

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 a case for every complaint received by this office. The following pages serve as the public decisions required by RCW 43.06C.040(2)(k).

<b>Case Closure Reason</b>	<b>Meaning</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Assistance Provided</b>	The OCO achieved full or partial resolution of the person's complaint.	48
<b>Information Provided</b>	The OCO provided self-advocacy information.	66
<b>DOC Resolved</b>	DOC staff resolved the concern prior to OCO action.	16
<b>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</b>	The incarcerated person did not yet pursue internal resolution per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(b).	34
<b>Substantiated Without Resolution</b>	The OCO verified the concern but was unable to achieve a resolution to the concern.	17
<b>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</b>	Insufficient evidence existed to substantiate the concern.	31
<b>No Violation of Policy</b>	The OCO determined that DOC policy was not violated.	74
<b>Unexpected Fatality Review</b>	The incarcerated person died unexpectedly, and the death is under review.	0
<b>Person Left DOC Custody</b>	The incarcerated person left DOC custody prior to OCO action.	8
<b>Person Declined OCO Involvement</b>	The person did not want the OCO to pursue the concern or the OCO received no response to requests for more information.	11
<b>Lacked Jurisdiction</b>	The complaint did not meet OCO's jurisdictional requirements (typically when complaint is not about an incarcerated person or not about a DOC action).	4
<b>Declined</b>	The OCO declined to investigate the complaint per WAC 138-10-040(3).	2

# Monthly Outcome Report: October 2022

Complaint Summary		Outcome Summary	Case Closure Reason
<b>Airway Heights Corrections Center</b>			
1.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that the individual has been having issues with their cellmate. The loved one reports that the individual has tried to speak with DOC staff about the problems, but they are not responsive to him and he has been threatened with an infraction for refusing cell assignment.	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
2.	The incarcerated individual reports that DOC staff have gone through the individual's medication during cell searches and he does not think that they should look through his medicine.	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
3.	The incarcerated individual reports he was infractioned for something he did not do during a cell search. He is requesting the video footage to prove his innocence and wants a copy of the incident to be sent to the hearing officer. He is also requesting the right to review all the evidence.	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
4.	The incarcerated individual reports that he was infractioned. This person had their infraction overturned and moved units as a result of this incident. He reports that he tried to grieve the situation but grieved the infraction, not the staff conduct, so it was not accepted.	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
5.	Person reports concerns about an infraction that impacted their programming access.	The OCO is unable to investigate the concern because we are not able to verify that the incarcerated individual filed a grievance, appeal, or sought other administrative remedies as required by RCW 43.06C.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
6.	Incarcerated individual reports that after he was terminated from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) wildfire crew, some of his wages (gratuities) were withheld. The individual had worked the entire month prior to the termination and did not receive full compensation for the month. The incarcerated	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO raised the concern with DOC and DNR. The OCO asked the DOC to pay the withheld gratuities. After lengthy negotiations, the AHCC administration agreed to pay the gratuities out of the facility's budget.	Assistance Provided

individual reached out to the OCO about this issue because DOC's Resolution Program would not review the concern.

7.	The incarcerated individual reports that he filed a resolution request a couple months ago and appealed after receiving the response but has not received a response on the appeal. The resolution request was regarding an MRI for his shoulder. The individual reports that he filed another resolution request about the same issue and has not received a response. He says he has not received the medical care he needs related to the resolution requests.	After receiving multiple complaints about delayed medical grievances at AHCC, the OCO met with Health Service Administrators and substantiated general delays in health service grievances at AHCC due to a vacancy in the position. DOC is actively recruiting two health service resolution program coordinator positions at this time. The OCO also asked health services to review the patient's underlying medical concern and confirmed the MRI was not medically indicated at this time and the patient began physical therapy and received an orthopedic specialist consult after Facility Medical Director approval. DOC is awaiting records from the specialist regarding updated diagnosis and treatment plan.	Assistance Provided
8.	Patient turned in a medical kite requesting a refill for three medications. Person reports he was not issued the purple copy to pick up his Keep on Person (KOP) medications for over a month and ran out of medication during that time.	The OCO contacted health services and requested they review and address the patient's medication concerns. DOC reports the purple pass notification process was suspended during COVID outbreak when medications were delivered to quarantine units. This office verified the patient has now received his medication refills, several were refilled prior to OCO outreach and two were refilled after OCO outreach. DOC communicated that they are reviewing the medication request and delivery process and making a change in nursing supervision.	Assistance Provided
9.	Incarcerated person reports that they are transgender and when they moved to a minimum security unit they found that the toilets and showers do not meet PREA standards. Person also says that they had to undergo a gender assessment with a DOC Gender Affirming Care Specialist but it has been over two months and they do not feel that this is a necessary step given they are well aware of who they are. Overall, person says they feel forgotten about by staff at DOC.	The OCO contacted the DOC Trans Care Navigator about these concerns and confirmed the individual is scheduled for an appointment to discuss transgender resources and navigating the prison system. Upon entering DOC custody, assessments are conducted according to DOC policy 490.700 Transgender, Intersex, and/or Non-Binary Housing and Supervision. At the time of OCO outreach, the Transgender Housing Protocol had not been completed and DOC agreed to follow up with the facility to ask for a completion date. This office later followed up with DOC to ensure the trans housing protocol was moving forward. DOC confirmed the individual was moved from Medium to MI3 and at the time of OCO outreach there were no roommate concerns and PREA assessment was completed. DOC	Assistance Provided

reports the facility recently passed two Federal DOJ PREA audits. After the first audit, DOC made alterations to the showers for more privacy. DOC placed protective barriers in front of the showers and extended the height of the walls between showers. Shower stall doors were also raised to prevent exposure during showering. Transgender individuals can also request an alternative showering time for safety. There are also single toilet stalls in the unit. The OCO provided information related to DOC policy 490.700, PREA audit updates, and self-advocacy for responding to immediate threats. DOC HQ Women's Division confirmed the protocol was in review and would be approved.

10.	Incarcerated individual reports that after he was terminated from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) wildfire crew, some of his wages (gratuities) were withheld. The individual had worked the entire month prior to the termination and did not receive full compensation for the month. The incarcerated individual reached out to the OCO about this issue because DOC's Resolution Program would not review the concern.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO raised the concern with DOC and DNR. The OCO asked the DOC to pay the withheld gratuities. After lengthy negotiations, the AHCC administration agreed to pay the gratuities out of the facility's budget.	Assistance Provided
11.	Incarcerated individual reports that after he was terminated from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) wildfire crew, some of his wages (gratuities) were withheld. The individual had worked the entire month prior to the termination and did not receive full compensation for the month. The incarcerated individual reached out to the OCO about this issue because DOC's Resolution Program would not review the concern.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO raised the concern with DOC and DNR. The OCO asked the DOC to pay the withheld gratuities. After lengthy negotiations, the AHCC administration agreed to pay the gratuities out of the facility's budget.	Assistance Provided
12.	Incarcerated person reports that they have made many attempts to seek mental health treatment. Person says they have been added to the call out to see the medication provider, however, the appointments have been canceled every time. Person also says the facility is not awarding them custody points to promote custody levels and in many ways this is adding to the need for help with their mental health.	The OCO substantiated appointments were delayed due to COVID, cancelled due to provider out of office, and rescheduled again. DOC reports the individual is scheduled with mental health and their score was increased by 10 points since arriving at AHCC. The OCO later verified the scheduled mental health appointment occurred.	Assistance Provided
13.	Incarcerated individual reports that after he was terminated from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) wildfire crew, some of his wages (gratuities) were withheld. The individual had worked the entire month prior to the termination and did not receive full	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO raised the concern with DOC and DNR. The OCO asked the DOC to pay the withheld gratuities. After lengthy negotiations, the AHCC administration agreed to pay the gratuities out of the facility's budget.	Assistance Provided

compensation for the month. The incarcerated individual reached out to the OCO about this issue because DOC's Resolution Program would not review the concern.

14.	Incarcerated individual reports that after he was terminated from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) wildfire crew, some of his wages (gratuities) were withheld. The individual had worked the entire month prior to the termination and did not receive full compensation for the month. The incarcerated individual reached out to the OCO about this issue because DOC's Resolution Program would not review the concern.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO raised the concern with DOC and DNR. The OCO asked the DOC to pay the withheld gratuities. After lengthy negotiations, the AHCC administration agreed to pay the gratuities out of the facility's budget.	Assistance Provided
15.	Person reports when he was transferred from AHCC, DOC did not send his legal property. He says he needs this paperwork as it is related to his open legal case and he had deadlines at the first of this month that he could not meet because the property was not sent. He has grieved and was told that they will just write what OCO wants to hear and will not actually address the concern. DOC also took his JPay player and hygiene items, CPAP machine, medications.	The OCO contacted DOC and verified the person's property was shipped, medications addressed, and CPAP provided. The patient has an open OCO medical case; the office discussed the outcome of this case during an update phone call.	Assistance Provided
16.	Person reports they should qualify for an ADA cell due to disabilities and wheelchair confinement. The person says DOC staff told him there are no ADA cells at AHCC. His facility plan said he needed to be moved to a place with an ADA cell. He also reports his wheelchair pusher is either not assigned or not showing up.	The OCO contacted health services about the patient's wheelchair and wheelchair pusher HSR as well as ADA cell. DOC confirmed the patient has an active HSR for a wheelchair and pusher and a pusher is currently assigned and rooming with the patient. After OCO outreach, DOC met with the patient to confirm interest in SAGE, moved forward with an assessment, and submitted a referral for SAGE placement for the next headquarters review meeting.	Assistance Provided
17.	The individual reports that the unit's heaters have been turned on and their cell is about 90 degrees. This person told the staff, and the staff said that they would put in a work order to get the heat fixed. This person also reports that the sergeant checked the cell and confirmed their cell was incredibly hot.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO determined that the incarcerated individual submitted a grievance regarding this complaint, and the DOC fixed the temperature in this person's cell.	DOC Resolved
18.	Incarcerated person reports that over the past year and half they sought medical attention for issues with pain in their neck, head, and sinuses. The condition was originally treated as an infection but it has since worsened despite being prescribed medication. They were told a month ago they would be seen by a specialist but would need to be reassessed again.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted the Health Services manager and were informed the patient is scheduled for outside specialist consult this month.	DOC Resolved

19.	External person reports their incarcerated loved one was diagnosed with cancer and is not getting the proper medical care, leading to many health complications.	The OCO contacted health services and requested information regarding the patient's treatment plan and cancer diagnosis. The OCO substantiated an oncology delay due to limited specialists in the area and outside facility cancellation. This office confirmed the patient had been seen by urology and oncology prior to OCO involvement and has an active cancer treatment plan and prescriptions.	DOC Resolved
20.	The incarcerated individual reports that when he was moved to camp, some of his property went missing. He asked DOC staff about the missing property and he was told that they do not know where it is, but that he can file a tort claim. The individual did file a tort claim for his missing property but it was denied.	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual may appeal the tort claim denial.	Information Provided
21.	The incarcerated individual reports that he gets out soon and he is releasing to his elderly parents' house and the individual reports that he has a serious underlying medical condition. He says they are also not testing individuals in his unit. The individual say he has not been feeling well and wants to be in quarantine until his release to protect his parents.	The OCO provided information regarding DOC's COVID-19 testing protocol based on the CDC recommendations for congregate living settings. They are unable to accept individual requests to house in quarantine without clinical reason due to the need to keep quarantine space open in the event of an outbreak. This office also noted the person had been moved to a cell without a cellmate shortly after contacting this office.	Information Provided
22.	Incarcerated individual reports that DOC staff are not assisting him in obtaining an approved release plan. The individual requests the OCO review the planning process and ensure that DOC is performing their duties to help him obtain an approved release plan.	The OCO provided information regarding the individual's release planning. The OCO verified that DOC has been working to help the individual obtain an approved release plan. However, multiple outside issues occurred during this process that resulted in the release plans being denied. DOC staff were able to submit a plan that was approved after multiple denials, and the individual is scheduled to release soon.	Information Provided
23.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns that Washington State Library RCW 9.88.015 says nothing about it applying to the circulation of material that was restricted for content from the laws in the 50's.	The OCO attempted to review the concerns that the individual had listed but did not find that an RCW 9.88 existed. The OCO also looked at nearby RCWs but did not find any describing the concern. The OCO also reviewed DOC Policy 510.100 regarding library services and did not find anything relating to the stated concern.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
24.	Incarcerated person reports they have medical needs that require housing in a wet cell. Person was transferred from a facility that could accommodate that need to a facility that cannot. Person says that staff denied him access to the restroom and he was consequently	The OCO contacted the new and transferring facilities to request information about the patient's history of a wet cell. DOC reports they could not identify a current indication for a wet cell after a recent period on medical observation. The	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

infracted for refusing to follow orders when he repeatedly asked.

person was previously in a wet cell while in due to space limitations, not for medical reasons. DOC communicated that he does not qualify for a wet cell HSR at this time.

25.	The incarcerated individual applied for extended family visits (EFV) and was approved by the facility. When the application got to headquarters, it was denied due to a harassment charge from twenty years ago. This person hired a lawyer and submitted an appeal, but DOC headquarters still denied them visitation.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Policy 590.100 (10) says an individual with any documented history/indicator of domestic violence will be excluded from EFV privileges with the following: Persons with a like relationship to the individual as a victim (e.g., individuals who assaulted a spouse/state registered domestic partner, intimate partner) will be precluded from visits with a spouse or state registered domestic partner. The OCO determined that the individual's wife has a domestic violence indicator which is why they have denied this person's extended family visits.	No Violation of Policy
26.	Incarcerated individual reports that they never received an appeal response to a general infraction. The individual also reports that they received a serious infraction for something that they did not do and was found guilty.	The individual was advised the OCO does not investigate concerns related to general infractions and as a result, the office did not investigate this portion of the concern. The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet for the 655 infraction for making pruno and found a substantial body of evidence to substantiate the infraction.	No Violation of Policy
27.	Person states their disciplinary hearing was held over two months later from the infraction date and person was not notified that the hearing was being postponed.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet for a 752 positive drug test the individual pled guilty to. Per DOC Policy 460.000, time frame violations are non-jurisdictional and not grounds for dismissal of an infraction. The individual was provided a continuance that was within policy.	No Violation of Policy
28.	Incarcerated individual states they received a 724 infraction for refusing housing when they asked for protective custody because they were fearing for their life.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet for a 724 infraction for refusing housing and find there is evidence to substantiate the infraction as they refused the housing assignment despite DOC ensuring they were not going to be housed with anyone who they had an active keep separate with and they were not willing to provide DOC with specific information to verify that there was a risk to their safety if released to that particular housing assignment.	No Violation of Policy
29.	Incarcerated individual reports that they received an infraction for mail that tested positive for drugs. Afterwards, they got a letter stating that their mail was tested again and	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet for a 603 infraction for introducing drugs into the facility. The OCO found a significant body of evidence that	No Violation of Policy

	tested negative for cannabinoids. This person appealed their infraction because of this evidence, but their infraction was upheld.	substantiates this concern. The OCO did not find any information related to mail being retested and coming back negative.	
30.	Individual reports DOC issued them an infraction for not following orders to cell in, which resulted in them being fired from their job, and they were given the maximum sanctions for their first infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and find there is evidence to substantiate the 509 infraction for refusing to disperse as the individual became argumentative with staff about having to have their state issued clothing rather than their commissary in their cubby. They were then ordered to cell in and began to walk away but then returned to the officer's station and did not follow the orders to cell in. Regarding the sanctions, a 509 infraction is a category B level 3 infraction and the sanctions for a first-time offense in the past 12 months include: 30 days loss of good conduct time, 30 days confinement to cell and 3 months loss of packages. The individual's sanctions are within these guidelines.	No Violation of Policy
31.	The incarcerated individual reports concerns about transferring to another facility due to being an STG dropout. The individual says he has tried to contact DOC staff regarding his concerns but has not received responses.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The individual's Custody Facility Plan was completed per DOC 300.380, and there are no documented safety concerns at the facility the individual is pending transfer to.	No Violation of Policy
32.	Incarcerated person filed an appeal to a recent infraction and has not yet received a response. The person wants to know if there was a not guilty finding.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet. The 602 infraction was substantiated when the element: "possessing a weapon or sharpened instrument" was met by three razor blades located in the individual's cell. Because neither the individual nor their cellmate claimed possession, the infraction was upheld as a cell-tag. The individual was informed that their appeal was received and the guilty finding was upheld.	No Violation of Policy
33.	Patient reports being on medication for ADHD prior to incarceration. Person has been trying to resume medication since entering prison but is not having any success. The DOC provider has prescribed a variety of medications instead of his preferred medication, which he reports are not effective.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. Ritalin is a nonformulary medication. Under the DOC Health Plan, patients have the option to work with a provider to determine best formulary medication options considering the patient's conditions. The OCO provided information regarding next steps for discussing medication options with a DOC provider.	No Violation of Policy
34.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about policy and statutory rules and regulations	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet for the 509 infraction for refusing to disperse.	No Violation of Policy



concerning mainline not being followed. This resulted in the individual receiving two conflicting directives that ended in an infraction.

The individual was repeatedly told by one officer that they could not speak with the individual at that time and they needed to continue to move. That officer gave them three directives to move along and an additional directive to cell in, to which the individual did not comply and was subsequently infringed.

35.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about receiving an infraction for missing a callout because they did not hear it. They state they have been diagnosed with a hearing impairment and have an HSR for this.	The OCO reached out to DOC regarding the general infraction when the individual failed to report for a call out and verified that they do have a hearing impairment. However, DOC stated that callouts are posted in the dayroom of each unit and it is the expectation that each individual checks this list daily as it is their own responsibility. DOC verified that the individual was on the written callout for the day. Per DOC policy 420.155 an individual will be infringed with a 104 if they miss a call out and it is not excused because the facility must know where an individual is if they are not in their unit; missing a call out poses a safety and security concern. Although the OCO was able to substantiate that the individual does have a hearing impairment, the individual was advised that they must check the paper callout logs to ensure they attend any callouts they have that day.	No Violation of Policy
36.	Person reports that they went to the dentist for a tooth extraction and the dentist said their blood pressure was too high and they had to go to their provider to get medication first. Person went to provider and they said there was nothing wrong with their blood pressure. Then he wrote a grievance saying that the dentist lied. The person was trying to get them to pull the tooth then he got an infection and had to file an emergency grievance to have the tooth removed. It was removed but he feels as though this was inhumane treatment.	The patient called the OCO hotline and asked that OCO staff close the case.	Person Declined OCO Involvement
37.	Person has been trying to get a new mattress for over a year. Person was sent out for surgery and when he returned to the facility five months later he was issued an old mattress again which is making his recovery uncomfortable.	The OCO has discussed this issue with DOC and found that there is currently a halt in mattress production due to supply chain problems. DOC reports the goal is to begin production again early 2023. In the meantime, incarcerated individuals can kite their CUS about current mattress issues	Substantiated Without Resolution
38.	Person reports that he wants a new mattress. He has exhausted the grievance procedures without receiving a mattress.	The OCO provided information. The OCO has discussed this issue with DOC and found that there is currently a halt in mattress production due to supply chain issues. DOC	Substantiated Without Resolution

		reports that the goal is to begin production again in early 2023. In the meantime, incarcerated individuals can kite their CUS about current mattress issues.	
39.	Incarcerated individual reports that the DOC website states that all facilities have issued new mattresses to incarcerated individuals. The individual says this is not true, and over one hundred individuals in his unit have not received a new mattress. The individual has been on a waiting list for a new mattress since the beginning of this year.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO was informed by DOC that mattress production has been delayed due to distribution issues. The OCO was informed that the mattress distribution will begin again once the production of mattresses is restarted. DOC is releasing a memo to the incarcerated population with this information.	Substantiated Without Resolution
<b>Bishop Lewis - King County</b>			
40.	An external person reported stated her loved one was allegedly accused of getting in a verbal exchange with a DOC staff member at the Bishop Lewis Facility. The incarcerated individual is being singled out and wrongfully accused. He also states that due process and proper protocol was not followed in terms being denied written documentation and as well as video footage.	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
<b>Cedar Creek Corrections Center</b>			
41.	The incarcerated individual reports that he ordered headphones and Bluetooth adapter from an approved vendor, and the DOC is now stating that the adapter is a threat to the safety and security of the facility. The individual received a kiosk from HQ which said that he must send the item out.	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
42.	Person was denied GRE because the address, which belongs to a family member, was not approved. The person has an assault charge received as a juvenile against the same family member.	The OCO provided information regarding the incarcerated person's status on housing voucher approval for the same county of origin. The OCO met with DOC staff to verify new partial confinement plan approval.	Information Provided
43.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about two infractions they received on the basis that they had used another individual's pin number to make phone calls to introduce drugs. Person admits they were trying to introduce tobacco but not narcotics.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and found a substantial body of evidence to substantiate the two infractions.	No Violation of Policy
44.	Person reports concerns about an infraction that impacts their access to GRE.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet for a 202 harassment, 509 refusing orders and 353 disruptive behavior infractions they received when they took an extra tray at mainline, used profanity when speaking to an officer, threw their ID at them, and then failed to listen to the three	No Violation of Policy

directives to disperse. Because there is no audio of this incident, it is impossible to determine if they were able to hear the officer's directive or not. Because DOC operates on the "some" evidence standard, an officer's statement is enough to substantiate the low evidence threshold. The OCO substantiates their concern that this does impact their ability to access GRE. They lost 20 days of good conduct time as a result of the infraction and are no longer eligible for GRE because they do not have enough time before their earned release date.

45.	Person says their loved one received an infraction that they did not commit. Their loved one befriended an individual while incarcerated together and that individual was released. DOC then found a backpack containing drugs and paraphernalia and determined it was that individual who dropped it. DOC then infractioned the loved one for organizing the drop as they were in recent communications.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet for the 603 infraction for introduction of drugs and found there was sufficient evidence to substantiate the infraction. The evidence includes recorded phone conversations, JPay messages, and eye-witness testimony.	No Violation of Policy
46.	Incarcerated person states they were infractioned for not being able to produce a urine sample (UA) within the time allotted. However, the person states they take a medication that inhibits their ability to urinate on demand. The person states they are in the process of obtaining an HSR to allow for cotton-swab testing in lieu of a UA.	The OCO reached out to the facility regarding the 607 infraction for failing to provide a urine sample as the individual stated in their appeal that they received an HSR for a UA accommodation one month after the infraction. The facility spoke with medical at the time of the hearing and medical indicated that the medication the individual was prescribed would actually assist in their ability to urinate. The facility also took into account that the individual had a positive UA less than two months prior. Because of these reasons, the facility was unwilling to reduce the infraction to a general or reverse the sanctions of 20 days loss of good conduct time.	No Violation of Policy
47.	Family member of incarcerated individual reports that their loved one had a recent demotion in classification and was transferred facilities. The individual reports that the demotion was due to six major infractions.	The OCO did not receive the requested information from the individual and the individual did not contact this office to express their permission for this office to investigate. The individual was advised that if they would like the concern reviewed by the OCO, they must contact us via mail or the hotline and the case can be reopened.	Person Declined OCO Involvement

### Clallam Bay Corrections Center

48.	External person reports they were harassed by a staff member during an onsite visit.	The OCO has declined to investigate this case. At a minimum, complaints should meet the requirements in RCW 43.06C.040	Declined
-----	--	--	----------

		and 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. The OCO shared information with this individual on how to contact the facility leadership regarding this concern.	
49.	Person reports that their new custody facility plan was approved by the Superintendent. Person received a custody promotion, which they report usually requires HQ approval, but that was not obtained. Person is concerned that something is wrong with plan.	The OCO provided information regarding, custody facility plan approval. The OCO contacted DOC staff they were informed that his current plan was approved by the superintendent; it did not deem to go any further.	Information Provided
50.	Person is potentially being transferred to a facility, for medical reasons, that does not have a safe harbor unit and would put him in danger if housed there. Person says SIS is aware of the safety risk.	The OCO contacted DOC classifications regarding this transfer and the safety concerns. The facility he is transferring to is considered safe from the STG activity he has concerns about. The transfer is medically necessary for the care he needs to receive and he has been promoted to medium custody.	Information Provided
51.	Family member expressed concerns about their loved one being targeted by a staff member as well as property and infraction concerns that relate to this.	The OCO reviewed the evidence that was used to issue multiple infractions and spoke with the DOC leadership regarding these concerns. The OCO was able to substantiate that the DOC has the evidence to support their findings. The OCO could not find evidence to substantiate staff misconduct.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
52.	The incarcerated individual reports that staff misconduct is escalating. He reports that staff put him in segregation for ten days because staff alleged that he was harassing and intimidating them through JPay messages that he was sending to his family. This person was served a negative BOE and infringed at the same time.	The OCO reviewed documentation, messages, and phone calls regarding this complaint. The OCO was able to substantiate that the individual used abusive language multiple times when contacting outside individuals and towards DOC staff. The negative BOE and the infraction that was received on the same day were for based on two different negative interactions the individual had with staff. The OCO could not find evidence to substantiate staff misconduct.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
53.	Loved on expressed concerns regarding incarcerated individual getting infractions based on staff's personal issues.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and find there is evidence to substantiate the 896 infraction for harassment due to the language that was directed towards the individual's video visitor. The OCO also reviewed the infraction narrative and find there is evidence to substantiate the 506 infraction	No Violation of Policy

		for threatening when the individual threatened violence towards someone they had called and the 603 for introduction of unauthorized drugs when the individual had spice mailed into the facility.	
54.	Incarcerated person was infractioned and has experienced multiple problems stemming from the way the infraction was handled and the sanctions imposed.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet for a 603 for unauthorized drugs and a 605 for impersonating infraction. Per DOC policy 460.000, an individual cannot appeal a finding of guilt when they have pled guilty. Additionally, per DOC policy 460.050 the loss of phone access is mandatory for a 603 infraction. Lastly, their extended placement in IMU is a result of the infraction and was approved in their recent facility plan.	No Violation of Policy
55.	Family member reports the patient was poisoned by people at a previous facility and he has not received care for the symptoms he is experiencing. The lack of care has caused severe mental health struggles for the patient.	The OCO requested multiple wellness checks by medical staff on this person until he could be contacted directly. The incarcerated individual informed this office that he did not want the OCO to investigate the complaint.	Person Declined OCO Involvement
56.	Incarcerated individual reports multiple concerns. The individual reports that DOC moved him close custody due to disciplinary issues. Where he is housed currently is very loud and he has trouble sleeping and anxiety due to the noise. Eventually, some of the infractions were dismissed even though he lost his job in the process. The individual reports he takes medication for a mental health condition and DOC medical said they would increase the dosage but has not yet. The individual requests to be moved back to the unit and cell he was in prior to close custody. He also wants his job back and requests DOC medical increase his dosage of medication.	The incarcerated individual advised the OCO he did not want the OCO to investigate the complaint because the issues have been resolved.	Person Declined OCO Involvement

### Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

57.	A loved one reports that her visits with her husband were terminated because he received an infraction for introducing contraband.	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
58.	External person reports incarcerated individual was given some shoes for his very narrow feet when he was at one facility but they were taken when he moved. He is having an issue with the shoes available in the package program as they are all too wide which has led to problems with his ankles and knees. He has requested narrow	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	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

	shoes on a number of occasions but he is still struggling to walk. Person also expressed the patient is experiencing concerning symptoms when leaning forward and needs a medical assessment.	OCO verified that the patient had been scheduled for an assessment prior to OCO involvement.	
59.	Person was transferred for medical reasons. His medical hold ended but his property still has not been sent to him. He has filed complaints but still no 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
60.	Person has infraction concerns for possession of synthetic cannabis but has not appealed yet. They report DOC only tests for K2 so the test is not proper for the alleged drug and the officer originally lost their infraction and it had to be rewritten based on memory.	The OCO is unable to investigate the concern because we are not able to verify that the incarcerated individual filed a grievance, appeal, or sought other administrative remedies as required by RCW 43.06C.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
61.	Person reports he has mobility limitations and has not been provided with an access assistant. He has informed everyone about the need for an assistant but no one has been provided yet.	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
62.	Incarcerated person was denied a Health Status Report (HSR) for an extra hour to produce a urine sample for drug testing. Person reports having HSRs for the extra hour in the past for medical reasons, however, this year he was denied.	The OCO contacted health services to request they address this concern. After several mediated conversations and policy reviews, DOC agreed to issue the individual an HSR for oral fluid testing in accordance with DOC policy 420.380 Drug/Alcohol Testing which states "[i]ndividuals who are not able to provide a urine specimen within one hour and have documentation from a medical provider in the community or a current HSR documenting a medical/mental health condition that causes difficulty urinating will be tested using an oral fluid test." The OCO later verified the HSR in OMNI and DOC agreed to send a copy to the patient.	Assistance Provided
63.	The incarcerated individual reports he had a classification review about a year ago to be promoted to MI2 and moved to camp. The individual was denied promotion pending a chemical dependency assessment and taking "Thinking for a Change." He completed the Thinking for a Change class but was denied camp again because he had not had his chemical dependency assessment. The DOC recommended treatment and he is requesting	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO made contact with the DOC and reported that this person would like to participate in chemical dependency treatment. The DOC later reported that this person would be starting treatment next week.	Assistance Provided

help to get admitted into a substance abuse treatment program.

64.	Patient followed up regarding previous OCO medical case. He reports he has still not received his injection and is unsure of his care plan and whether he will receive an MRI.	The OCO contacted health services and asked that they address this concern. DOC medical agreed to schedule the patient for a sick call appointment next week to discuss pain and injection. The MRI was denied as not medically indicated and DOC agreed to discuss this outcome and the treatment plan with the patient again. DOC reviewed communication from the individual and recent encounter reports and could not identify a complaint about this specific pain or injection since his last injection earlier this year.	Assistance Provided
65.	Individual had a restoration plan that was submitted in early April. After the plan was submitted DOC made policy changes to the good time restoration policy. This policy change denied the pathway. The individual received a 603 in 2007. Previous policy states that he could get 100% of the good time back with a restoration pathway. Policy now says when a person gets a Category A infraction they can only get 50 per cent of the time back.	The OCO provided assistance with restoration pathway. The OCO spoke with DOC leadership who informed this office that some of the good conduct time would be restored. HQ will make a determination for the remainder of time.	Assistance Provided
66.	Patient reports issues with his right foot related to reconstructive surgery in 2021. He has been trying to get medical shoes since April 2022 as well as a cortisone shot for his foot but has not received a DOC response. He was fitted for the medical shoes but never received them. Resolution response states that the wait times are long for outside provider assistance.	The OCO contacted health services and confirmed the patient had been fitted for and received specialized medical footwear. The patient has requested the previous molds be ordered after reporting the shoes are not fitting correctly. DOC has contacted the specialist and is waiting for them to confirm a new appointment for the patient. DOC also reviewed the patient's chart and found that he may qualify for another cortisone injection and scheduled him with his primary care provider to discuss.	Assistance Provided
67.	The incarcerated individual reports that he has recently had issues receiving his newspaper. The individual reports that the mailroom staff were not helpful in addressing his concern.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The mailroom at the facility verified that it processed each newspaper received within timeframes.	DOC Resolved
68.	Incarcerated individual wants policy 440.050 to be changed so that transgender individuals can access women's pants (meaning pants DOC issues at the women's facilities).	The OCO provided information regarding policy 440.050. This policy is currently not under review.	Information Provided
69.	Person reports DOC is not handling the production and distribution of new mattresses correctly. He reports that mattress production has halted. He feels as though the new mattresses should be given to people with	The OCO provided information to the incarcerated person. The OCO has discussed this issue with DOC and found that there is currently a halt in mattress production due to supply chain issues. DOC reports that the	Information Provided

	medical problems before anyone else. His unit supervisor keeps pushing the date back for when he will receive a new mattress.	goal is to begin production again in early 2023. In the meantime, incarcerated individuals can kite their CUS about current mattress issues.	
70.	The incarcerated individual reports that there is an issue with DOC records and believes they were not given all of the good-time credit they should have earned. The person reports that DOC records told him to talk to his counselor, and his counselor told him they want nothing to do with it.	The OCO provided contact information for the DOC Records Department and advised them to contact the Records office to request a review of their time calculation.	Information Provided
71.	The incarcerated individual reports that his medical shoes which he paid for did not arrive when he transferred facilities. The individual reports that he filed a tort claim for the shoes but has not received a response. The individual says he would like information on appealing tort claims in the case that his claim is denied.	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual can appeal a tort claim if his claim for his medical shoes is denied.	Information Provided
72.	Person was billed a copay for two different medical appointments, the first of which was a follow-up appointment. The second billing was for an appointment that did not occur, instead person received a response that he would be seen the following month. Person says this should also be considered a follow-up appointment.	The OCO provided information about how to request a refund of copays through Health Services Management team.	Information Provided
73.	The incarcerated individual reports that DOC recalculated his jail time credits and took away credits. The person says the new calculation wrongfully supersedes their first sentence and is forcing him to re-serve time that he has already served.	The OCO provided information regarding this person's sentence. The OCO contacted the DOC Records office and they determined that the new sentence was calculated correctly.	Information Provided
74.	The incarcerated individual was assigned to a drug and alcohol class that meets four times a week. This person reports that his initial assessment said he did not need this class but the person that runs it has signed him up anyway. He is concerned because this is not in his judgment & sentence. The individual also reported that he refused to sign the document enrolling him into the program and was threatened with an infraction.	The OCO provided information regarding how to appeal the chemical dependency placement and contact information for the DOC Public Records office. The OCO contacted the DOC to obtain specific details of this person's admission into chemical dependency treatment and how this person can appeal the decision. This office again spoke to the incarcerated individual and gave them self-advocacy information on how to appeal their substance abuse placement. The OCO also provided the DOC Public Records address to this person in case they want to request a copy of their chemical dependency assessment.	Information Provided
75.	The incarcerated individual has a documented medical condition that causes them to have frequent bowel movements. This person is requesting a two-piece jumpsuit to wear on the	The OCO provided information regarding this person's next steps in requesting a two-piece jumpsuit.	Information Provided



chain bus during transport. The individual has submitted a grievance regarding this concern, and it was not accepted because this person does not have a current transfer order.

76.	Incarcerated individual reports he is not receiving adequate mental health care while housed in the Washington State Penitentiary Intensive Management unit (WSP IMU). They report in the IMU there is no access to programming or their personal property. The individual filed a resolution request about the concerns he had related to mental health access and spoke to his counselor, but remains in the WSP IMU. The individual requests to be transferred out of the IMU to a place where he can access more adequate mental health care.	The OCO provided information regarding his placement in IMU and his access to mental health care. The OCO explained DOC has classified him as maximum custody, which means that his current housing assignment is an IMU. The OCO spoke with DOC staff who said that the individual will be considered with a multidisciplinary team for a lower custody management in the near future because of good behavior he has shown since being in IMU. The DOC staff member shared that the individual is currently engaged in programming and is doing well in the programs. The OCO verified that the individual is receiving access to mental health care. The OCO shared options to access mental health services more frequently and when needed.	Information Provided
77.	External person reports their loved one is being harassed by staff. They have received multiple infractions and were accused of attempting to smuggle drugs.	The OCO reviewed the evidence that was used to issue multiple infractions and spoke with the DOC leadership regarding these concerns. The OCO was able to substantiate that the DOC has the evidence to support their findings. The OCO could not find evidence to substantiate staff misconduct.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
78.	The incarcerated individual reports that DOC staff is discriminating against them and is moving them out of their current housing unit to a different dorm-style unit. This person did nothing wrong, has not been in trouble and they do not understand why they have to move.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO spoke with Superintendent who informed the office that no negative programming impacts are occurring and movements of people will occur based on facility safety and security policy.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
79.	External person is requesting the OCO investigate why CRCC is the only facility that has been on Facility Wide Outbreak Status for over a month with only one case reported.	The OCO verified that this facility has had multiple COVID-19 outbreaks and due to their county COVID-19 numbers (Per Governor Proclamation) they are still masking. The facility is hoping to open back up after their next round of COVID-19 testing. This information is also provided on the Local Family Council Covid-19 calls. The OCO found insufficient evidence to substantiate the facility went into an outbreak status due to only one positive COVID-19 test.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
80.	The incarcerated individual reports that unit staff is discriminating against him and other individuals because they are white.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO spoke with the Superintendent who	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

		informed the office that there would not be a negative programming impact and movements of people will occur based on facility safety and security policy.	
81.	The incarcerated individual reports that they are being kicked out of their housing unit by DOC staff because they no longer meet the programming requirements. They report that they are being discriminated against because they are white.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO spoke with Superintendent and informed the office that there would not be a negative programming impact and movements of people will occur based on facility safety and security policy.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
82.	Incarcerated individual reports DOC is not allowing his loved one to visit. The individual reports that his loved one was terminated from visitation after a false claim from DOC and they have been trying to obtain approval to visit ever since. DOC allowed the individual and his loved one to have video visiting after some time, but has not yet allowed them in person visitation. The individual reports that DOC has not granted the visitation and he reports that the decision is unfair and is racial discrimination because he has seen people of other races be granted in-person visits again after being accused of the same thing.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the recent visitation application and responses and determined that DOC's decision was not in violation of DOC 450.300 Visits for Incarcerated Individuals which states, "Visitors who receive notification that their opportunities for appeal have been exhausted may resubmit an application after one year to be considered for restoration of modified or full visit privileges." This means for the individual that DOC is not willing to allow in person visits for this family, however they can resubmit an application in one year. The OCO was unable to substantiate that the decision to deny the in-person visitation was due to racial discrimination.	No Violation of Policy
83.	Patient injured his knee in 2014 and reports he did not receive treatment until 2016. He says he recently hurt his knee again by accident. He had an unrelated medical issue and is concerned about how DOC staff treated him during the medical emergency. The sergeant cancelled the medical emergency and he was issued six major infractions. Corrections Officer claimed the person said he was "going to bury him and then sue him". He says it makes no sense and the one infraction for threatening was dismissed. He has had other serious medical issues which he has needed to call medical emergencies for and was told no by DOC staff. He was told he would be infraacted if he called a medical emergency but officers told him he needs to call medical emergency for serious issues.	The OCO contacted DOC health services to report these concerns and follow up on the handling of medical emergencies. The office confirmed the patient has received appointments for knee issues. DOC reports patient declined recommended physical therapy and follow up x-ray. Medical emergencies were addressed with an assessment and most related to access to ice. An incident involving custody staff response to medical emergencies is being reviewed by the DOC grievance department. Disciplinary and infraction concerns were addressed in a separate OCO case and the outcome was reported to the individual in this closing letter.	No Violation of Policy
84.	The incarcerated individual reports they received an infraction they were not guilty of as they were cell tagged for some items that were not theirs, and their cellmate wrote a statement saying the tattoo ink belonged to them. This	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet as well as the evidence photos and find there is evidence to substantiate the 553 infraction (setting a fire). The cellmate did take responsibility of the tattoo ink,	No Violation of Policy

	person appealed the serious infraction and the infraction was upheld. This person lost 10 points and does not want this information in their personal record.	resulting in the proper dismissal of the 710 infraction. However, no one took responsibility for the burning smell, ash or burnt lead. As this was found in the common area of the cell and no one took responsibility, the cell tag appears to have been applied per policy.	
85.	Person reports that a Community Corrections Officer came to see him and claims he smelled alcohol on individual's breath. The CCO took him back to prison and continued to write major infractions (810, 706, 707) for the individual. He was discontinued from GRE.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC policy 300.500 person does not meet the qualifications to continue with the GRE program. After multiple interventions with GRE staff, person was found guilty of infractions that were related to alcohol use and once in prison person received major infractions unrelated to GRE revoke. Because of these infractions, person does not meet the 90-day infraction free requirement to be placed back on GRE.	No Violation of Policy
86.	Incarcerated person states he has not yet been seen by medical regarding the results of an x-ray that was taken on his ankle in July. Person says the larger concern is how medical scheduling is handled at the facility.	The OCO verified the patient was seen for x-ray results and ongoing care planning. The OCO was unable to identify a violation of the DOC Health Plan. This office is in ongoing conversations with CRCC about scheduling delays and addressing care access.	No Violation of Policy
87.	Incarcerated individual reports that they used to be a dog handler and got fired for allegedly abusing an animal. They later found out another individual did abuse the animal and that individual was kept in the program. They report DOC found that they did not abuse the animal but still got a major infraction for it (810). The individual appealed the infraction and the decision was affirmed. They feel the dog program is picking and choosing who they want to hire.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet as well as the hearing audio for the 810 infraction for failure to maintain employment. The individual expressed concerns about being found guilty of this infraction, but in the hearing audio the individual pled guilty to the 810 and stated they were "not going to contest that one." Because the individual pled guilty to the infraction and based on the DOC summary of the video evidence, there is evidence to substantiate that they mishandled the dogs based on the requirements of the dog program and this led to their termination .	No Violation of Policy
88.	The incarcerated individual reports that they received an infraction (704) for staff assault, as well as several other infractions and was found guilty on all of them. They have appealed all of the infractions and the appeal was denied. They report that they did not assault a staff member and this is clearly shown in the video footage that was taken and used as evidence during the infraction hearing. The individual also reports that they were given a 752 infraction for pruno, but they did not make, or consume any alcohol, it was just in the vicinity of the incident.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and find there is evidence to substantiate all four infractions: 709 for being out of bounds, 752 for positive test for alcohol, 704 for attempted staff assault and 506 for threatening.	No Violation of Policy

89.	Incarcerated person reports they were charged a co-pay to visit a provider two times for an ongoing and pre-existing medical issue which DOC has been treating for over 10 years. DOC policy says they can only charge an initial co-pay for medical issues and Health Status Reports (HSRs) that are ongoing and follow-up appointments are free. Person says this has only happened since he arrived at that facility, all grievances and kites submitted pertaining to this concern have been ignored.	The OCO could not identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. The office contacted health services and found that the patient was charged for a kite requested appointment and a medical emergency. RCW 72.10.020 states that incarcerated individuals must make co-payments for initial health care visits that the incarcerated individual initiates. DOC policy 600.025 states that patients will be charged a co-payment for all visits except those initiated by medical, mental health, or dental providers. Medical emergencies and kite requested appointments are considered incarcerated individual initiated.	No Violation of Policy
90.	Incarcerated person received an infraction to which they dispute the narrative and evidence. Person also is concerned they would be subject to a custody override and be transferred to a close custody facility where they would be assaulted.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and find there is evidence to substantiate the 661 infraction for sexual harassment of staff as based on the video evidence summary, they exited their cell, checked to see where the DOC staff member was, went back into their cell and then when that DOC staff member came to deliver their mail, they had their genitals in their hand and were smiling at the officer, they also made no effort to cover themselves. Regarding the transfer concern, at their last facility plan meeting, they requested to be transferred to the facility they are currently at and are being housed an appropriate custody level given their custody score.	No Violation of Policy
91.	Person's concern is that his rights were and are being violated by DOC's COVID-19 protocols. Person has been negatively affected emotionally, educationally, spiritually, environmentally, and physically throughout the use of these protocols.	The DOC is following clinical protocols based on recommendations from the CDC and WA department of Health for congregate living settings to determine quarantine and isolation procedures. There is no evidence of a violation of policy.	No Violation of Policy
92.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that the individual filed a PREA complaint against several officers earlier this year. The officers were placed on leave pending the investigation. The same officers recently returned to their loved one's unit and they are concerned about reprisals from the officers.	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
93.	Incarcerated individual reports the facility is not allowing him to religiously assemble. The DOC is not allowing Muslims to assemble for Juma prayer. This is a prayer that needs to happen every Friday with all Muslim men. DOC will not allow them to assemble due to cohorting although other religious groups can assemble.	The OCO contacted the facility leadership regarding this concern. The Muslim men are allowed to assemble for prayer, however they cannot all assemble together when they are in different units and cohorts. The facility is continuing COVID testing and is	Substantiated Without Resolution

hopeful the cohorting will be lifted by next week based on negative tests.

### Larch Corrections Center

94.	Incarcerated individual reports he was unable to provide a urinalysis sample and received an infraction. As a result of the infraction, the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) terminated him from the wildfire crew and withheld his pay (gratuities). The individual did not get in trouble at work so does not understand why his pay was withheld.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO requested and the DOC agreed to pay the individual the withheld wages.	Assistance Provided
95.	Incarcerated individual reports he was unable to provide a urinalysis sample and received an infraction. As a result of the infraction, the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) terminated him from the wildfire crew and withheld his pay (gratuities). The individual did not get in trouble at work so does not understand why his pay was withheld.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO requested and the DOC agreed to pay the individual the withheld wages.	Assistance Provided
96.	Incarcerated individual reports he was unable to provide a urinalysis sample and received an infraction. As a result of the infraction, the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) terminated him from the wildfire crew and withheld his pay (gratuities). The individual did not get in trouble at work so does not understand why his pay was withheld.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO requested and the DOC agreed to pay the individual the withheld wages.	Assistance Provided
97.	Individual states they were found guilty of an infraction but the paperwork was incorrect. They were given a urinalysis test (UA) and could not provide the sample because they had just used the restroom. They also state the officers who did the UA were not listed on the infraction and the bathroom number was incorrect.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet for a 606 (refusing UA) infraction when they were not able to provide the sample within the allotted one-hour timeframe. This infraction is within policy. The individual expressed concerns about alleged serious errors of technicality, and, as a result, DOC offered them the ability to provide witness statements to address these concerns including statements from the officers who did the UA. However, the individual did not request any witness statements.	No Violation of Policy

### Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women

98.	Patient reports she has been without her upper teeth since October 2021 and needs help getting on the dental list for an appointment and care.	The patient was seen by dental and referred to the dentist for the next available appointment prior to OCO outreach.	DOC Resolved
99.	Loved one is concerned for the population at MCCCW and the COVID protocols that are being followed. They would like to know what the protocols are.	The OCO provided the most recently updated version of the WA State DOC COVID-19 Screening Testing, and Infection Control Guidelines to the person.	Information Provided
100.	The incarcerated individual's photos are being rejected because the people in the photographs	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy	No Violation of Policy

are currently incarcerated. The person reports that the photos are being rejected as third party because the sender is not in the photographs.

by DOC. Policy 450.100 Mail for Individuals in Prisons, Section XIII, B: Incarcerated individuals must meet at least one of the following requirements: 1. Are members of the same immediate family, 2. Have a child together, as proven through a birth certificate, and only if both individuals still have parental rights, and/or 3. Are co-parties in an active legal case, or one individual is providing a witness statements in the other individual's active legal case. The OCO has determined that because the person's relationship does not meet any of these requirements, the DOC is within policy to deny their photographs.

### Monroe Correctional Complex

101.	The incarcerated individual has concerns regarding whether or not their counselor has the authority to decide whether or not a person can release to a specific address based on their own discretion.	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
102.	The incarcerated individual reports that there is a transgender individual in his unit, and they are not allowed to use the toilet when the person is showering. He reports that if they go to the bathroom while the other individual is showering, they will get an out-of-bounds infraction, and he believes this violates the ADA. The individual reports that he defecated on himself because he was not allowed to use the bathroom while the other person was showering.	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
103.	The incarcerated individual reports that he was threatened by a staff member for reporting an important issue to the CUS. The individual reports that he had a meeting with DOC staff and was told that he is on thin ice and that the staff member is watching him. This person is concerned that the staff member is going to retaliate against 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
104.	A family member reports that their loved one has been in the intensive management unit (IMU) since the beginning of the month without deodorant or toothpaste because DOC has run out of supplies. The loved one also reports that the bars of soap are small, and individuals have to wait 20 days to request a new soap bar.	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
105.	Person states there has been a situation of homophobic/transphobic retaliation against two	The OCO contacted DOC headquarters regarding this infraction and reviewed the	Assistance Provided

individuals that has resulted in false accusations and infractions.

underlying records. OCO's review determined that DOC further investigated this concern and found that the individual was unable to properly prepare their own defense due to an error with the incident reports. As a result, DOC has remanded them for a new hearing.

106.	External person reports retaliation and a faulty investigation that placed two incarcerated individuals in segregation.	The OCO has reviewed this concern and contacted the incarcerated individuals identified in the concern. This office had multiple conversations with the DOC and the DOC has agreed to remand the hearing for the infractions. The incarcerated individuals will now have the opportunity for a new hearing.	Assistance Provided
107.	The incarcerated individual met with staff to review medical records and paid \$6.40 to have records copied. They never got copies and have requested a refund multiple times. The individual filed a grievance, and the response has been that the facility has the authority to refund, and the refund has been requested. However, the facility mentioned in the grievance is not the individual's current housing location.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported that they located the missing records and forwarded a copy to the individual fulfilling his original request.	Assistance Provided
108.	The incarcerated individual reports their accident/injury report was thrown away and the DOC did not allow for them to file.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO met with DOC staff and it was confirmed that injury report was thrown out because of confusion on the injury. The OCO was able to have DOC provide another injury report to the incarcerated person and they will be provided the process to pursue possible remedy.	Assistance Provided
109.	The incarcerated individual has had extreme pain for the past five years. He was told he was going to see a surgeon for possible surgery but nothing has happened. When he has tried to put in a medical emergency staff threatens to infract him. He has severe pain and has problems standing and walking. He is afraid to file medical emergencies after threats of infractions.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting DOC Health Services management and patient scheduler. There was a clerical issue found on the side of the outside clinic, causing a delay in the scheduling of the surgery. The OCO verified that has been resolved and this person has been scheduled for surgery.	Assistance Provided
110.	Patient states they have hearing disabilities are unable to hear announcements on the loudspeaker system, thus missing movements, call-outs, and program assignments. Person has attempted to resolve the issue with the ADA coordinator and access a pager or other accommodations to no avail. Person received a negative Behavior Observation Entry as a result.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting the ADA coordinator and Health Services management to request that they review the patient's request for a pager. This office informed the request for the pager was approved, however MCC's pager system is currently not working. DOC is working on a statewide fix to this issue. This office also requested the Correction Program Manager	Assistance Provided

		review this person's Behavior Observation Entries; the CPM determined that the BOEs had been entered within policy.	
111.	The person has filed a PREA claim against their therapist. They think that she is attracted to them and it makes them uncomfortable. They would like this office to investigate the PREA investigation that is done by the Department of Corrections.	The OCO spoke with mental health providers, who stated they were willing to consider a change of counselor if the person were to fill out the form and first have a meeting with the mental health administrator. The PREA allegation was not substantiated.	Assistance Provided
112.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about receiving an infraction for being out of bounds when they were in in the diet line but had an HSR to be there. When they went to submit the appeal, the officer who served the initial paperwork told them that if they did appeal, they would be infractioned for trading/borrowing/lending and lying to an officer. The individual was concerned and decided not to appeal out of fear of receiving two more infractions.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet for a 551 infraction for providing false information to the hearing officer or in a disciplinary appeal for lying to hearing's staff about having a valid HSR for lighter fare. Based on the infraction narrative, it appears the individual had shown the officer a previous HSR that was rescinded earlier in the year. However, the individual did have a valid HSR at the time of the time of the infraction. The OCO contacted facility leadership about this concern and they dismissed the 551 infraction.	Assistance Provided
113.	Incarcerated person states the infraction they were found guilty of was based on misinformation and was written by a staff person who did not witness the situation. Person further states the staff member targets them, their witness statements were ignored, and DOC stated they could not find the video relating to this incident.	The OCO contacted DOC headquarters regarding the infraction, and they further investigated this concern. It was found that several incident reports were located in the physical evidence bags which resulted in the individual not being able to fully prepare their proper defense. As a result, DOC headquarters has remanded them for a new hearing.	Assistance Provided
114.	Incarcerated individual states they were moved units and discovered that their new cellmate had contraband. They then reported this to DOC staff because they were concerned about getting a cell tag and requested to be moved. They then refused to return to their cell and received an infraction for the contraband.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet for a 251 (possessing tobacco/tobacco paraphernalia), 553 (setting fire), 655 (making alcohol), 702 (possession of unauthorized tool) and 752 (positive drug/alcohol test). The OCO does not review general infractions and did not review the 251 infraction. A cell search was conducted and staff found three burnt candles in the cell which substantiates the 553 infraction and an altered flex pen used for smoking that tested positive for spice under the individual's mattress which substantiates the 752 infraction. The two altered batteries with wire attached as well as a piece of sandpaper were found in the bunk area assigned to the cellmate, however, the individual was still infractioned for a 702. Additionally, an altered soda cap with a tube used to make pruno was found	Assistance Provided



		<p>under the bunk assigned to the cellmate, yet the individual was still infracted for a 655. The OCO reached out to the facility regarding the 702 and 655 infraction. Because the two items that were found were not in the common area, but instead they were in the cellmate's assigned area, the facility dismissed the 702 and 655 infraction.</p>	
115.	Incarcerated individual reported concerns for his safety if his scheduled transfer takes place.	The OCO contacted DOC classifications staff to discuss the transfer and safety concerns. Upon this office's request, the DOC re-evaluated him. After the review, he was transferred back to a safe harbor facility.	Assistance Provided
116.	Incarcerated person reports they are subject to ongoing medical negligence by the DOC. Person filed resolution requests which were found substantiated by headquarters. However, the problem has not been rectified.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting Health Services management and requesting the patient's health status reports (HSR) be renewed. The patient has received all requested HSRs.	Assistance Provided
117.	Patient says he has stage 4 cancer and DOC medical staff did not consult with his oncologist before administering a COVID medication. Person says he felt misled when medical gave him the consent form to sign before taking the medication, assuming they followed through with consulting the oncologist. He tried to grieve the issue, but was told the provider did contact his oncologist when he had emailed the wrong doctor.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed related medical records and resolution requests and found an error in the transcription of the handwritten resolution request that changed the content of the complaint. The OCO substantiated the wrong provider had been emailed. This office elevated this concern to the Chief Medical Officer of DOC who reviewed the records and agreed to offer an apology to the patient.	Assistance Provided
118.	Incarcerated person states that they should be eligible and prioritized for programming based on DOC Policy 320.120. Person says instead they are continuously passed over for educational programming opportunities. They say DOC is citing their Early Release Date as the dictating factor which is contrary to the policy.	The OCO reviewed the concern and the custody facility plan that was approved after the concern was submitted. The custody facility plan states that he was approved for educational programming.	DOC Resolved
119.	A loved one reports that her son is being held in solitary confinement and struggles with mental illness. She is concerned that staff at the facility have not been very helpful and reports that her son is being discriminated against.	The OCO provided information to this person's loved one regarding the housing location and schedule that is available to this person. The OCO contacted the DOC to discuss this person's housing location, mental health status, and daily routine. The DOC staff followed up with this person's weekly schedule in an email, and this office provided that information to their loved one.	Information Provided
120.	A loved one reports that incarcerated individuals are being written up for not wearing a mask while outside. This person reports the incarcerated population is being treated as if	The OCO provided information on the facility's current COVID protocols and informed the loved one that this person's	Information Provided

the facility is on outbreak status when it is not, and no one wants to file a grievance because they fear retaliation. However, they were informed they should be getting a verbal warning, not a write-up.

infraction regarding this issue had been dismissed.

121.	Person states DOC treated him poorly after testing positive for COVID-19. He was placed in a hot vehicle before being moved to isolation where he was ignored. Person says staff did not wear PPE, pick up resolution requests for days and delivered medication inconsistently. Person also says the cell he was housed in was never cleaned and was filthy. Person is frustrated with the leadership of DOC and how incarcerated people are treated overall. This person is requesting the OCO file a lawsuit against the DOC.	The DOC is following clinical protocols based on recommendations from the CDC for congregate living settings to determine quarantine and isolation procedures. The OCO does not engage in litigation; per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(j) says "The ombuds must remain neutral and impartial and may not act as an advocate for the complainant or for the department." 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.	Information Provided
122.	Incarcerated individual had property moved to the Monroe Correctional Center Twin Rivers Unit (MCC-TRU) visiting room for storage during a facility-wide COVID outbreak. The individual had packaged seven boxes of his property, but only received six boxes back. They filed a resolution request and a tort claim; both of them were denied. The individual reports he did everything he could to get his property back is being denied by the facility and the tort claim investigators. The individual requests that the tort claim investigators interview the DOC staff member that remembers he had seven boxes of property when he stored them in the visiting room.	The OCO provided information about the tort claim investigation process. The OCO found that it is the responsibility of the tort claim investigator to speak with all witnesses who may have information about the incident. The OCO spoke with the DOC staff member who could not recall speaking to a tort claim investigator. The OCO provided information to the individual about how to contact the Department of Enterprise Services (DES) tort claim division and provide the witness information. The OCO does not have jurisdiction to review the actions of the DES tort claim division.	Information Provided
123.	The incarcerated individual reports that following medical care, he remained housed in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) despite having a custody designation of long-term minimum. The individual reports that it is against policy which supports housing at the least restrictive level.	The OCO provided information regarding the individual being temporarily housed in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) at a different facility for medical needs. Once the individual completes his appointments, he will return to his living unit at his previous facility.	Information Provided
124.	Person states they were moved into an isolation unit after a positive rapid COVID test. All of his subsequent tests were negative. He would like the COVID protocols to be updated to include double-checking positive patients before grouping them with others who are testing positive.	The OCO provided information about the recent updates to the WA State DOC COVID-19 Screening Testing, and Infection Control Guidelines. The DOC bases the guidelines on the CDC recommendations for congregate living settings. Patients who receive positive results must be isolated to mitigate the risk of spreading infection. Discharge from an isolation unit is done on a case-by-case basis and is dependent on	Information Provided

current protocol and the patient's health status.

125.	The incarcerated person is requesting that a specific person be kept separate from him and that this person be investigated.	The OCO provided information to this person about how to request a keep separate order.	Information Provided
126.	The incarcerated person witnessed an altercation between two incarcerated individuals. The person says one of the incarcerated individuals attempted to walk away while the other one escalated the confrontation. The individual who escalated the confrontation is in a leadership position as a tier representative, and the person is concerned that he would be allowed to continue to use their position to threaten the safety of others, particularly those who are more vulnerable.	The OCO provided information regarding this person's next steps in reporting this situation.	Information Provided
127.	The incarcerated individual reports that he received a response for his grievance stating that he has five open grievances and cannot submit anymore. The grievance he is concerned about includes a staff member not wearing his mask correctly in a quarantine unit. He reports that he would not have to submit numerous grievances if staff would follow protocol.	The OCO provided information regarding the status of this person's grievances.	Information Provided
128.	External person reports the facility has been serving rotten vegetables, bruised fruit and is not following the menu.	The OCO verified that this concern was received by the DOC facility leadership and they responded to this external reporter. The facility is returning to non-precut product and preparing it themselves to prevent vegetable and fruit discoloration. The DOC stated they do serve the state menu, however item or brand substitutions are made if there are product shortages.	Information Provided
129.	Incarcerated individual has requested a copy of DOC staff's guarantee that he will be provided a roll of toilet paper in COA. He has not yet received the copy.	The OCO contacted the SOU leadership regarding this concern. All incarcerated individuals are given a certain amount of toilet paper while housed in the COA. The reason for not receiving whole rolls is because toilet paper can be used to cover the cameras and cell windows. This individual has not been being guaranteed his own roll of toilet paper and no such guarantee document exists. The OCO did verify that the individual who submitted the concern does have toilet paper.	Information Provided
130.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that several small paper greeting cards he sent to the individual over the past two months were rejected and confiscated due to being potential contraband. The loved one reports that he has been mailing cards to the	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted the DOC about the mail rejections and the DOC could not provide any information related to this concern. This office tried to contact the incarcerated	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

	individual for years and they had never been rejected until recently.	individual, but this person declined the phone call.	
131.	The incarcerated individual reports that his counselor is making false accusations about him. The individual reports that his counselor told him that he was telling other incarcerated individuals that they are being snitches for talking to the counselor regarding reports of pruno in the individual's cell.	The OCO reviewed the full investigation related to this concern, including interviews with witnesses listed by the individual. This office was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
132.	Incarcerated person reports that they were investigated for a PREA incident that happened a year prior and had already been investigated and unfounded in both investigations. The first investigation resulted in a verbal statement that the allegation was unfounded and during the second investigation it was stated by staff that the prior investigator failed to submit the paperwork. Person would like these investigations removed from his central file.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO spoke with DOC staff and verified that the investigation and infractions are not visible in central file.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
133.	Person reports they have information about past crimes other people committed but when they try to provide information to the authorities it is labeled as mental health issues and gets added to their file.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate the concern as the complaint relates to an action by an agency other than WA DOC.	Lacked Jurisdiction
134.	Person states there is not a valid reason for denial of extended family visits (EFVs) with wife.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO review verified that the denial for EFV visits is consistent with DOC 590.100 Extended Family Visiting section III(A)(10)(b) which states that an individual with any documented history/indicator of domestic violence will be excluded from EFV privileges with "[p]ersons with a like relationship to the individual as the victim" including a spouse. This person has indicators in their background that do not allow for this person to receive EFV visits.	No Violation of Policy
135.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about DOC making them serve 10 days cell confinement but, because the sanction paperwork had the wrong WAC number on it, they were infraacted two more times for not serving the cell confinement.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet as well as the hearing audio for a 103 infraction when the individual was not wearing their mask and a 658 for failing to comply with previously ordered sanctions when they were supposed to be on cell confinement but were seen talking to other individuals at their cells when they knew they were not supposed to be in an unassigned cell. They pled guilty to both of these infractions. The OCO also reviewed the concern about the wrong WAC number and found that the individual was informed by officers that they were going to get an	No Violation of Policy

		<p>infraction for not following sanctions and being in someone else's cell and they responded by using profanity in addressing the officer. If DOC were to put the wrong WAC number, this would be a clerical error that is nonjurisdictional and not grounds for dismissal of the infraction. They also had explicit warning in the infraction paperwork that if they were to not serve the cell confinement, this would result in a 658 infraction. This warning was applicable regardless of the wrong WAC number being listed.</p>	
136.	<p>The incarcerated individual reports they received an infraction during a video visit but says what they did does not constitute an infraction. The individual feels there should be rules posted for video visits.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative and find there is evidence to substantiate the 103 infraction for refusing an order and the 504 infraction for engaging in a sex act. The individual did not wear a mask during the visit and made motions and references to sexual acts.</p>	No Violation of Policy
137.	<p>Person reports that he was infracted while on GRE. Person says the WAC violation alone does not terminate someone from the Graduated Reentry Program (GRE). Person says DOC Headquarters told them they were going to be placed back on the program and into the community; however, their release address was rescinded.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy 300.500 by DOC. The person was given several infractions that impacted his return to GRE.</p>	No Violation of Policy
138.	<p>Person reports they raised concerns through the grievance program about being discriminated against when screened for the Graduated Reentry program (GRE) but the response from staff cited this was a group concern. Person says they clearly indicated how the discrimination impacted him directly and they now fear retaliation, harassment, and bias for taking actions to complain.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy 300.500 by DOC. The OCO contacted DOC and they were informed that the person was denied locally at the work release based on the fact that the person did not meet the requirements for GRE.</p>	No Violation of Policy
139.	<p>The incarcerated individual's custody facility plan says that they are not eligible for GRE because of minimal treatment received while incarcerated. They feel that they are a perfect candidate for GRE and should be allowed to have access to this program. DOC has recommended that this person do chemical dependency treatment because they have not done enough programming while they were in prison. They tried to receive treatment and they could not get into classes, so they did workbooks and received certificates; they do not understand why that doesn't count as programming.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO identified that the person still has enough time to complete treatment and be able to apply for GRE. This person's earned release date is more than four years away.</p>	No Violation of Policy

140.	Patient is disputing the results from the recent diagnostic testing and reports being denied cancer care.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO contacted Health Services management and the patient's primary provider. Per the primary provider there is no cancer present and there are no treatment recommendations for this patient regarding the diagnostic testing. The OCO reviewed provided records and confirmed this information.	No Violation of Policy
141.	Person reports that their facility has been under quarantine for two weeks and they are about to be put on two more weeks of quarantine.	The DOC is following clinical protocols based on recommendations from the CDC and WA Department of Health for congregate living settings to determine quarantine and isolation procedures. There is no evidence of a violation of policy.	No Violation of Policy
142.	External person expressed concerns that their incarcerated loved one was cleared by mental health to be transferred to a different facility and his mental health needs will not be met. Person says their loved has not made enough improvements currently and moving him to another facility will be like starting over again. Person says this is a retaliatory measure by staff.	The OCO contacted health services and could not identify evidence to substantiate a violation of DOC policy. Patient has declined treatment and DOC reported additional concerns that led to removing the individual from the Residential Treatment Unit (RTU). The patient did not contact the OCO to request assistance and the OCO cannot impact DOC's transfer decision at this time. The OCO cannot disclose mental health treatment or security details. This office contacted the incarcerated person via letter to request more information and asked that they contact this office if they would like to report concerns or request OCO's assistance.	No Violation of Policy
143.	The incarcerated individual was violated from graduated reentry (GRE) because he would not give the correctional officer his bank information. This person is currently in the intensive management unit (IMU) and has no hygiene products, or access to grievance forms. This person wants to file a grievance but is being told the unit does not have any forms. This person also reports that the grievance box appears to be full and no one is picking them up.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO determined that the individual was terminated from GRE for reasons that fall within policy 390.590. The individual failed to maintain placement requirements which included getting authorization before participating in community outings. The OCO followed up with the DOC about the availability and regular pick-up schedule for resolution requests. The DOC reports that grievance forms are available and picked up regularly.	No Violation of Policy
144.	The incarcerated person reports that his loved one sent him \$50 and the DOC would not deposit the funds into their account because the loved one was sending money to multiple incarcerated individuals. This person reports	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Policy 200.00 II Deposits E. Family, friends, and/or other persons may only deposit to more than one individual's trust account or to any other account maintained	No Violation of Policy

that the DOC is holding on to the funds and will not give them back.

by an approved vendor (e.g., media account) with Superintendent/designee prior approval. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern and determined that the individual could have requested a review regarding the deposit. However, this person did not follow this process, and the funds were deposited to the Incarcerated Individual's Betterment Fund.

145.	External person reports that her husband was initially denied approval for work release due to having multiple warrants, however, her husband was able to verify that he does not have warrants or detainers and wants his unit counselor to re-submit the application for work release. Person says the unit counselor is refusing to re-submit the application and is placing the blame on the work release staff instead.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy 300.500 by DOC. The OCO contacted DOC and they were informed that the person was denied locally at the work release based on the fact person did not meet the requirements for GRE.	No Violation of Policy
146.	External person reported an incarcerated individual had completed a pathway in 2018/2019 to get his good time back, which was about 300 days. He was then told that because it was a class A infraction, he couldn't get his good time back after he had already completed the pathway. He wants his good time back as promised.	The OCO reviewed the Restoration Pathway located in the Custody Facility Plan. After the review, the OCO contacted the Deputy Director. DOC 350.100 states that an individual will need to remain serious infraction free and follow the guidelines outlined in the plan to receive good time restoration. Unfortunately, the incarcerated individual has received multiple serious infractions and no longer qualifies for the Restoration.	No Violation of Policy
147.	External person reports her loved one is being poisoned and has multiple safety concerns.	The OCO contacted the incarcerated individual regarding these concerns. The individual stated they did not have any current concerns.	Person Declined OCO Involvement
148.	Incarcerated individual reports his roommate was asking him to do inappropriate things and it was making him uncomfortable. The individual reported this to DOC and staff would not listen. Then he requested protective custody and DOC placed him in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU). The individual just wanted to be moved out of the unit, not placed in IMU.	The incarcerated individual advised the OCO they did not want the OCO to investigate the complaint. The OCO verified that DOC is reviewing the allegations related to the individual's roommate and DOC has placed the individual into another unit, so he is no longer in the IMU.	Person Declined OCO Involvement
149.	Incarcerated person has multiple complaints about being treated unjustly by DOC staff. Person was accused of fighting back when attacked and was terminated from the SOTAP program. Person also has concerns about being pat searched by staff and being required to take medications that are against his religious beliefs.	The incarcerated individual wrote a kite to his counselor and asked her to call us and cancel his OCO request. The OCO contacted the facility and confirmed the cancel request.	Person Declined OCO Involvement

150.	Incarcerated individual has questions about the ORCS program, including how he will be released and if he will have a ride and if people will help him get to the CCO office.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action
151.	Incarcerated individual is inquiring if he has active warrants.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action
152.	This incarcerated individual reports that he reviewed kiosk messages confirming that money was deducted from his spendable account for restitution. This person does not understand why this happened because he does not owe restitution fees.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint. This concern was opened shortly before this person's projected release date.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action
153.	The incarcerated individual reports every time they are placed in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) it is for long periods of time because of medical needs. Individual says they are losing earned time and want a complete review of all earned time.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action
154.	The incarcerated individual reports that the staff have been extremely rude and mean since he is being held past his release date. He reports that he is refusing to accept their clothing and shoes and is ready to refuse their food.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint. This concern was submitted shortly before their projected release date.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action
155.	The incarcerated individual reports that the DOC is issuing major infractions for people wearing their masks below their nose. He reports that signs around the facility warn that individuals will receive infractions, but this happens when people are eating or taking a drink of water. This person received a major infraction, but had it overturned during an appeal. What concerns them is that other people are experiencing the same issue, and they feel like DOC is making up policy as they go along. This person also requested information about whether or not DOC has the authority in policy to issue major infractions when people are not properly wearing their masks.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action
156.	Individual expressed concerns about the lack of services available in the hospital wing. The issues include: No OCO information, JPay operation problems, no DRW information, no policy books, no kiosks to message counselors.	The OCO contacted the Health Services Administrator to inquire about these concerns. The HSA verified that the hospital wing did have limited access and the reason in the past was because it was not supposed to be a long-term housing unit. As the needs of the population change, the DOC is aware that they may need to make changes to accommodate individuals who must be housed in the hospital wing long term. The	Substantiated Without Resolution



OCO did request for OCO forms and policy information to be provided if requested.

<b>Olympia - Thurston County</b>			
157.	Person states staff that acted retaliatory and made comments about their behavior and infracted them over several comments when DOC stated they were threatening staff. They feel this is discrimination because of their religious beliefs.	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 internal DOC appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
<b>Olympic Corrections Center</b>			
158.	Individual reported that he and another individual were falsely infracted for a 752 infraction. They are being told the UA policy is not for incarcerated people to view. They are not being given the policies to represent themselves at the hearing. Policy 420.480 and 420.075 are visible when they researched them but DOC's procedure documents are not. Individual reports other procedures related to infraction and UA are not followed properly.	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 internal DOC appellate process. The OCO did speak with Superintendent and determined that they are following policy.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
159.	Incarcerated individual reports he was re-sentenced and therefore his Earned Release Date (ERD) was re-calculated. The individual reports there was an issue with the calculation determined, but no staff are willing to fix the error. The individual was promised meetings to address and resolve the error but he never met with anyone and was told to write to the headquarters records department.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed the individual's sentence and the actions of DOC. The OCO verified DOC has reviewed this calculation multiple times and confirmed that the current calculation is correct. The OCO requested and DOC staff agreed to meet with the individual to explain his time calculation. The staff member was incorrect in their calculations and DOC headquarters staff explained the issue to the individual.	Assistance Provided
160.	Person reports they have old domestic violence charges that were dismissed, but the DOC is using the charges to disqualify them from approval for GRE.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by the DOC. The current offense of the incarcerated individual is a crime against a person. Under GRE policy 300.500 the current offense and previous offense can disqualify a person.	No Violation of Policy
161.	Person states they are currently in substance abuse treatment (TC) program, with a hold that is impacting their reentry plans. Person states they should not be in TC program.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO was able to identify a DOSA compliance hold on the individual, this hold means there must be mandatory substance abuse treatment programming. This person has been released from TC program and DOC is preparing the person for release with reentry plans. The person was not able to participate in partial confinement programming because per	No Violation of Policy

policy 300.500 person must have at least four months to ERD.

162.	Incarcerated individual reported they are eligible for GRE track I, but they do not qualify because they have been assessed as being at high risk of sexual re-offense (level 3). Person reports that the sheriff is actually the one that makes the final decision about what level “sex offender” they are when they release from prison, so the sheriff could classify them at a lower level. Person reports they went to their counselor who attempted to assist with submitting an appeal but headquarters would not let them submit an appeal because they were assessed at level 3.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy 300.500 by the DOC. The OCO spoke with DOC staff and were informed that the person is “a “level 3 sex offender” and does not meet the requirement for approval of GRE.	No Violation of Policy
<b>Other: Community Custody, Jails, Out of State, Statewide</b>			
163.	The incarcerated individual reports they received an infraction, and the sanction was a loss of 10 days earned good conduct time. He had another violation for the same infraction and being in public without authorization. This person reports his community custody officer and inpatient treatment counselor came to a verbal agreement on phone that he could stay on graduated reentry (GRE). However, six days later, he was arrested and taken back to prison, they revoked his GRE, and he received 140 days added to his sentence.	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
164.	Incarcerated person is requesting resources and reentry planning assistance.	The OCO provided information to the incarcerated individual regarding reentry resources.	Information Provided
165.	The incarcerated individual reports concerns regarding community custody including the officer telling the person’s employer about their charges.	Per RCW 43.06C the OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate community custody concerns.	Lacked Jurisdiction
166.	The incarcerated individual was found guilty of a community custody violation and says the hearing process was unjust. The individual reports that he was not allowed to have witnesses on his behalf. However, a state’s witness was allowed to be at the hearing against him and this person told the hearings officer to find him guilty. The person believes this compromised the hearing, violated his rights and has led to the community custody revoke.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint does not involve a person committed to the physical custody of the DOC. This concern was created when this person was in community custody and is related to that hearing.	Lacked Jurisdiction
167.	Individual incarcerated on Graduated Re-Entry (GRE) reports they had been infractioned for unaccounted time in the community. This unaccounted time is the time they ride the bus one way to their job.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and found evidence to substantiate all three infractions. The OCO also reviewed the sanctions and find the 120 days loss of good conduct time (GCT) is within guidelines as	No Violation of Policy

each of these infractions are a category b level 3 offense and because this was their fourth serious infraction within 12 months, they would be allowed to be sanctioned with up to 180 days loss of GCT or up to 360 days loss of GCT with superintendent approval.

### Stafford Creek Corrections Center

168.	The incarcerated individual reports that they filed a grievance over a month ago, which still has not been processed. The grievance was regarding legal mail that went missing.	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
169.	Patient reports that it has been over two weeks since medical said they would see him but he hasn't been seen. Has urinary pain concerns that are persisting despite medication. He has not grieved this issue.	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's review noted that the person is receiving medical treatment from DOC.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
170.	The incarcerated individual reports that he notified the clothing warehouse that his state issued shoes are a special order size and that the facility should order a couple of pairs to keep in stock. The individual reports that he has since worn out his current pair of shoes and will need the new pair soon. The individual says that the facility has not responded to his request for a new pair of shoes in his size.	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
171.	The incarcerated individual reports that DOC policy fails to treat women with equality. The person reports the department has failed to provide a suitable alternative for women as men are allowed to remove their shirts while they are in the yard.	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
172.	The incarcerated individual reports she received sexual comments from the unit staff who are misgendering her and calling her derogatory names. The individual received infractions for swearing at staff, and there were officers who tried to advocate for her but it did not help with the infraction.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

173.	Incarcerated individual states that they tried to appeal an infraction, but it was beyond the 15-day timeframe.	Per DOC Policy 460.00(G)(1) an individual may appeal an infraction within 15 business days. 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
174.	The incarcerated individual reports that he noticed discrepancies with his pay and has been unsuccessful at getting answers from DOC staff. This person notes the rate they should have received and what was actually credited to their spendable account is incorrect.	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
175.	Person reports they have plantar fasciitis and received an order for specialized medical shoes, which DOC denied. He had the shoes and they did not fit correctly. Now DOC is saying they will not pay for them to be replaced because a different provider made the order. Person also reports access assistant concern regarding not being able to read or write and needing assistance filing grievances.	The OCO contacted health services about this concern. After OCO outreach, DOC staff reviewed to see if specialized shoes are approved in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU). The OCO was told if the shoes are approved while in the IMU, the individual will be provided the shoes; if not, the shoes will be provided when he transfers out of IMU. This office followed up and DOC reported the shoes were not approved while in IMU setting but are available and will be provided once the person transfers to general population. After speaking with the patient via phone, the OCO again contacted DOC to request information about why the medical shoes were not approved in IMU and what alternatives DOC is providing since the shoes were medically indicated. DOC then approved the shoes for IMU and reported they would be issued to the patient and he would not have to wait to access the medical shoes in general population. The OCO received an update from the patient that the shoes did not fit correctly and contacted health services to request a fitting. The facility is currently on outbreak status and only accepting emergent care appointments and will schedule the individual to address shoe size once outbreak status is lifted. Person was also approved for an Access Assistant after OCO outreach.	Assistance Provided
176.	Incarcerated individual reports they are attempting to utilize the resolution program, but are not being allowed to file resolution	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed the individual's resolution requests and found that the individual did	Assistance Provided

requests due to the amount of requests they have filed that are currently being reviewed. The individual feels like they are being punished by not being allowed access to the resolution program.

file numerous resolution requests that placed him over the limit of five active requests as outlined in the resolution program manual. The OCO found evidence indicating some misunderstanding from the individual of how to engage with the resolution program effectively. The OCO discussed the concern with DOC staff who agreed to create a plan to help the individual have success in using the resolution program and navigate prison processes.

177.	External person reported concerns about a medical hold being removed and potential transfer of their loved one to a facility that cannot meet his medical needs.	The OCO reviewed the custody facility plan and reached out to facility leadership and classifications. The individual has received multiple infractions in 2022, which changed his classification to close custody. Classifications did identify a different facility he could be placed in with an override, however if he receives another infraction, he could be sent to close custody.	Assistance Provided
178.	Incarcerated individual sent a check to TV Weekly for a subscription from their inmate trust account; however, TV Weekly claims they never received the check. The individual is requesting a refund from the department for the amount of the check that appears to be lost.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. Prior to the OCO contacting banking at the individual's facility, the check was cleared by banking as received by the recipient. The OCO confirmed the check was cleared.	DOC Resolved
179.	Person states that his new hearing aid should be at his previous facility. His new provider is trying to send him out to another outside doctor to get the hearing aids.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO verified the patient has received his hearing aids.	DOC Resolved
180.	A number of dog trainers were removed from the Brigadoon program because of their crimes. The program possibly received a grant but the condition was that individuals with sex offenses were not allowed to participate, therefore nearly 75 per cent of the trainers were removed.	The OCO contacted the facility leadership regarding this concern. The program grant funding did change, however all individuals in the program have been grandfathered in and will not lose their jobs.	DOC Resolved
181.	This person reports that DOC staff have terminated him from the Veteran's Pod and is delaying his transfer from the unit. The individual reports that white individuals are following the orders of a DOC staff member to harass black individuals in this pod.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO has determined that this person was moved out of the unit where they were having problem and is now in a different housing location.	DOC Resolved
182.	Person reported that DOC staff forged other staff signatures on multiple infractions. They would like them investigated.	The OCO reviewed this concern and the resolution request that was filed by the incarcerated individual. The DOC had substantiated this concern before OCO involvement. The staff did not write an infraction per policy and due to this the	DOC Resolved

		infraction was dismissed. The DOC leadership addressed the issue with staff.	
183.	The incarcerated individual reports that his unit is on quarantine despite the individual and his cellmate testing negative for Covid-19.	The OCO provided information regarding clinical decisions based on Covid-19 tracking and why the unit may have been put on quarantine, even if the individual and his cellmate tested negative.	Information Provided
184.	The incarcerated individual reports that medical continues to charge them a co-pay when they are not resolving their medical issue. This person has filed numerous grievances and was told to file a tort claim to get their money back. This person is requesting that medical stop charging them a co-pay until their medical issues have been resolved.	The OCO provided information regarding the DOC copay refund process. The OCO contacted DOC Health Service management and were informed the patient's co pay had been refunded and of additional resources for the patient to remedy the accounts issue.	Information Provided
185.	Incarcerated individual reports issues with his time calculation. The individual reports DOC records is running his convictions consecutively instead of concurrently. The individual reports he has tried to ask DOC staff to resolve the issue and no one is willing to fix the issue.	The OCO provided detailed information to the individual about the calculation and why it is correct. The OCO verified that DOC did a thorough review of the time calculation. DOC is following RCW 9.94A.589(2)(a) which states that confinement will run consecutively if a new conviction is placed on the person while serving time for another felony. The OCO provided information about other legal avenues for resentencing through the courts because DOC does not have authority to change court orders.	Information Provided
186.	Incarcerated individual reports DOC placed him in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) and has not shared with him why he was placed there. DOC staff are unwilling to explain to him why he is in the IMU and the paperwork he was given does not provide information about why he has been placed in the IMU. The individual reports he did not receive an infraction recently or any other behavioral issues that would constitute him being housed in the IMU.	The OCO provided information regarding the individuals IMU placement. The OCO finds that DOC placed the individual in IMU pending a confidential investigation. DOC staff reported to the OCO that the individual was told that this was the reason for his IMU placement. The OCO verified that the individual has been placed back into general population since the OCO inquired about the placement. The OCO provided this information to the individual.	Information Provided
187.	Patient reports he has not been seen by mental health in over a year. He has sent multiple kites to the providers requesting medication. He has filed resolution requests and was told he would be seeing the psychiatrist, which has not happened.	The OCO provided information to the patient about the process and eligibility to receive medications through mental health channels. The OCO reviewed the patient records and discussed the patient's case with the Director of Mental Health. Per the facility psychiatrist, the patient has been seen by mental health staff multiple times and does not meet the criteria to meet with the psychiatrist.	Information Provided
188.	The incarcerated individual has an open PREA investigation involving a staff member and after	The OCO contacted facility leadership to inquire about the PREA investigation. The	Information Provided

that he received three major and one minor infractions within a month and was then sent to segregation. When he was released he received another infraction. He believes all the infractions are related to the PREA investigation. He has not heard back about the PREA investigation.

OCO was able to substantiate that this individual has still not received a finding. After this office contacted the facility, the Superintendent was able to review the PREA allegation and it was determined to be unsubstantiated based on the evidence reviewed. There is no clear link to retaliation with the infractions he received following the PREA complaint. The OCO is reviewing the infractions in a separate case.

189.	Incarcerated individual reports he did not receive final resolution request response related to this complaint. Resolutions staff explained to him via kite that the concern was not accepted. He has appealed it. The complaint was regarding a negative comment a DOC staff member made while at an outside appointment.	The OCO verified that the Resolution Request was not accepted per the Resolution Program Manual. The incarcerated individual at the time had five open Resolutions Requests regarding other concerns. The OCO did still review the concern regarding the DOC staff member's conduct and could not substantiate what the DOC staff member said during the outside appointment.	Information Provided
190.	External person raised concerns that patients who need insulin are not receiving it in a timely manner, often hours beyond meal times. The time insulin is given is not documented and snacks are not being provided to diabetic patients when they need it either.	The OCO contacted the Health Services Manager regarding this concern. There was a delay that was identified. The insulin carts were being kept on the units in a locked room in an attempt to streamline insulin line. Some people inserted items into the lock on two separate occasions causing the DOC to have to call the locksmith to get the insulin cart out. The DOC has since moved the carts back to medical and have created a dedicated medical cart for each unit so the carts do not have to be moved between outbreak areas. The insulin cart does carry snacks for days when meals may be delayed.	Information Provided
191.	Incarcerated individual ordered religious items from Amazon and upon arrival, DOC said that he was not allowed to have them. The individual spoke to the religious program manager, who explained that religious items are only allowed to be purchased from union supply. The individual filled out a Religious Requirement Information Sheet (DOC 21-142), in hopes to obtain the rejected religious property. The individual requests access to his religious property purchased from Amazon.	The OCO provided information related to the process for purchasing religious items and appealing rejected property. DOC denied the religious property because incarcerated individuals can only buy religious materials from Union Supply. The OCO found that the individual has not engaged in the appeal process for the rejected religious property. The OCO explained to the individual completing the property rejection appeal is the correct avenue to determine if DOC will allow the individual to obtain the items. The individual has decided to use DOC 21-142 titled Religious Requirement Information Sheet, which is described in DOC 560.200 Religious Programs as, "When an	Information Provided

[incarcerated individual] requests a religious faith practice or program not currently being allowed/provided: s/he will provide the name and address of an outside religious authority of the religious faith group to the Chaplain on DOC 21-142 Religious Requirement Information Sheet. The Chaplain will send a copy of the form to the religious authority to complete and return, verifying the request is consistent with faith standards.” The DOC 21-142 will not overturn the property rejection and OCO explains to the individual in detail how to obtain the religious items he requires and how DOC 21-142 is used within DOC.

192.	Incarcerated individual transferred out of state but has not received their property from the Washington State facility they transferred from. Person has been in their new state for four months without any property and all attempts made by their family and current facility have not been answered by WA DOC.	The OCO contacted DOC classifications to verify out-of-state transfer processes. The individual will need to reach out to the property sergeant at the facility they departed from and send money for postage for the property to be sent to the new facility. The OCO sent the mailing address of the facility to the incarcerated individual.	Information Provided
193.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that the individual is going to transfer to a facility in Eastern Washington but his family is in Western Washington. The loved one reports that medical issues make driving long distances difficult and is concerned about not being able to see the individual at the new facility.	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual may appeal his classification if he does not agree with the facility transfer.	Information Provided
194.	Person reports another unit was put on quarantine and he is not sure what is going to happen to his living unit since they were in a cohort together. He would like to know if incarcerated people are still subject to quarantine per the newest version of COVID-19 guidelines.	The OCO provided information about DOC’s current COVID-19 Isolation and Quarantine protocol.	Information Provided
195.	The incarcerated individuals reports that he went to straighten up his cell after a cell search and noticed his television had been broken. The individual went to speak to one of the officers who conducted the search and the officer admitted they must have broken it. The individual reports that now the officers are denying that they broke his television.	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual can file a tort claim if his property was damaged or broken.	Information Provided
196.	The incarcerated individual reports that the facility is putting them on outbreak status. The population is being told that they have to stay on quarantine for 21 days, instead of seven. Their unit is being placed on isolation status because no one will take a COVID test, and they	The OCO provided information regarding the DOC following clinical protocols based on recommendations from the CDC for congregate living settings to determine quarantine and isolation procedures. The current guidelines do still include	Information Provided



will have to remain on this status for 21 days. Right now other people at the institution are allowed to move around and go to work, because those people are taking a rapid test. This person wants to know why the facility is making their unit stay on a 21 day quarantine when the CDC guidelines require seven days.

quarantine and isolation within DOC facilities. The length of quarantine is dependent upon the test results of the patients and staff in that unit.

197.	Incarcerated individual reports DOC has not been able to explain the outcome of an investigation they completed. The individual reports DOC staff confiscated his property as a part of the investigation and gave back some but not all of the property. The individual wants to know more details about the DOC investigation and wants DOC to return the property they confiscated.	The OCO provided information regarding the DOC investigation and how to get more information about the outcome. The OCO verified that the investigation occurred and the individual was provided information about the outcome in 2021. The investigation was prompted after DOC received reports that the individual had information about people that have active cessation orders against the individual. The individual will not be allowed to have the information back. The OCO explained the outcome of the investigation and provided the individual resources to obtain more information from DOC if needed.	Information Provided
198.	Person wants the conduct concerning the monkey pox and COVID protocols investigated. Believes DOC is testing these diseases on incarcerated individuals because DOC comes in and out of their cells all night and then they wake up with rashes.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. There is no evidence that DOC is testing viruses on the population.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
199.	Incarcerated person reports it seems like DOC is trying to turn his unit into a pod for the LGBTQ+ community.	The OCO could not find evidence to substantiate the unit reported in the concern has been turned into a pod for the LGBTQI+ community.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
200.	Incarcerated person reports ongoing disputes with a staff member who later infringed him. Person believes this was done in retaliation and although he was ultimately found not guilty of the infraction, it still remains in OMNI and could negatively impact post-conviction relief such as clemency.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office reviewed all grievances information and the incarcerated individual's infraction history. The OCO was not able to find evidence to substantiate the claim that the infraction is still viewable in OMNI.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
201.	Incarcerated person appealed a number of recent infractions and had them either overturned or dismissed. Since then, they state they have been targeted and found guilty of two major infractions, which are both under appeal. Incarcerated person feels they were not afforded proper appeal procedures.	The OCO addressed all five of the individual's concerns. First, the OCO informed the individual of the infractions that were overturned. Second, the OCO discussed the elements of each of the new infractions that were upheld as the behavior met the elements of each infraction and there was no violation of policy in upholding the infractions. Third, the OCO informed the individual that timeframes are nonjurisdictional and are not grounds for dismissal of an infraction. Fourth, the OCO	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

		discussed the concern about the Herzog memo regarding lowering infractions to general infractions, however, the individual had already had numerous warnings, negative behavioral observation entries and prior general infractions regarding the same behavior that had continued. Thus, a reduction to a general infraction was not appropriate. The OCO found no evidence to show any correlation between staff retaliation and the infractions; each of the infractions is a direct result of infractable behavior.	
202.	Incarcerated person is concerned that incarcerated individuals and staff can see his whole body when showering.	The OCO contacted the CUS of the unit regarding this concern. The CUS checked the showers and reported back to the OCO that due to the layout of the inside yards, an incarcerated individual could possibly see into the shower from inside the yard. However, the shower doors have a metal screen with tiny holes that prevents a complete clear view of the incarcerated individual. The metal screen has BB size holes so staff can still see in for safety and security reasons, but was designed to give the incarcerated individual some privacy. The OCO also requested and reviewed photos of the stall. This office could not find evidence to substantiate that staff and other incarcerated individuals can see his whole body while showering.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
203.	Incarcerated person is concerned the transgender staff and LGBTQ staff are concealing institutional prostitution and his sexuality is being exploited.	The OCO could not find evidence to substantiate that this facility is concealing institutional prostitution.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
204.	External person reports that DOC locked down the entire facility for COVID. They feel the pandemic is over and DOC should not be quarantining residents any longer.	The OCO provided information stating the DOC is following clinical protocols based on recommendations from the CDC for congregate living settings to determine quarantine and isolation procedures. There is no evidence of a violation of policy.	No Violation of Policy
205.	The incarcerated individual reports that they were put on administrative segregation after they were assaulted, and were told by DOC staff that they cannot appeal their placement because they are in protective custody. The individual is awaiting transfer to another facility, but that facility is on outbreak status so they continue to be housed in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU).	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 320.200, individuals may be assigned to administrative segregation when deemed by employees/contract staff to require protection. The individual will transfer facilities once the outbreak is over.	No Violation of Policy

206.	Individual expressed concerns about three infractions they received regarding introduction into the facility.	The OCO reviewed the infraction summary that contained the confidential information used to substantiate the three infractions for a 603 (drug introduction), 752 (positive drug test) and 889 (unauthorized usage of phone) and find no violation of policy.	No Violation of Policy
207.	Person states the COVID rules regarding testing and cohorting getting individuals down. He is concerned that the rules are confusing and not making sense. Has filed a grievance but not confident anything will come of it.	The DOC is following clinical protocols based on recommendations from the CDC and WA Department of Health for congregate living settings to determine quarantine and isolation procedures. There is no evidence of a violation of policy.	No Violation of Policy
208.	Person feels DOC is unnecessarily quarantining individuals. Person reports the superintendent is locking units down for financial gain.	The OCO provided information stating the DOC is following clinical protocols based on recommendations from the CDC for congregate living settings to determine quarantine and isolation procedures. There is no evidence of a violation of policy.	No Violation of Policy
209.	Person states DOC keeps resetting their quarantine schedule because some people are refusing to test. They feel they will not ever get off of quarantine.	The DOC is following clinical protocols based on recommendations from the CDC for congregate living settings to determine quarantine and isolation procedures. There is no evidence of a violation of policy.	No Violation of Policy
210.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about being found guilty of an infraction based off of an infraction summary that is not true. They state their PREA investigation is not being handled anonymously and the infraction is retaliation.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet for a 549 infraction (providing false information during a sexual misconduct investigation) and find there is evidence to substantiate the infraction as the individual's PREA case was deemed unfounded. Because the individual reported false information in the PREA report, they were infractions according to policy.	No Violation of Policy
211.	Incarcerated person alleges their civil and constitutional rights were violated by the DOC under racist discriminatory practices by department staff. Person claims they did not receive a fair and impartial infraction hearing and has evidence to prove such.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet, evidence photos and hearing audio and find there is evidence to substantiate the 752 infraction. The OCO also found the individual did receive a fair hearing and was allowed to have their hearing continued to receive the witness statements they had requested. Additionally, the individual's desired resolution was for the DOC staff to be fired and for the OCO to help with a lawsuit. The individual was advised that the OCO does not aid in the pursuit of any lawsuits, does not offer legal advice, and the OCO does not have the ability to have DOC staff fired.	No Violation of Policy
212.	The patient reports exhausting the grievance process through level III regarding medical treatment for a sleep disorder. DOC has seen him for sleep apnea but has not followed up on	The OCO reviewed resolution requests, behavior observation entries, and health records. The OCO also discussed this patient's case with the health services	No Violation of Policy

the other sleep disorder. He previously saw an outside doctor that recommended he see a neurologist.

management team and the Director of Mental Health. The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of the DOC Health Plan. Per the facility psychiatrist, the patient has been evaluated and it was determined to be a condition not treated under the DOC Health Plan.

213.	Incarcerated person states they were sexually assaulted by a DOC staff member and after they reported the assault they were infracted and subsequently found guilty of a major infraction because they refused to be interviewed by the assigned investigator.	The OCO reviewed information related to three incidents of a 549 infraction for providing false or misleading information during any stage of an investigation of sexual misconduct, as well as the related PREA investigations. Each of these infractions were due to false PREA reports. The individual had filed over a dozen PREA concerns in a two-month period, all of which were found to be unsubstantiated or unfounded. The individual was informed a 549 infraction is for providing false or misleading information during any stage of an investigation of sexual misconduct. In each of the three infractions the OCO reviewed, DOC found the individual had filed false PREA claims, and as a result of that, they were infracted. There is no evidence that shows they were infracted because they would not be interviewed by the investigator.	No Violation of Policy
214.	Loved one expressed concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO mailed the individual a request form to ensure they wanted us to investigate the concern, but did not respond to our office. As a result, the case was closed without further investigation. The person was advised that if this closure was made in error, the case can be reopened if they contact us.	Person Declined OCO Involvement
215.	Patient reports submitting a grievance about this concern nine months ago. To this day they still have not had their teeth cleaned. Their grievance should be at level two, but they are not sure because no one at DOC will tell them. This case was reactivated when the patient followed up with the OCO to report he still had not received his appointment.	The OCO contacted health services and verified the patient is on the list for a dental appointment for cleaning. DOC reports the facility is currently on COVID outbreak and has experienced multiple outbreaks throughout this year that have impacted dental access. DOC COVID dental protocols limit dental appointments to emergent care during facility outbreaks. The OCO cannot expedite this appointment since routine cleaning does not qualify as emergent.	Substantiated Without Resolution
216.	Person says that staff receiving training on proper response for medical emergencies is not enough. Person says this is staff misconduct and wants an official reprimand placed in the staff	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO does not have the authority to dictate staff discipline. Individuals who have been harmed or who	Substantiated Without Resolution

person's file and an investigation whether that staff person is fit for their position in DOC.

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.

### Washington Corrections Center

217.	Person cites concerns with how the units are operated at their facility. Concerns include the lack of urgency in completing the classification process, lack of ability to contact family, shower, or get recreation time when on quarantine, the policy for allowing three people to live in a cell and that gang members are controlling who has access to the phones.	The OCO is unable to investigate the concern because we are not able to verify that the incarcerated individual filed a grievance, appeal, or sought other administrative remedies as required by RCW 43.06C	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
218.	Individual reports DOC has policy for medically assisted treatment (MAT) and ADA recommends chemical dependency treatment related to addiction. Person says Suboxone use for addiction is common and this is classified as a disability. The problem at DOC is that ADA law says corrections centers must find a way to administer Suboxone to disabled individuals in a way that is safe to all individuals, however, DOC says a person only qualifies if they were already on the medication while in county prior to transfer to prison, and have 6 months left on their sentence or 90 days until release. This means that all the other individuals who do not meet this criteria are not allowed to get the proper treatment which they feel is discrimination.	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
219.	The incarcerated individual reports that staff in the close observation area would not give him water for 15 hours. The individual reports that they did receive water but only because medical staff got involved.	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
220.	The incarcerated individual reports that he works at the law library but it has been closed. He reports that DOC staff who work at the law library are being put on other tasks such as working during yard. The individual reports that due to the limited time that the law library is open, other incarcerated individuals are having trouble accessing what they need.	The OCO provided assistance by meeting with DOC Headquarters staff to discuss the concerns regarding the law library closures at this facility. The DOC is currently aware of issues at WCC. DOC staff will visit the facility law library in the upcoming weeks. The OCO has asked the DOC to share with this office the resolution to this issue after the onsite visits.	Assistance Provided
221.	Person has been attempting to resolve the issue involving a shortage of pillows in his unit.	The OCO contacted facility leadership and confirmed the pillow shortage. The DOC agreed to pass out pillowcases and extra	Assistance Provided

blankets to individuals who are waiting for a pillow.

222.	The incarcerated individual is reporting that the facility is on outbreak status and everyone is on quarantine. No one has access to visitation or EFVs and the only way individuals can communicate is via phone calls. During the pandemic earlier this year, the facility temporarily lifted sanctions of restricted phone calls so those individuals could call their families.	The OCO contacted facility leadership regarding this request. The DOC agreed to lift this sanction restriction and allow this individual to have one phone call per day during quarantine.	Assistance Provided
223.	External person reported inhumane conditions. The light is burnt out in her loved one's cell and he is in the dark 24/7. He has been served peanut butter and jelly sandwiches for all three meals and is not able to leave his cell.	The OCO contacted the facility leadership to discuss this concern. The Superintendent had already resolved part of the concern prior to the OCO involvement and responded to the external reporter. The light in his cell was replaced and it was confirmed that peanut butter and jelly sandwiches have been served once a day. Currently the facility is experiencing COVID-19 outbreaks that has limited movement in the facility.	Information Provided
224.	This person reports that he had an infraction and was found guilty. On appeal, his infraction was overturned, but the visits with his wife were still taken. This occurred a few years ago, and he is still trying to get the visits back. This person reports that he had a review hearing today and asked for the visits to be reinstated, but DOC is saying no because there was evidence for the infraction.	The OCO provided information about a recent case this person had with this office regarding this same visitation concern.	Information Provided
225.	External person reports an incarcerated person has been held at a temporary facility for an extended time during a transfer. They state he has been exposed to COVID-19 by being held there and has not received his test results as promised.	The OCO provided information to the incarcerated person regarding how to request COVID-19 test results and outbreak status of both facilities delaying transfers.	Information Provided
226.	The incarcerated individual reports that he notified staff that he was in danger of being assaulted. The individual reports that DOC staff ignored the notification that he was in danger and he was assaulted because of his offense. Staff did not do any follow up but he was moved to another cell and subsequently transferred. The DOC did not do any work to verify the claim and the individual wants to know what next steps he can take.	The OCO requested and reviewed the investigation related to this concern. There were no supporting documents, witness statements, or video evidence to substantiate that the individual reported that he was in danger of being assaulted. The OCO provided tort claim information if the individual wishes to file a claim for injury or damages.	Information Provided
227.	Incarcerated individual reported he is on medical quarantine due to COVID and was told by staff he could lose his position or be infractioned for not going to work. He was told he has to go	The OCO contacted the facility leadership regarding this concern. The OCO verified that during quarantine, individuals can safely opt out of going to work and should	Information Provided

	because he is in a position that is considered essential. His main concern is the DOC is using this to justify firing him.	not be terminated from their positions. The OCO provided information to the incarcerated individual regarding contacting this office if they are terminated while on quarantine.	
228.	The incarcerated individual reports that he is being continuously harassed and was assaulted by his cellmate.	The OCO provided information regarding this person's next steps in the event this happens again.	Information Provided
229.	Person says Incident command is not following COVID guidelines. He says two units have been quarantined. He has been pulled from work, however people from the other unit are still allowed to work and go to rec. Incident Command is not treating the two units equally. The stress of being under quarantine is more impactful than COVID at this point.	The DOC is following clinical protocols based on recommendations from the CDC for congregate living settings to determine quarantine and isolation procedures. The DOC informed this office that both units have been quarantined.	Information Provided
230.	The incarcerated individual reports that he submitted a staff misconduct grievance against the hearings officer and a sergeant. He reports that he was not allowed to use witness statements at his recent infraction hearing. The individual requested a different hearings officer, but the superintendent has said that this hearings officer is impartial. The individual believes that the hearings officer has a problem with him and is retaliating by giving him an unfair hearing.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO set-up a phone call with this individual and had a conversation about the specific details of their concern. This office then contacted DOC staff, relaying the individual's concerns with the hearings office and a possible conflict of interest. The DOC did an internal investigation and reported that there is no conflict of interest and will not be changing this person's hearings officer.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
231.	Incarcerated individual is on a hunger strike because DOC has not moved her to level 3 in the IMU. Staff took away her radio this morning saying she was not going to get it back. She said the staff are refusing to give her PREA complaint forms, so she filed them on toilet paper. She has contacted a lawyer. She does not plan to start eating or drinking until they move her to somewhere she feels safe. She is concerned they are just going to put her in the COA.	The OCO reviewed the documented behaviors that led to a level demotion. Her radio has been taken but with good behavior she will be able to have it returned within the next few days. She has been given lined paper in place of PREA complaint forms, medical kites and regular kites because many DOC forms are currently unavailable due to printing issues The PREA concerns she wrote on toilet paper will need to be rewritten on lined paper, which has been provided. The DOC reports they are giving her 20 sheets of paper every couple of days. The OCO verified she has been accepting her meals and is not on hunger strike. This office could not substantiate that the DOC is refusing her access to filing PREA concerns and she has not been moved to the COA.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
232.	Person reports that they asked for their medications and staff told them to commit suicide instead. Person says that an hour later they attempted suicide.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO's review determined that there were	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

		no witnesses who could testify to this occurring.	
233.	Incarcerated individual reports he shared with DOC staff that he was no longer affiliated with a Security Threat Group (STG) and the staff classified him as an individual requiring safe harbor. After this determination, the individual was transferred to Washington Corrections Center (WCC) and was assaulted while housed in the WCC reception center. The individual reports the assault was related to him dropping out of an STG. The individual explains he told a DOC staff that he was considered safe harbor and the staff member did not move him until after he was assaulted.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO found that the assault was not STG related based on the information reviewed. While the individual is considered a safe harbor individual, DOC determined that the receiving unit would be safe for this person. After the assault, DOC moved the individual to a safer area in the receiving units, until a bed was available in the living unit he was assigned. Once the individual was moved, he and the individual who assaulted him had been living near each other with no other issues or physical altercations.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
234.	The incarcerated individual reports that there has been a mistake in the time calculation for the remainder of his sentence. This person reports that through a series of infractions, DOC took away 200 days of good conduct time, but they should not have had 200 days left to take.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Policy 350.100 I. (A) says, Individuals may lose ERT on any eligible current or consecutive cause during the current confinement for being found guilty of a serious violation. The OCO contacted the DOC who confirmed that this policy allows the DOC to take back earned release time that had already been given on a previous cause.	No Violation of Policy
235.	Incarcerated individual reports he has been in prison since he was very young and knows that serious infractions have limits on how the DOC staff can sanction different infractions. When the individual received his first infraction many years ago, DOC took all of his good time as the sanction. The individual wants to know if the sanction was approved because it exceeds the sanction guidelines. The individual would like to have some of his good time restored and wants to understand how DOC was allowed to take this much good time away from him.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO spoke with DOC staff and found that when this infraction was issued, DOC was allowing disciplinary hearings officers to sanction individuals with a loss of good time that exceeded the sanction guidelines with proper approval. Per DOC 460.050 Disciplinary Sanctions, "If the circumstances of an offense require a sanction beyond the maximum range for loss of good conduct time per Attachment 2, the Disciplinary Hearings Officer will submit a written recommendation to the superintendent. Sanction recommendations for loss of good conduct time in excess of the guidelines established must have final approval by the Assistant Secretary for Prisons." The OCO found that the original loss of good conduct time was approved per policy, and the individual was given 46 days back after an audit of the original infraction. DOC is willing to work on a restoration plan with the individual once his current infraction behavior is improved.	No Violation of Policy



236.	External person expressed concern about an incarcerated individual receiving a 709 infraction for being out of bounds without a behavioral observation entry or warning after learning that their loved one passed away and they went to a friend's cell to grieve.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and find there is evidence to substantiate the 709 being out of bounds when they were in another individual's cell without approval. They state in their appeal that the infraction should be reduced to a 210 per the Herzog memo, however, they had already been given an out of bounds infraction that was reduced to a 210 previously.	No Violation of Policy
237.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about receiving a "refusing to program" infraction after their counselor had filled out a job application and forged their signature and then did not go to the interview for that job.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and find there is evidence to substantiate the 557 infraction for refusing to work when the individual did not attend the callout for their scheduled job interview. According to the infraction narrative, they were assigned to the job as your job screening had been completed for over a month and they did not seek a program or assignment. As a result, they were placed on that area's workers list as a default. There is no evidence that an application was filed for this job, and as a result, no signature would be needed.	No Violation of Policy
238.	External person reports that incarcerated individual is in a crowded cell with two other people, and has been in quarantine for 30 days. He is only getting 10 minutes out of cell and has not seen mental health.	The OCO contacted the DOC staff and learned the concerns had been addressed. The external person who originally contacted us declined further OCO involvement.	Person Declined OCO Involvement
239.	Person says all units in the facility he is housed at except one have received new mattresses. Person says this issue has been addressed by the OCO in the past but the R1 unit is still issuing the old mattresses which are causing him pain.	The OCO has discussed this issue with DOC and found that there is currently a halt in mattress production due to supply chain issues. DOC reports that the goal is to begin production again in early 2023. In the meantime, incarcerated individuals can kite their CUS about current mattress issues.	Substantiated Without Resolution
240.	Person states they have significant back pain that is exacerbated by the old, thin mattresses currently being issued in the unit he is housed in.	The OCO has discussed this issue with DOC and found that there is currently a halt in mattress production due to supply chain issues. DOC reports that the goal is to begin production again in early 2023. In the meantime, incarcerated individuals can kite their CUS about current mattress issues	Substantiated Without Resolution
241.	Person says that all the mattresses in the unit he is housed at are thin and that is the only unit in the facility that has not been issued the new mattress.	The OCO has discussed this issue with DOC and found that there is currently a halt in mattress production due to supply chain issues. DOC reports that the goal is to begin production again in early 2023. In the meantime, incarcerated individuals can kite their CUS about current mattress issues	Substantiated Without Resolution

242.	Person says he is developing back problems due to the poor quality of his current mattress and all of the other units at the facility he is housed at has received new mattresses with the exception of the unit he is in.	The OCO has discussed this issue with DOC and found that there is currently a halt in mattress production due to supply chain issues. DOC reports that the goal is to begin production again in early 2023. In the meantime, incarcerated individuals can kite their CUS about current mattress issues.	Substantiated Without Resolution
243.	Person says that every unit at the facility he is housed at has a new mattress except the one he is in.	The OCO has discussed this issue with DOC and found that there is currently a halt in mattress production due to supply chain issues. DOC reports that the goal is to begin production again in early 2023. In the meantime, incarcerated individuals can kite their CUS about current mattress issues.	Substantiated Without Resolution
244.	The incarcerated individuals reports that female housing was recommended by her counselor for safety and security reasons. She feels that her safety is at risk at the current facility. She wants to go to a female prison in Washington or out of state.	The OCO reviewed this individual's custody facility plan and had multiple conversations with the DOC Women's Division Leadership and DOC Classifications about this individuals facility placement. The OCO substantiated that the counselor had stated that the individual should be moved to a women's facility; however, the incarcerated individual was not approved by DOC Headquarters to move to a women's facility. The OCO could not achieve the resolution the individual had requested. They are scheduled to transfer to a different men's facility.	Substantiated Without Resolution

### Washington Corrections Center for Women

245.	The incarcerated individual reports that unit staff can be heard making fun of people in the unit from their office. The individual reports that her counselor tells her personal information about other incarcerated individuals, and has also shared her salary information with the individual. The individual says she is reporting this behavior in hopes that others do not have to experience 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
246.	Incarcerated individual reported safety concerns with their cell assignment due to housing with a transgender woman.	The OCO contacted facility leadership regarding this concern and the process to move to a different cell. The incarcerated individual was then moved.	Assistance Provided
247.	Patient reports being diagnosed without being seen by a neurologist. The neurologist consult has not been presented to the Care Review Committee (CRC) yet. The person said she was started on a medication without discussing it with a specialist first. She is currently refusing the medication due to the listed side effects.	The OCO contacted health services and DOC reports the patient's reported symptoms are being addressed via medication and monitoring, findings will be reported to a neurologist for review and consideration. DOC reports there is no diagnosis of Parkinson's and patient's symptoms are being assessed for potential referral. The OCO provided information to the patient	Assistance Provided

		<p>regarding diagnostic process and followed up with health services to see if the patient had been provided education regarding the prescription and assessment process. DOC agreed to schedule the patient with the provider and Nurse Care Manager to discuss medication, diagnostic steps, and answer any questions the patient has about her care plan.</p>	
248.	<p>Group of people showed kiosk messages regarding the option to purchase Dr. Pepper on store. They had an item code for it form a different kiosk message that has since disappeared. They were told when they tried to order it was not available. Also the prices for commissary are going up but the pay remains the same.</p>	<p>The OCO contacted CI to ask about the food selection on commissary. The DOC stated that Dr. Pepper is not available to institutions in Western Washington due to distributor rights. E.K. Beverage owns the rights to distribution of all Dr. Pepper products. This is also why they cannot sell any type of Pepsi or Coke products statewide, because they do not 'own' the distributor rights to those products. The OCO provided information regarding the process by which DOC may increase compensation for incarcerated individuals. RCW Chapter 72.64 and DOC 700.100 Class III Work Programs govern incarcerated individuals' pay. Per 72.64.020, "[t]he secretary shall make the necessary rules and regulations governing the employment of prisoners, the conduct of all such operations, and the disposal of the products thereof, under such restrictions as provided by law." The OCO reviewed DOC 700.100 Class III Work Programs which states, "[w]orkers will be compensated for hours worked. Compensation must be supported within facility budgeted funds and will not exceed \$55 per month. Exceptions to compensation, including flat rate compensation assignments, require written, advance approval from the Assistant Secretary for Prisons/designee."</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
249.	<p>Incarcerated individual reports her fiancé turned in marriage paperwork and DOC told her they would not approve her marriage because her first language is Thai and his first language is English. Individual says other people have been able to get married while in prison and she does not understand why her marriage was denied.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the status of her marriage application. The OCO's investigation found that the individual has not spoken to DOC staff or filed paperwork to start the marriage process since 2015. The OCO provided detailed information about how begin the application process for marriage. DOC staff report that DOC does not deny a marriage solely on a language barrier and has services available to facilitate marriage processes</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

with individuals who speak languages other than English.

250.	Incarcerated individual reported that CCU still hasn't gotten back to kitchen work. This is resulting in nearly no jobs for those in CCU and there are only in unit jobs. She states she has filed a resolution request but hasn't heard back and knows that the kitchen is open for work.	The OCO contacted the Superintendent to discuss this issue. The OCO substantiated that the facility was utilizing MSU only for the kitchen work during COVID outbreaks, however the schedule is changing and individuals in CCU will be going back to work. The OCO's review determined that the resolution request was still being processed within the Resolution Program guidelines.	Information Provided
251.	Person reports that the pay rate is no longer sufficient to maintain healthy hygiene and cleaning habits due to the high and rising costs of the products offered for purchase.	The OCO provided information regarding the process by which DOC may increase compensation for incarcerated individuals. RCW Chapter 72.64 and DOC 700.100 Class III Work Programs govern incarcerated individuals' pay. Per 72.64.020, "[t]he secretary shall make the necessary rules and regulations governing the employment of prisoners, the conduct of all such operations, and the disposal of the products thereof, under such restrictions as provided by law." The OCO reviewed DOC 700.100 Class III Work Programs which states, "[w]orkers will be compensated for hours worked. Compensation must be supported within facility budgeted funds and will not exceed \$55 per month. Exceptions to compensation, including flat rate compensation assignments, require written, advance approval from the Assistant Secretary for Prisons/designee."	Information Provided
252.	WCCW will not give the population access to the same channels that are available at the men's facilities. They have no sports channels.	The OCO contacted facility leadership to inquire about the cable services. When the TV/cable provider (in this case Direct TV) comes up for renewal, the tier reps are given voting forms. Incarcerated individuals vote, then turn in the forms to the Recreation Supervisor who tallies the votes. In the past it was reviewed by the facility Superintendent and Associate Superintendent of Programming who may or may not elect to remove or modify some channels selected based primarily on inappropriate content concerns. The package of channels is then purchased and fed into the facility by the vendor. There are some channels that the facility gives direction on such as programming covering multiple religions and some alternative language programming such as Spanish	Information Provided

based on population needs. There is some sports programming available on the current package but not a dedicated sports only channel. Sports channels have never been restricted or even discouraged, they just were not selected during the last review by the population. It is possible that a sports channel did not get as many votes as other premium channels like HBO etc.

253.	The population reported concerns regarding ongoing issues with a staff member. The OCO received reports that the staff member makes new rules and does not inform the tier reps. The staff member is not answering kites or kiosk messages, and is refusing to meet with people; she instead directs people to the pod officer. People have tried filing Resolution Requests but the behavior continues.	The OCO contacted facility leadership regarding this concern. The administration is working to resolve this issue by being more available in the unit and providing coaching for the staff member named in the complaint. The OCO asked the population to continue to turn in Resolution Requests if the issue is ongoing. This office will continue to monitor the concern.	Information Provided
254.	The incarcerated individual reports that a staff member is continuously harassing her by reading her mail, withholding medications, and banging on her door at all hours of the night. The individual reports that this staff member has also commented incorrectly on her sexual orientation.	The OCO discussed medication withholding concerns with the patient by phone. The patient reported additional details about the particular staff member who would not provide her medication as Keep On Person (KOP). She shared that she had since moved units and was no longer interacting with that staff member. The OCO confirmed the patient is now receiving KOP medications. The OCO shared self-advocacy information with the patient for any new medical concerns and discussed how she can request an appointment to review her medical records.	Information Provided
255.	Person reports that classes are being delayed because of COVID, this means that they do not get to phase up and their programming is delayed. As a result of the delays, holds for GRE take longer and inevitably this impacts their release plans.	The DOC is following clinical protocols based on recommendations from the CDC for congregate living settings to determine quarantine and isolation procedures. The facility outbreak status does impact programming and education.	Information Provided
256.	The incarcerated individual reports that they are having problems with their cellmate. They have gone to numerous staff members requesting help because their roommate is yelling all the time and keeping them up most of the night. This person reports they filed an emergency grievance but staff said that this is not an emergent situation.	The OCO provided information regarding how to request a cell move.	Information Provided
257.	The incarcerated person stated that staff spoke poorly to her visitor. Person was ill and the nurse was forced to come to visitation and provide care with other persons present. She received two general infractions from the staff.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO requested all footage from the day of incident and none could be provided because the 30-day retention window had	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

passed. Additionally, no infractions could be found.

258.	Person had a classification review and the Correctional Unit Supervisor (CUS) asked why she was not going to work in the kitchen. She explained that she has a Health Status Report (HSR) for standing limitations. Then the provider wrote to her saying CUS called her and now she cannot provide her with an HSR. She believes the CUS should not have contacted her provider.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted Health Services management and were informed that the Health Status Report in question expired and was not discontinued by the provider. The person has since changed jobs to one that does not have the same standing requirement.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
259.	The incarcerated individual reports that she has a false PREA allegation which has been substantiated. The alleged victim is a friend who has repeatedly stated that there is no inappropriate situation between them. The individual said they had a verbal argument and the PREA complaint was reported by a third party. The individual feels that she may be targeted because she is a transgender woman.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The PREA case was found to be unsubstantiated.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
260.	Incarcerated individual reported staff misconduct that is impacting her GRE. He threatened her with having to stay until her max date because she reported his lack of action. She quit her job after she complained about conditions and he threatened to take away her housing voucher.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of DOC 300.500. The OCO made contact with the DOC staff member who stated that the incarcerated individual was approved for GRE but the individual opted to decline participation.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
261.	The incarcerated individual reports she was sent back to prison on a graduated reentry (GRE) revoke for having Suboxone tabs at her treatment center. She was approved for Suboxone, had allergic reactions to the strips, and switched to tabs. She reports that she was never informed tabs were not allowed. She was not given her medication and missed several doses because her medical notes mentioned she was allergic to Suboxone strips. She was taken by ambulance to the ER for medical emergencies, her GRE was revoked, and she was sent back to prison.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
262.	Persons complaint suggests that they have been targeted for having a relationship with a transgender person.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO spoke with DOC staff and they were informed that the move was made based on safety and security policy of the facility. The OCO cannot impact change to inside housing placement.	No Violation of Policy
263.	Incarcerated person reports that she was spoken to and treated disrespectfully by a staff member when she asked for cleaning supplies. Person says she filed a Resolution Request but	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy 100.500 by DOC. The OCO's review determined that the Resolution Program	No Violation of Policy

	the coordinator's response defended the staff member's behavior.	was unable to substantiate the claim due to a lack of witnesses.	
264.	Incarcerated person was infraacted for refusing to work in the kitchen, however, they have medical conditions that make them not physically able to perform the job duties.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet for the 557 refusing to program and found the individual does have an HSR related to weightlifting restrictions. At the time the OCO received the case, the appeal had not been responded to for several months and contacted the facility who responded to the appeal and upheld the infraction on the basis that the staff were working to accommodate the individual's HSR needs so that they would be able to work in their assigned position despite the weightlifting restriction.	No Violation of Policy
265.	Person reports retaliation and set up by DOC due to a pending civil rights lawsuit and received three 603 infractions.	The OCO was unable to find any evidence to substantiate retaliation or a set up by DOC due to a pending civil rights lawsuit as there is evidence to substantiate each of the three 603 infractions after reviewing the infraction and appeal packet for each of the infractions.	No Violation of Policy
266.	Patient was told they would have a comprehensive dental exam in January and it has not occurred yet.	The OCO verified the patient was scheduled for a comprehensive dental exam earlier in the year, however, COVID outbreaks at the facility initiated the DOC Dental COVID protocols. During facility outbreaks, nonemergency dental care is canceled and only emergent dental needs are addressed. The protocol has been updated and the facility is no longer on outbreak. DOC confirmed the patient was scheduled for a dental appointment.	No Violation of Policy
267.	Person is a transgender male and feels like he is being discriminated by unit staff. Person has had several medical emergencies and felt they were not being listened to.	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. The OCO requested for the person to call the OCO and they did not return the call.	Person Declined OCO Involvement

### Washington State Penitentiary

268.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports concerns regarding staff shortages at the individual's facility. The loved one reports that this creates multiple issues for the incarcerated individuals as well as DOC staff.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	--	--	-------------------------------------

269.	Family member expressed concerns about loved one entering their incarceration while needing a surgery for a nerve condition in their arm. The individual was attacked and felt further damage done to their arm. They have requested medical assistance multiple times and is only being given ice which the family member feels is inadequate and a major violation of the individual's right to receive proper medical treatment. The family member requested the patient be released on GRE.	The patient has not filed a medical grievance or contacted this office after receiving a letter from the OCO. Because the patient has not reported a medical concern and the family member's request relates to the person being approved for GRE, the OCO has closed this case and will await a medical related request from the patient before pursuing a medical related review.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
270.	Incarcerated person reports several instances of retaliation by staff after filing medical emergency grievances. Person says this retaliation has cost him ten weeks of isolation and several infractions.	The OCO reactivated and staffed this case. After review, this office found the individual has not appealed the infractions. This office is reviewing the medical care in a separate case.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
271.	Incarcerated individual reports concerns regarding mistreatment with the sergeant and other officers, as they have been infracted and had their radio and points taken away. They also report concerns regarding food, commissary, and a cell search.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
272.	The incarcerated individual reports that he has been trying to get off the vegan diet (Mainline Alternative) because it is giving him heartburn and makes him sick. He wants to switch to the regular diet, and he reports that he filed a grievance two weeks ago but has not received a response. The person was told by the chaplain that his request was approved but his diet has not changed.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted the DOC religious coordinator who explained how an individual may request to change their diet. The OCO followed up the chaplain who re-submitted this person's diet change request. The next day the OCO determined that this person's diet had been modified to end their mainline alternative diet. The OCO arranged for a follow-up phone call with the incarcerated individual to ensure that the dietary changes had been made. The individual reported that they had made an appointment with the medical department who also changed their diet from the Mainline Alternative.	Assistance Provided
273.	Person reports dementia, terminal illness, and regular diaper use. He is concerned that the bar association refuses to represent him and the Governor refuses to respond. He said the clemency board said they will not accept any more petitions. He shared concerns about his family and says DOC does not give him proper medical attention. He has grieved this to level III and says DOC will not give him his medications.	The OCO substantiated a delayed follow up appointment and after OCO outreach, DOC agreed to schedule the patient with his provider. The OCO later confirmed the appointment had occurred and an additional follow up had been scheduled. DOC submitted DOC Form 13-420 in response to mental health concerns reported by the individual to headquarters and considering the reports about medical access from OCO. The patient was then seen by a mental health provider. This office	Assistance Provided



does not have jurisdiction over clemency or bar association concerns.

274.	Patient reports ongoing issue with toe fungus. DOC medical has removed toenails on all toes and has not prescribed anti-fungal medication. Person says that he has filed a grievance and has not gotten any relief since the removal of the toenails.	The OCO contacted health services and verified the patient had several toenails removed and was prescribed pain medication. No antifungal cream was given at that time as the treatment plan was to remove the toenails with the fungus and for the patient to return if the issues arise again. After OCO outreach, DOC health services agreed to prescribe oral medication (antifungal) as well as labs to check liver function now and in six weeks. If medically indicated, the medication will be considered for an additional six weeks.	Assistance Provided
275.	Incarcerated person reports he was air evacuated out of the facility. Patient says he was bleeding internally and had to have four blood transfusions at the hospital. Person reports they have been back at the facility for several days and are starting to spit up blood again.	The OCO contacted health services leadership at DOC headquarters to review the patient's medical records, history, and care plans. OCO review determined that the patient's care is being monitored by the Chief Medical Officer considering his complex medical and mental health conditions, ongoing concerns, and fear of DOC medical staff. The patient also requested information regarding Extraordinary Medical Placement (EMP), which the OCO provided via hotline.	Assistance Provided
276.	Incarcerated individual is housed in the Washington State Penitentiary Intensive Management Unit (WSP IMU) for non-disciplinary reasons and does not want to lose his food property. DOC staff have explained to him that per WSP Operational Memorandum (OM) 440.000, "consumables will not be held in long term storage." This means if an individual is held in the WSP IMU for more than 30 days, they will have to dispose of their food property. The individual has attempted to communicate via kite to DOC staff requesting they allow his food items to be held until he is transferred to another facility, but DOC was not responsive to his communications. The individual also tried to use the resolution process, appealing each response, but DOC resolutions staff insist this is a COVID-19 related issue and therefore are not willing to accept the resolution request.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke with WSP facility leadership, and they agreed to allow the individual to keep all unopened and non-expired food items. WSP staff agreed to review concerns similar to this on a case-by-case basis. The individual has since been transferred out of the IMU and into a housing assignment that allows people access to all of their property items.	Assistance Provided
277.	Person is concerned that this office is not receiving his concerns. Person cites several cases that were not listed in our database when reviewed with an OCO staff person while on the hotline.	The OCO reviewed and provided a status update on the person's current active cases via phone. This office verified receipt of the person's concerns and clarified the number of current active cases and topics covered in each case.	Assistance Provided

278.	Person is housed in the IMU and was approved for transfer five months ago but has not been finalized. Person says the administration is aware of this issue but have not taken action and this is against DOC policy.	The OCO contacted DOC HQ classifications regarding this concern. The OCO was able to confirm that the transfer has been finalized and he is scheduled to move. Due to COVID-19 outbreaks at numerous facilities, the transfer process has been delayed.	Assistance Provided
279.	Person had previous cases with the OCO and now has a lawsuit open with the DOJ Office for Civil Rights. Person wants the OCO to aid in the DOJ's investigation given this office's familiarity with DOC staff.	The OCO is not able to assist with this request. 43.06C.040(2)(j) states that "[t]he ombuds must remain neutral and impartial and may not act as an advocate for the complainant or for the department." Additionally, WAC-138-10-040 states the ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The requested resolution is not within the ombuds' statutory power and authority. The OCO does not have the statutory power or authority to assist with litigation.	Declined
280.	External complainant reports their loved one suffers from chronic back pain and recently injured his back again. He was in need of a cortisone shot related to sciatic nerve condition, but he was told that night he could only get the shot if he was able to walk to the health services building. He was unable to walk due to pain, the reason for needing the shot. He was then scheduled for his cortisone shot but that appointment has been canceled by WSP medical at least three times and the person has not been able to access their medication.	The OCO contacted health services and confirmed the patient had received recent appointments for injections after outreach from the incarcerated individual's loved one.	DOC Resolved
281.	The incarcerated individual reports that they will be transferred to another facility, and their safety is in danger. Right now, this person is supposed to be transferred to a facility's close custody, and they cannot be released to the general population because they are a security threat group (STG) dropout. This person has pursued every avenue possible by writing their concerns to their counselor, submitting a grievance, writing to classifications, and sending a letter to headquarters and the chief of classifications.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The incarcerated individual has been transferred to the close custody facility he requested.	DOC Resolved
282.	The incarcerated individual reports being pepper sprayed during a suicide attempt and now has an eye infection. He said he has had two rounds of treatment for his eye but it is still infected.	The OCO contacted health services to discuss DOC's response to the suicide attempt and whether the patient had received treatment for eye irritation after being exposed to OC spray. This office substantiated DOC sprayed the patient with OC spray during a use of force response to a suicide attempt. The patient received a	DOC Resolved

		<p>medical assessment and a prescription for eye drops to help with the irritation. The OCO substantiated the prescription had been discontinued while the patient was in the Close Observation Area (COA). During a meeting with health services leadership at the facility, DOC confirmed the patient had a recent appointment to discuss eye issues and the prescription had been reactivated. DOC had resolved the prescription concern prior to OCO outreach.</p>	
283.	<p>External person reports they have been unsuccessful in getting a clear explanation from the GRE team why her loved one is not eligible for the GRE program. Person says the GRE criteria and the initial reason for denial is conflicting and the answer given by the screening team seems to overlook the RCW establishment of how the earned release date is to be used.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to confirm through email evidence that the DOC GRE Program Supervisor reached out to this external person and scheduled a phone call to discuss her questions.</p>	DOC Resolved
284.	<p>Family member of an incarcerated individual reports that DOC did not complete the documents needed for DOC to prove a fair review of the decision to approve or deny an Extended Family Visit (EFV). The family member knows this because the requested all documentation related to their denial of visits and DOC reported the document does not exist.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO found DOC staff explained to the family member that at the time they requested the documentation, only the facility level review had been completed. The documentation was not required at the facility level determination, therefore the form did not exist at the time of the request. DOC did use the form once the EFV decision was appealed and DOC headquarters EFV Review Committee reviewed the appeal. DOC explained this information to the incarcerated individual's family member.</p>	DOC Resolved
285.	<p>External person reports incarcerated individual was beaten almost to death by other incarcerated individuals. He is now in a coma. They do not want him to go back to WSP.</p>	<p>The OCO substantiated that this incident did occur. The individual was hospitalized for an extended amount of time and has now been returned to the facility. He is in a vegetative state and is currently in the infirmary with 24-hour care. The DOC is currently working on an extraordinary medical placement.</p>	Information Provided
286.	<p>Person was on the MAT program since being incarcerated and allowed to maintain medication while in initial facility. Person was then transferred and removed from the MAT program, however, they will be releasing in less than six months and would like to be put back on the program to promote a successful transition.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information on how to be placed on the MAT program. Patients will need to request consideration for induction (the process to start the medication) from their healthcare provider. Not all facilities offer this part of the MAT program. If their facility is not one that offers the MAT induction process, they will be provided with resources prior to release to get support in the community.</p>	Information Provided

287.	Incarcerated individual reports that class three wages have not increased since 1989 and have not kept up with today's inflation. Commissary prices have increased over the last month and the population was informed via kiosk message. The individual requests an increase in wages for incarcerated individuals.	The OCO provided information regarding the process by which DOC may increase compensation for incarcerated individuals. RCW Chapter 72.64 and DOC 700.100 Class III Work Programs govern incarcerated individuals' pay. Per 72.64.020, "[t]he secretary shall make the necessary rules and regulations governing the employment of prisoners, the conduct of all such operations, and the disposal of the products thereof, under such restrictions as provided by law." The OCO reviewed DOC 700.100 Class III Work Programs which states, "[w]orkers will be compensated for hours worked. Compensation must be supported within facility budgeted funds and will not exceed \$55 per month. Exceptions to compensation, including flat rate compensation assignments, require written, advance approval from the Assistant Secretary for Prisons/designee."	Information Provided
288.	Person followed up on previous OCO case to report he was in IMU during the missed appointments and staff did not make an effort to bring him in. He filed an emergency grievance today for pain and has not been seen for the emergency grievance. He has an enlarged spleen, is retaining water, and has serious gastrointestinal (GI) issues. Patient says he was supposed to have a specialist consult, that the specialist's email said to follow up after a few months if issues continued, and it has been longer than that. He is not healing small injuries normally, has abnormal bruising, and GI complications.	The OCO contacted health services and confirmed the patient had been seen for the reported concerns. Providers have discussed GI specialist options with the patient and he declined the appointment due to fears of it impacting his release date. The OCO provided the individual with self-advocacy information for contacting DOC if he changes his mind about this appointment after confirming it would not impact his release date. The individual filed multiple mental health and medical concerns and the OCO met with the Health Services Manager and mental health specialist to discuss monitoring of the patient's ongoing care needs.	Information Provided
289.	Person reports several medical and dental appointments have been cancelled. He reports suffering two heart attacks this week. He believes he is going blind in his left eye because of an infection. He is being harassed by another incarcerated person which he says is complicating his heart problems. He is having issues chewing his food because dental will not fix his teeth. He is requesting a Health Status Report (HSR) for a single person cell and that the OCO contact the Governor for clemency.	The OCO contacted health services and verified the patient had received a recent medical appointment with recommendation of follow up in six months. This office also verified the patient had been scheduled for dental treatment but refused the appointment. DOC dental has recommended tooth extraction related to infections and has attempted to discuss this treatment plan with the patient, including offering a referral for an outside dental specialist. The individual was screened for a single cell and was denied. The OCO could not provide the resolution requested as the office does not have jurisdiction over	Information Provided

		clemency. The OCO provided self-advocacy information regarding following up with dental if he chooses to move forward with treatment.	
290.	The incarcerated individual reports that Union Supply is charging too much money for the items in their catalog.	The OCO provided information regarding inflation; it is not within DOC's control.	Information Provided
291.	The incarcerated individual reports that his dentures were thrown away by DOC staff and the DOC will not replace them. The individual was quarantined and staff packed up his property. He reports that his dentures were on the top bunk and staff threw away everything that was on the top bunk as trash.	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual can file a tort claim if his dentures were thrown out and are not located through his resolution request.	Information Provided
292.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that staff at the individual's facility held a barbeque for DOC staff using funds from the Incarcerated Individual Betterment Fund (IIBF).	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office confirmed that the barbeque was paid for using funds allotted from DOC Headquarters.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
293.	Incarcerated person was infractioned for assaulting a medical staff member, however the person states they are legally blind and just bumped into the staff person.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet for a 661 infraction for sexual harassment of a staff member and a 704 infraction for a staff assault. The individual was advised that the standard of evidence for guilt in prison infractions is very low and in a prison disciplinary hearing, only some evidence is needed which is often only a staff person's statement. Because there is no video evidence of this alleged incident, the OCO is unable to substantiate the individual's statement of events and the "some evidence" standard is what is used to substantiate the infraction.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
294.	Incarcerated individual reports they were assaulted by DOC staff while being served their meal through the cuff port. Incarcerated individual was bent down to speak to the staff member through the cuff port and the staff member hit him in the face with the tray. The individual was not offered medical attention after the incident.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed video and investigative documentation that report the interaction occurred because a DOC staff was not engaging in a conversation with the individual about obtaining a new towel. The DOC staff continued with dinner distribution and did not engage in the conversation. The OCO verified DOC staff did place the foam dinner tray into the cuff port while the individual was bent down speaking through the opening. However, the DOC staff did not push the tray through with movement that would prove intent to harm. After the incident occurred, the incarcerated individual was able to speak with the unit sergeant and received access to medical	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

		care. The OCO confirmed DOC medical staff assessed the individual and determined there were no major injuries at the time of assessment.	
295.	The incarcerated individual reports that they were assaulted by staff; believes it was because of their skin color.	The OCO requested and reviewed the investigation related to this concern. During the investigation, the incarcerated individual declined to be interviewed. By the time this concern was reported to the OCO, video footage of the reported incident was no longer available. The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
296.	Incarcerated individual was placed in Intensive Management Unit (IMU) and was not served regular meals. Individual also tried to file emergency grievances for medical and mental health services, but staff were unresponsive. The individual reports his CPAP machine power was cut off while sleeping and after was taken away. Incarcerated individual requests access to his CPAP machine and the supplies for its use and access to mental health and medical care.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO verified that the individual has access to meals and is being seen regularly by mental health and medical staff. The OCO verified that the individual's CPAP machine was taken due to a pattern of misusing the machine. Medical is overseeing the individual during this time to ensure he is stable without the CPAP machine. DOC medical is willing work with the individual to create a plan to obtain the CPAP machine again. The OCO provided the individual with advice on how to continue to work with DOC medical to work out a plan to allow him access to the CPAP machine.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
297.	Loved one expressed concerns on behalf of their family member who is incarcerated and received several infractions for items being in the common area of the cell that did not belong to them.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and found there is evidence to substantiate all four infractions which included a 702 infraction (possession of unauthorized tool) for sandpaper that was found in their cell, a 603 (introduction of drug paraphernalia) for a pen that they altered into a pipe to smoke with that tested positive for meth, a 710 infraction (possessing tattoo paraphernalia) for a tattoo needle that was found in their cell and a 606 infraction (possessing tobacco) for a tea bag that was found in their cell filled with a tobacco like substance that had a tobacco aroma. They claimed possession of the sandpaper, tattoo needle and the altered pipe pen thereby substantiating the 702, 603 and 710 infractions. Regarding the 606 infraction, the tobacco was found in the common area of the cell and upheld as a cell tag which is within policy.	No Violation of Policy

298.	The incarcerated individual reports that he sent a letter to the OCO but it was rejected by the mailroom and returned to him.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by the DOC. The incarcerated individual wrote "Legal Mail" on the envelope which would require DOC staff to enter the mail in the mail log. Per DOC 450.100, employees will not document (e.g., mail log) sending, receiving, or issuing mail to/from the Office of the Corrections Ombuds.	No Violation of Policy
299.	The incarcerated individual reports that someone attacked them and they are now in segregation for their own protection. They were supposed to be leaving on GRE and they are wondering if that is still going to happen. They have kited their counselor and staff, but no one will tell them what is going on. They are wondering if DOC changed their earned release date too.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy 300.500 by DOC. The OCO contacted DOC staff and learned that the person is still approved for GRE.	No Violation of Policy
300.	Incarcerated individual reports when he transferred to Washington State Penitentiary (WSP), WSP staff determined that his TV was altered and therefore not allowed in the facility. The individual reports the staff at his previous facility allowed the TV to be shipped out with no issue, therefore he does not understand why WSP staff will not allow him to have the TV. The individual reports there is a small issue with the cord but other than that the TV is in good condition.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO spoke with DOC staff and found that the determination was in compliance with DOC 440.000 Personal Property for [Incarcerated Individuals], which states, "[t]he following items will be considered contraband when found in an [incarcerated individuals] possession and will be disposed of per the Disposition section of this policy: Any items found in the [Incarcerated Individual's] possession having distorted or altered markings and/or are substantially modified from the manufacturer's original configurations." The determination for allowable property is the decision of the receiving facilities property sergeant.	No Violation of Policy
301.	The individual had a recent previous case with the OCO and was told that he was going to be re-classified with medium points and moved appropriately. This person reports that they are still in Close Custody and met with their counselor, who requested an override to keep him in close custody. The person reports that staff told him that if his family does not stop calling headquarters, they will send him to the worst place possible.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Policy 320.200 II (C) Upon receipt of an individual's written request for protective custody, the individual will be designated as a voluntary, temporary assignment to Administrative Segregation. This person requested placement in administrative segregation for their own protection, which means that DOC is not violating policy by keeping them there.	No Violation of Policy
302.	Person was found guilty of two infractions as a result of contraband found in the cell they share with another person. Their cellmate admitted responsibility for the items found and that this person had no knowledge of them and made a	The OCO reviewed the infraction summary for a 602 infraction for possessing a weapon and a 734 infraction for unauthorized gang activity when a cell search resulted in the finding of numerous contraband items.	No Violation of Policy

	statement as such. Person says the infractions are unjust for something they did not do and have negatively impacted their ability to participate in the GRE program.	Because all of this was found in the common area of the cell, it was upheld as a cell tag. Due to the massive amount of contraband, DOC upheld the infraction as they found it hard to believe that due to the sheer volume of the contraband, the individual had no knowledge of it in the cell.	
303.	The incarcerated individual reports a need to see a neurology specialist. He reports that he has received two MRIs but nothing else has been done and lack of treatment is causing other complications. He says he is not receiving medical care and reports that the DOC has lied to the OCO and told the office that he is receiving care. He has put in multiple kites and grievances and is told they will get to him but it has not happened. He is concerned that once again DOC will say they are going to do something and send him to a neurologist but it will not happen.	The OCO contacted health services and verified the patient received an MRI in June; neurosurgery reviewed and did not recommend surgical intervention at this time and the patient's treatment plan was updated. Patient is scheduled with neurology; appointment dates cannot be shared with patients for security reasons. The OCO confirmed the appointment date aligns with neurology recommendations and cannot influence an earlier appointment date with the specialist. The OCO confirmed the neurosurgery appointment occurred and neurology follow up is scheduled.	No Violation of Policy
304.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about receiving two infractions for refusing housing because their cell was not ADA accessible. This has pushed back their early release date (ERD) by two months which is impacting their release plan. The individual needs a permanent ADA cell because of their limited mobility and this was not granted at the headquarters level.	The OCO reviewed the 724 refusing housing infractions and found that DOC accommodated their requests for both an ADA accessible cell and an alternative location for housing but each time these accommodations were made, the individual still refused the housing. DOC attempted to place them in general population and they stated that would not be willing to release to that particular cell and understood that they would be infraacted for refusing a housing assignment.	No Violation of Policy
305.	Incarcerated person reports that a staff member targeted them and they were subsequently infraacted for something they did not do. Person says the staff member did not open their door so they could get their lunch tray. When they were able to get the attention of staff to open the door lunch was done being served. The staff member then infraacted this person for threatening someone else, but person says they could not have done it because they were locked in their cell during lunch and then went right back to their cell when they finally got the door open and saw that lunch was over. Person does not believe they got a fair hearing.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet as well as the hearing audio for a 506 infraction for threatening another with bodily harm that was reduced to a 663 infraction for using intimidation against any person. The individual expressed concerns about not being given witness statements but per the infraction report and hearing audio, the hearings officer confirmed with the individual that they did not want any witness statements and the individual confirmed that that is correct. The individual also expressed concerns about the infraction being changed to a 663 after they had prepared to defend themselves against a 506. The change from a 506 (category b level 1 infraction) to a 663 infraction (category c level 1 infraction) was	No Violation of Policy



		a reduction that benefited them as 5 points instead of 10 points were taken. The 663 element of the “[incarcerated individual] has used body language, words or actions to intimidate another [incarcerated individual]” was met.	
306.	Person reports that he is not being seen by medical for back pain. He also expressed a need for a new mattress.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint. The OCO confirmed the patient was seen by medical prior to releasing to the community.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action
307.	Incarcerated individual reports his Earned Release Date (ERD) was changed to a later date because he refused a telephone interview about financial matters with a person DOC would not identify. The individual reports there is no other reason that his good conduct time would be lost.	The OCO found that no good conduct time was revoked from the individual’s ERD. The OCO confirmed the telephone call was related to his release planning and was not related to his finances. The OCO verified that the individual was not negatively impacted for declining the call. The individual has not been willing to work with his classification counselor on his release planning, which is holding him past his release date. This individual was released prior to the OCO providing information about how to resolve the individual’s complaint.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action
308.	Incarcerated individual reports he was transferred to Washington State Penitentiary Intensive Management Unit (WSP IMU) to complete maximum custody programming. The individual paid to have his property transferred to WSP. Upon arrival, he was given a property disposition form and told he needed to inform DOC of how to dispose of his commissary items because per WSP Operational Memorandum (OM) 440.000, “Consumables will not be sent to Long Term Storage.” Property disposition forms are used to allow incarcerated individuals to choose whether DOC disposes of the property or sends it out to a community member at the individual’s expense. The individual says this OM is not a policy and when he tried to file a resolution request about the OM DOC said this was not an issue accepted by the resolution department.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO found that DOC did provide the individual with a property disposition for the disposal of his food property after arriving at WSP. After the OCO received multiple concerns related to this 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. The OCO finds that because the individual was housed in the WSP IMU on maximum custody DOC was not willing to allow him to have his food items. They were disposed of as a result.	Substantiated Without Resolution
309.	Incarcerated individual reports that two units in their facility have not exchanged all of the old mattresses for new ones yet. The individual attempted to file a Resolution Request to address their concern and noted that they were	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO was informed by DOC that mattress production has been delayed due to distribution issues. The OCO was	Substantiated Without Resolution

told more mattresses could be purchased using pandemic emergency funds. The resolution program requested that the individual contact OCO because they did not know anything about the status of the new mattresses or the agreement DOC made with the OCO after the mattress report was published. The individual reported they also contacted medical to obtain a new mattress for medical purposes.

informed that the mattress distribution will begin again once the production resumes. DOC is releasing a memo to the incarcerated population with this information. The OCO shared the process for appealing a resolution request deemed not accepted by the facility to headquarters for review. This concern is one that can be answered internally by the resolutions department.

310.	Incarcerated person appealed their current classification decision. Person states they have completed all requirements and programs and have been sitting in maximum custody for nine months without the possibility of promoting. Person says this violates all reform policies implemented this year.	The OCO has had multiple conversations with DOC Classifications regarding this placement. The DOC has stated that due to STG activity it has been difficult to find this incarcerated individual a safe placement. The department is currently working on creating a viable placement for individuals who are not safe in general population who will not accept safe harbor. The OCO substantiated this concern, however this office could not reach a resolution with the DOC.	Substantiated Without Resolution
311.	Person received a badly damaged mattress when they arrived at the facility. He attempted to bring this to staff's attention by making several requests for a new mattress and was repeatedly turned down stating various reasons. Person is of a larger size and his current mattress is used/damaged beyond reasonable use causing him physical pain and declining mental health due to inability to sleep restfully on the damaged mattress. Person quoted a previous OCO systemic report detailing the ability for DOC to issue a second mattress to accommodate problems such as this; DOC denies this is feasible.	The OCO has discussed this issue with DOC and found that there is currently a halt in mattress production due to supply chain issues. DOC reports the goal is to begin production again in early 2023. In the meantime, incarcerated individuals can kite their CUS about current mattress concerns.	Substantiated Without Resolution

## **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