by 28 C.F.R. §115.6 in the National Standards to Prevent, Detect, and Respond to Prison Rape (under the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003).

These definitions are used to categorize allegations of sexual abuse within New York State correctional facilities and to separate allegations by perpetrator type (staff or person in custody) and type of abuse.

Similar to the Survey on Sexual Victimization (SSV), the following categories of sexual abuse have been disaggregated into five categories as indicated below.

Person in Custody Nonconsensual Act - sexual contact of any person without his or her consent, or of a person who is unable to consent or refuse; and

- Contact between the penis and the vulva or the penis and the anus including penetration, however slight; or
- Contact between the mouth and the penis, vulva or anus; or
- Penetration of the anal or genital opening of another person, however slight by a hand, finger, object, or other instrument.

Person in Custody Abusive Act - sexual contact with any person without his or her consent, or of a person who is unable to consent or refuse; and

• Intentional touching either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks of any person.

Person in Custody Sexual Harassment – Repeated and unwanted sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or verbal comments, gestures, or actions of a derogatory or offensive sexual nature by one person in custody directed toward another.

Staff Sexual Misconduct – any act or behavior of a sexual nature directed toward a person in custody by an employee, volunteer, contractor or official visitor or other agency representative.

Sexual relationships of a romantic nature between staff and person in custody are included in this definition. Consensual and nonconsensual acts include:

- Intentional touching, either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks that is unrelated to official duties or with the intent to abuse, arouse or gratify sexual desire; or
- Completed, attempted, threatened, or requested sexual acts; or
- Occurrences of indecent exposure, invasion of privacy, or staff voyeurism for reasons unrelated to official duties or for sexual gratification.

Staff Sexual Harassment – Repeated verbal statements, comments or gestures of a sexual nature to a person in custody by an employee, volunteer, contractor, official visitor, or other agency representative, including:

- Demeaning references to gender; or sexually suggestive or derogatory comments about body or clothing;
- Repeated profane or obscene language or gestures.

Appendix B

General Definitions

Resulting determinations from completed investigations are classified as outlined in the Code of Federal Regulations Title 28, Chapter 1, subpart A, section 115.5, *General Definitions* (28 C.F.R. § 115.5) as Substantiated, Unsubstantiated, or Unfounded. This standard state that agencies shall impose no standard higher than a preponderance of the evidence in determining whether allegations of sexual abuse or sexual harassment are substantiated.

Substantiated – An allegation was investigated and determined to have occurred based on a preponderance of the evidence.

Unsubstantiated – An allegation was investigated, and the investigation produced insufficient evidence to prove the event occurred.

Unfounded – An allegation was investigated and determined not to have occurred.