

Notice: The Office of the Corrections Ombuds is currently updating our case closure process to ensure that our data reflects the outcomes reached by the office and to provide greater transparency into the work of the office. We anticipate implementing these changes with the March 2022 Monthly Outcome Report.

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). Per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(k), at the conclusion of an investigation of a complaint, the ombuds must render a public decision on the merits of each complaint.

As of September 1, 2020, all cases open at the time and all cases opened since by OCO are considered investigations for the purposes of the statute. The following pages serve as the public decision required by RCW 43.06C.040(2)(k).

In providing an anonymous summary of each complaint, OCO staff have worked to limit as much identifying information as possible while still providing a substantive explanation of the concern so as to protect the complainant’s confidentiality while also providing transparency into the office’s work.

Note: The following case summaries also include OCO’s closed case reviews, in which a complainant whose case was closed requests a review by the supervisor.

All published monthly reports are available on oco.wa.gov/reports-publications/monthly-outcome-reports.

Case Status	Explanation
Assistance Provided	OCO, through outreach to DOC staff, was able to achieve full or partial resolution of the person’s complaint.
DOC Resolved	Case was resolved by action of DOC staff prior to OCO action.
Lack Jurisdiction	Complaint did not meet OCO’s jurisdictional requirements (not about an incarcerated individual, not about a DOC action, or person did not reasonably pursue grievance/appellate procedure).
No Violation of Policy	After reviewing all relevant documents and DOC policy, OCO staff determined that DOC policy was not violated.
Unable to Substantiate	Insufficient evidence existed to support the complainant’s allegation.
Information Provided	OCO provided self-advocacy information.
Substantiated	OCO substantiated the concern/allegation, but it was not resolved by DOC and OCO was unable to reach a negotiated agreement.
Decline/Other	Some other reason existed for the closure of the case, generally release.

Monthly Outcome Report

December 2021

Institution of Incident	Complaint/Concern	Outcome Summary	Case Closure Reason
Airway Heights Corrections Center			
1.	Family member reports concerns that incarcerated individual is having difficulty starting suboxone prior to his release. Patient is approaching his release date and requested to begin the MAT/Suboxone program before his release. He has discussed with medical staff and was told to watch the callouts but still has not received an appointment.	The OCO notified facility and headquarters administration of this concern. Learned that the delayed initiation/access to MAT programming was due to staffing shortages. Learned that patient was scheduled for post release clinic and prescription upon release. Individual released to community prior to the OCO closing this case.	Declined, Other
2.	Incarcerated patient was approved for outside specialist appointment. He went to the appointment multiple times, but each time he was late due to shortages of appropriate transport staff and had to return to prison not having been seen by the specialist.	The patient released from DOC prior to the OCO investigating this complaint.	Declined, Other
3.	Incarcerated individual went to segregation and requested their active legal work. They never received any of the paperwork requested.	Incarcerated person has not grieved to level 2. Per RCW 43.06C, OCO cannot investigate a concern until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it via the grievance process, administrative action, or appellate process.	Declined, Other
4.	Incarcerated patient reported several concerns related to health services. (1) Following DOC removing jaw wires, he learned from outside specialist that his jaw was still unhinged. Provider said he would need to get his jaw wired again and they would have to check to see what DOC would allow. (2) Following jaw being wired shut a second time, he experienced a seizure and broke his foot in three places. Reports that nurse reviewed the wrong chart and told him to take Ibuprofen. Reports being afraid that foot is not healing correctly. Part of foot is still swollen. Requested	The OCO notified health services staff at the facility that this patient transferred to after contacting this office. OCO staff was able to verify that DOC is coordinating with an outside specialist regarding the incarcerated individual's jaw treatment. The OCO staff verified that follow up appointment for foot assessment has been scheduled and x-rays ordered. OCO staff also verified that the patient continues to receive medication and is able to use a walking boot.	DOC Resolved

confirmation on follow up appointment for jaw as well as healing assessment for foot.

5.	Incarcerated person reported that he received an onsite adjustment and was then infractioned and suspended from their job at Correctional Industries (CI). Even though co-defendant took full responsibility for the incident.	The OCO contacted DOC about this concern. The OCO learned that DOC had removed the BOE prior to the OCO investigating.	DOC Resolved
6.	Incarcerated person says that his steel bed and thin mattress have caused him severe back, hip, and shoulder pain.	The OCO provided information to complainant about DOC's practices regarding mattress issuance. Also informed him that DOC will not use his age as a means of obtaining a new mattress ahead of others.	Information Provided
7.	Incarcerated person reports that they cannot reach the IRS and DOC has not been able to assist. Person needs to address issues with stimulus check and feels blocked from doing so. Also has resolution requests that have not been answered within the timeframes.	The OCO provided the mailing address for the IRS and informed the complainant that the best way to contact the IRS is by mail. The OCO reviewed the grievances and noted that DOC had responded to them by the time this office reviewed the concern.	Information Provided
8.	Incarcerated individual reported concerns with an infraction he received.	The OCO explained that the infraction must be appealed before the OCO can pursue an investigation. We are able to review the infractions once DOC issues an appeal response.	Information Provided
9.	Incarcerated person reports that he is hard of hearing and requested that medical put a hearing impairment tag on his door but never received a response. He leaves door open at night so that he is able to hear the call for pill line, but custody staff tell him he cannot leave door open. He reports receiving behavioral observation entries (BOEs) for leaving the door open. Nighttime staff are also writing him negative BOEs for doing things that are related to medical, including needing to use the restroom after taking a water pill. Also reports that his hearing aid does not work properly; battery runs down quickly.	The OCO provided information to this person about health status reports (HSRs) and accommodations that he may wish to request. Explained that he should work with his medical provider to identify alternative ways for him to be alerted to call outs, counts, etc., as well as ways to meet other access needs he may have. Also informed him that, because it appears that all BOEs have been written per policy, it is unlikely that DOC will remove them.	Information Provided
10.	Incarcerated person reports that he was struck in the face by another incarcerated person a month ago and is dissatisfied with the medical attention he has received from DOC.	The OCO assisted with custody aspects of this person's situation. However, this person has not yet filed a grievance regarding the specialized medical care he would like to receive. Per RCW 43.06C, the OCO cannot	Lack Jurisdiction

investigate a concern until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it via the grievance process, administrative action, or appellate process.

11.	Incarcerated person reports that staff did not allow him to have a case law printout that he had printed at the law library because it was printing from a third-party vendor. Person questions this the case was found on the government computer within the facility at a website they allow. Additionally, the case was from California in the early 2000s and the complainant in the case had since released.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. Policy 590.500 Legal Access for Incarcerated Individuals does not outline a specific rule related to DOC staff printing materials from the resource computer. When asked by OCO staff, DOC staff at the facility explained that their internal rule does not allow incarcerated people to print or purchase printed materials from the resource computer. While it was true that DOC staff printed materials from this computer during the COVID-19 quarantines to provide legal access while the law library was closed, it is not their normal practice. Incarcerated individuals are allowed to copy the material onto notebook paper and may receive legal materials by mail from outside contacts.	No Violation of Policy
12.	The incarcerated person was told there was a limit on how many open grievances they could have at one time. Reports he was pressured into closing five grievances in order to be in compliance with the rule.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The resolution program manual and DOC policy 550.100 Resolution Program state that a person may have a maximum of five active resolution requests open at one time. The resolution coordinator will reach out to the person and ask them to prioritize their top five resolution requests in the event they are over limit.	No Violation of Policy
13.	Incarcerated person reported that he informed unit staff that he believed he was in danger when he was moved into a cell with certain cellmates. He states that DOC staff told him he had to stay in that cell or he would receive a major infraction for refusing cell assignment.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. However, the OCO notified the facility of this complaint and discussed concerns and best practices regarding safety and reporting. DOC staff agreed that each concern does need to be considered before a person is infraacted.	No Violation of Policy
14.	Incarcerated person reports being denied a transfer that would allow him to take the classes required for him to have good time restored. He feels he is being treated unfairly.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. DOC is following policy 500.000 Education and Vocational Programs in Prisons. The classes this person is referring to are not yet considered a priority by DOC staff for this person given his release date. DOC staff are willing to	No Violation of Policy

		review this need and spatial constraints at each facility planning meeting.	
15.	Incarcerated person reports that he was assaulted at camp and is now in the Special Management Unit (SMU). His family was told that he will not be moved out because DOC has placed a transfer hold on him while the Airway Heights Police Department investigates the assault. Person has grieved and received no response. He was demoted a custody level.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. Investigation by the OCO revealed that this person was placed in administrative segregation for his own protection, which is authorized by DOC policy 320.250 Maximum Custody Placement/Transfer/Release. The OCO confirmed that this person was moved from segregation prior to closing this case.	No Violation of Policy
16.	Incarcerated person reports that he cannot work at Correctional Industries (CI) due to his escape history. The escape history is a charge for escape from community custody. Person believes it should be treated differently than an escape from prison charge.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. DOC 700.000 Work Programs in Prison states that, to be eligible for class I, II and IV work programs, workers must meet certain requirements, including being at least two years past any escape. Additionally, to be eligible for off-site work crews, workers who were sentenced for a violent or serious violent offense may not have an escape history within the past 10 years. Because policy references "any" escape history, it appears the DOC is acting within policy in applying it to an escape from community custody. The OCO suggested that this person contact the superintendent about this matter as he has the authority to override this policy and issue an exception.	No Violation of Policy
17.	Incarcerated person reports that, despite his life without parole sentence, he is being charged a fee to send his property to another facility. He believes policy or law states that people serving a life without parole sentence cannot be charged. He reports that he has never been charged before. He has written about three grievances and multiple kites but has not received any response. He states that he does have four boxes which exceeds the limit of two boxes paid at facility expense as provided in DOC 440.020.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. Policy 440.020 states that property items will be transported at the expense of the DOC in no more than two shipping boxes. The OCO could not identify any policy, regulation, or statute that creates an exception to this rule for individuals with life without parole sentences.	No Violation of Policy
18.	Incarcerated person reports being charged more than \$35 to send books, although he had wanted to send the books using the media mail rate which would be less than \$10. Staff told him that he was not allowed to use media mail. Person reports that he had been	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The media mail rate is only provided by the USPS and not by any prison mailroom. Weight and destination impact the total charge to send property, which resulted in the \$35 charge. The OCO provided this person an explanation	No Violation of Policy

allowed to send out books and magazines using media mail at other facilities. Incarcerated person also reported that he began missing letters after he grieved the media mail rate concern. He believes his mail is now being given to other incarcerated people.

of the mail disbursement policy. It does not appear that other incarcerated individuals are receiving his mail. The OCO contacted DOC staff about this; staff explained that officers distribute the mail directly to the recipient and the mailroom did not have any grievances or kites about this concern.

19.	Incarcerated person reports that she was targeted and infracted for being trans and having gender affirming materials in her possession. She received a WAC 728 infraction for possession of sexually explicit material for photos she had been using for gender affirming purposes.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. Investigation revealed that contraband contained images of breasts which violates WAC 137-48-020, which defines sexually explicit materials to include breast nipples exposed in whole or part including under thin material.	No Violation of Policy
20.	Incarcerated person reports that the DOC is in violation of policy for discrimination by DOC staff. The staff person in question was verbally unpleasant to this person, by speaking loudly to them. They state they were treated unfairly based on gender identification and feel targeted.	The OCO was unable to substantiate this complaint due to insufficient evidence. After reviewing the resolution request responses and speaking with DOC staff, there was not sufficient evidence to prove misconduct.	Unable to Substantiate

Cedar Creek Corrections Center

21.	Incarcerated individual has been placed on administrative segregation for over 97 days and has not received any sort of extension paperwork or update on his investigation. He feels that DOC is violating DOC 460.000.	The DOC resolved this concern prior to OCO involvement. This person has since been transferred out of segregation and is currently in minimum custody/general population at another facility.	DOC Resolved
22.	Incarcerated person reports that he was placed in segregation and moved to another facility months ago. He reports that he never received an infraction or facility review or anything else that would explain this transfer. Prior to this, he had been approved for graduated reentry and work release. He believes his case continues to be in limbo as he has not been assigned a counselor and he has a release date in March.	The OCO reviewed available documents and was unable to identify a related grievance. Further, this office learned that this person did receive an infraction but had not appealed it. Informed him that he must pursue internal resolution before OCO is able to investigate.	Information Provided

Clallam Bay Corrections Center

23.	The incarcerated person says he had an approved address in place, but his reentry plan was suddenly canceled for victim concerns. The address was in the county where the incarcerated person's family and support network is located. The person reports that the DOC is now proposing a change of address to a distant county where he was first convicted. DOC is also stating this person would be subject to another 35-day notifier to victim services. He is now being held beyond his original earned release date.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO alerted the person's classification counselor about these concerns. After being notified, DOC staff terminated the second round of notifications that would not have been required. This person was released shortly thereafter.	Assistance Provided
24.	Incarcerated person says he transferred to CBCC and paid to have property shipped. However, due to COVID and tuberculosis outbreaks at CBCC he was held at another facility prior to arriving at CBCC. Person is now at CBCC, the facility of approved transfer, but because of the stop at the other facility, DOC is telling him he must pay a second time to ship his property.	The OCO contacted DOC staff about this concern and learned that the DOC shipped this person's property at no additional charge to the incarcerated person.	DOC Resolved
25.	Incarcerated person reports he is consistently having allergic reactions from the meals not being labeled or handled correctly. He is allergic to peanuts. The meals sometimes contain peanut butter, peanuts, and other times staff remove the peanuts and substitute other items, but the peanut items have already touched the remaining food.	The OCO learned that this person has transferred to another facility. Provided instruction to contact the OCO again if this issue reoccurs at the new facility.	Information Provided
26.	Incarcerated person reports he is not getting any hot meals and that he is living off of pre-made "boats" (packaged meals).	Incarcerated person has not grieved to level 2. Per RCW 43.06C, the OCO cannot investigate a concern until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it via the grievance process, administrative action, or appellate process. The OCO informed this person of the required process.	Information Provided
27.	Incarcerated person reports he was potentially exposed to COVID-19 by a staff member who tested positive. DOC did not notify the incarcerated person	The OCO informed this person that the OCO is not opening individual cases in relation to COVID-19 at this time as the DOC is following policies 410.030, 410.430,	Information Provided

who had been in close contact with the staff member around the time the staff member tested positive.

410.050, 670.000 and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, OCO is actively monitoring DOC's response to COVID-19, including preventative actions. This office has been gathering COVID-related information from incarcerated individuals and will make additional recommendations to DOC for further improvements.

28.	Incarcerated person reports that his unit was placed on quarantine in June, which resulted in problems for him accessing his legal documents. He filed two separate grievances on the staff involved. The DOC Resolution office at headquarters combined the two grievances into one and are not investigating them separately. DOC has also marked the concern as a classification issue when it is actually a staff misconduct issue. This person reports that he feels the resolution teams are unwilling to investigate his claims.	OCO reviewed his placement in quarantine and found he did not receive his property or legal work at the time of arrival. This person was on legal priority access at the time, which prioritizes his need for access to the courts and available resources in the legal library. His placement in quarantine was necessary due to the facility's current status and a standard protocol for the incoming person. This protocol also extends to property, so his items were quarantined and not received right away. This COVID-19 operating procedure is not a violation of policy. The OCO's review of the two grievances found that the DOC had not responded on time but did adequately review the concern. DOC did combine the grievances as they had nearly identical information.	Information Provided
29.	Family member stated that her son was at a facility that did not have running water. The family member alleged that DOC could not provide proof of sanitation stations during that time, and they believe this impacted the subsequent COVID 19 outbreak.	The incarcerated person has not pursued an internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO provided information about pursuing internal resolution to the complainant and her incarcerated son.	Information Provided

Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

30.	Incarcerated person reports that he has been awaiting a delayed appointment regarding medical concerns and pain. He was informed that the ultrasound results were "concerning" but has not received follow up. He has been told he will be put on the callout but has not	The OCO was able to provide assistance. OCO staff confirmed an appointment was scheduled after he was transferred to a new facility. Records indicate ultrasound results were discussed and the patient declined exam and provided updates. This office provided information for	Assistance Provided
-----	---	--	---------------------

	been put on callout to date. He reports that the OCO previously confirmed an appointment on his behalf, but he was transferred and never received the appointment.	follow up if patient changes his mind or issues are ongoing.	
31.	Incarcerated person reports that he was given incorrect medication for the third time at pill line. He expressed his concern to the person facilitating pill line and was told to "disperse." DOC is now saying that he was given the correct medication and that he is refusing medication. He reports that this is incorrect and that he is not going to pill line because he is not receiving the correct medication.	The incarcerated individual was released prior to OCO initiating an investigation of his concern.	Declined, Other
32.	Incarcerated person reports not being scheduled for medical issues and not receiving responses to his kites requesting timely medical appointments.	The OCO review determined that this person had withdrawn his grievance and that DOC had scheduled his appointments.	DOC Resolved
33.	Incarcerated individual reports being diagnosed with a torn rotator cuff from an injury sustained in March. Reports that doctor prescribed physical therapy, but he has never seen a physical therapist. He has sent multiple kites, filed a grievance, and mailed a complaint form.	The OCO review showed no recent grievances about medical care had been filed. Additionally, learned that the DOC has placed this person at top of list to be seen.	DOC Resolved
34.	The incarcerated individual has been unable to be scheduled for dental, optometry, and other necessary medical appointments. The grievance was "informally resolved" but he never agreed to this. Several kites requesting appointments have gone without response.	The OCO learned that the incarcerated individual requested the grievance be withdrawn and closed out. The OCO did not further investigate as it appears his concerns were addressed based on a documented medical appointment that the individual had shortly before he requested the grievance be withdrawn. The OCO advised the individual that if this scheduled appointment did not resolve the concern about the delay in access to medical care to contact this office so that we can further investigate.	DOC Resolved
35.	Incarcerated person states that grievances are taking too long to be addressed. The procedure of processing grievances "as soon as possible" is not acceptable.	The DOC appears to have resolved the concern about this person's grievance. The OCO learned that the processing delays are due to COVID and staffing shortages.	DOC Resolved
36.	Family member relayed concerns about their inability to contact an incarcerated individual and the	The incarcerated individual has not grieved their inability to contact the family member. Per RCW 43.06C, the OCO	Information Provided

	inconsistencies with the time frame for the contact prohibition. The DOC has blocked the family member's number and another phone number of theirs, and DOC also blocked them on JPay.	cannot investigate a concern until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve concerns via the grievance process, administrative action, or appellate process	
37.	Outside individual tried to mail a letter to an incarcerated individual, but it was rejected because of the pen used in the letter.	The incarcerated individual has not grieved the mail rejections. Per RCW 43.06C, the OCO cannot investigate a concern until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve concerns via the grievance process, administrative action, or appellate process.	Information Provided
38.	Incarcerated caller reports that the minimum security units do not have to follow the same COVID-19 guidelines as the medium units. He believes that this is unfair. He has grieved this issue and was told that individuals in medium custody have not shown they can be safe to have open day room. He believes this is an untrue statement because minimum security has had far more outbreaks than medium security has experienced.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. Investigation revealed that DOC COVID protocols are being followed to ensure safety as DOC indicated that the medium units were not meeting the requirements regarding social distancing, mask wearing, and hand sanitizing. Because of this, DOC stated the cohorts will continue for safety and security reasons.	No Violation of Policy
39.	Incarcerated patient reports he is supposed to receive an injection to treat a skin condition as prescribed by a specialist. It has been over three months and he still has not received it. When the OCO initially contacted the DOC, he finally got follow up testing and other treatment, but not the shot. Report that his skin is burning and he has constant joint pain. Concerned that DOC is going to try to give an alternative shot.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO contacted the DOC to ensure that this patient has access to treatment for this condition. This office learned that his DOC provider prescribed a similar formulary medication and that the patient is now scheduled for follow up.	No Violation of Policy
40.	Incarcerated person states that his vaccination status was shared with the program manager and chaplain for sweat lodge programming. Person claims chaplains have implemented policy/rules that separate Native Americans into vaccinated and unvaccinated when participating in the sweat lodge. These policies are not imposed on other religions.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. As detailed in the DOC memo issued August 16, 2021 "Sweat Lodge Protocols during COVID-19," there are two separate callouts for vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals. The total number of unvaccinated or partially vaccinated individuals on the callout is based on how many people will be able to socially distance in the sweat lodge area and can only participate in modified sweat lodge services. The total number of vaccinated individuals on the callout is allowed at the pre-COVID level and must participate in rapid antigen testing. Additionally, only	No Violation of Policy

vaccinated individuals are allowed to participate in certain services and do not have to wear masks while inside.

41.	Incarcerated individual states he was recently informed that he has five negative behavior observation entries (BOEs). He has appealed them as he believes the entries were incorrectly upheld.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO investigated each BOE and found that each appears to be supported by evidence.	No Violation of Policy
42.	Incarcerated person expressed concerns about three different infractions, some of which were related to transgender issues. One involved the person's use of the ADA-accessible restroom and another one involved a situation in which they were not given a mouth swab when a female officer was not present for a urinalysis.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. Investigation revealed that two infractions are supported by evidence of violating cell confinement sanctions and being out of bounds. The OCO also found the third infraction is supported by evidence. The gender preference 02.420 form is only visible to certain staff members such as the Superintendent and, as a result, the incarcerated individual must request their gender of choosing each time they undergo a urinalysis or search. Because there is no evidence to indicate the individual requested a female officer conduct the urinalysis, the OCO is unable to substantiate a policy violation.	No Violation of Policy
43.	Incarcerated person reported that he was infraacted for using intimidation because he barely touched an officer. He reports that the hearing officer told him that an assault is a physical attack, so the hearing officer reduced the infraction to a lesser violation. Person feels he should not have even received the intimidation infraction.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The original staff assault infraction was reduced to an intimation infraction. The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and related documentation as well as video footage. Video footage appeared to show the incarcerated person's use of physical force against another person when he touched a staff member in attempt to move them out of the way.	No Violation of Policy

Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women

44.	Incarcerated person received an infraction for refusal to program. She appealed it. The reason for her refusal was that she was placed at the same facility as another person against whom she had a filed a report of a PREA violation.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed the disciplinary information as well as the PREA investigation. The DOC acted within policy to uphold the infraction for refusing to program. The individual was given multiple warnings that the infraction would be issued and did not specify safety concerns until she was appealing the infraction determination.	No Violation of Policy
-----	--	---	------------------------

Monroe Correctional Complex

45.		Incarcerated patient reports that DOC took his wheelchair for repairs. He was told it would be two to three weeks before he gets his new wheelchair, but it has been months and he still has not received it. The grievance response says he was issued a loaner chair while the new one is ordered and shipped, but DOC providers said his current chair <i>is</i> the new chair.	The OCO was able to provide assistance. This office notified the facility and DOC headquarters about this concern. The OCO substantiated that the wheelchair is in poor condition. The OCO ensured that the new wheelchair was issued and that medical will follow up periodically to check on issues related to wear and tear.	Assistance Provided
46.		Incarcerated patient reports having multiple health care concerns, including diabetes management, joint deterioration, high blood pressure (medications discontinued), losing eyesight, and needs a wheelchair that fits as the current chair is such a tight fit that he has sores on his legs and back.	Incarcerated person has not grieved these issues. Per RCW 43.06C, the OCO cannot investigate a concern until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve concerns via the grievance process, administrative action, or appellate process.	Declined, Other
47.	Special Offender Unit	Incarcerated person called with concerns about a PREA violation. Person said he reported it as an emergency grievance and filed a PREA report but his emergency grievance went missing. He was so distraught by that that he declared a mental health emergency. He was then infractioned for threatening but says he didn't threaten anyone, instead he states he could not "contract for safety."	This individual withdrew his complaint.	Declined, Other
48.	Special Offender Unit	Incarcerated person reports that he has submitted several grievances and other reports but DOC staff lets a lot of time lapse when things are submitted. Person has not received replies to their submitted issues.	The OCO sent a letter to this person to request additional clarifying information because the complaint did not provide any details. The individual did not respond within three weeks to our request for additional information.	Declined, Other
49.	Twin Rivers Unit	Incarcerated patient reports multiple transports to outside clinic for gastrointestinal specialist. Transport has been late to appointment at clinic three times and each time appointment cancelled by clinic because of tardy arrival for appointment. He would like to attend the appointments using appropriate transport.	This patient informed the OCO that he had received his appointment and testing. This office contacted facility to verify that the procedures approved by DOC's Care Review Committee have been scheduled.	DOC Resolved
50.	Twin Rivers Unit	Incarcerated person says that the extended family visit (EFV) policy is being incorrectly applied. Person says he is being denied EFV with wife and sister on the basis that he has a federal probation detainer which is an adjudicated charge. Policy implies the person must not	The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern and learned that the DOC had applied the policy incorrectly, corrected their mistake, and will now permit him to apply for EFV.	DOC Resolved

have outstanding or unresolved charges or detainers in any jurisdiction.

51.	Intensive Management Unit	Incarcerated patient reports that his medical hold for a permanent condition was lifted so he could be transferred. This follows an incident in which the patient had an altercation with another individual. He says that he needs to stay near Harborview.	This office learned that DOC had extended this patient's medical hold prior to OCO involvement.	DOC Resolved
52.	Twin Rivers Unit	Incarcerated patient missed two physical therapy appointments due to pain, blurry vision, and debilitating headaches which have required visits to the emergency room. He said that the nurse was rude to him. She immediately took his wheelchair and said we will let PT decide if you need this. This has increased his pain and he has fallen. He has had bowel movements on himself. Requested to get his wheelchair back.	The OCO learned that DOC resolved the issue: this patient now has his wheelchair back and his health status report (HSR) allowing him to use the wheelchair was renewed.	DOC Resolved
53.	Special Offender Unit	Incarcerated complainant says that he has been doing well and successfully completed a behavior modification program. He has a review coming up for possible placement in minimum custody but reports that mental health staff want to keep him at MCC-SOU. Also reported that his medication was abruptly discontinued.	The OCO notified DOC mental health leadership about these concerns and requested that this person's medication concern is reviewed. Learned that DOC has developed a long-term plan for possible transfer. Encouraged complainant to communicate his placement and medication goals and preferences with his treatment team so that the team is able to consider this information as they make decisions going forward.	DOC Resolved
54.	Washington State Reformatory	Incarcerated person reported that staff dropped his guitar when moving his property. The guitar sustained damage but DOC is not taking responsibility for the cost.	The OCO noted that the DOC substantiated the damage to this person's guitar through the grievance process. This office provided information to him regarding filing a tort claim to recoup the value of the guitar.	Information Provided
55.		A loved one reported incarcerated individual is currently being isolated because of her contact with a prison employee who tested positive for COVID. Her current conditions are very similar to those of being in solitary confinement, being under lock for 23 hours per day, having no access to email, having no hot water and having limited personal property. She is also not being told how long her isolation would last.	The OCO verified she was moved from medical isolation back to general population after quarantine. The OCO contacted the loved one who made the report to inform them she was moved and sent a copy of OCO's report on CDC guidelines and DOC protocol.	Information Provided

56.		The complainant is the legal guardian of her incarcerated son who has a cognitive disability and is scheduled to be transferred to another facility for required programming. Son was previously at this other facility and had extremely difficult time with staff which led to numerous infractions. He has had no disciplinary concerns at current placement. Complainant wants him to be able to stay at his current placement.	The OCO alerted DOC staff to this parent's concerns and discussed the case with DOC headquarters staff. The OCO then provided information to parent to explain the factors considered in approving son's transfer. Informed parent that she can communicate to DOC any specific suggestions for better supporting or accommodating this individual as he transfers. Provided additional information to her regarding changes being implemented by the DOC stemming in part from OCO's 2021 report on mental health services. These changes may positively impact her son and his experience at the new facility if/when he transfers there.	Information Provided
57.	Intensive Management Unit	Incarcerated person says the DOC is not following policy regarding processing outgoing legal mail and this is impacting their ability to access their attorney and meet deadlines. Specifically, staff is not sealing and logging outgoing legal mail in front of him. The mailroom has also been holding onto his mail that was rejected as legal mail and was not sent out appropriately when they tried to send it through regular mail before the required 10 days. There has also been some confusion in the responses to their kites to the mailroom.	The OCO informed this person that the DOC is aware of challenges in the mailroom and is making changes to process. The OCO is also releasing a public report regarding mail that will involves similar concerns.	Information Provided
58.	Intensive Management Unit	Incarcerated person reported concerns about the maximum custody program requirements as well as an infraction.	The OCO reviewed documentation and noted that this person did not appeal infraction. As a result, OCO is unable to investigate the infraction concern further. Provided information to him explaining that the program requirements are likely due to the infraction or a mental health program.	Information Provided
59.		Incarcerate person reports that they were on a hunger strike for two weeks to draw attention to safety concerns for transgender individuals. Worried the staff will give her a negative behavior observation entry (BOE) because she says she has no choice but to not eat. States she has an eating disorder and mental	The OCO contacted the DOC to inquire about this person's situation. This office learned that this person was present at her last FRMT. Her counselor stated she was informed of the housing appeal process. The OCO substantiated that she did receive a negative BOE, which can be appealed. The OCO learned that she is still under review	Information Provided

		health has refused to see her for follow up appointments. She reports she never attended her facility review meeting (FRMT) because no one came to get her. Additionally, the DOC is disregarding timeframes for proper programming placement which needs to be completed between now and her earned release date (ERD).	for possible transfer to WCCW. The OCO provided this information to the incarcerated person.	
60.		Incarcerated complainant states staff refused them the ability to take part in their transgender housing review. Claims medical and mental health staff did not meet with them before submitting their part of the data in the review.	The OCO informed this person that all transgender housing reviews can be appealed to the appointing authority after each review.	Information Provided
61.	Intensive Management Unit	Incarcerated person relayed concerns about excessive placement in segregation, an infraction, and a property concern.	The OCO informed this person that this office cannot investigate a concern until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it via the grievance process, administrative action, and/or appellate process.	Information Provided
62.	Intensive Management Unit	Incarcerated person believes PREA staff is not taking their job seriously. Believes staff is not taking enough action with complaints.	The OCO informed this person that this office cannot investigate a concern until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it via the grievance process, administrative action, and/or appellate process.	Information Provided
63.	Special Offender Unit	Incarcerated person reports that his grievances keep getting denied. He reports that he is still being threatened by other incarcerated individuals.	The OCO review determined that the person had been moved to another unit for safety reasons before his letter was received by this office. The OCO provided self-advocacy information to this person. This office informed him that he may file an appeal for the denial of the cell change as described in DOC policy 300.380. If the DOC does not resolve the issue, he should contact this office with the appeal response. The OCO may then be able to investigate the complaint. The OCO explained that RCW 43.06C requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a complaint via the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process prior to the OCO investigating.	Information Provided
64.	Special Offender Unit	Incarcerated individual states that the water in the unit is always brown. Reports that he is dehydrated but also	Incarcerated person has not grieved this issue. Informed person that, per RCW 43.06C, the OCO cannot investigate a concern until the incarcerated person has reasonably	Information Provided

		cannot drink the water because it causes headaches and stomach pains.	attempted to resolve it via the grievance process, administrative action, or appellate process.	
65.	Intensive Management Unit	Incarcerated person received an infraction for introduction and has had all mail restricted and visits taken away from him. However, this was not part of his sanctions, it was only a loss of phone. He reports that he appealed and that no one will help him figure out the sanctions.	Incarcerated person did not appeal this infraction, and therefore the OCO is unable to investigate. The OCO explained to this person that 180 days of loss of visits and restricted communication is a mandatory sanction for the infraction he received, which may be the reason for the concerns he relayed.	Information Provided
66.	MSU	Incarcerated person is requesting a hearing against the mental health unit because they are forcing him to clean the bathroom and hallway and not giving him a choice.	According to RCW 43.06C, the OCO may not investigate a complaint unless the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it via the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process. Informed this person that he can appeal the grievance to level one and then contact our office with the level one response if the problem remains unresolved.	Information Provided
67.	Twin Rivers Unit	Incarcerated person believes the cell change/move policy needs to be updated. The policy right now is too restrictive and has unreasonable expectations for individuals to meet.	The OCO does not have authority over DOC policies. OCO staff informed the incarcerated individual that the OCO would not be able to open a case to change the DOC policy.	Information Provided
68.	Twin Rivers Unit	Incarcerated person reports that he had legal mail sent as priority express which should have been delivered within two days. However, it was delivered too late which caused his legal filing to be late. He has grieved and sent numerous kiosk messages but hasn't received a response. His attorney contacted headquarters who contacted facility staff to try to get the mail delivered on time but sergeant never responded.	The OCO contacted DOC to inquire about this concern and learned that the DOC is aware of this issue. Informed person that DOC has added a quality assurance measure. Also relayed that the OCO is working with DOC on mail policy concerns and will issue a public report on the topic.	Information Provided
69.		Incarcerated individual is concerned that the 35-day notifier may be sent out prior to getting an approved release address. He believes the notifier should be sent out 35 days prior to release date, not after getting an approved release address.	The OCO informed this person that DOC is following DOC policy 390.300 section III.D.3.a. regarding Victim Services, which states, "From the date the notice is sent to the VSP of an approved release plan, the planned release date will be set for no less than...35 days if the individual is serving a sentence during the current period of confinement for a domestic violence court order violation of a violent, sex or felony harassment offense." Explained that he will need to have an approved release address to start the notifier.	Information Provided

70.	Washington State Reformatory Unit	Incarcerated person reports that the DOC took money from his stimulus check to use for child support.	The OCO provided information about CARES Act deductions to this person. Explained that DOC is following current state and federal protocols for deductions.	Information Provided
71.	Special Offender Unit	Incarcerated person requested that the OCO investigate corruption, police informants, and the attorney general of California.	The OCO does not have jurisdiction to investigate the allegations in this complaint.	Lack Jurisdiction
72.	Intensive Management Unit	Family member of incarcerated person contacted the OCO when the person had been held in administrative segregation beyond 45 days for an investigation. Family member believes it was unfounded. The incarcerated individual was told he was there pending a drug infraction, but the infraction he received did not involve possession. The infraction involved a loss of Good Conduct Time, when the individual's earned release date was about to come up.	This individual's appeal has not yet been received or processed. Per RCW 43.06C, the OCO cannot investigate a concern until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it via the grievance process, administrative action, or appellate process.	Lack Jurisdiction
73.	Special Offender Unit	Incarcerated person reported that DOC staff are using acoustic wave therapy which is affecting the person's environment.	There was insufficient evidence for the OCO to conduct an investigation into concerns related to acoustic wave therapy and how it affects the person's environment. The OCO provided information requested by the incarcerated individual, including addresses for government agencies to whom he could write.	Information Provided
74.	Special Offender Unit	Incarcerated person sent a public records request via certified mail to DOC public records staff. It was not signed by the person he sent it to, so he would like to have the address double checked. He would also like to know why his certified mail was not signed properly.	The OCO does not have jurisdiction to review this complaint, as the United States Postal Service is the entity responsible for collecting signatures at the time of delivery of certified mail. Because the failure to collect the signature was not a DOC duty or action, this office is unable to further investigate this complaint.	Lack Jurisdiction
75.	Washington State Reformatory Unit	Incarcerated person reports that he is eligible to move to Twin Rivers and that would be the most cost savings move for him to make at this time.	The DOC has authority to make placement decisions under RCW 72.02.240. The OCO does not have jurisdiction to modify or change placement decisions made by the DOC.	No Violation of Policy
76.		Incarcerated individual wished to challenge a recent infraction, stating that a staff member with whom she has had problems in the past was the staff member who reviewed this infraction. This individual has	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed the current infraction as well as recent history of infractions. Each infraction appears to be supported by sufficient evidence per DOC's evidentiary	No Violation of Policy

received multiple infractions after filing grievances and believes they were retaliatory.

standard. Without additional information showing a nexus between the infractions and behavior, the OCO cannot substantiate a claim of retaliation. The OCO did note that this individual has had negative interactions with the reviewing staff member in the past, but these were not sufficient to demonstrate a conflict of interest such that the staff member should have been removed from the infraction review.

77. Special Offender Unit	Incarcerated person says he is being investigated for something but DOC has not told him what for. The DOC has extended the investigation but has not provided him any updates per policy or provided any time extensions. He reports that this is causing him mental and emotional distress. It has been more than 65 days so far.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO contacted DOC staff and learned that this person will not get his J-Pay player back while incarcerated. He was found to be breaking the rules while utilizing it. He will be given the option to mail it to friends or family, donate it, or have it destroyed per DOC policy 420.375.	No Violation of Policy
78.	Incarcerated person reports that a correctional officer (CO) tried to force him to engage in sexual relations with her months ago. He states that because he refused, he started experiencing retaliation. Another CO later sexually assaulted him too. He has pending PREA investigations.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy in the DOC's handling of these concerns. Upon contacting the DOC, this office learned that the PREA investigations are still open and DOC is still investigating.	No Violation of Policy
79. Special Offender Unit	Incarcerated person says he was attempting to declare a mental health emergency. Person says he attempted to harm himself to get the attention for a medical concern but it went too far. He was sprayed with OC spray, which further complicating his breathing. Ultimately, he had to be transported to the hospital by ambulance.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The DOC was following DOC policy 410.200 (Use of Force), which authorizes employees to use any amount of force reasonably necessary without prior approval to prevent suicide or self-harm. Staff intervened in this situation during an incident of self-harm.	No Violation of Policy
80.	Incarcerated patient says that he has submitted a grievance for malicious indifference to medical needs and has received a response. He is appealing to level II and wants to be moved up on list for treatment for his condition. Patient also requested to be seen by a doctor.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO notified facility and headquarters staff of this concern due to delayed response. OCO staff learned that this patient is on the list for treatment and once out of COVID quarantine he will receive lab work for update on status and next steps.	No Violation of Policy
81.	Incarcerated individual received a heightened infraction for aggravated assault because the other	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed all related disciplinary materials. Prior	No Violation of Policy

		person involved needed medical care. However, the individual believed the only reason the other person needed medical care was because of a prior injury, and subsequent OC spray. The individual claims the infraction was unfairly upheld.	injury of a victim is not considered in assessing an aggravated assault; only that a victim needed additional medical assessment/treatment. The DOC appears to be acting within policy.	
82.		Individual's loved one asked for review of their loved one's hearing after learning that the hearing officer, off the record, asked questions about his family. The loved one believed these questions were inappropriate and showed bias on the part of the hearing officer.	The OCO reviewed the hearing but was unable to substantiate the claim. No inappropriate questions were asked on the recording listened to by OCO staff; however, the recording was paused for deliberation for some time. It is possible that questions were asked during that time. Without a recording of the entire hearing, including deliberation time, this office is unable to substantiate the claim of bias.	Unable to Substantiate
83.	Twin Rivers Unit	Incarcerated individual reports that DOC staff made a higher level incarcerated individual supervisor at his assigned work site. This supervisor yelled at the complainant for not asking for permission to go on a medical trip.	The OCO was unable to identify sufficient evidence that could prove that this individual's supervisor had yelled at him for asking to go on a medical trip. A review by this office revealed that this individual had resigned from that job and been assigned and accepted a different job with Correctional Industries after initially filing a complaint with the OCO.	Unable to Substantiate
Olympic Corrections Center				
84.		Incarcerated individual was denied access for a scheduled telephone court hearing. He now has a felony warrant.	The OCO review determined that this person had not informed DOC staff that he had a court date. This person has now been released.	Declined, Other
85.		Incarcerated person reports he was forced to work in the kitchen and was he would receive a major infraction if he refused. He also reports having difficulty getting his vegan diet filled without hostility. It is served to him still frozen. This has been an ongoing problem. It seems that there may be some problems with humanity and dignity given to the incarcerated population.	The DOC resolved this concern prior to OCO involvement. The OCO reviewed documentation related to this complaint and noted that the food manager corrected the issue after this person filed a grievance on the matter.	DOC Resolved
86.		Family member of incarcerated person reports that loved one is receiving inadequate care for critical medical needs at this facility.	The DOC resolved this concern prior to OCO involvement. The OCO review determined that this person had been transferred to a facility with proper access to medical care.	DOC Resolved

OTHER Jails			
87.	Incarcerated person from out of state requested the address for the Office of the Inspector General in Florida.	The OCO provided this person with the address they requested.	Information Provided
88.	Person reports that his Fourteenth Amendment rights have been violated. Reports he has not received any opportunity to make a phone call. Reports that the rules state that limited funds should not be a reason to prevent him from communicating.	The OCO does not have jurisdiction in this case because the person was incarcerated in a county jail. The OCO jurisdiction is limited to individuals incarcerated in DOC facilities; however, OCO staff contacted the person and provided some self-advocacy options.	Lack Jurisdiction
Stafford Creek Corrections Center			
89.	Incarcerated patient had allergic reaction to a prescribed cream he received for psoriasis. Also reported concerns about delayed treatment for leg injury. He didn't receive follow up and his leg conditions worsened into infection. Patient called via hotline with updates that he has since received care but is concerned about long term damage and wants to be assured that he is receiving appropriate treatment for his leg. Patient requested treatment for allergic reaction and cream/treatment for psoriasis that doesn't cause allergic reaction. Also requested assessment and treatment of leg injury and inquired about access to a specialist.	The OCO contacted DOC HQ for resolution due to delay at the facility level. OCO staff confirmed the patient has since received appointments and care, DOC communicated there is no clinical indication for a specialist at this time. The patient is encouraged to follow up in 6 months or sooner if needed.	Assistance Provided
90.	Counselor told the incarcerated individual that they were required to submit to Substance Use Disorder Assessment by the authority of Judgment and Sentence (J&S). A supervisor advised the incarcerated individual to discontinue the assessment, however the counselor continued the assessment without the incarcerated individual's presence or consent.	This person's J&S identifies the need for Substance Use Disorder assessment. DOC was contacted regarding the lack of response to the grievance. DOC indicated the reason for the delay was due to staff changes and shortages. Following OCO outreach, the incarcerated individual was interviewed and the process is now moving forward.	Assistance Provided
91.	Incarcerated patient says he had surgery with an outside provider who gave specific orders of no twisting or bending following the surgery. To go to his follow up appointment, DOC provided a car for transport. The DOC required him to try the transport	OCO staff contacted DOC health services and HQ due to delayed facility response. The OCO was able to confirm patient received his cane but was not able to confirm renewal of sweatpants HSR.	Assistance Provided

and when he was unable to get into the car, staff requested he sign papers saying he refused to go see his doctor; however, he refused to sign the document. Patient requested a cane after receiving an HSR and asked for renewal of his sweatpants HSR.

92.	Incarcerated individual says that property staff are failing to follow revised DOC policy 440.050 allowing certain items to now be consumable items. A memo was sent out regarding this revision; however, staff are refusing to acknowledge the memo and return the items that were confiscated using the outdated property matrix.	The OCO reviewed the property memos and found that this person's items should not have been taken. OCO staff contacted DOC about the concern and DOC staff then returned the person's property.	Assistance Provided
93.	Incarcerated patient had taken prescribed mental health medications for many years prior to prison. When he arrived at SCCC, he was told his medications would be discontinued. He is feeling lethargic, sleepless, and is having difficulty concentrating.	The OCO alerted DOC staff to patient's concern about discontinuation of mental health medications. The DOC agreed to look into whether patient received second review of records as suggested by 2020 grievance response regarding this same concern. Encouraged patient to simultaneously kite mental health to request re-evaluation.	Assistance Provided
94.	Incarcerated patient requested a therapy aide and recorder as ADA access items and he has not received them since he arrived to the facility years ago. Requested DOC follow ASR/HSR for therapy aide.	OCO staff contacted the facility and HQ ADA/health services due to delayed facility response. OCO review determined that HSR for therapy aide was issued and DOC agreed to follow up with Jobs Coordinator and ADA for placement. Recorder accommodation status report (ASR) for accessing grievances was also approved.	Assistance Provided
95.	Incarcerated patient has a terminal illness and has trouble accessing meals and other basic needs. Patient cannot prepare own food or take shower or walk on his own. Expressed a need for pain management due to progressing symptoms. Patient was assessed for Sage Unit placement but at the end was told he was not going anywhere because of his crime.	The OCO contacted the facility and confirmed patient has since been moved to Sage unit.	DOC Resolved
96.	Loved one reported that their incarcerated relative was told he could have knee surgery but is now being sent to camp without the surgery. Individual was not given a medical assessment prior to transfer.	The individual did not want OCO to pursue the concern received. The family member who initiated the concern declined further review.	Declined, Other

97.	Incarcerated patient has an HSR for ankle supports but has not received the items.	The OCO contacted DOC and confirmed new braces were ordered. Original options were not accepted, so follow up consult and new style option was ordered.	DOC Resolved
98.	Incarcerated patient has multiple healthcare concerns and is waiting for DOC staff to issue a new HSR for a walker. Has been sent to see outside provider and is waiting to have molds of feet taken due to arthritis.	The OCO contacted the facility and HQ and confirmed patient was seen by rheumatology and follow up scheduled. OCO staff confirmed the patient was scheduled with a provider and follow up was submitted. A wheelchair provided for distance only and nonformulary medication is pending review. The HSR is updated and active.	DOC Resolved
99.	Family member is concerned that their incarcerated loved one was told to sign a paper that stated they were a threat. Wants to know what that paper was and why they would need to sign that. Also shared concerns about current COVID-19 confinement.	The incarcerated person has not grieved to level 2. Per RCW 43.06C, the OCO cannot investigate a concern until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve the concern through the grievance process, administrative action, or appellate process. The OCO provided information to the complainant and the incarcerated person about the next steps to take and provided a confidentiality form and contact information for the OCO office so staff can speak with the family member.	Information Provided
100.	A family member reported concerns that DOC policy allows for brief interactions like kissing, but not at this time, even though they have to comply with strict COVID-19 testing. They would like restrictions lifted since they already have to go through proof of testing and wellness.	The incarcerated person has not pursued an 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. This office informed the individual of the need to pursue internal resolution.	Information Provided
101.	A family member shared concerns regarding wanting her loved ones' facility transfer to be changed. The incarcerated person was being transferred to another facility that didn't offer the parenting program they were enrolled into. The transfer to another facility was due to a clerical medical error.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information to the complainant. The OCO provided information regarding how their loved one could contact the OCO, information on the DOC's classification decisions, and the alternative parenting programs available at the facility the incarcerated person was moved to.	Information Provided
102.	The incarcerated person reported a verbal altercation that has the appearance to turn into a physical one.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information to the complainant. The OCO provided information regarding	Information Provided

	They would like assistance retaining the video of the incident.	how to file a public disclosure request with the DOC so the video of the incident, if available, could be preserved.	
103.	DOC is not giving time-sensitive legal/ court documents to the incarcerated individual in a timely manner.	Per RCW 43.06C, the OCO cannot look into an issue unless the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it via the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process. Informed person they should grieve concern up to a level two first and to contact our office when they received the level two response.	Information Provided
104.	Incarcerated individual states that his property was lost while being transferred from a new facility.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information to the incarcerated person. The OCO provided step-by-step guidance regarding how to try to locate the lost items through exhausting the resolution process, where to get the forms to file a tort claim if the property is not found, and what pertinent policies applied to his concern. Personal property is governed by DOC policies 440.000 Personal Property for Incarcerated persons and 440.020 Transport of Property.	Information Provided
105.	Incarcerated individual requires wheelchair transport but was forced to walk out to a van even though his wheelchair was with him. He was told to sit on a hard bucket seat without his wheelchair cushion during the trip back to the facility. DOC staff then returned his wheelchair. He reports that conditions on the trip hurt him. He grieved several times and has not received any answers.	The OCO review determined that the individual's grievance was appropriately reviewed by DOC headquarters staff (at level III). The DOC verified that the individual has a "T-5" PULHES-DXTR code, which will alert DOC staff to the need for wheelchair transport in the future. Additionally, the DOC verified the health status report (HSR) for the cushion and noted that it is still in place. The OCO provided this information to the incarcerated individual.	Information Provided
106.	Incarcerated patient was supposed to have a procedure with a urologist but now that he has been moved to a different facility, DOC is claiming to know nothing about the previously scheduled appointment. Requested appointment be rescheduled for the new facility.	OCO staff contacted to the facility and HQ due to the delayed response. The OCO was able to confirm a urology appointment was scheduled and declined twice. OCO staff provided the incarcerated individual with information about how to follow up if they still want to access appointment.	Information Provided

107.	Incarcerated person would like to have visitation with biological children approved and would like assistance securing permission from DOC. The courts amended their judgment and sentence documents to name his children as approved visitors and his wife as the supervising party, but DOC has rejected the request.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information to the incarcerated person. The OCO provided information regarding how to appeal the visitation decision and the DOC's decision not to overturn the denial at this time.	Information Provided
108.	Incarcerated person states that they acted to keep a person of color from being harmed during a recent incident. Also states that DOC stated it would not issue infractions for actions related to this incident and issued a memo on the topic. However, this person reports that they and others were infraacted for their actions.	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.	Information Provided
109.	Incarcerated person requested help because his grievances have been sitting for over a year, resulting in him not being able to participate in the grievance system during that time. He requested a review of the Behavior Observation Entry (BOE) he received for not being dressed when a female guard came on tier. He also reports that, because mental health staff are not available on the weekends, he is placed in Close Observation Area (COA) which causes more harm.	The OCO was able to substantiate that this person's five grievances were not answered by medical staff. Many of them were filed over a year ago. Due to being at the limit, this person was not able to participate in the resolution program for over a year without threat of receiving an infraction. DOC medical staff state they hired help and are working to address the backlog of medical grievances. This office was not able to locate the BOE of concern; it may have been removed. This office previously issued reports and recommendations to address COA concerns as well as concerns regarding the number of available mental health staff. DOC has indicated that the agency will address those concerns upon receipt of necessary funding.	Information Provided
110.	Incarcerated person reports issues with a stimulus check and the IRS not being responsive. Additionally, this person sent out checks but the people never received the check. He believes the mailroom has not mailed out the checks; believes mailroom is using COVID as an excuse to delay everything.	The OCO provided specific IRS contact information to this person as well as information about Form 3911 -Taxpayer Statement Regarding Refund to initiate a paper trace if the payment was lost.	Information Provided
111.	Incarcerated person states that they never received notification about a prior OCO decision because the	The OCO provided self-advocacy information to the individual explaining the OCO mail process with the DOC.	Information Provided

mail handlers did not give them their mail. This person is concerned that mail from OCO is not to be handled as legal mail.

This individual was provided the OCO documents that they had not received. The OCO notified also the facility mailroom of these concerns.

112.	Incarcerated person is concerned with some DOC staff not being in compliance with the COVID -19 vaccine mandate. Some DOC staff are very vocal about opposing the vaccine. Person is concerned that, if the vaccine mandate is not enforced, it will put the incarcerated population at risk.	The OCO informed this person that this office is not opening investigations for individual cases in relation to DOC policies 410.030, 410.430, 410.050, 670.000 and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, OCO has been actively monitoring DOC's response to COVID-19, including preventative actions. This office has been gathering COVID-related information from incarcerated individuals and will make additional recommendations to DOC for further improvements where needed and as appropriate.	Information Provided
113.	Incarcerated patient reports experiencing severe stomach pain, chronic diarrhea, cramps, and frequent urination. Patient has received medical appointments but disagrees with care and points to ongoing symptoms. He reports that has not filed a grievance because he has no faith that the process will bring him any kind of relief. Patient requested outside testing and effective treatment plan.	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. Also appears that patient's recent medication changes had mostly addressed his concerns. This office provided information and complaint form for follow up if issues continue and patient meets grievance requirement.	Information Provided
114.	Incarcerated person reports experiencing an allergic reaction due to food service error. Burrito contained tomatoes but individual is allergic to tomatoes. Ingredients are listed and obvious and food service staff wrote "no tomato" in green marker over ingredient list. It was not the first time this has happened. Filed a grievance but was told it was never received; kited grievance coordinator about the grievance and never received response.	The OCO review determined that the individual had filed grievances in the past but had withdrawn some and others had been returned as non-grievable. He expressed interest in filing a tort claim, so the OCO provided information to him about obtaining an SF210 Standard Tort Claim Form Packet from the DOC and submitting the completed form to the Department of Enterprise Services, Financial Management Division at the address on the form.	Information Provided

115.	Incarcerated person says that a mental health professional violated health privacy laws by sharing confidential information about other incarcerated patients and vice-versa. Reports that knowing this makes it difficult to engage in treatment now.	The OCO alerted the resolution program director of very delayed level III response to this person's grievance and requested prompt attention. Provided information to incarcerated person regarding OCO's recent report that addresses, in part, this concern. This office could not reach requested resolution of imposing staff discipline but explained that DOC had been informed of the concern.	Information Provided
116.	Incarcerated individual reports being at risk of losing personal items due to the hobby policy that does not state the number of permits or boxes an incarcerated person is allowed to have.	The OCO provided information to this person regarding DOC's interpretation of this policy. When asked by this office, DOC staff explained that, because the policy does not specifically state one hobby box per person but it does state that items will be stored in "a" clear plastic container, the DOC interprets this language to mean an allowance of only one box per person. The DOC also reported that this policy will soon be revised and this matter will be clarified. The OCO informed the incarcerated person that he could send out his personal hobby items to avoid losing them or, alternatively, file a tort claim for the loss.	Information Provided
117.	Incarcerated person reports having submitted medical kites about contracting COVID, but the matter has not been addressed.	The OCO informed this person that this office is not opening investigations for individual cases in relation to DOC policies 410.030, 410.430, 410.050, 670.000 and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, OCO has been actively monitoring DOC's response to COVID-19, including preventative actions. This office has been gathering COVID-related information from incarcerated individuals and will make additional recommendations to DOC for further improvements where needed and as appropriate.	Information Provided
118.	Incarcerated person has a very old mattress and reports that DOC staff are not doing anything to address the issue.	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. Informed person they should grieve the concern up to a level two and then contact the office with the level two response if the issue remains unresolved.	Information Provided

119.	Incarcerated person would like DOC to change its facility placement decision-making process so that the DOC would be required to consider whether an incarcerated individual has elderly family members who cannot travel far for visits. This comes after learning that some DOC facility units will close and individuals in those units will be relocated to other facilities.	The OCO explained that DOC policy 300.380 states that “[r]elease plans and family need issues will be considered when determining facility placement.” Additionally, this office provided information regarding potential self-advocacy options, including notifying his classification counselor regarding concerns related to institutional placement as well as encouraging his loved ones to reach out to DOC Headquarters Classification Unit to relay their concerns and any circumstances that may be relevant to his need to be placed at a different facility.	Information Provided
120.	Incarcerated person reported a concern about his sentence calculation as well as a concern that his counselor intentionally classified him as high violent by using data associated with his brother’s crimes instead of his.	The OCO contacted DOC to request a review of this individual’s time calculation. It yielded no change; DOC could not locate any increase in over a year as described to this office. The OCO also requested a reassessment of this person’s data for classification purposes. DOC reassessed the data and found that his information had been used, not his brother’s, and verified that the risk assessment was accurate. The OCO informed the incarcerated person of these results.	Information Provided
121.	Incarcerated person states that DOC staff put his safety in jeopardy when they shared his personal conviction information with another incarcerated person.	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.	Lack Jurisdiction
122.	Incarcerated person believes DOC has no jurisdiction over them and that they are being held in prison unlawfully.	Informed this person that the OCO does not have jurisdiction to review this complaint. Per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(e), the OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to the person’s underlying criminal conviction.	Lack Jurisdiction
123.	Incarcerated individual reports having a snoring problem that is significant enough that they were supposed to undergo surgery to address it prior to being incarcerated. Because of the snoring, nobody	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	Lack Jurisdiction

	wants to be their cellmate and their property gets destroyed. They are looking for assistance getting a Health Status Report (HSR) for a single person cell.	the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	
124.	Incarcerated person says that he was found guilty of items that were found in his cell that his cellmate claimed as his own. Even though the cellmate pled guilty, the cellmate was found not guilty, and the incarcerated complainant was found guilty. He believes the decision was based on racial bias.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. OCO staff reviewed documents associated with the infraction and found sufficient evidence for DOC to justify upholding the determination made regarding the infraction. The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern of racial bias due to insufficient evidence.	No Violation of Policy
125.	Incarcerated patient has been experiencing multiple symptoms related to severe pain and reports being seen by medical several times but feels treatment has been inappropriate and has resulted in additional symptoms that hamper their day-to-day activities.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO review determined DOC followed policy for the treatment and review of the case.	No Violation of Policy
126.	Individual was infraacted for a "507" (per WAC 137-25-030, a 507 is issued for "[c]ommitting an act that would constitute a felony and that is not otherwise included in these rules") but was not later prosecuted for felony activity. He felt the hearing was unfair, and the hearing officer referenced a different violation than what he'd been accused of, which made it impossible to prepare a defense.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed disciplinary information and confidential report from the investigation. Even if the supporting RCW for the 507 was changed at the hearing, DOC met its burden to show evidence that possible felony behavior had occurred, which is sufficient to uphold the infraction.	No Violation of Policy
127.	Incarcerated individual believes that they did not receive a fair and impartial hearing. Individual received an infraction after a fight but claims the only reason the other involved individual needed medical care was because of a prior injury. Further, individual stated his mental health concerns prior to the incident were not heard or considered, and prior behaviors were used during his hearing to solidify his guilt.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed the disciplinary materials. The DOC met the standard of evidence to establish guilt, regardless of the other individual's injury, and regardless of whether past behaviors were invoked. The OCO has discussed the need for consideration of mental health conditions throughout the DOC's disciplinary process in past reports, including the Mental Health Access and Services report published in 2021.	No Violation of Policy
128.	Incarcerated person received two infractions but stated that his hearing materials indicated that he was only found guilty of one. When he appealed the sanctions, he realized that he had been found guilty of both infractions. He believed the guilty finding of one	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed the paperwork error in question. The correct information was listed later on the same form. One incorrect listing is considered a harmless error and would not be sufficient grounds to overturn a guilty	No Violation of Policy

	infraction should be reversed because of the error on the form, and that the sanctions he received were too high.	finding that is supported by evidence. The sanctions received for that infraction were within policy.	
129.	Incarcerated person reports having problems with a staff member who is intentionally denying him access to his Zoom court appointments.	The OCO was unable to substantiate this complaint. This office was able to substantiate problems that had occurred with this person's last two video court dates, specifically: 1) the person's case was not heard because the camera was not turned on, and 2) the facilitator was on camera instead of the Incarcerated individual, so the case was not heard. The DOC did admit to partial fault as DOC staff did not have the current operating procedure for that court. Staff did, however, communicate with the court, but the court's expectations were not clear. This person's court appearance was moved to the county in which it was being heard to avoid further issue. The OCO was not able to establish that the staff intentionally caused these problems.	Unable to Substantiate
130.	Incarcerated individual believes they and another incarcerated person were wrongfully infringed. Believes correctional officer did not complete the infraction report properly: information was left out and it was written in a way that could be misleading. Incarcerated person believes they are being targeted because of their sexual orientation.	The OCO was unable to substantiate this complaint. The OCO reviewed the disciplinary record; there was no evidence available that would substantiate a claim of innocence.	Unable to Substantiate
131.	Incarcerated individual believes they and another incarcerated person were wrongfully infringed. Believes correctional officer did not complete the infraction report properly: information was left out and it was written in a way that could be misleading. Incarcerated person believes they are being targeted because of their sexual orientation.	The OCO reviewed the disciplinary record. There is no evidence available that would substantiate a claim of innocence. DOC was within policy to uphold the infraction.	Unable to Substantiate
132.	An incarcerated person would like the OCO to review why only one living unit at the facility pays their porters for five-hour shifts while other living units get paid for six-hour shifts. The person believes this is discriminatory.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO learned that the scheduled porter hours were agreed to in the Porters Expectations Form. This agreement was for five hours, five days a week. DOC 700.100 states that no porter can exceed 55 hours, and the compensation must be based on the facility's	Unable to Substantiate

budget. Although not scheduled for six hours like other living units, no porter exceeds the maximum. The individual gave no information to substantiate discrimination.

Washington Corrections Center			
133.	Incarcerated patient had been receiving mental health care while in jail, but care did not continue when he transferred to DOC custody. Patient says he is unstable and needs access to mental health care. Patient says he has tried to kite medical and has not received a response.	The OCO was able to provide assistance. The OCO alerted DOC mental health about this person's difficulty accessing services and his desire for a single cell. DOC staff agreed to review these concerns. Complainant later informed this office that he had been transferred to new parent facility and that he was able to properly access mental health services now.	Assistance Provided
134.	Patient says DOC staff are using medical care as a means of retaliation. He is being transferred to a facility for medical care despite declining further medical treatment.	The OCO was able to provide assistance. The OCO alerted DOC. DOC cancelled his transfer and he will remain at WCC.	Assistance Provided
135.	Family member of incarcerated person reported concerns about COVID-19 quarantine conditions for loved one with autoimmune disorder, including lack of heating.	Patient informed this office that no investigation was needed because he had transferred to a new facility.	Declined, Other
136.	Incarcerated person was relocated to a different unit because of testing positive for COVID. The cellmate of that individual remained in the same cell without the cell being properly disinfected and the cellmate was allowed in general population. DOC staff are not taking the appropriate measures and protocols to protect the health and safety of incarcerated individuals.	The OCO informed this person that this office is not opening investigations for individual cases in relation to DOC policies 410.030, 410.430, 410.050, 670.000 and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, OCO has been actively monitoring DOC's response to COVID-19, including preventative actions. This office has been gathering COVID-related information from incarcerated individuals and will make additional recommendations to DOC for further improvements where needed and as appropriate.	Information Provided
137.	Incarcerated person learned through his attorney that he had some negative behavior observation entries (BOEs) on his record, but says he was never notified of these negative BOEs when they occurred. Because he was not informed of them, he could not appeal them	The OCO reviewed past BOEs and was able to substantiate that he had not been notified. The OCO addressed similar concerns regarding BOEs in a 2019 investigation. The DOC committed to resolving these policy issues after OCO's	Information Provided

within appropriate timeframes. This person has filed grievances and appeals all the BOEs (in one appeal) but they have been denied.

2019 BOE report. The OCO informed this person that he may appeal each one individually.

138.	Incarcerated person grieved not receiving a paycheck. Resolution department found in his favor and stated that DOC would give him the money owed. However, the person has not yet received the money.	According to RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate unless the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve the concern through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. This office informed this person that the first step would be to appeal the grievance up to a level two. If the situation has not been resolved by that point, suggested he then contact our office and OCO staff may then be able look into the concern.	Information Provided
139.	Incarcerated individual is not being given a copy of their medical records.	The OCO sent letter in an effort to see if the person's situation has been resolved as the record request was pending. Provided information on how to contact our office again if their concern was not resolved and if they would like our office to open a case.	Information Provided
140.	Incarcerated individual is requesting assistance with his out-of-state transfer which was previously approved by headquarters. He was given a placement pending his transfer for 180 days and is still pending his transfer.	The OCO informed this person that his transfer has been approved by DOC, but out-of-state transfers require the approval of the accepting state, which has not come through yet. Relayed information that DOC will continue to monitor and will communicate with this person when that step has been completed.	Information Provided
141.	Incarcerated individual reports that the Custody Unit Supervisor (CUS) did not allow him to submit evidence documents during his disciplinary hearing. When a copy of all the documents was obtained, this person discovered a discrepancy in the days of good time lost. The number of days stated in the hearing was different than what was on paper. The CUS stated an error occurred during the hearing and that the person could appeal it. The incarcerated individual did submit an appeal and grievances but has not received any responses.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and determined that the appeal had been submitted and was still pending for these infractions. 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. This office informed this individual that they must first receive the outcome to the appeal before the OCO can open an investigation.	Information Provided

142.	Incarcerated person reports that another incarcerated individual leaked information about him so he is now in administrative segregation and has been there for months with no transfer plan. He is currently classified as medium custody.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and informed this person that he currently has a transfer order pending in the system to return to medium custody.	Information Provided
143.	Incarcerated person reports concerns about sentence calculations. He would like the county jail time that he served to be applied to his sentence correctly.	The OCO provided contact information explaining how to contact DOC records staff to request an explanation of how certified jail credits are applied.	Information Provided
144.	Incarcerated person would like a review of his earned release date (ERD) as it is different than what he had calculated.	The OCO provided information explaining how to contact DOC records staff to request an explanation of how their time was calculated with certified jail credits applied.	Information Provided
145.	Incarcerated person reports that he was supposed to receive suboxone through medical and never received his dose. He reports that he had been receiving suboxone every other day doses and was detoxing. Reports that DOC staff told him that the nurse had left but knew he had not received his dose. The incarcerated person then grieved and was told that records show that he received suboxone. He says that he experienced severe detox symptoms and alleges that medical records were falsified. He would like to be financially compensated for his losses including the difficulty dealing with staff and detoxing.	The OCO does not have jurisdiction over the tort claim process. OCO staff informed the incarcerated individual of the DOC tort claim process to pursue monetary compensation.	Lack Jurisdiction
146.	Incarcerated person participates in suboxone program. He reports receiving a kite which stated that DOC would remove anyone who had participated for more than a certain number of months from the program.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Lack Jurisdiction
147.	Incarcerated person states that meals are being served in melted Styrofoam containers and occasionally Styrofoam is melted into the food.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Lack Jurisdiction

148.	Incarcerated person reports that DOC is not honoring his 10 good days. He is not being released on time because the DOC failed to send out notifiers in a timely manner.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. Upon review of complaint and DOC 350.200, the OCO learned that the unit counselor was unable to submit this person's release plan until DOC headquarters completed supervision screening. Once the screening was complete the address was approved per DOC 350.200. A delay in HQ supervision screening may have caused a delay in the person's release date.	No Violation of Policy
149.	Incarcerated individual was infraacted for refusing a cell assignment, but claims they should not have been found guilty because they were being threatened by their cell mate.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO's review of the disciplinary packet revealed that the individual did not clarify to DOC staff who was threatening him.	No Violation of Policy
150.	Incarcerated person believes that they are being discriminated against because of their affiliation and prior infractions despite being found not guilty. This person believes that is the reason why they are being denied into the graduated reentry (GRE) or work release program.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. There is a basis for finding that DOC is following policies 390.590 Graduated Reentry and 300.500 Work/Training Release Screening. DOC 390.590 states that to be eligible a person must have served at least 12 months in total confinement in a state correctional facility. This person has served four and one-half months of total confinement in a correctional facility. Additionally, DOC 300.500 states that eligibility for work release requires that individuals must not have open felony warrants or misdemeanor warrants for unadjudicated criminal cases with bail set at \$5000 or higher. This person had two open warrants for unadjudicated misdemeanors set at \$8000.	No Violation of Policy
151.	Incarcerated caller reports that he was infraacted with a WAC 652 (group demonstration) and 720 (flooding) despite having nothing to do with the incident. He reports that he was just trying to keep the contaminated water out of his cell – he wasn't throwing anything or trying to contribute to the group incident. He says video evidence would corroborate his story.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed disciplinary materials and video footage. Unfortunately, the existing video could be interpreted as showing the caller participating in the riot, despite his alternate narrative. The DOC was within policy to uphold this infraction given the current low evidentiary standard.	No Violation of Policy
152.	Incarcerated person was placed on Dry Cell Watch for three days due to DOC's suspicion of contraband in or on his person. He was not allowed to grieve or get a pen and paper. He had to use the bathroom while	The OCO reviewed available information but was unable to determine any violation of policy. It appears that this Dry Cell Watch was within policy. There is no available	Unable to Substantiate

being watched, and reports it was a dehumanizing experience. He wants people to be treated more humanely while on Dry Cell Watch and wants DOC to use body scanners to detect contraband.

evidence to substantiate a claim that the policy was violated.

Washington Corrections Center for Women

153.	<p>Incarcerated patient requested information from Health Services about hormone replacement therapy. Patient reports medical expressed concerns regarding whether patient has adequate support in the community and questioned patient's age. Care Review Committee has indicated that it will not issue a decision until the patient makes a decision, but the patient reports that they have decided and that they have communicated this to medical, and yet medical continues to delay.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. This office substantiated delays in patient's access to treatment. The OCO notified facility and headquarters health services staff of these concerns and requested resolution. The OCO subsequently confirmed that patient had been approved for the requested treatment by the Care Review Committee.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
154.	<p>Incarcerated individual reported that they were using the rubber band-snap techniques they learned in therapy to help to manage stress. Person reports that a doctor came to the window and accused them of self-harm. The incarcerated person ignored the doctor. Then a team of correctional officers came into their cell and took them to the Close Observation Area (COA). The individual reports that they were not self-harming nor were they suicidal. They also reported that they were undressed while being recorded during the use of force.</p>	<p>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. Informed person the first step would be to file a grievance regarding the use of force concerns. Once they have received the response to the level one appeal, OCO staff may then be able look into the concern.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
155.	<p>Incarcerated person reports feeling targeted by DOC staff due to an incident that occurred over a year ago. Also reports discrimination due to sexual orientation.</p>	<p>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. Informed person they should appeal the non-medical grievances. Person can then contact this office and the OCO may then be able to look into the concern.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

156.	Incarcerated person believes that the requirement for male staff to announce their presence by ringing a bell at WCCW is anatomy-based discrimination and creates an unfair presumption of sexual preference. Believes this practice also discounts the risk of same sex assaults.	The OCO informed this person that this office would not open an individual case at this time. Per RCW 43.06C, the OCO cannot investigate a concern until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it via the grievance process, administrative action, or appellate process. The OCO informed this person that this topic may be reviewed for consideration for future systemic work.	Lack Jurisdiction
157.	Incarcerated patient reports that scoliosis is causing constant pain. Reports that they have requested an additional mattress and to be examined by an outside provider. Appealed DOC's decisions regarding mattresses and denial of evaluation by outside provider. Care Review Committee (CRC) denied these appeals.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO review determined DOC followed policy for the treatment and review of the case.	No Violation of Policy
Washington State Penitentiary			
158.	Incarcerated person reports that the MAX Custody Committee met and agreed to maintain him at maximum custody at WSP with a requirement to complete DOC Aggression Replacement Therapy (DOCART), which was scheduled to start in early to mid-May 2022. Person has been in the intensive management unit (IMU) since 2020 and has not completed programming because of COVID-19 restrictions that limit access to classroom-based programs in IMU.	The OCO provided assistance. OCO staff met with this person to discuss MAX custody placement and classification appeal process. During visit, OCO staff spoke with many other individuals who reported experiencing similar delays. After conversation, OCO staff notified DOC headquarters of this individual's concern as part of a group concern and requested that DOC determine a means for individuals waiting months to complete a mandatory MAX program (because of COVID restrictions). DOC's Housing and Case Management staff provided the OCO with details about the Hustle 2.0 pilot project they created to address the problem. It will allow incarcerated individuals to voluntarily enroll in an alternative in-cell program as an option to complete mandatory programming to help progress out of MAX custody sooner than originally planned. This individual is currently enrolled in the pilot project.	Assistance Provided
159.	Incarcerated individual, who has been in IMU since 2020, is concerned that he is not earning good time while in IMU. He has not completed programming because of COVID-19 restrictions that limit access to classroom-based programs and he feels he should be	The OCO provided assistance. OCO staff met with this person to discuss the MAX custody placement and classification appeal process. During visit, OCO staff spoke with many others experiencing similar delays. This office notified DOC headquarters about this individual's concern	Assistance Provided

earning good time. DOC's MAX Custody Committee recently agreed to maintain this person on MAX at WSP with a requirement to complete DOCART, which is scheduled to start in early to mid-May 2022.

as part of a group concern and requested that DOC determine a means for individuals waiting months to complete a mandatory MAX program (because of COVID-19 restrictions). DOC's Housing and Case Management staff provided the OCO with details about the Hustle 2.0 pilot project that will allow incarcerated individuals to voluntarily enroll in an alternative in-cell program as an option to complete a mandatory programing to help progress out of MAX custody sooner than originally planned. This person is currently enrolled in the pilot project. Regarding the good conduct time concern: DOC Policy 350.100 states that this person is not eligible to earn good time because he has served 20 days or more in one calendar month in Intensive Management Status. DOC staff communicated to this office that there is support for developing an exemption to policy for situations such as his. At time of case closure, OCO staff had suggested policy change to DOC leadership but no exemption has been published.

160.	Incarcerated patient has a health status report (HSR) for mechanic soft diet due to lack of teeth, but reports that kitchen is not following the diet. Patient says DOC gives him hard meals sometimes and will not provide an alternative despite the fact that he cannot eat it. He is concerned he is not getting full meals or the appropriate medical diet. Also requested ADA support for filing grievances, such as a typewriter.	The OCO provided assistance. This office alerted the HSR/diet concern to facility and headquarters and requested resolution. Subsequently confirmed that the kitchen had been notified of the HSR dietary need. Alerted facility ADA coordinator of this person's concern regarding filing grievances.	Assistance Provided
161.	Incarcerated patient reports that Health Services took him off medication for ongoing infection and that DOC is now telling him that, since he has been on the medication for a year and it's a viral infection, that he has been cured. DOC sent him to a specialist who indicated that this is not true and that the infection will not resolve as DOC describes. Patient also reports he is waiting to see DOC providers for other health concerns.	Patient called this office to close the case; he reported that he was able to see a doctor and that the issue is being investigated.	Declined, Other

162.	Outside complainant reports that incarcerated loved one is being held in IMU past the 30 sanctioned days. He is also not able to access the resolution program or any religious or mental health services.	The OCO provided information to the complainant regarding self-advocacy measures for them to relay to their loved one, including how to appeal the classification decision.	Information Provided
163.	Incarcerated person reports that DOC is medicating him against his will.	The OCO provided information to this person regarding how to file an appeal of the involuntary medication hearing if he has concerns about how the involuntary medication order was issued. Also alerted DOC mental health staff to this person's concern to ensure their awareness.	Information Provided
164.	Incarcerated person reports that the showers in the unit do not have any privacy; they are fully visible to two of the cells and everyone going up and down the stairs.	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. Informed this person that they should grieve the concern and contact this office again if the matter has not been resolved through the resolution program.	Information Provided
165.	Person reports that their incarcerated loved one was assaulted after DOC staff failed to properly re-classify him within the appropriate timeframes. She reports that he would not have been assaulted had he been in the correct custody. He is now in the intensive management unit.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. After a review of documents by this office, it appears that the classification process was handled correctly per DOC policy 320.250 Maximum Custody Placement/Transfer/Release. Appears that this person has been held in IMU for protection as a result of this assault. Also appears that a transfer order is in place and transfer should occur in the near future.	No Violation of Policy
166.	Incarcerated person was given a Notification of Restriction, restricting them from commissary, big yard, and weightlifting privileges. This was received after an incident that occurred out in the big yard, although this person was not directly involved in the incident. Because he socialized with the individuals who were involved, he too received that restriction as that is standard procedure. He believes he is being socially profiled even though he is not associated with either party involved.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. DOC policy 470.540 Group Violence Reduction Strategy (GVRS) defines the process for reducing violent incidents by using the strategy of issuing sanctions to all known close contacts of those involved in the violent incident.	No Violation of Policy

167.	Incarcerated person reports that the DOC took deductions from their stimulus check in error.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. It appears that the DOC has made deductions in compliance with the federal rulings related to stimulus checks.	No Violation of Policy
168.	Incarcerated person reports that staff stopped him on his way to the ice machine to get ice for swelling in his leg. Staff reminded him that he was not allowed out to dayroom. He explained that he had a health status report (HSR) for ice and needed to get some before the dayroom closed for the night. The CO asked him to prove that he has the HSR, so he went back to his cell to retrieve the paperwork. While in his cell, his cell door closed and locked. He used the in-cell intercom to request to be let out to get ice. The CO spoke to him using profane and degrading language and racial slurs. The person grieved this but DOC did not adequately investigate the incident.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy in the way the DOC responded to and investigated this incident. DOC facility leadership communicated to the OCO that a staff conduct investigation was performed per policy. It appears that, once notified of the allegation of racial slurs, DOC staff took appropriate actions per the DOC Resolution Program Manual page 14 and DOC 550.100 Resolution Program.	No Violation of Policy
169.	Incarcerated person reports that DOC confiscated some of his art supplies when he transferred. DOC states that the materials were taken away because they were not authorized, but person notes that the entire supply was purchased from other facilities and approved DOC vendors.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. It appears that, although the confiscated property is authorized by DOC, certain items are not allowed at WSP. Some items did not have proof of purchase and some items were in excess of what is allowed on the property matrix. Informed person that, if he can show proof of the purchase, he should provide that to the WSP property room and the confiscated items will be released. DOC has complied with DOC 440.00 (relating to personal property) as well as the facility Operational Memorandum banning tweezers and other sharp objects from WSP. Using the property disposition documentation provided when these things occur is the best way to be in communication with the facility property room to obtain property and/or receive information about why the items were confiscated.	No Violation of Policy
170.	Incarcerated person reports that the Indeterminate Sentence Review Board (ISRB) continues to deny him release due to PREA-related infractions. He reports that this violates his right to access PREA.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. A review of relevant documents showed that multiple factors were involved in the ISRB's decision finding him	No Violation of Policy

not releasable; it was not solely based on his infraction history.

171.	Incarcerated person reports that he has not received his property since he was transferred out of WSP. CBCC property staff report that they have not received any property. This issue has been unresolved for several months.	The OCO substantiated this person's concern but could not achieve his desired resolution of locating the property. DOC staff have looked at three facilities in an effort locate this person's property. One box was issued once he was released from the IMU. However, the second box could not be located. The OCO provided information to him regarding filing a tort claim with DES so that this situation could be investigated for possible compensation.	Substantiated
------	--	---	---------------

Abbreviations

The following are the full terms for abbreviations used in this report:

ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act

AHCC: Airway Heights Corrections Center

AO: (OCO) Assistant Ombuds

BOE: Behavioral Observation Entry

CI: Correctional Industries

CO: Correctional Officer

CRC: Care Review Committee

CRCC: Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

CUS: Correctional Unit Supervisor

DOSA: Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative

EFV: Extended Family Visit

ERD: Earned Release Date

HSR: Health Status Report

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

J&S: Judgment and Sentence

MCC: Monroe Correctional Complex

MCCCW: Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women

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

WSP: Washington State Penitentiary

Glossary

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.