

CASE INVESTIGATIONS: 189

Assistance Provided - 30
Information Provided - 74
DOC Resolved – 14
Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate - 25
No Violation of Policy - 41
Substantiated - 5

INTAKE INVESTIGATIONS: 62

Administrative Remedies Not Pursued - 34
Declined - 18
Lacked Jurisdiction - 5
Person Declined OCO Involvement - 1
Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action - 4

Resolved Investigations: **251**

Assistance or Information Provided in
OVER 55%
of Case Investigations

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

Case Closure Reason	Meaning	Total
Unexpected Fatality Review	The incarcerated person died unexpectedly, and the death was reviewed by the unexpected fatality review team, as required by RCW 72.09.770.	0

Assistance Provided	The OCO achieved full or partial resolution of the person's complaint.	30
Information Provided	The OCO provided self-advocacy information.	74
DOC Resolved	DOC staff resolved the concern prior to OCO action.	14
Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate	Insufficient evidence existed to substantiate the concern.	25
No Violation of Policy	The OCO determined that DOC policy was not violated.	41
Substantiated	The OCO verified the concern but was unable to achieve a resolution to the concern.	5

Administrative Remedies Not Pursued	The incarcerated person did not yet pursue internal resolution per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(b).	34
Declined	The OCO declined to investigate the complaint per WAC 138-10-040(3).	18
Lacked Jurisdiction	The complaint did not meet OCO's jurisdictional requirements (typically when complaint is not about an incarcerated person or not about a DOC action).	5
Person Declined OCO Involvement	The person did not want the OCO to pursue the concern or the OCO received no response to requests for more information.	1
Person Left DOC Custody	The incarcerated person left DOC custody prior to OCO action.	4

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

MONTHLY OUTCOME REPORT JANUARY 2023

COMPLAINT SUMMARY

OUTCOME SUMMARY

CASE CLOSURE REASON

CASE INVESTIGATIONS

Airway Heights Corrections Center

1.	Incarcerated individual reports they were terminated from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) wildfire crew and were not paid for their hours worked prior to the job termination. The individual heard that the OCO was working on this issue and requested assistance in his situation.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO requested DOC administration provide the individual with the wages withheld after his job termination. The DOC administration agreed to reimburse the individual's withheld wages.	Assistance Provided
2.	Incarcerated individual reports he was terminated from Department of Natural Resources (DNR) wildfire work crew for a positive urinalysis test. The individual was terminated with another incarcerated individual. DNR terminated this individual and withheld their pay as a result of this positive test.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO requested DOC administration provide the individual with the wages withheld after his job termination. The DOC administration agreed to reimburse the individual's withheld wages.	Assistance Provided
3.	Person reports that everything on people's tablets should have transferred over to the new system, but his did not. All the money is on his old JPay account, but nothing is being done.	In researching DOCs new contract with Securus, the OCO found that the person will need to contact Securus customer service directly to request a refund of money from the person's old account. The hotline for incarcerated individuals is 1-855-273-7292. Friends and family on the outside can call on the person's behalf at 1-800-844-6591 or 972-734-1111. The OCO also contacted JPay with questions regarding money transfers to the new tablets and they encourage patience during this transition to Securus. The person can also try accessing the old JPay account from the new tablet to gain access to the funds.	Information Provided
4.	Person reports that he wants to sue DOC because they would not allow him to go to a powwow. Person states that DOC will not let him attend because they say his crime was against children when it was not.	OCO staff were able to provide information at the time of the call. Staff provided person with self-advocacy information and information about obtaining records.	Information Provided

5.	The incarcerated individual made a tort claim for damaged/lost/broken property due to DOC actions. They have been offered \$395 for items and personal property that the individual believes to be worth \$10,000.	The OCO informed the individual that this office does not have oversight authority over the tort claims process.	Information Provided
6.	The incarcerated individual reports that family members who visit are required to test for COVID but cannot use the vending machines to buy food during visits. However, the DOC reports that COVID is the reason for not allowing the vending machine to be used.	The OCO provided information about the vending machine protocol available to visitors. The DOC reports that when the county and facility are in the "green," the vending machines are available. So, they give access if COVID levels are low in the community and the facility. However, if the county or the facility is in the "yellow" or medium risk, they do not allow access to the machines. The DOC follows procedural directions from the DOH and the CDC regarding COVID standards and regulations.	Information Provided
7.	Incarcerated individual reports that DOC denied him and his loved one Extended Family Visits (EFVs). The individual reports he was denied due to being deemed not amenable for conviction related programming.	The OCO provided information regarding filing an appeal for the initial denial of EFVs. Per DOC 590.100 Extended Family Visits, "Denial of participation in the EFV Program may be appealed to the Assistant Secretary for Prisons. 1. Appeals must be in writing and clearly state the facts that support the reason for the appeal. 2. Appeals may not be submitted by multiple individuals for the same denial. 3. The EFV Review Committee will review the appeal and make a recommendation to the Assistant Secretary for Prisons using DOC 21-470 Extended Family Visit Review Decision / Recommendation. 4. The Assistant Secretary for Prisons has final decision-making authority for EFV participation. a. The Assistant Secretary for Prisons/designee will send a letter to inform the person who submitted the appeal of the final decision." The OCO provided the individual with the policy information which explains how to appeal the EFV denial and submit it DOC headquarters by mail.	Information Provided
8.	The incarcerated individual reports that he was awarded a disability claim from Labor & Industries, however, the DOC is taking deductions from the incoming funds per policy for worker's compensation. The individual further states that facility medical staff whom	The OCO provided information regarding RCW 72.09.111, which outlines how deductions are distributed from incarcerated individuals' wages, gratuities, and benefits. This office also provided contact information for Labor & Industries should the individual like to contact them for more information regarding his disability claim.	Information Provided

he has never interacted with, consulted with L&I giving him a clean bill of health.

9.	Incarcerated individual reports a DOC staff member conspired with another incarcerated individual and provided false information to move another incarcerated individual into the cell he was housed in to create an unsafe environment for him. The individual reports he was then placed into the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) on involuntary protective custody because of this. The individual reports the other incarcerated individual conspired with the DOC staff member because he wanted the individual's beads. The individual reports that the beads are now missing after he was transferred to Airway Heights Corrections Center (AHCC).	The OCO provided information regarding the individual's placement and their missing property. The OCO reviewed the individual's placement and found that the evidence is insufficient to substantiate that the transfer to IMU was due to his cellmate disliking him, as DOC found legitimate safety concerns with the individual's placement. The OCO was able to substantiate that the individual's transfer was heavily delayed causing him to be housed in IMU for six months. The individual already transferred to AHCC when OCO received this concern. The OCO also verified AHCC staff provided the individual with his beads, beading material and personal property. The OCO shared with the individual how to attempt to obtain specific missing property if items are still missing.	Information Provided
10.	The incarcerated individual reports that he has not had a job since he lost his previous job a few years ago. The individual has asked DOC staff about his job referrals but reports he has not been given a clear answer. He feels that people are getting jobs when he should be above them on the job list and believes DOC staff are skipping over people on the list and choosing who they want to hire.	The OCO provided information regarding the status of the individual's job referrals. The OCO found that the individual did not attend three scheduled interviews for one of the positions that he has a referral for, which resets the referral date. This office also provided information regarding a position the individual is eligible for but does not currently have a job referral for. Since this concern was reported, the OCO confirmed that the individual has been assigned to a job and has additional referrals for other jobs.	Information Provided
11.	Incarcerated individual reports he submitted a release address 40 days ago for approval and has not heard back from the Community Corrections Officer (CCO). The individual reports his counselor has followed up and he has sent kites inquiring about it and they have not heard anything. The individual is past his ERD and requests assistance in receiving a response.	The OCO provided information regarding the status of the individual's release plan. The OCO verified the CCO denied the release plan prior to OCO outreach. Since the release plan has been denied the individual has not met with his counselor to discuss other options for release. The OCO provided the individual with information about options for releasing and how to work with his counselor to submit a new release plan.	Information Provided
12.	External person reports that an incarcerated individual needs to be transferred to the medical unit because they have several chronic conditions that affect their ability to fight infection.	The OCO provided information to the incarcerated person regarding the process to request a transfer to the medical unit. The decision to transfer a person into a medical housing unit depends on medical necessity determined by the provider and FMD. The	Information Provided

placement must be further approved by the Chief Medical Officer. Per DOC 610.110, to initiate a non-emergent transfer, the FMD/designee will bring the information to a weekly medical inter-facility transfer conference call with DOC Headquarters classification. The Chief Medical Officer/designee will consult with the FMDs/designees to determine the most medically appropriate placement, method of transfer, and any special requirements for the individual.

13.	Incarcerated individual reports they filed a Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) violation report about a DOC staff member. The individual reports they have not received any communication from DOC about the investigation and requests OCO review the actions of DOC in response to this report.	The OCO provided the individual with information about DOC PREA investigation process. The OCO verified the PREA report is still under investigation by the DOC. The DOC does not have a documented time frame of when PREA investigations are to be completed. The OCO shared with the individual how to request information about the investigation. This person can contact the OCO again if needed once DOC has completed their investigation.	Information Provided
14.	External person reports the incarcerated person was informed that, although it was substantiated what the officer did violated policy, the incarcerated person's rights were not violated therefore his infraction appeal was denied.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint; the infraction has been removed from his record.	DOC Resolved
15.	Person was charged \$21 for a TV rental and has not received the TV. It has been three months. The decision to not refund his money was made by the person in charge of the TV rentals.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO verified that DOC will issue a refund.	DOC Resolved
16.	Incarcerated individual reports a change in their medical care after reporting an incident to the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) violations reporting system. This incident included a DOC medical staff member. The individual reports after the incident their medical care greatly decreased in quality. The individual requests the OCO investigate their medical care.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the PREA investigation after multiple delays in investigation and verified the PREA was investigated per policy. This office substantiated that the investigation was delayed by DOC. The OCO reviewed the individual's medical care from before and after the PREA violation was reported and found no significant changes in care. The individual was provided medical per DOC 600.000 Health Services Management.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

17.	The incarcerated individual reports that they believe the DOC is intentionally trying to infect him with the COVID-19 virus. The individual reports that the DOC is not enforcing proper use of personal protective equipment, social distancing, or sanitation measures, which puts incarcerated individuals at risk.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office reviewed current WA DOC COVID-19 guidance. The DOC follows infection control guidelines and has put protocols in place to mitigate the spread of the virus. There is no evidence that the DOC is trying to infect incarcerated individuals.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
18.	Incarcerated individual reports that the housing committee wants to transfer him to another facility. Individual reports having been in a Safe Harbor for eight years and expresses having safety concerns about being transferred to the other facility.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. Upon investigation, the OCO found that the individual is to remain in his current housing placement rather than being transferred.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
19.	A friend of the incarcerated individual reports a concern on the individual's behalf. The individual reports that people are having their double mattresses taken away. It is creating animosity in the population and with staff. People are trying to sell and trade their mattresses or stealing better ones.	The OCO contacted the facility and found that they are not allowing individuals to double up mattresses as they do not have enough for the population and having two mattresses is not allowed in policy unless there is an HSR. Individuals could be trading the mattresses, however that is a violation of the unit rules. The DOC is monitoring the situation. The individual named in this concern is no longer incarcerated.	No Violation of Policy
20.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about being terminated from their job.	The OCO reached out to DOC regarding the job termination and find no violation of DOC policy. The individual was terminated from their position because of a violation of the conduct rules and behavioral issues. The individual was removed from their position but is still in the program.	No Violation of Policy
21.	The incarcerated individual reports that they have received multiple infractions but feels they did not do anything to deserve them. The individual feels they are being targeted and retaliated against after they wrote a resolution request about a DOC staff member.	The OCO reviewed the individual's infractions and did not find that they had appealed any of them. As a result, per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO was unable to proceed with a review of the infractions. In its review, the OCO did not find any evidence of retaliation or targeting as the infractions were substantiated by evidence or the individual admitted guilt.	No Violation of Policy
22.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about a 505 infraction for fighting with another incarcerated individual but states they feel they should not be infraacted because they approached staff several times to be moved and their cellmate attacked	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and in the witness statement, the individual told staff that they did not need to go to SMU and felt safe returning to their cell when asked if they were previously challenged to a fight, additionally, the individual had the ability to	No Violation of Policy

them, so they had to fight back.

disengage at a point in the fight but chose not to. As a result, the infraction was substantiated.

23.	Person reports concern and feeling unsafe with the new COVID protocols because he is at risk. Person reports that there are signs in his unit requiring that people wear masks because people are positive for COVID in the unit, and reports that people still have to go to mainline even while they are on COVID protocol.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. DOC COVID-19 guideline version 34 states in the Unit Operation and Cohorting section of the Outbreak and Cluster Testing Management guidelines that, "a. After a cluster is identified, movement of the population will not be affected," and that "c. Outbreak status is to inform of higher risk of COVID-19 transmission to the unit population and staff, so that individuals can take appropriate measures to decrease risk of infection." The policy also states that N95 masks are still available for individuals who choose to wear them. DOC is operating within these guidelines.	No Violation of Policy
24.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that the individual received two infractions and after being found guilty his Extended Family Visits (EFVs) were denied. The loved one reports that the infractions he received are not on the list of infractions that disqualifies an individual from participating in EFVs. The loved one reports that EFVs are very important for their family to be together.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 590.100, Extended Family Visiting, "an individual may be denied based on the nature of the crime, criminal history, and current/prior behavior. If there is reason to believe that an eligible individual is a danger to self, the visitor(s), or the orderly operation of the program, the Superintendent/designee may exclude the individual from the program." The OCO verified that these infractions can be reviewed to determine EFV eligibility. The DOC confirmed that the individual will be eligible to reapply for EFVs after one year.	No Violation of Policy
25.	The incarcerated individual reports that he received two infractions and after being found guilty his Extended Family Visits (EFVs) were denied. The individual reports that the infractions he received are not on the list of infractions that disqualifies an individual from participating in EFVs. He reports that EFVs are very important for his family to be together.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 590.100, Extended Family Visiting, "an individual may be denied based on the nature of the crime, criminal history, and current/prior behavior. If there is reason to believe that an eligible individual is a danger to self, the visitor(s), or the orderly operation of the program, the Superintendent/designee may exclude the individual from the program." The OCO verified that these infractions can be reviewed to determine EFV eligibility. The DOC confirmed that the individual will be eligible to reapply for EFVs after one year.	No Violation of Policy
26.	Person reports he had a trauma flashback after being interrupted during a phone call by a Psych Associate	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO investigated the incident and	No Violation of Policy

without prior notice. Person reports that this visit greatly upset him, resulting in a chain reaction that ultimately got him infraacted and demoted from minimum custody.

found that after the phone call, the person threatened the psych associate and multiple other staff in the following days. DOC 300.380 V. A. 2. b. states that “[i]nfractions resulting in a deduction of 20 or more points during a review period require evaluation for custody demotion.” DOC is acting within policy to demote him due to the infractions.

27.	Person reports that he applied for track one GRE and was told that he needed to complete the Therapeutic Community (TC) program, then go to camp before he would be approved for track one. This is an issue because he cannot go to camp as he needs to have access to pill line for his narcotics. He was not ordered to complete drug treatment and does not understand how they can ask him to do that.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Policy 580.000 states that substance abuse treatment does not have to be ordered by the court. DOC decides whether a person meets the needs for SUD programs based on many factors in a person’s file. Person can still access camp at a major facility.	No Violation of Policy
28.	Incarcerated individual reports the Indeterminate Sentencing Review Board (ISRB) determined he would not be releasable due to an infraction that was later dismissed. The individual reports that he has good community support and has grown but the ISRB only spoke negatively about him and were unwilling to release him. The individual requests the OCO review the ISRB decision.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the ISRB decision and found that while the ISRB briefly mentions the pending infraction, however the main concern and reason for the individual’s denial of release was due to lack of substance abuse programming. The OCO verified per RCW 9.95.052 the ISRB can determine an individual is not releasable for many reasons, including lack of programming. The OCO verified that the individual is listed to be assessed and placed in programming that will follow the recommendations of the ISRB.	No Violation of Policy
29.	Incarcerated individual reports that after filing an appeal DOC staff have been targeting him. The individual reports that DOC staff have been strip searching him more frequently and his cell has been searched more often. The individual reports DOC has harassed him, and DOC staff are provoking him.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO verified the searches performed by DOC on the individual were in compliance with DOC 420.310 Searches of Offenders. The OCO reviewed recent infractions and the individual's central file could not find evidence to substantiate staff targeting after appealing an infraction. The OCO requested DOC staff speak with the individual to address any outstanding issues with staff and DOC agreed.	No Violation of Policy
30.	Incarcerated person called on behalf of a patient who is on cell confinement. He reports the person on cell confinement is experiencing internal bleeding and needs medical attention and DOC is not	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy of the DOC Health Plan. The OCO contacted the facility and attempted several phone calls with the individual, which the patient declined. The patient did call the	No Violation of Policy

taking the concern seriously. The person requested that the OCO contact the patient directly and address the medical concerns.

hotline to provide information and the OCO based the investigation on information provided by the patient. This office contacted health services to request information about the patient's testing and treatment plan. DOC reports the patient was provided an abdominal ultrasound; they are awaiting test results. The OCO was informed the patient is scheduled for a follow up to discuss recent test results and added this case to the appointment tracker. The OCO also asked for an update on any colonoscopy results and if surgery is medically indicated at this time.

31.	The incarcerated individual reports that he received a COVID-19 vaccine, and when he asked about the Vaccine Incentive Kits, he was told that the DOC is no longer giving them out.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. This office spoke with DOC staff and reviewed the memorandum regarding the Vaccine Incentive Kits. The OCO confirmed that the memo was sent several months prior the individual receiving the vaccine and the kits were only available during the month that the memo was sent.	Substantiated
-----	---	--	---------------

Bishop Lewis – King County

32.	Incarcerated individual states they were recently infractioned by a staff member who resigned. They expressed concerns about the infraction's relation to the staff member being allowed to sue DOC.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal narrative and find there is evidence to substantiate the infraction based on the incarcerated individual's behavior. The individual was informed that the infraction is independent of any action the former staff member chose to take against DOC.	No Violation of Policy
-----	--	---	------------------------

Cedar Creek Corrections Center

33.	The incarcerated individual reports they received an infraction and then a week later were infractioned again for another positive UA result. This person reports that they should not have received a second test within a week because the UA would still be dirty.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting DOC leadership and getting the individual's second infraction dismissed.	Assistance Provided
34.	This patient reports he is unable to access needed dental care. He has been scheduled to transfer to get care but that was cancelled due to quarantine and has not been rescheduled. The patient contacted this office again to report that he would be transferred for his dental needs but does not want to go to the facility DOC chose to assign him to. He feels he should not be permanently transferred.	The OCO provided information to the patient regarding the status of their transfer request. The patient's request was submitted with the most recent facility requested and is currently being reviewed. The OCO also provided information to the patient about DOC 610.110 that states "Unless otherwise specified, an individual who is transferred to another facility for health services that are expected to last less	Information Provided

than 6 months will be returned to the sending facility when care/treatment is completed. B. If the health services are expected to last more than 6 months, further classification action must be initiated at the facility where the individual is being treated per DOC 300.380 Classification and Custody Facility Plan Review.” The time he is at the new facility will be determined by the amount of care he needs to receive.

35.	Incarcerated individual states DOC did not give them their 24-hour notice of their infraction hearing and was not allowed to attend the hearing.	The OCO reached out to DOC regarding this infraction hearing and DOC states the individual was present at the hearing as the staff member recalls having extensive discussion with the individual regarding this infraction. Additionally, there is an audio recording of the hearing.	No Violation of Policy
36.	Person's medical code was changed to a 3-status based on the fact that he has done some medical visits and now that is impacting his camp custody level, and they want to change him to another facility. Person says the medical code is not correct and that he does not require a level 3.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The Utilization code is used to indicate the needs of the patient, was determined by the Facility Medical Director and was discussed with the patient. Per DOC 610.110 Transfer of Individuals for Health Reasons, the facility Health Services Manager/designee and/or Facility Medical Director (FMD)/designee will determine if an individual's condition requires an emergent or non-emergent transfer to another facility. Transfer decisions will be based on the following: Required medical, mental health, or dental treatment is beyond the scope of the current facility's resources.	No Violation of Policy

Clallam Bay Corrections Center

37.	Person reports that when he arrived at IMU someone stabbed another incarcerated person. The whole unit was put on max placement. The unit was then placed on “Out of State List.” Unit is only allowed level 2 programs, and no one has received an infraction. Individual has 12 months left of sentence and feels this will make it harder for him to be released.	The OCO reviewed this individual's record and contacted the DOC Headquarters to discuss this concern. This individual did not receive an infraction for this incident and is close to his ERD. The DOC maintained that due to the assault this individual does not have safe placement in the general population, however they did agree to screen him for GRE. He was found to be eligible for GRE and the DOC is reviewing him for possible approval.	Assistance Provided
-----	--	---	---------------------

38.	Incarcerated individual reports a DOC staff member is punishing multiple people by not allowing him and other individuals access to clean their cells. The individuals are instructed to press the call button at a certain to time request to be let out of their cells to clean them one at a time. The individual is reporting that when he presses the button requesting to be released from his cell to clean it, when a certain staff member is working the booth, they are not let out to clean. The individual reports that this DOC staff member does this to other incarcerated individuals as well.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the investigation conducted by DOC and verified that DOC cannot check to see when the call button is pressed and if the DOC staff are consistently allowing only certain people out of their cells. DOC staff explained that they open the doors in the order the call buttons are pressed to the best of their ability. With the statement from DOC staff working the booth and the inability to review when the call buttons are responded to, there is insufficient evidence to substantiate what occurred.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
39.	A loved one expressed concerns about an infraction an incarcerated individual received when the mail they sent in tested positive for drugs.	The OCO reviewed the infraction summary and found there is evidence to substantiate the infraction.	No Violation of Policy

Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

40.	Patient reports a leaking hernia and need for foot surgery. The person says the health issues were documented at his previous facility but since being transferred the new facility staff are saying they have no records of any of his medical issues. Patient also reports a need for a wheelchair that was provided but then taken away two days later after he was seen limping and trying to readjust his chair. He also reports he has not received his pain medication for four days because DOC will not bring it to him.	The OCO contacted DOC health services about the patient's care and medication access. This office could not identify evidence to substantiate the facility had no records of his medical issues. A six-month supply of medications was provided via Keep On Person (KOP) upon transfer and the OCO confirmed the patient's prescriptions are available for pick up at pill line at his current facility, including pain medication. Medications are not delivered, and the patient will need to attend pill line for any prescriptions that are not KOP. After short-term use pending a medical assessment, DOC authorized an HSR for wheelchair use for long distances, valid until June 2023. The patient is scheduled for a hernia surgery consult and DOC agreed to schedule the patient again to assess foot concerns. The patient received a foot x-ray earlier in the year and there is no current medical diagnosis that requires foot surgery; the patient is scheduled with his provider to discuss ongoing concerns. The OCO tracked case on appointment tracker and confirmed the patient is scheduled for a follow up on his foot concerns with a DOC provider as well as an off-site appointment	Assistance Provided
-----	---	--	---------------------

for his hernia. The patient reported they did not have access to their KOPs since transfer and the OCO followed up with DOC to request they double check his KOP access. The individual is responsible for kiting property once leaving segregation in order to schedule a time to pick up their property. KOP medications are usually encouraged to be stored in their chain bag; however, the individual did not keep KOP in his chain bag and did not reach out to property according to DOC. However, the individual reported attempts at kiting property. The OCO was able to confirm the patient received their property after OCO outreach.

41.	The incarcerated individual reports that he is having issues with DOC records department staff and has waited over a year for some records. He also reports that he is not being sent the DOC records that he paid for and requested. He mentions that there is no accountability from DOC records staff.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted DOC Public Records and explained this situation. After further review, the DOC determined that they would reopen this request and perform another search for this person's records. They also reported they would track his refund to ensure it has been processed.	Assistance Provided
42.	Incarcerated individual reports he was terminated from Correctional Industries (CI) for not masking when he was told by unit staff that he did not have to wear one. The individual reports they were encouraged to not mask by DOC staff in the unit. When the individual arrived at work, they were told to leave work and were terminated for not wearing a mask. The individual requests DOC reinstate his employment or change to job assignment status from 'terminated,' to 'dropped,' so he will be able to obtain other employment before six months has passed. CRCC has an Operational Memorandum (OM) which states incarcerated individuals terminated from employment must wait six months before being hired for another position.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed the termination and spoke with DOC staff about the incident. DOC staff could not substantiate the staff instructed incarcerated individuals to attend work without their masks. DOC shared with OCO that per recent Labor and Industries (L&I) instruction all CI workers were required to mask at work at the time of this incident, and CI staff were instructed to terminate any workers that came to work without their mask. It was unclear if the individual was allowed to mask and refused, or if they were terminated without the opportunity to mask. After speaking with DOC staff, they agreed to change the job assignment status from 'terminated' to 'dropped' so the individual could be employed again immediately and erase any negative entry related to this incident from the individual's central file.	Assistance Provided
43.	The incarcerated individual reports that they were terminated from their employment position in Correctional Industries (CI) textiles because they went to	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed the termination and spoke with DOC staff about the incident. DOC staff could not substantiate the staff instructed	Assistance Provided

work without a mask. This individual was not given an opportunity to get a mask, they were simply terminated. DOC Staff did not tell them why they were terminated from the position.

incarcerated individuals to attend work without their masks. DOC shared with OCO that per recent Labor and Industries (L&I) instruction all CI workers were required to mask at work at the time of this incident, and CI staff were instructed to terminate any workers that came to work without their mask. It was unclear if the individual was allowed to mask and refused, or if they were terminated without the opportunity to mask. After speaking with DOC staff, they agreed to change the job assignment status from 'terminated' to 'dropped' so the individual could be employed again immediately and erase any negative entry related to this incident from the individual's central file.

44. Incarcerated individual reports he was terminated from Correctional Industries (CI) for not masking when he was told by unit staff that he did not have to wear one. The individual reports they were encouraged to not mask by DOC staff in the unit. When the individual arrived at work, they were told to leave work and were terminated for not wearing a mask.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed the termination and spoke with DOC staff about the incident. DOC staff could not substantiate the staff instructed incarcerated individuals to attend work without their masks. DOC shared with OCO that per recent Labor and Industries (L&I) instruction, all CI workers were required to mask at work at the time of this incident, and CI staff were instructed to terminate any workers that came to work without their mask. It was unclear if the individual was allowed to mask and refused, or if they were terminated without the opportunity to mask. After speaking with DOC staff, they agreed to change the job assignment status from 'terminated' to 'dropped' so the individual could be employed again immediately and erase any negative entry related to this incident from the individual's central file. CRCC has an Operational Memorandum (OM) which states incarcerated individuals terminated from employment must wait six months before being hired for another position.	Assistance Provided
45. Individual reports the DOC is making him do a substance use disorder class and he does not want to do it because he is not in for a drug offense.	The OCO reviewed the substance use disorder assessment and this individual's documented behavior, sentence, and WaONE. The OCO could not find evidence to substantiate that this individual qualified for Therapeutic Community, as indicated in the	Assistance Provided

assessment. The OCO contacted the Substance Use Recovery Unit to discuss the findings and found that there was documentation when the individual first entered the DOC system that indicated a possible abuse of substances. The Substance Use Recovery Unit agreed that he did not rise to the Therapeutic Community level of care but that he would need to take a drug and alcohol class before release. This class would be a lower level of care and he will not need to transfer from his facility to take it.

46.	Person was placed in segregation pending a transfer to a new facility. DOC is placing a prohibited placement on him following an incident he was infractioned for, but the infraction was later dismissed upon appeal.	Person's infraction was dismissed. However, the prohibited placement is reviewed by a separate committee. Based on DOC 320.180, for facility/state prohibitions, the Superintendent/CCS or designee will submit DOC 17-087 Separation/Prohibition Addition/Removal in an email to DOC HQ Facility State Separation Prohibition Committee containing full disclosure of information supporting the request (e.g., investigation information, professional summary). Once the committee agreed on prohibited placement, the person was no longer eligible to return to general population.	Information Provided
47.	Incarcerated individual reports concerns with the DOC resolution program. The individual reports the program does not assist individuals in resolving concerns. The individual reports he and others are experiencing delays in response time and requests for rewrites that seem unnecessary.	The OCO provided information about how to file a complaint about the facility's resolution program specialist. The OCO reviewed resolution requests the individual filed and found one that was deemed not accepted because it was a concern about the resolution program specialist's decision to request a rewrite. The DOC Resolution Program Manual states that the resolution specialist may use their discretion to send a Resolution Request back for a rewrite. To report concerns with the facility resolution program specialist, the individual may write to the Resolution Program Manager at DOC Headquarters with the concerns to be reviewed further. The OCO shared with this information with the individual.	Information Provided
48.	The incarcerated individual reports that he has back problems and has an HSR for a new mattress. This person had a new	The OCO provided information about this person's level II resolution response and clarified that it does not appear that he has	Information Provided

mattress but was moved to a new cell and could not take his mattress with him. He filed a resolution request regarding this issue that was found to be unsubstantiated, and staff told him he would get a new mattress once one becomes available.

an HSR at this time. The office recommended they request an HSR for a new mattress.

<p>49. Incarcerated individual reports a new DOC staff member in their unit is discriminating against individuals in the unit who identify as LGBTQ+. The individual reports the DOC staff member has been commenting about moving these individuals from the unit and has been harassing LGBTQ+ individuals frequently since coming to work in the unit.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding how to report concerns about DOC staff. The OCO spoke with the DOC unit supervisor who shared they were made aware of the concern and spoke with all parties involved. The unit supervisor explained that discriminatory behavior is not tolerated and will be addressed as it is reported. The OCO verified the concern was addressed by DOC staff and explained to the individual how to report these concerns as they arise to be addressed at the facility level.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>50. Incarcerated individual reports that his DOC counselor is refusing to let him release to any county other than his county of origin. Individual states he has supports in other counties and does not want to release back to his county for fear he will fall back into old bad habits and be around people who are bad influence on him. Individual reports he is releasing with DOC voucher but that his counselor is refusing to look into addresses/options in other counties.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the Transition and Release policy, DOC 350.200. In DOC 350.200, there is an Alternate County of Origin Reasons policy, which cites RCW 72.09.270 (8)(a), stating that, "the department may approve a residence location that is not in the incarcerated individual's county of origin if the department determines that the residence location would be appropriate based on any court-ordered condition of the incarcerated individual's sentence, victim safety concerns, and factors that increase opportunities for successful reentry and long-term support including, but not limited to, location of family or other sponsoring persons or organizations that will support the incarcerated individual, ability to complete an educational program that the incarcerated individual is enrolled in, availability of appropriate programming or treatment, and access to housing, employment, and prosocial influences on the person in the community." This individual is within policy to request being released to an alternate county. The OCO was also able to verify that this person's counselor is searching for housing options in other counties.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

51.	Incarcerated individual reports that DOC is trying to take away the ability to have four televisions in a four-person cell and will only allow two televisions instead. Individual reports that DOC says they cannot afford to fix the issue.	The OCO provided information regarding this ongoing issue at Coyote Ridge Corrections Center. This is an active conversation at DOC that the OCO is monitoring, and it has not been resolved yet.	Information Provided
52.	Loved one expressed concerns about an incarcerated individual receiving a minor infraction and losing their job over a miscommunication of names.	The OCO reached out to DOC to get more information about the individual's loss of job. DOC substantiated the job loss based on the individual lying to staff and being out of bounds after being recently warned not to do so. The OCO also reached out to the DOC staff who the incarcerated individual states gave them permission to be in another area but said staff member was on leave at the time and could not have given the permission. The incarcerated individual was informed they can interview again six months from when they lost the job.	Information Provided
53.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about their lawyer sending a court invitation to their counselor but the counselor denying receiving it and not allowing the individual to attend the hearing.	The OCO reached out to the legal liaison office of the facility who states they have not received the hearing form from the court. The individual was informed that any time an incarcerated individual has a court hearing that they wish to attend, the court must send the facility legal liaison office the 02-027 form. Once that form is received, the hearing will be scheduled.	Information Provided
54.	Incarcerated individual reports several concerns including staff misconduct and infractions.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and found there is evidence to substantiate the infraction as the individual admits to transferring the drugs from a different unit with the intent to sell them. The OCO informed the individual that the staff misconduct concerns cannot be investigated until they have filed a grievance and received at least a level two response from DOC.	Information Provided
55.	Person informed DOC staff about illegal activities going on in the facility, which were substantiated and now his safety may be in danger. He is requesting that DOC move him into a safe facility but DOC is asking why he should not be transferred to general population.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. Individual was moved to another facility	DOC Resolved
56.	Patient states he was scheduled for an approved surgery over six months ago, and had a consultation scheduled this month	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed appointments and confirmed	DOC Resolved

but it was cancelled. He says his condition is worsening and the pain is increasing, and he can no longer work because of this.

the consult occurred resulting in a referral for surgery. The individual can kite medical, grieve to level I, and contact the OCO if future concerns arise related to access to surgery.

57.	External person reports their loved one had his gallbladder removed, then was exposed to TB, and has been in severe pain for a month while waiting for an x-ray. The patient has swollen legs, cannot go to the bathroom, has filed emergency kites, and the family has talked to DOC. The person reports the patient had a scheduled appointment today, but DOC canceled, and he needs medical attention.	The OCO contacted health services and DOC reports the appointment was rescheduled for the following week and the patient had attended this appointment prior to OCO outreach. The OCO also provided the patient with information about how to contact the OCO directly for future concerns.	DOC Resolved
58.	Individual was infracted and found guilty but did not appeal. As a result, they have been demoted to close custody. The demotion also included a loss of good time. They did not appeal infraction. Individual states that they are treated differently by COs and other staff just because they are transgender.	The OCO reviewed the resolution requests and infractions on file. The infractions were issued due to the threatening statements made in the resolution requests. The infractions caused a loss of points which resulted in a custody demotion. The OCO could not find evidence to substantiate that the individual was targeted with infractions due to their transgender identification. In addition, the infractions were never appealed.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
59.	Incarcerated individual reports DOC staff at every facility they have been housed at have mistreated or harassed him. The individual reports DOC staff target him due to his conviction. The individual also has questions related to pursuing litigation against DOC.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The incarcerated individual reports multiple undocumented interactions between him and DOC staff from years prior to reporting to OCO. The OCO spoke with the individual and shared how to access the DOC resolution program to resolve issues with staff at the facility level and create a record of the incident. The OCO explained to the individual that if current issues with DOC staff persist after pursuing the resolution program, he may contact to OCO again for further review of current concerns.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
60.	A family member is reaching out for assistance with visitation between her daughter and the father, who is incarcerated.	The OCO could not identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. Policy 450.300 IV.A.1.a states that the Department may still deny court-authorized visits on a case-by-case basis after conducting a full review of available information.	No Violation of Policy

61.	Person reports they were infracted for a major infraction, for a cellphone. They took a USB charger off the back of the TV and officers found it in the individual's shirt pocket and said it was a cellphone charger. Maintenance confirmed that it was not a cell phone charger, rather it was a charger that belonged to the facility.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet for an 882 infraction for possessing a USB cable to charge a cellphone. In the infraction packet there was an attached email stating the cord is a power supply for the old AM/FM transmitters. Because of these statements, it did not appear this item was a USB cable used to charge a cellphone. As a result, the OCO reached out to DOC to see if they would be willing to dismiss this infraction or reduce it. DOC was unwilling to overturn the infraction as the item was a USB wall charger he was found to be possessing. The OCO confirmed that the item was a wall charger and not a cord. The charger could be used to charge a variety of devices including cellphones. As a result, DOC agreed with the appeal response and were unwilling to overturn.	No Violation of Policy
62.	Incarcerated individual states their rights were violated at their infraction hearing when they were not allowed witnesses or a staff advisor.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and hearing audio and find there is evidence to substantiate the infraction and no evidence to show the individual was not denied witnesses or a staff advisor. The individual refused to answer qualification questions regarding a staff advisor and was removed from the infraction due to disruptive and interruptive behavior.	No Violation of Policy
63.	Person says that he was moved because of a Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) accusation and was not allowed to move back to the unit because the person who accused him lives there. Person reports that a different person whom he had a PREA case with is in the unit he got moved to. Person states that DOC is only picking and choosing how they want to apply policy.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. DOC 490.820 VI. A. states "Before placing the individual in a multi-person cell/room, employees responsible for making housing assignments will review the PREA Risk Assessment (PRA) identifier to ensure the compatibility of cell/roommates." RCW 72.02.210 states that DOC can determine the "confinement and placement in such correctional facility under the supervision of the department as the secretary shall deem appropriate." DOC is within policy to move the incarcerated individual as they deem appropriate. The OCO provided information about requesting a different cell assignment.	No Violation of Policy
64.	An external complainant reports that an incarcerated individual's transfer request to another facility was denied. The individual	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO found that RCW 72.02.210	No Violation of Policy

has minimum custody points and has family near the other facility.

states that DOC can determine the “confinement and placement in such correctional facility under the supervision of the department as the secretary shall deem appropriate.” The OCO also found that DOC Policy 300.380 VIII B states “facility placements cannot be appealed.”

65.	The incarcerated individual reports that he was trying to send outgoing mail and it was rejected. This person is appealing the rejection and requesting that DOC send out their mail because they are not violating policy.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO spoke with DOC staff who reported that the individual’s outgoing mail was rejected due to him asking for the recipient to make photocopies to return to the individual. Per DOC 450.100 Attachment 1, Unauthorized Mail, mail which contains multiple or similar copies/photocopies of the same photograph, document, and/or publication/subscription, in whole or part, may be rejected. The OCO confirmed with DOC staff that the individual was writing requesting copies of documents enclosed in outgoing to mail for the recipient make copies and send in different envelopes. Per DOC 450.100 Attachment 1, Unauthorized Mail, mail may be rejected if it “contains plans for activity that violates state/federal law, the Washington Administrative Code, Department Policy, and/or facility procedures.” The OCO as added this concern for future policy review.	No Violation of Policy
-----	---	---	------------------------

Larch Corrections Center

66.	Individual was evacuated from Larch Corrections Center. During cell front visit at new facility, individual stated he was in extreme pain from lower back issues. He had requested medical services but reported that he had not yet kited medical or submitted a resolution request for this issue.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted Health Services management and were informed the patient was seen by a provider upon return to his home facility.	DOC Resolved
67.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction.	The OCO reached out to DOC and DOC headquarters about this infraction, but DOC was unwilling to overturn the infraction as the “some” evidence standard was met and there was a concern regarding timeframes.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
68.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about retaliation related to a grievance they wrote and then received a neutral behavioral observation entry (BOE) as well as an	The OCO reviewed the concern and did not find any evidence of retaliation as the negative BOE and infraction were substantiated based on the individual’s	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

infraction and negative BOE they received related to cordless phone privileges.

behavior. The OCO reached out to DOC and clarified that the cordless phone is a privilege that is separate from sanctions and regular phone privilege.

Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women

69.	A loved one relayed concerns regarding scheduled video visits with her daughter disappearing off the electronic visitation schedule. This person also reported that this was never an issue before the facility switched to the new Securus tablets. Since the process has changed, they have missed numerous video visits that should have been on the schedule.	The OCO provided information from DOC staff regarding scheduled video visits between this person and their mother.	Information Provided
70.	External person reports their loved one has faced significant delays to important outside specialist appointments. They are requesting that their loved one be scheduled for the specialist appointments they need.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted Health Services Management and were informed the patient is scheduled for the outside appointments. DOC staff request the first available appointment; however, the clinics are scheduled out for many months. The appointment availability depends on the clinic's availability and they are on the list to be moved up if there is a cancellation. This office encouraged the patient to reach out to their provider with any symptom updates so they can be addressed.	DOC Resolved

Monroe Correctional Complex

71.	Person states he was supposed to have surgery on his ear. It has been a year and a half; the patient has received a Level III resolution response but does not know if he will have the surgery.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting the Patient Care Navigator and requesting the consult be reviewed for scheduling. The appointment was scheduled as a result of this contact.	Assistance Provided
72.	Patient reports he has been waiting to have an MRI since March 2022. They have had appointments canceled multiple times and has not heard if or when he is getting his MRI.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting the Patient Care Navigators and requesting a review of the consult status. OCO staff followed up with the Care Navigator to ensure scheduling of the appointment occurred.	Assistance Provided
73.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about a 633-assault infraction they received but they feel it does not meet the DOC definition of the behavior.	The OCO reached out to DOC regarding this infraction and upon further review, the 633 infraction for an assault was overturned and the weightlifting ban sanctions were reinstated.	Assistance Provided
74.	Individual reports that he filed a complaint against a mental health provider and the	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW	Information Provided

grievance coordinator sent it back to him and requested a rewrite to provide additional information. The individual did rewrite the grievance and put the original log ID number. But he has not been given a response. He says he has sent several kites asking about the status of his resolution, and he has not received a response.

43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. At this time the resolution request has been received by DOC and is currently pending at Level 1. The OCO will be able to review the case if the individual still needs assistance after receiving a Level 2 response.

75.	The incarcerated individual reports that he should be approved for GRE, and he does not understand why it has been two months, and there is no decision yet.	The OCO provided contact information to the person to request information on his GRE decision.	Information Provided
76.	Incarcerated individual reports the television in the unit day room is on 24 hours a day. The individual has had success in negotiating that the TV be turned off during the night shift so that individuals can have some quiet time. Recently, there have been new staff on this shift that are not honoring the rule. Staff are reporting that the TV is helpful to pass the time while on this shift and DOC staff have requested it stay on. The individual requests a compromise be made to allow incarcerated individuals quiet time during the night hours.	The OCO provided information about how to alert DOC staff of issues with the TV volume on night shift in his unit. The OCO found DOC staff have created a plan to keep the unit TV at a very low volume as a compromise. Sometimes staff who do not regularly work in the unit will turn the volume up past the marked volume. The OCO confirmed the correct DOC staff member to direct these concerns to who will address them as they arise. The OCO verified that the incarcerated individual agreed to this compromise but may not know who to report concerns to. The OCO provided the individual with that information.	Information Provided
77.	The incarcerated individual reports that if the cable is not going to work correctly, then he should not have to pay for it. The channels come in fuzzy, and most channels available are things he does not watch like golf, shopping channels, and the Monroe bulletin board.	The OCO provided information about the current cable status in their facility. DOC leadership reported that this person's unit does come in fuzzy, and they would increase the amperage to get a clearer picture. The DOC reported that they must talk with the cable company about changing the channel selection before making any changes and could not verify a timeline for this decision.	Information Provided
78.	Incarcerated individual reported asking for protective custody (PC), because of being harassed on her tier for being a trans woman and being uncomfortable with her roommate. After requesting PC, she was placed in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU). The individual requested information about getting back into general population and described it as the "lesser of two evils" compared to being in IMU.	The OCO provided information over the phone about opting out of protective custody. The OCO verified through DOC records that the incarcerated individual spoke to her counselor and was placed back in general population with a different roommate.	Information Provided

79.	Family member called in because incarcerated loved one sounded not like himself when she talked to him, and she is worried about what is happening with him. She and her daughter are his Power of Attorney and medical POA. DOC is saying that they do not have this on file, and she is concerned that he is having a medical issue and they might need to use it.	Person will need to verify that the person wants the chosen family members to have Power of Attorney. The OCO cannot assist with this process. Person can reach out to the classification counselor to start the process of granting Power of Attorney.	Information Provided
80.	The incarcerated individual is requesting a list of names for the OCO Director and Supervisors.	The OCO provided the names of supervisors and the director to this individual.	Information Provided
81.	Person reports that they are still mandated to wear a mask although masking requirements have been lifted per DOC memo.	A DOC memo dated December 19, 2022, states COVID protocols at the facility mandate mask if there is an outbreak anywhere in the facility. Currently there is no outbreak at Monroe Correction Complex-TRU. However, there is an outbreak in another area of the facility masking will be necessary.	Information Provided
82.	Family member reports their loved one was supposed to have surgery recently and they have not heard any information if it occurred or how it went.	The OCO provided contact information to the external reporter.	Information Provided
83.	The incarcerated individual reports that he has filed resolution requests against staff, and now they are retaliating against him. The resolution specialist is enforcing multiple rewrites and is unwilling to investigate the resolution requests that he has submitted. This person would like staff to do their job correctly and stop censoring his resolution requests. He also reports that he has four infractions related to this retaliation.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office has already reviewed the infractions referenced in this complaint. The office reviewed this person's electronic file but could not find evidence that the resolution specialist is unwilling to investigate his concerns. The OCO met with DOC leadership regarding this complaint, and the DOC reported they had had several meetings with this person working to resolve this concern.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
84.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about extended placement in IMU.	The OCO reviewed the individual's most recent custody facility plan and find there is no violation of DOC policy 300.380. The individual is being placed in IMU according to policy for their safety and security.	No Violation of Policy
85.	Patient reports he is not recovering adequate pain management after suffering an injury at work. He has been approved for medications through the Care Review Committee and is receiving them, but feels he needs his dosage raised and the medications approved for long term use.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO contacted the patient's provider and Health Services manager and reviewed the current care plan. The patient is receiving multiple forms of pain management while being evaluated for an injury. The OCO is not able to recommend treatments or interventions	No Violation of Policy

that are not clinically indicated. Per the Health Plan, his case will have to be presented to the Care Review Committee (CRC) when his approval and order expires.

86.	Person states that she was denied a strip search by female officer and was searched by three men. When she requests a female officer, she was told that TRU is not considering doing that. She has spoken to leadership at the facility and was told by them that they are not going to ask female staff to do the strip searches.	When there is no female officer available to perform the search DOC is within policy to have a male officer complete the search. Per DOC 490.700 IX (B) search preferences will be documented on the individuals DOC 02-420 Preference Request. (1) Searches will be conducted in accordance with the stated preference unless circumstances do not allow for the preference to be implemented during a pat or strip search. (a) if unable to accommodate the request in Prisons and reentry centers, the shift commander/duty office will consider appropriate alternatives. 1) When a pat/strip search is not conducted according to the DOC 02-420 Preference Request, an Incident Management Reporting System (IMRS) report will be completed.	No Violation of Policy
87.	Person was housed in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) at MCC, and reports concerns about the conditions of confinement while there. Person says they submitted complaints to the DOC Resolution staff who eventually substantiated the complaint, however, there has not been a plan, or any actions taken to fix the issues.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. The OCO reviewed the related level III grievance and substantiated there are no TVs in IMU at the facility due to lack of outlets in those cells.	Substantiated

Olympic Corrections Center

88.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns regarding an infraction they received.	The individual was informed that once they receive an infraction appeal response, they can contact the OCO to investigate this concern.	Information Provided
-----	---	---	----------------------

Other- Community Supervision, Jail, Out of State, Statewide

89.	Person called asking if the OCO has jurisdiction over county jails and reported a use of force incident that happened to him in a county jail in 2022. The OCO informed the person that the office does not have jurisdiction and provided the number for a county government complaint hotline.	The OCO provided a phone number for a Pierce County government complaint hotline during the hotline intake for this case.	Information Provided
-----	--	---	----------------------

Stafford Creek Corrections Center

90.	The incarcerated individual reports that medical staff took away his HSR for a cane that he needs. He reports that the DOC staff	The OCO provided assistance by elevating the case to the Health Services Administrators (HSAs) after substantiating a lack of documented clinical evaluation. DOC	Assistance Provided
-----	--	---	---------------------

made false allegations saying that he did not need a cane due to his activity level.

agreed to the need for a documented clinical assessment when changing HSRs for mobility aides and the OCO continues to engage in conversations on this topic during biweekly meetings with the HSAs. This person has been scheduled for an appointment with their provider for such an assessment.

91.	Person reports they did not have lab work done at the requisite six-month mark and have not seen the cardiologist yet. He was not interviewed for the resolution they filed about this concern either. He would like this scheduled and to know who his primary provider is.	The OCO provided assistance to the patient by contacting Health Services management and requesting the specialist follow up needs be reviewed for scheduling. The patient is now scheduled for needed follow up. The OCO also provided the information the patient requested.	Assistance Provided
92.	Incarcerated individual reports a DOC employee discriminated against him by refusing to refer him to a program that can assist qualified individuals with reentry services. Incarcerated individual reports they should qualify for the program and are being denied the opportunity to apply for the program.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke to DOC staff who explained that the individual did not meet the criteria to automatically qualify him for the program. However, this is not the complete process for determining eligibility. DOC staff agreed to review the individual's eligibility requirements and reach out to him with the determination and next steps to access services once released if he is deemed not eligible. At the time OCO made contact with DOC, this review was not started, and DOC agreed to complete the process to determine eligibility for the program after OCO's outreach.	Assistance Provided
93.	External person reports that the incarcerated person was placed on medical hold. The person was supposed to be going in for a medical procedure that week, but instead, DOC removed the medical hold and transferred him to another facility across the state without explanation.	The OCO provided assistance. This office elevated the concern to DOC health services, substantiated a medical hold was removed and the patient was transferred prior to receiving their medical procedure. DOC agreed to transport the patient back to the original facility and keep the current appointment. The OCO confirmed the individual was transferred and tracked case on appointment tracker.	Assistance Provided
94.	A loved one expressed concerns about an incarcerated individual not getting their phone privileges reinstated on the date it was supposed to happen.	The OCO reached out to DOC regarding the individual not having phone privileges, DOC stated on that date in question, after the OCO had reached out, DOC Headquarter has decided to lift the individual's phone restrictions.	Assistance Provided
95.	Incarcerated person states they are currently in the Veteran's pod and was one of the	This office reviewed this request and identified he received his infractions within	Assistance Provided

individuals who received infractions between a specified time period as noted in a recent OCO report. Person was ultimately not removed from the pod but would like to double check that he was not forgotten and if his infractions are eligible for dismissal.

the same timeframe as reported by the OCO. The OCO contacted the facility leadership, who then agreed to dismiss the infractions.

96.	The incarcerated individual was provided state-issued shoes that are too small and hurt their feet. The individual has filed a resolution request but has not received a response. This is a new type of shoe that runs small, and many other incarcerated individuals are complaining that their regular shoe size does not fit.	OCO staff provided information to the incarcerated person detailing how to request to be resized for state issued shoes. The OCO contacted DOC Property staff and were informed that while special size ordering had been halted, it has now resumed, and incarcerated people should kite property to request to be resized.	Information Provided
97.	Person states she has medical concerns that she has not grieved because she already has the limit of open resolutions. She states her medication is running low and this could give her blood clots.	Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. Since the person has the maximum allowable number of open complaints on file with the resolution program, they will not accept any additional complaints until one of the current complaints is closed or withdrawn. The person can withdraw a resolution that is currently open, or the person can wait until one has been resolved and then re-submit this issue to the resolution program. The OCO is currently working on an investigation related to a similar issue regarding not being able to file complaints with the resolution program and not receiving health care services. This office will continue to investigate the open complaints currently on file with this office and will follow up with the person regarding these issues.	Information Provided
98.	Person reports the resolution specialists closed his case when his TV was destroyed without resolving the concern.	The OCO cannot replace or refund property. This individual will need to file a tort claim for their damaged property. Per DOC Policy 120.500(I) All incarcerated individual's tort claims alleging personal property damage/loss must be filed by the individual with the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services (DES) Risk Management Division. The Department does not assume responsibility for filing claims with the DES Risk Management Division. (II)(A) Individuals will complete Washington	Information Provided

State SF 210 Tort Claim Form Packet and Mail it to the DES Risk Management Division address noted on the form. Tort Claim Packets can usually be found in the Law Library.

99. External person reports their loved one transferred facilities and has not received all of his property.	The OCO contacted property and DOC reports the two chain boxes were delivered in September, and two boxes and a TV in October 2022. The facility contacted AHCC and DOC reports sending another box and tote on the chain bus two weeks prior to OCO outreach. The OCO provided self-advocacy information, including instructions on how to file a tort claim if there are still items missing. The person can Request a Tort packet in the law library.	Information Provided
100. Patient reports a need for medical shoes that are not being provided as an ADA accommodation (Accommodation Status Report - ASR) and says the shoes he is using are causing further injury.	The OCO could not identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy and the DOC Health Plan. This office reviewed the related grievance investigations and found the patient received a pair of state purchased medical sport shoes after the date of the initial resolution request. Policy 440.050 outlines that the state will only issue one pair of sports shoes and the individual will need to work with property for a list of approved vendors and medical for Offender Paid Healthcare if interested in an additional pair. If specialized shoes are medically indicated, the patient can work with their medical provider as these accommodations do not go through non-medical ADA staff or the Accommodation Review Committee (ARC).	Information Provided
101. Person reports his property came up missing when he was moved to IMU. He has filed a resolution and it took two months for them to respond. Person feels like no one wants to investigate his property concerns because he went through this recently with the tort claim.	The OCO is unable to assist with this complaint. Person is able to file a Tort Claim to be reimbursed for lost/damaged property. Per DOC Policy 120.500(I) All incarcerated individual's tort claims alleging personal property damage/loss must be filed by the individual with the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services (DES) Risk Management Division. The Department does not assume responsibility for filing claims with the DES Risk Management Division. (II)(A) Individuals will complete Washington State SF 210 Tort Claim Form Packet and Mail it to the DES Risk Management Division	Information Provided

address noted on the form. Person can find tort claim packets in the Law Library at the current facility.

102.	Incarcerated individual reports concerns with being denied an Extended Family Visit (EFV). Incarcerated individual says he applied for an EFV with his wife, the request was sent to DOC Headquarters, and then denied for a domestic violence (DV) indicator. Individual reports the alleged DV was against a family member when he was a teenager and was told that DV indicators only correspond to like relationships, and that a family member is not a like relationship to a wife. Individual reports that he resubmitted the paperwork and then got a letter from DOC Headquarters sharing that the EFV denial is because his wife has not visited over six times in the last 12 months.	The OCO provided information about DOC Extended Family Visit Policy. DOC 590.100 III. B. 4. states the EFV applicant must “have previously visited with the individual a minimum of 6 times, to include video visits, within the last 12 months.” The OCO was able to substantiate the DV indicator and that it regarded the individual’s family member, which does not appear to be a like relationship as defined in DOC 590.100. Once the individual’s wife has visited the minimum amount of time in a year, they can apply for an EFV again.	Information Provided
103.	The incarcerated individual reports an issue with records not running his sentences concurrently. This person reports that he received a court order explaining his sentences are to run concurrently, but records are implementing his other sentence as jail credits. He believes they are calculating his time backward, and he should be getting 48 days of earned good conduct time.	The OCO provided information about this person’s next steps: escalate the resolution request to level III.	Information Provided
104.	A loved one reports that the DOC is not approving their EFVs because she needs to provide an original copy of her birth certificate. She is from Iran and cannot request an original copy at this time. She does not understand why they will not accept the same documentation for the visit, as they did for the marriage.	The OCO provided information on the status of this person’s EFV application. The OCO contacted the DOC, who reported that this person’s documentation had been approved, and the EFV application has continued to move through the approval process.	Information Provided
105.	Incarcerated individual reports calling Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) hotline numerous times and getting a recorded message, even though she calls at the time that it is supposed to be open. Individual reports there is no rape psychotherapy available, and she is being told to just call the PREA hotline.	The OCO provided information regarding PREA. The PREA hotline is operated by the federal government and is outside DOC jurisdiction as to whether it uses a recorded message or not upon initial call. DOC Policy 490.800 XI. C. states that “in-person consultations may be available” for sexual assault survivors but does not provide for psychotherapy specifically. DOC Policy 490.800 XI. A. 1. also states incarcerated individuals can call the Sexual Assault	Information Provided

Support and Information Line operated by the Office of Crime Victims Advocacy. DOC Policy 490.800 XI. B. also states that sexual assault support services may also be obtained via mail through Just Detention International.

106. Incarcerated individual is past their Early Release Date (ERD) but none of their release plans have been approved. The individual reports that they have had three release addresses approved through the housing voucher program, and the DOC continues to deny all the release options. The individual reports they have not received any infractions, and have good behavior, therefore do not understand why they cannot release. The individual has reached out to DOC staff at multiple levels and not received a response.	The OCO provided information regarding release requirements and the civil commitment process. The individual is currently being considered for civil commitment which requires him to release to transitional housing on supervision. DOC has made attempts to locate transitional housing for this individual however the available spaces have not elected to house him. The OCO verified DOC is currently reviewing release options and was unable to substantiate that DOC was denying the plans. The OCO shared with the individual that per DOC 350.200 Transition and Release, "Individuals requiring an approved release address may be held in confinement up to the Max Ex date until an approved release address is secured." The OCO also provided the individual with information for self-advocacy surrounding his release and the civil commitment process.	Information Provided
107. Incarcerated individual reports that his unit is not allowing individuals to use two grey mattresses and is threatening to issue infractions. The individual requested the OCO send the report regarding mattresses so he can prove to the sergeant that this was already addressed.	The OCO provided information regarding the OCO mattress report. The OCO's report about mattresses in DOC facilities can be accessed on the tablets and could be accessed in the law library, as with all reports published by this office. The OCO also shared that new mattresses are set to be distributed soon.	Information Provided
108. Incarcerated individual reports when he files resolution requests they are deemed not accepted and are not being appealed to the resolution program manager at DOC headquarters. The incarcerated individual reports the resolution specialist has intentionally denied his resolution requests and refused to send them to the DOC headquarters for review. The individual reports that the resolution specialist at their facility is not allowing meaningful access to the program.	This office provided information regarding the resolution program and reported the OCO's findings after reviewing three months of resolution requests filed by the complainant. The OCO found in the review of the individual's resolution request that multiple requests were deemed not accepted in compliance with the resolution program manual. The individual also requested a resolution appeal to the next level when the current level investigation was not complete. The OCO shared with the individual how to write a complaint to the	Information Provided

headquarters resolution program manager if they wish to report the actions of the resolution specialist. The OCO also encouraged the individual to review the Resolution Program Manual to understand the resolution process.

109. The incarcerated individual reports they were terminated from their Correctional Industries (CI) employment in retaliation after filing a resolution request related to the amount of pay given for the position they held. The individual reports they received positive remarks from their supervisor just before they were terminated. The individual reports DOC shared their reasons for their termination, but states that the actions were all approved by the work crew supervisor. The individual requested DOC pay the outside crews the amount they are entitled to and requests OCO review their employment termination.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. DOC reviewed the resolution request per the DOC Resolution Program Manual and responded to the individual. The OCO verified the DOC response is accurate and within DOC policy. The individual shared that the job termination was reflected in their file as dropped from the job, which has no negative impact on their DOC record. The individual indicated that the issue was resolved and requested to have the complaint withdrawn. The OCO determined DOC resolved this issue because actions were taken by DOC to remedy the concerns the individual expressed.	DOC Resolved
110. External person reports an incarcerated individual seems to have ongoing issues with high and low insulin levels. The individual once again hit dangerous lows causing him to be incoherent, unstable on his feet, and causing concern in his unit. Person is concerned medical staff are not providing the individual the correct medications and are causing wide swings in his blood sugar levels. Person also reports insulin dependent individuals are getting locked out of mainline after getting insulin first.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted Health Services management and were informed the patient is receiving insulin and direct monitoring regularly. It was noted that this facility maintains snacks on the insulin carts to mitigate issues with delayed mainline. These snacks are available for all insulin dependent patients at this facility.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
111. Incarcerated individual reports DOC did not provide them with notice of a rejected electronic deposit until ten months after it was rejected. The individual reports the funds were mailed out of the institution before they received notice and time to appeal the decision.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO was unable to confirm when the notice of the rejected funds was sent to the individual due to the amount of time passed since the funds were rejected. The OCO spoke with DOC and confirmed the process for notifying incarcerated individuals of rejected funds has since changed, and there is no record of when the individual was notified. The OCO verified that the rejected funds were rejected in compliance with DOC 200.000 Trust Accounts for Incarcerated Individuals.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

112.	Incarcerated individual reports they filed a classification appeal after a classification hearing to DOC headquarters and did not receive a response. The individual requests OCO investigate the lack of response to the appeal.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO was unable to locate evidence to substantiate the whereabouts of the appeal.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
113.	The incarcerated individual reports that he feels he is being discriminated against by not being given a job. He reports that he received an infraction a while ago but believes he is now eligible for a job. The individual reports that a lot of people who should have been below him on the job lists have been hired, but he has not. The individual reports that his evaluations for work show he is qualified to work in several areas and has performed well in the past.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office spoke with DOC staff and reviewed the individual's job placements and referrals and found that at the time this concern was submitted the individual did have a job, though it was not his preferred job. The OCO confirmed that the individual had additional referrals for jobs that he was most interested in and has since been assigned to a new position.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
114.	Patient reports concerns about the psychiatrist changing his diagnosis. He is being told he does not qualify for SOU placement even though he has a history of placement in residential treatment. Person's priority concerns are transferring back to SOU and discussing medication increase.	The OCO reviewed the mental health record and spoke with the DOC Mental Health Provider regarding this concern. This individual is functioning well in general population and has been in regular contact with mental health and medical staff. He does not currently rise to RTU level of care. The OCO could not find a violation of policy within his current treatment plan.	No Violation of Policy
115.	Patient reports that he was taken off a medication he had been on for years. He was taking this medication for both mental health and medical reasons. He has tried to kite mental health but has not received a response.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO contacted Health Services management and were informed the patient had been seen by the provider who ordered alternative treatments for the patient. The clinical appropriateness of a medication must be determined by the ordering provider or the Care Review Committee.	No Violation of Policy
116.	Incarcerated individual reports he was involved in a DOC investigation which resulted in DOC confiscating some contact information they had from people in the community. The individual requests OCO review and see if it is possible for the individual to have the contact information back, because it has been a few years since the information was confiscated.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed relevant restricted DOC policy and the determination of the facility investigations unit and found the contact information are from people who have a cessation order against the individual. Due to the cessation order, DOC will not re-issue the contact information.	No Violation of Policy
Washington Corrections Center			
117.	Incarcerated person states that third shift workers are not being given recreation time	OCO was able to provide assistance in ensuring this issue was corrected. During	Assistance Provided

and are getting pent up stress with no release.

OCO Quarterly meeting Tier Reps asked a question about this issue. OCO staff then followed up with Associate Superintendent of the facility and were able to verify that action was being escalated due to attention brought at the meeting and follow up. With the light pole fixed WCC third shift workers now have access to the yard for recreation time after their work shifts. Verified yard is open for third shift workers.

118. Individual reports they were demoted from a position at CI after they had filed a racial discrimination concern that was substantiated.	The OCO contacted the Director and Assistant Secretary of CI at DOC to discuss the concern. This office verified that there was no written documentation to justify a demotion from the position. The DOC agreed to promote him back to his lead position and provide a job description for the individual to follow. He did not lose any gratuity or wages during this incident.	Assistance Provided
119. Person states he has a negative BOE for throwing a testing swab at a nurse. Individual states that he did not throw the swab. States the nurse has since been fired for misconduct and was known to make false statements to DOC officers and reported negative BOEs on a bunch of different people.	The OCO contacted the facility leadership and asked for a review of the negative BOE. The DOC then agreed to remove the negative BOE.	Assistance Provided
120. Population concern received in person by OCO staff. Multiple incarcerated people report that their recreation time is being limited in the IMU and Lower Rs to well below the policy minimums.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting the associate superintendent at the facility and requesting a review of how much the incarcerated individuals are getting recreation. This facility is starting a new recreation schedule in January that should mitigate this issue.	Assistance Provided
121. Person reports that he continues to have difficulty accessing mental health. He is at a new facility and has been there for months. He has not been seen for his psychiatry evaluation and his medications were discontinued this week.	The OCO provided assistance to the patient by requesting the Health Services Manager (HSM) schedule him for an appointment with Mental Health and Psychiatry. OCO Staff followed up with the HSM to verify the patient was seen several times in the following month.	Assistance Provided
122. Person says their current cell is not ADA wheelchair compliant and the shower is not accessible because it is also not ADA wheelchair compliant. Person says their last shower and shave was over ten days ago before they were transferred to their current facility.	The OCO was able to provide assistance. This office met with DOC staff and DOC agreed to review ADA shower accommodations. The OCO met with the individual in person during a facility visit and confirmed that an ADA shower chair was provided after OCO outreach.	Assistance Provided

123. Person states there was an investigation being done and while that investigation took place visitation was suspended/terminated. Person was unclear as to what kind of investigation.	Per DOC 450.300(X)(A) A visitor may appeal an initial visit application, denial visit privilege restrictions/suspensions/terminations, and/or VMDT decisions in writing to Headquarters Correctional Program Administrator. A written decision will be mailed through the USPS when email is not an option for notification to the visitor.	Information Provided
124. Person states WCC is still not following the new COVID rules. Person states he had family visit and he was not able to share a meal with his wife due to COVID rules per visiting room staff. Person states his family (wife) took a rapid test which was negative and was still denied being able to share a meal with the contact. He states it seems like WCC staff are enacting some parts of the new rules but not others and that it does not make any sense. Person states WCC is no longer following the intake separation per the memo sent out, but then still following other parts of the old rules.	The DOC has stated that when the county and facility are in the "green," the vending machines are accessible, and individuals can eat while visiting. However, if either the county or the facility is in the "yellow" or medium risk operations, they cannot grant access. These rules are per DOH (Department of Health) and the CDC (Center for Disease Control).	Information Provided
125. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about their right's being violated when they were not allowed to go to their infraction hearing. They also feel the incident itself does not merit that level of infraction they were given.	The OCO contacted DOC regarding two concerns for the infraction: (1) the individual states they were not allowed to attend their hearing as they were not given notice of it. DOC verified the individual signed a notice of their hearing when it was served and verbally refused to attend the hearing as verified by a waiver of attendance signed by two escort officers, (2) the individual filed an appeal but has not received a response. DOC verified they do have the individual's appeal but due to a staff being unexpectedly out of the office, processing of appeals are being delayed.	Information Provided
126. Person states that the Native community is being treated unfairly in their religious practices. Despite all of the updates to the COVID protocols, the sweat lodge participants are the only one who are still required to test before participating. Those who decline to test are not given an alternative call out. No other religious groups are forced to test before gathering indoors. They are also not able to access the area where they prepare their regalia for events.	The OCO met with the facility leadership and chaplain to discuss the protocols and access to regalia for events. The DOC is currently following a Sweat Lodge Protocol that was issued on November 21, 2022. Due to the close contact of this religious event, the DOC is unwilling to change the protocol, as this was clinical advice issued to the department. It was reported to the OCO that the sponsor of this group is willing to accommodate the group if they need to come into the facility at	Information Provided

	a different time for more access to regalia. The OCO shared this information with facility leadership who will follow up on this issue. Staffing shortages continue to be a roadblock in incarcerated individuals' access to programming time.	
127. Person states that his time has not been calculated correctly. DOC is not giving him credit for his county jail time served and is holding him past his release date.	The OCO provided information regarding how to request information pertaining to the person's sentence and time calculation. Incarcerated person can submit a kite or a kiosk the records department, explaining why the person believes the time calculation is incorrect.	Information Provided
128. Persons first language is Spanish, he would like to know more about the GRE program.	The OCO provided information regarding the GRE program. The OCO sent the person the GRE policy in Spanish.	Information Provided
129. Incarcerated individual states they reported a Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) concern a few months ago and no DOC staff have met with them to discuss the concern. The individual reports DOC is doing this in an attempt to protect the staff named in the PREA report.	The OCO provided information regarding the reported PREA concern. The OCO verified that the individual was offered mental health services after the report was filed and declined the services. The OCO reviewed the current PREA investigations policy and found no direct timeframe outlining when PREA investigations should be complete. The DOC explained that due to a lack of qualified staff to complete the investigation it was delayed. The OCO was unable to locate evidence to substantiate that DOC delayed the investigation to protect the named staff member. This office confirmed the investigation is now complete and shared this information with the individual.	Information Provided
130. External reporter shared concerns over their loved one being required to do programming that is not directly related to the persons conviction. They would like their loved one released or given a release date.	The OCO provided information to the incarcerated person regarding DOC 460.130 Response to Violations and New Criminal Activity, Attachment 2: Community Corrections Officers (CCOs) and Indeterminate Sentence Review Board (ISRB) Hearings Investigators will use this guide when recommending a sanction in response to violation behavior. The Programming recommendations from the ISRB are within policy.	Information Provided
131. Person states they should have access to the proper medical assistance program for their disability. Person has been an opioid addict for over 20 years and was prescribed suboxone prior to incarceration. Person	The OCO provided information to the patient about the Medication Assisted Therapy (MAT) program protocol. The current DOC MAT protocol states that persons at WCC with more than 6 months remaining on their	Information Provided

reports they need this medication to function properly because their disability and chemical imbalance has far progressed.

sentence will tapered off the medication. If a person is sent to a facility that offers induction to the medication it can be restarted when the patient has less than six months remaining. If a person is retained at WCC until release or sent to a facility that does not offer induction to the program, community resources will be set up by the reentry nurse so the patient may start the medication upon release.

132. Person reports that at SOU he had a Health Status Report (HSR) for wipes to bathe with. He states he has issues that make him unable to use the shower. This HSR was approved by the Care Review Committee and was still active when he was transferred. When he arrived, he was told they do not do that there. He now cannot access what he needs to clean himself.	The OCO provided information to the patient regarding the availability of wipes at WCC. The ordering and issuing of wipes by WCC medical have been stopped due to the negative impact they have on the plumbing. This has impacted multiple patients at this facility. The patients with Health Status Reports for wipes for bathing have been offered an alternative method of hygiene. The OCO continues to discuss the options available to accommodate these patients with Health Services management.	Information Provided
133. The incarcerated individual is requesting seven OCO Review Request forms, three Closed Case Review forms and would like the zip code of the OCO's address. This person reports new staff is in their living unit, and OCO forms are unavailable.	The OCO provided the forms this person requested as well as address information. This office also followed up with the Correctional Unit Supervisor to ensure that OCO forms are available in their unit.	Information Provided
134. Person reports concerns about the potential to be moved into a space during quarantine that is not friendly of transgender individuals, posing safety risks. Person expressed fear of being placed in segregation for protection or quarantine with an unsafe individual if positive for COVID.	The OCO provided the individual with information related to housing process for quarantine. The OCO contacted headquarters to discuss housing processes related to COVID quarantine and the transgender housing protocol, outlined in DOC 490.700 and version 34 of the WA State DOC COVID-19 Screening, Testing, and Infection Control Guidelines. This office also discussed the case with the incarcerated individual in person and the individual was not in quarantine at the time. Individuals can discuss safety concerns with the (CUS) if other unit staff are not providing approved accommodations or support. Current guidelines and policy do not require a new housing protocol be completed due to COVID quarantine and people are placed according to risk levels.	Information Provided

135. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about not being seen by mental health.	The OCO reached out to DOC regarding this concern and DOC confirmed the individual had been seen twice by mental health. The OCO advised the individual that access to mental health care is often minimal while in the receiving units but if they need an appointment, they will need to kite mental health and let them know it is an emergent need. Additionally, those with an elevated "S" code (code identifying an individual's mental health needs) are prioritized and if the individual does not have an elevated S code, they may not receive a mental health evaluation until they transfer to their home facility.	Information Provided
136. Person reports that all of his teeth were pulled and then DOC told him he is not qualified for dentures unless he has been housed in the IMU for two years. In the meantime, he cannot eat regular food.	The OCO reviewed the related resolution and found that DOC agreed to provide dentures once the individual is transferred to a parent facility. The OCO provided information regarding how to follow up with dental once transferred to their assigned facility and how to appeal their DOC resolution request to the next level. This office also provided information about how to kite to request meal accommodations while awaiting dentures.	Information Provided
137. The incarcerated individual reports he was assaulted by active gang members twice, one day after the other. The individual is a documented drop out gang member and prior to the assaults, had asked to be moved from the tier housing active gang members. The individual reports staff disregarded his concerns for his personal safety and now suffers medical and mental health complications as a result of the assaults. The individual requests compensation for the complications inflicted while he was housed in this unit.	The OCO shared information with the individual about how to file a tort claim with the Department of Risk Management to be considered for potential compensation.	Information Provided
138. Person states he may be experiencing mental health concerns and needs access to mental health services.	To request access to mental health services person will need to send a kite to request an appointment. If person is not scheduled an appointment, the individual should file a resolution request.	Information Provided
139. The incarcerated individual reports that he was supposed to have cornea transplant surgery and the appointment has been	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted Health services management and were informed that appointments were	DOC Resolved

cancelled twice. He now has to wait for another transplant donor.

cancelled multiple times, but the procedure had occurred. The Health Services Manager confirmed that custody did not cancel the appointments; power outages in the clinic, inclement weather, and doctor illness were the reasons provided for why the appointments were cancelled.

140. Person says they are having trouble accessing mental health services and have to wait long periods of time unless they state they are going to harm themselves.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed the resolution request which stated the person was receiving the care he was requesting and was signed by the person.	DOC Resolved
141. Person reported in person to OCO about an active PREA investigation involving a staff member. He says he is the victim and is in protective custody pending transfer. Now he does not feel safe at the facility, especially accessing medical and mental health since the incident occurred in the infirmary (health services) where he worked.	The information given to the OCO does not match the information in OMNI. This individual is housed at a different facility, and it would not have been possible for them to report information in person at WCC. The OCO could not verify the information that was reported.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
142. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received and believes DOC violated policy in the collection of the UA that led to the infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal narrative for a 778 diluted urinary analysis (UA) infraction and find there is evidence to substantiate the infraction. The standard of evidence for DOC is "some" evidence which includes just an officer's statement. In this instance, because the officers state they observed the individual reach into their pocket and put something into the UA cup, this would be enough for some evidence standard. Additionally, the sample did not test positive for creatine or specific gravity which indicates it has been altered. DOC also substantiated this infraction based on the fact that this is the individual's third drug related infraction in 10 months.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
143. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about being denied an investigation into DOC falsifying dates of an infraction and appeal.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and find the appeal was responded to the same day it was received. As a result, there was no evidence showing there was a violation of DOC policy by DOC not following timeframes as the individual alleges.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
144. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about a 709 out of bounds infraction for entering someone else's cell but says this did not occur.	The OCO reviewed the video footage that accompanied the infraction but due to the quality as well as the presence of other individuals in the hallway, it was not possible to identify which individuals went into which	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

cells or the cell numbers. As a result, the OCO reached out to DOC to see if they would be willing to overturn this infraction based on this, however, they were unwilling to overturn the infraction.

145. Person submitted anonymous complaint that a third shift unit porter is receiving special treatment from the unit sergeant to include gifts, access to OMNI, and other privileges.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO does not know what unit the person is in or have enough information to investigate the complaint.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
146. This complaint was reported on site. Person does not agree with the mail policy rule applied to sexually explicit content he states it is gendered. Person states the definition is not clear and is not applied fairly.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Policy 450.100 states the mail will be reviewed and if rejected a person can appeal the rejection. The policy is currently not under review. Person's feedback was received.	No Violation of Policy
147. This complaint was taken on site. Person reports that he does not agree with the suboxone policy program. He thinks he should be able to be placed on the program before six months to release.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Policy 580.000 states that Suboxone shall be administered when a person is six months to ERD. Currently the policy is not under review. Person's feedback has been received.	No Violation of Policy
148. The incarcerated individual reports that he has been sleeping on the floor since admission to the facility. The individual reports that he has injuries and should not be sleeping on the floor and feels that this is cruel and unusual punishment.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. The OCO is aware of individuals' sleeping on a mattress on the floor at the Reception and Diagnostic Center (RDC). The RDC is often populated over capacity which requires individuals to be assigned to a floor bed at times. These bed assignments are generally short in duration under normal circumstances; however, the Covid-19 pandemic has lengthened floor bed assignments due to the need to maintain individuals in cohorts in an attempt to prevent the spread of the virus. The OCO followed up on this individual's housing location and determined that they had been moved out of receiving and transferred to a new facility. The OCO will continue to discuss this matter with the DOC.	Substantiated

Washington Corrections Center for Women

149. Person reports sending kites to medical to address bacterial infection and STD concern. Patient says DOC has not been responsive nor given the person the medication needed.	The OCO contacted health services to request a Release of Information (ROI) be completed for the patient and her medical issues be addressed. DOC reports the patient was readmitted to DOC a few months ago and received routine testing which showed	Assistance Provided
---	--	---------------------

normal findings including antibodies. Medication is not medically indicated since test results returned negative for active or prior STI. After OCO outreach, DOC scheduled the patient for an appointment with her primary care provider to discuss recent test results and any ongoing concerns. The OCO talked with the patient directly via phone at the person's request. After continued OCO outreach, patient received another appointment with GYN, additional testing, and the patient is scheduled with her provider to go over results and next steps. Patient is still in testing and diagnostic phase. The OCO attempted a scheduled phone call to communicate and receive updates and did not receive a call from the patient.

<p>150. Anonymous person reports medical and mental health are failing the population. When patients are in crisis or self-harming, they are sent to the Close Observation Areas (COA) for three days and put back on the unit without any step-down care even though there is a housing unit for that. They are not utilizing TEC (Treatment and Evaluation Center) acute as much as they could be to prevent reoccurring COA placements. The person also reports nursing staff are not doing full assessments during sick call, not taking vitals, and not scheduling promised follow ups when turned away from sick call or medical emergencies.</p>	<p>The OCO elevated the concerns to the Health Service Administrators (HSAs) who followed up with the facility. DOC reports that the length of stay is determined by a risk assessment and clinical need; everyone admitted to the COA for danger to self (there are other reasons for admission), gets an admission and discharge risk assessment, as well as a treatment plan to work on while they are in the COA, which includes a safety plan. The OCO would need more information about impacted individuals, dates, or incidents to investigate further.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>151. Person reports they broke their foot and faced delay in treatment that has resulted in chronic pain and reoccurring injuries. The patient requests that the delay in care be substantiated and a complaint be filed against her medical provider.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance by reviewing the medical records and encounters. The OCO substantiated the delay in the diagnosis of the injury. The delay was caused by a comorbidity that complicated the reporting and evaluation of the injury. The OCO confirmed the patient is receiving ongoing care.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>152. Patient reports she was taken off her pain management medications. She was told she would start a new medication, but that decision was reversed and she was referred to physical therapy and given a different medication. This person does not feel as though her pain is taken seriously.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information to the patient about the process of getting approved for different pain management. The patient must participate in conservative measures before the requested treatment plan can be approved. The OCO confirmed the patient is scheduled for physical therapy.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

153. Person states she has multiple needs that have to be addressed by dental. COVID has delayed her care and she wants to get the fillings and partial she needs.	DOC Staff resolved this concern prior to OCO involvement. The OCO contacted Health Services Management and confirmed the patient is scheduled with dental. This case was added to the appointment tracker to monitor for completion. The treatment the patient is requesting must be covered by Health Plan and deemed medically necessary by the dentist before the treatment can move forward.	DOC Resolved
154. Patient reports that her pain medications were stopped five days after surgery and she was not allowed to contact the surgeon to report swelling and bruising that occurred after surgery. She was offered over the counter pain medication but that is not effective for her pain.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted Health Services management and were informed the patient had been evaluated by medical for the reported symptoms and had been offered treatment in line with clinical indications. The OCO verified the patient's follow up appointments were scheduled with the surgeon. OCO staff also verified that the pain management offered was within protocol. No additional pain medication is clinically indicated.	DOC Resolved
155. Person reports she was suspended from her job at the PPP program in retaliation by the Director because she spoke up about safety concerns after two inmates were bitten by dogs.	The OCO contacted the facility leadership to inquire about this incident involving the dogs. The DOC did do a full investigation and provided training to the PPP Program regarding how to report incidents. This individual has since resigned from her position and is in a different job. The OCO could not substantiate retaliation in this incident.	DOC Resolved
156. Person says she had referrals in for two reentry centers in different counties. Recently, she was excluded from the list for transfer. She was told that one county was removed from her referrals, and no one could provide an explanation. Person believes she has been treated unjustly, unfairly and these decisions were racially motivated.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This person's counselor confirmed she was approved for both houses. There is no evidence to support the concern that her referral for the second house was pulled. Per DOC 350.200 Transition and Release, Individuals who require an approved release address will be returned to their county of origin/alternate county of origin as determined and approved per Attachment 1. The housing this person was finalized for is in her county of origin.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
157. Person reports one of the officers came to get her for a medical outing and sounded congested and sick. While on the medical outing, the officer said she did not feel good,	DOC implemented policies to address COVID-19 conditions within the facilities. The OCO was not able to determine the DOC actions in this case were outside of those implemented	No Violation of Policy

and the person told her she needed to get a COVID test. The officer ended up testing positive and the patient is now in segregation and is not being tested until day five. She is concerned her isolation will continue based on a scheduled offsite procedure. Patient signed a paper saying she can quarantine in her unit and DOC is saying because she was in contact with a positive staff she could not quarantine in unit.

policies. Individuals are placed in quarantine or isolation based on version 34 of the WA State COVID-19 Screening, Testing, and Infection Control Guidelines. The OCO reviewed the individual's placement and found the person is no longer in COVID isolation.

158. The individual reports issues with medical and the treatment she received for her eyes. She reports that she has documentation saying that she is visually impaired permanently that cannot be corrected with glasses. She reports issues getting ADA accommodations regarding being vision impairment.	The OCO met with the ADA coordinator and HSM. The individual recently had cataract surgery. Once her post-op is complete, the accommodation review committee will review her ADA requests. If they are denied, she will have the opportunity to appeal.	No Violation of Policy
159. Family member expressed concerns about an incarcerated individual receiving an infraction for a powdery substance that they say is flavored water and not being allowed additional lab testing.	The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative and appeal and find there is evidence to substantiate the infraction as the K9 alerted to the white powdery substance as being crushed pills that was found during a cell search, the powdery substance tested positive for amphetamine, medical confirmed the individual was not on any medication at the time that would test positive for amphetamine, and the box where the powdery substance was found was located in the common area of the cell and no one admitted guilt so it was upheld as a cell tag. Additionally, incarcerated individuals do not have a right to further or external testing of evidence.	No Violation of Policy
160. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received and believes the officer escalated the situation.	The OCO reviewed the infraction summary and find there is evidence to substantiate the infraction based on the incarcerated individual's statements and actions.	No Violation of Policy
161. Individual reports that she filed a PREA against staff and was terminated from her position.	The OCO reviewed the PREA report and job termination. After the review the OCO contacted the facility leadership to discuss this concern. This individual was removed from the job due to criminal conviction. Certain offenses disqualify individuals from working in certain areas of the facility and unfortunately, she was placed in a job that she was not appropriately screened for. The facility stated that the individual was given	No Violation of Policy

	an opportunity for different employment and the PREA is still under investigation. The OCO could not find a violation of the DOC policy in the ongoing PREA investigation or in the job re-assignment.	
162. Person reports staff conduct concerns and feels this is retaliation for filing a lawsuit. Patient requested to be placed on another provider's caseload, an HSR for meals in unit, and a formal complaint filed against the Facility Medical Director.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of the DOC Health Plan. The medications requested are nonformulary and the patient was approved for alternative medications through the FMD and Care Review Committee (CRC). This office confirmed the patient has an HSR for wheelchair and contacted staff to confirm there are access assistants available in the unit. The OCO requested but was unable to impact change related to an HSR for meals in unit. Patients are assigned to providers based on alphabetical names.	No Violation of Policy
163. Person reports they are being held in segregation after reporting an incident to PREA and filing a grievance that the reported individual was still in her unit.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate a violation of DOC 490.800, 490.820, 490.850, and 490.860. The OCO reviewed the related PREA report which is still under investigation. This office also reviewed the placement of the reporter and the accused and person that was reported is no longer in the same unit. The individual was no longer in segregation and had been moved back to a unit. The individual has been released.	No Violation of Policy
Washington State Penitentiary		
164. Person has two disabilities that require medically necessary Durable Medical Equipment. Person needs both hearing aids and eyeglasses, however, the fit interferes with each other. The eyeglasses do not fit around the hearing aids causing discomfort and headaches so person requested contact lenses instead. Medical denied the contact lenses but offered that person could pay for them through the Offender Paid Health Plan, however they say they cannot afford the cost. In the meantime, person feels they are being forced to choose between hearing and seeing.	The OCO contacted facility medical staff and elevated concern to the Health Service Administrators. The HSAs agreed to send the case through the Care Review Committee (CRC) to consider contact lenses since the patient does not qualify for them under the DOC Health Plan. The OCO provided the individual with self-advocacy information related to CRC appeals and how to follow up if the CRC denies the appeal.	Assistance Provided
165. Incarcerated individual reports they have been having medical issues for the past year and half. They report they are unable to work	The OCO reviewed the infraction concern and contacted the medical provider who corroborated the individual's story about	Assistance Provided

due to these medical concerns. They state they were unassigned from work and then got a write up due to missing work and was found guilty.

missing work due to medical conditions. The OCO then reached out to the facility who was unwilling to overturn the infraction. The OCO then contacted DOC headquarters about the infraction as hearings staff did not contact medical about the concerns during the investigation of the infraction and the medical concerns being substantiated by the provider. The infraction was then overturned, and the sanctions were reversed.

166. Person states him and his wife of 35 years are being denied visitation and he does not understand why. She has a conviction of rendering assistance to a family member. Person has read the DOC policy relating to this issue but states that it does not appear to apply to their situation.	The OCO has reviewed DOC 450.300. On November 21, 2022, there was a revision to the Attachment for visitation eligibility. The following statement was added to the Attachment "Exception may be granted by the appropriate Assistant Secretary or their designee for immediate family member with official documentation of relationship." Based on the November 21, 2022, policy update, the person's wife may wish to reapply for visitation privileges; however, she may still be denied due to her record.	Information Provided
167. An external person is looking for help regarding how to get their loved one a "compassionate release."	The OCO contacted DOC Health Services to inquire about Extraordinary Medical Placement. The DOC verified that they are reviewing his case per DOC 350.270.	Information Provided
168. Person reports that when he went to the Intensive Management Unit (IMU), DOC packed his property and misplaced multiple items. Person has receipts on file and has tried to get resolution through DOC. Person reports that DOC lost all his important papers, but that it should show up on his property matrix. Person expresses wanting to file a tort claim.	The OCO provided information about filing a tort claim. DOC 120.500 states "All incarcerated individual tort claims alleging personal property damage/loss must be filed by the individual with the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services (DES) Risk Management Division".	Information Provided
169. The incarcerated individual reports DOC has his max date calculated incorrectly.	The OCO provided information about this person's time calculation. This office spoke to the individual and DOC records regarding his max date and provided him with a letter clarifying his extended max date.	Information Provided
170. Individual reports that DOC has added 203 days to the end of his sentence. The person reports this is related to when he was out on DOSA, and he believes he should have received time served for the time he was out.	The OCO provided information regarding submitting a public records request to DOC. DOC 280.510(b) incarcerated individuals may request to inspect their own central file by completing and submitting DOC 05-066 Public Record Request to the Facility/local records unit.	Information Provided

171. External individual reports water heaters in a unit at Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) is broken and it is impacting the incarcerated individual's ability to shower. The external individual also reports the cable TV at WSP is still not working properly and the DOC staff they speak with about it only gives excuses and do not have any way to solve this issue.	The OCO provided information regarding the hot water heater in the WSP unit and the cable TV at WSP. The OCO verified the part was ordered to fix the water heater and would be installed as soon as it arrives. The OCO substantiates the concerns related to the Cable TV at WSP and has spoken to DOC staff at the facility who are aware of the issue and working to resolve it. The cable issues stem from the physical plant of the WSP facility and its age. These factors create barriers in providing quality cable access. The contractors working with DOC are looking at multiple ways to try to resolve the issue.	Information Provided
172. Incarcerated individual reports he was called to take a chemical dependency program and DOC told him that if he did not participate, he will be infraacted for failure to program. The individual reports they have not used drugs for many years and does not want to be placed in this type of program.	The OCO provided information regarding the individuals current programming. The OCO verified that the individual was screened to determine chemical dependency programming needs, however the assessment showed that chemical dependency programming was not needed, and the individual did not have to engage in this type of programming. The OCO explained the process for behavior programming assessments with the individual.	Information Provided
173. Incarcerated individual is inquiring about the reason(s) DOC would hold a person past their Earned Release Date (ERD) other than for disciplinary reasons. The individual is also wondering if it is legal for DOC to hold someone past their ERD.	The OCO provided information to the individual about Earned Release Dates and how long DOC can legally hold an individual in custody. Per DOC 350.200 Transition and Release, "Individuals requiring an approved release address may be held in confinement up to the Max Ex date until an approved release address is secured." The OCO verified that the individual will be required to have an approved release plan to release on his ERD.	Information Provided
174. Person states he is still in need of physical therapy after a stroke a few years ago. COVID impacted the availability of physical therapy and he wants to receive it again.	The OCO provided information to the patient about the process to get a referral to Physical Therapy. To be referred back to physical therapy after it was ended, a patient must discuss the need with their primary care provider if the previous referral has expired. It is possible the request may need to be submitted to the Care Review committee for approval.	Information Provided
175. Person had an invasive procedure done by a DOC provider and had a bleed during the	The OCO provided information to the patient regarding the process to receive financial	Information Provided

procedure. The procedure was not successful, and the patient feels like he was operated on for no reason. The person is requesting financial compensation.

compensation. Individuals who have been harmed or who have suffered a loss as a result of negligent actions by a state employee or agency can submit a tort claim to the Office of Risk Management (ORM). ORM is required by law (RCW Chapter 4.92) to receive these claims.

176.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about resubmitting a family member's visitation application but not receiving a response.	The OCO reached out to DOC regarding the application but there are none on file from the timeframe referenced. DOC advised that the family member can apply again as it has been over a year from the last denial.	Information Provided
177.	The incarcerated individual reports that he qualifies for graduated reentry (GRE), and his counselor will not screen him. The individual's counselor says he will not send in the GRE application until this individual has 18 months left to serve. The individual reports that DOC headquarters sent out a memo saying that people can be screened for GRE at 30 months, and he does not understand why his counselor will not get him screened.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO verified that the DOC has screened the individual for GRE and DOC is creating a plan for the individual to transition into GRE prior to any OCO contact with DOC.	DOC Resolved
178.	Individual reports he is unsafe at his current facility and is requesting transfer. He is not receiving mental health treatment, even though he has self-harmed.	The OCO confirmed this individual is months past his ERD and experiencing mental health issues. He now has a PRD set and the DOC is not going to transfer him to another facility since he is releasing soon. This office verified that DOC Mental Health is meeting with him regularly and following protocol when he self-harms.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
179.	Person reports they are a verified PREA victim and is being denied outside community and support. .	The OCO could not substantiate that this individual does not have access to contact the community. This office verified that the individual has daily access to phones and mail.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
180.	External person reports that individuals in IMU are housed in units that have no heat where there are open windows and vents letting freezing air in. Person says some of the individuals do not know why there are being held in IMU, only that there is an investigation.	The OCO followed up with the facility and could not substantiate that staff was allowing cold air in the IMU. The OCO did not receive any other concerns regarding this issue. Per DOC 320.200 Administrative Segregation, individuals may be temporarily placed in Administrative Segregation pending investigation.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
181.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about the conditions of the Bar units.	The OCO reached out to DOC regarding this concern and DOC states there have been no lockdowns since the individual began living in the Bar units, there is access to big	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

and small yards as well as recreation programming and showers are offered everyday as well as the dayroom when phones are available for use.

182.	Person reports being assaulted by another inmate which resulted in a serious injury to his arm in 2021. Person says they tried to warn DOC staff prior to the assault but DOC did not reply. In 2022, the person reports being injured by a DOC staff member who grabbed his injured arm and forced it behind his back, ignoring the person's Health Status Report (HSR). Person reports that medical refused to examine him after the second injury and the bruising thus went undocumented. Person is now having trouble with the vague language in the HSR and was told his medical provider needs Ombuds permission to issue a more detailed HSR.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the patient's HSRs and verified there is an active HSR on file, however, there were no IMRS (incident reports) on file for the 2022 date provided. The OCO does not have authority to issue HSRs or change HSR language and the patient will need to work with their provider to address this concern. The person can follow up with the OCO after a level II grievance if their HSR concerns are not addressed.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
183.	Incarcerated individual reports they filed a classification appeal after a classification hearing to DOC headquarters and did not receive a response. The individual requests OCO investigate the lack of response to the appeal.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO was unable to locate evidence to substantiate the whereabouts of the appeal.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
184.	Family member expressed concerns about an incarcerated individual completing the program that they were asked to complete but still being in IMU with more programs to do.	The OCO reviewed the individual's most recent custody facility plan and find no violation of policy. The individual was recommended to maintain IMU due to recent infractions. As part of the plan, he is ordered to complete programming as assigned by his case manager.	No Violation of Policy
185.	Individual reports he was in the enhanced closed custody and was maxed out without any infraction. He was then placed on the out of state transfer list.	The OCO reviewed the max placement and out-of-state transfer referral. Currently, the DOC has reported that they do not have a safe place to house this individual in the Washington State DOC general population due to STG activity. Per DOC 330.600, individuals under the Department's jurisdiction may be considered for Prisons Compact transfer (out-of-state transfer) for safety/security reasons. The DOC is within policy to transfer the individual to a different state. The OCO could not find evidence of an infraction that would have caused a demotion to max custody. The OCO finds that this concern is	No Violation of Policy

substantiated, however, the DOC still refuses to move this individual to General Population based on safety and security issues due to STG activity. The DOC is within policy 300.380 to issue an override to max custody.

186.	Person reports that DOC is making him do an additional chemical dependency program, and that he has already graduated a program in the past. Person reports being scheduled for a chemical dependency evaluation today. He is worried the evaluation will force him into a program that will keep him past his Earned Release Date (ERD). Person reports that a positive substance test infraction removed him from Graduated Reentry, and he is trying to appeal that infraction.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. DOC policy 580.000 states, "individuals whose initial screening result indicate the probability of substance use disorder may be assessed", so DOC is within policy to do another chemical dependency evaluation. The Graduated Reentry Policy 390.590 II states DOC "retains the authority to return an individual participating in Graduated Reentry to total confinement for any reason."	No Violation of Policy
187.	Incarcerated individual reports they had concerns with their roommate and were moved out of that cell as a result and placed in the infirmary (IPU) to be medically assessed and to discuss placement options. Prior to discussions being complete, DOC staff came to the unit to escort the individual back to general population. The individual filed official reports about the DOC staff member there and asked why they were present. After the interaction, DOC infringed them for refusing cell assignment and placed them in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU). The infraction was later dismissed, and the individual requests OCO review their placement and recommend they be issued a single cell for safety reasons.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed assessments including single cell assessments performed by DOC and found DOC completed these assessments in compliance with DOC 420.140 Cell/Room Assignments and DOC 490.700 Transgender, Intersex, and/or Non-Binary Housing and Supervision. The OCO verified DOC dismissed the infraction and determined the individuals housing based on the individual's safety concerns.	No Violation of Policy
188.	Incarcerated individual reports he was transferred to Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) and was told to dispose of his consumable commissary items. The individual was also told to dispose of hygiene items and legal documents. The individual requests the OCO assist him in keeping the property before DOC disposes of it.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. The OCO finds that the individual is housed in the WSP IMU to complete a maximum custody program and was provided with the form to choose to donate or dispose of their consumable items. The OCO verified the individuals legal and non-consumable property is being held in long term storage and only consumable items were disposed of. The	Substantiated

OCO received multiple concerns related to this Operational Memorandum (OM), the OCO spoke to WSP administration who agreed to review these types of concerns on a case-by-case basis and provide individuals with unopened, unexpired food items. Individuals housed in the IMU due to their custody level or because of behavior, will not be reviewed and their food property will be disposed of.

189.	Incarcerated individual reports while housed in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) awaiting transfer to another facility was given a 90-day property disposition notice to send out about five boxes of food that was purchased from the inmate food package program. The individual was not provided an option to appeal this and feels this is punishment to not be able to keep purchased items and transfer those items to the new facility with him. The individual reports they were in the IMU waiting for transfer not due to discipline.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. The OCO finds that the individual was housed in the WSP IMU awaiting transfer to another facility and was not provided with an option to keep the items. This incident occurred prior to the OCO discussion with DOC staff. They were disposed of as a result. The OCO received multiple concerns related to this Operational Memorandum (OM), the OCO spoke to WSP administration who agreed to review these types of concerns on a case-by-case basis and provide individuals with unopened, unexpired food items. Individuals housed in the IMU due to their custody level or because of behavior, will not be reviewed and their food property will be disposed of. This issue has increased since COVID-19 protocols have made transfer times longer and IMU stays longer due to unit quarantines.	Substantiated
------	--	--	---------------

INTAKE INVESTIGATIONS

Airway Heights Corrections Center

190.	External complainant reports that their loved one was verbally harassed by a DOC officer and that their cell is very cold.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
191.	Incarcerated individual is transgender and trying to get approved for gender affirming surgery. Individual reports they got hormones while at a different facility, have done their psych evaluation, and qualify for the transgender program.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

	Upon transfer to Airway Heights, they no longer have a contact to figure out next steps. Incarcerated individual has kited medical and has not received a response.	the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	
192.	An external complainant reports that mail is being withheld from an incarcerated individual.	Per WAC 138-10-040(c) The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: C. The nature and quality of evidence. The OCO could not find a mail rejection number, or a timeframe of when mail was rejected. This office encouraged the individual to provide additional details to the OCO in order for an investigation to proceed.	Declined
193.	Person reports that no response was ever received to the donation requests that were mailed by USPS to the facility nor to the email request. Person realizes they took a chance shipping the donation without a written approval.	Per WAC 138-10-040, the Ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reason(s): A. Lack jurisdiction over the complaint. At a minimum, complaints should meet the requirements in RCW 43.06C.040 and be: i. about an incarcerated individual."	Declined
194.	External person reports on behalf of the incarcerated individual that she was made to shower with men. The incarcerated person is a transgender female and should not be forced to shower with men.	The OCO has verified with the incarcerated individual that this external reporter does not have permission to contact the OCO on their behalf. The OCO has also substantiated evidence that this external reported attempted to forge a relationship disclosure to receive information about this individual from the OCO. This office has declined this concern.	Declined
195.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about difficulty obtaining a witness statement they were told would dismiss their infraction.	The OCO reviewed the individuals two most recent infractions for a 655 making pruno, both of which the individual pled guilty to. As a result, the OCO will not further investigate this concern.	Declined
196.	External person reports their loved one's property was removed during a cell search and no search report was given to the incarcerated person.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request to provide additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged this person to contact this office if they would like to request assistance.	Person Declined OCO Involvement
197.	The incarcerated individual reports multiple issues with medical neglect. The individual had problems with his back and had to go to the hospital and use a wheelchair. Soon after, he had surgery on his ear. He reports that because they did	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action

not give him proper medication and aftercare, he had to go to the emergency room twice and receive emergency surgery due to the infection near his ear being close to his brain. He is in a lot of pain and the DOC will not give him the pain medications prescribed at the hospital for the surgery/infection. He also reports that medical will not provide a note regarding missing programming and threatened to infract him. He also reports he has been charged excessive co-pays.

Bishop Lewis - King County

198. Person states they are short staffed at the reentry center. Person feels they are being targeted about his past, and when he goes and asks for socials, he states they state he should not even be at the reentry center.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
--	--	-------------------------------------

Cedar Creek Corrections Center

199. Person states they received a major infraction for a dirty UA. Person was threatened with revocation of EFV visits for a year, gate card for work, and loss of good conduct time earned.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. In order for the OCO to investigate an infraction concern, the incarcerated person should first receive a response to their appeal.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
---	--	-------------------------------------

Clallam Bay Corrections Center

200. External person reports her husband had his infraction hearing and they gave him an infraction for aggravated assault because the other person was injured. Person states it was self-defense.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
201. Persons states the prison took money from his account that was on a hold, and it could only be used for the shipping of his TV's and instead it was sent to AHCC and he states AHCC never sent him anything while he was at AHCC for a surgery. Person states that DOC is not	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

	allowed to do that with money that has been placed on a hold status.		
202.	Person received multiple infractions and has appealed them. Person was found intoxicated with his cellmate and the staff said he was resisting the cell extraction. Person plead guilty to making alcohol and being intoxicated, but he does not believe he was resisting cell extraction and the rest of the infractions. Person says he was not served the infraction at the facility of the incident.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
203.	Person reports incident in 2018 in which he was assaulted. Person reports that he found out DOC staff knew he had been targeted by a Security Threat Group (STG) before being put in general population. Person believes he was targeted because of his sexuality. Person was transferred to a different facility where he was told he could not review any of the information in his central file that pertained to this issue. Person states he has not filed a resolution request because of COVID issues in the facilities.	Per WAC 138-10-040, the OCO may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: (3)(e) the alleged violation is a past rather than ongoing issue. The OCO also provided information about accessing his central file through his classification counselor.	Declined
Coyote Ridge Corrections Center			
204.	Incarcerated individual reports trying to get into the Veteran's Pod. He provided Veterans HQ with the needed information, including DD214, and Veterans HQ reported they got the information. Four weeks later, they reported they never got it. Incarcerated individual talked with his counselor who said he would get the information to Veterans HQ. Weeks later, the individual contacted Veterans HQ and they still have not gotten the DD214 from his counselor.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
205.	Person reports he has an infraction hearing tomorrow for an unauthorized tattoo. Person said that he has proof he had these tattoos when he entered county jail.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

206.	Person states he is still not satisfied with the lack of access to programming and transition planning. Person states he also has no access to envelopes. He does not know who his assigned counselor is, and the counselors he has talked to dismiss him and refused to provide him with help.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
207.	Person reports that they are under investigation and several of his phone numbers have been abruptly restricted. This has caused undue hardship preventing him from accessing his business line to conduct business effectively and correspondence with his legal team.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
208.	External person reports their loved one is experiencing serious mental health symptoms. The external person requests that DOC allow them to have contact, because the no contact orders between them have expired.	The OCO has declined to review this concern. The OCO is required to establish priorities based on the limited resources available to the office. As WAC 138-10-040(3)(d)(e) states, “(d)The complaint does not allege violation of policy, procedure, or law; (e)The requested resolution is not within the ombuds’ statutory power and authority.” The OCO verified per DOC 450.100 Visits for Incarcerated Individuals attachment 1, “The following are ineligible to visit incarcerated individuals: A victim of the incarcerated individual’s current offense(s) or any previous adjudicated offense. Exceptions may be granted for immediate family members by the appropriate Assistant Secretary. A minor may be denied due to the nature of a crime of conviction if the minor is profiled as comparable to that of a victim. Victims may participate in a one-time visit per DOC 390.300 Victim Services Program.” The external person has been identified as a victim of a conviction the incarcerated individual was charged with.	Declined

GRE/CPA

209.	Person in community custody reports that some of the Community Corrections Officers (CCOs) used to be Corrections Officers at the facility he used to be in, and that they treat him unfairly. He expressed concern about their current	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	---	--	-------------------------------------

	involvement in his community custody and feels they want to see him fail. Person reports mental and behavioral health issues that are affecting their community custody and not being supported by their CCO. Person also reports he has filed several grievances but things they have been thrown away because he never received.	the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	
210.	Person reports a CCO treated her so terribly when he was in her home that she had a panic attack.	Per WAC 138-10-040- The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: Lacked jurisdiction over the complaint.	Declined
Larch Corrections Center			
211.	Person reports that during his visit a corrections officer accused visitor of introducing contraband into the prison. Corrections officer stated that visitor gave the inmate a ring. Person reports that the ring is listed on his property matrix, and he was already in possession of the item.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
Monroe Correctional Complex			
212.	Family member states that an individual was arrested for violation of absconding from March to October and counted him as out of compliance and his time has stopped. He was found not guilty of the violation and now he is in on a new violation and has been revoked.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
213.	Incarcerated individual reports concerns with the water quality and that the food does not meet nutritional requirements. The individual reports having thrown up multiple times due to expired food.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
214.	Person reports another incarcerated individual told him there is someone in Monroe Correctional Complex (MCC) with an AR-15, cocaine, and other contraband. Person has been wanting to reach the FBI.	The OCO is declining this request. Per WAC 138-10-040(c) The OCO may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The nature and quality of evidence. There is not sufficient evidence to substantiate that an incarcerated individual at MCC is armed and may have contraband.	Declined
215.	Person reports they suffer from chronic upper respiratory issues. Person has	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	Person Left DOC Custody

	attempted to seek treatment but has not yet received adequate treatment to alleviate their condition.	Prior to OCO Action
216.	Person reports they are in severe pain and is wheelchair bound due to a lack of medical follow up after have both hips replaced. Person further reports that in a response to their filed resolution request, DOC states that he would be seen by an off-site pain specialist in approximately three weeks, that appointment did not happen.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint. Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action

Olympic Corrections Center

217.	A loved one called on behalf on an incarcerated individual, reporting that he is being made to put all his property into a small cubby hole, including jackets and clothing. The loved one reports that a captain is enforcing that the incarcerated individual is not being allowed to keep anything that cannot fit into the cubby hole.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	--	---

Other – Community Supervision, Jail, Out of State, Statewide

218.	External person shared concerns regarding the current treatment that loved ones have endured, due to the inconsistency of how the Washington State Department of Corrections is implementing rapid COVID testing at the facilities. The person states there is an active Safe Start policy on the official DOC website that says the incarcerated have the right to opt out of COVID testing. The incarcerated population at some facilities are facing infractions, 21-day quarantine, and being told they will be sent to segregation if they refuse to test. The population is being told that the Department has a right to test. Per page 4 of the Safe Start Plan Washington State Corrections Coronavirus (COVID-19) Response Version 33.1, the person says they interpret this to mean people can opt out of testing.	The OCO contacted the individual multiple times with questions and requests for details, however, did not receive the requested information from the complainant. The complainant did not identify an incarcerated individual or facility impacted by the concern. Per WAC 138-10-040(3), "the Ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: (a) Lack jurisdiction over the complaint. At a minimum, complaints should meet the requirements in RCW 43.06C.040 and be: (i) About an incarcerated individual; (ii) About an alleged department action; and (iii) Made after the incarcerated individual has reasonably pursued resolution of the issue through the internal grievance, administrative, or appellate procedures with the department...; (c) The nature and quality of evidence; ... or (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	Declined
------	---	--	----------

	factors.” The OCO provided information about the most up to date DOC COVID protocols.	
219. External person reached out to the OCO with suggestions regarding the placement of fire alarms in prisons.	This was not a concern regarding a DOC facility. The OCO will decline to investigate complaints that do not meet the requirements of RCW 43.06C.040; specifically, that complaints must be about an incarcerated individual; about an alleged department action; and made after the incarcerated individual has reasonably pursued resolution of the issue through the internal grievance, administrative, or appellate procedures with the department.	Declined
220. Person is currently on community supervision. Person needs a psychosexual evaluation and cannot afford to get one due to financial hardship.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint does not involve a person committed to the physical custody of the DOC.	Lacked Jurisdiction
221. The incarcerated individual requests the OCO forward his complaint to the State of Georgia Ombudsman Office.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections. The OCO has no jurisdiction in Georgia and responded to this individual with contact information for Ombudsman & Inmate Affairs in Georgia.	Lacked Jurisdiction
222. Person states that their term of community custody has not been recalculated per RCW which states that DOC has the authority to recalculate and reset the term of community custody for all offenders sentenced under the repealed and amended law.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint does not involve a person committed to the physical custody of the DOC.	Lacked Jurisdiction
223. The wife of a Community Correctional Officer reached out to the OCO to report harassment by the family of an incarcerated individual. Person wanted to dispute any allegations of harm and expose the intent of those who are causing the harassment.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint does not involve a person committed to the physical custody of the DOC.	Lacked Jurisdiction
Stafford Creek Corrections Center		
224. Person has been authorized to get speech therapy with outside provider. The new facility says they cannot accommodate this even though it is via telehealth	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

	the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	
225. Person reports they had a PREA interview and the officer was not being unbiased. The officer told her he did not want to be there. She told him she was going to file a PREA on him for not being unbiased and the officer then reported she was threatening him.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
226. Person states that they are being harassed due to medical issues. He saw medical to address prostate issues and to get more medication. A few days later he got a UA and could not produce urine due to prostate issue, and then a few days later got another UA and again could not produce enough urine. He has grieved being harassed by DOC, for them giving him UA's knowing that he has a medical condition that inhibits his ability to produce urine. He also grieved medical regarding the way they are handling his treatment. He asked for an HSR to accommodate his condition. Medical stated DOC told them to not give HSRs to give people more time to produce a urine sample.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
227. The incarcerated individual called to report that he was laid off from his CI job due to COVID-19. He reports that when he was laid off, he was making \$2.05 and believes that he should return to making that amount. He is currently making \$1.05 and started at .65 cents and had to start all over again.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
228. Person reports he saw his health provider to update HSR and update medication following back surgery. He was charged \$4, and he's not supposed to be charged for a follow up. Person says this happened several times last year and it was resolved after filing a resolution request.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. In order for the OCO to investigate, the incarcerated person should contact the OCO after the grievance is at a level two response or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

229. Person states that he is constantly being housed with people who have committed sex offenses as cellmates and he does not get along with them. Person believes this is amounting to conspiracy against him by staff.	The OCO has declined to review this concern. The OCO is required to establish priorities based on the limited resources available to the office. Per WAC 138-10-040- The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The complaint does not allege violation of policy, procedure, or law.	Declined
230. The incarcerated individual reports that their counselor is throwing away their legal mail and grievances. The person requests that the OCO scan a letter they included in their mail to the General of Morocco.	Per WAC 138-10-070, The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The complaint does not allege a violation of policy, procedure, or law.	Declined
231. Incarcerated individual reports he had a medical callout and that the Corrections Officer (CO) escorted him to medical, which has never happened before. The entire time the individual was at medical, the CO was standing there. The individual filed a resolution request and wanted to know why he received abnormal treatment.	The OCO has declined to investigate this concern. Per WAC 138-10-040 (d), the ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The complaint does not allege violation of policy, procedure, or law.	Declined
232. The incarcerated individual reports that he needs reading glasses and that he does not want CI glasses. He reports that his vision is poor.	The OCO has declined to investigate this concern. The OCO has received multiple concerns from this individual regarding this complaint and this office has responded to the issue. The OCO has reviewed the medical records and determined that the DOC is not in violation of the healthcare plan. WAC 138-10-040 permits the ombuds to decline to investigate any complaint or to close any investigation when the complaint does not allege violation of policy, procedure, or law.	Declined
233. Incarcerated individual reports his roommate was a sex offender, and he filed a resolution. The individual was then moved, and he feels like this is retaliation against him. The individual states that he has let staff know that he does not want to be housed with a sex offender.	The OCO has declined to review this concern. Per WAC 138-10-040- The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The complaint does not allege violation of policy, procedure, or law." This individual asked not to be housed with someone who committed a sex offense, and the DOC granted that request.	Declined
234. Person called and asked for information from OMNI.	The OCO has declined to review this concern. RCW 43.06C.060 prohibits the OCO	Declined

from releasing information from the DOC Offender Management Network system.

Washington Corrections Center

235. Person says he was found guilty of an infraction for a positive urinalysis (UA) test; however, he was never asked to take a UA test and the original infraction was for possessing tobacco. Person says this is one example of how he is being retaliated against for coming forward against a staff member.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
236. Incarcerated individual was charged with a serious infraction for ordering an assault and now is in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU). Individual reports that the situation was based on hearsay and said that the head of Intelligence and Investigations spoke with him and said she was going to fix it.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
237. Patient states he has been suffering from migraines for many years and that he has been on a daily medication for migraine that is no longer working. He says medicines will work for a while then no longer work and he has been asking for medical re-review his meds to see if there is something new that can help.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
238. Person is not being allowed to have his retainers/aligners for teeth, which is causing his teeth to misalign. Person reports his mouth is in pain. DOC states the retainers/aligners need to be paid for. Person states they have already been paid for. Person reports he can't even eat because of the pain and that he has lost weight.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
239. Person is concerned his sentence was not calculated properly and he did not get the credits from time served in jail. Person did write to records but has not received a response.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
240. A family member reports an incarcerated individual is not receiving his psychiatric medication that he has been on for a long time. The family member reports that he	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

stopped receiving the medication while at a county jail and is still not receiving the medication at Washington State Penitentiary. The family member reports having tried to call the incarcerated individual's counselor and has not gotten any information.

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

Washington Corrections Center for Women

241. An external person reports their loved one has been subjected to three room searches in the span of four days. All three searches were marked for "cause," but no search report was completed or provided to the incarcerated person. Staff communicated they were "dead lining" the room because of a burnt outlet.	The OCO verified that room searches had occurred, and the individual was infracted for the burnt outlet. This office confirmed that the individual was found not guilty at the hearing and the infraction was removed from their record. The individual did not file a resolution request related to the cell searches.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
242. Individual reports when they check in with a CO the officer is telling other COs and incarcerated individuals. They are now being targeted and called a snitch.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
243. Person filed a resolution request and a PREA. Person says after PREA was filed there was three cell searches in one day. Person feels that this is retaliation and targeting.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO cannot review a PREA investigation until after it is complete. The Resolution Request will need to be a Level 2 before the OCO can review.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

Washington State Penitentiary

244. Incarcerated individual reports being terminated from the Graduated Reentry (GRE) program due to an infraction after failing a mouth swab test. Individual reports he has had points reduced and can no longer go to work because of the decision.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
245. Person states they were supposed to get new tablets today but now it is being pushed back to February without reasoning. Has not filed a grievance about this due to fear of retaliation.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

	the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	
246. Person describes the mattresses as cruel and unusual punishment. Person reports DOC HQ is issuing new mattresses statewide and they were shipped to the facility. Person reports that in his MI2 facility, "the east complex" has not gotten the new mattresses, and he has heard the captain say they would not be getting the new mattresses. Person has not filed a grievance due to fear of retaliation.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
247. Person reports DOC put him on dry cell watch for twelve days during which he had no access to soap or a toothbrush. He was told to sleep on the floor and not allowed to shower or use the restroom or phones. He reports having bowel issues and soiled himself while in the dry cell. DOC policy says that dry cell watch is only three days. The person said they were issued an infraction that was later dismissed. He was not allowed to appeal the classification decision.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO verified that the person was no longer on dry cell watch at the time he filed the complaint.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
248. Family member expressed concerns about an infraction an incarcerated individual received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction concern and find the individual admitted to possession of the drugs.	Declined
249. Person reports DOC took an excessive amount of earned time in 2018.	Per WAC 138-10-040, the OCO may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for the following reason(s): the alleged violation is a past rather than ongoing issue.	Declined
250. Person states his offender score was calculated incorrectly.	Per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(e), the OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to the person's underlying criminal conviction.	Lacked Jurisdiction
251. Person followed up on a previous OCO case. DOC communicated that the person had declined the specialist appointment due to fear of impacting his release date. Person later communicated interest in the appointment, but DOC has not provided the appointment. The person is interested in getting a specialist appointment prior to release and discussing continuity of care options with a reentry nurse.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action

Abbreviations & Glossary

ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act

AHCC: Airway Heights Corrections Center

ASR: Accommodation Status Report

BOE: Behavioral Observation Entry

CBCC: Clallam Bay Corrections Center

CCCC: Cedar Creek Corrections Center

CI: Correctional Industries

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

CO: Correctional Officer

CRC: Care Review Committee

CRCC: Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

CUS: Correctional Unit Supervisor

DES: Department of Enterprise Services

DOSA: Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative

EFV: Extended Family Visit

ERD: Earned Release Date

GRE: Graduated Reentry

HCSC: Headquarters Community Screening Committee

HSR: Health Status Report

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

J&S: Judgment and Sentence

MCC: Monroe Correctional Complex

MCCCW: Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women

OCC: Olympic Corrections Center

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

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

SCCC: Stafford Creek Corrections Center

SOTAP: Sex Offender Treatment and Assessment Program

SVP: Sexually Violent Predator

TC: Therapeutic Community

WaONE: Washington ONE ("Offender Needs Evaluation")

WCC: Washington Corrections Center

WCCW: Washington Corrections Center for Women

WSP: Washington State Penitentiary