

UNEXPECTED FATALITY REVIEWS: 3

CASE INVESTIGATIONS: 301

- Assistance Provided - 33
- Information Provided - 117
- DOC Resolved - 44
- Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate - 43
- No Violation of Policy - 46
- Substantiated - 18

INTAKE INVESTIGATIONS: 91

- Administrative Remedies Not Pursued - 49
- Declined - 23
- Lacked Jurisdiction - 12
- Person Declined OCO Involvement - 6
- Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action - 1

Resolved Investigations: **395**

Assistance or Information Provided in
50%
of Case Investigations

The Office of the Corrections Ombuds (OCO) investigates complaints regarding any Department of Corrections' (DOC) actions or inactions that adversely affect the health, safety, welfare, and rights of incarcerated individuals. RCW 43.06C.040. RCW 43.06C.040(2)(k) directs the ombuds to render a public decision on the merits of each complaint at the conclusion an investigation. All cases opened by the OCO are considered investigations for the purposes of the statute. As of March 15, 2022, the OCO opens an investigation for every complaint received by this office. The following pages serve as the public decisions required by RCW 43.06C.040(2)(k).

Case Closure Reason	Meaning	Total
Unexpected Fatality Review	The incarcerated person died unexpectedly, and the death was reviewed by the unexpected fatality review team, as required by RCW 72.09.770.	3

Assistance Provided	The OCO achieved full or partial resolution of the person's complaint.	33
Information Provided	The OCO provided self-advocacy information.	117
DOC Resolved	DOC staff resolved the concern prior to OCO action.	44
Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate	Insufficient evidence existed to substantiate the concern.	43
No Violation of Policy	The OCO determined that DOC policy was not violated.	46
Substantiated	The OCO verified the concern but was unable to achieve a resolution to the concern.	18

Administrative Remedies Not Pursued	The incarcerated person did not yet pursue internal resolution per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(b).	49
Declined	The OCO declined to investigate the complaint per WAC 138-10-040(3).	23
Lacked Jurisdiction	The complaint did not meet OCO's jurisdictional requirements (typically when complaint is not about an incarcerated person or not about a DOC action).	12
Person Declined OCO Involvement	The person did not want the OCO to pursue the concern or the OCO received no response to requests for more information.	6
Person Left DOC Custody	The incarcerated person left DOC custody prior to OCO action.	1

All published monthly outcome reports are available at <https://oco.wa.gov/reports-publications/reports/monthly-outcome-reports>.

MONTHLY OUTCOME REPORT

March 2023

COMPLAINT SUMMARY

OUTCOME SUMMARY

CASE CLOSURE
REASON

UNEXPECTED FATALITY REVIEW INVESTIGATIONS

Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

1. Per RCW 72.09.770, the OCO formally requested that the incarcerated individual's death be referred for an unexpected fatality review.	This case was reviewed by the unexpected fatality review team. RCW 72.09.770 directs DOC to conduct an unexpected fatality review in any case in which the death of an incarcerated individual is unexpected, or any case identified by the OCO for review. UFR-22-031 is publicly available on the DOC website.	Unexpected Fatality Review
--	--	----------------------------

Reynolds - King County

2. Per RCW 72.09.770, the OCO formally requested that the incarcerated individual's death be referred for an unexpected fatality review.	This case was reviewed by the unexpected fatality review team. RCW 72.09.770 directs DOC to conduct an unexpected fatality review in any case in which the death of an incarcerated individual is unexpected, or any case identified by the OCO for review. UFR-22-034 is publicly available on the DOC website.	Unexpected Fatality Review
--	--	----------------------------

Washington Corrections Center

3. Per RCW 72.09.770, the OCO formally requested that the incarcerated individual's death be referred for an unexpected fatality review.	This case was reviewed by the unexpected fatality review team. RCW 72.09.770 directs DOC to conduct an unexpected fatality review in any case in which the death of an incarcerated individual is unexpected, or any case identified by the OCO for review. UFR-22-032 is publicly available on the DOC website.	Unexpected Fatality Review
--	--	----------------------------

CASE INVESTIGATIONS

Airway Heights Corrections Center

4. Patient reports that she was transferred to receive gender affirming care. Her appointment was cancelled due to DOC actions. Due to the capacity of the outside specialist, it could be months before she able to be seen. She has already been waiting over a year for this appointment.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted the patient's facility leadership and discussed the missed appointment. DOC confirmed that they did miss the appointment time and she was rescheduled. She was rescheduled to several months out, but the DOC was able to secure a closer appointment after OCO outreach. This concern was substantiated because the patient did miss the appointment through no fault of her own.	Assistance Provided
5. Incarcerated individual reports he was not paid for hours he worked on a Department of Natural Resources (DNR) fire crew after he was	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reached out to DOC administration and alerted them of the concern. DOC reviewed the situation and agreed to pay the individual the wages that were withheld.	Assistance Provided

terminated from the crew. The individual requests the OCO assist in him accessing the withheld pay.

<p>6. External person reported their loved one is not receiving the necessary medical care for his condition. Person says medical staff continuously said he would be scheduled to see a vascular specialist. It has now been more than two months and his condition continues to worsen. The patient was contacted and updated the case with a request to verify that a procedure was scheduled.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance by confirming the procedure is scheduled for the patient. It was substantiated that the procedure date was outside of requested timeframe; however, this was noted as the first available appointment for the outside clinic. The OCO will continue to monitor the appointment for completion on the appointment tracker.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>7. Patient reports concerns about access to medical care for a knee injury. The person previously reached out to the OCO but had not met administrative remedies at that time. They followed up to report a level I resolution request that was closed as informally resolved.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to provide assistance. This office contacted health services and confirmed an active treatment plan, including physical therapy (which he is on the waitlist for). The OCO confirmed an x-ray occurred and an MRI or additional imaging will be considered after physical therapy results. After OCO outreach, DOC agreed to schedule the patient for a follow up to discuss the sizing of the brace, updates from the patient regarding symptoms, and next steps in treatment plan.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>8. The incarcerated individual reports that the law library removed all the Session Law PDFs claiming that they are available on LexisNexis, however, this is not true. Person says that he filed a resolution request about the issue and the response stated to talk to the law librarian which he already did, and the law librarian could not help him.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. At the time the individual reported this concern, the new tablets did not have the LexisNexis application. However, it was available on the tablets shortly after. The individual confirmed that he is okay with using this application for research purposes.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>9. Person states they completed their pathway to restore Good Conduct Time (GCT) and DOC has not restored the time.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO was able to verify that the individual did receive their Good Conduct Time (GCT) back, which resulted in the Earned Release Date (ERD) being changed.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>10. Person reports he does not have the appropriate clothing to go outside in below freezing weather. He tried to resolve this issue before the cold weather began but no resolution was made. This person has medical issues that prevent him from being able to wear standard issue clothing for cold weather.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed the patient's resolution requests and verified that DOC was able to customize clothing to accommodate the patient's needs. The OCO also verified the patient has active Health Status Reports to maintain the custom clothing.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>

<p>11. The incarcerated individual reports that the heat has been out for the past several months in his unit on the lower side of the tier. This person reported it to staff, and they confirmed that they put in a work order, but the fan is not pushing the heat out. The pod is so cold they must sleep with multiple blankets every night.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted the facilities department at this prison and asked if there was an issue with the heat. DOC confirmed that last month there was an operational issue with the air handler, resulting in lower-than-normal temperatures. DOC staff corrected the problem and verified with a screenshot of this unit, which included the current temperatures of this building. Temperatures ranged between 70.8 - 74.5 degrees Fahrenheit.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>12. Patient expressed concerns about DOC not responding to medical kites and delayed access to treatment.</p>	<p>The OCO contacted health services and confirmed the patient was screened according to DOC medical protocols and scheduled for Fibroscan and follow up with the Facility Medical Director (FMD). The patient's diagnosis was confirmed and the OCO confirmed the patient is receiving medication and is scheduled for regular lab work and follow up appointments. DOC resolved this concern prior to OCO outreach as the patient was tested according to internal protocol and already scheduled for final scan and follow up. The OCO requested updates and confirmed diagnosis and treatment.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>13. Incarcerated individual reports he has not received his property since transferring to another facility. DOC staff reported they sent postage transfer funds to the other facility and the other facility is reporting that they sent all the property they had to the individual. The individual reports he is missing multiple sentimental items.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed a resolution request about this concern and found DOC located his lost items and the property has been sent to the individual.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>14. Person reports that they opted to have their tablet sent home to family and they have not received it.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to provide information regarding the old tablets being sent out. per DOC Memo dated January 13, 2023, DOC states that on January 10th a distributed memo gave misinformation about surrendering the old tablets. The new memo states that after further discussion with Securus it was determined the old tablets must be returned. All purchased content and messages will be transferred to the new player. The person will have until August 1, 2023, to provide Securus with an address for a refurbished tablet with nothing on it to be mailed. The memo also states that no one will receive their original tablet back.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>15. Incarcerated individual reports he was terminated from his employment at Correctional Industries (CI) solely</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the individual's job termination and being denied off-site work approval. The OCO found the individual</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

after receiving a negative Behavior Observation Entry (BOE). The individual reports after the job termination DOC staff told him he can only get a job as a porter and will not approve him to work on an off-site work crew even though he was approved to work off site by DOC staff. The individual reports that he does not understand why he was denied approval to work off-site when other individuals incarcerated for the same reason are allowed to work off-site.

was not terminated from the job due to a negative BOE, but due to performance issues at work. The OCO could not locate evidence to substantiate that DOC staff told the individual he was eligible for only a porter job, however, the OCO was able to locate information about approval for off-site work. The OCO found DOC facility staff did approve him but DOC headquarters made the final decision that the individual was not suitable for off-site work at this time but could be reassessed in a few months. The OCO identified the individual had not been reassessed for off-site work approval and was past due for reassessment. DOC assessed the individual again and found the risk level to be too high to work off-site. The OCO shared this information with the individual and shared options to access job programming.

<p>16. The incarcerated individual reports that they are not being given their legal property that was taken from them.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding how they may access their legal documents. Per DOC 590.500 Legal Access for Incarcerated Individuals, limitations may be placed on the possession time and amount of personal legal documents/papers allowed in a specific security level and/or housing unit. The facility has placed limitations on legal materials individuals may possess in a four-person cell, however, exceptions may be made for individuals who are working on active cases. The individual may kiosk the property room to provide legal information on an active case and will be allowed to keep the relevant materials in their room.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>17. Person reported experiencing severe burning sensations in his eyes, nose, and throat, and was told there was smoke in the air in the unit. Person later had a migraine, chest pain, and nausea and called a medical emergency. Person reported that Medical told him that DOC staff performed an unauthorized training exercise with a tear gas bomb that went wrong and flooded his unit's HVAC system.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding this office's review of the incident report and subsequent visit to facility. This incident was a mistake by the DOC training team and the DOC has investigated the incident. Individuals in the unit were provided access to medical and their co-pay was waived. In addition, the filters in the unit were changed. The OCO encouraged the individual to seek medical attention again if he continues to have issues.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>18. Individual reports issues with the new Securus tablet. Person states that company is not responding to trouble tickets.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding other methods to contact Securus. The OCO provided the phone number for Securus' hotline for incarcerated individuals, as well as a toll-free number if they have family members able to help resolve the issue from the outside.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

19. External person reports that the incarcerated person has been waiting for months to be permitted to enroll in a program that is required to be completed before release.	The OCO was able to provide information regarding what steps need to be taken for re-entry into the program. The OCO was able to determine that the individual did follow the appeal process, had a hearing and was denied readmittance into the program for breaching confidentiality. Individual was advised to reach out to program manager.	Information Provided
20. A family member reports that his loved one was transferred to another facility a few years ago for programming. The incarcerated loved one has finished programming and the family would like them transferred back to be closer to family.	The OCO was able to provide information regarding DOC 300.380 C. Plan Change Reviews 1. Plan change reviews will be used to document an individual's compliance with the current CFP and conducted: b. annually on the anniversary of the ERD for individuals six years or more to their ERD. c. Every six months or as targeted in a previous CFP, for individuals within six years of ERD. d. Anytime an unscheduled custody or facility placement change is indicated or recommended. The individual was advised to address wanting a facility change at their next Custody Facility Plan Review. If they receive a denial, please contact the OCO via hotline or mail to file a complaint.	Information Provided
21. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about two negative behavioral observation entries (BOE) they received.	The OCO reviewed the incarcerated individual's BOE record and did not find any matching those described by the individual. The OCO also informed the individual that they can appeal their BOEs through the CPM.	Information Provided
22. Individual reports they want to be released to a certain county and have been released to that county in the past. They stated their counselor believes that being released to county of origin is a law. The individual wants to be released to the last county they resided in.	The OCO provided information regarding DOC Policy 350.200 Transition and Release, section IV Release Plan Development D. individuals who require an approved release address will be returned to their county of origin/alternative county of origin as determined and approved per Attachment 1. County of Origin. The individual has not submitted an alternate address in the county of choice to be reviewed at the time of the OCO investigation. The OCO also provided information on how to appeal if an address is denied.	Information Provided
23. The incarcerated individual reports that the mailroom is charging for outgoing mail incorrectly. He reports he sent out two packages of the same weight and one cost a few dollars more and he does not believe this is correct. He reports that the facility does not have anything posted to let individuals know the postal rates and shipping options. He reports that he was told that rates change so often that they can't post shipping prices.	The facility has agreed to post "Mailroom Frequently Asked Questions" in each unit. Due to factors including size, shape, and weight of the box, where it is being shipped to and from, what class of mail, it is very difficult to post general shipping rates, which change frequently. The facility is concerned that if individuals try to calculate shipping prices and their calculation is inaccurate, it will create additional problems. The facility provided the individual information on why the shipping rates for the two packages in question were different. This office recommended the	Information Provided

	individual contact the mailroom if he has any questions on the price of outgoing mail/packages.	
24. Person reported being promoted to camp but was told he cannot have the medication he was already on. Person has been seen by mental health but has not been able to get his medication.	The OCO provided information about kiting medical and filing a resolution request about getting his medication. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Information Provided
25. A loved one reported that an incarcerated individual's power cord on their new tablet is not working.	The OCO provided information about sending a kiosk message about the power cord to receive a replacement or remedy to resolve the issue.	Information Provided
26. The incarcerated individual reports that he works in the kitchen and officers in the unit are supposed to open his door so that he can go to work, however they do not always do so. The individual reports he hit the emergency button to get attention and the officers say that he missed the movement so he was denied access to work which he could get an infraction for.	The OCO provided information regarding the process for individuals being on the callout to go to work. If the name of the individual is not on the callout, the individual should try to get an officer's attention to alert them. Hitting the emergency button goes to Main Control, not the unit, and should not be used in non-emergent situations. If the individual continues to have issues with not being on the callout, this office encouraged him to kite/kiosk the CUS and encouraged him to contact the OCO if this does not address his concern.	Information Provided
27. The incarcerated individual reports that he was moved from the unit after an altercation with his roommate but the other person was not moved. The individual does not agree with the move but was not content with the roommate.	The OCO provided information regarding the individual moving cells and what he may do if he would like to move rooms. The individual was moved to another unit following the altercation but was not demoted due to this. If the individual is dissatisfied with his current room, per DOC 420.140 Cell/Room Assignment, cell/bed courtesy moves may be requested by incarcerated individuals by completing DOC 21-595 Cell/Bed Change Request and submitting to the unit/facility designee.	Information Provided
28. The incarcerated individual reports unsuccessful attempts to enroll in GED classes.	The OCO provided information about this person's GED status. The facility confirmed he is on the waitlist and will be added to the class when an opening occurs.	Information Provided
29. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about a female officer conducting a urinalysis (UA) for a male individual which is a violation of DOC policy.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative and found that DOC confirmed with the other two staff members that were present at the conducting of the UA that the female officer was outside while the UA was conducted.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
30. Person says they are not accepting any of his grievances.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the person's open resolutions. It was noted that the patient has the maximum number of open resolutions set by the Resolution Program Manual.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

(See Concerns Not Accepted: when an individual has 5 active resolutions (This can be exceeded for medical concerns and must be reviewed by the Resolution Program Manager/designee for acceptability).) The OCO contacted the Resolution Program Manager to request they meet with the person. The OCO also provided information regarding tort claims. Individuals who have been harmed or who have suffered a loss as a result of negligent actions by a state employee or agency can submit a tort claim to the Office of Risk Management (ORM). ORM is required by law (Chapter 4.92 RCW) to receive these claims. The OCO also provided information to the person regarding how to request past resolution documents from DOC.

31. Person called and reported that DOC agreed to provide him an MRI, related to a previous OCO case, and they have not provided one yet.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate the concern. This office reviewed the updated concerns and the previous OCO case and found that the MRI was not medically indicated or part of the resolution. This office then provided self-advocacy information regarding next steps in treatment plan and options for requesting an MRI again if symptoms persist or worsen.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
32. Incarcerated individual reports while working in a product line DOC staff stated the job could not fulfill his Health Status Report (HSR) which was previously being fulfilled. The individual reports he is hearing mixed information from DOC staff and his position was abruptly changed. The individual reports he was never spoken to about misbehavior and that he filed a two week notice to leave the job after being harassed by DOC staff about his HSR. The individual requests another position within Correctional Industries (CI) or to be re-hired to his previous position without any negative impact.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO was unable to locate evidence to substantiate DOC staff misconduct. The individual put in his two weeks' notice and was not reprimanded for leaving that position. The OCO verified the individual has another job with CI and is employed with no noted issues at the current position.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
33. The incarcerated individual reports that he has filed resolution requests and has not received responses. He reports that the DOC is outside of the time frame to respond.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office reviewed the individual's resolution requests and found that he has several that were recently submitted and responded to, as well as currently active resolution requests. The OCO asked that the individual provide more specific information about the	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

	resolution requests he reports issues with if he has not received responses.	
34. The incarcerated individual reports that the DOC terminated all visitation with his son's mother and he has not been given an explanation as to why. The individual reports that the mother appealed the termination of in-person visitation but now the DOC has terminated video visits as well. The DOC claims that the mother has multiple violations, but he has not received a response regarding the evidence of violations.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 450.300 Visits for Incarcerated Individuals, if a visitor is out of compliance with rules, a suspension or termination may be imposed. Due to repeated violations of DOC 450.300, persons who have facilitated and/or allowed an individual to violate Department or court ordered conditions while in the community are ineligible for visit privileges. The DOC has evidence of multiple instances of violations. Per DOC 450.300, visitors who receive notification that their opportunities for appeal have been exhausted may resubmit an application after one year to be considered for restoration of modified or full visit privileges.	No Violation of Policy
35. Incarcerated individual reports DOC wrote her a negative Behavior Observation Entry (BOE) for wearing eyeshadow. The individual reports she is targeted often for expressing her gender identity and reports that it is a violation of policy to negatively impact her central file for feminizing.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the BOE and found the negative BOE was written for using colored pencils as eye makeup, which is not their intended use. The OCO verified the BOE was written in compliance with DOC 300.010 Behavior Observations. The OCO shared with the individual makeup items are available for purchase and she will not be negatively impacted when using items from the commissary.	No Violation of Policy
36. Incarcerated individual reports that they are eligible for Graduated Re-Entry (GRE) however DOC has denied them from the program due to a revocation from a partial confinement program. The individual reports that he was never revoked from a program and meets the requirements to be approved for GRE. The individual requests OCO review the GRE denial and have DOC approve him for GRE.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO spoke with GRE staff at DOC and verified that individuals that have been revoked from a partial confinement program such as DOSA, SSOSA and/or CPA are not eligible for GRE due to the revocation of good conduct time taken as a result of a revocation from a partial confinement program. In a partial confinement program, individuals must follow a set of rules and sign that if the rules are not followed good time will be revoked and they will be sent back to total confinement. This agreement would make the individual ineligible for GRE. The OCO verified the individual was revoked from the DOSA program.	No Violation of Policy
37. An external person wants to know why their loved one's transfer was deferred. The incarcerated person has been housed in segregation for over a month due to a keep separate situation. The loved one has concerns that keeping a veteran in segregation	It is not a violation of policy to hold an individual in Administrative Segregation if there is a keep separate issue. Policy 320.200, VI. (C) states that an individual who voluntarily makes a written request for protective custody may request, in writing, to be returned to the assigned housing unit at any time. This request may or may not be approved as	No Violation of Policy

<p>is damaging to their mental health. The external person reports the Veteran's Unit would be the most appropriate housing option for him, or to remain at his current facility and be returned to the general population.</p>	<p>indicated by a threat/risk assessment and housing review. The OCO has determined that this person was kept in administrative segregation until their transfer was approved. This office verified that the person is no longer in administrative segregation and has been moved to another facility.</p>	
<p>38. Person reports that the Indeterminate Sentence Review Board (ISRB) added 36 months to his sentence and said he must do more programming. Person expressed that he thinks the ISRB added that time to his sentence due to his ICE detainer.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. DOC 320.100 II A. states that "[t]he Board will set minimum terms of confinement consistent with the purposes, standards, and sentencing ranges per RCW 9.94A and RCW 9.95.040" and RCW 9.95.0002(8) states that "the members of the indeterminate sentence review board will possess and shall exercise independent judgment when making any decisions concerning [incarcerated individuals]. These decisions include, but are not limited to, decisions concerning [incarcerated individuals'] release, revocation, reinstatement, or the imposition of conditions of supervision". The OCO reviewed the ISRB's decision and verified that the ICE detainer was not the reason they added time to his sentence, and that the ISRB is within policy and the law to add time to his sentence.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>39. Incarcerated individual reports a DOC staff member announced to the unit the bunk number of the incarcerated individual who accidentally destroyed documents that the unit was waiting to have restocked. The individual filed a resolution request about the issue and was told that since it was not directly about him that it was not accepted.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. The OCO found that the DOC staff member did announce the individual's bunk number to the whole unit. DOC staff shared that although the resolution request was not formally accepted, the resolution specialist did share the concern with the unit's management. The OCO verified DOC took action after the resolution specialist notified the unit leadership.</p>	<p>Substantiated</p>
<p>40. The incarcerated individual reports that his counselor gave confidential paperwork regarding his ISP to another incarcerated individual. He reports that this is a violation of HIPPA laws. He reports he is in the residential treatment program. The individual says he gave confidential paperwork to another individual twice.</p>	<p>The DOC substantiated the issue and reviewed the concern with the relevant staff member. Additionally, the incarcerated person was assigned a new counselor as a result of the issue.</p>	<p>Substantiated</p>
<p>41. Person states DOC is trying to impose classes and rules on him that were waived in his judgement and sentencing.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 570.00 III Program Referral (B)(1) d. Seek readmission to SOTAP, including those who: 4.</p>	<p>Substantiated</p>

Were previously unsuccessfully discharged from treatment or had time added to their sentence by the indeterminate Sentence Review Board (ISRB). C. Individuals may be referred by the Board or the SOTAP Risk Assessment Unit at any time. The individual is under board jurisdiction and is subject to mandatory program referrals.

Cedar Creek Corrections Center

42. Person reports that they are unable to download their music and games to new Securus tablets.	The OCO was able to provide information regarding Securus issue. Per Securus, it is taking longer than expected for previously downloaded material to be accessible on the new tablets. Individuals can try logging into their old JPAY account to gain access to their downloads. The individual was advised to continue to send help tickets to Securus until they receive a response.	Information Provided
43. The incarcerated individual reports that they were denied Graduated Reentry (GRE) and Work Release and is concerned that without the ability to participate in that program they will not have the funds and resources necessary to provide for their family.	The OCO provided information regarding the individual's denial for Work Release and his potential eligibility for Electronic Home Monitoring (EHM) only. The individual will be screened for EHM and the DOC will determine his eligibility per DOC 390.590, Graduated Reentry.	Information Provided
44. The incarcerated individual reports that the DOC is trying to rush his custody demotion. He reports he was in the Therapeutic Community program and was kicked out after receiving an infraction.	The OCO provided information regarding the individual's termination from the Therapeutic Community as well as how he may apply to be reconsidered. The OCO found that the individual had been terminated from treatment per DOC 580.000, Substance Use Disorder Treatment Services, Substance Use Treatment Participation Requirements. This office informed the individual that he may reach out to the Substance Abuse Recovery Unit (SARU) by sending communication via CE Prisons requesting services. SARU will evaluate the possibility for services based on assessed need and available services. The OCO shared how the individual may contact SARU if he would like to be considered for Therapeutic Community in the future.	Information Provided
45. Person states when he transferred to the new facility and received the new tablet, he was not able to download his purchased music. He has tried to write a ticket with Securus with no resolve.	The OCO was able to provide information on ways to contact Securus in order to get the issue resolved, since a help ticket had been unsuccessful. JPAY acknowledges that there have been delays and technical issues with the	Information Provided

new roll out and the transition to Securus. The OCO is actively monitoring this issue.

<p>46. A loved one reports concern about an incarcerated individual being transferred to Coyote Ridge Corrections Center (CRCC) and expressed safety concerns.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed DOC records and could not find keep separate orders for this individual at CRCC. The OCO found that this individual was transferred due to infractions which caused a custody demotion. DOC Custody Facility Plan 300.380 V. A. 2. b. states, "Infractions resulting in a deduction of 20 or more points during a review period require evaluation for custody demotion."</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>47. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about a Correctional Unit Supervisor (CUS) doing an infraction hearing which they believe is against policy.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 460.000 Disciplinary Process for Prison section (II)(B)(1)(a) a disciplinary hearing officer must have the rank of lieutenant, CUS or corrections specialist 2 or higher.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>48. Person reported that he was on Community Parenting Alternative (CPA) partial release and completed all his programming. Person said he received two infractions and reported after the incident the Community Corrections Officers (CCO) followed him and called his daughter. After being infractions, this person was put back in total confinement.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed DOC records and saw that this individual was infractions for driving a vehicle, when he's had a past conviction related to driving, as well as infractions for being in an area that was not approved by his CCO. 380.540 Personal Vehicle Use by Incarcerated Individuals Policy, section II. A. 4, states that "Vehicle use must be approved by the CCS and the individual must: 4. Not have a crime of conviction involving a motor vehicle". The OCO was unable to verify that this individual's CPA revocation was outside of DOC policy.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>49. Incarcerated individual reports that he was placed in substance abuse treatment program even though he already completed four treatments.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reached out to the facility superintendent who said that the individual was refusing to attend the treatment program, and was terminated from the program and infractions, which the OCO confirmed in DOC records. DOC 580.000 B. states that "Individuals whose initial screening result indicates the probability of a substance use disorder may be assessed," and DOC 580.00 VI. B. states "Individuals who refuse admission, do not complete the treatment program due to their refusal to continue</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>

treatment, or are out of compliance with program requirement will be subject to disciplinary action.”

<p>50. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about being found guilty of a 607 infraction for refusing a urinary analysis (UA) and then being found guilty of the same infraction a few days later, but not being given the time needed to detox from the substance they were using. As a result, the individual feels there is a violation of policy because of the close timeframes between when the two UAs were given.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction narratives that corresponded to the two 607 refusing UA infractions. According to DOC Policy 420.380, there are no time limitations in between when an individual may be given a UA. Because the individual refused the UA each time, there is no violation of policy.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
---	---	-------------------------------

Clallam Bay Corrections Center

<p>51. Person reported being moved to segregation and that upon moving to segregation, he was not allowed to have all his legal paperwork. Person also reports that DOC took some of his property during the move, including his dental retainer/partial denture, and that DOC said they would throw away that property because he didn't have receipts for the items.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reached out to the Custody Unit Supervisors and confirmed that the partial denture would be returned to the individual. The OCO also confirmed that this individual was not allowed his legal paperwork due to DOC Administrative Segregation policy which states that individuals in segregation can only access legal paperwork for cases with an active deadline, which was not the case for this individual. The OCO also talked to DOC staff about other property that belonged to the individual but could not verify it was on his property matrix.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>52. Incarcerated individual reports he was transferred to a new facility and the property that was supposed to transfer with him was not put on the transfer bus with him. The individual requests the OCO assist him obtain his items.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. The OCO verified that the property did not transfer with the individual. DOC staff had some confusion about the length of time the individual would be housed at the new facility and did not send all his items. The OCO was able to share this information with the previous facility who agreed to send the individual the rest of his property.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>53. An external person reports that the incarcerated individual is being transferred to another facility. The individual is concerned about the DOC sending him somewhere he fears for his safety as he has lawsuits against DOC staff.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information and confirmed there were no validated safety concerns at the facility in question. This individual has had a change to their custody points and is now going to a different facility and is no longer scheduled to go to the facility of concern.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>54. Patient reports concerns about DOC staff response to a 2022 medical emergency related to a fall, including Health Status Report (HSR) for lower bunk, pain management, testing, and follow up. The person also called back</p>	<p>The OCO contacted health services at the facility of incident and confirmed staff response to medical emergency, including assessments, HSR for lower bunk, pain medication, ice pack, and follow ups. The OCO provided self-advocacy information about appealing level II grievances to</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

	to request information about next steps on their level II DOC resolution request.	HQ level III, how to request updated HSRs and report changes in symptoms at new facility since the person transferred facilities since the 2022 incident.	
55.	Patient reports he went to a pain management specialist and DOC denied the medication recommendations through the Care Review Committee (CRC). The patient believes the Facility medical director did not present his case correctly and did not include the pain management recommendations in the CRC request.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. There was no evidence that the patient's case was not presented properly to the Care Review Committee (CRC). The medication was denied by the CRC, there was no evidence to support that the pain management recommendations were not shared with the CRC. These recommendations were commented by the medical provider in the CRC request. The OCO verified the information in the CRC request referencing the Washington State Opioid Guidelines in the Interagency Guideline on Prescribing Opioids for Pain. The WA DOC Health Plan describes the health and mental health care services available to incarcerated individuals, as well as the services that are limited or not available. To be covered by the WA DOC Health Plan, services must be: Medically necessary, or necessary for the health and safety of the incarcerated community for public health reasons, or required by law, regulation, or department policy, and ordered by a department health care practitioner, and authorized according to department policies and procedures, and delivered in the most cost-effective manner and location consistent with safe, appropriate care.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
56.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC as DC complied with DOC Policy 460.000 related to the infraction procedure. The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal narrative and found there is evidence to substantiate the infraction. Additionally, the individual admitted guilt in their appeal.	No Violation of Policy
57.	An incarcerated person shared concerns regarding not being able to have access to their glasses due to a recent placement in the intensive management unit. The complainant states that the restrictions on eyewear in the intensive management unit are not uniform by facility nor communicated at purchase.	The OCO verified the complainant's concern but was unable to achieve a resolution to the concern. The DOC stated that incarcerated persons would learn of the eyewear restrictions in the Intensive Management Unit handbook. The DOC also stated the decision to accept or reject eyewear is at the discretion of certain staff members and on a case-by-case basis to ensure safety and security. The OCO provided self-advocacy information by giving step-by-step	Substantiated

guidance for the complainant to file a tort claim as they requested compensation for their eyewear.

Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

58. Incarcerated individual reports DOC did not pay him for hours worked for a month. The individual attempted to resolve the concern through the resolutions program but was unable.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke with staff at the facility and found there was an issue with the individuals timesheet for that month. DOC located the individual’s original timesheet which showed the correct hours worked and paid him the correct amount owed.	Assistance Provided
59. Patient reports concerns about access to treatment for ongoing stomach issues.	The OCO was able to provide assistance. This office contacted facility health services and elevated the concern to the Health Service Administrators (HSAs). The OCO confirmed the individual was not receiving treatment because a diagnosis was not yet on file and mediated resolution with DOC for several months. DOC scheduled the patient for additional testing and follow up and the OCO confirmed appointments, testing, diagnosis, and treatment plan. The person’s most recent encounter reports show improved symptoms based on current treatment.	Assistance Provided
60. Incarcerated individual reports he has applied for Graduated Reentry (GRE) and has not heard any information about his application since. The individual has tried to work with staff to obtain more information and that has been unsuccessful. The individual requests the OCO investigate the status of his GRE application and states he wants to be approved for the program.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO inquired with DOC staff about the status of the individuals GRE application. DOC shared that the individual is approved for the program if he continues to stay infraction free. The OCO verified that the individual’s classification counselor will meet with him to discuss the next steps in the GRE process and verify that the individual still wants to participate in the program.	Assistance Provided
61. The incarcerated individual reports that the DOC rejected an affidavit sent to him regarding his family member being a victim of a crime. The individual reports it was rejected due to risk of physical harm to the individual due to personal information.	The OCO provided assistance. This office discussed the reasons for the rejection notice with DOC staff who reported that the rejection was in error as the affidavit is related to a crime outside of Washington State. DOC staff confirmed the document was sent to the individual.	Assistance Provided
62. Person was transferred and his medical records did not follow him. As a result, he is having trouble accessing a necessary medication as medical staff have no proof he ever had an order. The patient has been without his medication for weeks.	The OCO substantiated that the patient’s records were undiscoverable for some time and he was taken off a necessary medication. The OCO contacted the Health Services management to verify his records had been found and asked if he would be considered for this treatment again. Due to the complexity of the Medication Assisted	Assistance Provided

Therapy (MAT) protocol, the patient was not able to be immediately restarted on the medication but has started treatment since the outreach.

63. A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that the individual works outside the gate at the facility with his supervisor and is strip searched every day. The loved one reports that this occurs each time they go outside the gate upon return.	The OCO provided assistance. This office spoke with leadership at the facility who agreed that a new Operational Memorandum (OM) was needed for the camp. DOC staff reviewed policy and the practice of strip searchers at other facilities. The new OM states that all offsite work crews will continue to get strip searched upon returning to the facility. Incarcerated individuals on outside perimeter detail work, under staff supervision, will be for cause only and only longer subject to strip searches each time they come back from work.	Assistance Provided
64. Patient states he was supposed to have an urgent colonoscopy and it has not happened. He is experiencing concerning symptoms but hasn't been told what they are going to do to help.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to OCO involvement. The OCO contacted Health Services Management who informed this office that the patient had received the coloscopy and has a treatment plan created based on the results.	DOC Resolved
65. Person states they requested special insoles from medical nearly a year ago. They also requested cortisone injections. When they spoke to medical staff, they were told the insoles would be ordered but has not heard anything since.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted Health management and confirmed the patient had received the insoles and the providers are still working towards a diagnosis before deciding on the best clinical interventions.	DOC Resolved
66. The incarcerated individual reports that he legally changed his name to one name, however, the DOC is misrepresenting their name by adding an X as the first name. The individual reports that staff are now calling him by the wrong name which is dehumanizing. The individual has tried to address this issue but the response was that the computer system won't accept a single name.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed the investigation related to this concern and found that the individual and the DOC made a compromise that worked with the computer system. The individual's singular name will appear as both his first and last name.	DOC Resolved
67. Incarcerated individual reports he is being targeted by DOC staff after filing a Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) violation report on a DOC staff member. The individual reports the staff member is working in the unit while the investigation is underway, which is a violation of policy. The individual requests to be transferred out of the facility to avoid further targeting.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed the actions of DOC staff and found the original PREA allegation did not meet the criteria for a PREA investigation. However, the reported retaliation did. The DOC investigated the retaliation concerns and met with the individual to discuss them on multiple occasions prior to OCO contact. The OCO shared with the individual the process for requesting a facility transfer at his next custody facility plan meeting.	DOC Resolved

68.	The incarcerated individual reports that he ordered a commissary package and a package from Union Supply before he transferred to another facility. The individual reports that he did not receive these packages and has not been refunded from the facility or Union Supply.	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual may contact Union Supply to request a refund for the package that he ordered and did not receive. This office contacted DOC staff at the individual's previous facility who confirmed he was refunded the full amount for his commissary order.	Information Provided
69.	The incarcerated individual reports that he did not receive the correct amount of jail credits. He reports that he received a letter from the DOC stating that they are no longer tolling and would like assistance with this concern.	The OCO provided information regarding contacting DOC Records for questions regarding his jail credits and Earned Release Date (ERD).	Information Provided
70.	Person reported that he is supposed to be in a specific behavior program, which was at his old facility. Person was then sent to a new facility and was contacted by this program saying they don't understand why he was transferred.	The OCO reviewed DOC records and found that Headquarters was unable to send this person to a facility with this behavior program. Headquarters stated that he has enough time left to complete the program before his release date, that they will try to get him moved to a facility with this program when he promotes custody levels. The OCO shared this information with the individual.	Information Provided
71.	Person reported he is being made to go to school, and that DOC is threatening a custody demotion if he doesn't go to school. Person also reports struggling with his mental health.	The OCO provided information about Washington State Law and DOC policy, and also provided information about mental health resources. RCW 72.09.460 states that "(2) The legislature intends that all incarcerated individuals be required to participate in department-approved education programs" and prioritizes "(i) Achievement of basic academic skills through obtaining a high school diploma or a high school equivalency certificate."	Information Provided
72.	Person reports that they are afraid of retaliation from the Internal Investigation Unit (IIU). Person states DOC did not provide a search report after a cell search was conducted.	The OCO was able to provide information regarding the individual's search report. The person was provided with a copy of the search report per the response on their resolution request. The individual was advised to submit a separate resolution request if they have concerns regarding staff conduct.	Information Provided
73.	Person reports they believe their sentence was calculated incorrectly and they should be released this year, not next year.	The OCO was able to provide information at the time of the hotline call. The individual was advised to pursue the resolution program and to contact the OCO when they have received a level two response. They were also directed to kite the records department to request a breakdown of their sentence.	Information Provided
74.	Person reported that he was released to general population from segregation	The OCO cannot provide help seeking financial compensation for this incident and provided	Information Provided

in cold temperatures and had to navigate back to his unit with limited mobility and no assistance. Person reported that he missed pill lines because of this and couldn't get his medication until 3 weeks later. Person requested financial compensation for the suffering from this incident.

information about filing a tort claim. DOC 120.500 states "All incarcerated individual tort claims alleging personal property damage/loss must be filed by the individual with the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services (DES) Risk Management Division". RCW 4.92.100 states, "(1) All claims against the state, or against the state's officers, employees, or volunteers, acting in such capacity, for damages arising out of tortious conduct, must be presented to the office of risk management."

75. Person reported that he had two hearings for the same infraction. Person requested compensation for damages for his pain and suffering while in DOC custody.	The OCO cannot provide help seeking financial compensation for this incident and provided information about filing a tort claim. RCW 4.92.100 states, "(1) All claims against the state, or against the state's officers, employees, or volunteers, acting in such capacity, for damages arising out of tortious conduct, must be presented to the office of risk management." DOC 120.500 states "All incarcerated individual tort claims alleging personal property damage/loss must be filed by the individual with the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services (DES) Risk Management Division".	Information Provided
76. The incarcerated individual reports that he has missed several virtual court hearings due to the facility not allowing him to participate. The individual reports that he is no longer receiving correspondence from the court regarding his case. He reports the facility has not notified unit staff to arrange his participation in the hearings.	The OCO provided information regarding the individual not being allowed to appear in virtual hearings for his court case. This office spoke with DOC staff who confirmed that the court has not moved forward in the case because they are awaiting fees to be paid by the individual, as the case was initiated by him. If the court requires an individual to appear, they will plan with the facility. The individual will need to meet the court's requirements to be eligible to participate in hearings.	Information Provided
77. Person attempted to submit a Resolution Request regarding an incident at pill line. They wrote the grievance in their native language, but it was rejected or they did not get a response from the Resolution Specialist.	The OCO provided information regarding the translation services used by DOC. There was no evidence to support that the resolution requests were being denied or not completed. The dates the requests were sent for translation were documented by DOC. The OCO has investigated the medication error in a prior case and will provide information on tort claims. Individuals who have been harmed or who have suffered a loss as a result of negligent actions by a state employee or agency can submit a tort claim to the Office of Risk Management (ORM). ORM is	Information Provided

required by law (RCW Chapter 4.92) to receive these claims.

78.	The incarcerated individual reports that he is six months to his Earned Release Date (ERD) and was told he does not qualify for Graduated Reentry (GRE) due to his conviction. He reports he also does not qualify for Work Release because his counselor at his previous facility applied too early, and he was rejected.	The OCO provided information on the individual's denial for GRE and Work Release by the Headquarters Community Screening Committee (HCSC) due to existing community concerns. The individual currently has an approved Offender Release Plan (ORP) and an upcoming Planned Release Date (PRD).	Information Provided
79.	An external person reports that Coyote Ridge Corrections Center is using Group Violence Reductions Strategy (GVRS), however, policy states that this practice is only to be used at Washington State Penitentiary and Clallam Bay Corrections Center.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office spoke with leadership at the Coyote Ridge Corrections Center who reported that they are not using GVRS at the facility. The facility has implemented "half-racking" which means that individuals in the unit on different tiers are allowed out for the same amount of time as usual, however, they are allowed out at separate times. This does not impact the amount of time individuals are allowed out of their cells, but there are less people out during the given time.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
80.	The incarcerated individual reports that he lost his job on false allegations. He reports he worked in maintenance and had an issue with an officer who reported the individual caused a scene, but the individual reports that is untrue. The individual says that he was not infraacted or given a negative behavior observation entry (BOE) but can't get a job now because he is no longer allowed to pass through the clean room.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office spoke with DOC staff who reported that the individual was not terminated by the officer but by the maintenance program. The OCO confirmed that the individual does not have any restrictions on movement through the clean room and the DOC staff reported that they may reconsider the individual for another position in maintenance in the future.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
81.	Incarcerated individual states they received an infraction for getting tattoos while in prison but states they had these prior to entering prison and should not be infraacted for them.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the individual's intake records that show the individual had fewer tattoos than when the infraction was issued. The individual was in possession of tattooing instruments. DOC also delayed the hearing three weeks to let the individual get documentation of the tattoos to show they had them prior to entering prison but they did not produce this evidence.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
82.	Person reported that the Sergeant was planning to move an individual with an incompatible PREA score who is a	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reached out to the unit management staff who said that	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

	<p>potential predator into the cell, and that originally he was told he could choose his own cellmate. Person said that the concerns of LGBTQIA individuals are routinely ignored, particularly about PREA score issues with potential cell mates.</p>	<p>the potential predator was never housed with this individual, and this office was able to verify that this individual is now housed with someone with a compatible PREA score. The OCO also addressed concerns about discrimination against LGBTQIA individuals with the unit management staff.</p>	
<p>83. The incarcerated individual reports that the DOC imposed monetary limit for musical instruments is too low now that prices have significantly raised. The individual reports that musical instruments plus necessary accessories cost more than the allotted dollar amount.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 440.000, Personal Property for Offenders, Attachment 1, Maximum Allowable Personal Property Matrix, individuals have a maximum limit of \$400.00 for musical instruments and accessories. This policy is currently under review and DOC staff are required to adhere to the current policy until the new revision comes into effect.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>	
<p>84. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about group sanctions resulting from the “split rack” process even if an individual was not involved in the infracting behavior.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the grievance regarding the split rack process. The grievance was closed as a memo from the Associate Superintendent was previously provided that explains the process as the split rack process is needed in order to better monitor behavior following certain incidents. DOC and the OCO did not find any violations of RCWs or WACs that prohibit such practice.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>	
<p>85. Person states their incarcerated loved one was infracted and is now being transferred to another facility that they feel is unsafe.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 300.380 V. Custody Level Designation and Eligibility B. Infractions resulting in a deduction of 20 or more points during a review period require evaluation for custody demotion. VI Facility Assignment and Transfer A. Determining facility placement will be consistent with department needs and 1.) address safety and security issues, including separation and facility prohibitions 2.) meet requirements of individuals custody level and health service’s needs. The individual was in IMU while awaiting to be assigned housing at new facility.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>	
<p>86. The incarcerated individual reports he had photos sent to him which were rejected. The individual appealed the rejection, but it was upheld. He reports that the WAC cited in the rejection does not apply to the photos he was sent.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by the DOC. This office found that the individual has court ordered special conditions, and the letters that were rejected are considered sexually explicit. Per RCW. 9.94A.703 & .704, the</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>	

individual shall abide by any court and WA DOC conditions imposed.

87. The incarcerated individual reports that he paid for a weight deck permit at his previous facility. The individual transferred to a new facility and was told that his permit would be transferred, or he would be refunded. The individual reports that he has not been added to the list of transfers for weight deck access at the new facility.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by the DOC. This office reviewed the process for individuals who have transferred to that facility and wish to use the weight deck. Individuals must fill out the clipboard in the recreation area, which informs the recreation staff that the person has transferred to the facility and paid the weight deck fees, however, the individual did not follow this process. Per DOC 540.105, Recreation Program for Offenders, there will be times when weightlifting, music, or hobby craft areas will be closed or unavailable. This does not qualify offenders for a refund or alternative makeup use.	No Violation of Policy
88. The incarcerated individual reports that DOC's behavioral program forces role play as part of the curriculum can retraumatizes individuals who participate. The individual reports that the program is in a group setting and is not confidential. The individual says the class is assigned as mandatory programming and individuals who refuse to participate may be demoted. The individual reports he has sought alternative mental health treatment but has not received it.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. This office found that the individual was dropped from the program due to mental health concerns. DOC 500.000, Educational and Vocational Programs in Prison does state that failure to participate in assigned programming may result in disciplinary action, loss of earned time, and/or programming points, however, the individual did not face any consequences for dropping the program. The OCO also confirmed that the individual has been seen by Mental Health staff several times since reporting this concern.	No Violation of Policy
89. Patient reports he has a Health Status Report for a longer mattress. He was told by medical staff that it was the Correctional Unit Supervisor's job to order the longer mattress. He has submitted resolution requests but has not received the mattress.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. The OCO also confirmed the patient has an active Health Status report. The OCO contacted the Unit Supervisor and were informed the extra-long mattresses had to be ordered by the warehouse from an outside vender. The Unit Supervisor has requested the mattress, But the patient has not yet received the mattress.	Substantiated
90. Patient reports that his facility does not have adequate medical staff to meet the needs of the population. He is requesting that the facility bring on more providers to provide more access to care. He has kited several times to be seen and has faced extremely long wait times to be seen at sick call. DOC staff were saying it was because of COVID and safety concerns that his appointments were delayed. He is also	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. This patient has faced several delays in getting seen at sick call. These delays were explained as COVID related or the backlog of sick call requests. The OCO has taken this concern to the Health Services Administrators and continue to engage in discussions around improving health care access and hiring health care staff to meet the population's needs.	Substantiated

requesting care for a gastrointestinal issue that he was trying to get addressed through kites, sick call, and the grievance program.

Larch Corrections Center

<p>91. The incarcerated individual reports that he ordered a magazine subscription and received the first two, but the third issue was rejected due to sexually explicit photos. The individual appealed the rejection, but it was upheld. The individual was temporarily transferred to another facility and saw several other individuals who had the issue of the magazine that was rejected for him and does understand why some people were allowed to receive it but not others.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the reason for the rejection and why he saw it at another facility. This office reviewed the photos and spoke with DOC HQ staff in charge of mailrooms and confirmed that the images in that issue of the magazine contains sexually explicit material per WAC 137-48-020. Magazines are reviewed on an issue-to-issue basis, so some issues may be received while others are rejected. Regarding the individual seeing the magazine at another facility, DOC staff reported that the issue of the magazine was reviewed and overturned by the committee. This would allow the publication into the facilities. A Mailroom Sergeant appealed the committee decision days later. This would have allowed the publication to enter the facilities during that few days' timeline. Headquarters overturned the committee decision and rejected the publication. The publications that were already processed into the facilities during those few days were not confiscated.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>92. Loved one states that Securus website is saying they were denied visits but incarcerated loved one states they have been approved. Person wanted help resolving the issue.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to provide information regarding the visitor's status. The OCO was able to see in the DOC system that the loved one is approved for visits. They were instructed to contact the facility and Securus with any further issues.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women

<p>93. A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that a male officer entered the bathroom while the individual and another woman were showering.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding how the individual may file a Prison Rape Elimination Act violation to report this concern. This office encouraged the individual to contact the OCO if there are any concerns with the PREA investigation.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
---	---	-----------------------------

Monroe Correctional Complex

<p>94. Person reports continued issues after being transferred and levels have still not been addressed, leaving him without access to tv, property, and other items.</p>	<p>The OCO met with this individual in person to discuss the concerns. After the OCO visit, the Superintendent met with this individual to discuss these concerns and help resolve them.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>95. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about not having an infraction removed from their record that the OCO helped</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. The OCO followed up with DOC as the infraction was still on the individual's record despite prior negotiations,</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>

	them get overturned and not having their points restored that went along with that infraction.	the infraction is now removed. Per DOC 300.380(IV)(C)(I)(c), a custody facility plan is done every six months, the individual will have to wait until their next plan to have their points recalculated.	
96.	Patient reports he is still waiting to get his foot fitted for shoes and has been waiting a long time and has not been sized. He said the OCO reviewed this before but the appointment never happened.	The OCO was able to provide assistance. After OCO outreach, the patient was seen by DOC and referred for a specialist appointment to assess shoes and fitting. The OCO added this to the appointment tracker and confirmed the appointment is scheduled.	Assistance Provided
97.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about placing a kite in the box to get video preserved regarding their infraction and then receiving another infraction for being out of bounds while putting the kite in when they were directed to.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed the individual's disciplinary record and did not see any recent out of bounds infractions, as a result, DOC may have dismissed the infraction.	DOC Resolved
98.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about receiving two infractions for the same incident.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed the individual's disciplinary history and found based on the appeal response that DOC agreed the individual was infractions twice for the same incident and dismissed one of the infractions.	DOC Resolved
99.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about not receiving an infraction appeal response.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed this infraction concern and found none in the individual's disciplinary record that matched this concern. As a result, it appears DOC dismissed the infraction.	DOC Resolved
100.	External person reports their loved one has not received surgery after being injured in an assault.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted Health Services management and were informed that patient had received treatment for the reported injuries and was scheduled for follow up with the outside clinics. The OCO was able to confirm the delay in scheduling surgery was caused by the outside clinic canceling the patient's procedure due to staff availability.	DOC Resolved
101.	The incarcerated individual reports that he has had multiple magazines and books returned to the sender. The individual reports that refusal is not the same as a rejection and says that a reasonable effort should be made to identify the recipient.	The OCO met with DOC HQ staff responsible for mailrooms and mail policy who reports that mailroom staff have been asked to make a reasonable effort to identify the recipient of the mail/package. The OCO provided information regarding DOC 450.100, Mail for Individual in Prison, which is currently being updated and will include language regarding mailrooms making an	Information Provided

effort to identify the recipient if there are any minor errors in the shipping addresses.

102. The incarcerated individual reports that he is waking up with repeat injuries and does not know how they happen. He has gone to medical but never received any accurate diagnosis. The patient is requesting protective custody as a resolution.	The OCO Provided information to the patient on the eligibility and process of protective custody. The OCO requested Health Services management (HSM) review the patients file for a treatment plan. This office was informed that there was no documentation to indicate the symptoms had been reported to medical. The HSM contacted the patient directly asking if he was still experiencing the symptoms and invited the patient to kite medical if he was still having those issues.	Information Provided
103. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about a DOC staff member taking their religious headwear off their head and throwing it on the bathroom floor.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the original resolution request documentation as well as the individual's property matrix. In the resolution request the individual does not report concerns about staff misconduct. The OCO verified the individual does not have any religious items on their property matrix.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
104. Patient states the psychiatrist is aggressive and hostile towards him. He is having issues with his medication and has filed resolution requests due to these interactions. He is requesting his medications be restored and the provider to stop treating him with hostility.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the resolution request and verified that DOC staff have accommodated this patient's request to not meet alone with the provider. There was insufficient evidence to support that the interactions were inappropriate. OCO staff also verified the patient is receiving treatment.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
105. Person reports DOC did not conduct a physical assessment after filing a PREA report. The individual also wants to move to TRU for safety and community.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. This office reviewed the related PREA investigation, found that the individual was sent to the hospital for a forensic exam, and contacted health services to confirm. This office also confirmed the individual was reviewed and approved for TRU placement.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
106. Incarcerated individual reports they are being discriminated against by the Indeterminate Sentencing Review Board (ISRB). The individual completed all of the recommendations the ISRB gave at the last hearing and they still given additional time to their sentence.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the individuals ISRB hearings and found the ISRB added time to the individuals sentence in compliance with DOC 320.100 Indeterminate Sentencing Review Board which states, "The Board will set the minimum terms of confinement consistent with the purposes, standards, and sentencing ranges per RCW 9.94A and RCW 9.95.040. 1. The Parole Eligibility Date is the expiration of the minimum term set by the Board, less any earned time. B. New minimum	No Violation of Policy

terms will be set when an individual is denied release to the community or within 30 days of readmission when revoked from parole/ community custody.”

Monroe Correctional Complex - SOU

107. The incarcerated individual reports that a DOC officer made rude remarks towards him on his way to the gym. The individual reports that he felt threatened.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed the investigation of this concern and after DOC staff spoke with the individual and officer involved, the individual reported that his concerns were addressed, and the issue was resolved and chose to withdraw his resolution request.	DOC Resolved
108. Person is requesting information on how to get in contact with government agencies.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. Upon review the OCO was able to see DOC Risk Management Department provided the requested information to the individual in May of 2022.	DOC Resolved
109. The incarcerated individual reports that he has not been given access to the new Securus tablets.	The OCO provided information regarding why the individual has not been given a new tablet. The OCO spoke with DOC staff at the facility who report that the new tablets have not been issued to the individual’s unit. that area is not yet equipped with wi-fi, so the tablets would not be supported. The facility is aware of this and report that wi-fi should be installed soon and the tablets will be issued.	Information Provided
110. Person states that two units were supposed to be issued the new tablets by a specific date per DOC memo but that has not happened. Person states the units do not t have wifi, while the rest of the facility does.	The OCO provided information regarding tablet distribution to those two units. Per the CPM at the facility the units do not have Wi-Fi capability and the tablets would not work. The distribution has been placed on hold until the units have Wi-Fi installed. There is no estimated date set for the installation. The facility hopes to have more information soon on this matter.	Information Provided
111. The incarcerated individual reports that the DOC is rejecting outgoing mail to two organizations that they are trying to communicate with.	The OCO provided information regarding why the individual’s outgoing mail was rejected and how they may communicate with the organizations in a way that does not violate DOC policy. This office spoke with DOC Headquarters staff in charge of mailrooms and found that the individual was sending messages intended to be posted on social media or sent to another recipient. Per DOC 450.100, Mail for Individuals in Prison, Attachment 1, Unauthorized Mail, mail may be rejected if it contains correspondence to or from a third party. The OCO confirmed with	Information Provided

DOC staff that communication to these organizations is permitted so long as it does not include a request to correspond with a third party or social media. This office relayed this information to the individual.

<p>112. Person was told DOC received money in the form of a check from GTL to refund individuals or families who had money on the phone accounts before the transition was made to Securus. They have not received the refunds and believe that GTL or DOC may have stolen the money.</p>	<p>The OCO reached out to the banking and fiscal department at DOC and was able to confirm that these funds were transferred to this individual's account, and provide the individual with the information gathered from DOC. The OCO confirmed with DOC that funds were transferred from GTL to DOC Headquarters and then sent to Securus, who distributed the money to individuals' accounts statewide, and that money reached individuals' accounts in January.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>113. Person reports his Early Release Date (ERD) has been pushed back and time has been added to his sentence. Person states he thinks that DOC found an old charge from years ago and using it to add time.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information about filing a resolution request and contacting DOC Records Management Team. Per the Resolution Program Manual, pg. 6, individuals can file a resolution request regarding sentence structure, and per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>114. Person reports concerns about impacts of strip searches related to history of victimization and PTSD diagnosis. Person requested information about options to address the concern.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information about discussing an Accommodation Status Report (ASR) through mental health related to current diagnosis. This office also shared information about discussing the concern with the PREA Coordinator or filing a grievance and following up with the OCO if unresolved.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>115. The incarcerated individual reports concerns regarding the movement of their release plans. The individual has been chronically homeless in the past and is concerned they are being set up for failure because they are releasing soon, and release plans have not been made.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the individual's release planning. This office found that the DOC has been working on the individuals Offender Release Plan per DOC 350.200, Transition and Release. DOC staff are currently working with the individual to find suitable housing upon his release. The individual applied for a Housing Voucher which requires the individual to be within 60 days of their ERD which may slightly delay an individual's release.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>116. Person reported asking for placement at the Monroe Corrections Center Twin Rivers Unit, but is still in the Special Offenders Unit, where they feel unsafe. Person stated that they should have been transferred a</p>	<p>The OCO was able to confirm with DOC Headquarters that this individual's Trans Housing Protocol review has been completed, and that they will be transferred soon. The OCO provided the individual with this information.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

long time ago and is requesting a minimum custody placement.

117. The incarcerated individual reports that marriage paperwork was sent to them but they never received the paperwork or a rejection notice. The individual reports they are not getting an answer as to where the paperwork is.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office spoke with the mailroom who confirmed they have not received any marriage paperwork for the individual. The paperwork was never received by the facility, and it was not rejected.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
118. The incarcerated individual reports that he had an altercation with another incarcerated individual in the unit and staff said they would take care of it. He reports nothing had happened and he is concerned for his safety.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office found that the individual was moved to another unit the day after his concern was reported to DOC staff.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
119. The incarcerated individual reports issues with receiving responses to his resolution requests and feels he is being retaliated against for filing them. The individual reports that this is causing him stress.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office reviewed the individual's recent resolution requests and found that he has several open resolution requests at various levels which he has appealed. The OCO found that the individual did have some resolution requests which were administratively withdrawn due to a rewrite request which was not received, and another that was not accepted, as it was a duplicate. This office also reviewed the individual's infractions and Behavior Observation Entries (BOEs) and were unable to find documented evidence available to verify that DOC staff behavior meets the definition of retaliation. To substantiate retaliation, the OCO must be able to prove that a negative action from a DOC staff member is not only linked close in time to an incarcerated individual's protected action but there must be evidence of a clear relationship between the two acts.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
120. Incarcerated individual reports she filed a Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) violation against a DOC staff member and the staff member continues to try to discuss it with her. The individual reports the staff member continues to come into the unit.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO verified the individual does not have any active PREA investigations against the staff member named. The OCO shared options with the individual for filing a PREA report and shared how to reach out to PREA investigation coordinator at the facility.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
121. Incarcerated person states they continue to be infracted for their medical condition.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO extensively researched this individual's disciplinary record and found several infractions that raised alarm if they were a result of the	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

individual's medical diagnosis. The OCO reached out to DOC and DOC headquarters about the aforementioned infractions, DOC found that the individual does not have the diagnosis the individual had described to the OCO and as a result, the individual was not being infraacted for their medical conditions. As such, DOC was unwilling to overturn any of the infractions.

122. Individual states they did not receive yard or gym time while on Administrative Segregation.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO was able to verify via Daily Segregation Reports that the individual did receive yard and gym time.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
123. The incarcerated individual reports concerns with an officer who works overnight. The individual reports that the officer walks around the unit all night and feels uncomfortable using the bathroom when the officer is walking around. The individual reports that he was told that the officer walks around in order to get some exercise while he is working, but it is disruptive for the individual.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. This office reviewed the investigation of this concern including interviews, video footage, and logbook entries. The officer is conducting tier checks as expected and does not engage with incarcerated individuals unless it seems necessary to address something. The OCO reviewed the Unit Post Orders, and a minimum of one tier check per hour is required, and additional monitoring is acceptable and encouraged in the interest of safety and wellbeing of individuals living on the unit.	No Violation of Policy
124. Incarcerated individual reports a staff member was not terminated after a Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) violation was substantiated. The individual reports per DOC policy the staff member should be terminated.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed DOC 490.860 PREA Investigation, which states, "IV. Staff Discipline A. Employees may be subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination, for violating Department PREA policies." The OCO also reviewed the PREA investigation and determined DOC followed the PREA investigation protocol.	No Violation of Policy
125. Use of force was initiated because the person was making threats to bodily harm staff, person was not compliant, OC spray was used and then staff gained compliance, person said they had suicidal thoughts and was taken to SOU COA.	The OCO reviewed the Use of Force incident and determined the Use of Force was per DOC policy.	No Violation of Policy
126. The incarcerated individual reports that he was bullied into sexually assaulting himself and DOC staff are telling him that it is his fault because he was not on his medication. The individual reports that he has filed two PREA reports and told therapists about the incidents. The individual would like a polygraph test to prove it was not his fault.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate that there was a policy violation by the DOC. This office verified that the individual's PREA concerns were documented and investigated per DOC 490.800, Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Prevention and Reporting. The OCO cannot facilitate a polygraph test.	No Violation of Policy

Monroe Correctional Complex - TRU

<p>127. The incarcerated individual reports that he was recently found to be releasable by the Indeterminate Sentence Review Board (ISRB), but his addresses continue to be denied by the facility. The individual reports that because he is under the ISRB his release addresses should go directly to the Community Corrections Officer and then Headquarters and they should not be denied by facility staff.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. This office spoke with DOC staff who reported that there were concerns with the address the individual initially submitted and that it would most likely be denied. This would cause a delay in the individual's release and result in needing to find a new address for consideration. After the OCO spoke with DOC staff, they relayed this information to the individual and he agreed that it would be better to submit another address. The individual agreed to continue to work with his classification counselor to find a suitable address that would likely be approved. The OCO confirmed that the individual now has an approved Offender Release Plan (ORP) and Planned Release Date (PRD).</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>128. The incarcerated individual reports ongoing complaints and claims of retaliation by DOC staff related to civil suits filed and reading comprehension issues that he has, which prevent full participation in various processes, including programming, grievance process, review of medical documentation, and participation in tort and civil processes.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided. The OCO verified that this individual received approval for an Accommodation Status Report (ASR) for Access Assistant Care by the DOC.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>129. Patient reports they have experienced a delay in dental care which has caused issues with bone density and loss of teeth. This person was supposed to be fitted for a partial as well. DOC states they suspended non-critical dental care due to COVID. His appointment for partials was never scheduled after cleaning. he is being told he is on the list but hasn't occurred.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance by contacting Health Services management to ensure the patient would be scheduled with the dentist. The OCO monitored the case on the appointment tracker and followed up with the Health Services Manager when the requested appointment was cancelled. The patient has now been seen by the dentist and treatment will be determined by that provider. The OCO was not able to substantiate the claim that the delay in getting dental cleanings caused bone density loss or loss of teeth. The patient's record was reviewed by the DOC Chief of Dentistry, it was determined that the patient's condition has existed for many years and there has not been substantial changes in the patient's imaging in the last 5 years.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>130. Person reported that the Resolution Program is declining his complaints. Person states that he had a concern about medical records, filed a resolutions request, and that the Resolution Program is refusing to accept his complaint.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed this individual's resolution request and saw it was not accepted by the Resolution Program at first, and then was appealed to Headquarters. Headquarters overturned the Not</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>

Accepted decision, and the request is now being investigated at Level 1.

<p>131. External person reports concerns about not being contacted by DOC when her incarcerated loved one was transported to the hospital for medical emergencies. Person is seeking information about why she was not contacted and an agreement from DOC that she will be notified in the future of any medical emergencies requiring transport to the local hospital.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information about notification regarding medical emergencies. DOC does not typically notify loved ones of medical emergencies or hospital trips due to safety and security concerns. According to DOC policy 620.200, V. "Family notification in prison states that health services employees/contract staff will request an updated notification for seriously ill patients housed in the infirmary or special needs unit. Seriously ill is defined as currently or expected to be physically/mentally incapacitated, or a health condition that carries a high risk of mortality and has less than 6 months to live." The decision regarding the severity of the illness of the individual is determined by the medical officer at the facility. If they determine that the individual does not meet those criteria, the family member would not be notified. There is a process in place to alert the family member via DOC 13-109 should that person meet the qualification of "seriously ill" as outlined in the policy. The OCO also shared how a family member can find public DOC health services contact information.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>132. The incarcerated individual reports that she had previous cases regarding an incident that the OCO investigated, but reports that the cases did not examine the retaliation. She wants to do an inquiry as to what drove the DOC to write a serious infraction for her and the other individual. She reports that there was a lot of work gone into making sure the infraction stuck even though there is no evidence. She reports that she is not concerned about the infraction per se at this time but wants the retaliation/targeting investigated.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed this original concern and worked with the DOC to rehear the infraction and move them off the out of state transfer list. This individual was still found guilty based on a some evidence standard and has been moved back to population. Retaliation is an intentional, adverse action taken against an individual for their good faith participation in the resolution program, filing a lawsuit, making a complaint, or other legally protected action or their involvement in any investigation or review. The OCO does not find evidence of retaliation based on the allegations in this infraction. This office did give the individual information about how to file a Tort claim.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>133. The incarcerated individual reports that his six-month review was not completed within policy timeframes. The individual reports that he filed a resolution request regarding this and received an infraction which he believes is retaliation.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the individual's six months review and the reason he received an infraction. This office confirmed with DOC staff that the six-month review was not completed within the timelines outlined in policy. After the individual filed a resolution request, DOC staff contacted the individual and the review was completed shortly after. The</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

individual agreed that this was an acceptable solution and asked that his resolution request be withdrawn. The OCO reviewed the general infraction the individual received which was for lying to staff about a current HSR. This office confirmed that at the time of the incident, the HSR had expired, and it is the responsibility of the individual to contact their provider should they want it renewed.

<p>134. The incarcerated individual reports that he has tried to send legal mail, but it has not been received by the courts or the law office. The individual reports he sent legal mail on various dates and the documents were not received.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the process for legal mail. The OCO spoke with the mailroom sergeant at the individual's facility who did not find any entries in the legal mail logbook for the individual around the dates he reported he sent out legal mail. This office also spoke with DOC HQ staff in charge of mailrooms who confirmed that legal mail should not be sent via regular mail even if it is marked legal mail. Individuals must present the mail to law library or unit staff who will enter it into the legal mail logbook to ensure it will be documented and treated as legal mail.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>135. Person states he is frustrated with the conflicting priorities of strict masking everywhere except at mainline.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to provide information regarding the WA State DOC Masking Guidance-version 7 which supersedes any previous masking guidelines. Guidelines were updated December 23, 2023. When facilities are in the yellow, red or have limited cluster or facility outbreaks masking will be required, indoors and outdoors.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>136. Person reported concerns that he is being targeted by the Intelligence and Investigations Unit (IIU) after leaving the facility on bad terms, and then returning to the facility when he did not request to be transferred there.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information about writing to DOC Headquarters or filing a resolution request about concerns of IIU staff misconduct.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>137. The incarcerated individual reports that he was trying to send out legal mail, and the mailroom staff rejected it and would not send it out for him. He reports that he followed the process when he was sending it out, and an officer checked it before it went into the mail. He does not understand why the mailroom staff then opened and rejected it.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding DOC 450.100, Mail for Individuals in Prison, which states that legal mail may only contain paper documents that are legal in nature and must comply with DOC 590.500, Legal Access for Incarcerated Individuals. The individual was trying to send a greeting card to his attorney's office, and thus it was rejected. The OCO informed the individual that he may send a greeting card to his attorney through regular mail.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>138. The incarcerated individual reports concerns with legal access and the</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the reason the individual's resolution requests were</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

Resolution Program denying his resolution requests because the topic is similar. The individual reports concerns about the law library being closed and the LexisNexis application not being available on individuals' tablets.

not accepted and the LexisNexis application. This office reviewed the individual's resolution requests regarding legal access and the law library and found that several were closed as duplicate concerns after the initial one was responded to. The individual filed resolution requests regarding the law library being closed on different days which were considered duplicates, as the DOC was already aware of the issue and the reason for closure remained during the short period of time the individual submitted the resolution requests. The OCO spoke with DOC staff at the facility and confirmed that the LexisNexis application became available on incarcerated individuals' tablets shortly after this concern was reported.

139. Person would like information on Cost of Incarceration (COI) fees. Can fees be waived, due to their length of incarceration?	The OCO was able to provide information regarding Cost of Incarceration. Per RCW 72.09.480 (9), incarcerated individuals who have been sentenced to life imprisonment without possibility of release or sentenced to death under chapter 10.95 RCW receives funds, deductions are required under subsection (2) of this section, with the exception of personal savings account under subsection (2)(b) of this section.	Information Provided
140. Patient reports that he did not heal correctly because his wheelchair was taken by medical staff and was given a walker six days after surgery. The provider says that there's nothing wrong despite still having pain. He is requesting to see the podiatrist and have the procedure redone.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence that DOC staff actions caused the patient to heal incorrectly. It was found the patient was not following the specialist's post-operative instructions to wear protective medical equipment. OCO staff contacted Health Services management to confirm there would be further specialist assessment of the patient. The OCO verified that DOC has scheduled the patient for a repeat surgery and follow up appointment.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
141. Person reported multiple issues with his Securus tablet and said the help ticket button on the tablet is not working, and that Securus is not addressing help tickets.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reached out to the Securus liaison at his facility and confirmed that this individual has met in person with the Securus representative multiple times and is regularly on the callout to talk to the representative. The OCO also confirmed that this individual received a new tablet.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
142. Loved one expressed concern about sanctions an incarcerated individual received for an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the sanctions and found they were within DOC Policy 460.050 Disciplinary Sanctions.	No Violation of Policy

<p>143. Incarcerated individual reports he received a negative Behavioral Observation Entry (BOE) after taking a pre-approved day off of work for a family visit. The individual was infraacted a month later for taking another day off to be seen by medical.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the individuals central file and found the infraction was dismissed by DOC. The OCO also reviewed the BOE and verified the individual did not have a visit scheduled for the day the BOE was written. DOC shared with the OCO that even if a visit was scheduled, the current protocol is to attend work, then the individual will be called out of work to attend the special visit. The OCO found the BOE to be in compliance with DOC 300.010 Behavior Observation.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>144. Person states that they called a female DOC staff member Sir by mistake and was given an infraction. Person sates that this staff member is aggressive, and they believe they are trying to mess with his time by giving him infractions.</p>	<p>Per DOC 460.140 E. Hearing Officers will consider only the evidence presented at the hearing and will determine if the evidence meets the preponderance of the evidence standard. 2. The Hearing Officer will specify on the record the evidence considered. The guilty finding for the infraction was upheld based on the individual’s testimony as well as that of DOC staff members.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>145. The incarcerated individual reports that since the mask mandate was lifted, DOC staff are still forcing him to wear a mask, even outside. He reports the other areas of the facility have Covid-19 positives, but he does not feel this should affect the area he is in.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by the DOC. The OCO reviewed the current WA State DOC Covid-19 Masking Guidance, and masks are required for the whole facility when there is a Limited Outbreak Status and/or Limited Outbreak Cluster in any area of the facility.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>146. Incarcerated individual reports he was terminated from behavior related programming and disagrees with the decision. The individual requests that the OCO review the termination and ask that DOC overturns the decision.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO verified the individual was terminated from the treatment program in compliance with DOC 570.000 Sex Offense Treatment and Assessment Programs. The OCO verified DOC transferred the individual to another facility where they will allow him to enter the program again.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>147. Patient reports delayed access to specialist appointments.</p>	<p>The OCO substantiated delayed scheduling and access to specialist appointments after reviewing the related resolution request and outreach to DOC. The individual was released from state to federal custody during the OCO investigation and the OCO does not have jurisdiction over federal detention centers.</p>	<p>Substantiated</p>
<p>148. Patient states he broke his foot and it took 20 days to get an x-ray from the time the injury was reported. He attended sick call and was treated for an infection and ordered an x-ray. The x-ray appointment was canceled due to quarantine status.</p>	<p>The OCO substantiated that the patient did face an extended delay in getting x-rays for the reported injury. COVID precautions for that time provided strategies for x-rays to continue to be available by local Health Services. Health Services management has reported this concern</p>	<p>Substantiated</p>

to be reviewed for process improvements. The OCO provided information to the patient on how to file a tort claim. Individuals who have been harmed or who have suffered a loss as a result of negligent actions by a state employee or agency can submit a tort claim to the Office of Risk Management (ORM). ORM is required by law (RCW Chapter 4.92) to receive these claims.

Olympic Corrections Center

<p>149. Person reported that the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) office is not taking and filing his PREA complaints. Person stated that this is retaliation from a PREA report he filed years ago, and that it's now impacting his Work Release and Graduated Re-entry (GRE).</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding DOC PREA policy and the individual's GRE denial. The OCO reviewed a resolution request from this individual that was sent to the PREA triage, but did not meet the standard for PREA complaints, and was refiled as a resolution request. DOC 490.800 PREA Prevention and Reporting Definitions (attachment 1) defines the actions that constitute a PREA complaint, and the OCO found that the PREA office reviewed and filed this individual's complaint in accordance with this policy. The OCO also reviewed this individual's denial of Work Release and GRE and found that he was denied due to valid security concerns, not related to a PREA complaint.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>150. Person states that their Graduated Reentry was denied.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to provide information regarding Graduated Reentry. Per DOC 390.500 II Eligibility C. Individuals who have already served time in partial confinement as a Community Custody Prisons or Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative reclassification, may not be eligible for placement or the full amount of participation time per statute. D. Previous jail time credit does not count toward the total confinement time requirement. The OCO was able to verify that the individual's Graduated Reentry was approved.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>151. Person reported being sent to Olympic Corrections Center (OCC) and being told to take a drug and alcohol evaluation there. Person reports no history of drugs on his record and says that people at OCC are forced into inpatient treatment.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed DOC records and could not substantiate that this individual was placed in a substance abuse treatment program. The OCO reviewed DOC records and verified the individual did have a history of substance use. DOC policy 580.000 states, "individuals whose initial screening result indicate the probability of substance use disorder may be assessed".</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>

Other

<p>152. Individual reports they are on a fixed income, and they are required to pay for</p>	<p>The OCO was able to provide information regarding resources to the individual about pay</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
---	--	-----------------------------

testing as a condition of release. Person is looking for resources to help with payments.

rates and getting fees waived for testing. Individual was instructed to contact their community custody officer to complete indigency approval for polygraph form.

153. Person reports feeling that her Community Corrections Officer and Supervisor do not have her personal safety and interests in mind with the decisions they are making for her life.	The OCO provided information about contacting the Community Custody Division at DOC. The OCO lacks jurisdiction over Community Custody Concerns.	Information Provided
--	--	----------------------

Reynolds – King County

154. Person reports being released to a DOC approved clean and sober house and had to pay rent in advance. After moving in, there were structural issues with the home and DOC pulled them out of that placement. The landlord is refusing the refund the rent they paid. Person also reports that the house was not appropriate for release, due to drug use at the house, and was still approved by DOC.	The OCO provided information about filing a tort claim. DOC 120.500 states “All incarcerated individual tort claims alleging personal property damage/loss must be filed by the individual with the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services (DES) Risk Management Division”. After this individual’s situation, DOC amended policy to require release addresses to be physically visited by DOC before approval for partial confinement.	Information Provided
--	---	----------------------

155. Person reports being released to a DOC approved clean and sober house and had to pay rent in advance. Person reports that he was not allowed to see the house before moving in. After moving in, there were structural issues with the home and DOC pulled him out of that placement. The landlord is refusing the refund the rent he paid. Person also reports that the house was not appropriate for release, due to drug use at the house, and was still approved by DOC.	The OCO provided information about filing a tort claim. DOC 120.500 states “All incarcerated individual tort claims alleging personal property damage/loss must be filed by the individual with the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services (DES) Risk Management Division”. After this individual’s situation, DOC amended policy to require release addresses to be physically visited by DOC before approval for partial confinement.	Information Provided
---	---	----------------------

Stafford Creek Corrections Center

156. The incarcerated individual reports negative treatment of his family during EFV’s including limiting meals and not allowing his family member access to important medication in a timely manner.	The OCO contacted the facility leadership to inquire about this concern. This individual had also filed a complaint with DOC Headquarters. The facility is fixing the issue for future visits and this individual received an apology letter from the Department.	Assistance Provided
---	---	---------------------

157. Incarcerated person has been housed in IMU for over 5 years with no pathway out.	The OCO had multiple conversations with the DOC Classifications Unit regarding housing for this individual. The DOC maintained that he was not safe in general population and they were following DOC 330.600. The OCO did ask the DOC to move this individual to priority an out of state transfer, if possible due to the length of time he had been housed in solitary confinement. He was accepted by another state and has now left Washington State.	Assistance Provided
---	--	---------------------

<p>158. Person reported an officer is targeting him with BOEs. He feels like the white guys on the unit are being treated differently and when he asked why the situation was different for those guys in the same situation, he was written another BOE saying the incarcerated individual was implying he was being racist.</p>	<p>This office reviewed the negative BOE and found that the staff member recorded an implied behavior when he stated the incarcerated individual called him a racist. Implied behaviors are not appropriate for BOEs. BOEs are to be factual and will not contain opinions, conclusions, conjecture, or judgements about the documented behavior per DOC 300.010. The BOE was edited to reflect the behavior. The OCO has received multiple complaints regarding the conduct of this specific staff member, and this office continues to report the concerns to the leadership team at this facility. The OCO could not substantiate white individuals are treated different on the unit as there has been an uptick in infractions and negative BOEs for many different people on the unit.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>159. Patient reports he is having issues accessing dental care through the Offender Paid Health Plan. He has attempted three times to get the process started and has been transferred each time, starting the process over. During this time he has been placed on a mechanical soft diet, causing him to lose weight quickly.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance by requesting Health Services management to make contact with the patient at the new facility to restart the process to access the Offender Paid Health Plan. The Health Services Manager agreed and offered to also educate the patient on the reasons the process has been delayed. The OCO confirmed the patient's diet is necessary due to his dental status.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>160. Patient reports a custody staff member told him that he could not have extra time to eat despite having an active Health Status Report (HSR) for extra time. The staff member contacted his provider and as a result his HSR was discontinued.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance by contacted the Health Services Manager and requesting they review the situation that resulted in the patient's Health Status Report (HSR) being discontinued. The patient now has the needed HSR and kitchen staff have been notified. The OCO also contacted the Correctional Program manager to inform them of the reported friction with staff and were told that new staff were educated on how the facility had been accommodating this person's needs in the past.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>161. The incarcerated individual reports that they should have been moved out of the IMU. They do not know why they are still in the IMU.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the IMU placement. His classification had changed, and he was housed in Ad-Seg awaiting transfer. The OCO did have safety concerns for the individual at the facility he was being transferred too and asked mental health to review for another placement. Mental health reported he was not interested in mental health services. He was then transferred and assaulted at the new facility. This resulted in another Ad-Seg placement. The OCO contacted DOC Classifications and asked if he could be</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>

considered for an override and transfer to a different facility. His new custody facility plan indicates he will be transferred to a medium facility.

162. Person reported difficulty with being able to see a medical provider. Person reported kiting medical several times and was told that he missed his call outs and no showed to appointments. Person wants to be seen by his provider.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. This individual called the OCO and informed the office that he was seen by his provider.	DOC Resolved
163. Person says that he uses a wheelchair and normally utilized the ADA access to the gym, but COVID shut it down and he must go to the gym with the rest of the unit. The problem is, he moves more slowly than everyone else and by the time he gets there the equipment is taken. He was advised by medical to exercise but it has been a year and a half, and he cannot exercise without getting to the gym first.	Verified with ADA coordinator that access to Limited Mobility Gym was not able to be arranged by DOC due to COVID and staffing issues related to COVID. Verified that as COVID restrictions were lifted Limited Mobility Gym is now available at the facility. Delay in availability was due to COVID restrictions and lack of staffing which have been resolved.	DOC Resolved
164. Individual reports they have been in administrative segregation for many days after an infraction. They would like to be released.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO was able to verify that this individual is no longer in administrative segregation.	DOC Resolved
165. Patient reports he was scheduled to see a urologist for the past four months and every time he was supposed to have an appointment it was cancelled. He reports it is difficult to talk to the specialist due to DOC not letting him communicate with the urologist. He says they are not telling him when he is going out due to security reasons, so he does not even know if he has an appointment scheduled.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted Health Services management and were informed the patient had been seen by the specialist for a procedure and has follow up scheduled.	DOC Resolved
166. Person reports feces and sewage water is backing up through their sink.	The OCO was able to provide information regarding this issue. A sergeant at DOC wrote up a work order for this issue. At the time the OCO reached out to DOC a plumber came in to fix the problem. The individual called into the hotline to verify that the issue had been addressed. The individual was advised that if they have any further issues to please follow the resolution process and contact the OCO after they have received a level two response.	DOC Resolved
167. Person states that they were charged \$8.00 for two copays. Person states they did not receive care at one visit and should not have been charged. Person does not feel	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO confirmed the individual was refunded one copay. Patient copays are outlined in DOC 600.025 Health Care Co-Payment Program.	DOC Resolved

that the incarcerated should be charged at all.

168. Person reports DOC lost his CPAP, he has an active Health Status Report until 07/2023. He says is being told he must buy a new CPAP on his own.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. OCO staff visited the patient and confirmed he has the CPAP machine.	DOC Resolved
169. A loved one reported that an incarcerated individual was given a urine analysis (UA) test and was treated unfairly.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information and shared with the individual how to file complaints with this office.	Information Provided
170. Person states they have medical and mental health issues that he believes should exclude him from working certain jobs. He states DOC staff are interfering with his access to Health Status Reports and is receiving poor treatment from their counselor. When he attempted to resolve through the resolution department, he was told the issue is not able to be grieved due to other avenues of resolution.	The OCO provided information about the pathway to request a different job placement. The OCO could not substantiate that DOC staff were interfering with the HSR process. The OCO contacted Health Service management it was noted that the patient does not have any documented diagnosis that would exclude him from working where he is assigned. OCO staff verified this information by reviewing the patient's health records.	Information Provided
171. Person states they do not have access Resolution Program to report staff conduct.	The OCO was able to provide information to the individual on how to report staff conduct concerns. The OCO was able to verify through the individual's counselor that they do have access to file grievances. Counselor stated the individual can ask officers, sergeants, or his counselor for the paperwork to file a grievance.	Information Provided
172. Patient states he is not able to access medical care for a chronic skin issue. He reports DOC is saying that he is refusing medical attention and staff are attacking him to prevent him from going to medical.	The OCO provided information regarding the steps taken to assist in the patient's resolution. The OCO has had multiple conversations with Health Services Management and DOC leadership regarding the patient's needs. OCO visited the patient on-site to attempt resolution. The OCO continues to be in conversation with DOC leadership to identify possible solutions for this patient.	Information Provided
173. Person submitted request for medication refill two days before the order expired. When he went to pick up the medication, he was told the order had expired and he could not have the medication. He is requesting to receive the medication.	The OCO provided information to the patient about medication delivery process. Patients are asked to submit refill requests seven days prior to order expiration or running out of the medication to give time for processing and shipping of the medication. The pharmacy is closed on state holidays when the request was submitted and was not able to be processed before the expiration date. DOC staff cannot issue medications whose orders have expired, regardless of the date of refill. The patient will need to request a new order from their provider.	Information Provided
174. The incarcerated individual reports that the new Securus tablets are not working,	The OCO provided information about Securus and their resolution requests. If individuals are	Information Provided

and DOC is listening to his calls or cutting them off. He also reports that DOC is hiding his resolution requests and sending him an empty envelope as a response.

having issues with the new tablets, they will need to report it to Securus and file a trouble ticket. The OCO verified that this individual has filed multiple Resolution Requests, and they have all been entered into the system. Per the Resolution Program Manual, only five Resolutions are allowed at a time.

<p>175. Person reported he has been denied Graduated Re-entry (GRE), but says meets the requirements, and should be eligible for electronic home monitoring. Person also reported concerns about his Good Conduct Time Restoration Pathway (GCTR Pathway) not being restored after an infraction was dismissed.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information about this individual's custody facility plan, classification status, and GRE policy. This individual is pending a classification promotion after an infraction was removed from his record which could make him eligible for GRE. The OCO also shared information about his GCTR Pathway.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>176. Person reported being served expired food, including expired and discolored meat, multiple times at Stafford Creek Correctional Center (SCCC), and said that staff are aware they are handing out expired food. Person reports talking to the resolutions department about it and that the issue was informally resolved. Person said he cannot afford commissary to supplement the food that is expired.</p>	<p>The OCO reached out to the food manager at SCCC. The food manager described the process that the food is made and frozen at Airway Heights Corrections Center's food factory and then shipped to SCCC. The food manager described that they changed the way they process certain meats that has given it a different color, and said that to alleviate concern, they have replaced that meat with turkey. The SCCC Superintendent also shared with the OCO that he spoke with Correctional Industries at Airway Heights and confirmed they are following USDA standards regarding frozen food storage and shipment. The OCO also reached out to the Assistant Director of Correctional Industries at AHCC, who clarified that the date printed on the meats and cheeses is a manufactured date, and the dates on products like cookies and crackers is a best-by date, not an expiration date. The OCO also spoke with the Operations Manager at AHCC, who confirmed that the USDA guidelines do not state a true expiration date for frozen food.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>177. Person reports they are under investigation and being held in the IMU. States they have not been given information on how long they will be in or where in the process the infraction that they are being investigated for is at. At the time of placing call to OCO contact states he had been in the IMU for 5 days with no information provided to him.</p>	<p>Individual was provided self-advocacy information twice via the hotline but did not file an appeal on the infraction. Individual was moved from IMU after conclusion of infraction hearing.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>178. Patient states he is not able to access medical care for a skin issue that started</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the steps taken to assist in the patient's resolution.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

months ago. He reports DOC is saying that he is refusing medical attention and staff are attacking him to prevent him from going to medical.

The OCO has had multiple conversations with Health Services Management and DOC leadership regarding the patient's needs. OCO visited the patient on-site to attempt resolution. The OCO continues to be in conversation with DOC leadership to identify possible solutions for this patient.

179. The incarcerated individual reports that his tablet from Securus is not working correctly. He can send out emails, but his family members cannot send emails back to him. This person reports that his family receives a response saying, "you are restricted from sending emails." This person submitted a help ticket and received a response back from Securus stating that he is restricted from accessing email because he is in the intensive management unit (IMU). This person also reports that he cannot access the music catalog previously available on his other tablet.	The OCO provided information about the new Securus tablets. The DOC reported that Securus fixed the messaging issue with individuals housed in the intensive management unit. They also reported that music would be downloaded in phases and should be completed by now. If this person does not have their music, they will need to submit a new trouble ticket with Securus.	Information Provided
180. The incarcerated individual reports that the Resolution Specialist is not investigating his resolution requests by not interviewing him before closing the resolution requests.	The OCO provided information regarding interviews of individuals for their resolution requests. Per page 8 of the Resolution Program Manual, "the Resolution Specialist is strongly encouraged to interview the individual at the time of the Level I review" per page 14, "Resolution Specialist will be strongly encouraged to conduct the required in-person interview during the Level I review prior to promoting the concern to a Level II. Resolution Specialists can mandate interviews at any or every level for Level 0–II reviews". The OCO found that the individual was interviewed by DOC staff investigating the resolution request which is not always the Resolution Specialist.	Information Provided
181. Incarcerated individual reports DOC staff confiscated two breakfast boats leaving him with no breakfast. The individual reports another incarcerated individual gave him his breakfast boat and DOC staff confiscated both. The individual reports harassment from staff after the incident are requests the OCO assist him in being assigned a new classification counselor and an apology from DOC.	The OCO provided information regarding options for accessing a new classification counselor and the findings of the OCO investigation. The OCO reviewed the DOC Resolution Program investigation and found DOC substantiated the concern and apologized for the incident. The OCO could not locate evidence to substantiate harassment from the individual's classification counselor. The OCO asked DOC leadership if they would consider assigning the individual to a new classification counselor, and they did not agree without moving the individual to a new unit. The	Information Provided

	OCO provided the individual with this information including his options for accessing a new classification counselor.	
182. Person states he was directed by an attorney to contact the OCO and The US Dept of health and human services, to report a potential HIPPA violation. There is only a 1-800 number provided which he is unable to call. Person states he needs an address because DOC staff are unwilling/unable to help.	The OCO provided information regarding how to write to the Office of Civil rights to report a HIPPA violation. The OCO provided information on how to contact the OCO if he would like the office to investigate this issue.	Information Provided
183. Patient reports that he had been recommended injection therapy by a specialist over a year ago. The patient received the first two injections and believes he should be receiving a third. When he requested the third injection, the request was denied in favor of the patient attempting physical therapy. The patient is requesting that he be allowed to receive the injections.	The OCO provided information regarding how his care plan will be developed with the specialist consult. The patient did not have an active prescription or Care Review Committee approval for the treatment requested. It was noted that the patient had received the full treatment series twice in the past, completing the orders. Any new outside treatment request, including repeat treatment, must be reviewed and approved by DOC and the requesting patient may have to attempt conservative treatment measures before advanced treatment will be approved.	Information Provided
184. Individual states they ordered commissary and was sent to the Intensive Management Unit. Person states someone signed for his commissary, and he wants a refund for the items he never received.	The OCO was able to provide information regarding the tort claim process. The OCO cannot provide help seeking financial compensation for this incident and provided information about filing a tort claim. RCW 4.92.100 states, "(1) All claims against the state, or against the state's officers, employees, or volunteers, acting in such capacity, for damages arising out of tortious conduct, must be presented to the office of risk management." DOC 120.500 states "All incarcerated individual tort claims alleging personal property damage/loss must be filed by the individual with the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services (DES) Risk Management Division".	Information Provided
185. Individual reports they are due for a Facility Risk Management Team review to receive custody points and be promoted custody.	The OCO was able to provide information regarding the Custody facility plan. The individual has a current plan in the system. The person will need to wait until after a Custody Facility Plan (CFP) is complete. The person will have 5 days to appeal the decision if they disagree with the outcome.	Information Provided
186. The incarcerated individual reports that DOC staff have discriminated against him and reports issues regarding his religious diet.	The OCO provided information regarding religious diets yet were unable to substantiate that DOC staff have discriminated against the individual. The OCO reviewed the individual's	Information Provided

diet requirements and spoke with the Food Services Manager at the facility. The specific religious diet the individual requests is not offered at WA DOC facilities, however, there are alternative diets that suit the individual's diet requirements. The OCO provided self-advocacy information and recommended the individual continue to work the chaplain and use forms DOC 20-428, Religious Diet Requests, and DOC 21-142, Religious Requirement Information Sheet.

<p>187. Person reports diagnosed medical condition that impacts speech. Person is having difficulty getting his pension from Pennsylvania and is unable to contact anyone with the company to get the issue resolved.</p>	<p>The OCO provided self-advocacy information regarding the facility ADA Coordinator and how to contact them for assistance. The OCO also provided information about requesting an access assistant. The person can also reach out to the communications coordinator at HQ.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>188. Incarcerated individual reports DOC approved but did not transfer money out to his family in 2021. The individual requests the OCO review the concern and ensure that his family receives the money.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information to the individual about what occurred in 2021 and the process for approving and transferring funds from an incarcerated individual's mandatory savings account to family. The OCO found the transfer request was initially denied, then was sent to the Associate Superintendent for further review. Before the Associate Superintendent made a final decision, the individual was transferred to another facility and therefore the approval process was halted. The individual would then need to request a funds transfer again at the facility they were transferred to, as the previous facility has no authority to allow the funds transfer. The OCO verified that funds were not taken from the savings account.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>189. Loved one expressed concern regarding an infraction an incarcerated individual received for a fight that occurred, but the loved one maintains that the individual was not involved in the fight, rather, they were attacked.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and requested photos of the injuries from DOC, but no photos existed. As there is no video of the incident and no photos of the injuries, it's not possible to determine who started the altercation.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>
<p>190. A loved one reports concern that an incarcerated individual is being transferred to Coyote Ridge Corrections Center. The loved expressed concern that this individual is being retaliated against due to the actions of his family member.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reached out to DOC staff at his previous facility and found that he was moved due to an ongoing confidential investigation that posed significant risk to him, and was transferred for valid safety concerns, not as an act of retaliation against the individual.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>

191. Patient reports he was left alone for an extended time on the hospital unit, after returning to the facility post-operation. He suffered an infection and now has healed improperly. He has requested to see another specialist and states that DOC is refusing to give him a second opinion.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the patient's medical records and confirmed patient assessments occurred within the timeframe ordered. The DOC provider submitted the request for a second opinion prior to OCO outreach. The OCO followed up with Health Services management on the results of that request which was declined by the outside clinic. OCO also verified the patient has received follow up specialist appointments related to this issue.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
192. Person reports that the facility's ARNP refuses to work and give him medical treatment for chronic care such as his prescribed medication. DOC policy states that the ARNP can treat mental health conditions and prescribe medications but she refuses to make an appointment to see him. He is requesting that Health Services management and Chief of Psychiatry be made aware of the provider's refusal of treatment.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted Health Services Management and informed them of the patient's concern. The OCO was informed the patient's medications are current and the patient is followed by their primary therapist and the psychiatrist who orders the mental health medications. The patient's medical provider is not responsible for adjusting mental health medications. The OCO also verified the patient was scheduled with his primary care provider for chronic care management.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
193. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about a facility transfer that did not consider their safety concerns.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan and do not find any evidence that they raised safety concerns related to a facility transfer. Additionally, since the individual has transferred, they have not filed any Resolution requests about safety concerns.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
194. The incarcerated individual reported that he was found guilty of an infraction when the Copal in his religious box tested positive for meth. The individual reports his Copal is tree sap, not drugs, and is used for Native American practices.	The OCO reviewed the evidence that was collected and determined that the Copal was tested twice with two different drug tests, and both times it tested positive for amphetamines. The religious coordinator also reported that incarcerated individuals should not have Copal. The OCO does not have the evidence to substantiate that this is not amphetamines.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
195. External person reported an incarcerated individual was denied use of a toilet in cell by staff member taking away his cell door key and DOC identification, she left them in her office, locked the door and left the area. Another staff member was able to get them, however he was infractioned over it and transferred.	The OCO reviewed this concern and verified this individual received a general infraction in November 2022 for not wearing his ID tag properly. He was transferred due to keep separate issues not because of infractions. The OCO could not find evidence to substantiate staff misconduct this concern.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

196. Incarcerated individual reports he was not provided food or proper responses to medical and mental health emergencies while in Close Observation Unit (COA).	The OCO reviewed the related incident reports (IMRS) and could not identify evidence to substantiate the concerns. DOC has since approved the individual for placement at the Special Offender Unit for access to more mental health services and staff. The OCO is planning a COA visit to review facility conditions in person.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
197. A loved one reported that an incarcerated individual was transferred to another facility while he was in the middle of finishing education and programming at his previous facility.	The OCO reached out to this individual's counselor at his new facility, and the counselor said the individual has not expressed concerns about programming, and that he's enrolled in education classes for the spring. The OCO verified that this individual was transferred and reclassified in accordance with DOC 300.380 Classification and Custody Facility Plan Review, and was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC.	No Violation of Policy
198. Person reports multiple infraction concerns. One infraction is for refusing a job assignment that he could not do because of disabilities, another for refusing transfer, and another for being accused of telling another person to make a threat.	The OCO reviewed the infractions and hearings listed in this concern. The DOC had evidence to substantiate the guilty finding. The individual was offered an ADA approved position that he declined, he did refuse a transfer and video evidence was presented to indicate he had asked another individual to provide false information for him. The OCO finds no violation of DOC 460.000. A guilty finding for an infraction is based on a some evidence standard.	No Violation of Policy
199. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about termination from GRE and not being able to appeal that decision as well as being held passed their earned release date (ERD).	The OCO investigated both concerns and was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 390.590(I)(D) an individual can be terminated from GRE administratively and there are no appeals to that decision. Per DOC policy 350.200(I)(B) an individual requiring an approved release address may be held to their max date until an approved address is secured.	No Violation of Policy
200. Person has complaints about the Resolution Program. Person states DOC does not follow timeframes given in the Resolution Program Manual.	The OCO was able to substantiate the concern regarding the Resolution Program timeframes. The OCO was able to verify that even when the individual was told they were outside of their timeframe appeals were still sent to headquarters for review. The Resolution Program is often outside of their timeframes. This is an issue statewide. The OCO was also able to verify that the Resolution Program was outside of the timeframe by one to three days in the situation the individual details.	Substantiated

<p>201. Person with complex medical issues reports that during cell-front pill line he was given another person's medications. Staff were aware this happened, admitted to the error. He kited the ARNP with the side effects and the response was that the nurse notified her of the error, and that there were no long-term effects expected from this error. She said she would get him into sick call if the effects continued, he went to sick call but she did not see him. He has filed a tort claim about this.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to substantiate the concern. The OCO contacted Health Services management for a review of the situation. DOC staff submitted a medication incident report upon discovery of the incident. The patient was monitored closely on the unit and the provider reviewed the records and determined there was no need for an appointment and that there would not be any long-term effects as a result of receiving a single dose of the medications. DOC has followed the protocol for reporting medication errors.</p>	<p>Substantiated</p>
---	---	----------------------

<p>202. The incarcerated individual reports that he sent a request for priority law library access but has not received a response to the request. The individual reports that he filed a Resolution Request regarding this and has not received a response. The individual says that he has a court deadline approaching and needs access to the law library.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. Due to the facility Covid-19 outbreak, there was limited access to law library resources and the facility only had a part-time law librarian. This office confirmed that the individual was able to file for two extensions for his court case which were granted due to limited law library access. The OCO confirmed that the DOC has implemented changes to ensure legal resources are made accessible, including the LexisNexis application which is currently available on individuals' tablets, and the facility hired a full-time law librarian.</p>	<p>Substantiated</p>
--	---	----------------------

<p>Washington Corrections Center</p>		
---	--	--

<p>203. External person reports this individual was moved to max custody and the out of state transfer list over an incident he claims he was not involved in. He was then infraacted six months later.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the incident this individual was accused of engaging in and reviewed the out of state transfer placement. After multiple meetings with the DOC HQ Classifications, this individual was taken off the out of state list. He was found not guilty of the infractions, and they have been removed from his record. He currently has a custody facility plan pending to promote out of Max custody.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
---	---	----------------------------

<p>204. Patient reports concerns about access to bladder surgery. He has requested release in order to access surgery in the community.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to provide assistance. This office contacted health services and confirmed the patient is now scheduled for a pre-surgical consult. The OCO added this case to the OCO appointment tracker to confirm occurrence or rescheduling. The OCO attempted a free, confidential phone call with the patient multiple times and the patient declined.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
---	---	----------------------------

<p>205. Individual reports DOC is not following policy by not allowing the population to shower for more than 3 days and not receiving clean clothes.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the resolution that was filed, and it indicated low staffing was the reason behind delayed showers. The OCO visited the facility and did a tour of the units to inquire if individuals were not getting showers. Incarcerated individuals indicated that delays</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
---	---	----------------------------

have happened in the past, however it is not an ongoing issue. Our office spoke with the Correctional Program Manager and Superintendent to ensure they are aware that this has been an issue.

<p>206. Individual reports he has requested mental health assistance and also reports that he had been hit by a car and was due to have surgery. Person stated he is currently using a catheter which is changed weekly and using a urine bag for urination. He states he is concerned about missing the needed surgery for the issue related to the catheterization and also concerned about not receiving mental health care while in prison.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to provide assistance. This office contacted facility health services and DOC agreed to send a mental health provider for a wellness check and reviewed the patient's access to mental health appointments. The Health Service Manager (HSM) also reviewed the patient's access to surgery. This office attempted a free, confidential phone call with the patient, and they declined the call, so self-advocacy information and other details were sent via closing letter.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>207. Patient states he has been trying to get in contact with mental health to adjust his medications but the providers have not been responding or coming around to check on him.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted Health Services management and confirmed the patient had been evaluated recently and medication changes were ordered.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>208. Individual states DOC has his sentence calculated wrong and he is not receiving credit for time he was in county jail.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. DOC supplied the individual with their time calculation and a breakdown of how the time was calculated. Felony conviction time does not start until an individual is assigned to a DOC facility.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>209. Person reports DOC authorized a surgery for this patient. He was transferred months ago and is waiting on an urgent consult and then surgery date. He has a history of being in a single cell, but WCC is placing him in a cell with another person. He needs a single cell to complete his personal care.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted Health Services management and were informed that patient has been approved by the Care Review Committee to be single cell assigned. The procedure the patient is requesting is approved, but the patient must complete a preliminary procedure that is scheduled already, per the specialist clinic. The patient will be scheduled for the requested procedure when the results of the first procedure have been received.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>210. The incarcerated individual reports that the DOC did not calculate all the credits for jail time served and reports that his release date is inaccurate.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The individual contacted DOC Records around the time he reported this concern to the OCO, and his credits were adjusted, and his Earned Release Date (ERD) was changed to reflect this. The individual has since been released.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>211. The incarcerated individual reports that the facility is not abiding by statewide Covid-19 policies, specifically related to</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the individual's facility being under one facility for outbreak guidelines. At the time the DOC</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

visitation. The individual reports that outbreaks will not affect or prevent visitation, but the facility is continuing to impose the same visiting restrictions under the old policy.

memorandum had been sent out, there was a current Covid-19 outbreak and the individual's facility was told by HQ that they are still under the previous Covid-19 guidelines based on the directive from HQ Clinical, which is that the facility is to follow the guidance that was in place at the time that the outbreaks were identified. The timeframe for outbreaks remains 20 days after the last positive is identified in that area. Any additional positives from those areas would extend that timeframe. An outbreak in one unit will impact visitation in all units in the facility.

<p>212. Person reports he was assaulted. He filed a grievance for DOC failing to protect him since he had been reporting safety concerns prior to the assault. He asked for a keep separate against the person who assaulted him. He is concerned about why no charges filed against the person who attacked him. There is also a general issue with people attacking prisoners who have sex offenses on their record.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed this concern and verified that this individual has been sent to a different facility and a keep separate was entered in the system. The Prosecutors Office in the County of where the assault occurred makes the decision to press formal charges, it is not a DOC decision. This office did give this individual information on how to file a tort claim to the Office of Risk Management if he believes he was harmed due to DOC staff negligence. The OCO has discussed the safety of individuals convicted of a sex offense with the leadership at the facility. The facility continues to attempt to mitigate these concerns.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>213. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about not being transferred to their home facility as DOC is saying they have a keep separate that is being investigated but does not believe they have a keep separate with anyone.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information to the individual about the DOC investigation. The OCO contacted DOC about the delayed facility placement and DOC confirmed that the delay is due to an investigation of a potential keep separate which the OCO verified is being investigated.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>214. Incarcerated individual reports he is not able to meet with Mental Health providers often enough to follow through on his treatment plan and it is impacting his eligibility for Graduated Re-Entry (GRE).</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the individuals status for GRE and how to reach out to mental health providers at the facility. The OCO did not receive a Release of Information from the individual which created a barrier to investigate the concern further. The OCO provided the individual with options to provide the OCO with a release for further investigations and provided the individual with self-advocacy information.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>215. Patient states he fractured a bone and was transferred when he should have had a medical hold. He was not given a shower chair or wheelchair until he fell. He is requesting follow up appointments with the provider.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information to the patient about health care access in the community now that he is out on GRE. The OCO reviewed the patient's resolution requests and noted that he chose to prioritize GRE access over having a medical hold placed for further imaging.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

<p>216. Incarcerated individual reports he applied for Graduated Re-Entry (GRE) but has not heard back since applying. The individual requests OCO's assistance in getting an answer from DOC about his GRE application.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding DOC's GRE application process and the delays in application review. The OCO found the incarcerated individuals GRE application was submitted four months prior to his Earned Release Date (ERD) which was not enough time to be approved currently due to the amount of GRE applications submitted. The individual is serving a relatively shorter sentence which creates a smaller time frame for DOC to review the GRE application. The OCO verified the individual has a planned release date and is releasing soon.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>217. Incarcerated individual reports they were strip searched by an officer of the opposite gender, which is a violation of policy.</p>	<p>The OCO provided the individual information about how to fill our DOC 04-420 Preference Request. The OCO found DOC was unaware of the individual's gender identity at the time of the search. This strip search prompted the process for the individual to explain to DOC how they identify. The OCO provided information about how to ensure DOC has their preference form and shared information about the current DOC process for cross gender strip searches.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>218. The incarcerated individual reports that his property was taken or lost during a cell search. The individual reports that the search report does not have the names of the officers who conducted the search. The individual reports that he needs this documentation in order to file a tort claim.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the cell search the individual reports concerns about. This office spoke with DOC staff and found that of the cells in the unit were searched by Special Teams due to behavioral issues in the unit. The individual was moved to another unit due to not complying with the search process and becoming confrontational with staff. The OCO verified the individual did not file a resolution request for his missing property until he was transferred to another facility. DOC staff report that Special Teams generally only do a search report if something was found or taken from the cell. The individual was given his property within three days of moving to another unit. The OCO provided information on filing a tort claim for his missing property and noted that because he was in a receiving unit, the only property allowed would be store items and the individual may include receipts for these purchases in his tort claim. The OCO shared that the individual can reach out to property and ask what items are there so that he can take next steps through the Department of Risk Management.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>219. Incarcerated individual reports a loved one was denied visits due to alleged charges in</p>	<p>The OCO provided information about the appeal process for visiting. The OCO verified the</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

another state. The individual reports that because their loved one was not charged, the other state reports there is no way to prove she was not charged. DOC is telling them the loved one will need to prove they were not charged in order to be approved for visiting.

individuals loved one did not appeal the visitation denial. The OCO provided information to the individual about to have their loved one file an appeal to the visitation denial.

<p>220. The incarcerated individual reports that the medical provider for the Medication Assisted Treatment (MAT) program wrote a prescription for nine months of Sublocade injections. He has since been transferred to a different facility that is trying to cancel this order, citing that they are tapering him from Suboxone.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information about the MAT program. This person received a nine-month prescription of Sublocade injections because he came into the facility on a community custody revocation. At that time, it was not certain how long he would be in the physical custody of the DOC. He was reclassified and given a sentence of longer than six months, so they began tapering him off the medication.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>221. Person reported having is transfer deferred and sent to the receiving unit for several months due to an infraction, but still has minimum custody points. Person reported that he was supposed to be transferred and that no one has told him what is going to happen next. Person reports that he is on 23-hour lockdown in receiving, even though he has minimum custody points.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding his upcoming transfer. The OCO reached out to DOC and discussed the circumstances regarding this individual's being in R unit, and DOC detailed multiple factors that have the delayed the transfer process. The OCO was able to confirm this individual will be transferred soon and shared that information with the individual.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>222. A loved one reported that an incarcerated individual is serving time for possession charges, and that because of the Blake decision, if DOC removed that charge, it would change his facility placement.</p>	<p>The OCO provided the individual with information about kiting records and filing a resolution request regarding his sentence structure.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>223. The incarcerated individual reports that DOC continues to ignore his requests for mental health treatment.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO confirmed six mental health and psychiatry appointments in 2023, including a full mental health assessment. DOC reports the patient reported not wanting a defined treatment plan at their most recent appointment and would kite if they felt they required services.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>
<p>224. Person reports he is having trouble accessing the process to order personal shoes. He has attempted to order personals shoe but was told he needed a podiatrist's signature. The patient feels he is being discriminated against because people of other races are able to get their personal shoes ordered quickly, but his request was routed through medical because he has foot and ankle issues.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO verified DOC has provided the patient with medical shoes. If the patient feels those shoes are not adequate, he can pursue a podiatry consult through the Offender Paid Health Plan (OPHP) and request the shoes recommended by the specialist be approved for use within DOC. The OCO provided information to the patient about the process to purchase personal shoes through the Offender Paid Health Plan (OPHP).</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>

Alternatively, the patient may order shoes from Union Supply Catalog for personal use.

<p>225. Incarcerated individual reports DOC staff have retaliated against him after filing a resolution request about staff misconduct. The individual reports he was employed in an area that the staff was supervising, and the staff was inappropriate towards him. The individual was terminated from the employment but was hired at another position in the same area. The staff member found out about the individual's new employment, and the individual was directed to lay-in from his position until his upcoming Facility Risk Management Team (FRMT) meeting. The individual reports that he was terminated without grounds to terminate him from the position and requests the OCO recommend that the employment program be run by the Agriculture Department.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the timeline of events and found that the individual stopped going to the job with the staff member he was concerned about without following the rules to lay in or leave the position. The individual was terminated from the position as a result of not attending work. The individual filed the resolution request after the termination occurred and DOC investigated the incident. DOC found that the individual then was employed in the same area without the DOC hiring staff following the proper protocol and DOC staff immediately directed the incarcerated individual to lay-in, as they were investigating the staff conduct concern in that area. The OCO finds the timeline does not substantiate retaliation. The OCO shared information with the individual how the program run and by which organizations.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>
<p>226. Patient reports DOC medical suggested segregation in response to a medical emergency.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate the concern. This office contacted the facility Health Service Manager (HSM) and discussed DOC response to medical emergency. Patient was assessed by medical during the medical emergency, sent to the local hospital for additional testing and treatment, and seen by medical for follow up appointment. The patient has been scheduled with a GI specialist and provided Health Status Reports (HSRs) and treatment options while awaiting the specialist appointment. The OCO also reviewed the related Incident Management Reporting System (IMRS) and IMU placement history and could not identify evidence to substantiate medical responded to the emergency with a referral to or placement in segregation. The patient is scheduled with DOC for an additional follow up prior to scheduled specialist appointment and can kite medical to be seen sooner if needed.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>
<p>227. Person reports that he has an injury that is not properly medicated for the pain. Person wants to be seen by an outside provider but was denied because he is housed in the Intensive management Unit.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO was not able to substantiate that the patient's assigned housing unit was a factor in the medication denial. OCO staff contacted Health Services management who informed this office that the patient has a current pain management plan. The request was made for a specific type of</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>

	medication for pain management and was denied by the Care Review Committee. The OCO encouraged the patient to keep their provider updated with any changes in symptoms so the treatment plan can be updated accordingly.	
228. Person reported a verbal altercation between himself and a DOC staff about the use of the phone in the dayroom. Person said the staff spoke to him unnecessarily aggressively and that he was subsequently infraacted.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed DOC records and found no infraction for this person from this incident.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
229. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about being denied a staff advisor during an infraction hearing.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reached out to DOC regarding the infraction and whether the individual was given a staff advisor, DOC said the individual did not request a staff advisor as seen on the notice of hearing form. Additionally, DOC stated even if the individual had requested a staff advisor, they would have been denied this request as the individual did not qualify as they read/write/speak English, is articulate in their writing and speaking as evidenced through the appeals and other correspondences and is fully capable of navigating a disciplinary hearing on their own.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
230. Person reports he is being held past his Earned Release Date (ERD) and needs an approved release address and will be on supervision upon release. Person reports that he was told when he signed paperwork in jail, he would not need supervision upon release.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed this individual's Judgement and Sentencing documentation and verified that he was ordered by the courts to have an approved address upon release and required to be on supervision. DOC 350.200 I. B. states "Individuals requiring an approved release address may be held in confinement up to the Max Ex date until an approved release address is secured". The OCO also verified that this individual's counselor is actively working on getting an approved address for release.	No Violation of Policy
231. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet as well as accompanying documents and found there is evidence to substantiate the infraction.	No Violation of Policy
232. Incarcerated person is asking for an override to a lower custody facility where he will be able to program.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC, per DOC 300.380 Classification and Custody Facility Plan Review.	No Violation of Policy

<p>233. Incarcerated individual reports him and his loved one have been denied Extended Family Visiting (EFV). The individual reports DOC denied them EFV's due to "domestic violence indicators" that he reports are not accurate. The individual requests OCO review the EFV denial and recommend the denial be overturned by DOC.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the individuals EFV denial documentation and found DOC denied the EFV due to DOC 590.100 Extended Family Visiting which states, "An individual with any documented history/indicator of domestic violence will be excluded from EFV privileges with the following: a. The victim of the documented domestic violence, and b. Persons with a like relationship to the individual as a victim (e.g., individuals who assaulted a spouse/state registered domestic partner, intimate partner) will be precluded from visits with a spouse or state registered domestic partner." The OCO verified the individual does have domestic violence indicators related to another person the individual was in a like relationship with.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>234. Person reported filing a resolution request in June 2022, which was escalated to level 2 in September of 2022. Person appealed the level 2, and it was never escalated to level 3, and the person has not heard any response since then.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO reviewed the resolutions request and the Level 1 response and saw that the individual filed a resolution request regarding the lack of response in March 2023. The OCO reached out to the Associate Superintendent of Washington Corrections Center, who stated that the response was now ready and would be given to the individual. This office verified that this resolution has now been escalated to Level 3. The OCO substantiated that the resolution request was severely delayed.</p>	<p>Substantiated</p>
<p>235. Person reported that they were sent to a different unit for COVID-19 quarantine and that this unit did not have a covered shower area for transgender or non-binary individuals. Person reported that DOC was made aware of their request for a separate shower time and that this request was not accommodated.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO reviewed DOC documents and found that the resolutions program substantiated this concern and committed to review DOC 490.700 Transgender, Intersex, and/or Non-Binary Housing and Supervision Policy with staff in the unit, and that this issue is being currently reviewed by DOC Headquarters. DOC 490.700 VII. A. states, "Transgender, intersex, and/or non-binary individuals may shower separately if requested by the individual or deemed necessary due to safety and security concerns". The OCO also verified that this individual is no longer in the COVID-19 quarantine unit.</p>	<p>Substantiated</p>
<p>236. Individual reports their mother recently passed, and they were able to have a Zoom death bed visit. Individual states, the zoom</p>	<p>Issue was sent to DOC Deputy Director, and he verified that policy was not being interpreted correctly, and that the individual should be able</p>	<p>Substantiated</p>

visit was in lieu of in person death bed visit, and he is being told that they cannot submit a form to request to attend their mother's funeral because they had the zoom death bed visit. Individual says that DOC staff they talk to tell them that death bed visits and funerals are usually one or the other but virtual visits should not have the same limitations. DOC staff continue to refuse to accept a second packet to assess if they should be able to have the funeral visit. Individual states they have complied with DOC requests and have no infractions and would like to go to their mother's funeral.

to have both a virtual deathbed visit and in-person funeral visit as the only one is in-person and the other is virtual. Unfortunately, the funeral for this individual's mother already took place. DOC Deputy Director reports that this issue has highlighted an issue that he will take up with Superintendents across DOC facilities to ensure policy is followed correctly going forward.

Washington Corrections Center for Women

237. Patient reports ongoing concussion symptoms related to an injury that occurred in prison. The patient is requesting additional testing.	The OCO was able to provide assistance. This office contacted health services for more information about the patient's assessments and follow up. After reviewing the relevant DOC Health Service protocols, the OCO asked about a mental health referral for TBI assessment as outlined in protocol. DOC agreed and submitted a referral to mental health for further assessment.	Assistance Provided
238. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about continuous problems with a former cellmate that resulted in an infraction.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed the individual's disciplinary record and found no infractions matching this description. As a result, it appears DOC dismissed the infraction.	DOC Resolved
239. Patient reports being refused an MRI during an offsite appointment due to safety concerns.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The appointment was cancelled due to safety concerns about self-reported symptoms. DOC staff reviewed the patients records for contraindications and are working with the imaging clinic to reschedule the patient's appointment.	DOC Resolved
240. Individual reports they are pregnant and at risk of bodily harm from roommate after comments that were made. would like to be moved or have roommate moved.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO was able to see the individual met with their counselor and discussed the courtesy room move process. The OCO advised the individual if they do not feel the issue has been resolved to contact the OCO office.	DOC Resolved
241. Person reports that she went to court and the judge signed an immediate release order. Judge said she's served all her time and she's now 9 months past her max date.	The OCO verified she was released the day after the concern was filed.	DOC Resolved

<p>242. Patient has been requesting an MRI for a year after suffering a fall from the top bunk. She was told she does not meet the criteria for a low bunk HSR as well and was prescribed Physical Therapy and medication for treatment. She is requesting an MRI and a low bunk HSR as well as a different provider.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted Health Services management and were informed that the patient had declined several scheduled appointments with Physical Therapy and had been discontinued from the treatment plan. The orthopedic specialist was consulted, and it was determined that an MRI was not clinically indicated. The patient must attempt conservative treatment measures before an MRI would be an appropriate intervention. DOC has scheduled the patient back with the physical therapist upon her request. The patient's care has been referred to the Facility Medical Director.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>243. Patient reports she has not been cleared by her surgeon to return to work, but DOC is forcing her to return anyway. She states she has attempted to resolve the issue through the resolution department and kiting medical. Medical told her she would have to wait for her primary provider appointment to request the Health Status Report. The patient also reports she has received infractions for not going to work.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed the patients records and found there is an active Health Status Report for no work until evaluated. There are no infractions on file for the patient not going to work.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>244. Person reported not getting credit for time she spent in county jail in the calculation of her sentence structure. Person said her attorney has faxed over records of the time she has already served.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information about contacting the Records Department at DOC Headquarters to address the issues with her time calculation.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>245. External person called to get self-advocacy information about the OCO as well as internal DOC resolution process for an issue that is impacting a unit at WCCW. Person said there is a staff member instructing a male officer to go into the rooms and showers of women at WCCW and people are concerned about retaliation if they report the issue.</p>	<p>The OCO provided the caller with self-advocacy information about the OCO online complaint form, internal DOC resolution process, Superintendent contact information, and next steps for addressing a concern at WCCW impacting multiple women in a unit. The person thanked the OCO for the information and said they would follow up if needed and pass along the self-advocacy information to their loved one.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>246. The incarcerated individual reports that she had to move cells due to issues with her cellmate, but she is in a wheelchair and the cell she was moved to was not an ADA cell.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the current requirements for an ADA cell assignment. The individual's HSR and facility codes reflect some limitations of mobility, so the individual's wheelchair is only required for long distances. Based on the individual's mobility, the wheelchair may be parked outside of the cell. If the individual's mobility changes, she may contact the medical provider to be screened for an ADA cell. If an ADA cell is recommended, the</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

	individual may bring this to unit staff who should accommodate the recommendation.	
247. Incarcerated individual reports retaliation after PREA and an increase in infractions	The OCO reviewed the infractions named in the concern. This individual was given general infractions for being out of bounds, which escalated to serious infractions when they were found out of bounds again. The issuance of the infractions is within DOC 460.000. This office could not substantiate an intentional, adverse action taken against this individual for their good faith participation in the resolution program, filing a lawsuit, making a complaint, or other legally protected action or their involvement in any investigation or review. The OCO could not find sufficient evidence that indicates retaliation or targeting based on the narratives of these infractions	Information Provided
248. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about someone threatening their life and lunging at them with a weapon.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reached out to DOC to discuss this concern and confirmed the situation is being investigated by the facility. At the completion of the investigation, the OCO reviewed DOC's findings which concluded that a keep separate was not appropriate for the situation given the lack of evidence of the concern the individual reported. DOC also offered the individual protective custody, but they declined.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

Washington State Penitentiary

249. Patient reports the facility will not allow him to use a glucose machine and insulin pump due to safety and security concerns.	The OCO was able to provide assistance. This office contacted health services and after confirming a referral was placed for this item, DOC agreed to submit an order for an insulin pump and is awaiting approval at the facility level. Then the order will go to DOC HQ for purchasing and will take at least 30 days for the item to arrive. The OCO later confirmed the insulin pump was approved at the facility and the order was sent to HQ.	Assistance Provided
250. The incarcerated individual is requesting assistance to preserve video evidence of an incident involving a DOC staff member but their request was not met. The individual reports that DOC staff discussed their juvenile records with others.	The OCO provided assistance. The incident the individual reported involved DOC staff speaking with other incarcerated individuals, and because video does not have audio recordings it would not be able to substantiate the individual's concern. The OCO reviewed the individual's records and found that there was a juvenile record file accessible to DOC staff. This office spoke with DOC HQ staff who reported that the record should not be accessible to DOC custody	Assistance Provided

staff and removed access to it. The individual was transferred to another facility, but the OCO asked that he contact this office if this issue is ongoing.

<p>251. Incarcerated individual reports staff confiscated his legal documents to test the paper for contraband. The individual reports that DOC has had the documents for close to a month and has not been provided them back. The individual reports he requires the documents for a hearing in the near future.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. The OCO alerted DOC of the concern and inquired about when the individual would receive their legal documents back. A few days later, DOC issued the individual his documents and were unaware of any court hearing needing to be met.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>252. Patient reports DOC custody staff removed the metal piece in the wrist brace that was provided from medical.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to provide assistance and substantiate this concern. The OCO contacted health services and substantiated that a brace had been issued by medical and custody staff later removed the metal piece due to “safety and security” concerns. The OCO requested medical assess if the brace meets the patient’s needs without the metal support, and DOC confirmed the brace no longer met the medical need after custody removal of the metal support. After OCO outreach, DOC agreed to order a new brace for the patient that meets his medical needs as well as facility security requirements. This office confirmed the brace was ordered.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>253. External person reports their loved one was diagnosed with cancer two years ago and has not received medical treatment.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. DOC contacted the OCO after this was reported and informed this office that the patient has been seeing his provider regularly and had an appointment pending in the near future.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>254. Person reported that he was transferred to Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) from Cedar Creek Corrections Center and that only two of his five boxes of property got to him. Person reported that DOC took all his legal work, personal journals, receipts for grievances and kites, as well as his typewriter.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reached out to WSP staff who confirmed that this individual did receive his missing property. The OCO also reviewed letters between the individual and DOC Headquarters that confirmed he received his property and withdrew his resolution request.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>255. Individual reports they are missing property.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern. Per phone conversation update with the individual, they reported that they had received their property.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>256. Incarcerated individual reports programming staff at the facility are often not available facilitate programming. The individual reports the programming is required to be moved out of the Intensive</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO spoke with DOC staff who shared that there were a few days in which programming was cancelled due to staff absence however this did not affect</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>

	Management Unit (IMU) and the lack of staffing is prolonging this process.	program completion. The individual has since completed the program and DOC is in the process of transferring him out of IMU.	
257.	Person reports they transferred units and have not received their property. They have sent kites and filed a grievance but have not received a response.	DOC staff resolved this concern. Per phone update with the individual, they did receive their property.	DOC Resolved
258.	Person reported receiving an incoming mail rejection notice and stated that he wants to send the rejected mail to his son. Person has sent kites and kiosk messages to the mailroom stating this, saying that he does not want DOC to destroy the mail, and has not heard back from the mailroom. Person states that DOC did not provide a form to state what he wants done with the mail.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed the mail rejection and the individual's kite to the mailroom and found that DOC did send the rejected mail to the individual's son.	DOC Resolved
259.	Individual states they are in a cell with no electricity and unable to charge their tablet. Person was moved from another facility and current facility will not restore his maximum custody levels.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. Via hotline communication the individual let the OCO know they had been moved to a different cell, received their custody level back and their tablet back.	DOC Resolved
260.	Person states it has been three months since they were transferred, and they have not received their property from previous facility.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO was able to verify that an informal resolution was made March 2023. The individual was advised to complete a postage transfer and have their counselor send it to the property Sergeant at the previous facility.	DOC Resolved
261.	Person expressed concerns regarding the lack of mental health care he is receiving, he does not get along with the current provider. DOC is refusing to let him see someone else.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted Health Services management and was informed that DOC has already assigned the patient to another Mental Health provider.	DOC Resolved
262.	Incarcerated individual reports programming staff at the facility are often not available facilitate programming. The individual reports the programming is required to be moved out of the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) and the lack of staffing is prolonging this process.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO spoke with DOC staff who shared that there were a few days in which programming was cancelled due to staff absence however this did not affect program completion. The individual has since completed the program and DOC is in the process of transferring him out of IMU.	DOC Resolved
263.	loved one submitted complaint stating their incarcerated loved one is facing Discrimination	The OCO provided information regarding what administrative remedies need to be followed before the OCO is able to investigate a complaint. Since the complaint was filed by an outside source an Ombuds Review Form was included with the letter in order to gather more information.	Information Provided

264.	Person reported he has been in his unit for a month, and he has not been assessed regarding what job opportunities are available to him. Person wants to know his job and programming opportunities.	The OCO provided information about kiting his counselor or the Correctional Unit Supervisor (CUS) and filing a resolution request. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Information Provided
265.	Person is diabetic and has multiple new and continuing concerns about delays or denied healthcare. Person reports missing insulin shots due to DOC short staffing and has not been scheduled for laser surgery for over 20 months. He also reports not being seen following a head injury in county jail.	The OCO contacted health services to request information about the patient's testing, treatment, and appointments after the individual returned to the facility from court. DOC reports the individual is scheduled for an ophthalmology consult and follow ups. This office added the consult to our appointment tracker and confirmed it occurred and a consult report was sent back to facility health services. The OCO also requested more information about the patient's insulin access and confirmed current access at the facility. The reported head injury and related Health Status Reports (HSRs) occurred at a county jail, which the OCO does not have jurisdiction over. The OCO provided the individual with tort claim information since the requested resolution was financial compensation.	Information Provided
266.	Person reported receiving a letter from DOC Records updating his Early Release Date (ERD) and added an extra year to his sentence.	The OCO provided information encouraging this person to contact the DOC contract attorney, file a Resolution Request, and send a kite to the Records department.	Information Provided
267.	Person reports the address they submitted for release was denied. Would like information on how to appeal this decision.	The OCO was able to provide information regarding appeals for denied release plans. Per DOC 350.200 VI (A) Appeals may be submitted within 10 business days of receiving notice of the denied release plan or county of origin determination, including the reason and any additional information, to the Assistant Secretary for Reentry at P.O. Box 41126, Olympia, WA 98504-1126	Information Provided
268.	Incarcerated individual reports that another individual threatened him while they were having yard together. The individual reports that he is concerned at the way the person threatened him and does not want to fight the other person.	The OCO provided information to the individual about how to report a concern with another incarcerated individual. The OCO reached out to DOC staff who had no knowledge of any altercations with between the two individuals. The OCO explained to the individual how to report concerns with other incarcerated individuals to DOC and recommended the individual share these concerns with unit staff to be addressed at the lowest level possible.	Information Provided

269.	Person reported being hit in the face with a softball and getting a surgery a week later. Person expressed thinking DOC slow walked the surgery because they didn't want to pay for it the night it happened. Person reported medical took five of his teeth without his permission during the surgery, and that he wants DOC to pay for the implants to replace his teeth.	The OCO provided information regarding the DOC dental plan, which does not include implants. This individual will have to use his offender paid health plan if he wants implants. The OCO also shared information about filing a tort claim if he is seeking compensation for delayed care.	Information Provided
270.	Incarcerated individual reports the Indeterminate Sentencing Review Board (ISRB) continues to deny him release due to racial discrimination and because the individual files many complaints through the resolution program, the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) reporting system and the courts. The individual reports that his mail is also not getting the destination he is mailing to and requests the OCO assist in ensuring the mail get to the recipient.	The OCO provided the individual with information about the findings of the OCO investigation. The OCO reviewed the individuals recent ISRB hearing documents and found no evidence to substantiate the ISRB denied him release based on race or due to the number of complaints he files through different avenues. The OCO shared with the individual the reasons for the denial of release and shared with him next steps available to him to take that may improve his chances of release at the next ISRB hearing. The OCO verified that DOC staff resolved the mail concern with the individual.	Information Provided
271.	Loved one expressed concern about an incarcerated individual having received an infraction and then being kept in The Intensive Management Unit (IMU) with no clothing or running water.	The OCO met with facility leadership to discuss these concerns. Upon admittance to IMU, the individual received their full issue of bedding/clothing. The OCO confirmed that there was running water in cell. The phone banks are located in an outside area within the IMU. The OCO could not substantiate evidence that this individual was forced to make phone calls without clothing or that they were housed naked. The OCO also reviewed the infraction narrative and video of the incident and find there is evidence to substantiate the infraction.	Information Provided
272.	Individual requested information regarding Senate Bill 6164.	The OCO provided information regarding Senate Bill 6164. The individual was interested in information within the bill that could be used to petition the court for resentencing.	Information Provided
273.	Incarcerated individual reports he has been housed in Closed Custody at Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) and states he asked for protective custody placement. The individual wrote a statement yet was placed in general population even though he does not feel safe. The individual states his release date is near and does not want to release from the Intensive Management	The OCO provided information to the individual about requesting protective custody. The OCO verified DOC did place the individual in protective custody as a result of some of the requests. Other times DOC could not verify the concerns and shared that with the individual. The individual has also been working with mental health staff at the facility and has been placed in the Close Observation Area (COA) based on the mental health concerns verified by	Information Provided

Unit (IMU) as it is bad for his mental health.

staff. The OCO shared with the individual the process for requesting protective custody and what information DOC need to grant it. The OCO also provided information about placement options for him until his release.

274.	Person says it has been four months since he has been able to meet with a provider. Patient has written numerous kites about treatment for cancer. DOC has not supplied him with Psyllium. He says he is choking because his stomach valve is not functioning.	The OCO investigated these issues without a level I grievance due to the medical concerns reported and provided information to the patient regarding following up after a level I grievance if he is still concerned about medical care. DOC confirmed the patient has been seen by a provider in the past 30 days, Psyllium is prescribed, and PSA testing showed normal results and no diagnosis of cancer. The patient has not reported choking or stomach valve issues during appointments with providers and the OCO encouraged the patient to kite or sign up for sick call to discuss his recent concerns. The patient is also being considered for SAGE placement for on-going long-term care.	Information Provided
275.	Person reported that Washington State Penitentiary is refusing to give the new mattresses that were approved by DOC Headquarters to the minimum custody population.	The OCO provided information that production for the mattresses was stalled, and that it will resume soon.	Information Provided
276.	Incarcerated individual reports they cannot be housed at a certain facility due to a staff assault, however DOC keeps trying to send them there. He fears for his safety at this facility and has been treated poorly there in the past.	The OCO verified with DOC HQ that there is a prohibited placement in effect at the facility until 2054.	Information Provided
277.	The incarcerated individual reports that he was charged for a Public Disclosure Request (PDR) from the OCO and received a letter for the first installment but did not receive the documents. He has since received a letter stating that his second installment was ready to be charged, but he still has not received the first. This individual believes that DOC is withholding the mail sent to him by the OCO.	The OCO provided information to this person about their public records request. During a phone call with the individual, this office was able to establish that this person has received the only public records installment the OCO has fulfilled. The OCO verified that this person is due to receive a second installment later this week and communicated this information to the individual.	Information Provided
278.	Incarcerated individual reports DOC management has taken over the job assignments, access to unit programs and property distribution in the unit he is housed in and reports the staff is bias. The individual reports if the staff member does not treat individuals fairly	The OCO provided information regarding how job assignments are issued. The OCO spoke to DOC staff about job determinations and verified that several factors are considered for job placement including relevant experience, security concerns, programming needs and the time when the individual was referred for	Information Provided

and if the staff dislikes an individual they will not be hired for a job or get their property.

employment. The OCO found that currently individuals in close custody have a six to nine month wait time to be placed in employment due to the factors associated with safe job placement. The OCO also reviewed the DOC investigation regarding the individual's property and found DOC recommended he file a tort claim to possibly be compensated for the lost items. The OCO explained to the individual how to file a tort claim through the department of enterprise services.

279.	Person reported that DOC staff threw away his property and he requested information about how to obtain copies of his past grievances.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information over the hotline about how to request records from DOC.	Information Provided
280.	The individual reports that staff is opening letters from the OCO because incarcerated individuals work there. DOC staff told this person that letters must be checked if they are coming from the OCO office.	The OCO provided information about the mailroom. This office followed up with the facility, and the DOC reported that no one is opening mail sent to incarcerated individuals from the OCO. DOC Leadership mentioned they would also follow up with unit staff regarding the process for OCO mail.	Information Provided
281.	Person stated that he mailed his old JPay tablet to his family and that it hasn't gone out. Person said he bought the tablet, and that it was not owned by Securus. Person said DOC told him to contact FedEx, but he has not gotten the receipt that FedEx received it.	The OCO reviewed this individual's resolution requests and DOC's responses, as well as reached out to the facility's mailroom and property room. The property room confirmed that all old JPay tablets have been sent to Securus to be cleared of data and reprogrammed, and that it is Securus' responsibility to distribute the old tablets to individual's families. The OCO provided this information to the individual.	Information Provided
282.	Patient states that his resolution request response did not address his request for medication and did not receive a response for an extended amount of time. The individual is requesting a specific long term medication treatment as remedy to the grievance of his medical care.	The OCO provided information regarding the medication the patient is requesting, that medication not clinically indicated for long term use. The OCO requested DOC Health Services management send the patient the related Health Services/Pharmacy protocol for that type of medication so the patient understands why it was declined. The OCO substantiated the level 1 resolution responses was outside of DOC timelines, it did not impact the result of the resolution process. The OCO verified the patient has been offered alternative treatment for the issue.	Information Provided
283.	Anonymous person reported an increase in staff assaults due to staff behavior towards the population.	The OCO contacted leadership at this facility to discuss the concern and the recent staff assaults.	Information Provided

284.	Person reported filing a resolution request and that the resolutions coordinator told him that he was not going to help him and to stop complaining. Person also reported that his resolution requests are not being responded to.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed all this individual's resolution requests on file for 2023 and found that they had been responded to and could not find any statement in writing telling this individual to stop complaining.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
285.	Person reports they had to complete a urinalysis and they asked DOC to send it to the lab. DOC stated they do not send them to the lab. Person was told there is a form to be filled out to get the urine sample sent to lab. The urine sample had been disposed of and was unable to be tested. The individual states they filed a grievance and written up a month later.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO was unable to prove that this individual asked for the urine sample to be sent to the lab. The individual did not file an appeal for this issue.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
286.	Person reported being classified as medium but was put into a close custody unit. Person stated that he told DOC he didn't want to go to this unit, and that he was infraacted after getting there, and that because of those infractions he can't get transferred to the unit he wants to be in. Person expressed that he feels DOC set him up for failure.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed DOC records and saw that this individual was placed in a unit that has mixed custody levels but is not a close custody unit. The OCO informed the individual that once the hearings occur, he can appeal the infractions and contact the OCO if he has concerns about the outcome of the appeals. The OCO confirmed that DOC classified and moved this individual in accordance with DOC 300.380 Classification and Custody Facility Plan Review Policy.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
287.	Incarcerated individual reports another incarcerated individual attacked him and he suffered medical events after the assault. The individual reports DOC is not providing him with medical and dental care and the attack further exacerbated his medical issues.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO was unable to substantiate an assault occurred. The OCO reviewed incident reports related to the individual and could not find anything in recent years. The OCO also spoke with DOC staff and requested any information about recent assaults and DOC informed OCO they were not aware of any assault occurring. The OCO verified the individual has been seen by medical multiple times in recent weeks and is receiving medical care.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
288.	Person reported concern with being put on mainline at Washington State Penitentiary (WSP), when he has protection and security concerns for his own safety. Person said he has requested Safe Harbor but was denied.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO verified that the Max Custody Committee met and discussed this individual's placement and could not validate security concerns at WSP and will not move him to Safe Harbor. The OCO reviewed DOC records and could not find evidence that this individual is currently having safety concerns at WSP.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

289.	Patient reports that the DOC optometrist and outside eye clinic are refusing to schedule a repeat eye surgery. If the DOC optometrist and the outside clinic do not agree to schedule the procedure he is requesting that the OCO file criminal negligence charges and remove their medical licenses.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the patient's medical records, including consult reports from the ophthalmologist. There was no indication in the records that a second surgery was planned. If there is no clinical indication for a procedure, the DOC cannot schedule the procedure. The OCO does not have authority to charge any provider with criminal negligence or take away medical licenses. The OCO also does not have jurisdiction over the outside medical clinic.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
290.	The incarcerated individual reports that he was put in for a chemical dependency evaluation and treatment but there are no drug or alcohol related details in his judgement and sentencing (J&S).	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. Policy 580.000 Substance Use Disorder Treatment Services does not require drug or alcohol evaluation and treatment be explicitly required in a J&S. The OCO provided this policy information and how to review central file via health services kite. The OCO reviewed the person's assessments and self-reporting indicates history of substance use.	No Violation of Policy
291.	Person states they were put in administrative segregation and released after two months. However, person still lost Good Conduct Time and would like time restored.	The OCO was able to verify that there was no violation of DOC policy 460.050. The individual was found guilty of multiple infractions and did not file appeals.	No Violation of Policy
292.	Person reported being revoked from Graduated Reentry (GRE) and Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative (DOSA). Person reported having a positive urine analysis (UA) test a few days after being let out on GRE and admitting to it and being given a written warning. Person continued to get positive UAs and was infracted for them. Person reported that he was on medications that caused a false positive for benzodiazepine. Person was then told he would be terminated from GRE and DOSA due to the UAs.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO found that this individual was terminated from community substance use treatment, which is why he was terminated from GRE and DOSA. DOC 580.655 states that individuals on DOSA "will be reclassified to serve the remainder of the DOSA sentence if they fail to complete or are administratively terminated from SUD treatment".	No Violation of Policy
293.	Person states they ordered a catalog, and it was rejected. Person feels they are being discriminated against due to sexual preference and the DOC policy needs to be changed.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 450.100 III Inspection B Mail will be rejected based on legitimate penological interests and per Attachment 1. Contains sexually explicit material per WAC 137-48-020(13)(a). XI Publications F. No publications withheld solely on a basis of their appeal to a particular ethnic, racial, religious, or political	No Violation of Policy

group, or sexual orientation. This policy is under review at this time.

294.	Person reports his visits were approved and then denied with his fiancée.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 450.300 III Approval Process 2. Providing false/misleading information or failure to list previous criminal history on visit application may result in denial of visit privileges. Per Eligibility Requirements for visitors Attachment 1. 6. Former Department employees, contract staff and volunteers who are not immediate family may request visiting privileges after one year has elapsed from last date of employment/work/volunteering for the department.	No Violation of Policy
295.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal narrative and found there is evidence to substantiate the infraction.	No Violation of Policy
296.	DOC prison officials at facility assert outgoing mail addressed to the news media and incoming mail from the news media is not to be treated as privileged communication. DOC states it may be opened and read outside of the person presence.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 450.100 III Inspection A.) Superintendent will designate employees to inspect and read mail to prevent 1.) sending/receiving contraband or materials that threaten facility order or security and/or 2.) criminal activity.	No Violation of Policy
297.	Person states due to safety concerns they would like to stay at current facility until infraction appeal is complete.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 300.380 VII Appeals A. Individuals may appeal by submitting DOC 08-037 72 hours after being notified of decision to the: 1. Superintendent/CCs at the facility where the classification decision was made B. Facility placement decisions are final. The OCO was unable to verify that there were safety concerns with the individual being moved to another facility. The person was advised to discuss facility placement at their next Custody Facility Plan review.	No Violation of Policy
298.	Incarcerated individual reports that staff used excessive use of force during a transport. The individual was then taken to segregation and infractioned for his behavior. The individual alleges DOC staff did not follow the Use of Force policy and there is conflicting information in the infraction report. The	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the infraction, the Use of Force packet and DOC's restricted Use of Force policy and found DOC acted within policy. The OCO verified the individual's actions met the necessary elements to infract for the incident. Video was not available in this instance due to where the use of force occurred in the county jail. The OCO finds	No Violation of Policy

individual also reports his legal documents were lost in this transport.

based on the documentation available no policy was violated. The OCO investigated the concern regarding the individuals lost legal mail in a separate OCO case.

299.	Person says that they were placed on an IBMP in retaliation for filing lawsuit against staff members at WSP. Person says the plan states that anytime he feels suicidal or is having an anxiety attack he is to be punished by being placed in the restraint chair and to only be released back to his cell in IMU Max custody and not to placed in the COA like all the other incarcerated individuals. Person says DOC policy specifically states that the restraint chair is not to be used for punishment.	The OCO reviewed this concern, the IBMP and the use of restraint chairs. The OCO could not find evidence of the DOC using the restraint chair outside of policy. This individual has a long history of housing between maximum custody and the COA. The IBMP was created by mental health staff to help him successfully move out of max custody. He has now been promoted to close custody.	No Violation of Policy
300.	Patient reports that he disagrees with his wound care treatment plan made by the outside hospital and his DOC provider. The patient is requesting a new provider because he has active lawsuit against his current provider.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 600.00 Clinical decisions are the sole province of the responsible health care practitioner and are not countermanded by non-clinicians. Potential conflicts between clinical decisions and administrative/ security needs will be resolved jointly by the Superintendent/ designee, Health Authority, and Facility Medical Director (FMD) and/or appropriate clinician. OCO did contact the Health Services management to have the concern reviewed by the Facility Medical Director. It was decided that there is no conflict-of-interest present as providers often provide care to patients who have lawsuits active. The OCO also confirmed the patient is receiving on-going care for this injury.	No Violation of Policy
301.	Person says they have multiple medical and disability issues and HSRs to accommodate his medical needs. They were transferred from a facility and housing situation that did meet his needs to a new facility and cell that is not meeting his ADA accommodation needs. Person reports that the cell he is in cannot fit his medical equipment including his wheelchair. Person already fell trying to get into the shower with his walker because there is a lip on the bottom of the shower he could not get over.	The DOC received a resolution request relating to ADA and did not address the issue for five months, at which point some of the needs were addressed, additional needs were identified as not resolved, and the access issue was finally resolved after seven months. This complaint was substantiated by DOC staff. Incarcerated person has also since moved to a different facility.	Substantiated

302.	Patient reports DOC discontinued weekly medication injections.	The OCO substantiated the concern. This office contacted health services and found the weekly injections were discontinued after test results determined injections are no longer medically necessary. Due to Facility Medical Director (FMD) approval, the patient's prescription was renewed regardless of testing levels.	Substantiated
303.	Incarcerated individual reports he was searched after taking medication and DOC had him take his shirt off and did not give the shirt back to him. The individual had to walk back to the unit without a shirt on.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. The OCO confirmed that the individual was not given a shirt after being directed to take his off for a search. The OCO verified DOC has taken action on this concern and created new processes to prevent this from occurring in the future.	Substantiated
304.	The incarcerated individual reports that they have not had the same access to religious services as everyone else. The individual reports that Christian services continuously get cancelled for short staffing or other reasons.	The OCO was able to substantiate that religious services are sometimes cancelled due to staff shortage. This office was unable to substantiate that only Christian services are being cancelled or that there is any discriminatory practice in which religious services are cancelled. Per DOC 560.200, Religious Programs, religious programs and services may be cancelled and not rescheduled due to unavailability of the sponsoring religious faith group or a designated employee/contract staff/volunteer supervisor, reasons of facility safety and security, inclement weather, natural disaster, and other reasons as determined by the Superintendent/designee.	Substantiated

INTAKE INVESTIGATIONS

Airway Heights Corrections Center

305.	Person states tier representatives were working on a new TV contract with more channels and DOC renewed the previous contract. Person reports their facility has less channels than other facilities.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. Person was instructed to contact the OCO when they have received a level II grievance response. They were also advised to speak to their tier rep about this concern so it could be addressed at their next meeting.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
306.	Person reports battery in Securus tablet has expanded and will not hold a charge.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process,	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

		administrative, or appellate process. The OCO instructed the individual to file an appeal if the issue has not been resolved and to contact the OCO when they received a level two response.	
307.	Loved one reports that she sent color copies of cartoon characters to incarcerated individual so they can use them for beadwork. Person states DOC photocopied the pictures and supplied black and white copies.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
308.	Individual states they received a major infraction and the hearing has been continued multiple times.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO advised the individual to contact the office after their infraction hearing and when they have received a decision from DOC.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
309.	Person reported a correctional officer threw out his coaxial cable, claiming it was altered. Person reported being given a week to file property disposition form, when policy says he was 90 days to do so.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
310.	Person reported that he was infraacted and does not feel he was guilty.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
311.	Individual states that they were moved from camp back to facility and does not understand the move. Person is worried transfer may be in retaliation for a complaint they filed.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The individual was advised that they have five days after the completion of Custody Facility Plan to appeal the decision.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
312.	An external family member expressed concerns about the incarcerated individual being placed in the special	Initially the incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request to provide additional information within 30 days and so	Declined

management unit and being issued an infraction for something he did not do. Incarcerated person reached out and followed up re-requesting OCO review the complaint.

the complaint was closed as “Declined OCO Involvement.” Contact reached out to OCO again and the case was reactivated. The infraction in question was reduced by DOC. The OCO declines to further investigate this complaint based on WAC 138-10-040 (e).

313.	Individual reports holding cells are not being searched by staff prior to use.	The OCO has declined to review this concern. The OCO is required to establish priorities based on the limited resources available to the office. Per WAC 138-10-040, the ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of several listed reasons, including the nature and quality of evidence. There is difficulty gathering evidence for this type of concern.	Declined
314.	Person wants to be allowed to purchase items from sources other than Correctional Industries. Person states they would like the Correctional Industries monopoly broken.	Per WAC 138-10-040, the ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of several listed reasons, including that the complaint does not allege a violation of policy, procedure, or law.	Declined
315.	A loved one reports she was turned away from visiting an incarcerated individual for wearing leggings. The loved one reports that she complained to DOC Headquarters and that the response incorrectly stated that they were offered scrubs and that a sergeant turned her away (she stated it was an officer). The loved one is requesting DOC look at the camera footage of the incident.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint does not involve a person committed to the physical custody of the DOC. DOC 450.300 Visits for Incarcerated Individuals Directive H states that “all visitors are expected to adhere to Department policies, including attachments and guidelines.”	Lacked Jurisdiction
316.	Person states that their legal case should be closed with time served.	Per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(e), the OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to the person’s underlying criminal conviction.	Lacked Jurisdiction

Cedar Creek Corrections Center

317.	Individual reports that they received an infraction after contraband was found in a common area.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The individual was advised to contact the OCO after they have appealed the infraction and received a response from DOC.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	--	--	-------------------------------------

318.	Individual would like help being released from incarceration. States they have no new charges.	Per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(e), the OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to the person's underlying criminal conviction	Lacked Jurisdiction
------	--	---	---------------------

Clallam Bay Corrections Center

319.	Person reported that his veteran's affairs paperwork was removed from his chain bag by Clallam Bay Corrections Center staff after transfer and has not been returned to him.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	--	--	-------------------------------------

Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

320.	Individual received an infraction and feels they did not deserve it. Person states the DOC staff report does not state what really happened.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The individual was advised at intake to appeal the infraction. They will need to contact the OCO after they have submitted an infraction appeal and received a response from DOC.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	--	--	-------------------------------------

321.	Person reports he has an infraction hearing tomorrow for unauthorized tattoo. Person said that he has proof he had these tattoos when he entered county jail.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	---	--	-------------------------------------

322.	Individual reports they received an infraction for using a friend's tablet. Person states that it was previously allowed by DOC. Individual states they should have received a warning before getting infraction.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO was able to provide information regarding how to appeal the infraction and to contact the OCO after the hearing is complete and they have received a decision from DOC.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	---	--	-------------------------------------

323.	Person reported receiving a major infraction for lending his tablet to another individual to watch a movie. Person did not know this was against the rules. Person stated his pod has a rule that a warning be given before receiving a major infraction,	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	---	--	-------------------------------------

and the corrections officer did not give a warning.

324.	Person states they received an infraction for requesting an officer of a different gender perform their search.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
325.	Person reported that a Community Corrections Officer (CCO) lied to DOC, and that's why he is back in custody. Person reported that this CCO is threatening him, saying he will make sure he won't get out of prison.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by DOC Community Custody.	Lacked Jurisdiction
326.	An external person reports that the individual was infringed after he became upset during a pat search due to having PTSD.	The Incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request to provide additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged this person to contact this office if they would like to request assistance.	Person Declined OCO Involvement

GRE/CPA

327.	Person reports being infringed while on Graduated Re-entry (GRE) and was terminated from GRE and the Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative (DOSA) program.	The OCO reviewed DOC records and verified that this individual was found guilty of multiple positive UAs, which caused the termination of GRE and DOSA. The OCO is declining this request. Per WAC 138-10-040(d) The OCO may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The complaint does not allege violation of policy, procedure, or law.	Declined
------	---	---	----------

Larch Corrections Center

328.	The incarcerated individual reports his hobby box was stolen while staff packed his belongings for his transfer to segregation. His counselor told him to file a tort claim, but he has not received the decision.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	--	--	-------------------------------------

Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women

329.	Person reported being infringed and sent to a different facility for segregation for not celling in. Person also reported that corrections officers were laughing at her because she was going to lose her Graduated Reentry (GRE).	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	---	--	-------------------------------------

Monroe Correctional Complex

330. Individual states that they are being retaliated against by DOC. Person has received negative Behavior Observation Entries and Infractions.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The individual will need to appeal the Behavior Observation Entries as well as the Infractions they received.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
331. Person reported receiving two infractions that he pled guilty to and described issues with the circumstances surrounding both infractions, including clerical errors.	The OCO has declined to investigate this concern because this individual plead guilty to these infractions. Per WAC 138-10-040, the ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: (d) The complaint does not allege violation of policy, procedure, or law.	Declined
332. Person reports an alleged sexual assault that took place between DOC staff in 2001.	Per WAC 138-10-040 The Ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: At a minimum, complaints should meet the requirements in RCW 43.06C.040 and be: about an incarcerated individual.	Declined
Monroe Correctional Complex - SOU		
333. Person reported that incarcerated individuals are doing hazmat work when cleaning up bio fluid in the unit but do not get special training or approval for that job. Person reported that he asked DOC staff if he can clean a hazmat cell and was allowed to do so without any training or clearance.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
334. Person reported that the water in their facility is not safe to drink and has rust in it because of the old pipes. Person said the living conditions in their unit are unclean. Person reported that cells are dirty and other incarcerated people he is near are not hygienic. Staff make incarcerated workers clean the cells, but do not address hygiene issues with the individuals.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
335. Person reported he has requested to have meals delivered to his cell, and states feeling observed, exposed, and unsafe when made to eat in front of correctional officers and other incarcerated individuals, due to PTSD.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative,	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

	or appellate process. The OCO also provided information about contacting mental health regarding PTSD.	
336. Person states they filed a grievance regarding a suicide in the Closed Observation Area.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
337. The incarcerated individual reports that an officer has been trying to startle and harass him while he was talking to himself.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
338. Person reported that they are being targeted by staff because of their creed, race, origin, religion, gender, and heritage. Person believes they are being retaliated against at the facility they are housed in and reported that DOC staff are laundering money, eating government food, chewing tobacco, drinking, and having parties.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
339. Person reports they received a negative Behavior Observation Entry after reporting something they witnessed to a Corrections Officer.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO provided information to the individual regarding filing an appeal to have the negative remarks removed from their record.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
340. Person reported that DOC staff jeopardized his safety because a corrections officer told him to call his relatives. Person feels that he was given a directive that put him in danger.	The OCO has declined to investigate this concern. Per WAC 138-10-040 (d), the ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The complaint does not allege violation of policy, procedure, or law.	Declined
Monroe Correctional Complex - TRU		
341. Person reported that the library is not open and that staff do not know when it will be reopened. Person also reported that the yard is no longer ADA-accessible because the walkway is covered in deep mud.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

	the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	
342. Person reports receiving infractions for being out of bounds in 2011.	Per WAC 138-10-040 The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaints or may close any investigation for any of the following reasons: C. The nature and quality of evidence; F. The alleged violation is a past rather than ongoing issue.	Declined
343. This person is attempting to appeal his one-year suspension from the DOC Resolution Program.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as permitted by RCW 43.06C.040(2)(c) which states that the office “may decline to investigate any complaint as provided by the rules adopted under this chapter” as well as WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) which permits the office to decline to investigate for “[a]ny other reasons the ombuds deems relevant to the complaint including, but not limited to, the priority and weight given to these and other relevant factors.” The specific reason cited for the reason to decline has been removed from this public outcome summary to protect the confidentiality of the incarcerated person.	Declined
344. This person wants the OCO to help him get the DOC to reopen resolution requests about an access assistant that were closed by the Resolution Program. He is unable to appeal this decision because he has a one-year suspension from the Resolution Program.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as permitted by RCW 43.06C.040(2)(c) which states that the office “may decline to investigate any complaint as provided by the rules adopted under this chapter” as well as WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) which permits the office to decline to investigate for “[a]ny other reasons the ombuds deems relevant to the complaint including, but not limited to, the priority and weight given to these and other relevant factors.” The specific reason cited for the reason to decline has been removed from this public outcome summary to protect the confidentiality of the incarcerated person.	Declined
345. This person is appealing DOC’s decision to suspend his access to the Resolution Program because, according to him, he did not abuse the program.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as permitted by RCW 43.06C.040(2)(c) which states that the office “may decline to investigate any complaint as provided by the rules adopted under this chapter” as well as WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) which permits the office to decline to investigate for “[a]ny other reasons the ombuds deems relevant to the complaint including, but not limited to, the priority and weight given to these and other relevant factors.” The specific reason cited for the reason to decline has been removed from	Declined

		this public outcome summary to protect the confidentiality of the incarcerated person.	
346.	Person states that he received the typed copy of his level III appeal and, according to him, the typed copy was not an exact copy of his handwritten resolution request. According to him, the DOC says the mistake was corrected and the revision sent to Headquarters. However, person says the corrections were not made and his complaint was not heard or addressed by the level III investigator. He is requesting the OCO investigate this complaint because the DOC suspended him from the Resolution Program.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as permitted by RCW 43.06C.040(2)(c) which states that the office “may decline to investigate any complaint as provided by the rules adopted under this chapter” as well as WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) which permits the office to decline to investigate for “[a]ny other reasons the ombuds deems relevant to the complaint including, but not limited to, the priority and weight given to these and other relevant factors.” The specific reason cited for the reason to decline has been removed from this public outcome summary to protect the confidentiality of the incarcerated person.	Declined
347.	In late March 2023, this person called the OCO hotline to report a medical complaint from May 2022 after the DOC suspended this caller from the Resolution Program. However, the DOC communicated to him that if he has a medical issue to please continue to kite his provider.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as permitted by RCW 43.06C.040(2)(c) which states that the office “may decline to investigate any complaint as provided by the rules adopted under this chapter” as well as WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) which permits the office to decline to investigate for “[a]ny other reasons the ombuds deems relevant to the complaint including, but not limited to, the priority and weight given to these and other relevant factors.” The specific reason cited for the reason to decline has been removed from this public outcome summary to protect the confidentiality of the incarcerated person.	Declined
348.	An external person reports that the incarcerated individual sent out a package containing his property to their loved one, but the package was never received.	The Incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO’s request to provide additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged this person to contact this office if they would like to request assistance.	Person Declined OCO Involvement
349.	Person reported concerns with DOC not honoring a keep separate with someone that had coerced them.	The incarcerated individual advised the OCO they did not want the OCO to investigate the complaint.	Person Declined OCO Involvement
Other			
350.	A loved one reported she felt that a Community Corrections Officer abused his power over an individual on community custody, and that the individual violated terms of probation and was put back into full custody for two weeks.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint does not involve a person committed to the physical custody of the DOC. The OCO lacks jurisdiction over the actions of Community Corrections Officers.	Lacked Jurisdiction
351.	Person is currently being held in a mental health facility and was directed to contact the OCO office to file a complaint about a local crisis response unit.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction

		The OCO provided information for another agency that provides ombuds services, the Office of Behavioral Health Advocacy.	
352.	Individual states that they were revoked while on community custody and pled out to charges. Person was told they were mentally disabled and could not participate in community custody.	Per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(e), the OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to the person's underlying criminal conviction.	Lacked Jurisdiction
353.	Person reports their appeal was denied after Nisqually Jail failed to send out their appeal in a timely manner.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections. The OCO cannot investigate a mail issue at the Nisqually county jail.	Lacked Jurisdiction
354.	Person reports their incarcerated loved one is being denied commissary in Grant County jail.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections	Lacked Jurisdiction
355.	Person is requesting medical assistance for an injury sustained while in the county jail. Person is in pain and appears to have been assaulted by jail staff.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
356.	Individual reports issues with the grievance process at Lewis County Jail.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction

Stafford Creek Corrections Center

357.	Person was told they would receive their property once they promoted levels. Person was moved and still has not received property.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The individual was advised to contact the Correctional Unit Supervisor (CUS) if they have not received their property after being moved.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
358.	Person reports they were infraacted for calling a false medical emergency. Person states they have valid medical issues and infractions should be dismissed.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. Person was instructed to contact the OCO once the infraction hearing is complete.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
359.	Person reported losing his job and receiving an infraction and negative BOEs (Behavioral Observation Entries) for being	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

	in the nurse's station, which is out of bounds.	complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	
360.	Person reports another incarcerated person threatened to harm them.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The individual was advised to send a kite to their counselor to discuss this issue.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
361.	Person reported infractions for multiple issues, including throwing objects and feigning an illness. Person also reported multiple issues with his communications with staff.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
362.	Person reports they are a level one and should be able to order commissary. They state they are not being allowed to order items.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO gave the individual information on their current level and what amount they are able to spend on commissary. Individual had not grieved this issue and was advised to follow the Resolution process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
363.	Incarcerated individual reports DOC staff did not provide distilled water to him required for the medical equipment he uses. The individual reports he has asked DOC staff for the distilled water, and they never came back to provide him any.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
364.	Person reports receiving three infractions for one incident.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The individual was advised to contact the OCO after they have submitted an infraction appeal and received a response from DOC.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

365. Loved one reports that the mattress distribution at their incarcerated loved one's facility is taking too long. Wants DOC to distribute the mattresses faster.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. Since this complaint was submitted from an outside source, the incarcerated individual was advised to file a grievance if they have an issue with the mattress distribution at their facility.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
366. Person states that they received a package while in Administrative Segregation and is unable to have the items while there. He was told by DOC staff the package would be sent back. Person states he was told by DOC staff they do not know where the package is located.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. Person withdrew Resolution Request. The OCO advised the individual to follow the resolution process and contact the office once they have received a Level two response.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
367. Person reported being threatened by a correctional officer over the intercom. Person also reported issues with his sink.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
368. Person reports they feel DOC is targeting them because they keep receiving infractions	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO will not review this case until the person has had a hearing for their appeals.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
369. An incarcerated individual reported that a different incarcerated individual hasn't been given a tablet, cannot use the phone, and is being held passed his Early Release Date.	The OCO is declining to investigate this concern, per WAC 138-10-040, the ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: (c) The nature and quality of evidence.	Declined
370. Person reports that Latino staff are racist towards him and attack him in various ways, including poisoning his food and taking away his pens and paper. Person	The OCO is declining this request. Per WAC 138-10-040, the ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: (c) The nature and quality	Declined

reports that he gets infracted for reporting the staff's treatment of him.

of evidence. There is no evidence to substantiate this individual is being attacked by Latino staff or that they are poisoning his food.

371. Person reports someone was moved to the tier that keeps people awake at night. Individual wants to be moved, or for the other person to be moved.

The OCO has declined to review this concern. The OCO is required to establish priorities based on the limited resources available to the office. Per WAC 138-10-040 The Ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: (d) The Complaint does not allege violation of policy, procedure, or law.

Declined

Washington Corrections Center

372. In person contact in dayroom stated that staff has threatened to confiscate his crafting supplies (yarn, knitting looms, knitted items) if he goes to the bathroom and leaves the craft supplies unattended for any period of time. Individual states the threat of removal of these supplies scares him and makes him not want to use the restroom.

Individual has not filed any resolutions relating to this issue. closing "Administrative Remedies Not Pursued." The OCO sent the individual information on how to file a resolution request if DOC staff does remove his craft supplies while he is on a bathroom break.

Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

373. The individual reports that while he was at Washington Corrections Center there was a poor response to COVID protocols, and he was placed with other individuals that were in quarantine. Staff would not allow individuals to clean the phones or showers in between uses. The individual filed a resolution request, but the issue was not resolved.

The OCO will decline to investigate this case because this resolution request is from August 2022. Per WAC 138-10-040 The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: (f)The alleged violation is a past rather than ongoing issue

Declined

374. External individual reports an incarcerated individual has safety risk by being transferred to another facility. The external individual reports the transfer will subject him to a negative lifestyle that he is trying to get away from. The external individual requests OCO halt the individuals transfer.

The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request to provide additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged this person to contact this office if they would like to request assistance.

Person Declined OCO Involvement

375. A loved one reported being concerned with the release address of an incarcerated individual getting approved.

This person was released to an approved address prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.

Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action

Washington Corrections Center for Women

376. Person reported that she is Jewish and supposed to rest on the Sabbath, which is Saturday, and says her job in the kitchen is not giving her Saturdays off for the

The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has

Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

Sabbath. Person stated she has spoken to the religious coordinator and her supervisor in the kitchen and still must work on Saturdays. Person reported there are no Jewish services offered at the facility and the supervisor is only understanding the need to “attend services” not the religious need to not labor on the Sabbath.

reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.

377.	Person reported seeing a sergeant take a unit phone from an officer while that officer was on a call. Person reported that the officer was removed from the unit.	The OCO has declined to investigate this concern. Per WAC 138-10-040, the ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: (a) Lack jurisdiction over the complaint. At a minimum, complaints should meet the requirements in RCW 43.06C.040 and be: (i) About an incarcerated individual. This concern regards two staff members.	Declined
378.	Individual has had issues with cellmates following her return to the facility from GRE. She has asked to be in a single cell for between 30 and 45 days to transition to medications she needs for mental health issues. Was attempting to get an HSR through her mental health counselor for that stabilization period but has been denied. Individual says that she has attempted to appeal the single cell issue but has not been successful, despite support from her therapist.	The incarcerated individual advised the OCO they did not want the OCO to investigate the complaint.	Person Declined OCO Involvement

Washington State Penitentiary

379.	Person reports they received infractions and was told more are coming.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The individual was advised to submit an infraction appeal and to contact the OCO after they have received a response from DOC.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
380.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about not having their urinalysis sent to the lab despite their request to do so.	The incarcerated person has not perused internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the internal DOC appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

381. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received, and the timeframes related to the process.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
382. Person reports blood clots in his right leg and is trying to get X-Rays on his leg. Person reports that he's not getting adequate care or respectful treatment from Medical.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
383. Person reports staff conduct concerns.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
384. Person stated he was having mental health emergency and was trying to alert staff by pressing the call button inside his cell. The button appeared to have been inoperable because staff never responded. Person was subsequently infraacted for tampering with a lock device. Person said DOC did not follow policy when issuing the infraction.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
385. Individual was written up for not providing a full cup of urine for a Urinalysis. Person was sent to segregation for it and provided another sample while there. Person was still infraacted for failing to give a urine sample.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The individual was advised to contact the OCO after the appeal hearing and decision has been received from DOC.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
386. Person reports they received several infractions. Person states officers are not giving an accurate account of events that took place.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO was unable to verify that the individual submitted an appeal for the infractions.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

387.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about retaliation from a particular staff member and concerns about an infraction they received.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
388.	Person states that a corrections officer pushed them to the ground and told them they were resisting. Person is unsure if use of force paperwork was done, but they were infraacted for resisting. DOC states they have proof on camera.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. Individual was advised to contact the OCO once the appeal has been heard and they have received an appeal decision from DOC.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
389.	Individual is not filing a complaint but has a suggestion for OCO related to Hotline times	Added suggestion to hotline tracker update request section for Director to review. No letter being generated due to nature of report - this is not a concern relating to OCO purpose per RCW 43.06C.020	Declined
390.	Person reported being sexually abused by a parole board member in the 1970's. Person reported that he has tried to report the abuse by filing a PREA but was threatened with an infraction if he attempted to file the report.	The OCO is declining to investigate this concern. Per WAC 138-10-040, The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: (d) The nature and quality of evidence, and (f) The alleged violation is a past rather than ongoing issue.	Declined
391.	Person has complaints about the Washington State Bar Association, civil statues and how they relate to their underlying criminal conviction.	Per RCW 43.06C.040 The ombuds may not investigate any complaints relating to an inmate's underlying criminal conviction.	Declined
392.	The incarcerated individual reports that he is not receiving requested public information from OCO and reports that he does not agree with the amount of documentation provided by the OCO.	Per WAC 138-10-040- The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The complaint does not allege a violation of policy, procedure, or law of the Department. This office provided information to the individual and encouraged him to write an appeal for any public records requests that do not meet his standards.	Declined
393.	Person requested help in a lawsuit regarding his tort claim being denied. Person reported that DOC took his property and that he has the paperwork to prove it.	The OCO has declined to investigate this concern. Per WAC 138-10-040 (e), the ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The requested resolution is not within the ombuds' statutory power and authority.	Declined

394. Person states they are being imprisoned illegally by the Indeterminate Sentence Review Board.	Per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(e), the OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to the person's underlying criminal conviction.	Lacked Jurisdiction
395. Loved one expressed concern about an incarcerated individual being in segregation for nearly two years and not having access to mail, kits or resolution requests and is not being given their medication.	The OCO did not receive contact from the individual confirming they wanted this concern investigated within the time the individual was advised. The individual was informed if the case was closed in error and they would like it investigated, they can contact the office.	Person Declined OCO Involvement

Abbreviations & Glossary

ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act

AHCC: Airway Heights Corrections Center

ASR: Accommodation Status Report

BOE: Behavioral Observation Entry

CBCC: Clallam Bay Corrections Center

CCCC: Cedar Creek Corrections Center

CI: Correctional Industries

Closed Case Review: These reviews may be conducted by the OCO when a complainant whose case was closed requests a review by the supervisor of the original case handler.

CO: Correctional Officer

CRC: Care Review Committee

CRCC: Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

CUS: Correctional Unit Supervisor

DES: Department of Enterprise Services

DOSA: Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative

EFV: Extended Family Visit

ERD: Earned Release Date

GRE: Graduated Reentry

HCSC: Headquarters Community Screening Committee

HSR: Health Status Report

IIU or I&I: DOC's Intelligence and Investigations Unit ("Intelligence & Investigations")

J&S: Judgment and Sentence

MCC: Monroe Correctional Complex

MCCCW: Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women

OCC: Olympic Corrections Center

Pruno: Alcoholic drink typically made by fermenting fruit and other ingredients.

PULHES-DXTR codes: Washington DOC assigns health services codes to every individual incarcerated in its system. These codes, known as PULHES or PULHES-DXTR codes, are meant to note the presence and severity of various health-related factors, such as medication delivery requirements, mobility limitations, developmental disability, and use of mental health services.

SCCC: Stafford Creek Corrections Center

SOTAP: Sex Offender Treatment and Assessment Program

SVP: Sexually Violent Predator

TC: Therapeutic Community

WaONE: Washington ONE ("Offender Needs Evaluation")

WCC: Washington Corrections Center

WCCW: Washington Corrections Center for Women

WSP: Washington State Penitentiary