Survivors in Crisis:

Lack of Access to Sexual Assault Support Services in Immigration Detention Facilities
About TAASA

TAASA is the unifying voice to eliminate sexual violence in Texas. As the statewide coalition of rape crisis centers, advocates, and survivors, we are committed to fostering a culture that respects the fundamental rights and dignity of all individuals in Texas.
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Introduction

The detained immigrant population in Texas is in need of rape crisis center services. Detained immigrants suffer sexual victimization in their home countries, during migration to the United States, and in detention. The Prison Rape Elimination Act (“PREA”) envisions that immigrant detention facilities will make community-based support services, including rape crisis centers, available to detained survivors. Based upon our findings, this is not happening with any regularity in Texas. We hope this report will improve the relationships between rape crisis centers in Texas and immigrant detention facilities in their respective areas.

This report is organized in five sections. Section 1 provides background information on why immigrants are migrating to the United States from Central America, including the sexual abuse they suffer both in their home countries and during their travel to the United States. Section 2 discusses the Prison Rape Elimination Act, which is intended to prevent and respond to sexual assault in custodial situations in the United States. Section 3 discusses the immigration detention system and prevalence of sexual assault within it. Next, Section 4 examines detainees’ access to rape crisis centers and children’s advocacy centers’ services. Finally, Section 5 offers recommendations for improving rape crisis centers’ access to survivors in immigration detention facilities, and what the Department of Homeland Security can do differently to decrease victimization of this population.

This report is based upon interviews with attorneys and advocates for detained immigrants in Texas, a survey of rape crisis centers and child advocacy centers, and supplemented by various news articles and human rights reports. It was beyond the scope of this report to directly interview detained survivors.

Notably, although rape crisis centers can take some steps independently toward improved access, there are significant barriers to providing services to detained survivors that are within the exclusive control of the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Health and Human Services. This problem cannot be overcome by the efforts of community-based programs alone.

This report is intended to be one tool in overcoming some of the barriers that exist to providing services to detained immigrants. We hope rape crisis centers, and others, will find this report useful.

1 See Infra Notes 9 & 10.
Sexual abuse is a pervasive experience among migrants coming from Latin America to the United States. The migrant families that are being detained in Texas today are largely coming from three countries: El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala.\(^2\) They are most often fleeing extreme violence perpetrated by highly organized criminal gangs that engage in extortion, kidnapping, rape, and murder.\(^3\) Many of the women and teenage girls seeking asylum in the United States are motivated to do so because they have been raped or threatened with rape in their home country. This is true both because of the gangs’ pernicious use of sexual assault and also because of the prevalence of domestic violence from which the local authorities provide no protection.\(^4\) Sexual assault within the context of domestic violence relationships is another source of sexual victimization suffered by this population. Moreover, the violence and discrimination is even more extreme for LGBTQ individuals fleeing their home countries.\(^5\) As migrants leave home to escape violence, they suffer further trauma during their travel north from Central America to the US-Mexico Border region. During north-bound travel, they are similarly subjected to a very high risk of sexual assault. Commonly, people travel through Mexico by train, catching rides on freight trains that travel frequently to the United States. These trains, referred to colloquially as “La Bestia” or “The Beast” are also controlled by criminal gangs. Sexual assault is common on these routes.\(^6\)

A smaller population of migrants from other countries including Venezuela, Brazil, Cuba and African countries also make their way to the US-Mexico border to seek asylum.\(^7\)

In making the last part of the journey to the United States, women, girls and gender non-conforming individuals are often subjected to sexual assault at the hands of the “coyotes” or smugglers who guide their trip over the U.S.-Mexico border to stash houses on the U.S. side.\(^8\)

This means that before arriving into the United States and into government custody, migrants have – more than likely – suffered multiple instances of intimate partner violence and/or sexual violence.

---


Section 2
PREA Framework for Responding to Sexual Abuse in Custody

The Prison Rape Elimination Act (“PREA”) is intended to reduce the risk of sexual abuse in custodial situations, establish protocols for responding to sexual violence in custodial situations and increase oversight. Although PREA was passed in 2003, it took until 2014 for PREA to be applied to immigration detention circumstances.9

Based on the PREA framework, we cannot assess compliance with PREA, but we can conclude that it is not doing its job to protect incarcerated people from sexual victimization. One big hurdle to successful PREA investigations is the general attitude of the ICE and private contractor staff toward detainees. According to lawyers representing detainees, facility staff often perceive their clients as being untruthful. Therefore, when a detainee makes a complaint, he or she is not believed but interrogated as if the complaint has been made up.10 This creates a system where only complaints where guards or video evidence provide substantiation will be founded.

The PREA DHS rules go into detail on how to prevent retaliation against “any person, including a detainee, who reports, complains about, or participates in an investigation into an allegation of sexual abuse ...” However, as is laid out later in this report, this provision does not protect survivors or witnesses from retaliation when they participate in the investigation of a sexual assault.

One key component of PREA concerns the ability of rape crisis centers to access survivors of sexual abuse in DHS custody. According to Title 6, Section 155.53(a), “Each facility shall utilize available community resources and services to provide valuable expertise and support in the areas of crisis intervention, counseling, investigation and the prosecution of sexual abuse perpetrators to most appropriately address victim’s needs.”11 (emphasis added)

---


10 Interview with Elissa Steglich, University of Texas School of Law, Immigration Clinic, August 30, 2019.

11 Title 6 Section 155.53 Detainee access to outside confidential support services. (a) Each facility shall utilize available community resources and services to provide valuable expertise and support in the areas of crisis intervention, counseling, investigation and the prosecution of sexual abuse perpetrators to most appropriately address victim’s needs. The facility shall maintain or attempt to enter into memorandum of understanding or other agreements with community service providers or, if local providers are not available, with national organizations that provide legal advocacy and confidential emotional support services for immigrant victims of crime. (b) Each facility’s written policies shall establish procedures to include outside agencies in the facility’s sexual abuse prevention and intervention protocols, if such resources are available. (c) Each facility shall make available to detainees information about local organizations that can assist detainees who have been victims of sexual abuse, including mailing addresses and telephone numbers (including toll-free hotline numbers where available). If no such local organization exist, the facility shall make available the same information about national organizations. The facility shall enable reasonable community between detainees and these organizations and agencies, in as confidential a manner as possible. (d) Each facility shall inform detainees, prior to giving them access to outside resources, of the extent to which such communications will be monitored and the extent to which reports of abuse will be forwarded to authorities in accordance with mandatory reporting laws.
Regulations regarding rape crisis centers’ access to ORR facilities is even more direct:

“Care provider facilities must develop procedures to best utilize available community resources and services to provide valuable expertise and support in areas of crisis intervention and counseling to most appropriately address victims’ needs.”

“Each care provider facility must establish procedures to make available outside victim services following incidents of sexual abuse and sexual harassment; the care provider facility must attempt to make available to the victim a victim advocate from a rape crisis center. If a rape crisis center is not available or if the UC prefers, the care provider facility may provide a licensed clinician on staff to provide crisis intervention and trauma services for the UC. The outside or internal victim advocate must provide emotional support, crisis intervention, information, and referrals.”

Although both regulations speak to ICE and ORR facilities reaching out to rape crisis centers as resources for responding to sexual abuse in their facilities, as will become apparent in subsequent sections of this report, there is very little contact between rape crisis centers, ICE, Border Patrol and ORR facilities.

---

12 45 CFR 411.21 Victim advocacy, access to counselors, and forensic medical examinations.

(1) Where evidentiarily or medically appropriate, and only with the UC’s consent, the care provider facility must arrange for the alleged victim UC to undergo a forensic medical exam as soon as possible and that is 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 may be performed by a qualified medical practitioner.

(2) As requested by a victim, the presence of his or her outside or internal victim advocate, including any available victim advocacy services offered at a hospital conducting a forensic examination, must be allowed to the extent possible for support during a forensic examination and investigatory interviews.

(3) To the extent possible, care provider facilities must request that the investigating agency follow the requirements of paragraphs (a) through (c) of this section.
Upon arriving in detention, migrants enter into a vast and complicated labyrinth of border patrol lock ups, detention centers, jails and prisons while waiting to enter the United States, be it to apply for asylum or attempt to enter for the purpose of working. Most people begin their journey through the detention infrastructure by being arrested by Border Patrol. Others present themselves at a port of entry to apply for asylum and are detained pending the outcome of their asylum case. Once in Border Patrol’s custody, adults and children traveling together may be separated or detained as a family unit.\textsuperscript{13}

Border Patrol facilities are designed for short-term detention of people. According to recent press reports they are being used to detain individuals for weeks and even months.\textsuperscript{14} Detaining children is a violation of the “Flores Agreement,” which references a settlement agreement signed by the Federal Government that the Trump administration has been trying to amend or revoke. The Flores Settlement Agreement sets out standards for the detention and release of unaccompanied minors taken into custody by ICE.\textsuperscript{15}

After being detained by Border Patrol, migrants can be transferred to one of three places. If the government is seeking removal proceedings against an adult detainee or a family unit, the person or persons will be transferred to ICE custody. If the government is pursuing removal proceedings against a minor child, the child will be transferred to the custody of the Office of Refugee Resettlement, a division of the Department of Health and Human Services. If the government is pursuing criminal charges against the person for illegally entering or remaining in the United States without authorization, pursuant to 8 USC section 1325 or 8 USC section 1326, the person will be transferred to pretrial detention in the custody of the U.S. Marshall’s Service. If a person charged with a federal crime is ultimately found guilty, the person will then be transferred again to a U.S. Bureau of Prisons facility to serve a prison sentence before being deported.

The quality and safety of the various facilities used to detain migrants is not subject to a uniform set of oversight and conditions standards. Conditions in these facilities are problematic at best, and grotesque at worst. The remainder of this Section details findings related to specific types of facilities.

---

\textsuperscript{13} The Trump Administration was engaged in the highly controversial policy of separating children from their family-members in all cases for a period of time in 2017 and 2018 and has changed that policy to now only separate parents from their family-members in some cases. Both the separation of children from their family-members and the detention of families together continue to be highly controversial and problematic policies of the administration.

\textsuperscript{14} Romero et al., “Hungry, Scared and Sick: Inside the Migrant Detention Center in Clint, Tex.,” New York Times, July 9, 2019,

Who Has Custody? Aug. 2019
An overview of the detention systems migrants face upon arrival at the U.S.-Mexico border.

Children
(unaccompanied)

Custody: CBP
CBP (within DHS) custody is supposed to be for the purpose of short term processing. The TVPRA requires that unaccompanied children be transferred to HHS within 72 hours.

Families

Custody: CBP
CBP custody should be limited to 72 hours. CBP agents and officers—without the assistance of child welfare experts—exercise massive amounts of discretion to determine the fate of arriving families.

Adults

Custody: CBP
CBP custody is supposed to be for the purpose of short term processing. CBP’s own standards governing detention require that all people should be transferred out of CBP custody within 72 hours.

Custody: ORR
The Homeland Security Act gave ORR (within HHS) responsibility for care and custody of unaccompanied children.

Reunification
Federal law requires ORR to release children to the least restrictive setting as expeditiously as possible. Under Trump administration, the reunification process has been slowed because policies that involve ICE in reunification. Children reunified with sponsors in community remain in immigration proceedings.

Release
Families may be released on recognizance or alternative-to-detention programs

Separation
When CBP separates a family, the parent is transferred to ICE custody or U.S. Marshal’s custody. In the case of a referral for prosecution.

Custody: ICE
The Immigration and Nationality Act gives ICE (within DHS) the authority to detain people during their removal proceedings or while pending removal. Detention is considered “mandatory” for people facing removal with certain criminal histories and asylum seekers prior to establishing a “credible fear.” ICE has discretion to release in all other cases. ICE contracts with county jails and private prison companies to detain people.

Deportation
Mechanisms include: release on recognizance, bond, alternatives to detention, and/or parole (for asylum seekers who have established credible fear).

Read More:


Glossary:
CBP: Customs and Border Protection
DHS: Department of Homeland Security
HHS: Department of Health and Human Services
ICE: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
ORR: The Office of Refugee Resettlement
TVPRA: Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthoriza-tion Act

Contact with questions: Joann Bautista, jbaustista@heartlandalliance.org

Reproduced with permission from National Immigrant Justice Center, A Heartland Alliance Program
Part 1: Border Patrol Detention Facilities

Border Patrol detention facilities are intended to be very temporary in nature, for stays lasting no longer than 72 hours. These facilities are colloquially referred to as “hieleras” or “ice boxes,” because of their extremely cold temperatures, or “dog pounds,” which are large cages, some of which are outdoors. As a result of changing detention policies under the Trump Administration, thousands of immigrant detainees have been housed in Border Patrol’s “temporary” facilities for weeks or even over a month.

The conditions in Border Patrol detention have been reported as extremely inadequate, and even deadly, particularly because of extended stays and overcrowding. In addition to exposure to the elements, these facilities have been reported to violate basic norms for how to treat detainees, including holding people in standing-room only, with a lack of showers, soap, access to drinking water (except from the toilet), and lack of hot food. There have been multiple reports of physical and sexual abuse in these lock ups.

Part 2: ICE Facilities

ICE currently detains over 55,000 immigrants; there are approximately 11,510 people detained at ICE facilities in Texas.

There are approximately 30 ICE detention facilities in Texas. They include facilities owned by ICE, like the Port Isabel Service Processing Center, and several contract facilities. Some contract facilities, like the T. Don Hutto Residential Center, owned by Williamson County, Texas and operated by CoreCivic (formerly Corrections Corporation of America), are solely immigration detention facilities. Others, like the Burnet County Jail, contract with ICE to house some detainees in a facility that has an independent separate criminal-justice purpose.

For detention facilities housing thousands of women, girls and gender non-conforming individuals fleeing sexual violence and seeking asylum in the United States, allegations of sexual abuse in immigration detention facilities are alarmingly common. During 2018, the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, and the Department of Justice’s Office of Detention Programs conducted surveys of immigration detention facilities around the country. The surveys found that 35% of female detainees and 22% of male detainees reported experiencing sexual abuse.

23 For more information about Corrections Corporation of America and GEO Group, the two largest companies that contract with ICE, see: “‘Humane’ Immigration Enforcement and Latina Immigrants in the Detention Complex,” Cervantes, Andrea Gómez, Menjívar, Cecilia, Staples, William G., “‘Humane’ Immigration Enforcement and Latina Immigrants in the Detention Complex,” Feminist Criminology Vol. 12(3), 2017, pp. 276-77.
General for the Department of Homeland Security received almost 400 sexual abuse complaints from people in detention. Only 10 percent of those complaints were substantiated by the DHS investigation, in spite of the low likelihood that individuals would make a false claim of abuse.

There is good reason to believe that most incidents of sexual assault and harassment in ICE facilities are not reported to the authorities, because of the power dynamics between detainees and guards and the very real risk of retaliation. There is also a general confusion among detainees about what a complaint would do to their immigration case. Guards who assault detainees will often either threaten their victims with deportation if they tell anyone or promise that they will do something helpful to the person’s case as long as the victim “goes along” with the abuse. This manipulation, and the victims’ lack of understanding of how the immigration process works (guards inevitably have no influence over individual immigration cases) can be very effective. It is very difficult for detainees to differentiate between guards, who most often work for a private contractor, and their deportation officer, the judge and the other officials handling their immigration case.

---

26 Aguilar, Rose and Wenus, Laura, “What will it take to protect immigrants from sexual assault in detention?” Your Call, KALW, April 2, 2019.

27 Ibid.

Laura Monterrosa’s story

Laura Monterrosa was detained at the T. Don Hutto Detention Center in Taylor, Texas in 2017. She fled physical and sexual violence in El Salvador and was targeted because she is a lesbian. Starting shortly after her detention, a female guard began sexually harassing her. The guard started with asking inappropriate questions, then would brush against her breasts. The abuse escalated to full-scale assaults in areas of the facility where there were no cameras.

Laura sent a letter to an outside organization, Grassroots Leadership, in order to raise her complaint of sexual abuse. She had seen other women use the internal complaint process and be mistreated, so she wanted the assistance and support of an outside organization and public knowledge of her allegations. Before Grassroots Leadership could publicize her allegations, someone inside the facility called the tip line and reported the abuse internally.

The facility performed both a criminal and an administrative investigation and, in spite of finding some corroboration for Laura’s claims during the administrative investigation, concluded that her complaint was unfounded. Although some of the incidents occurred in areas with cameras, the facility failed to retain the camera footage for the relevant time periods.

After seeking help, Laura also suffered severe retaliation, including being placed in solitary confinement and threatened with deportation. Her supporters, including local elected officials, were refused admission to the Hutto facility to visit her. She remained in the facility while her attacker continued to work as a guard, leading to her attempt suicide. She was finally released later in 2018.

Transgender Detainees

Transgender individuals detained in ICE facilities are at particular risk of sexual assault and mistreatment after fleeing violence and persecution in their home countries. Transgender women are often housed in all-male facilities, making them targets for sexual and physical abuse. The South Texas Detention Complex in Pearsall, Texas, is a 1,700-bed facility that has historically housed a large number of transgender asylum seekers in poor conditions. The transgender women at Pearsall are housed in segregation, which means that they are isolated from the general, largely male, population. ICE’s response is often to house trans women in solitary confinement rather than finding an appropriate way to house them with people.

---

29 Aguilar, Rose and Wenus, Laura, “What will it take to protect immigrants from sexual assault in detention?” Your Call, KALW, April 2, 2019.
30 Ibid.
31 Interview with Bethany Carson, Grassroots Leadership, August 12, 2019, on file with author.
32 Aguilar, Rose and Wenus, Laura, “What will it take to protect immigrants from sexual assault in detention?” Your Call, KALW, April 2, 2019.
34 Interview with Bethany Carson, Grassroots Leadership, August 12, 2019, on file with author.
Part 3: Office of Refugee Resettlement

The Office of Refugee Resettlement (“ORR”) is tasked with housing and caring for unaccompanied minor children migrants. There are over 4,000 children in ORR custody in Texas.38

According to the federal government, thousands of immigrant children said they were sexually abused in ORR facilities between 2014 and 2018.39 ORR received a total of 4,556 allegations of sexual abuse or sexual harassment, 1,303 of which were serious enough to be referred to the Department of Justice. 178 of those most serious allegations involved accusations that adult staff members had sexually abused immigrant children. 85 of those incidents occurred in Texas facilities.

Examples of the 85 allegations provided that occurred in Texas between 2014 and 2018 include:

- “three clients in care have come forward to report inappropriate behavior between the client and a youth care worker, including hand holding and rubbing her leg and thigh.”
- “UAC [unaccompanied child] submitted a grievance stating that while he was showering another client opened and closed the shower door while UAC was naked. UAC, also stated in his grievance that a youth care worker opened restroom door and just stood there.”
- “Licensing investigator came in on 12/18/2015, regarding an allegation that a youth care worker had inappropriate contact with a minor, including youth touching her breast, legs and buttocks.”


When the U.S. Government chooses to bring charges against an immigrant for unlawful entry or unlawful re-entry into the United States, that person is transferred into pretrial detention with the U.S Marshals Services. U.S. Marshals contract with local jails to detain pretrial detainees. Upon conviction immigrants sentenced to prison time for illegal entry or re-entry are imprisoned in U.S. Bureau of Prison’s facilities, 15 of which are in Texas.40 At least one of these facilities, CI Reeves, is notorious as one of the worst prisons in the United States.41

---

38 Walters, Edgar; Murphy, Ryan; and Cameron, Darla, “Thousands of migrant kids are living in Texas shelters,” Texas Tribune, June 20, 2018, updated August 29, 2019 and Roldan, Riane, "Number of detained migrant children without U.S. sponsors spikes, federal official says," Texas Tribune, July 23, 2019.


40 Federal Bureau of Prisons website.

In Texas, there is very limited interaction between rape crisis centers, children’s advocacy centers and the immigration detention infrastructure, composed of ICE facilities, Border Patrol detention facilities and ORR facilities.

In a survey of rape crisis centers with geographic service areas that overlap with ICE detention facilities, only 6 of the 23 centers had provided advocacy accompaniment to a survivor who was detained at a nearby ICE facility.

Disturbingly, the survivors who have accessed rape crisis center services had most frequently been assaulted during their migration to the United States, prior to detention. Given the reportedly high prevalence of sexual violence within immigration detention facilities, this appears to reflect a bias in the institutional response in favor of survivors assaulted by coyotes, but against survivors who are assaulted inside government facilities.

Of the 23 centers near ICE facilities surveyed, only three have provided any therapy or advocacy services to survivors detained in the ICE facility. The Livingston SAAFE House provides services at the IAH Secure Adult Detention Facility. Both the Purple Door and the Montgomery County Women’s Center reported providing services at a detention center in the past but not doing so currently. However, this does not reflect a lack of willingness of rape crisis centers to meet this need. All of the rape crisis centers reported that they would like to provide therapy or advocacy services to survivors detained in a nearby ICE facility. Centers also stated that providing services to detained survivors in ICE facilities might be limited by availability of staff and other concerns, including lacking access to the facilities.

Rape crisis centers similarly lack access to Border Patrol facilities. Of the 15 rape crisis centers surveyed with geographic service areas that overlap with Border Patrol facilities, only 1 in 3 had provided advocacy accompaniment to a survivor who was detained.42 Of the eight children’s advocacy centers interviewed that are geographically close to Border Patrol facilities, none had ever worked in conjunction with law enforcement to facilitate a joint investigation of an outcry of abuse involving a child detained in the Border Patrol facility. In contrast, 3 of the 5 children’s advocacy centers near ORR facilities said they had partnered with law enforcement to investigate abuse in those facilities.

At least one of the rape crisis centers, Hope Alliance in Round Rock, has a memorandum of understanding with the T. Don Hutto Facility, which sets out a working relationship between the center and the detention facility. However, despite extensive documentation of abuse at the facility, the center has never received a request for services.

---

42 Our survey did not distinguish between ICE or Border Patrol facilities. These are largely the same facilities that answered yes regarding accompaniment of detainees in ICE facilities.
Section 5
What can be done to improve access to RCC’s in Texas?

There are many things rape crisis centers can do to improve access to services for detained immigrant survivors. However, access to services can only improve significantly with help from leadership at the Department of Homeland Security.

What can DHS do Differently?

1. Immigrant detention is an environment inconsistent with healing and recovery and makes people very vulnerable to abuse. ICE and Border Patrol should reduce the use of detention as much as possible by releasing as many people as possible immediately.

2. ICE facilities should encourage rape crisis center staff to provide services. This is consistent with PREA, which states “Each facility shall utilize available community resources ...” ICE facilities should also abide by the ethical standards and best practices of the rape crisis centers when providing services within their facilities and make it possible for services to be provided outside of the facility, based upon the preference of the detained person and in consultation with the rape crisis center.

3. ICE should ensure that victims of abuse in detention facilities have access to legal services to ensure that they have access to U-visas and other relief.

4. ICE/DHS should ensure that detainees receive access to appropriate language services to be able to make a report and receive services related to sexual violence in his or her preferred language. This should apply for services provided both inside and outside of detention. Immigration authorities should incorporate trauma-informed strategies into the way they handle credible fear determinations and asylum claims from start to finish. This should include training for immigration judges, asylum officers and everyone involved in the asylum case. When at all possible, credible fear determinations and hearings should be conducted in person rather than by tele-video conference or telephone.
What can Rape Crisis Centers do Differently?

1. ICE detention centers have Legal Orientation Programs where immigration attorneys provide information to detainees on their legal rights. Rape crisis centers can build relationships with the organizations and attorneys that provide the legal orientation program for their local immigration detention facility. This will enable RCCs to better understand the needs of this population as well as how to access immigrant detention facilities. The RCC’s may be able to provide materials that can be shared with detained immigrants during presentations in the facilities conducted by legal services organizations.

2. Rape crisis centers can reach out to the PREA Coordinator for the immigration detention facility in their area. Each ICE facility should have a designated PREA Coordinator. Rape crisis centers can work with the PREA Coordinator to facilitate providing services in the detention facility.

3. ICE allows educational materials in the facilities. Rape crisis centers can prepare a poster with their hotline and other information for posting in central areas in the detention facility.

4. There is a “free call list” in the detention facilities. Rape crisis centers can ask the facility to ensure that their hotline is included on the list of free phone numbers for the facility.

5. Rape crisis centers should be prepared to provide culturally appropriate services to immigrants once they have left detention. Many of the people detained in ICE and ORR facilities will become part of the local community upon their release from ICE custody. This is a great opportunity for the local center to provide services to this population and lacks the barriers of providing services to people while they are detained. Nevertheless, it requires cultural awareness and sensitivity to the issues faced by this population.

6. Rape crisis centers need to provide services that are language appropriate. There is a large increase in non-Spanish speakers migrating from Central America. Centers need to make sure they know if they are dealing with indigenous speakers and provide appropriate language services.
Appendix A – Map of Border Patrol Facilities in Texas

Key

- **Rio Grande Valley Sector**
  - Rio Grande City Station
  - Harlingen Station
  - Fort Brown Station
  - McAllen Station
  - Brownsville Station
  - Falfurrias Station
  - Corpus Christi Station
  - Weslaco Station
  - Kingsville Station

- **Del Rio Sector**
  - San Angelo Station
  - Del Rio Station
  - Bracketville Station
  - Comstock Station
  - Abilene Station
  - Eagle Pass Station
  - Eagle Pass South Station
  - Rocksprings Station
  - Carrizo Springs Station
  - Uvalde Station

- **Big Bend Sector**
  - Presidio Station
  - Van Horn Station
  - Big Bend Sub-Station
  - Sanderson Station
  - Alpine Station
  - Sierra Blanca Station
  - Fort Stockton Station
  - Lubbock Station
  - Midland Station
  - Marfa Station
  - Pecos Station
  - Amarillo Sub-Station

- **El Paso Sector**
  - *Las Cruces Station
  - *Albuquerque Station
  - Fort Hancock Station
  - *Ysleta Station
  - *Truth or Consequences Station
  - *Alamogordo Station
  - *Deming Station
  - *Santa Teresa Station
  - El Paso Station
  - *Lordsburg Station
  - Clint Station

  *indicates stations located in New Mexico

Source: [https://www.cbp.gov/careers/frontline-careers/bpa/duty-locations](https://www.cbp.gov/careers/frontline-careers/bpa/duty-locations)
Appendix B – Map of ICE Detention Facilities in Texas

El Paso Service Processing Center
El Paso, TX

West Texas Detention Facility
Sierra Blanca, TX

Randall County Jail
Amarillo, TX

Lubbock County Detention Center
Lubbock, TX

Val Verde Correctional Facility
Del Rio, TX

Rolling Plains Detention Center
Haskell, TX

Eden Detention Facility
Eden, TX

Webb County Detention Center (CCA)
Laredo, TX

Laredo Processing Center
Laredo, TX

La Salle County Regional Detention Center
Encinal, TX

South Texas Family Residential Center
Dilley, TX

South Texas Detention Complex
Pearsall, TX

Central Texas Detention Complex
San Antonio, TX

Burnet County Jail
Burnet, TX

Jack Harwell Detention Center
Waco, TX

Brooks County Detention Center
Falfurrias, TX

Karnes County Residential Center
Karnes City, TX

Coastal Bend Detention Facility
Robstown, TX

East Hidalgo Detention Center
La Villa, TX

Willacy County Regional Detention Facility
Raymondville, TX

Port Isabel
Los Fresnos, TX

Hutto CCA
Taylor, TX

Johnson County Law Enforcement Center
Cleburne, TX

Prairie Land Detention Facility
Alvarado, TX

Bedford Municipal Detention Center
Bedford, TX

Euless City Jail
Euless, TX

Montgomery ICE Processing Center
Conroe, TX

Joe Corley Detention Facility
Conroe, TX

Houston Contract Detention Facility
Houston, TX

Polk County Adult Detention Facility
Livingston, TX

Source: https://www.freedomforimmigrants.org/detention-statistics
Appendix C – Map of ORR Facilities in Texas

Key

ORR Facility

Baytown BCFS
Baytown, TX
BCFS Chavaneaux
San Antonio, TX
BCFS Health and Human Services TFC
San Antonio, TX
BCFS San Antonio Shelter
San Antonio, TX
BCFS San Antonio Staff Secure
San Antonio, TX
Seton Home
San Antonio, TX
Southwest Key Casa Blanca
San Antonio, TX
St. Peter-St. Joseph Children’s Home TFC
San Antonio, TX
St. Peter-St. Joseph Children’s Home
San Antonio, TX
BCFS Harlingen
Harlingen, TX
BCFS Raymondville
Lyford, TX
Bokenkamp Children’s Shelter
Corpus Christi, TX
Upbring Transitional Foster Care program
Corpus Christi, TX
Catholic Charities Fort Worth TFC
Fort Worth, TX
Catholic Charities Fort Worth
Fort Worth, TX
Catholic Charities Houston
Houston, TX
Southwest Key Casa Houston
Houston, TX
Southwest Key Casa Montezuma
Houston, TX
Southwest Key Key Casa Quetzel
Houston, TX
Southwest Key Houston (Mesa Drive)
Houston, TX
Southwest Key Mesa Staff Secure
Houston, TX
Shiloh Treatment Center
Manvel, TX
Southwest Key Antigua
San Benito, TX
Southwest Key Rio Grande
San Benito, TX
Southwest Key Canutillo
El Paso, TX
Southwest Key Casa Franklin
El Paso, TX
Upbring Transitional Foster Care Program
El Paso, TX
Southwest Key Casa Padre
Brownsville, TX
Southwest Key El Presidente
Brownsville, TX
Southwest Key Esperanza Staff Secure
Brownsville, TX
Southwest Key Nueva Esperanza
Brownsville, TX
Southwest Key Processing Center
Brownsville, TX
Southwest Key Casita del Valle
Clint, TX
Southwest Key Combes
Combes, TX
Southwest Key Conroe
Conroe, TX
Upbring New Hope Children’s Center
McAllen, TX

Source:
https://www.revealnews.org/article/heres-a-map-of-shelters-where-immigrant-children-have-been-housed/