

UNEXPECTED FATALITY REVIEWS: 0

CASE INVESTIGATIONS: 219

Assistance Provided: 18
Information Provided: 80
DOC Resolved: 33
Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate: 11
No Violation of Policy: 76
Substantiated: 1

INTAKE INVESTIGATIONS: 109

Administrative Remedies Not Pursued: 0
Declined: 5
Lacked Jurisdiction: 3
Person Declined OCO Assistance: 10
Person Released from DOC Prior to OCO Action: 5
Technical Assistance Provided: 86

Resolved Investigations:

328

Assistance Provided, Information Provided,
or Technical Assistance Provided in

56%

of Investigations

OCO Casework Highlights

November 2024

Assistance Provided

Reported Concerns: Incarcerated person reports that she is having difficulty communicating with DOC staff because they do not provide translation services regularly. She also reports that she was never given a handbook because the facility does not have one in Spanish.

OCO Actions: OCO escalated the concern to facility leadership.

Negotiated Outcomes: As a result of OCO outreach, DOC staff assisted in getting the individual a facility handbook in Spanish.

Assistance Provided

Reported Concerns: Incarcerated person reported concerns regarding the heat in their unit and reported that there was no heat coming in.

OCO Actions: OCO spoke with DOC staff which prompted them to look at the vent system and identify an issue with the system.

Negotiated Outcomes: After OCO outreach, DOC was able to swiftly remedy the issue.

Assistance Provided

Reported Concerns: Person reported that he was taken off the diabetic diet despite being diabetic.

OCO Actions: The OCO reviewed DOC records and reached out to DOC staff, who agreed to send this case to the Facility Medical Director. The OCO is aware of a system-wide change to requirements for the diabetic diet and is continuing to review this issue.

Negotiated Outcomes: After OCO outreach, this individual was seen by medical staff and placed back on the diabetic diet.

Assistance Provided

Reported Concerns: Person reported that DOC only allows two vendors for religious coordinators to purchase essential oils for religious purposes, but neither of these vendors sells essential oils. Person said that the OCO negotiated with DOC to get a memo released on this issue, but no progress has been made.

OCO Actions: OCO reviewed the two vendors that were allowed per the DOC memo and substantiated that they do not sell essential oils. The OCO reached out to the facility and to DOC headquarters and raised the concern that this issue was not resolved by the previous memo and the new vendors.

Negotiated Outcomes: After OCO outreach, DOC headquarters released a new memo allowing religious coordinators to purchase from a new vendor who sells essential oils.

Assistance Provided

Reported Concerns: External person reports her loved one's safety is in danger in close custody, so he refused housing. He is now on a MAX program without his tablet.

OCO Actions: The OCO reviewed the MAX custody placement and infraction history. After review, this office reached out to DOC headquarters to ask if this individual would be eligible for an override to medium since he does not have a violent infraction history.

Negotiated Outcomes: After OCO outreach, DOC agreed to bring his case in front of the MAX Committee this month.

Substantiated

Reported Concerns: The individual reports that she was moved to another facility and placed in the therapeutic community program when she should have had a hold because she was already attending intensive day treatment (IDT).

OCO Actions: OCO was able to substantiate this concern. This office confirmed with DOC that the individual should have had a hold for her IDT programming, but the hold was not applied until two days after her transfer was approved. The individual was very close to her release date at the time the OCO investigated this case, and therefore it was not feasible for her to transfer back in order to return to TC.

Unexpected Fatality Reviews

RCW 72.09.770 requires the Department of Corrections to convene an unexpected fatality review (UFR) committee to review any case in which the death of an incarcerated individual was unexpected, or in any case identified by the Office of the Corrections Ombuds (OCO) for review. The purpose of the unexpected fatality review is to develop recommendations for the DOC and the legislature regarding changes in practices or policies to prevent fatalities and strengthen safety and health protections for incarcerated individuals in the DOC's custody.

[UFR 24-010](#): The Unexpected Fatality Review Committee reviewed the unexpected death of a 30-year-old person in June 2024. The Unexpected Fatality Review Committee Report dated November 15, 2024 is a publicly available document.

The Office of the Corrections Ombuds has included this UFR report at the end of this Monthly Outcome Report.

Monthly Outcome Report: November 2024

Complaint Summary	Outcome Summary	Case Closure Reason
Case Investigations		
Airway Heights Corrections Center		
<p>1. External person reported her loved one's safety, so he refused housing. He is now on a MAX program without his tablet.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the MAX custody placement and infraction history. After review, this office reached out to DOC headquarters to ask if this individual would be eligible for an override to medium since he does not have a violent infraction history. DOC agreed to bring his case in front of the MAX Committee this month.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>2. Person reported that their early release date (ERD) is tomorrow, but he has a new pending class A infraction, and DOC said that they are not releasing him tomorrow because of the infraction. Person said he is being punished for something he has not been found guilty of.</p>	<p>The OCO contacted facility leadership regarding the individual's ERD. They had a pending Category A infraction for over two months that caused them to be held past the ERD. The DOC said, per policy, he would need to have his hearing. A few days later the individual had a hearing for a lesser infraction and was released.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>3. A loved one reports concerns about her husband's medical care related to his wrist surgery, cancer diagnosis, and dental work.</p>	<p>DOC resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint. This office contacted health services who verified that the individual has been rescheduled for wrist surgery and medical staff will be advised on his pre-procedure care. DOC health services also confirmed that his dentures fit and that this person declined follow up for the skin cancer biopsy.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>4. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding DOC not accepting their infraction appeal.</p>	<p>The OCO confirmed that DOC accepted the appeal for the infraction prior to OCO involvement.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>5. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding legally changing their name but DOC not updating this on the website.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the related grievance that states the name change is all up to date and confirmed that the individual's name is correctly shown on the DOC website.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>6. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding not getting an appeal response to an infraction.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the individual's disciplinary history and confirmed that DOC responded to the appeal prior to OCO involvement.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>7. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding not getting a response back from an infraction appeal.</p>	<p>The OCO confirmed that DOC responded to the appeal prior to OCO involvement.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>8. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being re-served infraction paperwork rather than getting a continuance for the hearing.</p>	<p>The OCO spoke to DOC about this concern and confirmed that people should not be getting re-served the infraction paperwork. The OCO informed the individual that if this occurs, they will need to address it on appeal and once they receive an appeal response, they can contact the OCO again.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

9. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding missing property and a desire to be financially compensated for this.	The OCO informed the individual that this office cannot help with financial compensation and the individual will need to exhaust the internal remedies by filing a grievance to level 3 and then file a tort claim with DES in order to seek compensation.	Information Provided
10. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a mailroom rejection for sexually explicit material and wanting to file a lawsuit.	The OCO spoke to DOC about this concern and confirmed that the rejection was overturned, and the individual was given the mail. The OCO informed the individual that this office is not able to assist in filing a lawsuit against DOC.	Information Provided
11. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding getting several behavior observation entries (BOEs) without their name on them.	The OCO reviewed the individual's BOE history, but as the OCO would need to view the records of each BOE to see if a name is included or not, without dates of when the BOEs occurred, the OCO was unable to investigate further. The OCO informed the individual that DOC released a new statewide memo on September 13, 2024, reminding DOC staff of the proper BOE protocol which should help with any BOE concerns.	Information Provided
12. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding needing a lower bunk and DOC refusing to give an HSR for this.	The OCO spoke to DOC about this and confirmed that the individual does not have an HSR for a lower bunk because they have not kited medical requesting this. The OCO informed the individual that they can request an HSR at their next medical appointment.	Information Provided
13. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a job termination.	The OCO spoke to DOC regarding this concern and confirmed that the individual is now in an alternative job but if they wish to return to their previous job, they will be placed on the referral list.	Information Provided
14. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC limiting their ability to hold and obtain property due to their four (4) person cell placement.	The OCO provided information to the individual regarding DOC's rules and regulations pertaining to four (4) person cell placements.	Information Provided
15. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding staff making a harassing comment towards them.	The OCO reviewed available evidence and was unable to substantiate the concern.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
16. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding several infractions due to a hearing loss issue.	The OCO reviewed the related medical records and compared them to the infractions listed but found no medical records of when the hearing aid was broken that coincided with the infraction dates, thus there was insufficient evidence to substantiate the concern.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
17. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
18. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
19. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding needing back surgery.	The OCO spoke to DOC about this concern and confirmed that the orthopedic referral for the surgery did not happen as this was not deemed medically necessary. The OCO informed the individual that if they disagree, they can work with their provider about this.	No Violation of Policy

20. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
21. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
22. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
23. Person reports that he requested protective custody, and he was placed in segregation. He is concerned about his facility placement and returning to general population.	The OCO reviewed this individual's placement and infraction history. This facility is considered a safe harbor facility and the OCO verified that he was involved in an altercation, however the witness testimony showed him as the aggressor. He has now been transferred to a close custody safe harbor.	No Violation of Policy
24. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being punished for an infraction before being found guilty by being removed from their program.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements. The OCO informed the individual that they can be terminated from programming or jobs for this when it occurs, not after the hearing.	No Violation of Policy
25. Person reported that he was prescribed a medication for substance use treatment while in jail, but that DOC took him off of this medication when he arrived in DOC custody.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed this individual's resolution request, which was reviewed at the facility and headquarters level, which stated that this individual is not eligible for that medication. The OCO reviewed the protocol for this medication and also found that this individual did not meet the requirements.	No Violation of Policy
26. Person reports that because of the recent infractions, he has been demoted. It was recommended that he demote to medium, and he has medium points, but classifications overrode the recommendation and demoted him to close custody and now he will be transferred where he will be in danger.	The OCO reviewed the custody facility plan and infraction history. This individual was in a safe harbor facility and will now be transferred to a close custody safe harbor. Due to his recent infractions, classifications did override him from medium to close. There is no violation of DOC policy 300.380.	No Violation of Policy
27. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
28. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the "some evidence" standard is met based on the injuries observed.	No Violation of Policy
29. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding wanting to go to multiple faith group events but states DOC is making them choose one.	The OCO reviewed available documentation and did not identify a violation of policy. Per DOC 560.200, individuals can be excused from mandated programs or work to attend a religious activity, not multiple.	No Violation of Policy
30. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a behavior observation entry (BOE).	The OCO reviewed the BOE and found no violation of DOC policy 300.010 as it was appropriately issued.	No Violation of Policy

Cedar Creek Corrections Center

31. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO spoke with DOC regarding the infraction but DOC is unwilling to dismiss this infraction as DOC does believe the incident occurred based on the evidence available.	Information Provided
32. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a desire to rejoin the higher work programs.	The OCO spoke with DOC regarding this concern and confirmed that DOC is unwilling to allow the individual to participate in the higher pay rate position due to their involvement in an altercation.	Information Provided
33. Incarcerated person reported concerns about the phones not working.	The OCO provided information. The OCO spoke with DOC staff multiple times regarding the phones and OCO was informed that updates have been made and the phone system is now working properly.	Information Provided
34. Person reports concerns about the DOC public records unit not responding to his public record requests.	The OCO provided information about the status of each request he reported to this office and gave information about how to submit a public records appeal to DOC.	Information Provided
35. Incarcerated person reported concerns regarding DOC not allowing them to send out property after it was confiscated. The person reported the property was not deemed contraband by the facility because their infraction was dismissed.	The OCO provided information regarding the infraction dismissal which occurred due to administrative reasons, and the confiscated property. The OCO viewed the property and verified the DOC deemed the property contraband and the DOC is unwilling to allow the property to be sent out.	Information Provided

Clallam Bay Corrections Center

36. Person reported that an offsite medical appointment was cancelled because of the conduct of the transport officers.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reached out to DOC staff, who said that this appointment was cancelled for safety and security reasons due to this individual's behavior. The OCO worked with DOC staff to get this appointment rescheduled and confirmed that this offsite appointment occurred.	Assistance Provided
37. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding placement in IMU and being referred to a MAX program.	The OCO reviewed the individual's classification and confirmed that they were not placed on MAX and are not in IMU.	DOC Resolved
38. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding placement in segregation.	The OCO reviewed the individual's placement and confirmed that they have been released from segregation.	DOC Resolved
39. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC holding them in IMU (Intensive Management Unit) despite having no reason to be there.	The OCO provided information regarding this individual's housing situation. The OCO was able to confirm that this individual was moved out of IMU.	Information Provided
40. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding group violence reduction strategy (GVRS) and not being allowed to have their religious chain.	The OCO reviewed the grievances related to these two concerns. The OCO informed the individual that GVRS cannot be grieved. GVRS is an evidence-based procedure used to deter incarcerated individuals from committing violent acts by imposing privilege restrictions. The OCO is aware of concerns about the implementation of GVRS and is in ongoing discussions with DOC about this procedure. The OCO confirmed that the necklace is not authorized per DOC policy 560.200 as it is not made of the approved light metal material and did not	Information Provided

come in through the approved process (donation form and approved vendor).

41. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction hearing.	The OCO reviewed the individual's disciplinary history but found no infraction matching this description or date range.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
42. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being placed at Clallam Bay.	The OCO spoke to DOC about this concern and confirmed that DOC found this placement to be the best in order to get the individual back on the West side of the state.	No Violation of Policy
43. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding their classification.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and found no violation of DOC policy 300.380 as there is evidence that the individual is a documented member of a notable security threat group (STG) and this behavior is not manageable at the previous custody level due to security and safety threats.	No Violation of Policy
44. Person called in to report that he has been placed on the out of state transfer list and asks OCO to review his situation. He says he is being held for affiliation with a security threat group (STG) that he has no affiliation with.	The OCO confirmed that the individual recently had a MAX review. The MAX committee stated that the security threat group the individual is affiliated with is responsible for increased levels of violence in prisons over the last two years and specifically implicates the individual as being involved in planning additional violence targeting staff. The DOC has placed them on the out of state transfer list per DOC policy 330.600.	No Violation of Policy
45. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding placement in IMU.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility placement (CFP) and found no violation of DOC policy 300.380 as their safety concerns were validated at one facility but not at another and the primary factor dictating the restrictive housing placement is due to their controlled substance seeking behaviors which is impacting the safety concerns.	No Violation of Policy
46. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being in a single cell even despite not meeting the criteria for it.	The OCO reviewed the single cell screening and found no violation of DOC policy 420.140. This office identified evidence that supports DOC's housing decision.	No Violation of Policy
47. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
48. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being placed at a facility where they were assaulted.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan and spoke to DOC about this concern and found no violation of DOC policy 300.380 as they were placed at that facility due to safety concerns at another facility.	No Violation of Policy
49. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
50. Individual reports safety concerns in close custody and DOC has denied safe harbor placement.	The OCO reviewed the custody facility plan and verified that this individual scores close custody and does not have documented history as a security threat group (STG) member. The DOC will not place him in a safe harbor and there is no violation of DOC policy 300.380	No Violation of Policy

Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

51. Person reported that DOC only allows two vendors for religious coordinators to purchase essential	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed the two vendors that were allowed per the DOC memo and substantiated that they do not sell essential oils. The OCO	Assistance Provided
---	--	---------------------

oils for religious purposes, but neither of these vendors sells essential oils. Person said that the OCO negotiated with DOC to get a memo released on this issue, but no progress has been made.	reached out to the facility and to DOC headquarters and raised the concern that this issue was not resolved by the previous memo and the new vendors. DOC headquarters released a new memo allowing religious coordinators to purchase from a new vendor who sells essential oils.	
52. Person reported multiple health concerns and stated that he was not receiving care.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reached out to DOC staff, who then scheduled this individual for appointments with his provider and offsite care. The OCO reviewed DOC records and spoke with this individual, who confirmed that he received care and has a treatment plan going forward.	Assistance Provided
53. A loved one reports that an incarcerated individual is pending an infraction for behavior they did not do.	The DOC resolved this concern prior to the OCO's involvement. This office verified that the individual was not given an infraction and was transferred to another facility.	DOC Resolved
54. Incarcerated individuals shared concerns regarding DOC failing to provide adequate medical care.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO was able to confirm that this individual has been seen extensively for their medical concern and DOC medical staff have scheduled them for further care.	DOC Resolved
55. Incarcerated person reported concerns regarding DOC denying them from graduated reentry (GRE) or a reentry center and asked the OCO to help them be reconsidered.	DOC resolved this concern prior to OCO action. The OCO verified this person has been accepted into the GRE program and will transfer soon.	DOC Resolved
56. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding wanting to receive education with proper accommodations.	The OCO provided information regarding the ADA accommodations approval process and why it may take time for educational accommodations to be met since these decisions must be presented to the Accommodation Review Committee (ARC).	Information Provided
57. Person reported concerns about being denied visitation with his child and said that he was never offered the option to appeal.	The OCO provided information. The OCO reviewed DOC documents and found that the child's guardian in the community was informed about the option to appeal the visitation denial. This office reached out to DOC staff, who confirmed that an appeal was never filed. The OCO informed this individual that the child's guardian in the community needs to file an appeal.	Information Provided
58. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a delay in getting eyeglasses.	The OCO spoke with DOC regarding this concern and confirmed that Correctional Industries (CI) optical received the glasses order but the PDF was cut off, so they were unable to fulfill the order. The order has been re-submitted and should be filled within 3-5 weeks.	Information Provided
59. Incarcerated person reported concerns about a DOC staff members actions that resulted in them receiving three general infractions.	The OCO provided information about how to address concerns related to general infractions and staff conduct. The OCO found the general infractions were not appealed. Incarcerated people that have concerns about infractions written as retaliation should appeal the infractions and share their concerns with the DOC hearings officer. They can also attempt to file a resolution request, however resolution requests that mention infractions are often not accepted.	Information Provided
60. Person reports concerns regarding DOC not responding to medical kites.	The OCO provided information about the DOC resolution program. The individual submitted a resolution request about DOC not responding to mental health kites and then appealed	Information Provided

DOC's response with an example about a medical kite. DOC staff interpreted this as two separate topics: medical kites and mental health kites. The DOC resolutions specialist followed the process outlined in the Resolution Program Manual by requesting a rewrite. The OCO encouraged the individual to submit a rewrite within 10 working days if they disagree with DOC's response.

61. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding the DOC resolution program not responding to their concerns.	The OCO provided information regarding the resolution program limits and why DOC was not responding to all their resolution requests. The OCO also reviewed multiple resolution requests within the past year to ensure that any potential issue that was reported and not investigated by DOC was looked into and substantiated or unsubstantiated.	Information Provided
62. Incarcerated person reported safety concerns. The person reported that another incarcerated person was unsafe for them to be around.	The OCO provided information about reporting safety concerns to DOC staff. The OCO spoke with DOC staff regarding this concern and verified that DOC took action regarding the safety concerns reported. The two people are now separated.	Information Provided
63. Incarcerated person reports concerns about their release.	The OCO provided information about the person's release. The OCO found this person does have a planned release date and that DOC is actively working to find this person housing, even though it is not required.	Information Provided
64. Person reports that his resolution request was not accepted. The resolution was for a specific medication because the person is fearful of the potential side effects of the medication he is ordered.	The OCO provided information to the person regarding the reason his resolution request was not accepted. The OCO also provided information from the DOC formulary manual to the person as the requested medication is not offered by the DOC Health Plan.	Information Provided
65. Person reported concern about correcting his medical record.	The OCO provided information about how to dispute and request an amendment to his medical record per RCW 70.02.100. The OCO reviewed DOC records and reached out to DOC staff, who said that this individual wrote a letter that has been added to his record expressing his concerns, but did not file the correct form disputing the record.	Information Provided
66. The person reports that incorrect information was entered into his drug assessment, and he wants an outside provider to redo his assessment, but DOC will not allow that to happen. This person would like to report this issue to the Department of Health (DOH) but has no way to contact them.	The OCO reviewed the individual's resolution requests and spoke with DOC staff regarding this concern. This office provided information about how this individual can file a complaint with the DOH by writing to: Health Systems Quality Assurance Complaint Intake, P.O. Box 478587, Olympia, WA 98504-7857.	Information Provided
67. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC staff not wanting to provide them with accommodations and mistreating them.	The OCO provided information regarding the ADA accommodations approval process and why it may take time for educational accommodations to be met since these decisions must be presented to the Accommodation Review Committee. The OCO was also unable to substantiate any misconduct by DOC staff.	Information Provided
68. Person reported concerns with ankle pain and that he is not getting care or follow up appointments. Person	The OCO provided information about filing a tort claim. DOC policy 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	Information Provided

reported wanting compensation for his ankle.	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." The OCO reviewed DOC records and reached out to DOC staff, who confirmed that this individual has received care and has appointments scheduled in the future.	
69. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC not providing them with adequate medical care.	The OCO was able to confirm that this individual was seen by medical professionals relating to their concern prior to transferring facilities. The OCO provided information regarding needing to kite medical to seek setting up an appointment for future treatment.	Information Provided
70. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being given someone else's medication.	The OCO reviewed the related grievance and confirmed there was insufficient evidence to show they were given someone else's medication but DOC staff were still given training regarding documentation and medical administration.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
71. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding staff touching their genital area during a search.	The OCO spoke to DOC about this concern and confirmed that DOC was able to review the video and identify when the pat search occurred, but did not see any issue with the way the officer searched this person. The officer did not appear to be anywhere near the individual's groin when the search occurred. Thus, there was insufficient evidence to substantiate the concern.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
72. An individual reports that DOC has been taking money for legal financial obligations (LFO) that should have been zeroed out from a superior court.	The OCO reviewed the resolution request and spoke with the DOC staff. This office verified DOC records showing no LFO deductions have been taken during this person's incarceration and confirmed that the current deductions are for his savings account and cost of incarceration (COI).	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
73. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding facility placement.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and recent infractions and confirmed that the individual was found guilty of multiple drug related infractions including a 603 in several months which prompted the demotion to close custody per DOC policy 300.380.	No Violation of Policy
74. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
75. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding not being able to attend a cultural event.	The OCO reviewed the related grievance and confirmed that because of the individual's judgment and sentence (J&S), they were not allowed to attend the event.	No Violation of Policy
76. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
77. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women		
78. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a graduated reentry (GRE) denial.	The OCO reviewed the individual's record and confirmed that DOC explained to the individual the reason for the GRE denial.	Information Provided

79. The individual reports that she was moved to another facility and placed in the therapeutic community program when she should have had a hold because she was already attending intensive day treatment (IDT).	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. This office confirmed with DOC that the individual should have had a hold for her IDT programming, but the hold was not applied until two days after her transfer was approved. Because the individual was close to her release date, it was not feasible for her to transfer back to return to TC.	Substantiated
--	--	---------------

Monroe Correctional Complex

80. Incarcerated individuals shared concerns regarding DOC not providing them with a proper snack.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO was able to speak with DOC staff and upon request, DOC scheduled a nutrition consult. The OCO was able to confirm that DOC staff worked with this individual to find a diet that they were comfortable with.	Assistance Provided
81. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding needing a proper CPAP replacement mask.	The OCO spoke to DOC about this several times and requested that this concern be addressed in a time sensitive nature. The OCO confirmed the individual was given a replacement mask and DOC ordered several of the masks to prevent waiting time in the future.	Assistance Provided
82. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC not prescribing them with the right medication and utilizing an alternative.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke with DOC staff regarding this individual's medical concerns and upon inquiry, DOC was able to ensure this individual's care was extended past what DOC medical staff initially thought was required. The OCO encouraged this individual to continue working with their medical provider to help take care of issues as they arise.	Assistance Provided
83. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO confirmed that the infraction was dismissed by DOC on appeal prior to OCO involvement.	DOC Resolved
84. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding treatment in the IMU and a desire to be released from the IMU.	The OCO confirmed that the individual was released from IMU prior to OCO involvement.	DOC Resolved
85. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding wanting to go to a facility without an active yard.	The OCO reviewed the individual's classification and confirmed that they were moved to a safe harbor facility.	DOC Resolved
86. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a false PREA complaint that resulted in placement in close custody.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and administrative segregation (ad seg) placement and confirmed that per their most recent CFP, the reason for the demotion was due to numerous infractions in a few months and behavior that required additional safety/security measures. The OCO confirmed the placement in ad seg was due to disrupting the unit significantly to the point where many others were going to staff with complaints.	Information Provided
87. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding ordering publications that have not arrived despite banking saying that the checks have been cashed.	The OCO spoke to DOC about this concern and confirmed that they have no mail that is pending processing and have not had any mail rejections for several months. The OCO informed the individual that they will need to work with the place that they ordered the publications from as DOC has no record of them having been mailed into the facility.	Information Provided
88. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding the food being served tasting like soap and causing digestion issues.	The OCO reviewed documents related to this concern and noted that DOC had checked trays and food and had not found any problems. Additionally, the OCO visited the kitchen to inspect and tested several dishes but did not find or see any soap residue.	Information Provided

89. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding not having a treatment plan.	The OCO spoke to DOC about this and confirmed the individual does have a current mental health treatment plan.	Information Provided
90. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding their earned release date (ERD) changing.	The OCO confirmed that the individual's ERD changed as their sex offender risk level changed resulting in difficulty finding the individual housing to release to.	Information Provided
91. The individual reports the need to have dental care scheduled and says he kited and grieved dental but is not getting any care.	The OCO provided information about his previous dental appointments, consults, and upcoming dental appointments.	Information Provided
92. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding filing a tort claim that was denied and wanting to know what next steps are available.	The OCO informed the individual that there are no further steps the OCO is able to assist the individual with as tort claim denials are separate from the OCO.	Information Provided
93. Person reported that the Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) denied his request for an ADA accommodation.	The OCO provided information. The OCO reviewed DOC records and the ARC denial and could not find evidence that this individual qualified for the accommodation he was seeking. The OCO encourages this individual to kite medical for further testing to confirm if he meets the criteria for the accommodation.	Information Provided
94. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding facility placement.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility placement (CFP) and found no violation of DOC policy 300.380 in this placement. The OCO provided the individual with more information about their housing unit and informed them to contact their counselor for reporting safety concerns.	Information Provided
95. Individual reported they were told they would be assaulted if they moved to a certain unit. They want the OCO to stop their transfer and help them get an override.	This individual was moved to the safe harbor in close custody. The OCO could not validate a threat to his safety.	Information Provided
96. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding disagreement with a case the OCO investigated regarding an infraction.	The OCO sent the individual a closed case review (CCR) form that they can complete and send back detailing why they believe the work the OCO did was incorrect.	Information Provided
97. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC endangering them by attempting to transfer them to a different facility.	The OCO provided information about the classification process provided by DOC. The OCO was able to confirm that this individual has a CFP (custody facility plan) currently in place that is taking their safety concerns into consideration.	Information Provided
98. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC administering their medication incorrectly and that medication not being as effective.	The OCO provided information regarding DOC's current medication administration policy and how it applies to this person's case.	Information Provided
99. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a desire to be compensated for destroyed property.	The OCO informed the individual that the OCO does not have authority to compensate individuals or ask DOC to compensate for lost property. The OCO informed the individual they must file a tort claim.	Information Provided
100. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being placed in segregation for attempting to die by suicide.	The OCO reviewed the individual's administrative segregation placement and confirmed that they were placed in segregation due to refusing housing and refusing a search. The OCO did not find any information showing they were placed in segregation for attempting to die by suicide.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

101. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction and the urinary analysis (UA) sample not being sent out at the time of the UA without them signing the authorization form.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the UA was sent to the lab at the individual's request.	No Violation of Policy
102. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding placement in solitary confinement due to an infraction. They also reported a desire to be interviewed for the solitary confinement report.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements. Because of this infraction the individual was given a MAX program and sent to the IMU. The OCO informed the individual that the solitary interviews were completed last year and the report regarding them has already been released and is available on the tablet.	No Violation of Policy
103. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being placed on a MAX program.	The OCO reviewed the individual's classification facility plan (CFP) and found no violation of DOC policy 320.255 as the individual was given a MAX program due to behaviors that DOC deems not safe for general population including sexual harassment, disruptive behavior and attempts at intimidation.	No Violation of Policy
104. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
105. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
106. Person reports his "Keep on Person" medications were taken from him in restrictive housing, despite that medication being allowed in his cell.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. OCO staff reviewed the person's medical records and found the removal of the medication was within policy. Per DOC policy 650.020 medications must be appropriately labeled by the pharmacy or an approved medical provider to be retained by patients. OCO staff contacted DOC staff and were informed that booth staff in the IMU do not typically log every medical request made over the intercom, only the movements out of the cell. OCO staff were unable to substantiate that the medication was not available to the person when requested due to insufficient evidence.	No Violation of Policy
107. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a visitation denial.	The OCO reviewed the visitation denial and found no violation of DOC policy 450.300 as victims of the current offense are ineligible for visitation.	No Violation of Policy
108. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding not being able to access the grievance program.	The OCO reviewed the individual's grievance record and confirmed that they have been able to successfully file grievances since the opening of this case and the grievances have been responded to properly.	No Violation of Policy
109. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
110. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a staff member trying to kick them out of the facility for no reason.	The OCO reviewed the grievance response and custody facility plan (CFP) and found no violation of policy as the individual was moved out of the facility due to behavior concerns with their peers and other reasons.	No Violation of Policy

Olympic Corrections Center

111. Person reported not getting mental health support at his facility. Person said he has asked to speak with a mental health provider and felt that he was not being taken seriously.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed DOC records and found that custody staff were made aware of his concerns in the unit, and that subsequently he was infraacted and transferred to a different facility. The OCO confirmed that his transfer was also to better address his medical needs and found that he has started medication. The OCO spoke with facility leadership and DOC headquarters about concerns over access to mental health support at the facility, and DOC confirmed that he was able to speak with a mental health provider. After OCO outreach, DOC headquarters and the facility changed their after-hours mental health crisis plan, particularly when providers are off-site. DOC was unwilling to overturn this individual's infraction.	Assistance Provided
112. Incarcerated person reported concerns regarding a contract staff member's behavior during programming.	The OCO provided information. The OCO verified the incident occurred and appropriate actions were taken by DOC. The OCO shared information with the person about actions the OCO can take in such instances. The OCO also shared how to request further services at their facility if needed.	Information Provided
113. Person reported concerns about how staff responded to him telling staff about the behavior of other incarcerated individuals.	The OCO provided information about addressing this staff conduct concern in a broader investigation the OCO conducted. The OCO reviewed the documentation from DOC staff and addressed this staff conduct concern with facility leadership.	Information Provided
114. Incarcerated person reported concerns regarding retaliation from multiple DOC staff members which caused him to be demoted custody levels.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed relevant records and spoke with multiple DOC staff members regarding the concerns to gather information about the allegations. The evidence available does not support that the person was demoted and transferred because of staff targeting them. The OCO confirmed that the demotion was not related to staff interference and was completed per policy.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
115. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy

Other

116. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding not getting their property after an out of state placement.	The OCO spoke to DOC about this concern and confirmed that the property has been shipped from Washington to the new state and the new state will decide what property is allowable.	Information Provided
117. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an out of state placement.	The OCO reviewed the out of state placement and found no violation of DOC policy 330.600 which states the department will transfer individuals between states if it is in the best interest of the state or welfare of the incarcerated individual.	No Violation of Policy

Stafford Creek Corrections Center

118. Person reported a sanitary concern resulting from a medical condition.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed DOC records and reached out to medical and custody staff and ensured that they found an alternative solution to address his sanitary concern.	Assistance Provided
119. Person reported that he is being denied specific diabetes treatment	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed DOC records and found that he was denied the treatment he wanted by the Care Review Committee (CRC), but he might be a good	Assistance Provided

and expressed concern that he is being racially discriminated against.	candidate for other treatment options. The OCO reached out to DOC staff and found that this individual had not been informed about these other treatment options. Upon OCO request, this individual was scheduled to meet with his provider to discuss treatment options. The OCO could not substantiate that his CRC denial was racial discrimination.	
120. Person reported that he was incorrectly charged for follow-up healthcare and that the resolutions program did not resolve his issue.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed DOC records and reached out to DOC staff, who substantiated that he was incorrectly charged and issued him a refund. The OCO also found that this individual needed translation services and connected the facility with translation support from DOC headquarters.	Assistance Provided
121. Person reported that he was taken off the diabetic diet despite being diabetic.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed DOC records and reached out to DOC staff, who agreed to send this case to the Facility Medical Director. This individual was seen by medical staff and placed back on the diabetic diet. The OCO is aware of a system-wide change to requirements for the diabetic diet and is continuing to review this issue.	Assistance Provided
122. Person called to reports issues with how he was being treated on the medical unit. The person is requesting to be moved back to his regular unit.	OCO staff provided assistance by contacting DOC and requesting the person be given any property that could be approved for his time in the medical unit. OCO staff confirmed that his placement was the most appropriate for the level of care he required. DOC staff agreed to meet with the person to resolve his immediate concern.	Assistance Provided
123. Individual reports that he was transferred to a new facility for physical therapy (PT) but has not been scheduled for any appointments.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed this individual's resolution request and confirmed that this person alerted health services of their concern. The OCO also confirmed in DOC records that this individual recently had a PT appointment and has an evaluation next month.	DOC Resolved
124. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being placed in a cell with a cellmate who is presenting hygiene concerns.	This individual contacted the OCO and stated that the concern has been resolved and the case can be closed.	DOC Resolved
125. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding their mail being wrongfully rejected by DOC staff.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. This office was able to confirm that DOC staff overturned the rejection and provided this individual with their requested mail.	DOC Resolved
126. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being accused of a PREA allegation.	The OCO reviewed the PREA case and confirmed that it was deemed unfounded. Thus, this concern was resolved by DOC prior to OCO involvement.	DOC Resolved
127. A loved one made a concern on behalf of an incarcerated individual regarding DOC refusing to test their cognitive function and provide ADA accommodations for them.	The OCO provided information regarding the importance of working with their provider to request accommodations. The OCO also shared information regarding medical diagnoses needing to come from medical professionals before being accepted as an accommodation basis.	Information Provided
128. Incarcerated person reported concerns regarding their safety. The person reports someone on the unit has been harassing them and they felt unsafe.	The OCO provided information regarding the process for the investigation that DOC is completing. The OCO also verified that DOC has followed the protocol for this type of investigation.	Information Provided

129. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding staff making sexually harassing remarks towards them.	The OCO reviewed the records related to the PREA and confirmed that one allegation was substantiated, and the staff member was properly disciplined.	Information Provided
130. Individual reports they had a keyboard before they left for IMU. They found out that the keyboard was found in another individual's cell despite the fact it should have been packed up in their property to be shipped out. They filed a grievance, and a tort claim but they denied the tort claim. They want the OCO to look at the cameras when investigating.	The OCO cannot reimburse individuals for missing property. They would need to go through the tort process and if it is denied, they can appeal. DOC only retains camera footage for 30 days. By the time the individual filed this concern, the OCO would not have been able to review footage.	Information Provided
131. Incarcerated person reported concerns about accessing their religious property.	The OCO provided information regarding the person's religious property. The OCO spoke with DOC staff and found that the property is a part of an investigation and DOC is unwilling to allow the person to have the property at this time. The OCO shared how to access religious property at their current facility.	Information Provided
132. Incarcerated person reported concerns about access to report staff conduct issues through a protected process. The person also reports that DOC is trying to send them back to general population when they are not safe there.	The OCO provided information. The OCO verified that DOC processed the reports concerning DOC staff and followed their protocol when investigating the report. The OCO found DOC kept the person in the unit they were housed in until they were transferred to another facility. The OCO provided information about how to verify their concern, which was reviewed by DOC and provided information about their placement.	Information Provided
133. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding not wanting to transfer due to a victim's relative working there.	The OCO reviewed the individual's grievance history and confirmed that the individual has been transferred and has not filed any grievances since transferring to indicate any ongoing concern. The OCO informed the individual they can call this office if there are specific staff conduct concerns.	Information Provided
134. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a negative behavior observation entry (BOE).	The OCO reviewed the BOE record and found no negative or neutral BOEs in 2024 matching the description the individual provided.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
135. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding placement in segregation.	The OCO reviewed the administrative segregation (ad seg) placement and found no violation of DOC policy 320.255 as they were placed in ad seg due to possible intoxication and for refusing orders.	No Violation of Policy
136. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
137. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a visitation denial.	The OCO reviewed the visitation denial and confirmed the appeal was denied because the visitor was sneaking in contraband. The visitor was advised that they can reapply in one year.	No Violation of Policy
138. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC mishandling an investigation and taking an extended period of time to respond to the concern.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO was able to confirm that DOC staff looked into this concern immediately upon hearing the complaint per DOC policy 490.800. DOC staff moved this individual, per their request, and the DOC investigation found this complaint as unsubstantiated.	No Violation of Policy

139. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
140. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding two PREA investigations.	The OCO reviewed the records for both PREAs and found no violation of DOC policy as the PREAs were properly investigated and deemed unfounded and unsubstantiated.	No Violation of Policy
141. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding staff speaking to them disrespectfully and targeting them because they are transgender.	The OCO was unable to investigate the specific instance of staff conduct as it was not grieved to a level 2. The OCO did review the infraction materials related to this and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the elements of the infraction.	No Violation of Policy
142. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
143. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding DOC refusing to give them their gabapentin.	The OCO reviewed the grievance responses and confirmed that there was no violation of DOC policy. The gabapentin was not refilled when the individual wanted it because they did not submit the refill card before they were out. There was no clinical indication in the individual's medical information that warranted using the MODA process to obtain the gabapentin and it was confirmed that the community hospital stopped the medication, not DOC.	No Violation of Policy
144. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 and informed the individual that if they are refusing housing due to safety concerns, they will be infractioned if they do not provide information that can be validated.	No Violation of Policy
145. Incarcerated person reported concerns about DOC transferring them and reported concerns about an investigation.	The OCO could not substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed the reasons for transfer and verified DOC transferred the person per DOC policy 300.380, and this transfer was related to a safety and security concern.	No Violation of Policy
146. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
147. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
Washington Corrections Center		
148. Incarcerated person reported concerns about being housed around a DOC staff member they previously reported concerns about. The person requested OCO assistance in being moved to the facility they are being transferred to.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted the facility and requested they speak with the person about their concerns. After OCO's contact, the person was spoken to and the OCO was informed they will transfer to the new facility very soon.	Assistance Provided
149. Incarcerated person reported concerns regarding the heat in their unit and reported that there was no heat coming in.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke with DOC staff which prompted them to look at the vent system and identify an issue with the system. The DOC then was able to swiftly remedy the issue due to OCO outreach.	Assistance Provided

150. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding difficulty getting to work release.	The OCO confirmed the individual was transferred to a reentry center prior to OCO involvement.	DOC Resolved
151. Person reported that his surgery, which the OCO helped with in a previous case, was cancelled and has not been rescheduled.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed DOC records and tracked this surgery appointment and confirmed that it was rescheduled.	DOC Resolved
152. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being stuck in the IMU.	The OCO reviewed the individual's classification and confirmed that they have been moved out of the IMU pending classification to their parent facility.	DOC Resolved
153. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding staff making threatening comments and a desire to not be near that officer.	The OCO reviewed the individual's placement and confirmed that the individual has transferred facilities and thus is no longer in interactions with the officer they reported concerns about.	DOC Resolved
154. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a pending transfer and a desire to be in a particular area.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and confirmed that the individual was placed where they requested.	DOC Resolved
155. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being stuck in the receiving units.	The OCO reviewed the individual's classification and confirmed that they have been transferred to a living unit.	DOC Resolved
156. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction and placement in the IMU.	The OCO reviewed the individual's placement, grievance and infraction history and found no recent infractions or grievances and confirmed that the individual has been released from IMU.	DOC Resolved
157. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction they were not informed of.	The OCO reviewed the individual's disciplinary record and found no infractions on their record, thus this infraction appears to have been dismissed by DOC.	DOC Resolved
158. Incarcerated person shared concerns regarding being wrongfully denied for graduated reentry (GRE) and release to a reentry center (RC) and not hearing back regarding their appeal of the denial.	The OCO provided information regarding why they were denied and why they will not be approved for GRE or RC placement.	Information Provided
159. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding placement in IMU.	The OCO confirmed that the PREA investigation is still open and under investigation. The OCO informed the individual that if they disagree with the outcome once it is closed, they can contact this office then. The OCO also confirmed that the individual was put in IMU due to several recent infractions, none of which have been appealed. The OCO informed the individual that if they want the OCO to investigate the infractions, they must appeal them first.	Information Provided
160. Incarcerated person reported concerns about access to their property to assist them in a legal case. The person also shared concerns about their placement.	The OCO provided information about how to access legal resources and verified that their property has been issued to them. The OCO reviewed the person's placement and found DOC has determined their placement is appropriate per DOC policy 300.380.	Information Provided
161. A loved one reported a concern from an incarcerated individual, who stated that Securus does not back up personal data on the tablets from incarcerated individuals, and that if	The OCO provided information. The OCO brought this concern to Securus and DOC staff at the Securus quarterly meeting, and both were unwilling to make a change to the software to be able to back up incarcerated individuals' data on the tablets.	Information Provided

they get a new tablet they lose their drafts and OfficeSuite documents.

162. Person reports he is not being offered pain management and is requesting to be approved for stronger medication. The person states that DOC has not responded to his Care Review Committee appeal.	The OCO provided information to the person regarding the Care Review Committee (CRC) decision. OCO staff confirmed the person's appeal was reviewed but did not change the CRC decision. The OCO cannot compel a medical provider to order a medication that is determined to not be medically necessary.	Information Provided
163. Incarcerated person reports concerns about peer support within the resolution program.	The OCO provided information about the DOC resolutions peer support program. The OCO spoke with DOC staff regarding the peer support program and found that it is not a mandatory program. Anyone can reach out to the resolution coordinator and share with them they do not want peer support. The peer support person is available to help others navigate the resolutions process and share how to resolve concerns outside the resolution program when applicable. The peer support person will also explain the next steps after the DOC staff have determined they are not accepted. The peer support employee will share the reason for that decision and share other options to resolve the concern.	Information Provided
164. A loved one reports that her brother is disabled and was attacked by another incarcerated person shortly after he arrived at the prison.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office contacted the facility about the individual's safety concern, and DOC staff confirmed the individual was safe. However, there was an incident that happened when the person was in county jail.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
165. Incarcerated individual reports that he hurt his back while in the military and has been asking DOC for over a year to speak with someone at the Veteran's Administration or a reentry specialist and DOC has been putting him off.	The OCO reviewed the individual's electronic file and determined DOC staff set up communication with VA staff and reentry specialist, but the individual was unable to receive information on the kiosk because he is in the IMU.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
166. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding facility placement.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and found no violation of DOC policy 300.380 in the facility placement.	No Violation of Policy
167. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding their facility placement.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and found no violation of DOC policy 300.380 in the facility placement.	No Violation of Policy
168. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the "some evidence" standard utilized by DOC to uphold infractions is met based on the confidential informant information.	No Violation of Policy
169. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an extended family visit (EFV) denial.	The OCO reviewed the EFV denial and found no violation of DOC policy as the denial is due to domestic violence (DV) history of a like victim, and a lack of desire to talk about the crime and engage in SOTAP.	No Violation of Policy
170. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding the way in which DOC responded to a medical emergency.	The OCO reviewed the grievance related to this concern and found no violation of DOC policy 610.040.	No Violation of Policy

171. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction element.	No Violation of Policy
172. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
Washington Corrections Center for Women		
173. Incarcerated person reported concerns about their tablet.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke with the facility DOC SecurUs Liaison, who shared they met with the individual after OCO inquiring and resolved the person's concern related their tablet.	Assistance Provided
174. An incarcerated individual reports that she is having difficulty communicating with DOC staff because they do not provide translation services regularly. She also reports that she was never given a handbook because the facility does not have one in Spanish.	The OCO provided assistance by escalating the concern to facility leadership. This office also contacted DOC staff who assisted in getting the individual a facility handbook in Spanish.	Assistance Provided
175. External person reports that she and her cellmate were inappropriately targeted for a PREA based on the reporter's prejudice. This person requested that DOC drop the investigation.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. OCO staff reviewed the PREA investigation and found that it was determined to be unsubstantiated. The OCO is in ongoing discussions with the DOC about the treatment of individuals accused of PREA. PREA investigations must be completed after being reported per DOC policy 490.800.	DOC Resolved
176. External person reports that she and her cellmate were inappropriately targeted for a PREA based on the reporter's prejudice. This person requested that DOC drop the investigation.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. OCO staff reviewed the PREA investigation and found that it was determined to be unsubstantiated. The OCO is in ongoing discussions with the DOC about the treatment of individuals accused of PREA. PREA investigations must be completed after being reported per DOC policy 490.800.	DOC Resolved
177. Person reports that she and her cellmate were inappropriately targeted for a PREA based on the reporter's prejudice. This person requested that DOC drop the investigation.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. OCO staff reviewed the PREA investigation and found that it was determined to be unsubstantiated. The OCO is in ongoing discussions with the DOC about the treatment of individuals accused of PREA. PREA investigations must be completed after being reported per DOC policy 490.800.	DOC Resolved
178. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC staff investigating them over a false claim and keeping them in segregation.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. DOC held this individual in segregation while conducting an investigation per DOC policy 320.000. This office was able to confirm that this individual was placed back into general population.	DOC Resolved
179. Incarcerated person reports the cable for the television in the Extended Family Visiting (EFV) area is not working. The person requests OCO assistance in getting the cable fixed.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO verified that this issue has been resolved prior to our outreach.	DOC Resolved

180. External person reports staff misconduct. A staff member has misgendered their loved one and continues to harass them.	The OCO reviewed this concern and contacted the facility. The facility leadership shared that they have already opened an investigation into this misconduct and the staff member has been reassigned.	Information Provided
181. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding the COVID protocols in the IMU.	The OCO spoke with DOC regarding this concern and confirmed that DOC separated the person who had COVID on their own tier and everyone else is on a different tier. DOC reported that they are able to do this because each cell has its own air flow, so no air is mixed. Additionally, the showers are cleaned and disinfected before anyone goes in after the person with COVID.	Information Provided
182. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding needing wet wipes.	The OCO spoke to DOC about this concern and confirmed that there currently are no alternatives to the peri-bottle and washcloths as they were the alternative to the elimination of wet wipes. The OCO informed the individual that they can attempt to request wet wipes through the care review committee (CRC) process by asking their provider to initiate this process.	Information Provided
183. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding wanting beard removal.	The OCO spoke to DOC about this concern and confirmed that this was determined to not be a medically needed procedure by both the individual's provider and the care review committee (CRC).	Information Provided
184. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding not being seen by dental for an extended period of time and having dental concerns that are not addressed.	The OCO provided information regarding the importance of working with their provider to receive requested care. The OCO was able to confirm that this individual is scheduled for an appointment regarding dental in the near future.	Information Provided
185. Person reported that they are being harassed by staff and misgendered.	The OCO spoke with the facility leadership regarding concerns of staff misconduct. The leadership team shared that there is currently an open investigation into the staff behavior.	Information Provided
186. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC medical staff not providing their medication before their extended family visit (EFV) and that caused a medical emergency.	The OCO was able to confirm that DOC staff recognized that there was an error made between DOC medical staff and DOC custody staff in ensuring individuals out on EFV have their medications. The OCO informed this individual that if this issue happens again, to reach back out to this office.	Information Provided
187. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC staff not providing them with adequate medical care.	The OCO provided information regarding continuing to work with their provider to take care of their concerns. The OCO found that this individual recently transferred facilities and will need to reach out to medical staff to schedule appointments.	Information Provided
188. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
189. Person reported concerns about being taken off a pain management medication and said she needs pain management for several injuries.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed DOC records and found that this individual was taken off this specific pain medication because she violated the medication protocols. The OCO contacted DOC staff, who confirmed that this individual has been working with her provider team and is receiving multiple alternative pain management medications and that her provider team is exploring other possible treatment options.	No Violation of Policy
190. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding being placed in	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. This individual was held in segregation per DOC policy	No Violation of Policy

segregation for an alleged assault despite being the victim.

320.000. The OCO was able to confirm that this individual was placed back into general population.

Washington State Penitentiary		
191. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC restricting the property they can have and not being clear on what they can have.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. This individual called and shared that DOC staff recognized that they made an error and fixed this individual's concern.	DOC Resolved
192. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding losing good time as a result of non-hearing cell confinement.	The OCO reviewed the grievance responses and confirmed that DOC substantiated the claims that assigned to cell (CTQ) is not recognized as a program and the previous grievance responses were overturned. DOC has taken action to prevent this type of issue from occurring in the future as CTQ is only a disciplinary sanction to be given after a guilty finding results.	DOC Resolved
193. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC staff not helping them take an assessment, revoking their programming opportunities, and being stuck in IMU (Intensive Management Unit).	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO was able to confirm that DOC staff will be transferring this individual to a location where they can utilize the programming they have been requesting.	DOC Resolved
194. A loved one reports that her husband was in a fight and broke a bone but DOC is delaying his medical care. They also reported that he has an ingrown toenail which needs to be removed and has no access to heart medication.	The OCO provided information about the resolution process and verified the person was seen for his broken bone. OCO staff reviewed the patient's record and monitored his appointment status on the appointment tracker. The individual is scheduled for monthly X-rays through the end of the year. This office contacted DOC health services and was informed that the requested care was in progress.	Information Provided
195. Incarcerated person reported concerns regarding their Intensive Management Unit (IMU) level. The person reports DOC is not allowing them to reach level 3.	The OCO provided the individual with information about how to engage in maximum custody programming while being housed in segregation. Engaging in programming helps people promote out of maximum custody. The OCO verified the DOC is not allowing people level 3 access based on their reason for max custody placement.	Information Provided
196. Family member relayed concerns regarding an incarcerated individual's facility placement.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and confirmed that due to security threat group (STG) involvement, a MAX placement is appropriate. The OCO informed the individual that if they disagree with the outcome of their in-process CFP, they can appeal within 72 hours.	Information Provided
197. Person reported appealing his risk level and said he never received a response.	The OCO provided information about the proper way to appeal his risk level by writing to the facility superintendent. The OCO reached out to DOC staff at the facility and headquarters, who said they never received an appeal.	Information Provided
198. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding facility placement.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and confirmed that due to security threat group (STG) involvement, a MAX placement is appropriate. The OCO informed the individual that if they disagree with the outcome of their in-process CFP, they can appeal within 72 hours.	Information Provided
199. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding wanting the behavior observation entry (BOE) process to change so that individuals are given timely notice or a copy.	The OCO informed the individual that DOC issued a memo for all prisons on September 13, 2024 regarding BOEs reminding staff to notify incarcerated individuals as soon as possible of positive, negative or neutral BOEs.	Information Provided

200. Individual reports he was given a max program and labeled an STG when he is not.	The OCO reviewed the individual's infraction history, max program placement and custody facility plan. This office also contacted DOC HQ. The DOC maintains that the individual has security threat group (STG) ties. The DOC denied the request to move him back to the general population.	Information Provided
201. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC holding them within IMU (Intensive Management Unit) for an extended period of time.	The OCO was provided information regarding why this individual was retained in IMU. The OCO reviewed documents relevant to this concern and were able to confirm that this individual has a recent history of major violent infractions. Due to safety concerns for this individual and others if placed in general population, the FRMT (Facility Risk Management Team), which determines an individual's custody level, decided to promote this individual to close custody from MAX per DOC 320.250.	Information Provided
202. Individual reports he would like to be moved out of segregation, he doesn't have a history that would indicate he needs to be in IMU and has had no violent write ups for many years. He has been on the out of state transfer list for years.	The OCO reviewed the individual's infraction history and max custody placement. The individual needs a safe harbor placement but has a keep separate with staff at one of the locations. This office asked for him to be placed in a different safe harbor and the DOC refused. The individual is on the out of state transfer list.	Information Provided
203. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC potentially moving them to a facility where they won't be provided with proper accommodation.	The OCO provided information regarding the classification process and how they can appeal a classification decision if they are unsatisfied with the outcome of their latest CFP (custody facility plan). This office was unable to confirm any current plans by DOC to transfer this individual.	Information Provided
204. Incarcerated person reported concerns about accessing DOC documents about their solitary confinement guidelines.	The OCO provided information about how to request documents from DOC. The OCO shared how to request records from DOC and suggested they review DOC 320.255 and 300.380.	Information Provided
205. Incarcerated person reported concerns about their placement in segregation and report that DOC is not listening to their safety concerns.	The OCO provided information about what information is required for DOC to validate safety concerns. The OCO reviewed the person's file and spoke with DOC about their concerns. DOC shared why the concerns were unable to be verified and what the person can do to assist DOC in verifying the safety concerns they have reported. The OCO provided this information to the incarcerated person.	Information Provided
206. Incarcerated person reported concerns about their housing assignment and reported DOC was not willing to listen to their concerns.	The OCO provided information regarding how to report safety concerns and the information DOC requires to validate safety concerns. The OCO verified DOC has provided this person with access to report their concerns. DOC is now transferring this person to a new unit.	Information Provided
207. External person reported an individual was removed from his unit due to a validated safety concern. He was placed on involuntary protective custody and is on the out of state transfer list.	The OCO verified that this individual was assaulted and there was a validated concern that he would be assaulted again. The WADOC does not have safe housing for this individual and has placed him on the out of state transfer list per DOC 330.600.	No Violation of Policy
208. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding confusion as to why they were placed at a specific facility.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and found no violation of DOC policy 300.380 as the individual had consistent recommendations to go to that facility.	No Violation of Policy

209. Loved one relayed concerns regarding an incarcerated individual's placement in segregation.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and confirmed that due to no other housing options, a MAX placement is the only place for him at this time.	No Violation of Policy
210. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
211. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being stuck in segregation.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and confirmed that per their most recent CFP, there was no validation to their claims of needing protection. The OCO informed the individual that they will need to provide specific names and other details for the safety concerns to be validated.	No Violation of Policy
212. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being stuck in segregation despite completing their MAX program.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and found no violation of DOC policy 300.380.	No Violation of Policy
213. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding their facility placement.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and confirmed that the MAX placement is due to ongoing behaviors that are unsafe for other custody levels.	No Violation of Policy
214. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the individual's behavior met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
215. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being stuck in segregation.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and confirmed there is evidence that their security threat group (STG) affiliation has eliminated all general population housing options.	No Violation of Policy
216. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding not being allowed to go beyond a level 2 while in IMU.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and spoke with DOC and confirmed that the MAX committee decided that the individual is to maintain a level 2 per DOC policy 320.255.	No Violation of Policy
217. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a loss of good conduct time sanction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and confirmed that this was the individual's sixth serious infraction within 12 months so the loss of good conduct time was appropriate per DOC policy 460.050	No Violation of Policy
218. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding placement in segregation.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and confirmed that due to no other housing options, a MAX placement is the only place for him at this time.	No Violation of Policy
219. Individual is requesting assistance to get moved to the general population. They have completed all the programming, remained infraction-free, and are accruing positive BOEs.	The OCO reviewed this individual's infraction history, custody facility plans and max custody placement. Based on their infraction history, the DOC is unwilling to give them an override to medium. The DOC max committee met to review this placement, and they concluded that in the general population, the individual continues to engage in problematic behaviors. The DOC is following DOC 320.250.	No Violation of Policy

Intake Investigations

Airway Heights Corrections Center

220. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding staff conduct concerns when they were formerly incarcerated.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(f) as the alleged violation is a past rather than ongoing issue.	Declined
--	---	----------

221. Loved one relayed concerns regarding a visitation application.	The OCO sent the individual an ombuds review request form to ensure that this was a concern that they consented to having investigated but never received the form back. As a result, this concern was closed without further investigation. The OCO informed the individual that if they believe this was closed in error, to please contact this office to open a new case.	Person Declined OCO Assistance
222. Loved one relayed concerns regarding being in segregation and having a broken ankle.	The OCO sent the individual an ombuds review request form to ensure that this was a concern that they consented to having investigated but never received the form back. As a result, this concern was closed without further investigation. The OCO informed the individual that if they believe this was closed in error, to please contact this office to open a new case.	Person Declined OCO Assistance
223. Incarcerated person reports concern regarding missing property after a transfer.	The OCO provided technical assistance by sharing how to resolve this concern within the DOC resolution process. The OCO verified that this person needs to appeal their resolution request and provided detailed information about how to do so.	Technical Assistance Provided
224. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding having their keyboard and tablet taken away.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
225. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding staff targeting them because they identify as transgender.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
226. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding not being able to release to their county of origin.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
227. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns about staff targeting them.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
228. Incarcerated person reported concerns regarding their time calculation.	The OCO provided technical assistance by sharing how to actively resolve their concern within DOC. The OCO found DOC has shared how to request an audit for his records and time calculation. This office also shared how to appeal their resolution request up to level three to ensure that their concern is reviewed multiple times.	Technical Assistance Provided
229. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding feeling like staff are treating them unfairly.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
230. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding getting demoted without due process.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
231. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a DOC staff member asking him to pick up a random box in the unit and throw it away. This box did not belong to the individual, so he refused to do it. The DOC staff member threatened to infract him if he did not comply with orders.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided

232. Incarcerated individual reports banking concerns.	The incarcerated person has not yet sufficiently escalated the concern through an appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. The OCO provided technical assistance about banking.	Technical Assistance Provided
233. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding feeling like staff are treating them unfairly.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
234. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a staff member announcing what prescriptions he was taking.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
235. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding frustrations with multiple DOC systems.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
236. The individual reported that DOC staff did not use proper mail protocol when sending out their legal mail and staff misconduct.	The incarcerated person has not yet sufficiently escalated the concern through an appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. The OCO provided technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
237. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a staff member not helping them with their release.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
238. Person reported that DOC staff use unfair treatment.	The incarcerated person has not yet sufficiently escalated the concern through an appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. The OCO provided technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
239. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a staff member swearing at them.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
240. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding feeling like staff are treating them unfairly.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
241. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding feeling like staff are treating them unfairly.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
242. Individual reported that the visitation room at camp has no television for visitors to watch.	The incarcerated person has not yet sufficiently escalated the concern through an appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. The OCO provided technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
243. Person reported that they are having a difficult time accessing healthcare services.	The OCO provided technical assistance about the resolution process and health services.	Technical Assistance Provided
244. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding staff members discriminating against them.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
245. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding not getting their property.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance regarding the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided

Clallam Bay Corrections Center

246. Loved one relayed concerns regarding a delayed transfer.	The OCO sent the individual an ombuds review request form to ensure that this was a concern that they consented to having investigated but never received the form back. As a result, this concern was closed without further investigation. The OCO informed the individual that if they believe this was closed in error, to please contact this office to open a new case.	Person Declined OCO Assistance
247. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding their counselor not helping them with their custody facility placement (CFP) goals.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
248. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding staff not sending out their mail.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
249. Person reports concerns about placement.	The incarcerated person has not yet sufficiently escalated the concern through an appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. The OCO provided technical assistance about appealing classification decisions.	Technical Assistance Provided

Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

250. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding wanting the OCO to help them file a police report against DOC staff members.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(e) as the requested resolution is not within the ombuds' statutory power and authority.	Declined
251. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding receiving the wrong infraction from DOC and not being provided with the proper appeal opportunities by DOC.	This person was released from DOC prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	Person Released from DOC Prior to OCO Action
252. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being harassed by certain staff members.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
253. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being harassed by certain staff members.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
254. Person reports that a DOC staff member is retaliating against him because he is in contact with the OCO.	The incarcerated person has not yet sufficiently escalated the concern through an appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. The OCO provided technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
255. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding staff unreasonably infracting them.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
256. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding staff making them cut their fingernails.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
257. Person reported DOC staff misconduct and racial bias during a medical trip.	The OCO provided technical assistance about the resolution process and how to file a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
258. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding staff treating them poorly.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided

259. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being harassed by certain staff members.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
260. Individual reported that during a cell search, an item was taken when they had proper paperwork to keep it.	The incarcerated person has not yet sufficiently escalated the concern through an appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. The OCO provided technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided

Monroe Correctional Complex

261. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding behavior observation entries (BOEs) that they were issued but he was not notified of in 2018.	The OCO declined to investigate further per WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) any 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. At this time, the OCO does not have the resources to investigate concerns that are from prior incarcerations.	Declined
262. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding wanting the OCO to help them get a check from DOC.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(e) as the requested resolution is not within the ombuds' statutory power and authority.	Declined
263. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding wanting the OCO to help them appeal their current charges.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(e) as the requested resolution is not within the ombuds' statutory power and authority.	Declined
264. The individual reported that their legal mail has been getting rejected.	The OCO provided technical assistance about how to appeal a mail rejection notice.	Technical Assistance Provided
265. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding the law librarian not sending their legal mail.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
266. Person reported that they did not receive all of their money when they moved to another facility.	The OCO provided technical assistance about the banking process.	Technical Assistance Provided
267. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a staff member discriminating and pre-judging people.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request related to staff conduct.	Technical Assistance Provided
268. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding staff taking away magazines they deem sexually explicit despite them being approved by the mailroom already.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
269. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding the way people act in SOU.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
270. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding staff telling them they cannot use the restroom when they were in another pod for programming.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
271. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns about issues they are having with a staff member.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided

272. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding staff making fun of them.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
273. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding DOC removing them from their mobility training.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance regarding the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
Olympic Corrections Center		
274. Loved one relayed concerns regarding infractions.	The OCO sent the individual an ombuds review request form to ensure that this was a concern that they consented to having investigated but never received the form back. As a result, this concern was closed without further investigation. The OCO informed the individual that if they believe this was closed in error, to please contact this office to open a new case.	Person Declined OCO Assistance
Other		
275. Loved one relayed concerns about Island County Jail.	The OCO declined to move the complaint beyond the intake investigation phase per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds lacks jurisdiction over the complaint.	Lacked Jurisdiction
276. Loved one expressed concerns about an individual's access to an attorney in a jail facility.	The OCO declined to move the complaint beyond the intake investigation phase per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds lacks jurisdiction over the complaint.	Lacked Jurisdiction
277. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding Pierce County Jail.	The OCO declined to investigate further per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds lacks jurisdiction over the complaint.	Lacked Jurisdiction
278. A family member made a concern on behalf of an incarcerated individual regarding DOC wrongfully imprisoning them.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	Person Released from DOC Prior to OCO Action
279. Person reports concerns related to records.	The incarcerated person has not yet sufficiently escalated the concern through an appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. The OCO provided technical assistance about DOC public records requests and records corrections.	Technical Assistance Provided
Reentry Center - Reynolds - King		
280. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC staff failing to assist them in proper reentry by not updating their paperwork.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	Person Released from DOC Prior to OCO Action
Reentry Center - Wenatchee Valley - Chelan		
281. A loved one shared concerns on behalf of an incarcerated individual regarding DOC staff mistreating them.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	Person Released from DOC Prior to OCO Action
Stafford Creek Corrections Center		
282. Loved one relayed concerns regarding a hearing officer's conduct during infraction hearings.	The OCO sent the individual an ombuds review request form to ensure that this was a concern that they consented to having investigated but never received the form back. As a result, this concern was closed without further investigation. The OCO	Person Declined OCO Assistance

informed the individual that if they believe this was closed in error, to please contact this office to open a new case.

283. Incarcerated person reported concerns regarding DOC denying them Extended Family Visits (EFVs) with their loved one.	The OCO provided technical assistance about how to appeal EFV denials. The OCO verified DOC is currently reviewing a recent appeal of the denial and this office shared with the individual that the OCO can review the denial after the appeals process has been exhausted.	Technical Assistance Provided
284. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding DOC not providing yellow packets of soap anymore and instead giving a liquid cleanser.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
285. Person wanted to get information on how to file a tort claim.	The OCO provided technical assistance about how to file a tort claim.	Technical Assistance Provided
286. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding DOC not providing them with an alternative time to shower due to their gender identity.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
287. The individual reports concerns about access to ADA compliant jobs.	The OCO provided technical assistance about the resolution process and the current ADA policy followed by DOC.	Technical Assistance Provided
288. Incarcerated person reported concern regarding an infraction they received.	The OCO provided technical assistance by sharing how to appeal the serious infraction to the next level. The OCO requests that people file and receive a DOC response to a serious infraction appeal prior to our involvement.	Technical Assistance Provided
289. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an assault that occurred.	The OCO confirmed that the individual is not currently in any danger and provided them with technical assistance about the resolution program regarding the previous assault.	Technical Assistance Provided
290. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding not being allowed to bring legal documents to visit with lawyers.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about filing a resolution request for staff conduct concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
291. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding DOC putting false statements in their electronic file.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
292. Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC wrongfully infracting them.	The incarcerated person has not yet sufficiently escalated the concern through an appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. The OCO provided technical assistance about appealing infractions.	Technical Assistance Provided

Washington Corrections Center

293. Loved one relayed concerns regarding a staff's conduct regarding disclosing people's crimes of conviction.	The OCO sent the individual an ombuds review request form to ensure that this was a concern that they consented to having investigated but never received the form back. As a result, this concern was closed without further investigation. The OCO informed the individual that if they believe this was closed in error, to please contact this office to open a new case.	Person Declined OCO Assistance
294. Loved one relayed concerns regarding a delayed infraction appeal response.	The OCO sent the individual an ombuds review request form to ensure that this was a concern that they consented to having investigated but never received the form back. As a result, this	Person Declined OCO Assistance

concern was closed without further investigation. The OCO informed the individual that if they believe this was closed in error, to please contact this office to open a new case.

295. Loved one relayed concerns regarding a medication.	The OCO sent the individual an ombuds review request form to ensure that this was a concern that they consented to having investigated but never received the form back. As a result, this concern was closed without further investigation. The OCO informed the individual that if they believe this was closed in error, to please contact this office to open a new case.	Person Declined OCO Assistance
296. Loved one relayed concerns regarding a visitation application.	The OCO sent the individual an ombuds review request form to ensure that this was a concern that they consented to having investigated but never received the form back. As a result, this concern was closed without further investigation. The OCO informed the individual that if they believe this was closed in error, to please contact this office to open a new case.	Person Declined OCO Assistance
297. A loved one made a concern on behalf of an incarcerated individual regarding DOC miscalculating their time served.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	Person Released from DOC Prior to OCO Action
298. Incarcerated person reported concerns about their time calculation.	The OCO provided technical assistance by sharing how to resolve this concern internally with DOC.	Technical Assistance Provided
299. Incarcerated individual would like more access to education and programming.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
300. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding difficulties communicating with staff through the cell intercom.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
301. Person reported issues during visitation with their family.	The OCO provided technical assistance about utilizing the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
302. Incarcerated person reported concern about staff actions during an incident.	The OCO provided technical assistance by sharing how to continue to resolve this concern internally with DOC. The OCO shared how to appeal the persons resolution request to level 2. If the issue is not resolve after received a level 2 resolution request response, the person can call OCO to open a case at that time.	Technical Assistance Provided
303. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding DOC not allowing them to finish their beaded medallion before sending it out.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
304. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding access to food.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
305. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding the receiving units being constantly damp and moldy.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided

306. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding the limitations on Muslim religious service meetings.	The OCO provided the individual technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
307. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding the Halal diet being served.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
308. Person reported that they were placed in segregation and could not make their appointment at the law library.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution process.	Technical Assistance Provided
309. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding their legal property not transferring facilities with them.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution process.	Technical Assistance Provided
310. Person reported a concern about medical neglect and litigation related litigation.	The OCO provided technical assistance about the resolution program and health services.	Technical Assistance Provided
311. Person reported that DOC lost their legal documents.	The OCO provided technical assistance about how to file a resolution request for staff conduct and property concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided

Washington Corrections Center for Women

312. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding difficulty getting a proper fitting bra and then getting infraacted for the bra they had.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance regarding the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
313. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding false positives with the body scanner.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
314. Patient reports staff conduct concerns and requested the health services staff member be fired.	The incarcerated person has not yet sufficiently escalated the concern through an appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. The OCO provided technical assistance about the process for addressing health services staff conduct through the DOC Resolution Program prior to OCO involvement.	Technical Assistance Provided
315. A loved one made a concern on behalf of an incarcerated individual regarding DOC keeping this individual in Ad Seg (Administrative Segregation) due to an infraction.	The incarcerated person has not yet sufficiently escalated the concern through an appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. The OCO provided technical assistance about the infraction appeal process.	Technical Assistance Provided
316. Incarcerated person reported concerns regarding not being paid correctly.	The OCO provided technical assistance by sharing how to appeal the person's resolution request to the next level. The OCO will review this concern once the person appeals their resolution request and receives a response.	Technical Assistance Provided

Washington State Penitentiary

317. Loved one relayed concerns regarding their facility placement.	The OCO requested guardianship paperwork in order to investigate but did not receive a reply regarding the requested guardianship documents, so the OCO closed the case.	Person Declined OCO Assistance
318. A loved one made a complaint on behalf of an incarcerated individual	The incarcerated person has not yet sufficiently escalated the concern through an appeals process or the DOC Resolution	Technical Assistance Provided

regarding DOC staff mistreating them.	Program. The OCO provided technical assistance about the resolution program.	
319. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding not getting their property after a transfer.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
320. Person reported that he gotten hurt and a DOC staff member said that he was lying about it.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
321. Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a job termination.	The OCO provided the individual with technical assistance about the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
322. Person reports concerns about staff taking his property.	The incarcerated person has not yet sufficiently escalated the concern through an appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. The OCO provided technical assistance about using the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
323. An external person reported an individual had safety concerns.	The OCO mailed a release of information form to receive permission to review the concern. This office never received a signed form back. This office did review the individual's current placement and verified the individual is in general population with no noted concerns.	Technical Assistance Provided
324. Person reports concerns about legal access.	The incarcerated person has not yet sufficiently escalated the concern through an appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. The OCO provided technical assistance about using the resolution program.	Technical Assistance Provided
325. Incarcerated person reported concerns about legal access.	The OCO provided technical assistance immediately over the OCO Hotline and shared that information again in writing. The OCO shared how to access the law library and shared information about resources available to them. The person shared they want to try these avenues prior to OCO involvement. The person was encouraged to call back if they still need assistance after trying the resources shared.	Technical Assistance Provided
326. Person reported concerns about how infractions were issued and reports people being targeted with no evidence.	The OCO provided technical assistance via the hotline and by mailing the individual the OCO's serious infraction process flyer and the strategic priorities flyer.	Technical Assistance Provided
327. Incarcerated person reported concerns regarding the infraction process and accessing Graduated Reentry or Reentry Centers as he gets closer to his release date.	The OCO provided technical assistance immediately over the OCO Hotline and shared that information again in writing. The OCO shared information about the infraction process and how to be an active participant in the infraction hearings. The OCO also shared information about the GRE and Reentry Center screening process and how they will receive further information on their eligibility and approval for these programs.	Technical Assistance Provided
328. Person reported that DOC staff removed their wheelchair from their cell.	The OCO provided technical assistance about the resolution process.	Technical Assistance Provided



Unexpected Fatality Review Committee Report

Unexpected Fatality UFR-24-010 Report to the Legislature

As required by RCW 72.09.770

November 15, 2024

Unexpected Fatality Review Committee Report, Publication Number 600-SR001

Cheryl Strange, Secretary
cheryl.strange@doc.wa.gov

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Legislative Directive and Governance	2
Disclosure of Protected Health Information	2
UFR Committee Members	3
Fatality Summary	4
UFR Committee Discussion.....	4
Committee Findings.....	6
Committee Recommendations	6
Consultative remarks that do not directly correlate to cause of death, but may be considered for review by the Department of Corrections:	6

Unexpected Fatality Review Committee Report

UFR-24-010 Report to the Legislature–600-SR001

Legislative Directive and Governance

[RCW 72.09.770](#) requires the Department of Corrections (DOC) to convene an unexpected fatality review (UFR) committee to review any case in which the death of an incarcerated individual was unexpected, or in any case identified by the Office of the Corrections Ombuds (OCO) for review.

The purpose of the unexpected fatality review is to develop recommendations for DOC and the legislature regarding changes in practices or policies to prevent fatalities and strengthen safety and health protections for incarcerated individuals in DOC's custody.

This report describes the results of one such review and presents recommendations. Within ten days of the publication of this report, DOC must publish an associated corrective action plan. DOC will then have 120 days to implement that plan.

Disclosure of Protected Health Information

RCW 72.09.770 requires DOC to disclose protected health information - including mental health and sexually transmitted disease records - to UFR committee members. Federal law, 42 CFR 2.53 subsection (g) authorizes the sharing of patient identifying substance use information to state, federal, or local agencies in the course of conducting audits or evaluations mandated by statute or regulation.

UFR Committee Members

The following members attended the UFR Committee meeting held virtually on October 3, 2024, and October 17, 2024:

DOC Health Services

- Dr. MaryAnn Curl, Chief Medical Officer
- Mark Eliason, Deputy Assistant Secretary
- Patricia Paterson, Chief of Nursing
- Dr. Rae Simpson, Director – Quality Systems
- Paul French, Administrator – Substance Abuse
- Deborah Roberts, Sentinel Event Program Manager
- Mary Beth Flygare, Health Services Project Manager

DOC Prisons Division

- James Key, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Prisons – East Division
- Deborah (Jo) Wofford, Deputy Assistant Secretary – Women’s Prison Division

DOC Community Corrections Division

- Kristine Skipworth, Administrator – East Region
- Kelly Miller, Administrator – Graduated Reentry

Office of the Corrections Ombuds (OCO)

- Elisabeth Kingsbury, Deputy Director
- Madison Vinson, Assistant Corrections Ombuds - Policy

Department of Health (DOH)

- Ellie Navidson, Nursing Consultant, Healthy and Safe Communities

Health Care Authority (HCA)

- Dr. Heather Schultz, Associate Medical Director

This report includes a summary of the unexpected fatality, committee discussion, findings, and recommendations.

Fatality Summary

Year of Birth: 1993 (30-years-old)

Date of Incarceration: April 2023

Date of Death: June 2024

At the time of death, this incarcerated individual was participating in Graduated Reentry program while residing in a community sober living house.

His cause of death was due to acute fentanyl intoxication. The manner of his death was accidental.

A brief timeline of events prior to the incarcerated individual’s death.

XX Days Prior to Death	Event
38 days – 3 days prior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He was transferred to the Graduated Reentry (GRE) program. • Narcan was provided to him. • He was participating in substance use treatment, as required. • All drug screenings were negative. • He was attending approved social visits with his family and had obtained employment.
2 days prior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The house manager received third party information that he deviated from his approved schedule
Day of Death	Event
0 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He was found non-responsive by a housemate. • Housemate called 911 and performed CPR until EMS arrived and assumed care. • He was declared deceased by EMS.

UFR Committee Discussion

The UFR committee met to discuss the findings and recommendations from the DOC Mortality Review Committee and the DOC Critical Incident Review. The UFR committee considered the information from both reviews in formulating recommendations.

- A. The DOC Mortality Review Committee (MRC) reviewed the medical record, the care delivered and provided the following findings and recommendations.
1. The committee found:
 - a. The individual received substance use disorder (SUD) treatment while incarcerated which was continued after his transfer into the GRE program.
 - b. Prior to his DOC admission he was not prescribed medication for opioid use disorder (MOUD) and requested to begin treatment. He did not meet treatment eligibility criteria at the time of his request.
 - c. He was transferred to his parent facility and enrolled in a therapeutic community as part of his SUD treatment plan.
 - d. During his incarceration, he required dental treatment. The facility where he was housed did not have on-site dental services and he was transferred for care.
 - e. He was transferred to the Graduated Reentry program from a facility that does not offer MOUD inductions.
 - f. He was scheduled for an appointment in the community to discuss available MOUD treatment options. He opted to not participate in the MOUD program.
 2. The committee recommended:
 - a. DOC continue to pursue necessary resources and partnerships to expand the use of medications for opioid use disorder (MOUD) treatment to ensure each individual who needs care has access.
 - b. DOC continue implementation of a mobile self-contained dental clinic to support facilities that currently do not have on-site dental services.
 - c. DOC Health Services continue to review and update process to maximize access to MOUD treatment for incarcerated individuals.
- B. Independent of the mortality review, the DOC conducted a critical incident review (CIR) to determine the facts surrounding the unexpected fatality and to evaluate compliance with DOC policies and operational procedures. The CIR findings were administrative in nature, did not correlate to the cause of death and will be remediated per DOC Policy 400.110 Reporting and Reviewing Critical Incidents.
- C. The UFR committee reviewed the work of the Mortality Review committee and the Critical

Incident Review and discussed the following topic.

Current State of Medications for Opioid Use Disorder Treatment in DOC Facilities:

Committee members agreed that this individual could have benefitted from medication assisted treatment for opioid use disorder (OUD) and discussed the importance of providing treatment when requested by incarcerated individuals as the window for treatment acceptance is often small.

DOC currently has one addiction medication physician who acts as a consultant to maintain individuals on medication assisted treatment after they are admitted to a DOC when their sentence is six months or less. If an individual is serving a sentence longer than six months, they are weaned off medication. Incarcerated individuals may request a transfer to a facility that does offer inductions prior to community reentry if they reside in one that does not offer this.

Committee members verified that DOC has requested resources to support expansion of their MOUD treatment program while the Health Services division is working to improve current processes to maximize medication assisted treatment program access.

Committee Findings

The incarcerated individual died as a result of acute fentanyl intoxication. The manner of death was accident.

Committee Recommendations

The committee did not offer recommendations for corrective action to prevent a similar fatality in the future.

Consultative remarks that do not directly correlate to cause of death, but may be considered for review by the Department of Corrections:

DOC should continue to advocate for resources to expand Medication Assisted Treatment.